

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Tuesday, April 9, 1974

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

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill No. 53 The Municipal Government Amendment Act, 1974

MR. STROMBERG:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a bill, being The Municipal Government Amendment Act, 1974. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to introduce a number of major amendments to changes in The Municipal Act.

Mr. Speaker, this bill includes a number of recommendations by municipal associations to government.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 53 was introduced and read a first time.]

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill No. 53, The Municipal Government Amendment Act, 1974 be placed on the Order Paper under Government Bills and Orders.

[The motion was carried.]

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

MR. SPEAKER:

I have the honour to introduce to hon. members some guests seated in the Speaker's gallery, the distinguished new Ombudsman for the province, Dean Ivany, Mrs. Ivany and their three daughters. I would ask them to rise and be recognized by the Assembly.

DR. BOUVIER:

Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure this afternoon to introduce to you and to members of the Assembly, two schools. The first one, a class of some 40 Grade 9 students from the Peter Pond School in Fort McMurray. They are accompanied by their teachers, Mr. Crow, Mr. Breneman and Miss Molnar. They are seated in the members gallery. I'd ask them to rise and receive the welcome of the House.

Mr. Speaker, seated in the public gallery, I'd like to introduce to you and to members of the Assembly, 30 Grade 7, 8 and 9 students from the school of Wandering River. They are accompanied by their teachers, Mr. McCullough and Miss Zaraza. They are seated in the public gallery. I would ask them to rise and receive the welcome of the House.

MR. ZANDER:

Mr. Speaker, it's indeed a pleasure for me to introduce today to you and through you to the Assembly, a group of wonderful ladies from the Winfield Ladies and Senior Citizens Club. There are also in that group some members from the constituency from Wetaskiwin-Leduc and some from the constituency of Ponoka. They are under the leadership of Mrs. Shirley Cripps. They are seated in the members gallery. I would ask them to rise and be recognized by the Assembly.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in introducing to you and to the members of the Assembly, 50 members of the Society for the Retired, located in Edmonton. Accompanying them today is their group leader, Mary Engelman. They are in the public gallery. I would ask them to stand and be recognized by the members.

TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, it gives me pleasure to file three reports with the Legislative Assembly, the first being the Swan Hills Erosion Control Program Progress Report, the second is the Athabasca Tar Sands Gathering System Study and the third is A Study of Pipeline Technology Related to Environmental Protection in Alberta.

MR. POSTER:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table Return No. 133.

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table the answer to Question No. 136.

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to file the Alberta Rural Libraries Project, which was prepared under the distinguished chairmanship of Mr. Harry E. Newsom of the School of Library Science.

MR. DOWLING:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to file with the Assembly a copy of the retail prices gathered jointly by the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Consumer Affairs.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Department of Agriculture

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make a short statement with regard to the question of milk pricing in Alberta and a new approach we propose to make towards milk pricing.

The Department of Agriculture, in conjunction with the Department of Consumer Affairs, has already begun preparation of a milk pricing formula which will involve the continuing collection and analysis of price and production data, and which will make use of both production and consumer price indexes. Production data will include realistic measures of farm labour costs for hired and family labour which exceed the standard 40 hour week.

The Public Utilities Board will be requested to accept the formula as a basis of more flexible pricing for Alberta fluid milk producers. The use of the formula pricing would avoid drastic price changes at lengthy intervals caused by the time lags resulting when producers are required to make periodic formal applications.

We are also able to announce, due to representations [saying] that neither the Public Utilities Board decision nor the new federal government dairy policy will provide adequate returns to milk producers in view of high feed costs, the government will continue to make

its feed incentive payments to producers on a phase-out basis. The payments for April and May will continue at the \$1.11/cwt. The payment in June will be \$.74/cwt and in July it will be \$.37/cwt. That incentive payment will then be phased out.

I want to make it clear, Mr. Speaker, that we are hopeful that by that time the feed costs - with the new pasture - we should have substantially reduced these forage costs by that time.

Insofar as the industrial milk situation is concerned, the incentive will apply in a similar way to the industrial milk producers. Again - and we are hopeful the federal government will accept the proposition we are making with regard to milk pricing so that we can have a similar situation in the industrial milk market as well.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

IPSCO - Alberta Option

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the first question to the Premier and ask if the government has arrived at a conclusion of its deliberations as far as the IPSCO proposal is concerned? And if it has, is the Premier in a position to advise the Assembly what that decision is?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, no, there are still some details that have to be cleared away before a final decision is made by the government. So we are not in a position to make an announcement today.

MR. CLARK:

Supplementary question to the Premier, Mr. Speaker. Is it the government's intention to ask for an extension of the deadline which, I believe, if my memory serves me correctly, is the fifteenth of this month.

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I suppose I can best answer that question by saying, probably not.

ALCB Strike

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, my second question is to the minister responsible for the Alberta Liquor Control Board. I'd like to ask the minister responsible, in light of the court decision this afternoon ordering the employees back to work, is the minister responsible now prepared to become actively involved herself in getting together the two groups, namely the Alberta Liquor Control Board and the employees, through the Civil Service Association? Is the minister prepared to become actively involved herself to get the two groups together and get negotiating?

MISS HUNLEY:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member perhaps has some information that I do not have. My last information was that the court was still in session and I don't have any opinion from that yet.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, for the information of the House, the court made that decision some time ago.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Cypress followed ...

MR. WILSON:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Solicitor General. Can the Solicitor General give this House assurances that no notations will be made in the personnel files of employees concerning actions taken in this dispute?

AN HON. MEMBER:

No.

MISS HUNLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I'm not prepared to discuss this. I'm not sure that the court has reached a decision. As of 2:30 I didn't have any information concerning it. I understood the hearing was continuing, and I prefer not to make any statements at this time.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Cypress followed by the hon. Member for Lac La Biche-McMurray.

Rapeseed Plant - Sexsmith

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. I noted in the statement that the Deputy Premier released the other day, he cited agreement having been reached between the co-op and the people who were promoting the rapeseed plant at Sexsmith. I'm wondering if he can inform the House as to how much the co-op had to put up for the assets of the promotional group?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, I can't, right off the top of my head, because it's a detailed agreement. I'm sure once everything is tied up that I'll be quite willing, in response to the outstanding Motion for a Return by the Leader of the Opposition, to table that information in the Legislature.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Lac La Biche-McMurray followed by the hon. Member for Macleod.

Tar Sands - New Townsite

DR. BOUVIER:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question this afternoon to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. Can the minister advise if he has received the feasibility study being prepared by Underwood, McLellan and Associates, commissioned by Shell Canada and Associates, regarding the proposed new townsite in the tar sands area?

MR. RUSSELL:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the company gave me a copy of that some time ago.

DR. BOUVIER:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is the minister prepared to table a copy of that report?

MR. RUSSELL:

No, Mr. Speaker.

DR. BOUVIER:

Supplementary. Has the minister or other members of the cabinet met with the proponents of the new townsite?

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, I think it's important to clarify what is in the report. It was a report commissioned strictly by Shell and their partners. They gave a copy to me out of courtesy, and I suggest if some other members want a courtesy copy they could make their

own arrangements to get one. I don't believe there is anything confidential in it. It's merely a suggested townsite that would work to the advantage of some particular proponents. But when we carry out our regional planning for the area, the whole area will be studied and not just the narrow references made within the report.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Macleod followed by the hon. Member for Bow Valley.

Governor General's Visit

MR. BUCKWELL:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Premier. In the upcoming visit of His Excellency, the Governor General, to Edmonton, will the members of this Assembly be able to meet him? What are the government plans along this line?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I regret that I don't have those facts present in my mind. My recollection is that there is going to be a representative group present from both sides of the Assembly at a dinner in honour of His Excellency. Whether or not there is anything else in the program, I would just have to check and I'll provide a note to the hon. member.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Bow Valley followed by the hon. Member for Drumheller.

Cow Camp

MR. MANDEVILLE:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development. The question is, has the minister had any request from Mr. Andras, the federal minister in charge of immigration, to hold a meeting with the province in regard to the cow camp at Wardlaw?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, no request from the federal minister has come to my attention.

MR. MANDEVILLE:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Would the minister be prepared to send an official from his department down to the camp to get a first-hand view of the operations of the cow camp?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Certainly I would, Mr. Speaker, and have given consideration to that. I should say though that one of the games that is being played at the present time, I think - making no suggestion that Mr. Andras shouldn't do that if he can - is to attempt to assign some of his responsibility for determining the right of the people who are there to be in the country to the Alberta Government. I don't intend to assume that duty.

MR. CLARK:

Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Health and Social Development. Has the minister received representation from any Alberta MPs asking him to help out on this particular case, namely the Member for Crowfoot?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I have had correspondence with the member of the federal House of Commons who represents Crowfoot.

MR. CLARK:

Supplementary, has he asked you to intercede in this matter?

MR. SPEAKER:

Would the hon. member please address the Chair.

MR. CLARK:

Has the hon. Member for Crowfoot asked the Minister of Health and Social Development to intercede in this matter on behalf of the cow camp?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the question, using the word "intercede" I think, is an overstatement. He has expressed some support for it but understands the difficulty of the provincial administration in dealing with federal matters.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Women School Superintendents

MR. TAYLOR:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the hon. Minister of Education. Has the department received any applications for a position of school superintendent from distinguished women teachers of the province?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Well, Mr. Speaker, superintendents under The School Act of 1970 are hired by school boards who advertise for the positions when they are vacant. Therefore the school boards around the province would have that information. However, if the honourable gentleman would like me to assess departmental records, insofar as these appointments have to be approved by the minister, I'll certainly get the information for him.

MR. TAYLOR:

Thank you very much. A supplementary, is the department encouraging the appointment of a woman school superintendent who would be the first in Canada?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, we, in the province of Alberta encourage the appointment of as many superintendents of excellence - of both sexes - as possible.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

ARR - , Repairs

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Industry and Commerce. Can the minister advise the Assembly what the present status is of repairs on the Alberta Railroad to Resources, and when the repairs will be completed?

MR. PEACOCK:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have a restoration progress report here in front of me. With the indulgence of the House I'll just read off very quickly - grade reconstruction is completed to Mile 152. The track laying and ballasting is completed to Mile 152, and the rock riprap is about 70 per cent completed.

I might point out for the information of the House that our engineering, that is the ARR engineering, has some concern in regard to the riprap.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question then, for clarification. Can the minister advise whether the same general roadbed is being used or whether there will be significant

changes, as a result of the floods, to try to avoid the same problem that occurred two years ago.

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, generally speaking there will be some significant changes in relation to the roadbed in regards to the areas that were washed out in the flood of two years ago, and subsequently a year ago. I might point out also in further answering the question to the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview that they anticipate completing the repairs some time in late September.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question. With respect to the same general route for the roadbed, has there been any independent study as to the feasibility of making changes in the route to avoid the recurrence of a flood such as occurred two years ago?

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, there has. As you will recall, when we signed the agreement with the CNR, the responsibility for the subsequent maintenance of the roadbed would be the CNR's. Therefore the care and concern that they would have in redirecting their route must be the responsibility of the CNR.

