

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Tuesday, March 19, 1974

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

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill No. 50 - The Municipal Statutes Amendment Act, 1974

MR. DOAN:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill No. 50, being The Municipal Statutes Amendment Act, 1974. This bill amends a number of acts. The first is The Municipal and Provincial Properties Valuation Act. It is amended by providing evaluation of municipally-owned property, with certain exceptions. It will remove one exception, the pollution-control equipment.

The second, The Municipalities Assessment and Equalization Act is amended by changing the definition of equalized assessment, also by changing the number of members on the board from three to five.

The third, The Municipal Tax Exemption Act is amended where the Lieutenant Governor in Council may or may not grant exemptions is hereby repealed and will be left to each individual municipality.

The fourth, The Municipal Taxation Act is amended by having regard for types of installation on power and pipelines.

The fifth, The Tax Recovery Act includes amendments, administration changes.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 50 was introduced and read a first time.]

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill No. 50, The Municipal Statutes Amendment Act, 1974 be placed on the Order Paper under Government Bills and Orders.

[The motion was carried.]

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

MR. ASHTON:

Mr. Speaker, it is again a pleasure to introduce some students from my constituency. There are some two classes of students from the Clara Tyner School on Ottewell Road. They are accompanied by teachers, Valerie Warke and Mary Mandryk and by several interested parents. I will request that they all stand and be recognized by the Assembly.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce to you today some Grade 8 students from the Calvin Christian School in west Edmonton, in my constituency. There are 30 students here today from that school and they are seated in the members gallery with their teacher, Mr. Tuininga and several parents who have brought them here. I would ask them to stand and be recognized.

Mr. Speaker, I again beg leave to introduce another group of students, more numerous this time, some 72 students from the St. Mark School. The students are in Grade 9 and are in the public gallery, accompanied by their teachers, Mr. Holzman, Mr. Wysocki and Mr. Jadinga, Jagodzinski, pardon me.

[Laughter]

[Applause]

Obviously, Mr. Speaker, it is an introduction to be remembered. I guess all I need do now is ask that the students rise and be recognized, and at the same time to apologize to Mr. Jagodzinski.

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to introduce to you and through you to the members of the Legislature two prominent gentlemen involved in community affairs in the Josephburg area in my constituency. I would like Mr. Hennig and Mr. Ashton to stand and be recognized in the House.

Mr. Speaker, I guess it's a bad day. It's Mr. Hicks - Mr. Ashley Hicks.

TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS

MISS HUNLEY:

Mr. Speaker, as required by statute, I wish to table a report from the Alberta Liquor Control Board for the year ending March 31, 1973.

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table the Annual Report of the Department of Municipal Affairs for 1973.

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, as required by statute, I'm pleased to submit the report that there were no recommendations brought forward up to the period March 31, 1973 by the Wilderness Areas Advisory Committee.

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, I should like to table reports of four pension acts for 1973 being, first, The Public Service Pension Act, The Public Service Management Pension Act, The Local Authorities Pension Act and The MLA Pension Act.

MR. CPAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to file one copy of the audited report of the Alberta Hospital Services Commission for the calendar year 1973.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Rapeseed Plant - Sexsmith

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct the first question to the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Agriculture if the Government of Alberta has paid any money or made any financial commitments to the recently announced rapeseed plant at Sexsmith?

DR. HORNER:

No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CLARK:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the minister.

Has the Government of Alberta given any financial guarantees to the group developing the rapeseed plant at Sexsmith or has the province given any guarantees to those people who have been engaged to supply equipment and materials for the developers of the rapeseed plant at Sexsmith?

DR. HOPNER:

The only government involvement with regard to the rapeseed plant at Sexsmith, Mr. Speaker, is through the farmers' co-operative in the area.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Has the Government of Alberta, through this co-operative, made any commitments on behalf of the people of Alberta as far as the Sexsmith rapeseed plant is concerned?

DR. HORNER:

Not at this time, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Can the minister advise the Assembly how much money has been raised to date by the co-operative?

DR. HORNER:

Not exactly, Mr. Speaker, but if the hon. member would like to put that question on the Order Paper I'm sure we could get the answer for him.

Edmonton Boundaries

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, a second question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. I would like to ask the Minister of Municipal Affairs, when he plans to make an announcement or a governmental statement on the proposed annexation of Sherwood Park and St. Albert into the City of Edmonton?

MR. RUSSELL:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't see myself making an announcement on that particular matter for some time.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Has the Minister of Municipal Affairs had discussions with the council of the Town of St. Albert dealing with the whole question of the boundaries commission - boundaries' recommendations and requests as made by the City of Edmonton?

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, there have been a number of meetings with the representatives of all the councils involved, not just the Town of St. Albert, and both the City of Edmonton and the councils of the other municipalities involved understand that no decision-making discussions or meetings, out of which recommendations might occur, would take place without representatives from all those councils being present. That is the situation at the present time.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. When does the government plan to give a definitive answer to the City of Edmonton on the question of the expansion of its boundaries?

MR. RUSSELL:

Well, as the hon. member may be aware, the working document on the proposed new planning act, under Section 12, contains an alternative to growth for the metropolitan areas as opposed to an outward expansion of municipal boundaries. We've asked the municipalities involved in those cases to assess that and let us have their comments or their response. In the meantime, I have advised the City of Edmonton that the Metropolitan Affairs Committee of cabinet will have the matter under review and hopes to make a recommendation to cabinet as to its next move at some early date.

MR. CLARK:

Supplementary question to the minister, Mr. Speaker. When does the government expect the report from the boundaries commission dealing with the problem of the urban growth of the City of Edmonton?

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, that's not a matter that has been referred to the Municipal Boundaries Advisory Committee.

In a letter to His Worship, Mayor Dent, I did indicate that the City of Edmonton, if it wished to pursue actively the matter of its boundaries, had several choices; that is, going to the local authorities board, going to the Boundaries Advisory Committee or else dealing directly with the provincial government. For the time being, at least, it has selected the latter.

MR. WILSON:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the hon. minister advise what year he proposes to introduce the proposed planning act he just mentioned?

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, I mentioned a question dealing with that earlier in the session. I pointed out to hon. members that the recommendations, terms of reference and areas of interest of both the land use forum and those principles involved in a new planning act are very similar and should probably be considered together. So it's unlikely that a new planning act would be introduced for members' consideration this year.

MR. HO LEM:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Might this be the last supplementary on this topic.

MR. HC LEM:

Can the hon. minister advise whether the minister would be considering introducing the concept of White Papers on the various issues that may come before the House for legislation before it is really debated in the House, so the municipalities may have an idea of what the issues might be and respond to them?

MR. RUSSELL:

That's exactly what we've done with the working document on the proposed new planning act, Mr. Speaker. In fact, the document, in contentious areas, puts forth not just one solution but in some cases two or three alternatives. In the letter of transmittal we've invited response, and of course, the purpose of the whole thing is to do exactly what the hon. member is suggesting.

MR. WILSON:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Perhaps we could come back to this topic if there is time left.

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

Fertilizer

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. Can the minister advise the Assembly whether he has had an opportunity to review the report tabled recently in the Manitoba Legislature with respect to monopoly practices by fertilizer companies in this country?

DR. HORNER:

I've been able to peruse it very briefly, Mr. Speaker, and have some idea of the recommendations with regard to the report. In regard to fertilizer, I might say, Mr. Speaker, we have today nominated two people, one from the department and one from the farm organization, to meet with the other provinces in relation to an overall review of the fertilizer situation.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Can he advise the Assembly whether his department has had an opportunity to monitor reports that fertilizer produced in Alberta is sold more cheaply in North Dakota and Montana than in the prairie provinces, including the Province of Alberta, and that the price spread is as much as \$30 a ton?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, I think that may have been true a year or two ago but certainly my information is that in the present year that the prices in fact have equalized or are as a matter of fact, higher in the United States. I might say, Mr. Speaker, that we expect any fertilizer plant set up in Alberta to allocate enough of their production to fully meet the needs of Alberta agriculture.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question to the hon. minister. Can the minister advise the Assembly what the position is with respect to the several plants announced over the weekend - whether or not these plants are going to produce, contingent on the export market or what percentage will be consigned to the Alberta domestic market?

DR. HORNER:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I thought I just answered that question. I want to make it clear for the hon. gentleman who can't apparently hear. Any fertilizer plant in Alberta will be required to allocate sufficient production from that plant to meet the needs of Alberta agriculture.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Agriculture. Has the Department of Agriculture monitored the fertilizer prices of the fertilizer produced in Trail - in a situation where Alberta farmers, especially farmers in southern Alberta, can buy that fertilizer more cheaply in the United States than they can in Lethbridge?

DR. HORNER:

Well, Mr. Speaker, again the hon. leader of the opposition should be listening a little more closely as well. As I said, a year or two ago and in past years, in fact, that was the case. My present information is that that is not the case for this year.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Would it be fair to say that your monitoring indicates that isn't right?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please.

MR. NCTLEY:

One final supplementary question, if I may, to the hon. minister. Is the minister prepared to table all the information that he has with respect to the relative prices in the United States and Alberta?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, if the honourable gentleman would like, I will have somebody put together all of our information with regard to fertilizer and fertilizer production and our requirements. Certainly the situation in fact is, that the use of fertilizer has jumped in the past two years by well over 100 per cent and our plants have not expanded their production fast enough to keep up with that anticipated use. I might point out, Mr. Speaker, that in 1971 nobody was using any fertilizer because it wasn't worthwhile in regard to the prices they were receiving.

MR. TAYLOR:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Might this be the final supplementary on this question.

MR. TAYLOR:

Thank you. A supplementary to the hon. minister. Has the hon. minister any idea of the percentage of the Alberta requirements that will not be able to be met this summer?

DR. HORNER:

I don't have an exact percentage, Mr. Speaker, that may not be able to be met. My information is that those farmers who planned their operation and ordered their fertilizer early will have their orders filled. For people ordering now it is going to be very dubious whether or not their supply is going to be there. I want to point out again, Mr. Speaker, that there are going to be shortages not only of fertilizer but of other necessary inputs in this province and that we have to live with that.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Cypress followed by the hon. Member for Drumheller.

Property Tax Reduction Plan

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. In the light of the announcement of the removal of education tax on property, I take it, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister, that this applies to all apartment owners?

MR. RUSSELL:

No, the announcement, Mr. Speaker, was very specific in that it only applies to fourplexes and those of smaller densities.

MR. STROM:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the minister could advise the House if his department is checking as to whether or not this advantage is being passed on to the renters in those cases where it is applicable?

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, I should explain for the hon. member, this will be the first year of the program and so for 1973 the tenants in those cases would get their rebate under the existing renters' rebate program via the provincial income tax. There's no way of checking this year yet because, of course, no taxes have yet been paid and no benefits received.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, I take it, from the answer, that there will be no overlap and that one will apply until the other becomes effective, which will not be until the end of 1974 or at the end of the tax year, whenever that happens to be.

MR. RUSSELL:

Just to be perfectly clear, Mr. Speaker, the relief on the property will apply for the 1974 taxation year. But this year those renters are getting their rebate for last year.

MR. WILSON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. Can the hon. minister advise when provincial government interference in municipal affairs will end as promised by the hon. Member for ...

[Interjections]

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. If the hon. member will take another look at 171 of Beauchesne he will find the answer to ...

MR. RUSTE:

A supplementary question to the minister. Has his department looked at the maximum amount of tax that would be reduced on residential property in the city, on one individual, let's say the one with the highest assessment, and what that amount would be?

MR. RUSSELL:

Well, of course, Mr. Speaker, that would vary in every municipality. I suppose if an MLA was particularly interested with respect to the situation in any particular municipality in his own constituency, he would get that information from the appropriate municipal official.

MR. HO LEM:

Mr. Speaker, in view of the tax reduction accrued to the renters, will legislation be introduced to limit the increase of rents from year to year?

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, I think the forthcoming budget and legislation, amendments to The Alberta Property Tax Reduction Act will answer the member's question later in the session.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Drumheller followed by the hon. Member for Hanna-Oyen.

Municipal Tax Assessment

MR. TAYLOR:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is also to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs.

Having regard to the removal of the provincial education tax and the elbow room mentioned in the Speech from the Throne, is the government taking any specific steps to make sure the municipalities do not fill this gap being vacated by the province?

MR. RUSSELL:

Under existing legislation, Mr. Speaker, of course the province has requested the municipalities to maintain budgetary increases to a 7.5 per cent increase factor in order to get their incentive grants. That figure is under review for this year at the request of the municipalities.

MR. KOZIAK:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the hon. minister advise if it would be possible to permit the municipalities the suggested elbow room and still prevent them from entering into the field that would be vacated?

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, not only this year but last year, of course, the municipalities have been given some elbow room, by the province assuming the responsibilities for some of the

rapidly escalating social programs that had previously been supported by property tax. Of course, we are moving into that.

This year the assessment for equalization purposes on non-residential land was reduced from 35 per cent to [a] 20 per cent factor. That was of significant benefit, certainly to the urban municipalities.

MR. TAYLOR:

A supplementary to the hon. minister. Does the Speech from the Throne, in mentioning elbow room, encourage the municipalities to expand their services?

