

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Tuesday, December 11, 1973

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

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you and through you to the members of this Assembly 30 charming young ladies and good-looking young men from the constituency of Edmonton Avonmore. They are attending Grade 10 of St. Mary's High School and are accompanied by Father Newmann.

Would you please rise and be recognized by the Assembly.

FILING RETURNS AND TABLING REPORTS

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to file Sessional Paper No. 281.

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to file Sessional Paper No. 268.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Petroleum Marketing Act

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Mines and Minerals and ask him if it is still the government's intention to go forward at this session with Bill No. 95, The Petroleum Marketing Act?

MR. DICKIE:

Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CLARK:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Mines and Minerals. At what stage are the consultations with the federal government regarding PART 4 of the proposed legislation?

MR. LUDWIG:

Come on Bill.

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could advise the hon. member. The last meeting we had with the federal government on this matter - this is at the ministerial

level - went into some detail as to how the bill might be used. We are not in any way confident, Mr. Speaker, that we will, in fact, be able to work out a cooperative arrangement so that we can proclaim that section of the bill. Nevertheless it is our intention to try.

MR. CLARK:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Mines and Minerals. What is the reason for us not proceeding with second reading of the bill as soon as possible?

MR. DICKIE:

Well, Mr. Speaker, we will be. The Government House Leader will be dealing with that question and setting out the order for the bills. There is no particular reason why that bill isn't being proceeded with.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, could the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs advise the Assembly whether there has been discussion with federal officials respecting PART 4 subsequent to the introduction of Bill No. 95 on first reading.

MR. GETTY:

No there hasn't been, Mr. Speaker, other than providing them with the actual bill itself. I would imagine, Mr. Speaker, that these are items that could well be handled when the bill is up for debate in the House.

MR. TAYLOR:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. Has the federal government given any indication that it too will be establishing a marketing board?

MR. GETTY:

No, Mr. Speaker, I don't believe we [have] had that directly although, as I have mentioned to the House before, there are a great many off-and-on kinds of ideas which the federal government has expressed. They are a moving target, so to speak.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. I'm wondering, is there continuing consultation between staff of your department - or any other department - and the federal government departmental staff as it relates to this particular problem?

MR. GETTY:

Yes there is, Mr. Speaker.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question, if I may. Is this on a continuing basis or is there a hit-and-miss approach to it? What I'm really wondering, Mr. Speaker, because of the importance of the situation facing us, is: do our government and the federal government have their staffs discussing this matter on a continuous basis?

MR. GETTY:

I think it would be fair to say that they do discuss it on a fairly continuous basis, Mr. Speaker. It is not hit-and-miss, although sometimes there is an inclination to hit.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Could the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs or the Attorney General advise the Assembly whether or not we have received any information yet from the federal government, either at the ministerial level or at the administrative level, as to what their view is of the constitutionality of Section 4?

MR. GETTY:

We have not discussed the constitutionality, Mr. Speaker, and I would imagine that is something the hon. member may want to discuss during committee discussion of the bill, perhaps with the hon. the Attorney General.

MR. TAYLOR:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister. Would the government welcome the establishment of a federal marketing board in order that the two boards could work together in a non-partisan way?

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, the government would welcome a spirit of cooperation between the federal government and our marketing board. There is a variety of mechanisms that I could see they might use to do that.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary McCall followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View.

Federal Sales Tax

MR. HO LEM:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Mines and Minerals. Does the minister have information indicating whether or not Alberta coal companies have reduced the price of oil and gas at the retail and wholesale levels as a result of the federal government's recalculation of federal sales tax?

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, I read the announcement in the paper as to the reduction of price. Our department hasn't received any official notification on that but perhaps my colleague, the hon. Minister of Consumer Affairs, can answer that because he did deal with it in a telegram to the federal government.

MR. DOWLING:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we did have some communication with the federal authorities regarding this matter. They did remove 1.4 cents at the wholesale level for those areas east of the Ottawa Valley, and .8 cents for areas west of the Ottawa Valley. We have had no firm answers with regard to whether that amount of money has been passed on at the retail level at this time.

MR. HO LEM:

A supplementary to the Minister of Consumer Affairs. Is the minister doing any monitoring of prices at the wholesale and retail levels to ensure that the tax reduction is passed on to the consumer?

MR. DOWLING:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. We have a regular monthly survey done on wholesale and retail prices of gasoline through the Alberta Bureau of Statistics. These figures indicate, at the last release, that Alberta still pays the lowest price and has the lowest tax.

MR. NOTLEY:

A supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Consumer Affairs. Has the government any mechanism to force the companies to pass on the savings as a result of the reduction in federal sales tax?

MR. DOWLING:

Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member knows, the government has a great number of hidden powers which, at times, it is forced to use.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View followed by the hon. Member for Cypress.

---

Carillon Room

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Public Works. I have given him notice of the question, a notice that they are blocking off the ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. Could the hon. member come directly to the question please?

MR. LUDWIG:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. I wanted to clarify it to the minister. With regard to the carillon modification and the change in the carillon room, is the room going to be a bar for the ministers or a detoxification room?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Cypress followed by the hon. Member - unless the minister is particularly anxious to answer the question.

MR. LUDWIG:

He ought to know.

DR. BACKUS:

The answer is no to both questions.

MR. LUDWIG:

Supplementary, what is that thing, Mr. Speaker?

MR. HENDERSON:

Would the hon. minister then consider setting it up for the opposition?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Cypress followed ...

MR. LUDWIG:

What is that thing going to be now that they are changing it?

DR. BACKUS:

Well, Mr. Speaker, the proposal is that it will continue to be the carillon room. We believe the changes taking place will improve its function in this respect, namely that the actual carillon console will be turned in such a way as to give a side view to the audience - just as concert pianos are turned sideways - so that the audience will be able to see the carilloner performing.

The room, though, is being closed off on the one side so it can have a multi-purpose [function], also being used as a conference room, with the subsequent possibility that meetings can be held there at mealtime. Also, some of the furnishing in it will make it possible for dinner meetings to be held there, and so on.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Cypress followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Millican.

Energy Discussions - Participants

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs and ask him if he could give us the names of the individuals who are involved in the discussions with the federal government. If he could not give us the names or would not wish to do so, could he tell us how many people are involved, and if the same people are involved at all times in the discussions, as it relates to the subject of energy that we are particularly concerned about at this time?

MR. GETTY:

Well, it is difficult to limit the number, Mr. Speaker - I suppose it would be easier to give, perhaps, two or three who are in more continual discussion, because it often spills over to others - but I would say: the Executive Director of the Department of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs, Mr. McDonald; certainly my colleague, the Minister of Mines and Minerals' deputy minister, Dr. Mellon; and I'm certain my colleague's appointee to the international energy section of his department, Mr. Minion, is also in constant discussion with them.

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, I should perhaps supplement that and say that Wayne Minion from our department is the Executive Director of Energy Resources. In addition, there is a Hector McFadyen from the Energy Resources Conservation Board. They are appearing at the weekly meetings that have been set up by the federal government to deal with the technical advisory committee on the question of supply and demand of crude oil.

MR. STROM:

Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, and I'm not sure to which minister this should be directed. Are these men then involved in the hearings before the National Energy Board, and are they representing the province as people who are reporting back to the provincial government?

The second part of that question is, I would be interested in knowing, Mr. Speaker, whether or not they report back to an energy committee of the cabinet or to their respective ministers?

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, I think I've dealt with the representation of the government before the National Energy Board in the past, and it is generally not our intention to appear before a federal regulatory board. There may be some circumstances when, [because of] the particular nature of a hearing, we would have to break from that principle. It would be only on a specific, particular basis.

Other than that, Mr. Speaker, the officials of our department, and I'm sure those of my colleague, the Minister of Mines and Minerals, do keep a watching brief on the operations of the National Energy Board and do report back. And, in fact, there is an energy committee of cabinet.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary. Are any of these men who have been named sent to Washington to seek out information? I have in mind the statement made by the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs in regard to their willingness to get information from that source.

MR. GETTY:

Mr. McDonald, of the Department of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs, has been in Washington involved in one information-gathering venture and, Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure - perhaps my colleague Mr. Dickie may wish to advise, [since] the recent appointment of Mr. Minion, whether he's been able to get there yet or not.

MR. DICKIE:

No, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Minion hasn't had the opportunity yet. We have discussed that with him and perhaps in the near future he will be making a trip to Washington.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Millican followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Foothills.

---

Love Store

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question today to the hon. the Attorney General. It has to do with the broadcast aired last night that created quite a public stir. I'm referring to the CBC-TV program Hourglass and today's program on CBC radio regarding the proposed opening of a Love Store in Edmonton by the proprietor of a Love Store already operating in Calgary.

In view of the decision, Mr. Attorney General, of the Alberta courts in the case of the Queen v. Cardy, where the Crown successfully ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Could the hon. member please come directly to the question. The rather lovely preamble is getting a little long.

MR. DIXON:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, but in all fairness to the hon. the Attorney General, my statement has to hinge on my question. So I'm asking this: where the Crown successfully persecuted these cases and the Crown upheld that the merchandise was obscene, is the Attorney General planning to take steps to prosecute the proprietor and again seize the merchandise presently being offered for sale which has been ruled obscene by our Alberta courts?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I noticed that the honourable gentleman used the word "persecuted" rather than "prosecuted" and I don't know if that has any connection with the love theme of his question or not.

Mr. Speaker, I don't have any information on this particular topic that any other member of the Assembly doesn't have. All I can say to the honourable gentleman is that this matter will be dealt with in the same way as any other law-enforcement matter. If there is an apparent breach of the law, the department, I'm sure, will take the action here that it would take in any other case of an apparent breach of the law.

I conclude, Mr. Speaker, by saying that I hear in the background several volunteers to assist in the investigation and prosecution of this matter.

MR. DIXON:

My final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the Attorney General. If no action is going to be taken against these people, will Mr. Cardy be given his merchandise back so he can go back into business?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, that's clearly a hypothetical question. I don't think the honourable gentleman appreciates the position and I'll try again to explain it in as simple a fashion as I can.

The question here is simply whether there's a breach of the law. In the case the honourable gentleman referred to, it was brought before the courts, the courts decided that there was a breach of the law. No doubt that case will be a very important precedent when the members of the department are considering whether charges ought to be laid in the matter to which he's referring.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary ...

MR. TAYLOR:

Supplementary to the hon. Attorney General. Does anybody have to go to the love shops?

MR. SPEAKER:

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

---

Pheasant Scarcity

MR. McCRAE:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests. The closing of the pheasant season indicates a concern by the government with the scarcity of birds. Can the minister advise what plans the department has, first, to increase the number of birds, and second, to relieve the conditions contributing to the problem?

DR. WARRACK:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I really am very concerned about the level of pheasant population in the province. It has been declining for some time due to a lessening of habitat and this year a special problem occurred with the adverse weather in June.

As all members, I think, are aware, Mr. Speaker, this year we did not open the pheasant season for hen pheasants. In addition, when the cold weather struck in November, we closed this year's season two weeks early, on November 19 instead of the originally planned December 1.

I would also call member's attention to the "Buck for Wildlife" program and I would mention also that we are now planning a redevelopment of the Brooks pheasant hatchery. In those ways we're hoping to begin the long path back toward a proper pheasant population in the province.

MR. McCRAE:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Foothills with a supplementary, followed by the hon. Member for Little Bow.

MR. McCRAE:

Can the minister advise, sir, when the Brooks hatchery may be back in operation?

DR. WARRACK:

The hatchery at Brooks, Mr. Speaker, is presently becoming surrounded by the town of Brooks, which happily is growing in a very rapid and progressive manner these days.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Thanks to its MLA.