MR. NOTLEY:

One final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, if I may. Can the minister advise the Assembly whether or not the costs are in line with the original estimate, or whether there will be any substantial over-run in the rebuilding program?

MR. PEACOCK:

It is anticipated, Mr. Speaker, that the cost will be fairly close to what has been estimated, although the details of that won't be forthcoming until after September.

MR. KOZIAK:

Has the hon. minister considered the preparation or production of a television serial entitled "The Provincial Dream"?

[Laughter]

MR. TAYLOR:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister. Would the hon. minister be able to table in the Legislature a graph showing the old route and the new route being followed by ARR?

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, I am not sure whether that could be tabled but I would certainly take it under advisement and determine whether it can be.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Little Bow followed by the hon. Member for Lethbridge West.

Rural Gas Co-ops - Taxes

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, my questions are to the Provincial Treasurer. Would the minister be prepared to table today the letter he has sent to the federal tax people with regard to the \$1,700 payment made by co-op members?

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't be able to table it today because I believe that at about this time it should be in my secretary's typewriter.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. What recommendations did the minister make in that letter?

MR. MINIELY:

Really, Mr. Speaker, in my letter I don't make a recommendation because I think all hon. members should be aware that tax matters are largely a question of interpretation of law. I point out in my letter to the directors of taxation in Edmonton and in Calgary the history of the matter and previous advice that these offices have given, both to provincial representatives and to others. Of course, what appears from the facts is that conflicting advice has in fact been given from the taxation offices to the people who have enquired about this particular matter. Although that might be the case, I think we have to appreciate that while I can make that representation, in the final analysis it becomes a question of law and interpretation of the tax statutes.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Due to the nearness of time for filing the 1973 tax forms, will the minister consider making representation in person or have one of his officials do same, to expedite a decision?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Big deal.

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to do everything I can, along with my colleague, the hon. Mr. Farran, to try to assist in whatever way we can to see that the farmers gain the maximum advantage possible under the tax legislation.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Lethbridge West followed by the hon. Member for Lethbridge East.

Lethbridge Research Station

MR. GRUENWALD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Agriculture. To what extent, Mr. Minister, is the Department of Agriculture of this province involved in the expansion facilities at the Lethbridge Research Station?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, we signed a joint occupancy agreement with the federal government in relation to the research station building program in Lethbridge. The intent of that agreement is that our people working in southern Alberta on a regional basis should have a close working relationship with the federal research people at the station in Lethbridge.

MR. GRUENWALD:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Did the Department of Agriculture and the minister have any input into the planning of the facilities there to suit your participation?

DR. HORNER:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, in relation to that space which my department will be occupying.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Lethbridge East followed by the hon. Member for Sedgewick-Coronation.

Farm Labour Pools

MR. ANDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, my question is also to the Minister of Agriculture. Has the government designated the areas in which the emergency labour pools will be created?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, just off the top of my head, I know that two or three of the labour pools will be in southern Alberta, one at Taber. I would expect one in the Lethbridge area and

perhaps one in the Brooks area because of the very great need for labour in the irrigation areas.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Sedgewick-Coronation followed by the hon. Member for Taber-Warner.

Traffic Fatalities

MR. SORENSON:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address my question jointly to the hon. Minister of Education and the hon. the Attorney General. In light of the dramatic increase in traffic fatalities among young adults and teen-agers since the drinking age was lowered in 1971, would the hon. ministers consider having their departments sponsor in the driver education program and in our schools at large a more detailed and comprehensive program explaining the effects of alcohol and driving, both from the legal and health standpoints?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to get some more information as to the general assumptions being drawn but I certainly would be happy to draw the matter to the attention of school boards in connection with particular courses in schools. I think the program which is being initiated by the hon. Minister of Highways regarding driver education has a great deal of promise not only in the urban but also the rural areas of the province, and he may well wish to include some aspect of that important matter.

MR. SORENSON:

A supplementary to the minister. Would the minister consider making a study to determine whether there is indeed a direct relationship between the lowering of the drinking age and the number of traffic deaths amongst young drivers?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I would think that perhaps such entities as the Alberta Safety Council might provide us with a useful starting point as to whether or not such an exploration of that subject would be worth while in the long run.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Medicare - Doctors' Fees

MR. D. MILLER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question, Mr. Speaker, is to the minister responsible for the Health Care Commission. Could the hon. minister indicate to the Assembly if the review committee has examined the files of the 14 Alberta medical doctors who earned in excess of \$200,000 from the Alberta Health Care Commission last year?

MISS HUNLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I don't have that information but I would be glad to enquire from the Commission as to whether the profile review committee has met and reviewed it, and advise the hon. member.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Funeral and Cemetery Advertising

MR. HO LEM:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to address my question to the hon. the Premier. It's a follow-up question to the subject of funeral and cemetery advertising being mailed to senior citizens. Can the hon. Premier advise this House if the appropriate authorities

or departments have been requested to look into this practice of private cemeteries mailing advertising brochures to residents of nursing homes?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I believe my recollection is right that I agreed to take that as notice. Before responding, I believe I also responded to the supplementary question by the hon. member to the effect of some questionable practices and I haven't as yet received any information for the hon. member.

MR. HO LEM:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In view of the answer, and for the purpose of information, I would like to forward this file of information concerning this sort of practice to the hon. Premier. My supplementary answer, mm, question would be ...

[Laughter]

... and I hope that you will have a supplementary answer - my supplementary question would be, would the Premier report back to the House as soon as the investigation has taken place?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, yes I will, either from myself or from the Minister of Health and Social Development.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Alberta - Loans to Provinces

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question today to the hon. Premier. Has the government given an indication or actual commitment to provide financial assistance to another province in Canada that may be contemplating the takeover of a utility or private company, or an investment in private companies within another province?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I would presume, by the way the question is framed that it's an attempt by the hon. member to get me to answer something I was not prepared to answer before, relative to my discussions with the Premier of Newfoundland. I think I have to maintain the privacy of our discussions at this time. As soon as there is anything of a public nature that should be made, I will attempt to make it to the Legislature.

MR. DIXON:

A supplementary question to the Premier, Mr. Speaker. In light of the hon. Premier's answer, then there has been some indication that assistance would be made?

[Laughter]

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, another attempt to draw an assumption. I believe it is only fair to say that any decision that the government would make, a decision of that nature, was something that certainly would be presented at the proper time and proper place to the Legislative Assembly.

As far as total policy, leaving aside the particular point, is involved, from a straight debt point of view I see nothing whatsoever wrong with the government giving consideration to the appropriate placement of funds from time to time in other areas, in the better interests of Canada and Alberta, in particular. Certainly the experience of the government of the Province of British Columbia relative to the government of the Province of Quebec is a case in point.

MR. NOTLEY:

A supplementary question to the hon. Premier. Can the Premier advise whether or not there will be a position paper tabled in the Legislature which would generally outline the

criteria that might be used in terms of making such debt capital available to other parts of Canada?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, that would be a bit premature for us to answer now. We are in the process of a review which may take some weeks, if not months. When it is completed, it might be possible that that particular item is a portion of it.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Lie Detectors

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question the hon. Minister of Consumer Affairs. Will the government reconsider the decision and give further study to licensing operators of psychological stress evaluators and polygraph operators, commonly known as commercial lie detector operations?

MR. DOWLING:

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that this matter was raised in the House a day or two ago, and I indicated that I knew nothing of the situation the hon. member was referring to, I would suggest it is now incumbent upon the hon. member to provide me with specific details of the matter he refers to, in order that we might take it into consideration.

MR. WILSON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister. Can the minister advise under what circumstances Trans-World Private Investigators from Toronto tested over 60 Alberta 7-Eleven store employees with a psychological stress evaluator?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member's question fails to give any indication that anything has occurred which directly affects the hon. minister's department, or which they might know.

MR. WILSON:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, we are talking to the Minister of Consumer Affairs, or asking him questions, in relation to his role as the chief licensing officer for business operations in the province.

I have a further supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Can the minister advise under what circumstances the Alberta Jolly Mart employees were tested by an American polygraph operator?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Order, order.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member's further question is of the same nature as its predecessor. I would respectfully suggest to the hon. member that both questions might perhaps be put in the proper form. But as they are now, they are simply general inquiries which might be addressed to anyone in the province.

MR. WILSON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Manpower and Labour. Can the minister advise if the Human Rights Commission has considered this new investigative procedure?

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, the Human Rights Commission would not normally, of its own volition, investigate a matter like this. It would have to be on the complaint of a complainant.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Vermilion-Viking followed by the hon. Member for Wainwright.

Flooding - Vermilion River

MR. COOPER:

Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the hon. Deputy Premier, as minister in charge of disaster services. In view of the numerous warnings issued with regard to likely flooding of the Vermilion River, have any sandbags been stockpiled at Vegreville? That centre is very susceptible to flooding by the Vermilion River and I feel a bit responsible.

[Laughter]

DR. HORNER:

Well, Mr. Speaker, as the announcements by both my colleague, the Minister of the Environment, and myself have noted, the Disaster Services Agency has a coordinating committee that is now at work trying to prepare as best we can for any anticipated flooding. We have on order, and are stockpiling in the Department of Highways and Transport garages, substantial numbers of sandbags, and have received a great deal of cooperation from the Department of Highways and Transport in securing sand for the filling and so on.

I can get additional information that reflects the member's concern with regard to the Vermilion River, but we do have a stockpile of sandbags and we are taking as many precautions as possible to prevent as much damage as possible.

MR. GRUENWALD:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Agriculture. Is there any action the minister can take that might help to create a situation that might cause floods in southern Alberta?

AN HON. MEMBER:

It's beyond his jurisdiction.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Insecticides - Grasshopper Control

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Agriculture. Has the minister received an offer from the federal Minister of Agriculture regarding the setting up of control centres in Alberta with equipment and insecticides to control grasshoppers?

DR. HORNER:

Well, Mr. Speaker, what the hon. member is referring to is the - and he asked it last night in committee - I think there is some misunderstanding. The federal offer is from the Ministry of Transport and is an annual one, in relation to the availability of planes for spraying. That is the only communication we have had from the federal government and we have responded to it and will be cooperating with the Ministry of Transport in relation to having enough spraying planes available.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Prescription Drug Prices

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Consumer Affairs. Has his department investigated reports of large discrepancies in the cost of prescription drugs in the city of Edmonton - for the same type of drugs in different parts of the city?

MR. DOWLING:

Yes. Mr. Speaker, we followed the articles in the newspaper very closely and I can explain very briefly what causes the difference in price. The difference in price, Mr. Speaker, is based on the cost of medication plus a prescription fee. The maximum fee which can be charged on a prescription, I believe, is now \$2.65, as regulated by the Department of Health and Social Development.

Different drug stores or pharmacies charge different prescription fees. They may also buy in quantity to provide a less expensive cost per unit, or they may be required, because of their small store with very little prescription business, to buy in small quantities at a higher unit cost. I would suggest that's the major reason for the difference in price, Mr. Speaker.

I would also like to say that the price generally for prescription drugs over the past number of years, as verified by a pharmaceutical research study, has in fact decreased over the last number of years.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question for clarification. Can the minister assure the House that the dispensing fee allocated by the Department of Health and Social Development is, in fact, being lived up to and that all pharmacists are charging that fee and no more?