MR. SPEAKER:

This is certainly a matter of opinion and perhaps could have been brought up on another occasion.

MR. WILSON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister. Can the minister advise when authority and financial capacity will be returned to the local governments of Edmonton and Calgary, as promised by the hon. Member for Calgary West in 1971?

AN HCN. MEMBER:

Strike three and you're out.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member's question is one that invites argument and, maybe, extended argument. Possibly there might be another way, within the rules, in which he might deal with the topic.

The hon. Member for Hanna-Oyen followed by the hon. Member for Sedgewick-Coronation.

Commonwealth Games Plebiscite

MR. FRENCH:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. It is with respect to the plebiscite which will be held in Edmonton tomorrow.

What arrangements have been made to give the employees of the provincial government time off from their employment during which they can cast their ballots?

MR. RUSSELL:

I'd like to refer that question to the Minister of Manpower and Labour.

DR. HOHOL:

I appreciate the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to indicate that the usual rules, so far as I am aware - and we haven't addressed ourselves to them specifically - apply as they would in a municipal election.

MR. FRENCH:

Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. What are the rules?

[Laughter]

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, I was afraid he would ask that.

The rules are such that the employees are permitted at the end of the day to take the time, or at the forenoon to extend the time, to vote. There is a certain amount of time specified under The Public Service Act.

MR. BUCKWELL:

Rather vague.

Snow Removal

MR. SORENSON:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Highways. In light of the tremendous snow removal problems being experienced in east-central Alberta, will the Department of Highways make available some of the department's snow removal equipment to local governments in east-central Alberta?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, in the northern part of the province and the northeastern part of the province, there are acute problems with snow removal, not only from the municipal point of view, but also from the highways point of view. Many of these areas now require bulldozers to remove the snow and this is a very slow and expensive procedure. We are looking at the possibility of being able to help out the municipalities in some areas.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Ponoka followed by the hon. Member for Little Bow.

Beef Subsidy

DR. MCCRIMMON:

Mr. Speaker, my question is the Minister of Agriculture. Mr. Minister, in light of the confused situation with regard to the cattle industry, have there been any new developments in the past 24 hours that this House and the Alberta cattlemen should know about?

DR. HORNER:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. For the information of the hon. members I would like to table some of the documentation that we received from Ottawa, which might be helpful in answering any questions from their constituents.

In addition to that, it is my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that the markets are now open and buying on the basis of the American price plus a transportation allowance plus seven cents.

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, a point of order. Would this not come under ministerial announcements?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend from Clover Bar may not be concerned about the cattle situation but there are indeed a lot of people in Alberta who are.

[Interjections]

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, there is a section in this House, that is, under ministerial orders - I beg to say, Mr. Speaker, announcements - and that's where it could be given.

[Interjections]

DR. HORNER:

I'm glad to see you're a friend of cattlemen.

MR. SPEAKER:

The difference between an answer which may be appropriately given in the question period and one which should be made when the Order is called for ministerial announcements, is usually one of length and detail. If the hon. Deputy Premier is able to

answer the question briefly, it would appear to be one that is appropriate for the question period.

There is also a distinction, of which hon. members are no doubt aware, and that is that questions which are placed during the question period are traditionally on points which involve some urgency.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, everybody knows that the Deputy Premier is long-winded.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. Order please.

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, the ignorance of my honourable friends opposite with regard to the situation - the serious situation with regard to cattlemen - is appalling.

MR. HC LEM:

On a point of order, may I ask for clarification? Is there anything in the rules and procedures that refers to a cooked question?

[Laughter]

DR. HORNER:

Well, Mr. Speaker, my honourable friends again haven't had enough gumption to ask any questions and I can't really answer for them.

The situation is as follows, Mr. Speaker, which I think is important to the cattlemen of Alberta - and I would suggest to my honourable friends that if they are not interested in learning about it, I am sure that our cattlemen are - the situation is this: the markets are open today and are buying on the basis of American price plus the three cents transportation, plus the seven cents. The net effect of this, Mr. Speaker, is to give our cattlemen an increase in price of two cents per pound, and not seven cents as was originally announced by Ottawa.

I think this points up, Mr. Speaker, that if you are going to announce this kind of program, you should be ready to back up ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Possibly the hon. minister is now ...

MR. TAYLOR:

Supplementary to the ...

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary by the hon. Member for Drumheller followed by the hon. Member for Smoky River, and then I assure there's another supplementary, which might be the final one, by the hon. Member for Hanna-Oyen.

MR. TAYLOR:

Supplementary to the hon. minister. Has the federal government asked the provincial government to share, in any way, this subsidy to the cattle industry?

DR. HORNER:

They haven't asked to share the cost in any way, Mr. Speaker. We have been discussing it with them and there is a meeting set up for Thursday in Calgary at which all the farm organizations, the stockgrowers, the Alberta Cattle Commission and indeed my office, will be represented, to try to work out some of the continuing problems associated with it.

MR. MOORE:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister. Have you had any indication from Ottawa yet whether they are agreeable to accept your offer ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please.

DR. HORNER:

I haven't had a response from Ottawa in regard to that.

MR. FRENCH:

Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is also to the minister. It's pursuant to my question yesterday.

Has the minister now received information as to whether this subsidy will apply to the smaller packing plants and processing plants in the province?

DR. HORNER:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, that's why I filed these documents, one, particularly for the hon. member who does have some concern for the cattlemen in this country. It's outlined there that they will be covered.

AN HON. MEMBER:

One, out of 26.

[Interjections]

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please. In listing the supplementaries which I thought were waiting, I overlooked the hon. Member for Cardston. Perhaps we might have a post-final supplementary from him.

MR. HINMAN:

It's not supplementary to this one.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Mobile Home Loans

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. What low-interest loans are available through government for Albertans, specifically young married couples, who wish to purchase mobile units or double-wide units?

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, I think I should refer that to the hon. Provincial Treasurer who just released an announcement on that matter yesterday.

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, just yesterday I announced a new program of the Treasury Branch's which we think is going to be an extremely good program for those citizens in Alberta to whom the hon. member was particularly referring. Basically the program, Mr. Speaker, provides for loans of up to a maximum of \$15,000 over a term of 15 years at an interest rate of 9.72 per cent, which is close to bank prime rate and is an excellent interest rate.

MR. LUDWIG:

Will that be in the budget?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Little Bow followed by the hon. Member for Wainwright.

Homeowners' Assistance Program

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. Has the minister made representation to Central Mortgage and Housing authority to change the present policy which requires a young married couple, or a married couple, to have at least one child before the couple qualifies for a subsidized low-interest loan under the Homeowners' Assistance Program, thus discriminating against the ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. The hon. member's question is complete.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, certainly the last part of this question may not be in order, but the first part of the question refers to loans for mobile units. At the present time a young couple or a couple cannot qualify for a loan under Central Mortgage and Housing if they do not have at least one child. The province is involved in discussing that policy of the Central Mortgage and Housing authority and I would like to have it clarified.

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make it clear, if the hon. member doesn't understand, that we make representation to the federal government and federal agencies on a lot of different matters.

But we, in this province and this government, are prepared to have a program, a mobile home loan program which he refers to, where we are providing the leadership to meet the needs of our citizens and are not always looking at the federal government to do this.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Provincial Treasurer. Is the Provincial Treasurer prepared to lower the interest loan on the newly-announced program to be comparable to that which can be secured under the Homeowners' Assistance Program?

MR. MINIELY:

Well, Mr. Speaker, the Treasury Branch program I announced is a new program that is considerably below normal rates on conventional mortgages. It's close to bank prime, as I indicated. I am sure my colleague, the Minister of Municipal Affairs, would be glad to add on homeownership assistance programs through the Alberta Housing Corporation.

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, I think there is some confusion here because the hon. member started by asking specifically about loans for mobile homes or double wide units, and that very attractive lending program is being handled now by the Alberta treasury branches. However, for standard kinds of housing, as well as for mobile homes for families of lower incomes, there is a variety of programs available through the Alberta Housing Corporation, and in some instances Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation funding is used.

MR. BARTON:

A supplementary. Will this program be applicable to all banks too?

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, surely not. I don't run the banks, that's why I think the treasury branches have a real role in Alberta.

MR. BARTON:

A supplementary then. Will he be negotiating this program, as there are areas that have no treasury branches and it is quite difficult?

MR. LUDWIG:

That's a good question.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Flooding - Northern Alberta

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of the Environment. Is he in a position at this time to make any statement regarding the possibility of flooding in northern Alberta?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, in the next day or two I will be tabling in the House - or filing in the House - the projections on moisture content throughout the province.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Pincher Creek Hospital

MR. DRAIN:

Mr. Speaker, this question is for the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development. The question is, has the date been set to receive the delegation from Pincher Creek regarding a hospital?

MR. CRAWFORD:

No, Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware of an approach having been made in regard to receiving a delegation. I know that a delegation is expected and we do expect to hear from them.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Urbanization Task Force

MR. BENOIT:

Mr. Speaker, I am asking the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs if the task force on urbanization has been given an extended time in which to make its report, and if so, what is the new deadline?

MR. RUSSELL:

Yes it has, Mr. Speaker. The board of directors at its last meeting recommended to the government that an extension be given, and an extension for one additional fiscal year up to the end of March 31, 1975 was recently passed by order in council.

MR. BENOIT:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Will there be any interim report before that final report, and will the final report be made public?

MR. RUSSELL:

Well, Mr. Speaker, the board of directors of the task force is presently considering how best to handle or wind up the affairs of the task force, whether those people should be incorporated as a part of the Department of Municipal Affairs, or continue to operate as a separate agency. Perhaps when we get the answer to that I would be in a better position to answer that particular question.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary McCall followed by the hon. Member for Taber-Warner.

Municipal Grants

MR. HO LEM:

My question today, Mr. Speaker, is directed to the same hon. minister. In view of the difficulties during the past few years with regard to municipal grants based on census figures, will the minister consider amending Section 28 of the Act so that every local authority submits census figures based on identical timing and methods, or be subject to provincial equalization adjustment in the event of variance in practice?

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, that legislation was passed by the Legislature at the last fall session.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Taber-Warner followed by the hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest.

Taber Provincial Park

MR. D. MILLER:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests. Has the hon. minister plans for improving Taber Provincial Park this year?

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, relative to the future plans for Taber Provincial Park, I would have to check. However, I would like to remind all that there had been a serious situation due to a flood that occurred at Taber Provincial Park. With the help of a private company we were able to restore it completely and reopen the park.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest followed by the hon. Member for Vermilion-Viking.

Phillips Pass Survey

MR. DRAIN:

Mr. Speaker, this question is to the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests. The question is: is his department planning to extend the boundary survey from Phillips Pass north through the unsurveyed area some time in the future?

DR. WARRACK:

Would you believe, I don't know offhand. I'll have to take that question as notice.

MR. DRAIN:

Supplementary on this, Mr. Speaker, because it is 40 years late for me.

DR. WARRACK:

That was my fault.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Workers' Compensation Review Committee

MR. CCOPER:

Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Manpower and Labour. Is the review committee under The Workers' Compensation Act, as set forth in Section 26, now operating?

DR. HCHOL:

Mr. Speaker, the committee's membership is nearly concluded and will be announced in a matter of a few days.

Commonwealth Games Plebiscite (Cont.)

While I'm on my feet, sir, I should like to complete the response to the hon. Member for Hanna-Oyen with respect to voting privileges for employees of government. The government provides for the employees to have three consecutive hours for the purpose of casting a vote. I should also mention that the polls are open until 8:00 o'clock and the office is closed at 4:30. Shift workers will certainly be accommodated as to voting privileges.

MR. FRENCH:

Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question. In view of the condition of the roads in Edmonton, is any consideration being given to extend, say an extra hour so they can get through these roads?

DR. HOHOL:

I would say with three hours to vote to be tacked on to the noon hour or the end of the day, that half an hour - I think we would concede that.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Lethbridge East followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Millican.

U. of A. Residences

MR. ANDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Culture, Youth and Recreation. Is the government considering granting the three residences on The University of Alberta campus status as historic sites?

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Speaker, we are presently considering this matter. Also, of course, we are making sure the historical facts regarding these buildings are known before we make any decision.

MR. ANDERSON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the government be prepared to aid with the upgrading of Pembina Hall as a women's residence?

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Speaker, part of the consideration, of course, will be concerning the question the hon. member has asked.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Alberta Oil Prices

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question today to the hon. the Premier. Could the Premier bring the Legislature up to date on the present negotiations with the federal government regarding pricing of Alberta oil?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I don't think there is anything today that I could usefully bring to the members' attention that would be helpful in that regard.

MR. DIXON:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the Premier. Will the price being negotiated have a specified period of time to guarantee that price?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I would have to take it that the supplementary would fall in the same category as the original question.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Cardston followed by the hon. Member for Drumheller.

Fertilizer Plants - Lethbridge Area

MR. HINMAN:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Industry and Commerce. Have the communities within 20 miles of Lethbridge been informed of the location requirements for the fertilizer plant so that they might make their own presentations to attract that industry?