DR. WARRACK:

Because of that, we have to move the hatchery. What we're working on now, Mr. Speaker, is the redevelopment of the Brooks pheasant hatchery in conjunction with the major expansion taking place at the horticultural station in Brooks.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. Is the minister also considering the closing of the 1974 season?

DR. WARRACK:

If the hon. member is making that suggestion I'd be prepared to consider it.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Social Assistance Payments

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to either the Minister of Health and Social Development or the Minister Without Portfolio responsible for Northern Development.

Can the minister advise the Assembly whether the government has had an opportunity to investigate the dispute over social assistance payments in the Lesser Slave Lake communities of Faust and Driftpile?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, that subject had not directly come to my attention.

I would be pleased to look into whatever disputes are being referred to in the question and report back.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Has the government received any complaints with respect to social allowance payments in the province [claiming] that people are not receiving the maximum that they are eligible to receive and that in actual fact welfare officials are playing favorites?

MR. CRAWFORD:

No, Mr. Speaker. As a matter of fact, when the hon. member referred to the two communities by name, maybe what I should do is add that from an area - at least, [so] I understand - nearby the one the hon. member represents, there was a slightly different form of complaint. A petition was brought in indicating that some of the farmers felt that welfare was being dispensed rather too freely, and this is the part I'm not sure of, whether it's those specific two communities or not.

The complaint not being one that there was not enough being paid, I have asked a member of the department to go and interview the people who made the complaint. I believe that process is already under way.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, just a point of information to clarify my question for the minister.

My question didn't relate to the area that he mentioned, rather, to the complaint that I've received that in the communities of Driftpile and Faust along Lesser Slave Lake, that certain welfare officials had been cutting back on welfare payments to punish people who are considered troublemakers.

That's the reason I raised the question, and I'd like him to look into that.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I'll certainly look into that. I recognize it in the form of a question; it doesn't constitute an allegation. If it were an allegation, it would be a very serious one and certainly we have every interest in having something like that fully inquired into. Through the department, I undertake to get information on that.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Little Bow followed by the hon. Member for Clover Bar.

Day Care Centre - Alberta Vocational Centre

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Advanced Education. Is the government planning a day care centre in the Alberta Vocational Centre, here in Edmonton?

MR. FOSTER:

There is a day care centre in the vocational centre in Calgary and I understand discussions are under way for the establishment of one in Edmonton.



but I don't have up to date details on that subject. If the member would like, I could certainly get it and report to him.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Would the minister then consider having his department do a survey of the number of single parents who require day care services to continue their education at the present time at AVC?

MR. FOSTER:

Mr. Speaker, we are already looking into the question of day care facilities within those institutions for which the department has direct operational and management responsibility.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, supplementary to the Minister of Health and Social Development. In light of the Minister of Advanced Education's comments, is it the intention of the minister's department to change the arrangements for supporting day care in the Province of Alberta - in changing from the present arrangement through the preventative social service program?

MR. CRAWFORD:

No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Clover Bar followed by the hon. Member for Stony Plain.

Fort Saskatchewan Warden

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to address my question to the hon. Attorney General, in the absence of the Solicitor General, or you may farm it out to whomsoever you wish.

Mr. Speaker, is the Attorney General able to inform the House that the warden of the Fort Saskatchewan Correctional Institute has resigned?

MR. LEITCH:

I have no information at all on that topic, Mr. Speaker.

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, would the hon. Attorney General find out and inform the House if that is a fact?

MR. LEITCH:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. In the absence of the hon. Solicitor General, I would be pleased to get that information and pass it on to the hon. member.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Stony Plain followed by the hon. Member for Sedgewick-Coronation.

Big Game Hunting

MR. PURDY:

Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Lands and Forests. Will the minister's department consider having a draw system for American hunters hunting big game in Alberta, much the same as the government now controls the licence for antelope hunting for Albertans?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member has in fact made a representation, but perhaps the hon. minister might wish to comment on it briefly.

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member mentions, we are using that system for a number of big game species, not only antelope but Wainwright deer, and also Ya-Ha-Tinda elk and big game sheep.

I think it is one of the possibilities we need to look to in the future, Mr. Speaker. I might also note, while I am on my feet, that some of those suggestions were made during the course of the discussion on the resolution sponsored by the hon. member, Mr. Zander, and seconded by the hon. member, Mr. Trynchy, relative to big game populations in Alberta.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Legislature - Third Session

MR. SORENSON:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Premier. Could the hon. Premier inform the House as to the date, or the approximate date, of the opening of the third session of the Seventeenth Legislature?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, it was my intention to make a statement on that matter under Orders of the Day so I would be quite prepared to do it now.

It is the government's intention, provided there is not a change in the present schedule for the conference of first ministers on energy which is presently scheduled for January 22 and 23, to commence the third session of the Seventeenth Alberta Legislature on Thursday, March 7.

That date will be adjusted if we find, in the course of perhaps the next ten days to two weeks, that other first ministers are not able to attend the meeting date scheduled for January 22 and 23 and there is a postponement or a change in schedule. If that happens, I will undertake to communicate to all members of the Legislative Assembly by letter as to a changed date.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Millican followed by the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Consumer Affairs Deputy Minister

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question today to the Minister of Consumer Affairs. I was wondering if the Deputy Minister of your department has been appointed yet, Mr. Minister.

MR. DOWLING:

Mr. Speaker, he has not been. We are in the process next week of interviewing [a person] who we believe to be the right candidate, and I am hopeful that from that interview will come an appointment.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Leader of the Opposition followed by the hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest.

ETS Strike

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Manpower and Labour. What progress is being made in settling the transit strike in Edmonton?

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, not very much - not a great deal.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, I'm not accustomed to the minister's brevity.

A supplementary question, hopefully with the same brevity. Have the two groups, namely the city and its employees, met face to face this week?

DR. HOHOL:

Not to the best of my knowledge, Mr. Speaker. To the best of my knowledge they have not met face to face this week.

MR. CLARK:

A supplementary question, hopefully with the same brevity, Mr. Speaker. Will the minister become personally involved tomorrow?

DR. HOHOL:

I had not anticipated that I would be involved in that way specifically tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest followed by the hon. Member for Calgary McCall.

Separate School Boards - Assessment

MR. DRAIN:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Education. Is his department giving any consideration to bringing in legislation in the future to provide for a different formula for corporate assessment for separate schools?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I think that question was posed a few days ago and, as I indicated, the matter is under study by the department at the moment. We're looking forward to getting the advice of the Alberta School Trustees Association and the Provincial-Municipal Finance Council before determining where to proceed.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary McCall followed by the hon. Member for Drumheller.

Property Tax Reduction

MR. HO LEM:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Has the minister given consideration to legislation that would remove money spent on home improvement, up to \$2,500, from being assessed for property tax? This type of legislation is already in effect and working very well in other parts of Canada.

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, that is one of the many ways of reducing property taxes - for a certain class of property - that has been and will continue to be given consideration in an ongoing program.

MR. HO LEM:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. When will the minister make an announcement in this regard?

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, I've said this before, but as you know the emphasis in the first thrust of property tax reduction is now evident in the reduction of school assessment costs.

The broader aspect, via the recommendations made through our MLA task force, has been referred to the Provincial-Municipal Finance Council and it would be our hope, now that we have a pretty well-established pattern of property tax reduction and municipal assistance outlined for our municipalities, that rather than ad hoc in the manner that the hon. member suggested, perhaps we could take the broader outlook on the problem of provincial-municipal financing. But certainly taxation and assessment techniques, assessment equalization and ongoing problems of relief will be given continuing consideration.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Drumheller followed by the hon. Member for Sedgewick-Coronation.

#### School Facilities

MR. TAYLOR:

My question is to the hon. Minister of Education. Has the government issued any instructions to school boards, particularly in Edmonton, regarding community use of school gyms and school auditoriums?

MR. HYNDMAN:

No, Mr. Speaker, that is clearly a matter within the jurisdiction of local school boards. Throughout the province each of the 120 school boards have various policies regarding, in some cases, each of the junior high, elementary and other schools in their communities. So it is a matter within the jurisdiction of the board, I think, quite properly reflecting and taking the responsibility of trying to assess what people in its area wish in terms of community use.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Sedgewick-Coronation followed by the hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest.

#### Snowmobiles

MR. SORENSON:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development. Have there been any studies conducted on snowmobile noise in relation to hearing defects?

MR. CRAWFORD:

I would think so, Mr. Speaker. We have access to such studies through the division of the department that deals with industrial health, and they certainly deal with the question of noise. I would be glad to look into the question of snowmobiles from that point of view.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest.

MR. DRAIN:

Mr. Speaker, I've asked my question. Thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview.

#### Public Housing - Edmonton

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. the Premier. In light of last night's resolution by city council concerning the ultimate ownership of public housing, is the Premier prepared to meet with officials from the city concerning this matter, and has he received representation from the city as to a meeting date?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I'll refer that question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, I must admit I was a little surprised on reading the news item concerning last night's decision, or request, by Edmonton City Council because it is only really within the last few days that members of the Executive Council did agree to meet with a working committee of the AUMA. Mayor Dent, the vice-president of that association was present at the meeting when those plans were made, so I would expect that we could achieve Edmonton's objectives at that same meeting, yet at the same time have the added advantage of involving other interested municipalities as well.

MR. NOTLEY:

A supplementary question to the hon. minister, Mr. Speaker. Do I take it from your answer that the government will not be meeting specifically with Edmonton, but will only consider this question in relationship to a larger meeting with the AUMA?

MR. RUSSELL:

I don't think that's a fair conclusion to reach, Mr. Speaker, because certainly we have always attempted to meet with any municipality when they wanted to.

However, it is a province-wide problem. We have already agreed to meet with a working committee, representing all municipalities, through their association and it would be my guess that that would be a productive way to proceed.

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to advise the House of the business this evening. We will begin tonight at 8:00 o'clock with committee study of Bill No. 97, The Gas Utilities Amendment Act, followed by committee study of Bill No. 94, The Mines and Minerals Amendment Act, and if we complete those this evening then we'd move tomorrow, Wednesday, to second reading of The Petroleum Marketing Act.

#### WRITTEN QUESTIONS

[The Clerk called out Question No. 294 standing in the name of Mr. Dixon.]

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I'd ask that that question be held until the hon. Minister of Agriculture returns to the House which he should do within a matter of half an hour or so. Perhaps we could then take up this question between two of the resolutions that will be debated this afternoon.

MR. SPEAKER:

Is the House prepared to agree to the suggestion of the hon. Government House Leader?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

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

With regard to "A Guide to Programs of Assistance in Alberta" published by the Bureau of Public Affairs;

1. What was the total and per unit cost of production?
2. How many copies were produced?

3. How many have been distributed as of December 3, 1973?
4. What provincial department initiated the program, and for what purpose?
5. Has the program been advertised, and if so how, and what was the cost?
6. List the distribution by categories.

MR. PEACOCK:

That is acceptable, Mr. Speaker.

296. Mr. Ludwig asked the government the following question:

With regard to a public inquiry by A. M. Harradence, Q.C., pursuant to Order in Council 1295/73:

- (1) How many members of the Harradence Commission were engaged by and paid for by the Alberta government? Please provide names of each.
- (2) Has the Solicitor General been provided with a transcript of evidence, taken at the inquiry?
- (3) Will the transcript of evidence of the commission hearings be provided to members of the Legislature?
- (4) Would the minister advise when the findings of the commission will be submitted to her?
- (5) Will the report of the said commission be tabled in the Legislative Assembly?
- (6) What were the per diem rates of pay to each member of the commission, including the chairman?
- (7) Were rates of pay to the chairman and to those commission members engaged by the government communicated to the members of the commission before each was engaged?
- (8) What is the total cost of the hearings, to date?