MR. DOWLING:

Mr. Speaker, it is a fact that it is a requirement of the Department of Health and Social Development that the maximum fee is \$2.65.

MR. HENDERSON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, for clarification. I wonder if one of the two ministers involved here could advise the House as to whether the Department of Health and Social Development regulates all prescription service charges or just those that relate to the operations of the Department of Health and Social Development?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that the guidelines put forward by the department relate to the prescriptions handled under the social allowance program.

MR. HENDERSON:

A further supplementary. They are not generally applicable to the private citizen - these prescription charges throughout?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to check that because it has been my understanding that it has not been applicable beyond the contracts the department itself is a party to, although it may be used as a guideline by others.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask one further supplementary question for clarification from the minister. My question is, have the investigations of your department turned up that all pharmacists are, in fact, abiding by the point you have just made, that the dispensing fee should be \$2.65?

MR. DOWLING:

No, Mr. Speaker, I understand drugstores in some parts of west-central Alberta charge a \$1 fee.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Drumheller followed by the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Check Stop

MR. TAYLOR:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the hon. the Solicitor General. Is the department keeping a running summary of the results of the Check Stop program?

MISS HUNLEY:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we are.

MR. TAYLOR:

A supplementary. Will the summary be released publicly or to the Legislature?

MISS HUNLEY:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd be pleased to do that. They run about two weeks late by the time figures are accumulated and posted but that still gives us a pretty current picture of what is happening. I'd be pleased to table the most recent one.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, I was thinking - at the end of every three months or six months rather than every two weeks.

But my final supplementary is, do the results at this time indicate an increase or decrease in drivers who are impaired?

MISS HUNLEY:

I think, Mr. Speaker, it is a little difficult to answer that question specifically when I look at the statistics. They aren't a comparison from last year or through a number of years, they just reflect the numbers of cars that have been checked and the number of offences which have been recorded. If I were to try to compare them - we didn't have anything up until last October, so it is a little difficult to say.

Weather conditions also reflect the number of people who are driving. The number of times the police are out would reflect, so it is rather difficult to be exactly specific in the way the hon. member requests.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Expropriation Act

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Education in his capacity as House Leader. I would like to ask the Government House Leader if it is the government's intention to re-introduce, this session, The Expropriation Procedures Act? And secondly, then, is it the government's intention to have this Act dealt with in all three readings at this spring session?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Not The Expropriation Procedures Act, Mr. Speaker. That is the name of the old Act, but the new expropriation act, which will be new in its concepts for all of Canada and will be introduced again this spring. I suppose the extent of its progress thereafter would depend on the number of comments received from the public and from the MLAs which would determine its speed through the House and third reading after that.

MR. CLARK:

A supplementary question to the minister. Then this new piece of legislation - is it the government's intention to introduce it rather quickly after the Easter break because of the magnitude of the legislation?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Yes, I would think fairly shortly after the Easter break the House would see the bill, which would incorporate the unique home-for-a-home concept.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Federal Oil Export Tax

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the hon. the Premier or the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. It is regarding the announcement yesterday of the proposed export tax on refined petroleum products. My question to the hon. Premier or the minister is, were the producing provinces made aware of this action and does Alberta plan any protest regarding the new tax?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, the answer is yes, we were consulted and advised. Secondly, no protest would be considered because the view which I think anybody who studied the matter would reach is that it is logical if you are going to have an export tax on crude oil - no matter what one might think of that particular tax - the purpose of that situation can be defeated if you run into a situation where the crude oil was refined and then shipped across the border without a tax situation being levied.

MR. DIXON:

A supplementary question, then, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Premier in light of the answer. As Alberta gets none of the tax - that isn't the reason I asked the question. [I asked] why we wouldn't protest, why don't we try to get a share of that tax then if they are going to implement it? It will not benefit us, because we are not getting any of the rebate.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member is actually debating but if the hon. Premier wishes to deal with the question, perhaps this might be a good time to do it.

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, anxiously.

I think the answer to that situation really is that as far as the export tax is concerned, because we are dealing with crude oil, the participation of Alberta will be, of course, in the higher price, 71 per cent higher, of the price of crude oil which would flow to a refinery in Canada. We would get the full benefit of that portion of the increase flowing back to Alberta. So if the refining is done in Canada and then exported across the border, we'd be in roughly the same position as far as Alberta is concerned.

There is some possibility - I suggest only some - that because of the nature of having an absence of the export tax on refined products, we might have seen a situation of refining capacity developing in the Montreal area or in the Ontario area which would not otherwise have developed, which in the longer term interests wouldn't be favourable to Alberta.

MR. SPEAKER:

I should perhaps mention, with great respect to the Member for Calgary Millican, lest there be some thought that the Speaker is unilaterally trying to change the rules with regard to the question period, that when a debating question does get past the Speaker, it is almost necessary, in fairness, to permit a reply even though it might be a debating reply.

The hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview.

Denison Mines

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to either the hon. Premier or to the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests. Can the Premier advise the Assembly whether the government is currently studying a proposal for a major project by Denison Mines in the Willmore Wilderness Park?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I refer the question to the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests.

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, for some time now, I believe dating back to 1969, there have been mineral coal leases held by Denison Mines, now called Rock Lake Coal Company, in that area. The matters of further action on these areas have been held in abeyance pending the completion of the hearings and of the reports and recommendations through that area by the Environment Conservation Authority.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question, if I may. Can I ask the hon. minister whether or not a specific proposal is, however, being studied by the government at this time? I realize that no decision will be made until the eastern slopes decision has been made, but I'm asking whether or not a specific proposal is before the government at this time.

DR. WARRACK:

I'm not quite sure whether there is a specific proposal, presumably by Denison, before us at the present time, inasmuch as it is not receiving active consideration at this time for the reason that I just mentioned.

MR. SPEAKER:

I should mention that in the remark I made a moment ago, I was perhaps bringing to the attention of the hon. Member for Calgary Millican something which was not necessary, and I would like to assure the House that I have the greatest respect for his knowledge and experience in the procedure.

DR. BOUVIER:

On a point of order, does that ruling apply in reverse, too, when somebody asks a question and the answer is by way of debate? Does the questioner have the opportunity to debate the answer?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER:

The member has every opportunity to raise a point of order at the appropriate time.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

WRITTEN QUESTIONS

140. Mr. Notley asked the government the following question:

1. Have residents of the Half Way House operated by the Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission in the City of Edmonton worked at repairing and reconditioning furniture owned by private firms?
2. If so, did the firm or firms concerned pay the government or the residents of the Half Way House for this work?

3. Was any work performed by the residents of the Half Way House on furniture for Pocahontas Bungalows, Miette Junction?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table the answer to that question.

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

What are the Alberta Liquor Control Board employee resignation statistics for the months of January, February and March in the years 1973 and 1974?

MISS HUNLEY:

I accept the question.

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

What was the total amount invested under the Consolidated Cash Investment Trust Fund on December 31, 1973 and on March 31, 1974?

MR. MINIELY:

I accept the question.

146. Mr. Notley asked the government the following question:

1. How many contracts have been awarded to the consulting firm of L. W. Downey since September 10, 1971 and what is the total amount of money paid by the government to this firm since that date?
2. Has any other private consulting firm received (a) as many contracts and (b) as much by way of total payment from the provincial government since September 10, 1971?
3. Was there any contract or formal or informal agreement between the government and Mr. L. W. Downey at the time the role of the Human Resources Research Council was substantially cut back or subsequently concerning the allocation of future research work to Mr. Downey's firm?

MISS HUNLEY:

I accept the question.

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

Insofar as shown in government records:

1. What was the approximate incremental investment by the oil and gas industry in Alberta during 1973 on exploration, drilling and construction of field oil and gas processing facilities exclusive of Tar Sands and Cold Lake heavy oil deposits?
2. What was the approximate oil and gas industry incremental investment in Alberta in 1973 for drilling and construction of oil and gas field processing facilities in fields discovered prior to December 31, 1970?

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, that question is acceptable.

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

How much money was paid out by the Department of Health and Social Development during the 1973 calendar year or 1973-74 fiscal year to unemployed employable persons in receipt of social assistance or social allowance?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table copies of the answer to Question 149.

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

1. How many research studies were commissioned by the Government of Alberta in (a) 1972; (b) 1973?
2. How much did each study cost the Government of Alberta?
3. What was the purpose of each study?
4. What were the names of the firms or individuals to which the studies were assigned?

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, we have no objection to Question 150 standing in Mr. Cooper's name. I guess there could be some judgment factor that would have to be used in determining what is a research study and what isn't. However, we will try to make it as broad as possible a judgment factor, and then ask that the hon. member agree that it be made a motion for a return because it is going to take some considerable work and time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

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

What were:

- (a) The names of the members of the Department of Mines and Minerals and other individuals who were appointed to the five study committees looking into oil and gas royalties, drilling incentives, land tenure, cost allowances and sulphur?
- (b) Dates and locations of the preliminary meetings between these five departmental committees and representatives of IPAC, the CPA, and drilling contractors?
- (c) Any guidelines or instructions given to these committees in regard to royalties to assist them in these or subsequent discussions?
- (d) The amounts of money expended by the government on each member committee?

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, that question is acceptable.

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

1. What was the destination of all trips taken outside of Canada in 1972 and 1973 by the cabinet ministers, which were paid for from public funds?
2. (a) What was the total cost of each trip?
(b) The purpose of each trip?
3. Who accompanied the minister on each trip?

MR. MINIELY:

Accepted.

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

1. What are the names of the 25 oil fields producing 45 per cent of the crude oil in Alberta on which the Energy Resources Conservation Board has not placed any production rate limitations?
2. What per cent of the total Alberta proven recoverable non-Tar Sands oil reserves do the reserves of the above fields represent as of December 31, 1973?

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, that question is acceptable.

MOTIONS FOR A RETURN

143. Mr. Wilson proposed the following motion to the Assembly:

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

A copy of the March 4, 1974 "letter of intent" signed by the Civil Service Association and the Alberta Liquor Control Board.

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to move Motion No. 143 standing in my name on the Order Paper.

[The motion was carried.]

148. Mr. Henderson proposed the following motion to the Assembly:

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

Two copies of the brief presented by the Alberta Energy Resources Conservation Board to the National Energy Board public hearings in Calgary on April 2 or thereabouts.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I move Motion No. 148 standing in my name on the Order Paper.

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, there is no objection to the motion.

[The motion was carried.]

151. Mr. Wyse proposed the following motion to the Assembly:

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

With relation to all exploratory work for gas and oil in the Suffield Block during 1973 and 1974 copies of:

1. Instructions to bidders.
2. Tenders received in accordance with instructions to bidders.
3. Contracts entered into with successful bidders.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the hon. Member, Mr. Wyse, I move Motion for a Return No. 151.

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, there is no objection to the motion.

[The motion was carried.]

MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

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

Be it resolved that the Government of Alberta proclaim the week in which Remembrance Day (November 11) falls as Veterans Week in Alberta.

MR. PURDY:

Mr. Speaker, Motion No. 1 on the Order Paper today in my name asks that the week in which November 11 falls be proclaimed as Veterans Week in Alberta.