MR. FEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, the fertilizer plants that the hon. member refers to are initiated by free enterprise and the private enterprise sector. I don't think at this time that this government or any other government should be interfering or determining where they should be located. So they are free to negotiate with whatever areas they would be better located in.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Spokane World Fair - Display

MR. TAYLOR:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests. Has the government finalized its thinking in regard to the display that will represent Alberta at the Spokane World Fair?

DR. WARRACK:

The one part, including the valuable suggestion of last fall from the hon. member for that display in Spokane, is being carried forward as part of the Department of Lands and Forests' participation in the displays at Spokane. In terms of the overall display on the part of the Government of Alberta, I believe that the Minister of Consumer Affairs is in charge of that area and might, perhaps, want to add a comment.

MR. DOWLING:

Mr. Speaker, just to get in the act, it is the Minister of Culture, Youth and Recreation who has that responsibility.

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Speaker, a building which is going to be erected at the site ran into some difficulties, at first unanticipated, due to the ground rock. We expect to have that decision within the next few days.

MR. TAYLOR:

Supplementary. Will there be a display of any kind indicating the value of domestic coal in Alberta?

If I may just add one word, I ask this question because parts of Montana are now very interested in Alberta's domestic coal. I thought it would be a good chance to capitalize on that.

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Speaker, the exhibition in Spokane actually has an environmental theme and if coal is going to be part of that, of course, we would consider it when the final decision is made.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Sedgewick-Coronation followed by the hon. Member for Clover Bar.

CP Truck Services

MR. SORENSON:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Industry and Commerce. Has the minister met with CP transport officials regarding the discontinuance of their trucking services in many areas of this province?

MR. PEACOCK:

No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SORENSON:

Supplementary to the minister. Has the minister received any representations from Alberta communities regarding this matter?

MR. PEACOCK:

No, Mr. Speaker, not in my office.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Clover Bar followed by the hon. Member for Wainwright.

Anhydrous Ammonia Plants

DR. EUCK:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address my question to the hon. Minister of Industry and Commerce. My question is, can the hon. minister inform the House how many applications his department has received in relation to proposed anhydrous ammonia plants that would use Alberta natural gas?

AN HCN. MEMBER:

Put it on the Order Paper.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please.

It would seem to be a question that would be fit for the Order Paper unless the minister just happens to have the figures at his fingertips.

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, I think it might be better served on the Order Paper. However, to inform the House, there are no regulations or permits through our department by which we would have any control over how many plants. But we have been in conversation with a number of companies that have shown some interest in developing anhydrous ammonia plants in Alberta and they would number somewhere in the neighbourhood of a dozen.

DR. EUCK:

Mr. Speaker, may I ask a further question? Is the minister able to inform the House if the products from these plants will be for domestic purposes or for export?

DR. HORNER:

He already did.

MR. FEACCK:

Mr. Speaker, I think the Minister of Agriculture answered that, but certainly it is in the interests of Alberta to meet the needs of Alberta first, Canadians second and to export the surplus.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. Has the minister had an opportunity to discuss with federal officials proposed legislation which would bring the export of ammonia under the National Energy Board Act or under federal control?

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, in our meeting with Mr. Gillespie held last Thursday here in Alberta, we did have some discussion on how the federal government saw its role in making sure that resources produced in Canada would be upgraded as much as possible in Canada. The federal government has introduced some legislation which would assist in this area. We had some differences of opinion as well, because the Alberta government feels very strongly that the upgrading of resources should be as close as possible to the source. That has not always been the way it has happened within Canada.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Wainwright.

Farm Implement Repairs

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Agriculture, and deals with The Farm Implement Act, Section 7(1).

Is the government giving any consideration to increasing the required time to repair parts for farm implements beyond the present 10 year period?

DR. HERNER:

The whole question of the availability of parts and indeed, of machinery, is under continuous review, Mr. Speaker. I am pleased that the hon. member has now gone back and read the Act that he introduced.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Bcw.

Antique Goods

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Consumer Affairs. Can the minister advise if it is the intention of the government to introduce legislation to prohibit the making or altering of any object in such manner that it appears to be an antique and which would require any person who sells an antique to give the buyer a record of the history of the object?

MR. DOWLING:

Mr. Speaker, I'm not just certain what the hon. member is referring to but if he would like to give me some details on it after the session I will look into it for him.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview.

Fertilizer (Cont.)

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Agriculture for clarification. It is with respect to the local requirements for fertilizer.

My question is, Mr. Speaker, what mechanism does the department have to monitor the requirements for fertilizer and how will that mechanism work as it applies to the new fertilizer plants being set up, to ensure that local requirements are met?

DR. HORNER:

Well, as I have already said to the House, Mr. Speaker, we, in conjunction with Unifarm, are monitoring price and requirements throughout the province. Indeed, my departmental people, the field people who are spread all over the province, are continuing to monitor fertilizer needs. We get into an area where one has to estimate the needs for next year and that - as all farmers know - depends on their decision somewhere along the line. I think though, in a general way we can ensure, once we get the manufacturing capacity of the province to the stage that I will expect it will be within a year or so, that there will be an adequate supply in Alberta.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, one supplementary question. Has the minister received any information from his department as to what farmers can expect with respect to price increases in fertilizer this spring?

DR. HOFNER:

We're doing the general review again now. The earlier January review showed a 5 per cent increase over last fall. There was some hope at that time that those prices might stabilize but I would fear that they would be rising as everything else has.

MR. RUSTE:

A supplementary question to the minister. When could we expect a report from the committee you mentioned earlier - the committee established to meet with others in the fertilizer field?

DR. HORNER:

If the hon. member is referring to the three-province committee, I think that would be an ongoing committee, Mr. Speaker, which would be monitoring the situation and giving us some idea of western Canadian fertilizer needs for the present and the future. So I would expect that we might have some interim reports later on but I wouldn't want to put a date on them.

MR. SPEAKER:

There is time for just one final question by the hon. Member for Lesser Slave Lake.

Truck Hiring - Government Contracts

MR. EARTON:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Department of Highways. I was wondering if the Department of Highways is continuing a long-established Social Credit practice of hiring 60 per cent local trucks on all government contracts?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, like many of the long-established Social Credit policies, they are going the way of the dinosaur. We no longer keep that policy.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. In light of his answer, how come he has been in office two years ...

[Interjections]

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. Order please.

MR. EARTON:

A supplementary then, Mr. Speaker. Does that mean that local trucks no longer have that opportunity?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, local trucks have the same opportunity on every job in Alberta that other Alberta trucks have.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER:

If I might refer again to the remarks which I made yesterday concerning the motion by the hon. Member for Calgary Bow. I have had some representations from some hon. members. I think perhaps the matter should be dealt with now. If there are other hon. members who would like to express themselves on that point of order I would be grateful for their views.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I understand that the subject under discussion is the question of whether the motion of the hon. Member for Calgary Bow - Mr. Wilson's motion - is properly on the Order Paper. I would like to suggest that the reference made by you, sir, to Rule 131 ought not to be applied in this case, that it anticipates something that could be debated shortly after the motion is placed on the Order Paper.

I am suggesting that Rule 131 is a most antiquated rule; it has never been applied in this House and ought not to be applied at the present time. One can state that one is anticipating what may be in the budget but no one, including you, sir, with all respect, can anticipate that the budget will have anything in it dealing with this particular issue. It may be there but we don't know and nobody knows. In fact, the hon. the Provincial Treasurer ought not to leak any information which may be in the budget so that hon. members may then be told that, since it has been leaked, you can't put a motion on the Order Paper.

I think some of the rules which deal with interpretation of rules in this House are expressed in Beauchesne and I would like to read Rule 119 dealing with what guidelines we ought to use in the interpretation of rules. One says here that the viewpoints of Members of Parliament from all over the country are important:

... For this reason debates in the House are necessarily lengthy. ... In Parliament every corner of the country is represented and no rule should silence elected representatives when they think they have a message to deliver. ...

It's important under the circumstances that, when an hon. member has a message to deliver, his timing be considered. The fear that, perhaps, somewhere down the line he may second-guess something that ought to be done, ought not to be a reason for ruling this motion out, because the ministers need guidance and what we think ought to be done. Therefore, if our thinking is perhaps in advance of what the minister may want to do, that is a credit to the hon. member who brings in a motion like that. Therefore, the strict interpretation of a rule in this case, Mr. Speaker - I very, very firmly object to it.

Furthermore, I don't think this rule was ever resorted to in the past. It becomes a question to me, as a member of the opposition. Why is it raised now? There certainly have been motions in the last 10, 15 or 20 years which may have been one jump ahead of the ministers and maybe the government. But that is good representation, Mr. Speaker. We ought not to discourage that. We ought to encourage that.

So I think that anyone who gets up in this House, and with all respect to you, sir, to feel that this may be in the budget - it may be in the budget; the budget may never be debated. It's possible that it will be; in all likelihood it will be. The fact that it says that we will probably have an opportunity to debate this - you can rule out so many things if you apply the rules strictly.

I am stating that the hon. member, Mr. Wilson, has placed a motion on the Order Paper. It's a current topic. It has nothing to do with anything before the House at the present

time. I am saying that if it may, possibly, turn out that the hon. minister has something that may go in the budget, that perhaps guidance may still be in time for him to do what we think ought to be done.

On that basis, Mr. Speaker, I feel that motion ought to be proceeded with. The hon. member has done his homework. He has the motion on the Order Paper. It got there legally and rules ought not to be sought out and interpreted with a view to restricting debate. We ought to look to see if it is not possible to permit this debate. I want to make one more quotation here.

It says, in dealing with interpretation of rules, and I am quoting from Rule 119 on page 111:

... In border line cases the Member should be given the benefit of the doubt. A great deal of latitude must be allowed in the House of Commons which is a forum where every phase of public affairs can be discussed and every Member has the right to be heard, even if in doing so he sometimes disregards the rigidity of procedure.

Mr. Speaker, I'm saying that this rule - we have reviewed the Alberta rules and nothing on this particular point appears in the Alberta Rules. Under Rule 2 of our rules, it states that if some provision is not made in our rules to deal with a particular situation - and I'm quoting from memory - then we resort to custom and usage. So I'm urging Your Honour to resort to custom and usage.

But let's look at the custom and usage of this House first instead of relying on a rule that was never applied. If it has been applied in this House, I don't remember. I've been in approximately 15 sessions but it was never in my memory applied in this House. Furthermore, when we talk about custom and usage, if we want to be reasonably sure that this particular rule was applied in the House of Commons, say, in the last while, I don't recall running across it. It would be interesting to note whether since 1936, which is the date mentioned - and I'm quoting from memory again - which is the date mentioned in Rule 131, whether this has been the custom and usage or whether this custom and usage fell by the boards and not to stay where it fell.

So I urge Your Honour to give favourable consideration. I do not believe that any damage would be done to any budgetary preparations or statements and that the rule of repetition - that in the event we had a good debate on this motion - then I submit Your Honour has the right to state that this has been done, this has been debated or whatever situation should arise. And I'm stating that even on that basis that there are many opportunities that almost any motion that we put on the Order Paper can be dealt with in some other way. But that is not a reason, Mr. Speaker, to rule these things out. I'm saying that if Your Honour does resort to applying the rule strictly, that it is a first, and in my opinion would be an unfortunate decision.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, I want to speak to the point of order and immediately say to my hon. friend from Calgary Mountain View that because he has said a number of things doesn't necessarily mean that any of them are true.

It isn't a question of whether this is a first at all in this Legislature. It is a question of whether or not we are going to have proper rules and regulations by which this House can function in an orderly manner. This is not a "border line" case, Mr. Speaker, in my view. The resolution is obviously out of order because it precludes the entire budget debate and talks about government expenditure estimates in a general way - which is absolutely out of order in regard to a resolution of this kind.

I would also point out, Mr. Speaker, that the prerogative, over the years, for the introduction of money resolutions, of course rests with the Crown and the government. My hon. friend from Calgary Mountain View, of course, is very much aware of that.

So, on a number of grounds, Mr. Speaker, this resolution in fact is out of order and I suggest very sincerely that the hon. member should be asked to withdraw it and that it be dropped from the Order Paper.

MR. EENOIT:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a couple of observations with regard to the matter.

If I am properly informed, Mr. Speaker, this resolution appeared previously on the Order Paper at another session and at that particular time it had been accepted. If we're dealing with the principle of the resolution, then I can see no possible way of us anticipating something that has not come into the House. Therefore, this resolution, if

it were referring at all to any estimates, would be referring to the Estimates of the previous year, not Estimates of this year.

Anyway, it is not talking about Estimates. It is talking about the comparisons between the expenditures of government and is not making particular or necessarily any specific reference to any Estimates, whether last year or this year.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, just one or two points. In view of the fact that the budget is not before the House at the present time and won't be for some days and that this resolution has been on before and is again on the Order Paper, I believe a motion is in order because it is, in my opinion, a motion that is discussing inflation where we can pin it down. I think the words are "... that exceed the limit imposed upon municipalities ...". Then we can have a good discussion in this House as to whether we should have guidelines similar to those that are set out by our municipalities.

So there is something that can be debated. I don't think that it is ultra vires in relation to the budget debate that may come into this House on Friday evening.