MR. LEITCH:

We accept the question, Mr. Speaker.

#### MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

##### 1. Committee of the Whole.

Assembly in committee for the consideration of the report on House Rules.

[Mr. Speaker left the Chair.]

\* \* \* \* \*

[Mr. Appleby in the Chair]

#### COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:

The Committee of the Whole Assembly will now come to order.

As I remember, we had finished the section-by-section consideration of the Rules Report and we were then presented with a motion of amendment by the hon. member, Mr. Henderson regarding Rule 24. That is the stage we are at right now.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Chairman, just to pick up quickly from where we left off, I was pointing out to the House that 24(1) as in the proposed report contained a change from [a] previous rule; that following a ruling by the Speaker that an emergency

debate might be in order, the report recommended that: "Mr. Speaker, shall then rule on whether or not the motion is in order."

I think that is the simplest way to do it here.

If he rules in favour of the motion, he will put the question, "Shall the debate proceed?" to a vote of the House. Such a motion must have majority agreement of the House.

That constituted a change from the way the rule stands now which only required 15 members to stand in favour of the debate.

I pointed out to the House that the change from 15 members in favour of the debate to a majority was contemplated on the expectation of some development on Thursday afternoon, the Leader of the Opposition having certain prerogatives. I suggested to the House, since that didn't materialize, that this amendment, the recommendation of the committee report, was in keeping with the recommendation that the House Rules should remain in this regard as they now stand.

I think the Chairman has the draft of the amendment which I wouldn't propose to read further.

MR. BENOIT:

... [Inaudible] ... myself as being highly in favour of the amendment that has been suggested.

[The amendment was carried.]

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Chairman, I believe, insofar as that completes consideration of Volume II and all the amendments which have been made, I would move, seconded by the hon. Provincial Treasurer, that the Standing Orders as set out in Volume II of the Report of the Select Committee on House Rules, and as amended in Committee of the Whole, be adopted by this Assembly.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Chairman, in commenting on the motion just made by the hon. Government House Leader, it is the understanding, isn't it, that the changed rules will be in operation really through the 1974 session?

At the end of the 1974 fall session, if my memory serves me correctly, there will be a legislative committee set up to assess the pros and cons with a view in mind of that committee reporting back to the House, and some final determination being made then as to the new rules becoming permanent or [being] modified, and then becoming permanent.

MR. KING:

Mr. Chairman, I think that was contained in Standing Order No. 92 which was one of the amendments we adopted at our last discussion.

MR. HYNDMAN:

I move that the committee rise and report.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:

I believe the motion made by the hon. House Leader that the Standing Orders, as set out in Volume II of the Report of the Select Committee and as amended, be adopted by this Assembly. We have to vote on that.

[The motion was carried.]

[Mr. Deputy Chairman left the Chair.]

\* \* \* \* \*

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

MR. APPLEBY:

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has under consideration the Report of the Standing Committee on House Rules, and the following motion has been passed: that the Standing Orders as set out in Volume II of the Report of the Select Committee on House Rules, and as amended in the Committee of the Whole, be adopted by this Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER:

Having heard the report, do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. Provincial Treasurer, that the resolution just reported by the Chairman of Committee of the Whole concerning Assembly rules be concurred in.

[The motion was carried.]

MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS (CONT.)

2. It was moved by Mr. Ruste, seconded by Mr. Sorenson:

Be it resolved that, the Government of Alberta make representations to the federal government requesting that the capital gains on the sale of a farm by parent(s) to their child (children) be exempt from tax the same as is being done on the death of a parent, in order to assist in the preservation of the family farm.

MR. APPLEBY:

Mr. Speaker, as the hon. members of the Assembly are probably well aware, some considerable time has elapsed since this motion was first presented to the Assembly, and also since it was debated in the Assembly.

I wish to express my appreciation to Mr. Sorenson, who seconded the original motion, for bringing me up to date, and I referred back to Hansard to see what had been said.

I note in the issue of Hansard of April 17, that the hon. Minister of Agriculture at that time, in speaking on this debate, mentioned the fact that part of the original intent of this resolution had already been resolved by recent amendments to legislation existing in the House of Commons in Ottawa.

However, if we read the resolution, we see that it does refer to assistance and preservation of the family farm. I think that all members of the Legislature, Mr. Speaker, have a direct responsibility when we consider this aspect of the resolution. Certainly we should do anything we can that might persuade Ottawa to give us some assistance in preserving the family farm and this might be an opportune time to present such a request to them.

As we all know, Mr. Speaker, before this resolution was presented in the House, a great many programs of benefit - and very significant types of programs - had been presented, not only by the Minister of Agriculture, but by other ministers in the Executive Council as well, to assist in developing the family farm and in preserving the rural way of life in Alberta.

Since this resolution was first debated, Mr. Speaker, there have been a number of other programs introduced by various ministers which have the same objective in view, and that is the maintenance of the rural way of life in Alberta.

To mention some of these, Mr. Speaker, I think first in importance is the fact that the hon. Minister of Telephones and Utilities has, since this resolution was first introduced, been able to announce the rural gas policy which has had a very far-reaching and widely beneficial effect on rural life in Alberta. This program is now well under way and many rural homes and many rural farms are feeling the benefit of it already.



The only unfortunate thing at the present time, as the minister mentioned in the House a few days ago, is the fact that we may be faced with a shortage of plastic pipe and this could cause, during this coming year, some curtailment of the program. However, we hope that this problem may be overcome and that the program can proceed as quickly as possible.

The same minister, Mr. Speaker, has also proceeded with a very far-reaching and extensive program in extending rural telephone services and making the toll-free area much larger in many cases so that rural subscribers would have service into a centre where they could get many essential services that they were not able to contact without having to pay long-distance tolls before.

This will have a very significant effect on rural communities, and I think it's going to fulfill a need that should have been very apparent when the original buried cable program was first being planned in this province. In some areas exchanges were set up which are now found to be beyond the area where the extended service can presently be included in a service centre. Some of these exchanges, in my opinion, should never have been set up in the first place.

Under the Department of Agriculture and the Minister of Agriculture during the last year, we had the Future Farmers of Alberta program. This has been very well received and, in fact, I think it has had something to do with the numbers we have in the 4-H program in Alberta this year. We have the highest number of 4-H members in Alberta that we've ever had; something like 12,000 or more. Of course, some of the credit for this also has to go to the Minister of Culture, Youth and Recreation, who has introduced some very enthusiastic policies to assist in promoting the 4-H program which is now under his department.

MR. SPEAKER:

With great respect, the Chair has some difficulty in relating the 4-H program to the topic which is under discussion in Resolution No. 2.

MR. APPLEBY:

Mr. Speaker, I was referring to the preservation of the family farm and the programs that are in effect with regard to assisting in the preservation of the family farm. This is included in the motion.

MR. SPEAKER:

If the Chair understands the motion, the preservation of the family farm is to be achieved by the removal of a capital gains tax.

MR. APPLEBY:

Mr. Speaker, I'm trying to point out to you and to the Assembly that if we do not have the family farm we will not have the problem of trying to pass on the family farm from the parent to the child. The capital gains tax then would not be a significant feature we would have to consider.

We are well aware in this province I think, Mr. Speaker, of the fact that severe weather conditions during this past fall have considerably restricted the harvest in some parts of Alberta, particularly in the North. Our Minister of Agriculture has recognized this fact and has introduced programs of assistance to these farmers with snowed-under crops.

There have been many other programs, Mr. Speaker, which have been aimed at preserving the family farm so that it can be passed on from parents to children in the future. These have all been very beneficial programs. If we can get some assistance from the federal government in continuing to create and promote this type of program it will be very useful to all of us.

In supporting the resolution, Mr. Speaker, and in concluding my remarks, I'd like to point out that the programs introduced in Alberta have had as much flexibility as possible in order that they could be adjusted to meet unforeseen conditions and contingencies. Too often many programs introduced by governments have been placed within such restrictive legislative and regulatory guidelines that they are of little practical value. So if we can persuade the federal government to give some assistance in this respect, Mr. Speaker, I think the resolution will be worthwhile.

Thank you.

MP. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, very briefly, I'd just like to make a couple of comments on the resolution. First, I think that all hon. members are aware that from the beginning the Government of Alberta has indicated at finance ministers' meetings and first ministers' conferences at the time tax reform and tax revision were being debated in Canada that the taxation of capital gains in general was not valid where we were in a situation of encouraging a higher degree of Canadian and Alberta ownership. The federal government chose, of course, not to pursue that course, but, in fact, implemented a capital gains tax.

Secondly, with respect to the particular question my colleague, the hon. Minister of Agriculture, wrote to the Minister of Finance for Canada, the Minister of Finance, I believe, in the spring budget of this year, approximately indicated, in response to the concern of my colleague as well as the concerns of other provincial governments and ministers of agriculture, that capital gains on the passing of a farm from parent to son or daughter would, in fact, be exempt from tax. So there have been continuous representations made in this area to the Minister of Finance for Canada at finance ministers' meetings as well as by my colleague, the Minister of Agriculture.

In view of this, I certainly have no objection, and I'm sure my colleague, the Minister of Agriculture, does not object either, to writing to the Minister of Finance. I see nothing wrong with the resolution in that it states that an exemption be asked for on capital gains on the sale of a farm by parents to their child or children.

The only possible consideration that the hon. member who moved the resolution might consider is that the word "exempt" be changed to "deferred" until the point of sale if the farm were sold outside the family. In other words, if the farm passed from the father to the son, Mr. Speaker, or was sold by the father to the son, the difference in price, or what might be considered the gain then, would not realize a tax until the farm had been sold outside of the family.

This would be a deferral rather than an exemption, which would probably be more favorably received by the federal government. But that's just a suggestion, if the hon. member wishes to consider it. Otherwise I'm sure my colleague, the Minister of Agriculture, and I are prepared to write a letter based on the resolution the way it is worded now.

MR. SPEAKER:

May the hon. member conclude the debate?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. RUSTE:

Well, Mr. Speaker, it's certainly some time since this resolution was drafted, and it is some time since it was debated the first time. Many things have happened since, of course.

I'd just like to read the resolution in its entirety for the benefit of the members:

Be it resolved that, the Government of Alberta make representations to the federal government requesting that the capital gains on the sale of a farm by parent(s) to their child (children) be exempt from tax the same as is being done on the death of a parent, in order to assist in the preservation of the family farm.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that the preservation of the family farm is the item we are trying to get at. I appreciate the comments made by the Provincial Treasurer in his reference to deferring. Having studied this matter further since it was first debated I would like in the closing debate to refer this to the Provincial Treasurer and possibly the Minister of Agriculture to consider in their negotiations with the federal government. If we mean the preservation of the family farm, and if we mean to give a break to that family farm being transferred - for example where it's transferred in the family continuously for, say, five generations - what will happen at the end of the fifth generation when that individual, son or daughter, through some illness or through some condition in the family, has to part with the family farm as such?

I submit, Mr. Speaker, they will be left with a tax load at that time that isn't suitable if we mean what we say about preserving the family farm.

Certainly there should be qualifications or protections made so that somebody down the road doesn't sell the family farm after having had it transferred tax free from the capital gains. But I maintain that if we mean this, evaluation day should move from December 31, 1971 on to the date of sale in that case. If there is, in another case, a second sale, then it should move on to that point in time, and even the third. As Mr. Turner pointed out in his debate on this in the House of Commons, the value of the farmer's land is often subject to fluctuations which may have little bearing on the real value of the farm as such.

This is a point I want to make, Mr. Speaker, and I would ask that the Provincial Treasurer and others who are involved keep this in mind when they discuss this matter with the federal government.