Previously we have forgotten about the men and women who have fought for this dominion and province in which we live. How do we recognize veterans in Alberta? One day a year, two minutes silence at 11:00 a.m. on November 11, and that's about the extent of the celebration for these men of valour.

The Royal Canadian Legion does recognize the Saturday previous to November 11 as Poppy Day, but that's about all that is done. I feel the government must lead and show our veterans that we as a government, and people of Alberta, show respect for these men and women.

Let's go back and look at the end of each war. At the end of the First World War over half a million veterans had been placed into the labour market. War contracts had terminated making the competition for a livelihood ever more intense. The overseas men had other problems. Rehabilitation measures by the government were hampered by the lack of experience. There was little technical, educational or vocational guidance. The veteran had a choice, go farming or go fishing. There were squabbles with union leaders about the right to employment. There were complaints about hospitalization, pensions, civil service preference and other issues. Dissatisfaction on these points was justified, but disenchantment led to bitterness and some veterans began to overreact. The prestige of the returned men began to drop.

This shows the background which prompted the formation of the Royal Canadian Legion in 1925. Its roots go back to 1917 and the Great War Veterans Association.

Several veterans groups amalgamated that year to form a new organization. Its objective was to bring more strength and unity to bear on the problems of veterans and their dependants. The Legion has done this with considerable success for almost half a century. It has been a major influence in having adequate veterans' legislation established and administered. This is a continuing thing and requires constant attention. For instance, the latest major pension legislation dealt with the basic rate, and this was as recent as 1973.

The Canadian Legion in Canada does extensive work. Each year the Legion puts out more than [\$1.5 million] into communities. Mostly, this is youth oriented with over a half million youths involved. Organized in ten provinces and five states of the United States, its membership is still growing. As it turns into the '70s membership is approximately at the 310,000 mark with an additional 80,000 in the women's auxiliary and about 7,000 fraternal affiliations. In 1973 the first of the associations began to show in the Legion. This, Mr. Speaker, is where the youth who has had a parent in the armed forces may be able to join the Legion as a full pledged member. Sponsorship for air cadets, for example, involved over 6,200 boys in 375 squadrons. Hundreds of Legion members are involved as instructors and group leaders. An additional 1,250 boys take part in Legion sponsored scouts and cubs, making the Legion the largest sponsored organization among service organizations for this group. It also sponsors thousands of army and sea cadets.

Each community has its senior citizens and many of these people live in lonely isolation. Many branches have programs to assist them. The purpose of the community care program is to enable younger people to assist a branch in establishing contact with the senior citizens and promoting certain services: a courtesy service bus available to older citizens upon request, hospital visiting and visits to senior citizens' homes, hospital drop-in centres at Legion branches staffed by sons and daughters, meals-on-wheels and many other programs - mobile library service and a shopping service in winter for senior citizens.

Legion members and their younger members also work with the handicapped. They are involved unilaterally with thousands of young people in sports. Many Legion branches sponsor teams in hockey, baseball and so on.

In every corner of Canada a rich heritage is on the verge of extinction. Think of your community, the founders, the first settlers at the turn of the century. Even World War I veterans are receding and very little human interest material has been recorded in terms of this province. Therefore, an excellent project for the various communities to get involved in would be to interview the older citizens, veterans, and get their experience on tape before they are lost.

This would require considerable organization but it is the type of project that we could get from our local citizens. We can take a very serious look at the different projects that could be carried out in the province of Alberta. Legions that are in operation in Alberta, especially in the rural part of the province, do not have very good accommodations. Their borrowing powers are limited. The funds they do receive are from a local base. The Legion accommodations locally known as Legion huts are mostly small. They have inadequate facilities, and are inadequate to accommodate the social functions that they would like to carry on and the use of this facility with the community.

The number of people participating that may be made available to a Legion is also jeopardized. I think this is one of the handicaps placed upon Legions, that they can only

grow so large because of the accommodation they have to look after. With the lack of accommodation, only so many veterans can actually join. The government at this point, then, could become involved in an interest-free loan of some nature to the various Legions. We could set aside in our budgetary estimates each year a number of dollars that could be set up in a revolving fund, to allow various Legions in Alberta to borrow on this fund. It would certainly enhance the work of the Legion and recognize Legion facilities and the job the Legion is doing in Alberta, more so than it has done in the past.

We have made significant steps in the past to recognize other organizations throughout Alberta, agricultural societies, horticultural societies, art foundations, artists, people in literature and every other facet in life, but this is one group of people who have virtually been forgotten. The provincial government could pick three or four projects a year on a competitive base from the Legions now situated in Alberta and I would ...

MR. SPEAKER:

With great respect, the Chair has some difficulty in relating a general debate on veterans' affairs with the resolution asking the government to institute veterans week in Alberta. Perhaps the hon. member might relate his further debate more closely to the resolution rather than something which would appear to be outside the purview of the Government of Alberta and within the purview of the dominion government.

MR. PURDY:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was just leading up to that point. I was trying to evolve around my remarks here of what the government would do for veterans week in the province of Alberta.

I was about to say that most of this does come under the purview of the federal government, but it would enhance the people who are living in rural Alberta and veterans in this area if this week was proclaimed and this type of funding was made available to them. The competition I spoke of just recently would be done around veterans week.

In my constituency, Mr. Speaker, we have three Canadian Legions and they all have inadequate facilities. In the village of Onoway the Legion has just recently purchased an old school from the county of Lac St. Anne which they plan to move on to a site and, in speaking to the members of this Legion, there are not very many funds available for them to expand their facilities. This is also happening to other Legion branches which I have in my constituency, namely Spruce Grove and Stony Plain.

The concept of a week to recognize veterans in Alberta I think is a good one. In the past - and it happened last year - veterans and Legion organizations in the province of Alberta had difficulty, when November 11 fell on a Sunday, even to obtain a liquor permit and some work had to be done to have this. If it was proclaimed, the week in which November 11 falls, then these days could be set on a Saturday or Friday evening for these people.

That's about the extent of my remarks on this resolution, Mr. Speaker. I would ask that other members bring forth the points they consider on this resolution, and I hope we can get the support of the House on it.

Thank you.

MR. STROMBERG:

Mr. Speaker, may I offer my congratulations to the Member for Stony Plain for his worth-while motion.

Mr. Speaker, November 11 is set aside in most parts of the world for remembrance of the sacrifice of many on behalf of their homelands. To preserve the freedom we enjoy today in Canada, 110,000 young Canadians gave their lives and now rest forever in foreign fields.

Mr. Speaker, fortunately Remembrance Day is becoming more an occasion for tribute and remembrance. Mr. Speaker, witness the growing number of citizens partaking in November 11 cenotaph and church services. [Witness] the changing times where this government saw fit to declare November 11 a statutory holiday and the changing times of our young people, who are becoming more and more opposed to the waging of war. These same young people, Mr. Speaker, also recognize the tremendous debt of gratitude we owe our veterans.

Mr. Speaker, let's continue this recognition and become the first province in Canada to recognize veterans week.

MR. BUCKWELL:

Mr. Speaker, I hadn't intended to get into this motion. I want to commend the member for his thoughts, but I am rather surprised and somewhat hurt that he took the attitude that really it is Legion week and that all we're going to do is drum up business for the Canadian Legion. The Legion is only one organization - it's probably the largest - dealing with veterans affairs. The others, the Army and Navy and the Veterans Club, have almost as many members as the Canadian Legion in some parts of the country. There are a good many veterans - and I say this to the sorrow of the veterans - a good many veterans won't belong to either of the clubs. What has happened today is that the crowning point of most Legions is to get a liquor licence so they can generate some funds. The Legion in many parts has become nothing more than a glorified beer parlour. They do a lot of good work; I'm not decrying the Legion whatsoever.

But when we get down to Remembrance Day, November 11, 1918, it just so happens that this was the day peace was declared. Instead of having VE Day as a remembrance day for those who died in the Second World War, we still continued on with November 11. I would like to think that we still remember the eleventh day of November as one on which we remember those who died in foreign wars, those who died in defence of their country. It is really a day for the dead. It is a day we remember. Even the Legion, the Legion members - they in their poppy day - really come out in force to remember their fallen comrades.

I would like to think that we are not going to clutter up Remembrance Day with the week of promoting the Legion or the Army and Navy. Personally, I would sooner have seen the hon. member take a week in June, on VE Day, so we could have had some outdoor activities, say, Army or Cadet shows. On November 11 traditionally the weather has been inclement and this is one of the reasons that maybe has [withheld] people from going to the Armistice Day services and the outdoor services in the smaller areas in as great a number as they should. I think if we're going to have a veterans week, let's have it in June where people in the Legion, or the Army and Navy, or any veterans club, could put on some displays showing the work they are doing. It won't be very long now that - by next year - the war will be a 30-year memory of many. There are members in this House who were born after the end of the Second World War. Those families who have lost loved ones in the first or second world wars still remember, even though some of them may not get out in numbers the way they used to. But I don't think that 30 years after the war you can suddenly come along and say, let's remember veterans week - and solve anything.

I commend the member for the thoughts he has given, both he and the Member for Camrose, but if we are going to try to make the Legion a living, breathing organization, I don't think we should tie it down to November 11. We should maybe pick another week during the year for this thing and perhaps it would have a lot more support.

MR. BATIUK:

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to participate and make a few observations on this resolution. I think this is one resolution that is a very important, one that doesn't cost any money - which maybe it should. We have various weeks throughout the year that are proclaimed. We have the Education Week in March, the Agriculture Week - and many communities, towns or villages will proclaim a week for themselves. For example, maybe in Drumheller there could be a Hearts and Flowers week sometimes, or anything else.

AN HON. MEMBER:

A coal mine week.

MR. BATIUK:

However, I think that veterans week has very much in common with Remembrance Day and I think it should be kept in conjunction with the week of November 11.

I would like to make a little comparison - I don't know whether I'll do it rightly - and quote the scripture which says, God hath given to the world His only begotten Son, and those that believeth in Him shall not perish, but have life everlasting. Now whether I said it well or not - if I didn't I'm sure the hon. Member for Highwood could straighten me out.

However, I am indeed glad that decade after decade, generation after generation, century after century and for almost 2,000 years this tradition, this concept has been accepted throughout the Christian world - maybe with the exception where state control is being practised, where maybe an animal or a dictator is worshipped. However, I think that next to this particular area, those who have gone and given their lives, those who have come back, probably handicapped for life, come very close.

How many wives have lost their husbands, parents have lost their sons, children have lost their fathers? And how many homes have been broken because of this? Just as an

example, I'll tell you of one I know very well. Some have come back after the war and found that their homes were broken. In particular, I've heard of one where the man came back from overseas after two years. He came home and found his wife with an eight-month-old child and this really bothered him. It was just fortunate he went to the doctor and said, doctor, this and this - and the doctor was real good and he said, you know what? The first one can come any time. And I'm glad that settled the case.