So, Mr. Speaker, I believe, in my humble opinion, that the motion is in order.

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, perhaps a little background information might be helpful to the hon. members. The resolution that is on the present Order Paper is exactly the same as the one we finally got on the Order Paper last fall as a result of several weeks of research and negotiation, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of, not only your good offices, but outside counsel as well from the various parties concerned.

I think that the hon. members might appreciate the situation a little better if they did know all the details that went into preparing the resolution, Mr. Speaker. The word "estimates" that now rests within this motion is really not germane to the motion but was there at the suggestion of one outside adviser to help further identify the situation we are trying to talk about, and that is really the principle of the pressure that the government policy exerts on municipal government.

So, Mr. Speaker, if the resolution is not acceptable in its exact present form, and if it's the word "estimates" that is upsetting some hon. members because it's been suggested that the opposition members have no right to bring in money resolutions, well this certainly isn't a money resolution. It is the principle that we are trying to deal with. The word "estimates" was only referred to to help identify it from the Estimates that were in existence when the government policy was first enunciated. There is no reference to the budget in the resolution, Mr. Speaker, so it's certainly not a money resolution.

As far as the anticipation situation - the resolution does not anticipate any future budgets whatsoever from the time that it appeared on the Order Paper, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FOSTER:

Mr. Speaker, I would submit to you, sir, that Resolution No. 2, currently the subject of this point of order, is in fact, as has been suggested, a blocking motion. The previous speakers have talked, Mr. Speaker, about the matter of anticipation. You, sir, are aware of Rule 131 and of the Rules of the House, 22 (e), dealing with debate. Now, this is not a matter of debate but the principle is the same. Any matter that anticipates a matter on the Order Paper, or under Rule 131, proceedings that will be a part of the House, is out of order.

As Mr. Speaker knows, the operative provisions, in my submission, of Rule 131 are "probability" and "reasonable time". The wording of the resolution, Mr. Speaker, talks about government expenditure estimates. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the probability of the budget being brought down in the course of the next several days is extremely high. The matter of reasonable time is a matter of a few days. And on that point, Rule 131 is, in fact, operative and this resolution should be declared out of order.

I would point out, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member who seems so anxious to discuss and debate the matter of Resolution No. 2 will have every opportunity three or four days from now, in the course of budget debate, to discuss the matter of budget generally, since all subjects relating to the estimates of this House are open for debate at that time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. HINMAN:

Mr. Speaker, because of the history of this resolution, perhaps the House would permit some change. What I'm proposing is simply that I can agree that at this particular moment perhaps this is out of order because it does anticipate the budget. It didn't anticipate the Estimates last fall because they were not before the House.

The point is simply a dissatisfaction, I think, with the limitations placed on municipalities when they keep saying, well, we all ought to be governed by the same rules. I wonder if the House would consent to letting the hon. member revise this motion to the satisfaction of the Speaker and letting it retain its place on the Order Paper.

MR. SPEAKER:

Unless there are other members who wish to express themselves, I think perhaps I should now deal with the matter.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words on the matter.

In connection with Section 131, which deals with anticipation, I recognize that this is a very difficult section with which to deal because when you start anticipating, you could anticipate anything. You are looking into the future. It's somebody's opinion, and the Speaker is put in a position wherein he has to decide whether or not this matter is equal to a double reading of a bill, or raising something twice at the same session.

All of us can anticipate, but it is very difficult to know when anticipation is valid in connection with something like this. If this rule were used extensively, it could preclude debate on almost any subject. Because in the budget debate, practically everything is raised in connection with the province, certainly everything that involves money and many things that don't involve money. The general economic condition of the province is dealt with.

If we are going to use anticipation as a instrument to preclude debate, it could be used to almost the extent of closure on freedom of speech. Consequently, I suggest Section 131 is there to be used on very rare occasions and only when certain conditions are met.

The section itself deals with the anticipation rule and it goes on to deal with how that should be applied, at least to some degree. It points out that it is dependent on the same principle as that which the hon. Speaker would use in forbidding the same question being discussed twice. Now the only difference is, when a second motion is brought to the House that has already been discussed, certainly the Speaker is in a very definite position. He knows what has happened in the past.

When it comes to anticipation, the hon. Speaker, with all respect, is unable to say for sure what is going to happen in the future. He may have a better wisdom than that, and probably has, than that of many hon. members, but at best it is still a viewpoint because he can't be sure that that is going to happen. Consequently in this particular section, applying that particular point, I would suggest the anticipation rule would be ill-advised because the Speaker would be presuming that the content of this resolution is going to be part and parcel of the budget address or the Budget Speech. I don't think the hon. Speaker has access to the budget, and so at the very best it is his judgment.

Now when we look at the motion and consider that this expresses disapproval, it is not a money bill, it simply expresses disapproval of a certain item that may or may not be in the budget. Consequently to close it out, unless the hon. Speaker is very, very sure that it is going to be part and parcel of the budget, I think would be misusing this particular section of the bill.

The other point upon which this depends is that in applying the anticipation rule, it must be done in a descending scale of values, such as: is it a bill, a motion, or an amendment et cetera, going down the scale. Now there is no particular bill involved, there is no particular motion involved, there is no particular amendment involved. It's very difficult - at least I would find it difficult - to rule on the basis of a descending scale as set out as an example of how this could be applied in a debate in the House.

Consequently for that reason I would suggest that the anticipation rule would be ill-advised because again, unless the Speaker has some very strong judgment that this is going to be part and parcel of the budget debate, then certainly to use the anticipation rule on a mere guess basis would be tantamount to closure of the debate and tantamount to stopping freedom of speech.

The first point on anticipation then, I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, is that there is little reason to rule this resolution out of order because number one, as I pointed out before, it is not tantamount to second reading, the second consideration of a bill or a motion. Secondly, it is not possible to deal with it on the descending order of values.

The other point that was mentioned is that the anticipation rule is expressing disapproval of some government acts. If that is the basis of ruling it out of order, then I would suggest that every resolution henceforth that commends the government would also have to be ruled out of order on the same basis. Because it depends on which side of the fence you are on. For years, even during the life of this Legislature, we have had a number of resolutions commending the government, some of which this side has supported and some of which this side has not supported. But that is immaterial. The point is, if it is going to work one way, then it must work the other way. I would think it would be very embarrassing to look back over a number of resolutions that commended the government and wonder why anticipation was not used in that respect if it is going to be used in respect of one in which the Legislature may express disapproval.

Again, the resolution is simply a resolution. It may not pass, but if it passes or if it doesn't pass, I think is immaterial at this point. It does express an opinion which is a viewpoint outside the House, represented by a number of members here, to indicate to the government what some percentage of our people think about this particular procedure. That, I would think, the government would want to know. If a majority of the members feel that way, then the government would certainly take much more heed of the resolution than if only a minority of members feel that way.

I personally think the government is in a stronger position to hear the debate and then to decide whether it will accede or not accede to the wishes set out in that resolution.

The second point I would like to deal with in Section 131 deals with the word "blocking". Blocking is used in this as a means to prevent some discussion taking place at a future time. "... a bill must not be anticipated by (or more shortly "block") discussion of a motion, amendment or subject raised on another motion." Now, if I thought this was going to block or prevent some discussion in the future on the budget, then I could certainly agree that it would not be in order. But I can't find any reasons in my mind, or see anything in the resolution that would block another motion, that would block further consideration. It is simply expressing an opinion - which I would think the government would like to have - whether the people generally approve of this procedure or otherwise in regard to their incentive grants.

And so the blocking rule in my view is out. So, on the two points raised in Rule 131, anticipation and blocking, on both scores as I see it, the resolution is in order.

Mr. Speaker, in connection with it being a money resolution, if it was a money resolution it never would have been allowed on the Order Paper in the first place, and should not have been. It simply expresses an opinion on the spending of money; it does not ask for the expenditure of money. Consequently, in my view, it would not be a money resolution.

For those reasons, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that the resolution is in order.

MR. KING:

Mr. Speaker, if I could make just a few comments. It seems to me that what is important is not simply the wording of this resolution, particularly relative to a similar resolution of last year, but also the critical question of the time of its introduction. The significant difference between this resolution and the resolution of last year is that the resolution last year was introduced to the Assembly after the budget address. There could have been no argument at that time that it was anticipating something which, in that session, had already occurred. So that, regardless of the fact that it may - in its words - be patterned after the resolution of last year, in its timing it is significantly different. I think that this is important.

The question of anticipation, as I believe the hon. Member for Drumheller has accurately stated, is related to the order of the priorities of the business of the House. The fact of the matter is that this order of priority is predicated, at least in part, on the belief that government is more important than other business. The Speech from the Throne is probably the most important, followed by the Budget Speech, followed by government bills, followed by others.

The Government House Leader has risen in this House and announced that on Friday of this week a budget is going to be introduced, Mr. Speaker. When that budget is introduced there is also made a motion that the budget should be adopted. So we are anticipating a resolution of the House. The question is not whether or not we anticipate any of the debate that takes place on that resolution, but simply whether or not we anticipate the resolution itself. The precedent, the tradition of this House, is that a government

resolution on the budget has a higher priority than a private member's resolution or a motion other than a government motion.

The effect of that, then, is that this could block the resolution of Friday evening. In point of fact, the wording of the resolution which expresses disapproval is exactly the same wording as might be used in a motion of non-confidence on either the Throne Speech debate or the Budget Speech debate. The effect of it, if adopted, would be to preclude a certain course of action by the government. In fact, in terms of the non-confidence motion, it would be to do considerably more than that.

But it would be my argument, Mr. Speaker, that in view of the fact that the Government House Leader has announced to the House that a resolution will be moved on Friday night related to "... increases in government expenditure ..." - and we can forget the word "estimates" altogether - then I think that there can be no other logical conclusion except that any debate on this - forget "estimates", forget "incentive grants", forget the disposition of the resolution itself - is going to anticipate a resolution which the Government House Leader has already announced will be made in the House on Friday night and which, by the precedent and tradition of this House, has a higher priority than Motions Other Than Government Motions.

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Speaker, I don't want to take very much time. I would like to concur with what the hon. Member for Drumheller did say - I'm just going to come to the Member for Red Deer - when he indicated that there would be an opportunity to debate, in the budget debate. I would suggest to hon. members here that - this is the third year as I recall - we haven't finished the budget debate at any time. It's been left on the Order Paper. So, if he is arguing that point, that is restricted.

But I'm rather surprised to see the hon. members opposite rise in their places to try to prohibit, to restrict, debate on a resolution such as this. Certainly the people of Alberta were left with the impression that everything was going to be out in the open, everything was going to be done on the floor of this Legislature, nothing was to be swept under the rug. And here we have opposition to a motion made by an hon. member that is on the Order Paper and has been accepted as such.

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry but I can't accept the nonsense that has just come from the hon. Member for Wainwright. We are not dealing with this in any kind of partisan way but rather in how the ...

MR. LUDWIG:

Sit down. Sit down.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please.

I'm reluctant to establish a precedent in this particular debate whereby members may be speaking twice to the point of order. I believe all members who wish to contribute to the consideration of the point have spoken.

DR. BACKUS:

I would like to speak on this debate, Mr. Speaker. I think this suggestion, that we are not being open in this matter, is not very reasonable under the circumstances. I think if one reads the proposed motion, it would appear fairly obvious that what is said here is "... disapproval to increases in government expenditure estimates ..." and the rest of the sentence can be reduced to over 7.5 per cent which is, in fact, the limit imposed upon municipalities with regard to the incentive grant.

Now I don't see how a debate on this subject can be debated in the House at the present time without actual discussion of the government expenditure Estimates. I certainly can disagree strongly with the suggestion that this does not anticipate something that is coming up. I think anybody in the House would agree that we are anticipating a budget debate and we are anticipating the Estimates coming up. Therefore a motion that suggests this House disapprove of any increases in government estimates in excess of 7.5 per cent certainly is anticipating debate that is normally in session on the Estimates. I therefore rule out any suggestion and feel that Rule 131 does apply in this case and that all the arguments on the other side that suggest lack of openness are irrelevant to the matter of forcing a debate on a subject which will be coming up under the Estimates or under the Budget debate.

Speaker's Ruling

MR. SPEAKER:

I'm grateful to hon. members for the opinions which they have expressed on this point and I think that some of the difficulty perhaps arises out of the similar resolution or an identical one having been on the Order Paper last fall.

Dealing with the question of rigidity of application of the rules as argued by the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View, I would suggest that although there has to be some measure of flexibility - and the rules are the servants of the House rather than its master - that position can't be extended to extremes, otherwise we would have no rules at all.

It is precisely because of the concern which I believe the Chair must have for the rights of individual members of the Assembly that a question of this kind has to be looked at extremely carefully. In other words, if debate is going to be permitted on two or three occasions on the same topic, the time which is going to be used up in doing that is going to deprive hon. members from dealing with other business during that time. And as hon. members know, there is never sufficient time to deal with everything that comes before the House as fully as hon. members might wish.

It is very difficult for me to have regard to the customs and usage of the House in years gone by in the absence of a Hansard during those years, unless hon. members are able to refer specifically to precedents in the Journals, and of that so far there has been no suggestion.