I think that the young people of today are going to look at this. We have the family. They're looking at dad. Is it going to pay me to go into this? Let's look at it where we transfer it in the second, third or fourth generation. Young individuals can [ask,] what am I obligated to in the matter of taxes?

I think this is pretty important and in closing this debate I would ask the minister - certainly it is my understanding and I think the Minister of Agriculture referred to it when he entered the debate that he believed it was last night that it was cleared through the House of Commons. This was, in fact, several weeks ago now.

So I understand that what we have asked for here is in effect. But I would ask further that the valuation date be moved from the one that we know as December 31, 1971 on to the time of the sale from the father to the son or to whomsoever it might be, and on subsequent sales as long as it stays within the family. For I would hate to be a young person, 50, 60, 70, 80 or 90 years from now, having taken over a farm, then through illness or some family situation be faced with a large tax payment to make because I have taken over a family farm.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

[The motion was carried.]

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, as previously agreed, I move that we now revert to Question 294.

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the hon. Government House Leader have the consent of the House to revert to Question 294?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

#### WRITTEN QUESTIONS (CONT.)

294. Mr. Dixon asked the government the following question:

What is

- (a) The total amount of provincial funds spent in the Constituency of Whitecourt from November 1, 1972 to October 31, 1973?
- (b) The amount of provincial funds spent on highway construction, economic assistance and hospitals in the Whitecourt Constituency from November 1, 1972 to October 31, 1973?
- (c) The name of each village and the amount of money received for village utilities in the Constituency of Whitecourt from November 1, 1972 to October 31, 1973?
- (d) The total amount of provincial government money spent in the provincial Constituency of Barrhead, from November 1, 1972 to October 31, 1973?

1. The total amount of money spent on highway construction from November 1, 1972 to October 31, 1973?
- (e) The total amount of provincial money spent in the Constituency of Smoky River from November 1, 1972 to October 31, 1973?
  1. The total amount of money spent on highway construction from November 1, 1972 to October 31, 1973?
- (f) The total amount of provincial money spent in the Spirit River-Fairview Constituency from November 1, 1972 to October 31, 1973?
  1. The total amount of money spent on highway construction from November 1, 1972 to October 31, 1973?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, in response to this question, as has been pointed out in the House before, it's very difficult providing details of funds on a constituency basis. Therefore, I would suggest an amendment to Question 294, not in any way to restrict the information that might be available, but to make it easier to assemble and to place it before the hon. member that much faster.

In general, the amendment is a long one. But in general it deletes the word "constituency" in each case and replaces it with the name of the county and the improvement districts that are involved in each area.

I would therefore move - and I've given the mover of the question a copy of the amendment as well as sent one to the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER:

Is the House familiar with the amendment proposed by the hon. Minister of Agriculture?

MR. DRAIN:

Mr. Speaker, would you kindly read it. I've been out for a moment.

MR. SPEAKER:

The amendment, moved by the hon. Minister of Agriculture and Deputy Premier, seconded by the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs is that Question 294 be amended:

1. In paragraph (a), by deleting the words "Constituency of Whitecourt" and replacing them with the words "County of Lac Ste. Anne and Improvement Districts 14 and 15".
2. In paragraph (b), by deleting the words "Whitecourt Constituency" and replacing them with the words "County of Lac Ste. Anne and Improvement Districts 14 and 15".
3. In paragraph (c), by deleting the words "Whitecourt Constituency" and replacing them with the words "County of Lac Ste. Anne and Improvement Districts 14 and 15".
4. In paragraph (d), by deleting the words "provincial Constituency of Barrhead" and replacing them with the words "Counties of Barrhead and Lac Ste. Anne and Improvement Districts 15 and 17".
5. In paragraph (e), by deleting the words "Constituency of Smoky River" and replacing them with the words "M.D. of Smoky River and Improvement Districts 16 and 17".
6. In paragraph (f), by deleting the words "Spirit River-Fairview Constituency" and replacing them with the words "Municipal Districts of Spirit River, Fairview and Peace River and Improvement Districts 19, 20 and 21".

As the Chair understands it, it is not provided in Rule No. 29 that such a motion be debated. Unless an hon. member wishes to raise a point of order in this regard, I would propose to put the motion without debate.

MR. DIXON:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, to clarify things. I have no objection to the change in my resolution. The only point I would like to make is that I tried to get constituencies that were basically of the same population. As long as the change doesn't throw out the populations to a great extent it will be the same thing that I'm trying to get at.

[The motion as amended was agreed to.]

MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS (CONT.)

3. It was moved by Mr. Wyse, seconded by Mr. Ludwig.

Be it resolved that this Assembly give consideration to extending premium free Medicare to persons forced to retire before the age of 65 years because of ill health.

MR. ZANDER:

Mr. Speaker, continuing from where I left off last April 26 - it has also been a long time since this resolution [was debated]. You have to go back into Hansard to see what was spoken and what points were brought out in the debate.

Mr. Speaker, relating to the resolution, I think I dwelt mainly in the area of those under the age of 65 who were afflicted with incurable diseases such as cancer and others. Primarily, I think, I related it to cancer.

In the past year and since this resolution appeared, many of us have seen people, constituents and members of our own families, who have been afflicted with the dreadful diseases. Before that they have been relatively, modestly rich or well off. They were able to take care of their children. I recall three cases in the past year, Mr. Speaker, where the age was less than 40 years.

These people had not intended to become victims of cancer. You could class them as being people who were just in the prime of life. They had sufficient, and had probably also set some aside for a rainy day for the use of their family. Suddenly, afflicted by cancer, they became victims of social allowance. Many people have pride, Mr. Speaker, yet you have to tell the family that they must go to social assistance for aid because the family has no clothes, no food. It doesn't take long, Mr. Speaker, for any family to become destitute in cases where the breadwinner of the family, or not even the breadwinner [is ill.] It saps the financial ability of any family who is afflicted with these diseases.

In viewing three cases last year in my constituency, Mr. Speaker, I have come to the conclusion that society as a whole and we as a province, certainly have a responsibility to those who are afflicted with such dreadful diseases for which apparently there seems to be - at least at this time - no apparent cure. Society as a whole must accept the responsibility - whether it's government or any segment of society - that these children left from the family receive at least an equal share of the province's prosperity.

We can easily say that we are not our brother's keepers at some times. We sometimes overlook that we really are, and we refer them generously to the social allowance branch. Many people have, in fact, become addicts of social allowance - if you will call them that, Mr. Speaker - as I have noticed in the past few years.

But most of these people are proud people. They and their families are dependent solely on themselves. Then comes a time when they even refuse to go on social assistance when there seems to be no other way. Yet we, as some people have mentioned, call them freeloaders. But if you go back into the history of the family, you find that they're really not freeloaders. They're deserving of the little bit of life that we can possibly give them.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think probably I was rather reluctant to say what I have to say, but I believe that our medical men in the province, and as a matter of fact, in the whole of Canada and the United States, have done a lot for society and have given a lot of their time and energy towards the unfortunates of this world.

But I came across four cases this summer. They were not in my constituency. They happened to be in the city of Calgary. Following the history of those people, I can only say, Mr. Speaker, that our society - and maybe it's the

medical profession that we have in Canada and the United States - does not permit that type of medical practice being practised now. Then there are some Canadian doctors, some American doctors, practising in Mexico today, who are refused a license in Canada and Alberta and also in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, it amazes me that in some of these cases which have come out there is proof beyond any doubt that some of these people - medical men - who are refused practice in the Province of Alberta and also in Canada and the United States, are bringing about something like 70 per cent cures that our medical men fail to recognize within our own province.

Briefly, Mr. Speaker, I can only refer you to one case that I know of definitely, and that involved a lady who was given exactly three months to live. [Her husband], an executive of an oil industry in Calgary, took leave of absence from his job and went to Mexico for one year with his family. Many of us can't afford that, and I don't think even he could. Certainly they came back and there's evidence today - the family is there if anybody wishes to go to talk to them - that now after the lady had been given only three months to live, almost two years have passed since her treatment. Since they returned there is no evidence of cancer within that lady who is in Calgary now.

I'm saying this, Mr. Speaker, because perhaps in looking at the professions, all professions, but in particular medicine, I do believe that from time to time there is a revolution going on in the profession itself. Certain groups of medical men object to practices of other medical men. But I do believe that we as a government, if it is humanly possible, should get some of these people who are just in their prime of life to receive that treatment. If there's any way that we can do it, then we as a government should have a look at it. I hope that the Minister of the Department of Health and Social Development will. If he wishes, I will supply him with the names of these people.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I think in looking at the total it is true and it has been said that you can waive the medical premiums as assistance because these people can't pay their premiums. This is a fine gesture. I don't think these people are looking for that. I think sometimes it becomes necessary that we go beyond this.

Our physically handicapped also, Mr. Speaker - we have in the past year or two made great strides forward in giving these unfortunates, at least the families and the individuals, much better treatment than had been given to them before. If these are also a responsibility of society, then, Mr. Speaker, I think the unfortunates, those that are afflicted by these dreadful diseases, must also become a responsibility - if not of society as a whole, of Canada and Alberta - but certainly a responsibility of this Legislature.

MR. KING:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make a few remarks about the resolution which is before us this afternoon, and advise my hon. friend from Drayton Valley that he is lucky I got to my feet before my doctor friend from Edmonton Kingsway.

There was some muttering about some of those remarks.

Mr. Speaker, the first thing I think I must say is, that while I can appreciate that the mover of the resolution is a freshman in the Legislature, as I am - and I guess we both have the same kinds of problems - the motion was seconded by someone who claims considerable experience. I wish that he had used some of his experience to advise the mover of the resolution in the drafting of it. Because I'm not sure that the hon. member will have achieved anything very considerable by the time the debate is concluded.

The resolution says that, "this Assembly give consideration ... " - not that the department should, or not that the government should, but only that we should. I presume that we will have considered it sufficiently by the time the debate is concluded and the vote is taken, and there is no further step which will result from all of the debate that might take place in the House this afternoon or that took place on the earlier occasion.

The other thing that concerns me, about which I would like to speak this afternoon, is the narrowness of the resolution. It's a state of affairs not unique to this resolution, but it reflects a problem that I think has often arisen and often been embodied in government programs, both in this province and in other jurisdictions.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution suggests that there should be extended to people under 65 one of the same programs which is available to people over 65.

I would like for just a moment, if I could, to run through some of the programs available to people over 65 and suggest by extension what might be a problem that we would create for ourselves if we were to follow the recommendation of this resolution. I'll just restrict myself to dealing with programs that have been developed since 1971.

In 1972, when the home-owners' tax discount was still in effect, the provincial government increased the amount of the discount that was available to senior citizens. This was followed in 1973 by the Property Tax Reduction Plan which, although it applied to every resident of the province, gave some preferential consideration to senior citizens, whether they were owners or renters of property. In addition to the tax assistance that has been provided to senior citizens, we have instituted premium-free medicare for senior citizens.

On October 24 of this year we announced extended health care, which included the supply of prosthetics, glasses, dentures, hearing aids, crutches, wheel chairs, and a number of other things which senior citizens might need. At the same time we announced that we would be providing henceforth \$10 per month to every senior citizen in the province who qualified for the guaranteed income supplement of the federal government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I hasten to add that I am a member of the government which has done these things, and I have supported them because I don't think there is any question that much of the prosperity, much of the social wellbeing of this province, is the direct result of the work that has been done by these elderly people in our province for years and years and years. As a young person, I have no hesitation in saying that I think the contribution of senior citizens has long gone unrecognized, or been insufficiently recognized.