But in how many areas has this not happened? This goes on and I feel that whoever goes across, regardless of how he comes back, we must appreciate it. We are, this year, celebrating the RCMP Centenary. Our government is putting out quite a few dollars, and I think this is a very important occasion. But for some of those who have sacrificed their lives, just like the RCMP and so forth, maybe we should even think of putting a few dollars into communities or those that are going to take this into consideration and promote veterans week.

Why I really wanted to mention this today just makes me think of one lady who was widowed with nine sons. That happened in the twenties. This lady, because probably there was no social assistance, had to scrub floors for other people. She had to wash clothes and there was no automatic washer; it was the tub, the board and the hand-powered wringer. She had to weed gardens for other people to make a livelihood for these children of hers. When the conflict came all nine sons went. Only one of the nine returned.

I had sort of forgotten about this. I was young at the time. But being on the hospital visitors committee and very recently visiting a nursing home here in Edmonton, and looking at the name on the door, I recognized the name, very familiar. I walked into this elderly lady's room. She was about 75 or whatever. She was sitting in front of the pictures of her sons sobbing. I said to her, what seems to be the matter? She told me, yes, these are the eight sons I lost. She said, I wonder why God punished me? Well, I tried to sympathize with her, that this was not the reason. She was punished, if there was any reason, through the years that she had to bring up these children. I found out from the matron of the nursing home that this lady has been doing that day in and day out for all these years, and I think that veterans week is something very important.

Every morning when I get up I turn the radio on to CFCW. I hear, the trucker of the week is so and so. If you know him make it a good day for him. I think this is very good. But maybe during veterans week we should make it a good day and a good week for those veterans who came back, who perhaps are handicapped, who have sacrificed everything.

These are the things I would like to mention. Those who have gone, who have never returned. Those who have returned went, not for their own pleasure but to make it good for us so that we would know that somebody would not come and knock on our doors at night and maybe the head of the household would be taken away. They have made it so that we can enjoy living in a country where there is plenty to eat, plenty of everything, particularly in a province under the administration of the Conservative government.

I would ask that all members support and participate in this resolution. I think it's one that really deserves it.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. KING:

Mr. Speaker, I was born in 1946 which was after the Second World War. I wasn't old enough to have any memory at all of the Korean War ...

AN HON. MEMBER:

[Inaudible]

MR. KING:

... you mean there is somebody else who was born after the Second World War?

I hadn't really intended to speak on this resolution at all, but I thought that maybe it would be important that someone should speak to it who doesn't have memories of the Second World War, let alone the First World War which many people in Canada still remember.

I think November 11 is an important day for everybody in the country, not the least of which are the people my age and younger. I think the idea of a veterans week is an important thing for every Canadian to consider, not the least of whom would be the young people too young to remember any war.

Remembrance Day has always been a fairly important day for me, and it certainly isn't because of the memories because I don't have any. Remembrance Day is important to me, not because it's a day to honour war, but because it's a day to honour sacrifice that was made

by millions of people. And it's a day, not to glorify war, but to recall the inhumanity of war. I've often heard it said disparagingly that the Legion or other veterans' organizations exist only so that the veterans can get together and fondly reminisce about war. And I would make what I think is an important distinction in the language. I do not believe that veterans get together to fondly reminisce or recall the inhumanity of war, but rather to marvel at how the humanity of man can overcome the inhumanity of war, the humanity in the way one soldier may treat another, or indeed, the way in which one soldier may treat an enemy.

War, Mr. Speaker, is something which catches up people. It propels them, using events that may be beyond their control, or propels them with insane leaders. War inspires a sacrifice which is not always a wise thing. But in that case the need for self-examination lies not just with those people who make the sacrifice and go off to war; the need for self-examination lies more with those who have sent them. The need for self-examination lies more with the people who remain at home, enjoy war vicariously or profit from it.

In my view, Mr. Speaker, the need for self-consideration of the causes of war is something that should always be close to the hearts and the minds of every citizen.

As someone who didn't live through the events that led up to the Second World War, as someone who has only studied the events leading up to the First World War through the history books, I think it is more compelling to young people my age than even to other members of this Assembly that there should be some event which keeps constantly before us the need to wonder about the circumstances, the attitudes and the feelings of people; the relationships of people to each other that could have caused the four years we know as the First World War, the six years we know as the Second World War, the Korean war, the war in Vietnam or any of those other little disagreements that we dismiss out of hand, calling them civil wars, revolutions, or brush fire wars.

Mr. Speaker, I think the resolution has a good deal to commend itself to every citizen of the province and I would suggest that even more than to the people who have lived through those days, it commends itself to the people who did not.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the resolution, and I do so for three reasons.

I think there should be a veterans week, first of all, in remembrance. And in that connection I would like it to fall on the week of Remembrance Day and the day could be part of that week representing remembrance.

As one hon. member has pointed out, remembrance of those who died, those who did not come back, those who gave their lives or made the supreme sacrifice would be a very important part of Remembrance Day and would be a very important part of veterans week.

I like to take a few moments on Remembrance Day to remember men I knew or boys I knew who went over to try to make the world safe for those of us who remained at home. I think of the brilliant minds, the strong bodies who made the supreme sacrifice, and I also remember or try to remember what a tremendous contribution they would have made had there been no war.

Remembrance is a very important part of veterans week and I think, rather than taking three minutes on Remembrance Day, to spread that remembrance at least over a week would be a tremendous improvement. Too often we stop for a three-minute silence on Remembrance Day and then consider we have done our duty. We forget the loved ones of those who didn't come home, whose wounds are opened every Remembrance Day - indeed, if they are ever healed - and we sometimes forget those young boys and girls who had to be raised without a father, and the mothers who had to do the job entirely on their own. I would like Remembrance Day to be an important part not only of honouring those who gave their lives, but also of making sure we do everything possible for those who remained - the loved ones of those who died.

Some say, we have gone 30 years now without a war, so why should we keep Remembrance Day? Well, we've gone many, many years since the death of Queen Victoria. We still have a holiday on her birthday. I don't think there is anything wrong with that. But even more so, in my view, is it important to continue Remembrance Day and veterans week the further we get from another war or from the last war. I hope the last war was indeed the last war. But unless we do bring to the attention of young people what war is, then they may very well think only of the glories of war and the glamour of war and forget all about the other sordid side of war. So my first reason for supporting the resolution asking the government to declare Veterans Week in Alberta on the week of November 11 is to honour those who have died.

My second reason is one of appreciation. Every man and every woman who spent part of his or her life on the battlefields or in the air or on the sea during war left part of their lives in those areas. And in many cases it was probably the best years of their lives. Too often we forget to appreciate what this meant. It meant that many young people were unable to pursue their education. It meant that many jeopardized their future as far as wealth was concerned. It meant that many came back with only part of their human body, part of their anatomy. It meant that some have spent the remaining years of their lives in hospitals, some without arms, some without legs, some without arms or legs, some blind and some crippled with disease. I would think part of veterans week would be to have more and more people realize the importance of at least occasionally visiting those who are in that condition because they volunteered to keep this country free from oppression. I never visit the veterans hospital in Calgary without coming away with a deeper appreciation of those who left a good part of their lives on the battlefields and consequently have never since been able to live what we call a normal life.

Appreciation of veterans week could also extend to many, many organizations. I am a member of the Canadian Legion. I think it does a tremendous job. Too many people see only one side of the Canadian Legion and that is the beer licence. Certainly most legions have a beer licence and I suppose the same percentage of veterans drinks as the percentage of the population, and probably no higher. I know many veterans who don't drink at all but who are active members of the Canadian Legion. Many people don't even know the tremendous job the Canadian Legion does for these veterans.

On veterans week it could increase that work of taking veterans on trips, showing appreciation through dinners, making sure we give every assistance where pensions are required, et cetera. The Army and Navy Club is also important. But then I would like to think of almost every organization stopping on veterans week to review - not only to remember those who died, not only to appreciate those who left part of their lives on the battlefield, but also to stop and think about what a modern war might mean. The last war was bad enough. The one before was very bad.

We have implements of death now that not only kill one person, as generally was done in the early wars, but which can cripple and maim people in an entire city, thousands who would never be able to live a normal life again. And the implements of death are such that it should make anyone shudder who stops to think of what another war might mean. I am thinking about it from every point of view, not only from the people of Canada and those where we live, but from the part of a human being, and those on both sides are human beings. I can't help feel anything but remorse when I look at the victims in Japan who suffered the effects of the first atomic bomb, even though it was our side which set that bomb down. People consequently, ever since that time, have been unable to live normal lives. Their entire lives were ruined, not just a day, not just a week or a year, but their entire lives. I'd like to see veterans week exemplify what a modern war might mean so that those who profiteer on war would find out that people were thinking also about the sordid side of war.

I think we should use Veteran's Week to show appreciation to those who came back and to the loved ones of those who didn't come back, to make sure that they are receiving the proper recognition for what they did.

But the third reason for supporting veterans week is another one altogether different. That is what was touched on by the hon. Member for Edmonton Highlands. That is the matter of peace or war, now and in the future. I hate war. I think wars are necessary at times. I have no regrets that I volunteered in the last war. I have no regrets that hundreds of thousands of Canadians volunteered because, had they not, we might not have the freedom of speech we have in this Legislature today. We might not be able to assemble as we do today. We might not be able to stand on a soap box anywhere in our country and say what we think about the government or about what the government should be doing or what it hasn't done. We may very well have lost that right altogether.

When I hear those who deplore the sacrifice made in the last two wars, I ask them to think what it would be like in Canada today had Kaiser Bill in World War I and had Hitler in World War II won the war and we were the beaten instead of the victorious. We might very well find ourselves in a Nazi regime, as the hon. Member for Vegreville mentioned, where we wouldn't know what hour of the day or night someone could knock at our door and destroy the sanctity of the home.

I say I hate war, but sometimes wars are necessary if you are fighting for something that means life and death to you. When I saw posters in the last war in many of our barrack rooms - the happy family around a table of turkey and other good foods - I read the inscription underneath: "These are the things you are fighting for". Then, when I remembered the Depression and the hunger of the many years that preceded the opening of that war, I had to do a lot of deep thinking. These were the things we were fighting for, good food, freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom of the press and freedom from hunger and freedom from want. As one of those who went hungry at times prior to that, I couldn't help but think, this is something worth fighting for. I remembered that many of the young men who volunteered to put on the uniform volunteered after many years of riding

the rails when they were unwanted in this country and were kicked from pillar to post. There wasn't enough money to buy the food to feed them. Then when war came we suddenly found all the money necessary.

I would hope veterans week would show some of these things - the sordid side of war and the necessity, sometimes, of war if that's the only way you can retain your freedom. It's worth fighting for. Anything worth fighting for and dying for is worth living for. So I would hope that the major function of veterans week would be to show the advantages of peace, the importance of struggling for peace, the importance of turning every stone to make sure that we don't have another war with all itscrippings, deaths and sordidness. I think if we had a veterans week and we were able to put such thoughts in the minds of only a few of our young people, it would be well worth while.

I don't think anyone today wants another war, certainly no one who ever saw the country in war, no one who ever saw people on the battlefield or said goodbye to someone who left on a plane and never returned, who was probably lost in the North Sea, or whose ship went down in the Atlantic. No one wants war. Any veteran in our army and navy clubs and in our Legions - we find that the people who hate war the most were those who were closest to it in the last war and the war before. They don't glorify war. They are likely proud of the fact that they offered their lives to make sure we preserved the freedoms that we love in this country, but they hate war and only fight for something worth while.