With regard to the motion having appeared on the Order Paper both this time and last time, and certainly it appeared over the signature, or at least it was approved for inclusion on the Order Paper over the signature of the Speaker, I would draw hon. members' attention to Rule 43 which requires that it is before the question is put - I assume that is intended to mean before debate begins - that the Speaker is to draw to the attention of the House that a motion is out of order. I don't think that that necessarily precludes a motion being kept from the Order Paper initially, but it certainly is, you might say, the Speaker's last chance to deal with the matter, and this is what I'm doing at the moment.

If the motion were to stand on its own feet independently and deal only with the restriction placed on municipalities, it would probably be acceptable. But as the motion stands, it can't be debated on that basis. There are two items which the motion would require to be debated. One is the government expenditures and the other is municipal expenditures, and then of course, the motion requires that a comparison be made between the two.

Consequently I must say that in my opinion the rule against anticipation is indeed applicable, and I would respectfully draw to the attention of hon. members who have expressed very justifiable doubts about the prophetic ability of the Speaker, that it isn't certainty that's required. The opening in Citation 131 of Beauchesne, in dealing with the rule against anticipation, uses the word "probability" in line 3. It must be apparent to all members of the House that there is an extreme probability that this self-same matter will come up for debate when the Estimates are being debated.

So to conclude, I must say that I find the motion does offend against the rule against anticipation and that it should be removed from the Order Paper, notwithstanding the extreme importance of the topic which has been raised by the hon. Member for Calgary Bow. He isn't really left without a remedy. The same matter can be debated and brought up in the debates on the Estimates. And as far as the restriction on municipalities is concerned, it could certainly be brought up in a properly-worded motion divorced from the part which offends against the rule against anticipation.

I am therefore going to ask the Clerk to remove the motion from the Order Paper.

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of information, so that I might fully and clearly understand your ruling, does your rule apply if the motion is introduced subsequent to the introduction of the budget?

MR. SPEAKER:

This may be more or less hypothetical. It would have been something that perhaps we might have debated last fall when the motion was on the Order Paper.

My present view, subject to hearing on an appropriate occasion the expressions of opinion of members of the Assembly, would be that even after the Estimates had been

approved, the motion would not be in order if it so happened that the Estimates, as approved, exceeded the guideline, because then I would see the House in this position: having approved Estimates which exceed the guideline, it then would be asked to endorse a resolution that the House express its disapproval of something which it had just approved in the same session.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, on your ruling to delete the hon. member, Mr. Wilson's motion from the Order Paper, I challenge your ruling and appeal the decision to the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Ch, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

I respectfully refer the hon. member to the provisions of our present rules and suggest that he compare those with the previous rules. I think he will find that what he is now proposing to do is not permitted under the rules.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, may I comment on your remarks with reference to this order?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Order, order.

MR. LUDWIG:

With deference to the Chair, I'm submitting that there is provision to appeal the Speaker's ruling under the present rules, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Perhaps the hon. member would like to refer to the provision he has in mind.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I'm referring to the situation where, under Rule 2, if there is not specific provision in our rules to deal with any situation - and I'll read it:

In all contingencies not provided for the question will be decided by Mr. Speaker and in making his ruling Mr. Speaker shall base his decision on the usages and precedents of this Legislature and on parliamentary tradition.

There is nothing specifically set out in the rules, so this particular situation is not provided for. It is silent on the issue. I'm stating that, because since we refer to Beauchesne in anything that is not provided for, then under those conditions the right to challenge the Speaker's ruling exists. It was never ruled out, it was omitted. But that would be a negative approach to the issue and since no provision is made for it the right to appeal the Speaker's ruling has not been abolished in this House.

MR. KING:

Mr. Speaker, if I could speak to the point of order or to the comments that have been made by the hon. member.

As a member of the select committee which last year reviewed all of these rules, I would draw his attention to Rule 12(1) in the book which he has in front of him, and I would further draw his attention to Volume 1 of the Rules Committee Report last year. And I would invite other members of that committee to support me in what I am about to say.

When the select committee on the rules last year made its report, in amending Rule 12(1) to delete the reference to appeal on the decision of the Chair, it very specifically mentioned that the deletion of the reference to appeal was being done consciously because the members of the committee did not believe that there should be an appeal from the decision of the Chair, except by one way and one way only. That way was mentioned in the report of the committee. That was that an hon. member could introduce a substantive resolution upon notice. I think that the hon. member will find all of that in the report of the committee of last year.

MR. SPEAKER:

With great respect to the hon. Member for Edmonton Highlands, I have some doubt as to whether the deliberations of the committee have any effect in the House beyond what is actually expressed in the rules.

In dealing with the point of order subsequently raised by the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View, I would suggest to him that, unless there is specific provision for an appeal, then as the honourable and learned member would know, there is no appeal.

I believe that this is a time-honoured rule which has survived several centuries: that a right to appeal has to be specifically given, otherwise it isn't there. In this particular case we also have the fact that we can compare the present text with the former text in order to have some assistance in arriving at the intention.

I must therefore say that the hon. member's point of order is contrary to the present rules.

MR. HINMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I am not sure of my ground here, but I wonder if it is in order for me to propose that the House give unanimous consent for the hon. member to revise his resolution so that it is acceptable to you, and let it retain its position on the Order Paper?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

Having heard the request by the hon. member, I'm not sure whether he's intending it as a motion or whether it can be made as a motion at this time. Are there any other hon. members who would like to express their opinions on the suggestion made by the hon. Member for Cardston?

MR. FOSTER:

Mr. Speaker, I'm not really sure whether we're now speaking to another point of order following an earlier ruling or what, but whatever the provision that allows me to comment, my comment is this: that the remedy the hon. member wishes to take with respect to his motion which has now been ruled out of order, is surely up to him and whomever he has as his advisers and not up to this House to decide what he might now do. The motion having been ruled out of order, it seems to me the individual member can pursue whatever remedy he chooses, if any, for the reintroduction of that subject to this House.

MR. SPEAKER:

I would respectfully mention to hon. members that possibly the hon. Member for Calgary Bow was lulled into thinking he had a fairly high position on the Order Paper under private members' business. If the House were to accede to the suggestion by the hon. Member for Cardston, then the hon. Member for Calgary Bow would be able to retain that position in a motion perhaps put in another form which might not be objectionable.

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Speaker, although it's a very friendly and peacemaking suggestion, I don't believe it is sound. The hon. Member for Cardston admitted himself that he thought the resolution was out of order on the very grounds that you have reiterated. Now, to attempt to amend a resolution that is out of order to put it into order - I don't see how you can do it when the whole subject of the thing is obviously out of court. I think it is wrong. If they've goofed they can put in another motion and take their turn on the Order Paper like everybody else.

MR. SPEAKER:

Just in concluding, perhaps, this consideration, [may I] say that if it were not for Rule 43, it might be necessary for the Speaker to reserve his decision on a great number of motions which would result in a substantial delay in their arriving on to the Order Paper. With the safeguard that we have in Rule 43, I am able to approve a number of motions more lightheartedly and get them on the Order Paper a little faster.

WRITTEN QUESTIONS

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

1. (a) What is the number of full-time female employees hired by the Alberta government since April 1, 1973?
(b) How many were over 45 years of age when hired?
2. (a) What is the number of full-time female employees released or retired, or separated for any other reason from employment by the Alberta Government since April 1, 1973?
(b) How many were over 45 years of age when either released, retired, or separated from employment?
3. Of the female employees hired in 1. above, how many received salaries of:
(a) over \$10,000 per year;
(b) from \$8,000 to \$10,000 per year;
(c) from \$6,000 to \$8,000 per year; and
(d) under \$6,000 per year?
4. What is the average starting salary of full-time male employees hired by the Alberta Government since April 1st, 1973?
5. What is the average starting salary of full-time female employees hired by the Alberta Government since April 1st, 1973?

DR. HCHOL:

We accept the question, Mr. Speaker.

112. Mr. Cooper asked the government the following question:

- (a) What is the number of complaints received by the Alberta Human Rights Commission from women complaining of discrimination in employment since March 30th, 1973, and
- (b) What were the nature of these complaints?

DR. HOHOL:

We accept that too, sir.

MOTIONS FOR A RETURN

106. Mr. Ruste proposed the following motion to the Assembly:

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

A copy of the telegram referred to at the western economics conference held last year in Calgary when the Hon. Otto Lang, Minister in charge of the Canadian Wheat Board, said to the Hon. Dr. Horner, Alberta's Minister of Agriculture, "Why Dr. Horner, only a week ago I received a telegram from you in which you took an entirely different position."

DR. HORNER:

We accept the motion and I table the document that seems to be of some interest to the hon. member.

107. Mr. Clark proposed the following motion to the Assembly:

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

- (a) The names and locations of head offices of all advertising/public relations firms that were retained to do work by the provincial government, its agencies or

boards from January 1, 1973 to December 31, 1973, and the amounts received by each firm, and the specific advertising or public relations task they performed.

- (b) The total amount of money spent on advertising by the provincial government, its boards or agencies, in 1973, and the amount spent broken down into the following categories:

1. Daily Press
2. Weekly Press
3. Radio
4. Television
5. Brochures and publications.

DR. HORNER:

In a general way, we accept the motion. I would ask the hon. Leader of the Opposition whether or not the dates are germane to him there because it might save a considerable amount of money if we put it on the fiscal year rather than the calendar year. If that is agreeable to the hon. Leader of the Opposition it might save the taxpayers of the province some money.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, then I would move in my usual agreeable way as my colleague from Cypress said, that the dates of January 1, 1973 to December 31, 1973 be April 1 to March 31.

MR. SPEAKER:

I take it that the hon. Leader of the Opposition has the unanimous leave of the House to amend the motion as just expressed and that the motion is carried.

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

108. Mr. Ludwig proposed the following motion to the Assembly:

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

The amount of money spent by the Department of Highways and Transport on road construction and maintenance in the following constituencies in the fiscal year 1972-1973:

St. Paul
Olds-Didsbury
Drumheller
Innisfail
Little Bow
Banff-Cochrane
Lloydminster
Lesser Slave Lake
Bonnyville
Cypress

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleague the hon. Mr. Ludwig, I move Motion 108 stand on the Order Paper.

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, I would accept this motion amended thus: I move that Motion No. 108 be amended by deleting all the words in the first clause after "maintenance" and replacing them with the words "in the towns, counties, municipal districts and improvement districts in which the following areas are located in the fiscal year 1972/73".

[The motion as amended was carried.]

109. Mr. Clark proposed the following motion to the Assembly:

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

- (a) The dates and contents of any applications from the Ukrainian Cultural Heritage Village Project for financial assistance, and

- (b) The government decision on these applications and the reasons for making that decision, and
- (c) The amount of money made available by the provincial government to all ethnic cultural groups in Alberta in the fiscal year 1972-73.

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Speaker, I accept the motion.

[The motion was carried.]

111. Mr. Clark proposed the following motion to the Assembly:

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

- (a) The names of the minister(s) in the provincial government who attended the Commonwealth Games in Christchurch, New Zealand
- (b) The purpose of the trip
- (c) The places visited going to and returning from Christchurch
- (d) The actual days attended at the Games by each individual minister
- (e) Whether or not any member of the minister's family attended at public expense
- (f) The total cost to the public purse of these visits
- (g) The names of any members of the public service in attendance at the Games, and the purpose of their attendance
- (h) The cost to the taxpayers of members of the public service attending the Commonwealth Games.

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Speaker, I accept the motion.

[The motion was carried.]

MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

1. Mr. Moore proposed the following motion to the Assembly:

Be it resolved that the Department of Highways in cooperation with local school authorities be responsible for encouraging the development of a voluntary driver-education program at all high schools in Alberta in areas where such programs are not now available.

[Adjourned debate: Mr. Nctley]

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, in taking part in Motion No. 1, I would say by way of introduction that I generally agree with Motion No. 1. Clearly there is no doubt that we have to provide some assistance for driver-education programs. That's especially true in the rural school divisions where, Mr. Speaker, as most of the members know, there are a good many additional problems in providing instruction. When you face, in some cases, declining enrolment - if there are not funds to cushion that decline in enrolment it means that the quality of instruction is reduced. So it is a real problem in the rural areas getting driver education off the ground.

Now I hope when the budget comes in that we're going to see some kind of sparsity grant or contingency fund, or what have you, for the rural divisions but I won't get into anticipating what may be in the budget during the discussion of this particular resolution.

Nevertheless, the mere fact that we do have a problem at this stage does, I think, underline the importance of why the Department of Highways should cooperate with the local boards. Unless that cooperation is there and unless it is tied to some funding as well,

Mr. Speaker, we just aren't going to see much progress made as far as driver education is concerned in the rural divisions.

I would like to make several other observations. When the member introduced it, he pointed out that as a result of the Insurance Board, insurance companies are provided to give a preferential rate to those students who have gone through a driver-education program. That is true, Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, assuming that they took the driver-education program before acquiring their licences. But if they'd already received their licences then they aren't given a preferential rate. That is perhaps something, Mr. Speaker, which is in itself worth discussion in the Legislature.