But these approaches to a problem have been satisfactory in my view because they apply only to a very limited population - limited in terms of its size.

The problem that is created when we consider the extension of any one or all of these programs downward, is a problem to which governments have been addressing their minds for years and years and years. On the special select committee of The Workmen's Compensation Act, one of the things we were concerned about was something which is referred to as the redistribution of income. The Department of Health and Social Development, the Department of the Provincial Treasurer, the Department of Labour through the guaranteed minimum wage - these and a lot of other departments are concerned about the redistribution of income.

How do we guarantee to every resident of the province sufficiency of the necessities of life that they can lead a decent life and, hopefully, a socially useful life in the province? There are two ways in which it can be done.

One is to redistribute income. That is, to take away from the well-to-do and give to the less well-to-do through any one of a variety of means; the guaranteed annual income, the negative income tax, the second income plan - any one of these or an even larger number.

The second way in which you can do it is to redistribute essential services.

Third, of course, is to redistribute a combination of income and essential services.

What is involved when we discuss the question of redistribution? There is not only the mechanical way in which we are going to do it but also the consequences of it for the individual.

I know that in an examination of welfare, social allowance in the province for example, the question constantly before us is whether or not we should give people money and let them go out and buy services or alternatively, give them the services so that they don't have any money to misspend.

This basically is a question that has been raised in the resolution of the hon. member opposite. If there are people under 65 who for one reason or another - and the specific reason he refers to is ill health - are unable to look after themselves, then he suggests the government has a responsibility to assist them. That is something with which I certainly agree, as I think do all members on this side of the House.

But we then get into a more complex point. We then get into the question of determining how that assistance is going to be provided. Mr. Speaker, the concern I have is that we should not assume that because the method of

redistributing services has been wholly or partially successful in dealing with the problems of senior citizens, the same method of redistributing services would be as successful in dealing with younger people, that is, those people under 65.

It is a concern of mine, not because one group is younger than the other and I think that is going to make a difference, but because one group is substantially larger than the other. And not only is it larger now, but its boundaries are really ambiguous. When you talk about somebody under 65 years of age, how much under 65 years of age? Now certainly in this case we are talking about anybody of any age who can't work because of ill health. But we are talking about a foot in the door. We are talking about one kind of program when many similar kinds of programs are being provided to people over 65.

Is there going to be another resolution similar to this next year that advocates tax exemptions to people under 65 because they can't work, or that would advocate \$10 per month or any amount of money per month to people under 65 because they can't work?

The thing that concerns me is that this seems to me to be another example of the patchwork kind of approach that has been taken, I would say, particularly by the federal government, and that has resulted in all kinds of special programs for special interest groups and special transfers.

Mr. Speaker, both in considering The Worker's Compensation Act and the review of welfare which is presently taking place in the province, you discover that from the federal government there is available the old age security, the guaranteed income supplement, the Canada Pension Plan, specialty pensions from the Department of Veterans Affairs, and unemployment insurance, to mention only a few. Family allowance is another example that can't be omitted.

You then go to the provincial level and you discover that for a variety of people in a variety of different situations, there are all of the plans I have already mentioned for people over 65. There is, in addition, the property tax reduction plan for which everyone is eligible. There is workmen's compensation and there is social allowance. And if you go to the municipal level you discover that there are more transfer programs, transferring either money or services to individuals. Preventive social services and social assistance are two prominent examples.

The thing that concerns me is that all of these programs were implemented one at a time. All of them were implemented to deal with a specific problem which was considered to be real and important at the time that step was taken. And the consequence of implementing these programs, one at a time, over a number of years has been an administrative cost which is almost beyond comprehension. It has been the very odd, yet important, fact that in spite of this proliferation of programs there are still people who today have very real social problems for which no program of assistance exists.

In spite of this proliferation, every member of this Assembly knows people in his constituency or people in the province who fall down between chairs - and the ladies know it as well, the ladies perhaps better than any of us. But in spite of this proliferation of programs there are people who need help in this province and cannot get it from any program of the federal government, from any of our programs or from any municipal program.

And of course, the other side of the coin is that there are people who need only a little bit of help, and because of the fortuitous way in which their circumstances come together, they are being offered help at every side by the Department of Veterans Affairs, the Department of Health and Social Development and the preventive social services program of the city government, and are getting more help really than they know what to do with. I know of at least a few examples of people who are almost suffering under the burden of too much assistance.

Mr. Speaker, both of those are regrettable consequences of years and years and years of the kind of policy and program development that is being recommended to us by this resolution.

I would like to say that in spite of the remarks I have made, I am not opposed to the idea of developing programs of assistance for the people under 65 who need that assistance. But, for example, premium free medicare is already available to people under 65 in the province on the basis of need. If indeed there is someone who is unable to work because of ill health; if the fact that he can't work materially affects the income of himself or his family then, in



fact, assistance is available to him under the presently operating medicare program in the province.

A second alternative, made by the hon. member, Mr. Koziak when last we discussed the resolution, was that for a very small additional fee people could be provided with a waiver of premium clause exactly as they are with life insurance or any other form of insurance. If you pay a small additional monthly, quarterly or annual charge you would be guaranteed that during periods of illness the medical care would continue in effect. That's a basic principle of insurance.

Beyond suggesting either of those alternatives to the hon. Member for Medicine Hat-Redcliff, the thing I would really seriously suggest to him is that at some subsequent session of the Legislature he and his seconder should draft a resolution which commends to the consideration of the Assembly or of the government, or of some department of the government, a thoroughgoing study which is designed to come to conclusions about two things.

First of all, whether or not in order to help people we should be distributing income or services, or a balance of the two, and secondly, how in doing this we can rationalize the terrific hodgepodge of programs that presently exist and in the process of rationalizing all of these programs reduce our costs, reduce the number of people who suffer from an embarrassment of riches through these programs, and on the other hand provide some greater certainty that the people who are now in unusual and uncovered circumstances would be assisted by a single, more comprehensive program of a level of government.

I would say in conclusion, not so much to the hon. member who has moved the motion but to the hon. members on the front bench in their dealings with the federal government, that one thing which would be extremely beneficial, of course, would be to work out some kind of system whereby the funds would be transferred to a single level of government which would then be responsible for administering this one program in all its aspects, rather than the present situation where people can go from the federal government for one kind of assistance, to the provincial government for another kind of assistance, and to the municipal government for a third.

I know that the hon. Minister of Manpower and Labour and the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development have heard all this from me before, but the other ministers haven't. So you can think about that the next time you are at a federal-provincial ministers' meeting.

Those, Mr. Speaker, are the comments I wanted to make. I think that the motive behind the resolution is without question, but I think it should be clear to all of us as legislators that today, given the proliferation of programs that exist, and given the costs we have had to pay as a consequence of that proliferation of programs, the desirable response to a problem is not a piecemeal or a patchwork response, but a response which will deal with the problem in all its possible avenues and aspects.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BUCKWELL:

Mr. Speaker, I was quite interested in what the hon. member has just said and also what the hon. Member for Drayton Valley has said on this. I think it is rather an important resolution. It's a resolution that probably has more an emotional or moral appeal than an economic one.

The hon. member, Mr. King, in talking about those over 65 - just for a minute to get a perspective - maybe this government particularly has had more of a moral than an economic obligation to those over 65. The decision you have made in dealing with those over 65 has been well received from that group of people. But there are quite a number of people under 65 - as this resolution is trying to point out - who are in more dire circumstances than those 65 and over.

One of the things I would like to mention is one in my own area, a man over 65 with emphysema. Because he is over 65 the government pays his Medicare and he gets substantial tax savings. When he is in hospital he has to have oxygen and he has to be in the active treatment ward. And when he goes home he has to have oxygen. But because both he and his wife are on old age pension when he goes home they say, now you pay for your own oxygen. He would sooner be home, naturally, than in the hospital. If they were hard-nosed about it they would say, well let's leave him in hospital. Not only do you pay for his oxygen in there, you pay say \$30 or \$40 a day - the province would pay - for the cost

of having him in hospital. Why couldn't you turn around then and pay for his oxygen and let his wife take care of him at home? But no, we can't do this. Social development says you just can't provide oxygen at home. So they end up paying for it themselves so he can be home.

I mentioned before that this is the situation in Alberta at the moment. I know you don't like it any more than we do. This is where a man, say 66 years old - I used the case before where his wife was 50, but we'll say that his wife is 63. The husband dies and because they're 65 and over - say he was 66 - because he was over 65 he was getting free Medicare. The moment he dies, his widow then becomes eligible to pay the full Medicare premiums. If she can't pay them - and as I suggested, as the minister suggested to me that I was answering my own question, they can get subsidy. If they are that poor that they can't get subsidy, who pays for it - social development. In other words, the government pays it here or it pays it there. If he is over 65 then you can pay his Medicare premium here. When he dies he can't pay it, or his wife can't pay it, so you pay for it from social development here.

So I don't agree with the reasoning of the hon. member - I believe it was for Edmonton Highlands - that you're paying for them in either case, except that you now have the stigma that you wait until they're out of money, go to the welfare department and welfare pays it. In other words, the government is paying it anyway.

I'll take another case. This is a man under 65. We'll just say for argument's sake that he is 55 years old. He has worked all his life. He ends up - and I have a case in my own area that I can use as an example - a man who is an elevator agent, very active all his life. He gets moved from this little centre to a larger centre and buys himself a home because he has been living in, say, an elevator home all his life. He buys a home for himself and he ends up with a heart condition. So he is laid off. He is forced to retire. He doesn't even get the full pension because maybe he's got another ten years to go to full pension. So he ends up with a modest pension. He ends up with whatever savings he has. He is trying to pay for a home. Because of his own health condition, he has worries now he has never had before in his life. He has paid for his children's education and there is no one left at home with him and his wife. Maybe in this case his wife is going to work to try to make ends meet.

So here is a man who could well apply. You say well, let him pay for his own health care. He is not an old age pensioner and he still has some savings. So by the time he uses up his savings to augment his income, he then gets to the point for the first time in his life - and this is a matter of pride to a lot of people - maybe when he is 60 years old he is going to have to go to the welfare office and beg for help. You can say it is given freely but he is still begging for help. He then gets to the point where you are going to pay his Medicare premium. Why couldn't you have paid it right from the beginning? He gets a doctor's certification saying that he can't work; he is unable to work. That should be enough, whether he is 65 years old or not.

One of the arguments that had been used - we'll say people over 65. A man could be worth \$200,000. He could have an income of \$50,000 a year and yet you're paying for his Medicare premiums - for him and his dependants. Yet somebody under 65, even 64 or 63, because he is not 65 - oh no, we can't pay for them any more, or we don't pay for them. It's not a policy of the government. But the same person, 63 years old and on welfare, you will pay for. People who are not working simply and solely because they have a medical condition - surely you could take this into consideration.

I know for a fact - and we all know - that under the new royalty schemes a tremendous amount of new funds are going to accrue to the province. I know full well the front bench is probably a little apprehensive about what the back-benchers are going to decide on how this money is going to be spent. You're not going to have any shortage of ideas.

There are not that many in the province, that if on the one hand you can pay for them if they are over 65 - you think nothing of paying their Medicare premiums no matter what their economic conditions are. For those under 65, you have to wait until they go on welfare to pay it. If a man has a medical certificate from the doctor saying that he is unable to work, then I think it would take a tremendous amount of worry, a tremendous weight, off this person's shoulders if you could see your way to paying his Medicare premiums.

MR. DRAIN:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to preface my remarks by asking the hon. Provincial Treasurer for an opinion. That is, is free Medicare as given to senior citizens in certain income groups considered a taxable benefit in their hands for income tax purposes? It is? Well there is nothing to cry about then in relation to disparity of wealth. The tax gatherer succeeds in getting what is coming to him no matter what happens.