I would hope that veterans week, if it is proclaimed by the Government of Alberta - and personally I think it should be - would be a time when every organization, every member of the Legislature, every school, would show the whole picture of what war in the future would mean, the importance of remembering those who died in the past, the freedoms they bought with their blood for us who are here and show appreciation to those who left part of their lives on the battlefields.

MR. BENOIT:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to prefix my brief comments on this resolution by setting the record straight as to what the hon. Member for Vegreville said.

He quoted very accurately the words of Jesus when Jesus spoke of his supreme sacrifice and the purpose for it. Then he said, if he hadn't done it correctly I would straighten him out. Mr. Speaker, that was the part of the statement I wanted to correct. If the hon. Member for Vegreville needs to be straightened out, it is not I who can do it, but the One whose words he quoted.

In speaking to this resolution, Mr. Speaker, with regard to Remembrance Day and the memories of the war, I raise the question in my mind as to what war we ought to be remembering, because there have been so many wars, both before and after the two world wars. For nearly 30 years Remembrance Day was on November 11, and it was called Armistice Day because of the armistice that had been signed at the eleventh hour of the eleventh day of the eleventh month in 1918.

We were content to call it Armistice Day because it was supposed to be a war that ended all wars and, since that would be the end of war, we would have peace, armistice, a cessation of hostilities between sides. But when we had another world war and decided that we would remember the veterans of two world wars, we then called it Remembrance Day. We called it Remembrance Day in memory of those veterans, but we observed it on the Armistice Day of the First World War. There have been wars before, like the Boer War, and there have been many wars since where our men and women have been involved. Therefore I think that Remembrance Day or remembrance week, whichever it should be, should be what we would call it.

But, Mr. Speaker, I like very much the observation made by the Member for Macleod when he suggested that it would be probably more appropriate if we did it in June on VE Day or VE week rather than in November. I think that that needs to be considered pretty seriously when we think in terms of a whole week in which we have a celebration or a memory of the veterans of wars. Let it be the veterans of wars whatever the wars may be.

Mr. Speaker, I think we need to honour those who honestly sacrificed for a purpose in these wars. I don't think anybody is fooled by the idea that everybody went to war because they wanted to make a sacrifice and that they gave up a great deal in order to do it. We know many went for the thrill in it. The hon. Member for Drumheller drew our attention to the fact that the last world war was preceded by many years and, for many men who went to World War II, it was a means of [making] a living for their families. Had it not been for that, they felt their families might have starved. This is the way some wars are created.

The financial circumstances and the livelihood circumstances of a nation are such that when the war is called by the political leaders of the nation, they then have volunteers. These people volunteer, not always because they want to, but because they feel the

necessity for it. These are part of the memories that should be brought out in a week of memories, so people would know the awfulness of war, not the glory of war or the joys of victory. Because, Mr. Speaker, I do not believe anyone ever wins a war. In holocausts like these we have experienced in recent times in this century, those who are so-called victors, as well as those who are defeated, are both losers in the end - great losers - they lose in every respect. While some of us who are the victors in lands like Canada have reaped great monetary gains as a result of some of these victories, and sometimes even as a result of the war itself, in the end, spiritually, morally and materially we have lost. So there is really nothing in war that should be glorified.

If we decide there should be a whole week in which we have memories of veterans and honour those who have honestly given their lives in sacrifice, then let us do it in such a way that we do not glorify or perpetuate war, or encourage others to participate in war needlessly.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that if it is going to be called Veterans Week I think the word "veterans" should be expanded in our thinking on that particular week, whenever that week is, to include all kinds of veterans who have fought in all kinds of wars. I speak, for instance, of our aged people in this country who have fought not wars overseas against human flesh, but have fought wars during the years of the depression, attempting to keep body and soul together; those who have fought wars against immorality, against religious bigotry and against the powers of false governments; people who have fought wars inside themselves in order that this country might be the kind of a country it is. So, all people who are older, who have been veterans, who have sacrificed themselves for whatever cause for our country, might be remembered and respected. Some could indeed be glorified. For the nature of the war they fought did nothing but produce good, whereas some of the wars we are remembering on Armistice or Remembrance Day did a great deal of harm.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would not speak highly in favour and definitely not speak against [the resolution]. But if there is any value in this kind of a resolution, let it be a value that is genuine, that devotes a week to remembering all veterans who have fought in all kinds of wars. When the week is, really makes no particular difference.

MR. APPLEBY:

Mr. Speaker, I commend the hon. Member for Stony Plain for introducing this resolution today and also commend the people on both sides of the House who have entered into the discussion.

I think one point very apparent to all of us was that this was a very serious, a very somber type of discussion, and that people were speaking truly from their own personal feelings regarding the possibility of having a veterans week in the province.

I speak, as the Member for Drumheller, as a member of the Canadian Legion and as a veteran myself and I am well aware of the other veterans' organizations that do exist in the Dominion of Canada. Generally something of this nature arrives through a progression from a local group through to the various zones, the provincial commands and through the dominion command of these various types of organizations.

For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I would, at this time, be a little bit reticent about saying that I was heartily in approval of such a resolution as this, because I believe we have generated sufficient discussion here this afternoon that there will now be a reaction from various veterans' organizations. I would hope we would then be in a better position to judge whether we should vote on and pass a resolution such as this. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, at this time I would ask leave to adjourn the debate and I hope the matter will come up for discussion again before the sitting ends.

MR. SPEAKER:

Has the hon. member leave to adjourn the debate?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

2. Mr. Notley proposed the following motion to the Assembly:

Be it resolved that this Legislature urge the Government of Alberta to consider the introduction of a fully comprehensive, publicly administered, no-fault automobile insurance plan.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, in rising to move this motion and to introduce it I would say that there is really no area of fighting inflation more relevant to the average person than ways and

means of dealing with escalating car insurance costs. I know that all members have probably received many letters from constituents or from people throughout the province complaining about insurance rates or detailing some of the rather difficult experiences they have had in attempting to get claims settled. I know I have received a good many.

I think this kind of concern, Mr. Speaker, is not just one which occurs here, but it is a concern which generally is representative of a dissatisfaction throughout the continent with the operation of the car insurance industry.

As most members already know, the general thrust of insurance over the last number of years, Mr. Speaker, has been attempting to insure a driver against the legal liability arising out of negligence for the operation of his or her car. But there is a growing feeling, not just in the three provinces that have public automobile insurance, but throughout the continent and, indeed we find even in our province, that we've got to get away from this concept and move toward the proposition that the primary purpose of automobile insurance is to compensate the victim of an accident. That is a rather important difference in philosophy, Mr. Speaker, because in large measure it will eventually cut down, if not eliminate, much of the litigation.

I think in fairness it should also be stated that we don't really have an example anywhere in North America yet of a totally no-fault compensation plan. The schemes that are presently in operation are variations, they are partial no-fault schemes. It is interesting to note that in the United States, as interest in the no-fault concept has gained support among legislators, the legal fraternity has raised a good deal of opposition. I am interested to observe in a report prepared by the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation - it's called Public Automobile Insurance in Canada; it also goes into the United States - the report points out that legal fees in the United States last year arising out of car insurance claims amounted to the astronomical figure of \$1.4 billion. So one can appreciate why the legal fraternity is perhaps fighting to keep the negligence concept in the automobile insurance industry. They are doing very well out of it.

Mr. Speaker, we've had a number of reports prepared by different provinces, but with your leave I would like to quote from some of the arguments raised by a committee on insurance claims appointed by the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs in the Province of Ontario, October 1970. Mr. Speaker, I do this because I am sure most of the hon. members opposite expect me to just quote from Manitoba, Saskatchewan and perhaps British Columbia. I think on this day before our break we can all be jolly and non-partisan. Therefore, I'll quote from an Ontario report.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. The hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview was not in the Assembly the other day when we dealt with the question of quotations from authorities outside the Legislature. I would respectfully repeat my observation that the opinions which are entitled to be exchanged in debate in the Assembly are those of the elected members and not those of non-elected authorities who might otherwise thus, indirectly, be drawn into debate with members of another point of view.

If the hon. member wishes to adopt the arguments of any such authorities as his own, he is entitled to express them as his own, but I would respectfully suggest that he should not expect other hon. members to indirectly enter into debate with authorities howsoever eminent and howsoever great the works which they may have offered.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I certainly accept your ruling. With that in mind then, I also agree with the arguments presented to the minister in Ontario, so I'll state the arguments and just advise members that the arguments are confirmed, in case they are interested in a committee on insurance claims presented to the Ontario government in 1970.

The arguments made, and I certainly agree with them, are that there are unreasonable and unacceptable delays arising out of the existing system of settlement of claims. Well, I'm sure that is not news to any of us, Mr. Speaker, because we all have brought to our attention cases of frustration with the concept of claim settlements.

The concern too is, that where liability is clear there is a practice by some insurance companies of completely denying small claims or attempting to apportion fault. Again, another complaint we often get is, where liability is clear there is an unreasonable delay in making repairs.

The Ontario report also went on to express concern about foreign ownership in the insurance business. I've said enough about foreign ownership, Mr. Speaker, so I think my views on that are pretty well known.

Now we hear a great deal from the insurance lobby about the competition of the insurance industry, and that through competition we can get the best possible deal for the motoring public. Mr. Speaker, evidence indicates that there really isn't as much competition as the industry would like to lead us to believe. Of the 250 insurance companies operating in Canada, for example, for the most part they belong to two rating associations, The Canadian Underwriters Association and The Independent Insurance Conference. These two bodies write approximately 80 per cent of the total automobile insurance premiums in Canada. There are a number of smaller companies which try to get the cream of the market. They are often referred to, in the industry, as "creamers". That is, they try to move in and get the low-risk people but are not prepared to take some of the higher-risk drivers.

In any event, the fact of the matter is that 80 per cent of the business done in this country is done through these two major underwriting associations. There is, in my judgment, very little actual competition in rate setting. I could quote a number of letters I received, Mr. Speaker, but I don't really think I need to do that because I am sure other hon. members have received letters from their constituents as well about the lack of competition in the industry where a young driver, or a driver of any age, goes from one company to another and the variation is really pretty marginal.

I would like to take just a moment or two, Mr. Speaker, in introducing this subject, to review the situation in the province of Alberta. For a number of years this province has grappled with automobile insurance. In 1964, for example, we had the introduction of the green card system. There was no compulsory automobile insurance as such, but the driver had the option. He or she could take out insurance with a private insurance company, or purchase a green card which, in effect, didn't give them any insurance at all but the money was put into the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund.

Mr. Speaker, obviously as time went by the evidence grew that compulsory insurance of one kind or another was absolutely necessary and that really, no matter how one talks about the liberty of the individual, one doesn't have the right to be irresponsible in a society; and that there are certain constraints upon that liberty if we are to live in a civilized society. As a consequence, the Government of the Province of Alberta moved towards compulsory insurance.