I would feel that once a person has completed a driver-education program, whether he received his licence two years ago, two months ago or two days ago, he should be in line to receive a preferential rate, provided all other things are equal. If he has had a bad driving record of course, that's a different matter. Assuming all other things are equal I see no reason why he shouldn't receive the preferential rate. That's perhaps something which the insurance review board will have to look into.

Still another area that in my judgment should be looked at, Mr. Speaker, is the cost of driver education. I am told that in the Edmonton school system the actual cost works out to \$56 a student. That's shared by the board and by the student. I would judge that we should be making some more substantial assistance available to the divisions. Again, coming back to the resolution, indirectly we would be doing that if we had the Department of Highways involved.

The question of whether or not driver-education plans do any good, I suppose, is worth some discussion. But, in my view, if we can teach people better driving habits when they are young this is going to have some long-term impact on the accident and fatality rates. That's probably the major reason we should press ahead with driver-education programs.

Mr. Speaker, there is one other area that is indirectly related to this question. I raise it because I think it's time we gave some consideration to it. I would like to see the Department of Highways monitor - I won't call it the experiment, because it is now the law of the United States - the impact of the 50-mile-an-hour speed limit on the fatality and accident rates in the United States. I know that for many people who like to fly low the thought of reducing the speed limit might be an unpopular one, although I was in the U.S. for three weeks around Christmastime and I was surprised at how well accepted the 50-mile-an-hour speed limit was.

The thing that interested me was that we heard, almost every day, announcements that various insurance companies were thinking about reducing their rates as a result of the lowered fatality count. In the State of Massachusetts where we were, they were predicting a record fatality rate that had dropped off so much after the 50-mile-an-hour speed limit had been imposed that they had something less than a record fatality rate. I don't know whether this is because of the novelty of it. Obviously one can't jump to a conclusion by what happened in a matter of two or three weeks. But, Mr. Speaker, I do think we should be looking at it and monitoring it because if it does have an impact on the fatality rate then it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, we have an obligation to really ask ourselves whether or not we need speed limits at the cost of human lives. Again, that evidence isn't in, but I strongly suggest to the government that we monitor the evidence carefully.

Mr. Speaker, in general then, what Resolution No. 1 attempts to do is to encourage the promotion of driver education. We all favour that. That's like being in favour of motherhood and apple pie. But we, I think, have to see that intent backed up with some funds and with a commitment from the department that they are actually prepared to allocate the funds for that purpose. Beyond the department getting involved in the rural areas, we do have the question of what funding will be available for driver education, period.

Mr. Speaker, I would just underline the importance of trying to develop a pretty clear-cut policy on this as soon as possible because we all remember how important driver education was to a certain political party prior to 1971. As a matter of fact, we heard nothing else during part of the campaign other than this great driver-education program in the high schools.

But there is, perhaps, a more important reason, Mr. Speaker. If we are going to have a preferential rate for those students who complete driver education, providing they haven't got their licence, then the program has to be available to everybody, or the opportunity to obtain it has to be available to everybody. At the present time that just simply isn't the case.

I support Resolution No. 1 because, in my view, it is at least a proposal which has some practical possibility of being implemented in the rural areas. But I would hope that during this debate we will hear some idea from the government as to what they plan to do with driver education on a broader scale, and whether or not there will be funding available to make this kind of scheme practical all over the province.

MR. GRUENWALD:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few comments regarding the motion before us today. I think we'll all agree that driver training, driver safety and good drivers on the highway, of course, are extremely important aspects of our lives today - of living, as a matter of fact - because safe driving is important to all users of the highway, as a matter of fact. Not just those who are driving cars. We have our highways, our streets, our pedestrians and such a tremendous amount of our everyday life is affected by those people who are operating automobiles - even pedestrians as I say. As a matter of fact, some people say that a pedestrian is only the person who is crossing the street to get into his car. Sometimes I think that is quite true.

One of the things I like about this motion, Mr. Speaker, is the suggestion that it be voluntary driver training. So often, every time a motion or any type of legislation is brought in, there is a mandatory aspect to it. I, for one, get rather tired, sitting around listening to elected people telling others what they may or may not do. This becomes so dictatorial in our lives that you just wonder what you can do and whom you have to ask. I am much more enthused about programs such as this having enough merit and appeal on their own to ensure their success. I think this is the type of program, if they are in that way, then they will, in fact, really do a lot of good.

The big appeal for driver training as we know it now - and I should mention, by the way, that I believe the mover of the motion went to great lengths to try to explain that this was not a driver-training program, this was a driver-education program. Well, you may have a little bit of trouble trying to differentiate between the two. I believe both of them are very important. Driver training, as we know, is a vocational type of thing and there must have been time spent behind the wheel of an automobile to reap any of the monetary benefits of driver training as it applies to under-age drivers, or younger drivers, as we know them today. So we cannot talk about theory only and expect to reap all the benefits that driver training and driver education could bring us.

I suspect though, that the big appeal this is going to have will be the monetary reward that will be available particularly to those drivers who are in the ages between 16 and 19. That's the biggest group. Because immediately they have taken an approved driver-training course which means, I believe - I don't know if it has been set out clearly - but I believe they have to have at least six hours behind the wheel of an automobile in actual driving. Of course, then they move immediately to Class 3 or, in other words, they get credit for three years driving experience on their premium which can amount to a substantial premium decrease. It could be from \$75 to \$150 depending on the type of car they have, the type of coverage they seek. So from that point of view it has a lot of appeal for young drivers.

I wouldn't disagree with the Member for Spirit River-Fairview that if a 17-year-old was driving and was suffering under the premium schedule of only one-year driving experience, or a-half-a-year, then he probably should be moved up to the three year. I think it's within the power of the Legislature to see that this is done, as a matter of fact. I think this is reasonable and can be done and probably would be considered very seriously by the insurance companies, because the insurance companies are most anxious that the drivers are careful and that we have an accident-free driving population. After all, they are the ones who are charged with the responsibility of having to come up with premiums that are justified according to the loss ratio. So I don't really see a big problem there.

So if we are going to do this, Mr. Speaker, I think it is important, if we are going to put a lot of emphasis on driving training that we equally put a lot of emphasis and importance on the type of driving schools that we have. Because I actually believe that while we are talking about the schools and the Department of Highways, they each, separately and together, can make a great contribution to safe driving.

But I am inclined to go towards the private enterprise route. Because I know that if we put this into the schools, I can see a whole can of worms being opened up. We are going to see some people who are going to suggest then that it become a credit course. Okay, then when it becomes a credit course, those of you who know anything about the teacher set-up, right away you will have to have specially trained teachers. Well, you know now that to get certified teachers, they have to have had four years of training, so I can just see this thing building up and building up and we're going to have a bureaucracy type of thing. Only certain types of people can do it, and they are going to have to be certified, they are going to have to go to a special driver-training school, and it is going to go on and on and on, and the good Lord only knows where it is going stop cost-wise.

Not only that, Mr. Speaker, I'm very much aware that when you throw it into the schools, put it in the position of being a credit course, which I'm afraid may be suggested eventually, then we get into the certification of teachers, then we get into the equipment proposition. I have been to exhibitions of equipment for schools, particularly in the States - I haven't noticed them here yet - where they have these simulators,

where you sit in something that simulates a car and you get the feeling of driving. These things cost thousands and thousands of dollars. Now, I can just see the cost of this thing growing and multiplying and getting so far out of reach that it is beyond what was ever anticipated in the beginning. So these are the types of things that I think we should be cautious about.

I believe that driver training can be a good thing. I believe that it should go the private enterprise route. I would include in that people like the Alberta Motor Association, which I submit is doing a good job in the field of driver training. There are some independent driving schools that do a commendable job, but the only worry I see now, and I harken back to when I indicated that we should be careful about the people who are going to be giving driving instructions. They must have some minimum qualifications because they are going to have a big clientele when it starts to be known that there is a saving of \$75 to \$150 for under-age drivers because they take this training. We don't want just everyone jumping into a car, picking up a kid, taking him around the block a few times, telling him he has now trained for driving, and go pick up the saving. This is one of the dangers that we could find ourselves becoming involved in.

It is amazing, when a particular type of program is set up and a particular group wants to sell that program, the arguments they will use. The hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview indicated the decrease in the number of accidents, possibly because the speed limit in some of the States has now been dropped down to 50 miles an hour. I'm not ready at this particular time to accept that that is a fact. I think there is more to the fact that there are fewer automobiles on the road than that they have reduced their speed.

I think it is the Alberta Safety Council, or some group, which has been doing a lot of propagandizing regarding the use of seat belts. They always say how important it is that you should never leave your garage before you attach your seat belts, including shoulder straps. And they say it is the short haul, the short drive, where most of the accidents happen. They claim that four-fifths of all accidents occur below the speed of 40 miles an hour. So how do you reconcile that with the fact that we must not drive over 50 on the highways?

I just don't believe yet - and having received periodicals every year on the reasons for accidents, the cost of them, the age group, causes and the whole thing - that speeding, per se, is a big contributor to accidents on the highway. Within city limits, no question about it. But certainly, driving conditions are what really count. And certainly between here and Lethbridge, or Calgary I should say, and I have mentioned it before, there is a maximum posted speed limit of 70 miles an hour between, I guess it is Leduc and Red Deer. Between Red Deer and Calgary it is 65, and I would just like to know if there is any difference in the accident rate even with that little bit of difference. I submit that it depends on the driver, it depends on the car, it depends on his attitude, it depends on the highway, it just depends on all kinds of things.

But the information that I have been able to accumulate, and I get some every year from the insurance companies who are paying the losses, that the big losses, the number of accidents, are not very well documented to be caused because people are exceeding the posted speed limits on highways. And we are looking for that evidence. Drinking is terrible, drugs are terrible, driving against the rules, passing when you shouldn't is causing accidents. There are all kinds of things, but speeding, per se, is just not necessarily it.

So, Mr. Speaker, I concur in the spirit of the motion. I think that the intentions are good. We are all interested in safety on our highways. We want all of us to be safe, whether we are in a car as passengers, as pedestrians, it doesn't really make any difference.

I think one other thing would be worth considering, though. As long as we are just encouraging people to do things, let's encourage those, too, who have lost their licences because of the demerit system. Possibly there should be a lot of encouragement given to those people to take these defensive driving courses, so that they be reminded, Mr. Speaker, that after all the highway isn't just for them alone. I think this is one of the biggest problems. I can go out and get into an accident almost every day without actually breaking the law, but still show a gross lack of consideration for other drivers. I think that is one of the real problems we have, Mr. Speaker. Let's give some thought to that other person. He also has a right to drive on our highways.

MR. JAMISON:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to add a few comments to this very worthwhile resolution by the hon. Member from Smoky River. I'm talking on the subject of driver education. Having listened to three speeches, they have pretty well picked up all the points that can possibly be said, so without being repetitious, I will try and pick out from what I have noted here, some of the points that I think may be of interest.

Mr. Speaker, I think that in this day and age, when just about everyone either owns a car or drives a car, that it is most important that some type of driver education should be made available to, not only the young, but also to the old, and they do have programs such as defensive driving courses, that should be mentioned as well. I support the program at a very early age, as I think it is safe to say that most boys and girls can hardly wait to get behind the wheel of their dad's car, or maybe they have even picked up an old jalopy. It might even be safe to say that maybe some of them even get behind the wheel before they are of age.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that good drivers are developed from a combination of three things - knowledge, skills, and attitude. And I believe, Mr. Speaker, that to develop these essentials of a good driver, boys and girls should be afforded a driver-education course well in advance of the licensing age. The insurance companies welcome driver-education programs, and I think as we have proven now, that those who have taken courses are certainly those who are staying out of accidents. If a person learns young, he has a better chance of not developing many of the bad habits that possibly many of us have.

And on the subject of bad driving habits, it never ceases to amaze me when I talk to my friends who have taken a defensive course. They say when they have finished the course, you know I'm lucky to be alive. I have picked up so many bad habits over the years that I was not only a menace to myself on the road but a menace to everybody else on the highway. And so I would advocate any type of driving course, whether it be driver education for the young people. I would also urge that, whenever possible, take a course in defensive driving, because you may have picked up some of those bad habits and are a real menace on the highway.

Mr. Speaker, I talked to an insurance agent yesterday and it was interesting to note that over the past ten days, when we've been going through some bad icy conditions and snow, that the 35 to 50 age group amounted to 90 per cent of his accident claims. As I say, it's fine and well to give driver education programs in school to the young ones who are starting to drive for the first time, but I think this has to be continuing education. I would urge very strongly anyone who hasn't had a defensive driving course to take one.

On the subject raised by the Member for Lethbridge West, I believe this should be a voluntary program. The only trouble with voluntary programs is that a lot of people, a lot of the young ones, may skip out and say, well I've got enough to do; I haven't got time for it. So I think that, particularly in the rural areas where they travel back and forth to school by bus, the time to have this course would be during the noon hours when it would be available to most of them.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. LEE:

Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak to this resolution I, too, want to congratulate the Member for Smoky River and those who have spoken on this particular resolution for the concern they have expressed in this area, especially on the effects that our failure to be able to deliver a particular kind of service to rural Alberta is having. I am always interested in the comments from my colleague for Edmonton Beverly because I know, from having had many chats with him, the real concern he has about driver education and the definition which he has placed on it, not just as training but as a wider kind of attitudinal emphasis. It is certainly one that we can all pay heed to.