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure whether you can respond to a question in debate ...

AN HON. MEMBER:

Go ahead.

MR. DRAIN:

Mr. Speaker, may I ask the indulgence of the House then to ask the hon. Provincial Treasurer this particular question?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, the answer to the question is no. Free Medicare benefits by private plans are taxable but not the provision of free Medicare or premium-free Medicare by governments.

MR. SPEAKER:

May the Chair point out that supplementaries would also require the unanimous leave of the House.

MR. DRAIN:

Mr. Speaker, in accepting the reply of the hon. Provincial Treasurer, I'm now overwhelmed with knowledge and I am now prepared to proceed with the debate.

Referring to the resolution put on the Order Paper by the hon. Member for Medicine Hat-Redcliff and seconded by the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View, it is certainly one that should be given considerable consideration. I am not prepared to accept the view of the hon. Member for Edmonton Highlands that there should be nit-picking in the area of private members' resolutions because the objective of a private members' resolution is to bring before the hon. members, in my view, the necessity to follow different courses of action than we are presently following.

There is a subject I have dwelt on at considerable length, both in the compensation review committee and several times in the House, a problem that is very common in my constituency. And I refer, Mr. Speaker, to the problem of people who, in fact, have become redundant for health reasons or because of educational reasons, who can no longer fit into the format of the present progression of society.

I have in my constituency a unique problem in that we are located 6 to 8 miles from the British Columbia border. Where Alberta has led the way in the care of senior citizens and the succour of people who have needed assistance, we have in one particular area fallen, in my view, quite far behind.

I refer now to a situation which is quite common and I will dwell very briefly on the 'whys' of this. Any person who worked as a miner in the Crowsnest Pass, brought up his children and educated them, and is presently in his declining years, would in no way have been able to accumulate any amount of financial assets to see himself, or his wife, over financial difficulties which may well occur.

We have a situation, and I refer to one specific case, of two miners who spent 35 or 40 years at the working face and have now reached the age of 62 or 63. One lives in Michel, British Columbia, which is some 10 or 15 miles away. He receives free Medicare and a minimum of \$200 per month. In the same situation in Alberta a man with the same financial background, the same health

background and the same contribution to society received, prior to whatever raise has been given by the Department of Social Development, in the neighbourhood of \$87 or \$88 per month.

So how do I explain to a person who has made a substantial contribution and now lives in Alberta, after spending his lifetime working in this particular province, that he should now pick up and move west into British Columbia? There is no way that this can be explained - certainly not with any success.

So I believe, Mr. Speaker, that there should be some consideration given under circumstances of that nature. I do not believe there would be a large group of citizens who would qualify, but nevertheless, there would be some. In my opinion a social responsibility exists.

I had an occasion to visit a widow in Hillcrest about three or four weeks prior to the commencement of this final session. Her husband had died and she was quite proud of the fact that he had left her \$1,800. This widow was about 58 or 60-ish probably. She had \$1,800 in assets. She had a car. The money to pay for it had been borrowed from the credit union, but because of the insurance they carried it was now paid for. So these were her total assets. She said to me, "Is there a widow's pension for a person like myself? I said, "All assistance that can be given in situations such as yours is channelled through the Department of Social Development. So on your behalf I will bring your situation to their attention." - which I did do.

Of course, I was immediately made aware that the first thing she would have to do in order to get any assistance whatsoever was to dissipate practically all her assets. I think she was allowed \$500 to make provision for the funeral. Right at this moment she has to pay all of her personal expenses.

Additionally, the department would certainly take a very hard look at this woman's having a car - a fairly good car - sitting in the garage. And this may well be right in many situations. But there is a problem in transportation. A person gets older and requires certain health care which is only available by travelling eight or ten miles from her home. There is the requirement of a simple basic thing like going to get the mail, the groceries and so on.

But because of the fact that a situation like this and the situation of those two old fellows I referred to, does not in fact fit into any of the particular areas we have, there is a difficulty. Now I will point out to the hon. members that this responsibility has been accepted by the British Columbia government to the extent of \$200 per month.

There is no one who views a freeloader with greater repugnance than I do. But having regard for circumstances such as I have outlined - and there are a considerable number of people in the lower income brackets who because of the economic environment of the past were not able to assist themselves - these are the people who should be taken into consideration in the matter of this particular Medicare resolution which is presently under debate before this Legislature.

I certainly think the question of being forced to retire before the age of 65 because of ill health should not be the criterion. The economic position of the party should be given first consideration.

I concur with the thoughts of the hon. Member for Edmonton Highlands that in fact the social assistance programs we have in the Dominion of Canada are becoming more and more a hodgepodge. To me they represent to a great degree, an inverted funnel in which a vast amount of money is poured in the top and a few drops dribble down, essentially, to the people who have the essential need.

However, there is one thing about the drops. They will be dropped properly because we have the skilled social development workers, who have garnered many degrees, seeking out the cause of human assistance and who will drop this in the proper manner and in the proper channels - probably right on the foreheads of these recipients and thereby baptize them for the future.

I would certainly think that a lot of efficiency could be brought into social programs by looking in the direction of a consolidation of old age assistance, Canada pensions, unemployment insurance, family allowances, PEP programs, regional incentives and all of the particular areas. A vast giveaway program, in spite of the good intentions and good heart of the people who are directing these particular programs, does not, in fact, accomplish what it sets out to do.

There should be - and I can certainly agree with the hon. Member for Edmonton Highlands - an amendment to this particular resolution expanding the area it would encompass with the view to a committee being set up by the Legislature to determine precisely where this could go.

I would not think, Mr. Speaker, in terms of a social program that was non-contributory. I would feel there should be a responsibility of people to contribute in the same manner that they would contribute to an insurance program. I would think there should be the social acceptance of the responsibilities that should properly be directed towards becoming our brother's keeper.

DR. PAPROSKI:

Mr. Speaker, as I enter into this debate on this motion, I find that the request in the motion certainly is fleeting and miniscule when compared to what this government has already done for the seniors in our society.

Before I get into the body of my debate, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make reference to the hon. Member for Drayton Valley and indicate to him that his observations certainly are very interesting. I would suggest to him that cases like that are certainly reported to the medical profession and are handled very efficiently, in a scientific manner. Those that are valid, of course, are followed through and the appropriate measures are taken to improve the medical care of these seniors. I sincerely hope that he doesn't believe there is a revolution going on in the medical profession. I would hope he is suggesting a progressive evolution rather than a revolution.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Those are self-serving remarks.

DR. PAPROSKI:

Mr. Speaker, I also hope he is not indicating or suggesting in any way that tequila might be used for the treatment of cancer.

In reference to the hon. Member for Edmonton Highlands, I was really disappointed that the hon. member didn't bring up a few other points, although I know that we have discussed the matters he did bring up at some length in the past six to nine months. I was embarrassed indeed when he mentioned the "embarrassment of riches" that did get to the people in this particular segment of our society. I felt this really doesn't get to them at all, hon. member. He mentioned that there is a multitude of programs, federally, provincially and locally. There is indeed fragmentation, duplication and overlapping, lack of response of these programs to people. But I was disappointed he didn't come to the conclusion after all these months, that the key link, of course, to resolve all that is community health and social service centres.

Mr. Speaker, with reference to the hon. Member for Macleod, there is only one comment I would like to make. The individual who wants to have the subsidy for Medicare in the Province of Alberta certainly doesn't have to go on welfare. His subsidy will be granted, based on his earnings, as I understand it. He does not have to go on welfare. If his earnings are zero or nil, his subsidy will be almost 100 per cent.

Mr. Speaker, I feel when I stand here as the MLA for an average constituency, as I mentioned the other day - and I am sure all of our constituencies are more or less average - that I am speaking on behalf of those first rank citizens; the elders and seniors in our society. And I think it is appropriate that this government, on this side, be thanked for the great things they have done over the past 18 to 24 months for the senior citizens of our society.

As I have stated before repeatedly, unequivocally and publicly and in this Assembly, I don't think the seniors of our society should be thanking us. I think we should be thanking them, thanking them for the many things they have done for us in the past. They have opened up this province. They have paved the way. Mr. Speaker, they have fought, they have died, they have struggled and they have built this province. As a matter of fact they have paved that path so clear and true that we're indeed the richest province, I suspect, in Canada and probably the richest area in the world right at this juncture.

Mr. Speaker, of course, they have also died - died in the wars. And all of these things that I have stated as briefly as I have - and I'm sure that

all of us here could expand on them - are difficult to express in words, and certainly difficult to express in action.

Mr. Speaker, in recognition of these elders, this particular government, the Progressive Conservative government of this province, has carried out a number of programs which I'm sure we all know. If we don't know, I intend briefly just to review a few of them, for I think that review is good, not only ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. The Chair would have great difficulty in seeing the relevance of enumeration of what the government has done for people over 65. It would appear from the text of the resolution that we are more concerned with junior seniors and perhaps the hon. member might direct his remarks to the problems in that area.

DR. PAPROSKI:

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate what you have stated, and I'll try to zero in on dealing with those at 65 or near 65.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Under 65.

DR. PAPROSKI:

Mr. Speaker, when we speak of this important area, in all seriousness and all joking aside, hon. members ...

AN HON. MEMBER:

Get serious.

DR. PAPROSKI:

... it's certainly important to recognize that the attitude of a government is important and that this attitude shall not be forgotten, the attitude of deliberate action for the comfort and the dignity of the senior citizens and the attitude towards these senior people in our society to assure that their dollar is not eroded by inflation.

When we speak of health, Mr. Speaker - again I'm trying to zero in very carefully to assure that we are speaking about the resolution - we really should speak of total health.

It's not just physical problems, and mental problems, of course, which medicare deals with, but there are the other aspects of total health that are well described in the United Nations and well known amongst medical circles across the world. We're talking about food, clothing, shelter, housing, social security, freedoms, recreation and so forth. So when we speak of this motion, it seems to zero in on a very narrow area, yet there is so much more to be considered for the dignity and the self-respect and the self-worth of the senior members of our society.

The hon. members, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure will recall The Senior Citizens Benefits Act that was introduced which cost \$11 million and provided some 127,000 senior citizens and 25,000 dependants with free glasses, dental care, braces and supports, hearing aids and so forth.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please. Despite the hon. member's protestations of relevance, he seems to be slipping back into the senior, senior citizens area.

MR. DRAIN:

Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member answer a question?

DR. PAPROSKI:

After I've completed, hon. member, thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I'm sorry I have such difficulty in narrowing myself to this one area when I feel they are so relevant and this government has done so much for senior citizens, Mr. Speaker.

Without then going into any detail, Mr. Speaker, but merely just casually mentioning them as I pass by, I beg the indulgence of Mr. Speaker.

The premium free Medicare that was introduced ...

MR. SPEAKER:

With great respect, the casual irrelevance is irrelevance for all that.

DR. PAPROSKI:

Would the hon. member opposite like to ask a question?

MR. DRAIN:

Mr. Speaker, my question to the hon. member is, as a medical man, has he got a cure for "Omonopetant Benefactor Fantasty"?

MR. SPEAKER:

Possibly the hon. member's question might better be placed somewhere in the waiting room of the hon. Member for Edmonton Kingsway.

DR. PAPROSKI:

Mr. Speaker, I don't think that question deserves an answer.

Mr. Speaker, because of the limitation that I have had imposed on me - and I appreciate and respect those wishes, Mr. Speaker - I hope when we consider emotions such as this, dealing with premiums for Medicare for seniors in our society, and not only senior citizens, I hope that we consider the many things that have been done and the many things that have been suggested already from this side of the House and I'm sure from other members.