But if you are going to make insurance compulsory, then you have the difficult problem of public compulsion for private welfare, that is, the compulsion of everybody in the society to take out insurance, but the private profit of the individual companies who now are able to cash in on a compulsory scheme. So at first we looked at a number of options. One option suggested by a legislative committee in 1968 or 1969, if my memory serves me right, was the creation of an MLA insurance liaison committee which would review auto insurance rates. Well, really, upon further reflection, it became obvious that that kind of proposition wasn't too workable and we had the Alberta Insurance Board.

But as the minister pointed out last night, even though we have some capable people on the board, there is only one full-time person acting for the Alberta Insurance Board. In my judgment the board, however well meaning the individual personnel may be, is not really able to act as a guardian of the public interest. So, Mr. Speaker, I'm led to the view that if we are going to have compulsory insurance - and we've also moved a step further in Alberta as you know - and we have no-fault provisions, I want to underline that while we have no-fault provisions we have not entirely eliminated the negligence concept. A very great amount of litigation still exists. I think in fairness to moves made in the past in Alberta, really nowhere in the continent have we completely departed from the old system and moved to a system of compensation.

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of arguments in favour of public automobile insurance, as I view them. The first major argument is that, if you are going to have compulsory insurance, there is a great administrative saving in having everyone covered by one plan. Now we have [considerable] evidence I can cite, but I think that rather than getting into an outline of differing rates across the country, perhaps a more relevant way of describing this is the amount of money out of a premium dollar which is set aside for insurance and the amount of money which is necessary for administration, overhead, legal expenses and what have you.

In the province of Saskatchewan where they have had public automobile insurance for almost 30 years now, the consistent average has been administrative costs of 15 per cent. Eighty-five per cent of the premium dollar goes to insurance coverage. That is quite a difference from the Canadian average, Mr. Speaker, of 35 per cent on administration and 65 per cent towards insurance.

So it just stands to reason that, taken over the whole, regardless perhaps of differences in individual rating structures, you can buy an awful lot more insurance if you're spending 85 cents out of the dollar on insurance compared to 65 cents out of the dollar on insurance. The Manitoba scheme which has recently gone into operation shows for its first two years an average of 17 cents and 83 cents.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that the saving here is one which can be passed on to the individual driver. One of the major complaints about our present insurance system - and as I recall, we had quite a debate in this House last year about moving toward some kind of arrangement to bring insurance costs down for younger drivers. There's really no doubt that younger drivers in this province and generally in Canada are scandalously taken advantage of by the private industry. I'm not saying in an illegal sense, but certainly by applying their present rating methods younger drivers are assumed to be guilty of irresponsibility before they get behind the wheel, before in fact they are proven guilty. We have some of the most horrendous rates being charged younger drivers, and they are still being charged younger drivers in this province a year after the discussion we had last session. So one of the advantages of a public system is that you can make your automobile insurance scheme immediately responsive to public needs and, in my view, one of the public needs which is most necessary is to get across the concept that we should base rates on the driving record of an individual motorist and not base them on whether he's under 25 or over 65 or what have you.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I know that during the debate we will have at least some discussion on a bit of propaganda that was put out by the insurance lobby which deals with a substantial increase in rates in the Province of Manitoba. As a matter of fact, the rates on their minimum coverage increased by 11 per cent - that announcement was made around the beginning of this year - and 19 per cent on supplementary coverage, for an average of about 13 per cent.

Mr. Speaker, that has to be compared with what has taken place in Manitoba for the last number of years. In Manitoba in 1970 we had private insurance. In 1971 the insurance rates, once the plan went into effect, were actually dropped. In 1971 insurance rates in Manitoba were 85 per cent of their 1970 figures. That remained the same until 1973 when it dropped again to 81.6 per cent, and now with the new increase we're looking at about 93 per cent. So under the new increase the rates in Manitoba are going to be very impressive compared to what they were in 1970. We all know, Mr. Speaker, that - this is rather an unfortunate fact - accidents are rising and this is going to be true as far as any public or private insurance company is concerned, that as long as accident rates continue to climb there will be an increase in the premiums.

Now, what is the situation compared to other provinces? Well, in Alberta in 1970 we had - starting at the same basis, there was a 13 per cent increase in 1971, a 4 per cent increase in 1972, and it is my understanding that the rates went up slightly in 1973 and again in 1974. The average for Canada this year of the private industry ranges between 9 per cent and 23 per cent.

The point I'm trying to make - and I think it's worth noting when one reviews this information put out by the Insurance Bureau - is that, even with the increase which occurred this year in the Manitoba scheme, Manitoba premiums are still substantially below the premiums in other parts of the country, and that there has been a consistent increase year by year in premiums in Ontario, Quebec and Alberta, where you have private insurance companies operating.

I think the most valid argument, however, is not to get into a great fight over individual charges, but rather to keep in mind that of the insurance dollar the motorist spends, the key to determining the difference will be the amount of actual protection which is purchased. As long as we have a lower administrative cost, as long as we're looking at 17 cents or 15 cents on administration overhead compared to 35 cents in the private industry, the balance will favour public automobile insurance.

Mr. Speaker, there are many other arguments that could be advanced. For example, the money which is collected from the premiums under a public plan can be used for development within the province. This is one of the side benefits. The interest which is earned on money invested by a public automobile insurance scheme can be used to further cut premiums to the insured public.

And so, Mr. Speaker, all these arguments, in my judgment, add up to a good case for the Legislature at least investigating the principle of public automobile insurance. I would have to be a little naive if I could rise in my place today and expect 74 free-enterprisers to jump at the chance to vote for government insurance.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Agreed.

MR. NOTLEY:

But I do believe, Mr. Speaker, that we should at the very least investigate the feasibility of government insurance, especially when we have the examples of other provinces, and in view of the rising insurance premiums which are causing concern to drivers throughout the province, especially younger drivers.

Let me just conclude my remarks, Mr. Speaker, by saying that when car insurance was introduced in Saskatchewan in the late 1940s there was a great furor and the opposition at that time made it quite clear that if they got into office they would repeal government car insurance. Well, they got their chance a few years later in 1964. They were elected with a working majority, but the last thing they touched was the government insurance scheme. They made a number of other changes but they wouldn't tackle car insurance. The reason, Mr. Speaker, is because the Saskatchewan automobile insurance system is one which has worked very well and it is a system which has attracted the non-partisan support of people of all political persuasions in the province of Saskatchewan. Even though the province had a Liberal government for seven years, which preached the doctrine of pure free enterprise, they were unprepared to challenge government insurance.

Mr. Speaker, there was a terrific furor in Manitoba when the New Democratic Party government introduced public automobile insurance in that province. But there is really no doubt about it that that is becoming widely accepted in the province. I was rather amused during the course of the last campaign in the province of Manitoba to see how the other parties tried to avoid any commitment to repeal government automobile insurance. Because it does work. It's a sensible scheme. No one suggests that it's going to solve all the problems or keep insurance rates at an artificially low level. If accidents go up then obviously premiums will eventually have to follow. But the point is that as long as everybody is covered under the umbrella of one scheme, when you have claim centres that are situated throughout the province where you can settle your claims quickly, you are going to reduce the ultimate cost to the consumer.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge the members today to seriously consider the merits of at least investigating the matter further.

MR. DOWLING:

Mr. Speaker, in speaking in opposition to the resolution there are several things that must be considered. In my view, there are two separate and distinct issues involved. One is no-fault, and the other is publicly operated insurance programs.

I would agree with the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview that he should make little mention about the financial success of the government operated plans in our neighbouring provinces to the east, Saskatchewan and Manitoba. I was also pleased to see that he didn't mention the success of keeping the civil service down to a reasonable level in B.C. where they had to employ 1,200 whom they brought in from the private sector at considerable cost. At a later moment I will mention some of the losses that have been incurred by both government operated plans in Saskatchewan and Manitoba.

Two issues involved, Mr. Speaker, should be dealt with separately. There is no particular relationship between the two. One doesn't have to go with the other.

The first, Mr. Speaker, is no-fault. First of all, no-fault does not mean no responsibility. Under the law, people can still be charged and convicted if they cause or are at fault in an accident. A true, fully no-fault plan applies only to the settlement of claims. For example, it means that insurance company A will settle a damage claim for the party it insures, and insurance company B will settle the damages claimed for the party it insures. In that sense, the claim will be settled without the companies going to court, determining who was at fault and making the at fault party's insurance company pay. It is intended to eliminate a good part of the litigation that presently takes place and therefore hopefully reduce the costs that are involved because of legal action. Secondly, it could relieve the courts of the workload attached to insurance accident litigation. A truly comprehensive no-fault scheme suggested by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, Mr. Speaker, in his resolution, would require that everyone would be covered in order for it to be effective.

There are three areas to cover. Number one is accident benefits and by that I mean medical, hospital, rehabilitation, death, et cetera. The second is third party liability and the third is physical damage to one's own car or property. That is to say, first party coverage would also have to be compulsory. In Alberta, we indeed do have a compulsory and a no-fault scheme for accident benefits that are medical. This leaves us with third party liability and first party liability to consider under the no-fault principle. In Alberta, third party liability is already compulsory. We would therefore need only to require that the no-fault concept be applied.

To do that could mean the following, Mr. Speaker. Supposing driver A and driver B are involved in an accident, suppose that driver B actually caused the accident. Under no-fault, driver A would have his settlement paid by his own company and similarly, so would driver B. Let's suppose further that driver A is unfortunately involved in four more accidents that same year but does not actually cause any one of them. Five times, however, his insurance company would have paid out settlement money for repairs on his own car. It's extremely questionable if any company could continue to pay out claims in that fashion without raising the premium for Mr. A's insurance policy. If Mr. A's insurance premium is increased, it really means that Mr. A pays a penalty even though he has not

caused a single accident. It means that the good drivers will be forced into carrying some of the costs that result because of accidents caused by poor drivers.

Three questions therefore need consideration.

First, should good drivers be required to subsidize the poor ones? Is this right in principle?

Second, if we accept a no-fault principle, will the benefits derived from quicker settlements, less legal action and court costs offset the principle we would have to sacrifice in No. 1?

Third, will a no-fault scheme really reduce insurance premiums to the public? Or is it, in fact, a scheme that has generated a 'bandwagon' effect leading the public to assume that no-fault is the answer to expensive litigation costs and therefore a panacea to premium problems.

Mr. Speaker, that leaves us with considering first party liability. In Alberta first party liability is not compulsory. A no-fault program, as suggested in this resolution, would essentially mean that we would have to make first party liability compulsory and also apply the no-fault concept. If first party liability is made compulsory, it would mean that many people would be required to insure their own vehicles, even though the vehicle may not be worth the amount of the deductible on the policy, or given present repair costs, might not be worth the cost of repairing it.

Two additional questions need to be added to the ones stated earlier.

One, should we remove an individual's right to determine whether or not he wants to insure himself? If government requires an individual to hold insurance to protect an innocent third party, that may be one thing, Mr. Speaker. If we require that an individual hold insurance to protect himself, that is quite another. Is it therefore right to legislate first party coverage?

Two, is it right, or even sensible, to require that vehicles not worth repairing be covered by insurance and thus tend to increase overall costs?