I might make one note before I go into my remarks. I believe that the Member for Spirit River-Fairview is incorrect in his statement regarding whether an individual, after he has his licence is eligible for the preferential rates. It is my understanding that in fact he is, whether he has already got his licence or not. It's a question as to whether it's his first insurance policy rather than his first licence.

This resolution - and I might state at the outset that I support this resolution very strongly - has raised a number of questions. The questions are ones which relate to the nature of involvements and jurisdictions as they relate to driver education because as Mr. Moore as stated:

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Department of Highways in co-operation with local school authorities be responsible for encouraging the development of a voluntary driver education program ...

Implicit in the resolution then, there must be some establishment of relationships, of involvements, between jurisdictions, and in this particular case stated, as those of the departments of Education and Highways.

I might comment as to what might be some of the involvements of the Department of Highways, some of the things the Department of Highways now is involved in, and some of the areas of cooperation and encouragement that they are, and can be, involved in.

The first of these is funding. I think one of the recognized shortcomings that we have, especially in rural Alberta, is the failure of a program to be offered because it is just not economically feasible to run the program. There are not enough people, perhaps, ready to take the course; perhaps there are not enough training facilities available for a particular course. Those of us in urban Alberta have available to us a number of courses. But unless there is some kind of funding support, subsidization of the numbers of people taking courses and perhaps the actual training facilities and equipment, then the course may or may not be offered. So one possible involvement by the Department of Highways is that of funding.

A second possible requirement is that anyone who is getting his first licence be required to have a driver education course. It's one that some of the members have spoken on, and the Member for Lethbridge made his views known, as to whether this should be a voluntary program.

A third involvement of the Department of Highways might be that of the establishment of standards regarding instruction and course content. I think one of the concerns we will have, especially with this change now in the insurance rates, is that a number of people will be offering driver education courses. There certainly is a quality control concern relating to the courses offered and also to the nature of the instructors and their qualifications to offer courses.

And finally a fourth area that the Department of Highways might be involved in, in the encouragement and the development of these courses, is that it actually, as a department, provide the course, that it develop the course, establish the standards, that it accredit the instructors and actually deliver the course throughout - especially rural - Alberta.

I mentioned four possible involvements. I would like to give my personal opinion as to which the Department of Highways should be involved in and, crossing out some of these, make a statement as to who should be doing them.

First of all, I think the Department of Highways should be the department that is involved in facilitating driver education. Consequently, in those areas of funding, I would hope the Department of Highways would be involved in the funding of driver education, thus facilitating its delivery, especially in rural Alberta.

However, I do not think the Department of Highways should be involved in the second area, the establishment of licencing and accreditation standards. What we are talking about here now are those capabilities of instruction - the ability to instruct, the ability to develop a program.

I was talking with Mr. Lawrence of the Alberta Safety Council yesterday, and we were discussing this whole area of the accreditation of instructors. One of the things that really impressed me was the very rigorous standards which they apply, in this case, to their defensive driving instructors. I would hope that that particular agency would be involved in the establishment of standards and accreditation. But it seems inappropriate to me that the Department of Highways, which is not involved in this kind of instructional program, would be involved in the establishment of instructional standards.

A third area that would be possible for the Department of Highways is to make it a compulsory program. I agree with the Member for Lethbridge when he says that he wants it to remain voluntary. I concur with this. We certainly have the standards by which a person gains his first licence, the standards which he must reach in order to pass his driver examination. And certainly this is enough of a compulsion for an individual to gain proper driving habits.

And finally, I don't think it's appropriate that the Department of Highways actually deliver and instruct the course.

Having said that, and perhaps crossed the Department of Highways out of what some of you may have thought, or feel, they should be doing, I would like to give my own personal opinion on what the jurisdictional involvements should be of the different people involved in driver education.

I feel, then, that the Department of Highways should be the major department in facilitating driver education, through funding and the subsidizing of costs - both through the basic course itself and its delivery in rural Alberta. I think it should be, as it is, definitely involved in those standards relating to initial licencing, the actual examination of those drivers in-car as to whether they have the capability. Of course, this is something that traditionally this department has become involved in. It has done an excellent job. I would hope it would remain as the inspection department.

However, when we move to the actual delivery of a driver-education program, then I think we have to move to other departments. One that has been mentioned here in this particular resolution is that of the Department of Education. I am not so sure that the

Department of Education is the department that should actually deliver this particular program either. The reason there - and it's been stated by other people - is that driver education, when we look at the wide range of curricular offerings in education, will tend to get lost. Whether there are two credits or not, it's going to be given one of the last priorities within a local jurisdiction, and I would suggest that it's a provincial jurisdiction. It's one that, if there is a question of where we're going to put our dollars in education, I think our school boards are probably going to put as one of those "frills" along with athletics, counselling and some of the other fields that we see discussed in budgets.

However, the educational jurisdiction should be involved because very often they, in a rural area, can provide the infrastructure through which we can provide a program for children. We're talking basically now about younger drivers, and the obvious recommendation would be that the school as a building, the classrooms as rooms, be used for driver education, and that in fact we use those facilities, and perhaps those instructors who have taken driver education as part of their educational preparation, as instructors in the course.

I would share the same fear that Mr. Gruenwald would; I would certainly hope the only people who are going to teach this course wouldn't just be certified teachers, because we are talking about a particular, specialized kind of instruction here, not a general education such as we have in schools.

I would hope that, within the local jurisdictions, in the actual implementation, in the scheduling and the instruction, that the schools would be very closely involved, not necessarily in school hours, and maybe not necessarily totally in the school, but using those facilities.

I might make one note here - when we are talking about the delivery of these services to rural areas and talking about instruction, there is a driver-education course that was held in 1973, a training course, and it was only teachers incidentally who took this one, but I think it illustrates that we can derive our instructors from rural parts of the province. This was in 1973, and of the 17 people who took this course at The University of Alberta as part of credits towards their degree program, I understand, 13 of them were from rural Alberta - 13 of them - so there is an interest I believe in instruction and we probably can attract instructors. Mr. Moore has mentioned the possibility of using bus drivers and that is one possibility. I would hope that we wouldn't rely on that just as a primary source of instruction for driver education.

I come to a third jurisdiction now and I'm not sure it's one that hasn't been lost in the whole shuffle. It's the one that I think should be most involved in the actual delivery and the implementation of these programs. I'm talking now about the private organizations, the voluntary organizations that have traditionally been involved in driver education. I'm talking about the Alberta Safety Council, the Alberta Motor Association and many of those driving schools which, up to this point, have centred their activities in urban parts of the province. But with additional funding, with additional kinds of subsidization for this program, I'm certain that they would move into rural Alberta. These are the people who, in the past, have established and shown the kinds of standards that I think we want in a driver education program. I speak now of the Alberta Safety Council and the AMA as the two that I have been most acquainted with, but I am sure other private schools establish the same standards and I would hope that we would turn to these as a primary source of the delivery of these particular programs.

Well the point is going to be raised - "You know, these are just urban-based kinds of organizations. Take a look at the programs that are being offered now. There are no programs being offered in rural Alberta", and that is probably true. But the reason probably, as I said before, is that it hasn't been economical. If we provide the kinds of funding that we need in this program, why not give them the chance first before we turn loose a civil service, the establishment of a public service to deliver this program?

I might also mention that I feel we can also utilize these private organizations for the training of our instructors. I mentioned my visit to the Alberta Safety Council, but I'm sure that every one of these organizations is developed in the training of their instructors. And in the establishment of standards for instructors, which I think we are going to need now, in the accreditation of these training capabilities, I would hope that these private organizations, these voluntary organizations, would be very strongly involved, at least in an advisory capacity.

Another group that maybe we have forgotten about, too, as a training source - and here are the people I'm talking about, the ones who have assisted all of us in in-car kinds of training. I learned how to drive from my dad. I grew up on a farm as many of you have and I learned how to operate the in-car kinds of things from my father. Now in the accreditation there are two parts to driver education. There are in-car kinds of training and there are classroom, ground school kinds of training. I'm not so sure that we shouldn't involve in actual accreditation some mechanism by which we can accredit those hours, especially in rural Alberta, that a youngster may spend learning how to drive from

parents, relatives and friends. I know it is not going to be an easy kind of accreditation, but certainly it is only sensible that we do recognize this source of driver education.

Having said this, there are a couple of things I might state. First, since we're talking about a jurisdictional involvement here - and I've mentioned a number of them at this point, in the delivery and the development of these programs - it seems to me that we do require some kind of an advisory committee function. I would hope that in the developing of these programs, say by the Department of Highways, that we wouldn't very strongly rely on the Alberta Safety Council, the AMA, on citizens groups that have been involved or interested in driver education, on particular educational jurisdictions that have already offered this program as a two-credit course. I would hope that these people would be strongly involved in an advisory capacity in developing these kinds of courses.

In the actual regional supervision of these programs I'm not sure what would be the best department to be involved. Someone else has mentioned Culture, Youth and Recreation as a supervisory kind of capacity. This department has been involved in many kinds of instructional activities supplementary to educational jurisdictions. It would seem to me that we should consider this particular regional capacity for the supervision of these programs because once again we are talking about educational programs. And the closer we can come, I think, to an educational kind of supervision, I think the better off we will be.

In closing my remarks I want to relate to a particular area that Mr. Gruenwald brought up once again - I must note that he certainly stimulated my thinking this afternoon because I've referred to him on a number of occasions - but he has referred ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Possibly the hon. member could refer to the other hon. member by his constituency.

MR. LEE:

The other hon. Member is from St. Albert and these gentlemen made reference to driver education as it applies to adult groups - as it applies to those people who know how to drive already. I'd like to make a few comments in this area because there are different kinds of driver education, and I would hope that these would be considered in the development of a total policy on driver education.

When we talk about driver training, I guess this is what this resolution has talked about most of all, is teaching new drivers how to drive and how to function within an automobile. These are courses that have been offered mostly by the Alberta Motor Association and private companies. The hon. Member for Edmonton Beverly mentioned a course that is now being developed in driver training by the Alberta Safety Council, the Alberta driver's ground school which is another course which falls into this driver training kind of area. There are other programs too, and the second one was mentioned by the hon. Member for Lethbridge. This is the defensive driving course. It's a course that is probably best suited for those people who already know how to drive, who have the abilities and the capabilities, but perhaps in an attitudinal way require some kind of education.

There are two courses that perhaps you haven't been exposed to, and these are the two that I want to expand on at this time. There is a course called the Traffic Clinic Counselling Course. This is a course that has been presented by the Alberta Safety Council. It is a course that has been operational in Calgary and Edmonton and it is designed for those motorists who we want to facilitate an attitudinal change. It's a course that is given only to those people who are referred by the Department of Highways driver review board for this kind of training. It's a counselling course in that it undertakes a change of attitude rather than a how-to-drive kind of activity.

Having been involved with this particular course in Calgary, I would attest to the effect it does have. I am amazed, having instructed about five of these courses and having coordinated the program in Calgary, at the terrible records which some of the people did have. We added it up one day with one driver who was referred to the program. This was before the demerit system came into effect. If the demerit system had been in effect at that time, this individual would have had 65 demerit points and, believe it or not, the individual was driving at that particular time. Well, needless to say, we weren't talking about this individual's capabilities to drive. It was an attitude that had to be changed, an attitude to - in his particular case - speeding and reckless driving.

I was also amazed though at how, in these particular courses, attitudinal change was undertaken. It wasn't undertaken because of the instructor so much but because of the effect of the other people in the course. There were 15 people in there with terrible driving habits. It was amazing how by discussing driving, discussing their attitudes to driving they actually did change. There was a noticeable change in those attitudes.

The impaired drivers course is a fourth course, one that falls into the same area. It is a course that is now conducted, I understand, by the Department of the Solicitor General. It was under the Attorney General previously. It is designed for those people who lose their licence because of impaired driving. It is a very similar one to the traffic clinic course.

Having mentioned these courses I want to make a recommendation about their use. The first thing is: I would hope that all of these kinds of courses would be integrated into an umbrella kind of treatment of driver education. Right now we have some of them being offered in different departments of government; one in the Solicitor General's, one in the Department of Highways and another by the Safety Council. I hope that these could be treated in a more global way.

When we look at the offending driver, the person whose attitude we want to change, I would hope that we could tie these two courses - the Impaired Drivers Course and the traffic clinic course - into a compulsory kind of policy.

Here is what I suggest: when any individual has reached eight demerit points, no matter through what process he might do that - usually, speeding is the most common one - I would hope that the Driver Review Board would send out a letter similar to what they do now, perhaps more strongly worded, recommending that individuals take either a defensive driving course or this traffic clinic course.