I'm suggesting here, Mr. Speaker, that suggestions that should come out in such a resolution and possibly should be considered are the expanded Victorian Order of Nurses programs, rehabilitation programs, home care programs, and involvement of youth with our seniors in order that they may, in fact, keep viable and taste the viability of life and in fact our youth, by their association with them, would know their heritage first hand.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, ...

AN HON. MEMBER:

You haven't even started.

DR. PAPROSKI:

... I think we've done a terrific job for the seniors in our society. I think ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please. I shall have to ask the hon. member to resume his seat if he wishes to persist in the same irrelevance to which his attention has previously been drawn on at least two occasions.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Only those under 65.

DR. PAPROSKI:

Again, I'm very sorry, Mr. Speaker.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, this resolution I think is very narrow. Although I don't have any objection to the resolution per se and I would support it, I think it should be taken in the context of the total health care for the seniors in our society.

Thank you.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make one or two comments on the resolution. I really do have an objection to the resolution. It seems like legislators are continually thinking up ways of spending the people's money, and the people are getting a little tired of having money taken from them to spend on other people.

I don't think any worker - it doesn't matter how hard he works - objects to assistance being given to people who are unable to help themselves. But in our society, now, we have a number of programs which are taking from the poor to give to the rich. I don't think this is sound at all. As a matter of fact, I find a growing resentment against this type of thing.

The resolution talks about "premium free Medicare to persons forced to retire before the age of 65 years because of ill health." We immediately assume that these people have no financial resources.

There are people who are very wealthy who, because of ill health, have to retire before the age of 65. Should we use tax money to provide them with a free premium? If we do so, we do so at the expense of others who are having a difficult time. It has to be paid.

Governments have no special way of making money, except by borrowing it, which the people eventually have to repay and pay interest on it, or by taxation. We haven't yet used the technique of using our own credit. The banks continue to use our own credit and get full value for it, but governments haven't got around to doing that yet. I hope someday they will. But at the present time we pay for these programs either by taxation with money belonging to the people that comes from our resources, or by borrowing to do it.

I can't see the logic or the reason in paying the premium for persons under the age of 65 who are well able to pay that premium themselves. That's the point I want to make in this particular resolution.

Surely this resolution, in order to be complete, should have some financial limitations. Are we going to pay the premiums for people who are wealthy because they are ill and have to retire before the age of 65? I know many people, and I think every hon. member does, who are not well, under the age of 65 and who have to retire. But they are well able to get by. They have good financial means. They have investments.

Those who are working for governments and large companies under a pension scheme may be getting a better pension than hundreds or maybe thousands of our workers who have to pay the bill, who have to pay for this free premium. Should we provide free premium for those who are getting a good pension, because of the service they did before they got ill? I don't think so. I don't think that is right at all.

I believe there is a growing need in this country for the recognition of medical care of whatever sort for any age where the people are unable to provide it for themselves. There are very few people in this province and in this country who would object to a program like that.

A man at 22 who has no financial resources, who is ill and can't work, requires assistance. But a man at 55 who has a lifetime of work behind him and a good pension coming in doesn't require the public purse to pay his premium.

There's a good number of people today who are senior citizens who do not require the assistance we're giving them as far as free Medicare is concerned. Most people go along with that because they have spent a lifetime of building up this country. But there's a great number of people who are struck by illness, who don't have the means to secure proper and adequate medical attention. Today, under our Medicare system, this has been greatly improved. But it's still a worry when a catastrophe of any type strikes a family and they have very serious medical problems to look after.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the intent of the resolution is excellent, but let's not mix it up with a program of providing free premiums for people who can well afford to pay their own premiums.

MR. BENOIT:

Mr. Speaker, I have just two or three brief remarks. The former speakers have suggested that for those under 65 who are unable to meet their premium payments for Medicare, provision is made through the department of welfare



program, more nicely stated, social assistance or social development or in the form of social allowance.

I think that the stigma of receiving welfare, like the stigma of mental illness, is still with us to a certain extent. I know a number of people in our society who really need the type of assistance that social development will provide for them because of their need. But because of their pride they continue to stagger along in a lower income bracket than they should for their own good and for that of their children because of their pride and self-respect, one or the other or both.

When we talk about people under 65, Mr. Speaker, we're talking about a large group of people. There are a lot of people under 65 years of age who are raising families and who have a much greater need than many over 65 who are financially independent and who have no families to look after.

Therefore, I think the basic principle of the resolution is well worth considering. I do want to express the fact that I believe there is a difference in the way that money is given and the way people receive it. Nevertheless, the fact remains that in the end, if it comes from the public purse, no matter what it is called it is still the same thing, social assistance or social allowance.

I know a number of people who, if we continued the old system of giving disability pension or a blind pension or a mother's allowance, would accept it as such but who will not accept it because it is termed social assistance or social allowance, or more commonly welfare. For that reason we need to take a look at the way we dispense the public coffers to the needy people, regardless of their age.

The hon. Member for Edmonton Highlands suggested some alternative methods which, I think, need to be considered. For instance, when we're talking about people of all ages, and so that we can cover those under 65 who are needy, we should be giving serious consideration to a guaranteed annual income supplement.

Mr. Speaker, I add the last word because there is a difference between a guaranteed annual income and a guaranteed annual income supplement. If there is to be a supplement it will not be necessarily enough to live on by itself, but it will be enough to look after all those who have an under-the-poverty-line income. This, I think, is an area that really needs consideration. This is what this resolution is particularly talking about - those who because of ill health and need have had to retire under the age of 65 and are unable to look after their Medicare premiums.

There are a lot of other things with which some of these people need assistance, as well as their Medicare premiums. But when you come to delivering an annual guaranteed income supplement, you have one source and one administration from which it comes, and it is given to people without respect, without social or literate status in society so that everyone receives the same.

Those who refuse to work may find it very difficult to live on a supplement of this nature, but those who do work will find it is very helpful, particularly if they are in the lower income bracket. If they're in the upper income bracket, the income tax will relieve them of that which is more than sufficient, so it will be balanced out in the end.

One thing I am concerned about is that a lot of people are saying now that those who are under 65 can get help from their Canada Pension Plan because there is a disability factor built into the Canada Pension Plan. This is true of those who have paid into the Canada Pension Plan long enough to receive a disability pension. But the Canada Pension Plan is still very young and there are many people under the age of 65 who, because of ill health or inability to find employment, have not been able to make any contributions, or sufficient contributions, to the Canada Pension Plan to provide them with any degree of financial stability from that source.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that because there is plenty of evidence in the studies made along this line to show that a guaranteed annual income supplement would not in any way make the diligent people of our society slothful, we need to give consideration to this type of thing which would do away with a number of administrators so that you wouldn't have to have unemployment insurance, old age pensions, children's bonuses or allowances, social allowance and veteran's affairs pensions. It would all come from a scale of guaranteed annual income supplement which would be stepped-up after the age of 60 or 65, whichever it would be, so that those who were no longer in the work force of our country could live on that portion provided in the guaranteed annual income after the age when they are pensionable.

Because we do not have that, Mr. Speaker, then this resolution, which has been termed a patchwork situation, needs to be implemented so that we can carry on until the time comes when everyone can be put in a position where he can exist without suffering needlessly in a country where we have plenty.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I want to add just a few remarks to what has already been said with respect to this resolution this afternoon.

The resolution under consideration is one that, of course, affects one of my colleagues in its intent, as well as myself, and she is not here today. Miss Hunley being responsible for the operation of the Health Care Insurance Plan, however, has already spoken, I believe, on the resolution. I thought I might add my side of it at the present time.

For a resolution which has every appearance of being a simple and rather narrow resolution, it certainly has in it a very wide variety of implications. For anyone who doubted that before hon. members began to speak this afternoon, I don't think there remains any doubt about that statement. I think that I would really like to comment on several of the points raised. I will keep my remarks not overly long by reason of the fact that much of what I might have wanted to raise, and I would be selective because there were one or two things I might not have wanted to raise, but much of it has already been raised by the three hon. members from this side who have already spoken.

I was interested in the remarks of at least one of the honourable gentlemen opposite. When the hon. Member for Drumheller spoke, he raised the other side of this issue - a well taken point. A lot of people think we spend too much on aid programs sometimes rather than not enough. Those who are paying for it of course, are the taxpayers of this province and a resolution passed in precisely the terms of this, if made into a policy, would unjustly enrich some people. Perhaps not many but it would unjustly enrich some and I think that's perfectly clear. In that sense, the discussion of the resolution has in part become sort of a free-ranging discussion on questions like the whole structure of the Medicare premium plan and we have also had brought in questions relating to the means test and the like by implication, if not deliberately.

I wanted to say to the hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest, that I have an answer for one of his questions. He was talking about the very very low rates and he was talking about the hardship. No one, I would say to the hon. member, advocates or supports hardship. So there is no difficulty in speaking against that, we all do that. But when he says how does he explain the low rates, all I can say to him is, that except for the increases which have occurred in the last year or so, he can explain them by telling his friend that he is one of those who helped to make the policy of the recent government, and that he takes his full share of whatever he wants to take, blame or praise, for that.

But I won't leave that point immediately, because the figure of \$87 a month that one person to his knowledge was receiving by way of social allowance, I gather, is not high. I think people should know if a payment like that is being made, that it is not high. Because when the hon. Member for Drumheller spoke, he said many people have the impression the payments are much too high indeed.

Now, the argument that would arise there is that some would say knowing this gentleman, as the hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest undoubtedly does, he would have an argument to make that in his case, something more was justified, and that may well be.

If that were so, I hope he has taken the appeal he is entitled to take to the citizens appeal advisory committee and had the matter reviewed there. That is a committee of course, of residents of the area who are entitled to hear appeals on the question of assistance. That would be an appropriate course for him to follow.

MR. DRAIN:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, or a point of explanation. The point I was making is that there is suddenly a great discrepancy between our Alberta rates and the British Columbia rates, and that we live close to the British Columbia border where this is brought to our attention continuously.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that that was the hon. member's point and it didn't escape me. I was dealing with what I thought were some of the other points he also made.

Now, I mentioned that an appeal might be taken. I want to mention when you quote the amount of an allowance - I've been through this before and I have spoken right from this very place about it before. I can find you the list of files of those who receive welfare in excess of \$8,000 a year you know, if you like; the few that there are in Alberta. And I can show you that they are families with grave handicaps usually. In one such case - and I mentioned [it] during the estimates one year - the head of the house was a paraplegic woman who was in a wheelchair, and yet looked after her family at home by her guidance there, by being there.

Whereas if the amount of a home care worker were not built into that budget, that person would have been in an auxiliary hospital, and the children goodness knows where. In that case, there were seven or eight of them at home. I can find you cases where \$700 or \$800 a month in welfare is paid. Certainly there are not many, and certainly they can be defended.

In any event, I realize that is sidetracking it a little bit. I just wanted to say that where the statement is made and perhaps rightly so, that in a particular case not enough money is given, that can be. I think the gentleman in question should pursue his appeal which he is entitled to take.

But I have no really great quarrel with the remarks of most hon. members on this. I did think that point is one that might be clarified.

The speakers on both sides I think have made the point that in a sense, Mr. Speaker, so far as you have allowed them to do so, the resolution is almost a favorable commentary upon other existing plans of the government. I think that is so and without going into them, I am happy about the fact that this does appear to follow other programs already in existence.

The hon. Member for Edmonton Kingsway and the hon. Member for Edmonton Highlands were quite right, though, in indicating that this is only a very small part of the sort of the thing that may be undertaken in an overall and comprehensive way.

Some hon. members who are not lawyers did their level best to sound like lawyers in the course of the discussion by picking the resolution apart word for word. I must say, particularly for those hon. members opposite whose retirement from politics may be more imminent than for those on this side, that some of them do have a future perhaps in Philadelphia as Philadelphia lawyers.

I see, however, nothing wrong with pointing out the fact that not referring to ability to pay, is a very valid criticism of this resolution.

You could, for example, have the case - if you just pass a resolution which extends premium free medicare to persons forced to retire prematurely because of ill health - of your 40 year old dentist or your 31 year old plumber getting free care on retirement. That would not be appropriate.

Now, Mr. Speaker, just before concluding, I would say the other aspect of that of course, is that ill health or retirement need not be a permanent thing in individual cases. There may well be a person whose health problems are very grave indeed, but who may, in a year or so, of course, recover and be quite well again. In that sense I don't think the resolution should want to give him continuing support. A retirement for some people is a temporary thing and that would probably be more so.

I did want to say that there would be some difficulties as I see it in the mechanics of a proposal such as this, I don't mean difficulties in mechanics. I suppose what I meant to say is that the mechanics of it is something that should also have to be given consideration because of the fact that there is an existing vehicle, an existing way, of going about getting some substantial consideration in the reduction of premiums for Medicare for those who need it, that is, by way of an application to the Health Care Insurance Commission. That is the way it is done now, and I would just comment that in the event that the government considered the resolution in the form that it is, or the intent of it in any event, favorably, that sort of mechanism might be the appropriate one. I wanted to say that the way in which that works at the present time is upon application for subsidy to the commission.

I did not hear these figures repeated earlier today, so I think it might be appropriate to do so now. The situation at the present time is that a person can get Medicare coverage for the small sum of \$2 per month if he can show that he has no dependents and no taxable income in the preceding taxation year. If a person is on public assistance then there is no cost to him. But if he is on a very, very low income or just at that point when he will soon have the benefits available for those over 65 - and he is maybe on a small farm or in a small home in the city and living off savings perhaps or casual earnings - and can show that he has had no taxable income and no dependents during the past year, the amount that Medicare costs him is very small indeed. It is graduated on upwards from there. It will only be \$3 a month for someone whose taxable income is \$500 for the year.

I am not saying those figures are the correct ones. That the schedule maybe should be more generous in some respects, or less generous, is a matter for discussion. But I would point out that with the inflation of health care costs and generally speaking the inflation of people's incomes over the past couple of years in particular, those rates have not been changed upwards. It would seem to me that it is a fairly equitable arrangement, and not the sort of arrangement, I think, that would require us to bring in yet another program at this time.

In final conclusion, Mr. Speaker - you will note that I am following the politician's accustomed form this afternoon by saying first, in conclusion and then, in final conclusion - I have no quarrel with the intent and the spirit of a motion such as this. The difficulties that have been described by hon. members on both sides are in low case, I am satisfied, meant to argue against the good intention of the motion. My view is that in its present form, however, it perhaps will not do any good to anyone if it is passed. I am like the hon. Member for Edmonton Highlands in that way. I have no strong feelings one way or the other. If it were passed we would really just be saying that the Legislature should give it consideration. If I am not mistaken that is what we have already been doing, so the mover and seconder did achieve that purpose.

DR. BACKUS:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak for a short while on this motion because I feel I have a slightly different point of view to present here in the Legislature. First, though, I would like to perhaps answer a challenge put out in the course of debate as to the unacceptability, on the part of the medical profession, of practices carried out in other countries which have in fact shown effective cures and the fact that these people are not acceptable in either Alberta or the United States.

I think the point made really takes two points into account. First, the question of who are acceptable as medical practitioners here in this province, and secondly, the acceptability by the medical profession here of practices carried out in other parts of the world.

I believe that today we are only just beginning to realize the tremendous power of faith healing. I think that in many areas faith healing is practiced and is successful. In fact in some recent research by very expert members of the medical profession it has even been shown that parts of the body can be affected physically by mental controls, possibly even to the point of destroying cancer cells.

None of these methods, however far out they may appear to be, are utterly rejected by the medical profession. All of them are examined and we seek scientific as well as practical aspects of them. We attempt to repeat successful efforts in other countries, and in fact where we have found success, these are incorporated in the medical work carried out in this province because the medical profession is always trying to improve its ability to deliver health care.

On the other hand, I think the matter of accepting into this province, as medical practitioners, everybody who practices the art of healing is not necessarily something we should agree to. Because, although I am sure people would be able to report cases of healing by some of the medicine men in Africa, I don't know if the people of Alberta would want us to accept their practices, and them as practitioners, here in the Province of Alberta.

But to come more relevantly to the points of debate, I do support very much the view of the hon. Member for Drumheller, that the taxpayers of this province and this country are becoming weary of supporting the many socialized services in the province. I don't believe their dissatisfaction with doing so is based on really genuine cases of need where I think everybody is willing to recognize

that if they are so fortunate as to be able to make an adequate income they should contribute toward the support of those who are less fortunate and genuinely in a position where they are unable to support themselves.

I think the main complaint of most taxpayers is contributing to social services when it is their feeling that these social services are being abused by the people seeking financial help and where, in fact, they could have either previously made preparation for any possible illnesses they may have succumbed to or that they, are obtaining social assistance where they could probably go out and earn a living.

I think the same might well be applied in this instance. I say this from the practical point of view of the medical practitioner. Years ago there was a disability pension provided in our social assistance program. I think one might say that the doctor can easily recognize the person who is genuinely unable to work and therefore entitled to some assistance. I think there are a great many people who are seeking this type of assistance and who, in fact, would be able to work.

I think all of us can quote examples of people who, owing to some disability, have not been able to work and who have found difficulty in obtaining assistance without, in fact, getting rid of all their security and then going on to social assistance. But I think equally so, many of us will also be aware of a number of instances where people are, in fact, obtaining assistance where they could go out and work.

I had one patient who was paralyzed from the waist down as the result of a car accident. He is now doing a full-time job. He supervised the building of his own house and was, in fact, able to participate in it. He supports his wife and has supported his family through school and university. And I think, probably quite reasonably, anybody would have said right at the beginning, here is a man who can't work and should be on some form of social assistance.

I think perhaps if he had been put in this position where he was entirely dependent upon the state to support him, he might not have gone out of his way to develop a tremendous ability to work, to do a job in spite of his handicap, and I think we would have just had one more person who would be accepted as a cripple, both physically and probably mentally.

On the other hand I can think of a great many patients who come under a form of social assistance when, as a result of an industrial injury, come on the Workmens' Compensation Board.

I think probably one of the most difficult problems faced by a doctor is to assess the time that a patient should, in fact, be taken off unemployment insurance and put back to work. I don't think the problem is faced only by the individual practitioners who look after this patient, but I think even a board and a commission are also faced with a real problem in trying to make this assessment.

Therefore, I would say that any program where we suggest ill health as a criterion for increasing the social assistance to an individual becomes a real responsibility, either of the person's general practitioner or of a board, or of a commission. And to increase the responsibilities of those people in trying to reach a decision as to whether a person is, in fact, unable to work is often a burden that is pretty hard to carry on the part of the medical practitioner. We can always recognize the black and the white situations but I think we have a very wide grey area and I think this lays open to our financial support of these people the possibility that there will be abuse of the facility.

I am not for one moment suggesting that those who genuinely need our help should not be able to get it, but I do say that to enact a policy or legislation that opens a door for many people to seek further government assistance is creating problems and because, as our Minister of Health and Social Development pointed out, there are already routes open for these people. I do not think an additional service in this line should be added to the weighty legislation already present to protect them.

Under this, I would like to point out that we support or intend to bring in legislation in this area that does lay on the medical profession some responsibilities which are much more of a legal nature and I would certainly, on these grounds also, not like to see such legislation brought in. I talk about such problems as abortions. The medical profession is faced with deciding whether an abortion should be performed on medical grounds because the continuation of the pregnancy would endanger the health of the mother.

-----

This can be interpreted so widely in the medical field, either to the point of the World Health Organization's definition of health which is social, economic and medical well-being, to a very strict health diagnosis where you translate it as meaning that the pregnancy is liable to kill the mother. You do expect, through the legislation, for a doctor to make the assessment on that and it is my personal opinion that that decision is far more one that should be made by the legal profession, with possible input from the medical profession.

We then go further to expect the doctor to make the decision as to whether the 72-year-old is capable of driving. The people who send out the forms from the Department of Highways are not making ...

MR. WYSE:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I fail to see how an abortion has anything to do with this resolution.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Over 65?

MR. SPEAKER:

Possibly, since the resolution doesn't say how much before the age of 65, it lends itself to that type of debate. But I would have to say one would have to draw the line with regard to drivers over the age of 70.

DR. BACKUS

On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, I was simply drawing attention to the multitude of ways in which legislation is expecting the medical profession to make decisions which I don't think are entirely medical in origin, and I would suggest that this resolution is, in fact, a further step in this direction.

As I was saying, the question of the person's ability to drive is, I think, another demand on the medical profession to make decisions which often lead to considerable hardship for older people. I think the same decisions are expected to be made, if you wish to keep it under 65, for people who are younger. I feel that legislation such as this should be in the legislation. A medical referee, or the Highways Department should have a referee, with medical input and the decision should not be left to the family doctor to possibly restrict one of his patients who has been a patient of his for a good while, and therefore turn the blame on to the doctor for his recommendation if the patient is not then issued with a driver's licence.

I recognize that certainly the input of the medical profession is essential in many of these cases, such as the Workmen's Compensation Board, and I feel that here we are dealing with an injury, the follow-up of an injury. I think the medical profession is usually well-equipped in deciding when this individual reaches a point, however difficult the decision may be to make, that he is at least equipped to help in making the decision. But here again the final decision, and I congratulate the Workmen's Compensation Board, is in the hands of a board rather than in the individual doctor's hands. But I do wish to stress that this responsibility laid on the doctors, and additional responsibilities by our action should be looked at very carefully.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to come to a point on which I felt very strongly, on the question of reduction or elimination of premiums for health services. I think we have brought in probably the only one that is practical, in that we recognize the persons' income as their ability to pay. The lower their income - we recognize the need to lower their premium.

I think what we don't recognize is the large number of people who are in that income level where they, in fact, pay income tax and therefore pay a premium, but where it becomes a real hardship for them, compared to people on social allowance and social assistance who, in fact, may be making out of their social assistance almost as great an income, but they are excused from paying their premium for social health.

I fully realize that at some stage a point must be made and we must say, people above that point have to pay, people below that point don't pay, and you get a gray area again on each side of that line where we definitely see people suffering. However, I think some degree of consideration should be given to these people and we should seek a way of maybe even a greater gradation of the premium, rather than just making it either half or full, so that people whose incomes are low, approaching those of social assistance, should be given a

minimal premium to pay for their medical health care, because these are the very people who probably require the greatest amount of assistance for the health of their families.

I mention this on this motion because I think that here again we are adding another situation to the already confusing picture in this area of persons who may not be able to work as well as you or I could work. Maybe they are able to do a certain amount of work, but it is not going to produce for them the same income that an able-bodied person could earn. Would it not be better for them to refrain from work and apply to their local doctor to be told they ought to retire on medical grounds so they could be excused their premium? I think where people, in spite of some ill health, or in spite of some degree of ill health, make an effort to really continue their effort, these people should also be encouraged in this, and not, in fact, encouraged to go the other way and to seek government support for their activity and retreat from the field of effort.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DR. HORNER:

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

MR. SPEAKER:

May the hon. Deputy Premier adjourn the debate?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No.

MR. SPEAKER:

In case there is any doubt, the debate is adjourned.

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

[Mr. Speaker left the Chair at 5:29 o'clock.]