At the point where an individual has lost his licence, had it suspended because of reaching 15 demerit points, before that individual can get that licence back, I would hope that he would be required - not suggested, but required - to take a traffic clinic course. Because, when we reach 15 demerit points we're not talking about ability to drive or not to drive, we're talking about an attitudinal change which, if we don't try to change it, is going to have a continuing effect. I'm sure the Minister of Highways and Transport could indicate the number of people who come back, again and again. They hit 7 demerit points and pretty soon they're right up to 15. Perhaps their attitudes just continue even though they have been punished by the loss of their licence.

I would suggest that this be made a compulsory kind of course similar to what we do now with the Impaired Drivers Course. Before an individual gets his licence back, he is required to take this particular course. I would hope we would do the same thing for those people who reach the 15 demerits, but in this case require them to take the traffic clinic course.

So, Mr. Speaker, these are just a few of the comments I would like to make on this. I once again congratulate the hon. Member for Smoky River for bringing this before the House. It is one in which I hope the government would develop an overall policy for its implementation.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View followed by the hon. Minister of Highways and Transport.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, the motion is interesting and I would like to comment on the remarks of the hon. member who just spoke. He is a prime example of what happens to a person who doesn't know how to change gear.

If I may say, I got the impression that he spoke about three times as long as his time allotted for the debate on this motion. Now when I look at this motion, Mr. Speaker, it's all very good and there is a touch of motherhood in it. Why are we so concerned about training drivers - giving drivers education - in any particular area? After all, they are not restricted to driving in that area. I think we ought to extend this. We're going to spend money to provide driving education, then let all the people who help pay for it, benefit from it. Why have we taken care of everybody in the cities and the small towns? This is a restricted motion, Mr. Speaker. It says:

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Department of Highways in co-operation with the local school authorities be responsible for encouraging the development of a voluntary driver education [program] at all High Schools in Alberta ...

Certainly this is good. We're taking care of the high schools but there are many people who are eligible for this kind of training and need it who may not be in high school. They may especially need more training. So let's extend this to everybody who is eligible. There are many people who are learning to drive for the first time who have passed the age of high school, or he may have found out - as the hon. member said - how to drive from his father. Well, his father was a man of great patience and so the hon. member is still alive. At least, partly. Yes, more alive than his speech was, Mr. Speaker.

We mustn't be restrictive, mustn't be selective in saying well, just the high school students. Many of their parents can afford to provide for them. But there are so many people who need, want and are eligible for, driver education. It would better everybody in this province if they got it. Why stop, if we're going to spend public funds, why restrict it to a group that happens to be select and happens to be in high school? Most children go to high school. But how about the person who got to 15 years and for some reason couldn't continue? Let him go around without driver-education training and maybe he can learn it after he gets locked up for knocking somebody off.

So I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that those are all nice words that we heard. But we're not really dealing with the problem as it is. I'm all in favour of every high school student having an opportunity of driver education. That encompasses a wide range of meaning. I don't want to go into that because I'm sure that people who have been in driver training and in driver education know what is required and can extend their abilities and their knowledge to encompass whatever is required in driver education as intended by the motion.

But I would like to move an amendment, Mr. Speaker, as follows: that after the words "BE IT RESOLVED THAT" the following be substituted for the motion:

the Government of Alberta ensure the opportunity to every eligible person in the Province of Alberta of a driver-education course.

There are two copies, Mr. Speaker. I wrote it out. Am I entitled to that or does somebody else want a copy?

So the amendment, Mr. Speaker, extends what this motion means; to include all the high school students and a few of those who may not be in high school. Often those people who are not in high school and are eligible for driver education are probably the ones who are helping pay for the thing. They are probably earning a salary at some hard work and are helping pay for this. So at least we should include those - of every age - who are eligible for driver-education training. The age is not a factor. It is just as important for a person who is over 21, 25 or over 35 to ...

MR. GHITTER:

I'm wondering if the hon. member would have the courtesy to read his amendment to those members of the Legislature who are listening to him - to know what he is talking about?

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I'm wondering if the hon. member was asleep when I read the amendment? I read it. I gave the two copies to the Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The amendment substitutes for the present text, following the words "BE IT RESOLVED THAT" the following text:

The Government of Alberta ensure the opportunity to every eligible person in the Province of Alberta of a driver education course.

So, if the amendment is adopted, the motion as amended will read:

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Government of Alberta ensure the opportunity to every eligible person in the Province of Alberta of a driver education course.

MR. LUDWIG:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Those are made sincerely because we don't want just some safe drivers. We want them all to be safe. If we can afford to provide a driver-education course to a certain segment of our society, then, in fairness to everybody, we extend it to everybody.

I believe much has been done in this province now to provide opportunities for driver education. I am not saying we should pay for the whole thing but the opportunity - this is still retaining the voluntariness of the whole thing - if a person wants to, some provision should be made that he have the opportunity to have driver education.

MR. COOKSON:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. If I interpret the resolution, it clearly describes voluntary driver-education programs at all high schools in Alberta. It doesn't necessarily restrict education - driver training - to students. Therefore I wonder whether this is just redundancy to attempt to broaden something that is already quite broad in the resolution.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I believe that one would not have to stretch one's imagination too much - if you are going to restrict it to high schools and that is the medium through which you are going to do it, then one could presume very reasonably that it will be for high school students. Otherwise there is no point in having it in high schools because that is not the most convenient place through which to provide driver-education training. It might be one of the ways.

So I am saying that the interpretation that the hon. Member for Lacombe has put on this, has a very possible but a very remote meaning. I am submitting that the amendment is correct, that it is an acceptable amendment.

To wind up my remarks on this, I don't need to repeat all the details ...

MR. SPEAKER:

I don't know whether the hon. members wish me to comment on the amendment, but I would respectfully have to agree with the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View that, as the motion stands, there would be an implication that it would be aimed at high school students, and that this extends the scope of the motion in giving the words their ordinary implications.

MR. MOORE:

Mr. Speaker, I, too, wanted to comment on it, but I thought I would do it in debating the amendment and then ask the members to defeat the amendment.

MR. SPEAKER:

That course is open to the member in any event.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member for Smoky River has a menacing attitude towards this motion, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MOORE:

Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, with regard to whether or not the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View's amendment is in order, it was my intention, when I brought in this resolution, to word it so we would have a place throughout Alberta for high school students, young people who are not going to high school, adults as well, to have an opportunity to take driver education. The motion certainly does not restrict ...

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, with all respect ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please.

MR. MOORE:

The motion, as it is worded, does not restrict the availability of driver education to high school students, but rather, in my opinion, it suggests that driver education should be available at all high schools. I worded it that way purposely because high schools are scattered throughout this province in such a way that I think then, driver education would be available to all citizens in this province who require it.

MR. SPEAKER:

I agree the hon. member's motion might have been capable of that construction, but the amendment does, in my opinion, extend the scope of the motion explicitly. I suppose if someone wished to restore the high school aspect of it, they might do so by a subamendment.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, the intent of the amendment was to make it broader. I believe that it is reasonable, at least it is in my opinion, that we provide driver education for all those who may want it and who, if they didn't want it, probably wouldn't need it, but for those who wish it. We are spending public funds. As I stated, many young people who are not in high school are working, and are helping pay the taxes that pay for these things, so at least they should have the opportunity.

The motion, as I amended it, the intent was not in any way to take away from what was on the Order Paper, Mr. Speaker, but to add to it.

Those who feel that this should be restricted to what we had before, I suppose that is their privilege. But I believe the amendment gives a broader meaning to the whole motion and I urge the hon. members to support the amendment.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MOORE:

Mr. Speaker, speaking to the amendment once again, as I have stated earlier on a point of order, I would like to point out to the ...

MR. SPEAKER:

I have already recognized the hon. Minister of Highways and although I realize that was under the main motion, I believe he does wish to speak on the amendment.

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to speak to the amendment at this time. I am very delighted with the positive reaction that has been taken by all members in this debate today. It is a very important topic, the topic of car safety, of automobile accidents, and the costs, the staggering costs to the country as a whole.

I'm a little bit surprised that the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View would want to twist it and restrict it - a motion that is as well placed as this ...

MR. LUDWIG:

The only thing twisted about this debate ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. Order please.

I must draw to the hon. member's attention that a request for order is a request that he resume his seat. I must also draw to his attention that the repeated raising of apparent or not so apparent points of order may in itself give rise to a question of order.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Shame, shame.

MR. COPITHORNE:

Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member says, say it the way it is. And I will say it the way it is. His motion should be defeated and we will get along with the debate. I move that his amendment be defeated.

MR. LUDWIG:

Why? What reason?

MR. MCORE:

I would like to speak very briefly once again to the amendment. As I pointed out earlier, my motion was so structured that a specific department of government would be charged with some responsibility with regard to locating or encouraging driver education throughout this province.

It was my view, that you could best cover this province, in particular the rural areas, by ensuring that we have driver education available at all high schools. There was no intention, Mr. Speaker, when I framed the motion to restrict driver education at high schools to high school students only. Surely, Mr. Speaker, we have moved from that position held by the former government wherein high schools were only for high school students to a position now within the Department of Education, within the school systems throughout this province, where we are encouraging adults and people in many walks of life and of all ages to come into the high schools not only for driver education, but for many other types of education as well.

In my view the amendment to the motion broadens it to the extent that no single department of government is responsible for ensuring that the resolution, if it is passed, is carried out. It broadens it to the extent that we do not know where, in fact, driver

education programs will be made available. It says an "opportunity". An opportunity, in fact, may be one of driving 100 miles to get to a centre where driver education is available. For those reasons, Mr. Speaker, I would hope the hon. members defeat the amendment and approve the resolution.

SOME HCN. MEMBERS:

Question.

MR. DRAIN:

Mr. Speaker, my intention was to speak to the motion, but the amendment carries along to a great degree in the same direction as the motion. Hence, I will direct my efforts towards that.

There are several things, in my view, that have not been touched upon in the matter of driver education thus far. It seems that everyone has got on the bandwagon and said it's good. Everything is good, certainly, if it achieves the result that it is intended to achieve. I think there are some particular areas that should be looked at in determining what the criteria are that make good drivers.

I think one of the more important things is reaction time, alertness, and the sense of responsibility. Driver education, as it is taught ...

MR. MOORE:

On a point of order. If the hon. member wishes to speak to the main motion, then I suggest we have the vote on the amendment and we continue.

MR. DRAIN:

Well, the subject, Mr. Speaker, is still driver education, so let's keep driving right down the road here.

I think probably, looking at the subject, that there should be a more sophisticated approach taken to the aids that could be used for driver education. I'm thinking of the method that they use to train helicopter pilots for instance. At one time it was a very expensive and costly process and as a result of a development here in Edmonton where they had sort of a dead-man affair, they were able to reduce the actual flying time and still come out with a very sophisticated pilot. I am thinking, Mr. Speaker, of the impact of some specific type of movie that is shown in Ontario Place in a bathysphere and has an audience impact that is beyond comprehension. The people who go there are warned of the impact that it's going to have. At the time I was there they were showing a helicopter flight and you had the same reaction as though you were running that particular helicopter into the side of a cliff.

I would suggest that this is something that could be looked at in the matter of driver education for this reason. A youthful driver goes through stages. First is the stage of learning, with or without driver education, the stage of acquiring confidence. And a teenage driver becomes super-confident. If he is fortunate he has a little nip - a minor nip such as a fender, a tail light, or a near-accident that, in fact, brings before his mind the reality that what he is handling is a really dangerous object. Therefore, I see driver education as something that would provide the opportunity to give this particular shock without the costs. There are sophisticated mechanical means to do this. If the direction of driver education were such that it did make available this type of guide, I would certainly endorse it.

But driver education as I have seen it, which results in learning the rules and a minor amount of field practice, I certainly would question its present value. There have been cases made for driver education and cases made against it. There was a study conducted by The University of Michigan which came out with a totally opposite view to the one that the hon. members have on this particular subject of driver education. They stated as a result of their findings that there was no measurable difference between the driver who did not have driver education and the one who did. Now, a young person gets some experience in driving. He has to have enough experience in order to get his driver's licence to meet the qualifications the driving instructor who examines him has set out. He has to be able to write an examination defining the highway rules and so on. Therefore, I would think that there must be some knowledge that they would have to acquire with or without driver education. So then, the role that driver education should take is one of very sophisticated education that would, in fact, bring the day-to-day road problems directly before the person who is doing the studying.

There is a great tendency to think that people are digits, that they are sort of robots, that they can be computerized. But this is not so. There would be another realm that could be looked into with some ...

MR. SPEAKER:

With great respect, and although there may be many points which could be expressed which might be relevant to both the motion and the amendment, it would appear that the hon. member has strayed away from the subject matter of the amendment.

I would respectfully draw to his attention that the stricture which is placed on the Chair in regard to an amendment is, that after an amendment has been moved, the debate must be - the expression is - "strictly relevant" to the amendment.

MR. DRAIN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will reserve my remarks for the motion after the amendment.

MR. DIXON:

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

MR. SPEAKER:

May the hon. member adjourn the debate?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. HYNDMAN:

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

MR. SPEAKER:

Having heard the suggestion by the hon. Government House Leader and the time being indistinguishable from 5:30, the House stands adjourned until this evening at 8:00 o'clock.

[Mr. Speaker left the Chair at 5:30 o'clock.]