A third point, a further complication with respect to no-fault, relates to the matter of visitors to Alberta from other provinces in Canada and from the United States. Under a no-fault scheme, with no right to sue unless everybody accepted the same plan, there would be real problems. If a visitor from a province or state in which automobile insurance was not compulsory chose not to buy insurance and vacationed in Alberta, he would have no way of recovering damage loss if he was involved in an accident and the other party was, in fact, at fault.

Mr. Speaker, we do not want to leave the impression that we are entirely against a no-fault concept for automobile insurance. As a matter of fact, it was at the urging of this department and other consumer affairs departments in Canada, in the competitive enterprise provinces in Canada, that the Insurance Bureau of Canada undertook a major study of the no-fault principle. The study, Mr. Speaker, took some ten months at a cost in excess of [seven] million dollars. Their proposals on the no-fault program are before us at the present time.

MR. LUDWIG:

On a point of order, is the minister reading his own speech or somebody else's speech? Just not ...

[Interjections]

... just let me finish, Mr. Speaker. Not more than three days ago, I was cautioned not to read letters before I started. Now the minister is reading his speech, Mr. Speaker, and according to your previous ruling he is entirely out of order.

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I have never heard such intolerable arrogance on the part of the hon. member. Surely in a really worth-while contribution by the Minister of Consumer Affairs, which the hon. member and others opposite have been asking for, they should at least have the decency to listen.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MRS. CHICHAK:

It would seem to me that the topic in itself is a pretty complex one, and in order to put the viewpoints across accurately, I think it may be necessary to relate very extensively to his notes. Therefore, I think we should accept the fact that if he needs to read his entire outline we should accept it as very valuable information.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I speak again. I believe that everything that a member has to say in this House is important in his own mind, and when you apply certain rules to the hon. members here, Mr. Speaker, I am going to insist that they be applied uniformly. When I was prevented from reading an argument in support of my speech, Mr. Speaker, I insist that the minister can't read his speech, otherwise we are having double standards in this House.

MR. DOWLING:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I am not reading an article. I am reading my notes from which the speech is being given.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. The hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View has a valid point with regard to extensive quotations, which we dealt with the other day and which were dealt with a few moments ago in his absence, but I must say that it is not in any way apparent to the Chair that the hon. minister is reading his speech. The hon. minister has stated categorically that he is not reading his speech and his statement, as a member of this Legislature, is entitled to be accepted without any hesitation.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of privilege that if the hon. minister is saying he is not reading his speech, I would like to go and take his speech away from him.

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, how long do we have to accept this arrogant and intolerable nonsense from the hon. member?

MR. LUDWIG:

You are the most arrogant one here.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Bah! If not, he can go home.

MR. SPEAKER:

There is no purpose in my reiterating what I have just said. I would ask the hon. minister to continue with his speech.

MR. DOWLING:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

As most hon. members know, the Automobile Insurance Board was appointed and they, in turn, appointed a gentleman from Alberta to examine the Insurance Bureau of Canada presentation on no-fault. It is presently under way and we should have some response from that single-man committee within the year. It would be irresponsible for us, Mr. Speaker, to arbitrarily implement a no-fault automobile insurance program without knowing exactly what the implications of that program are.

The second part of the resolution, Mr. Speaker, deals with the matter of making automobile insurance publicly operated. Other than political ideology there is probably one primary reason that governments usually give for wanting to take over the automobile insurance program, other than perhaps the amount of money that is collected in premiums. The claim usually is, Mr. Speaker, that the premiums will, in fact, be lowered under a government operated scheme rather than a privately operated one.

We should take a look at some of the purported savings. We should also look at this government's policy of supporting the private sector in every way where programs can be operated more effectively and efficiently than they can under the publicly operated system. Until such time as the private sector no longer justifies our trust, Mr. Speaker, we will, in fact, continue our policy of supporting the private sector.

The resolution, Mr. Speaker, perhaps suggested that the confidence or justification no longer exists. In that connection, the usually reported statements that publicly operated programs will reduce rates, the following should be considered.

Relative to the Saskatchewan program, it is rather difficult to deal with because you can't find where in fact the medical expenses involved with accidents are paid from, where in fact the repairs to automobiles are paid from and where in fact the administrative costs are paid from. Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, has the lowest number of persons per mile of road of any province in Canada. Obviously that reduces the risk. It's about 7.4 people per mile in Saskatchewan, and that compares with 18.5 in Alberta, 45.6 in Nova Scotia, 55.1 in B.C. and 79.6 in Ontario. The number of vehicles per mile of road in Saskatchewan is 3.7 and that's about half of what it is in Alberta. The annual mileage travelled in Saskatchewan by Saskatchewan car owners is 20 per cent less than that of other Canadians. Canada continued to grow at a healthy rate of 17 per cent in the last nine years, while Saskatchewan remained almost static at 1.8 per cent over the same period.

Mr. Speaker, the Saskatchewan basic plan includes no passenger hazard coverage and, since the Saskatchewan plan is a Crown corporation, pays no income tax as private industry would. This means, in essence, that the plan is subsidized by the public purse and the non-driving taxpayer helps to subsidize the insurance costs for those who do drive. You might also consider the loss in tax revenue from that source.

The Saskatchewan plan, until 1968, was exempt from the 2 per cent premium tax that was levied on all insurers across Canada, regardless of whether they had a profit or not. The Saskatchewan plan has an accumulated surplus only on paper, Mr. Speaker. Premium tax in 1970, had it been charged, would have cost the plan \$2,678,000. Income taxes would have been \$1,540,000. Had the plan been subject to the same consideration of the private sector insurance companies, it would presently be in a deficit position rather than the alleged surplus position.

The Saskatchewan motorist has faced a premium increase of 135 per cent over the past ten years to the government operated insurance scheme. In provinces where private industry has run the plan, that increase over the same period was 90 per cent.

Effective March 1, 1974, Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan eliminated what was known as the rural territory, insofar as extended coverage was concerned. This means that all rural motorists will now be subject to the urban rates and this will result in an increase of approximately 11 per cent for all rural motorists.

With regard to Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, we all recall, in a speech delivered in the Manitoba House, that the estimate of revenues from insurance premiums in 1974 would be something of the order of \$200 million. That figure was based on the fact that insurance premiums in 1972 in the private sector in all of Manitoba were \$152 million. And extending that to allow for an increase in the number of drivers and cars, the maximum amount that should increase is \$177 million. It seems there are some glassy eyes in some jurisdictions other than this one, Mr. Speaker.

In a study on the Manitoba plan by Contemporary Research Limited in March of 1972, 60 per cent of the Manitoba car owners reported that they had saved no money under the government plan, 37 per cent said they paid more and 23 per cent said they paid about the same. One out of every two adult drivers, who were accident-free, said their premiums went up.

In February, 1974, the AutoPac program of Manitoba had a reported deficit - deficit - of \$10.1 million, and the \$6 million start-up costs, Mr. Speaker, were not even considered. Now I've always wondered, who pays the interest charges when there is a government deficit like that? Certainly somebody is going to have to pay and I would suggest it is the people who live in Manitoba.

In 1974, some phenomenal increases in Manitoba insurance premiums could take place. Reports indicate the following things: the basic general rate is suggested to be increased by 9.5 per cent; the extended coverage program is up by 19 per cent. Owners who use their vehicles 15 per cent or more on business have been reclassified from the all-purpose category to the business category. Twenty-seven thousand motorists will, therefore, pay 40 to 50 per cent more because of business coverage. The surcharge against driving records will be increased from \$50 to \$75 for any driver who has six demerit points or more. That is an increase of 50 per cent. The no-fault concept is being eroded. Fault is now going to be assessed. Drivers who are 50 per cent or more at fault in an accident will now be surcharged an additional \$50 for the first two accidents and \$100 for each additional accident.

In 1974, fleet owners will be subject to a retroactive surcharge. At the end of the year their accident records will be reassessed and, depending on what those records were, they could be refunded 25 per cent of their premium. They could have an additional premium of 50 per cent of their original premium, or it could remain as it was. A firm by

the name of Reed, Shaw, Stenhouse of Winnipeg reported one example of one fleet owner whose present AutoPac premium is \$2,600. One accident in 1974 would have added \$1,300 to that premium.

Private industry has had to come to the rescue of the government, and that is good news, Mr. Speaker. They have come up with an insurance scheme for the fleet owners to protect them in that gap. It's rather ironic that reports we receive indicate that some of the most interested customers in Manitoba for that private industry insurance plan to cover that hole are the Manitoba government agencies themselves who want to insure themselves against their government.

I have mentioned, Mr. Speaker, the 1,200 brand-new shiny civil servants in British Columbia, and the fact that they came into the public service all smiles because of the tremendous benefits they would reap as a result of the high wages they were being paid. These are excellent people but they come pretty expensive, Mr. Speaker.

I would just like to give you one brief example of the kind of insurance premiums that are paid in Alberta, Manitoba and Saskatchewan. A 25-year-old accident-free driver, driving a 1973 Ford LTD or a Chev Impala in an urban area, has \$300,000 third party coverage, death and disability benefits and \$50 deductible all perils. In Alberta his premium is \$183 to \$186; in Manitoba, \$183; in Saskatchewan, \$181. Not very good examples of how you save costs in Alberta. But let's just remember what is hidden in the \$10 million deficit in Manitoba, the fact that we cannot determine what portion of the premium in Saskatchewan pays for medical care, pays for the repair of automobiles, pays for, in fact, the administration of the automobile insurance plan.

So I would suggest that we have less expensive insurance in Alberta, Mr. Speaker. We do have a partial no-fault. We are in the process, Mr. Speaker, of examining all of the no-fault provisions proposed by the IBC, including a legislative package which could easily be used by all of the private enterprise jurisdictions in Canada. However, we want to be extremely careful that we don't push down the throats of Albertans something that they really do not want in the long run.

Just one more thing, Mr. Speaker. The public in some instances has been rather anaesthetized into accepting a government controlled and manipulated program as being the right thing, through misleading comparisons in accurate costing procedures and slanted information.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge all hon. members who believe in the private sector to unanimously and unequivocally reject this resolution.

[The motion was lost.] [Motions Nos. 3, 4 and 5 were not taken up when called.]

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

Be it resolved that the provincial government make representation to the federal government in the matter of Capital Gains as it relates to the family farm, that the evaluation date be moved from December 31, 1971, to the date of the last transfer of the farm within the family.

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak to Motion No. 6 which reads as follows:

Be it resolved that the provincial government make representation to the federal government in the matter of Capital Gains as it relates to the family farm, that the evaluation date be moved from December 31, 1971, to the date of the last transfer of the farm within the family.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we had considerable debate on this - the somewhat similar motion that was before the Assembly during the last session - and I think in the debate at that time certain changes were made. I appreciate those. But I feel pretty strongly that the evaluation date should be moved. This goes on the basis of the fact that in the farming industry this becomes a lifetime proposition, and I would hate to think that as a young person who takes over a family farm under the present situation he becomes indebted for something that has gone on before him. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, in looking at the reply the hon. Provincial Treasurer received from the federal Minister of Finance as a result of the resolution that was passed earlier in this House, I think it goes on to point out that there is provision to meet the resolution as passed previously.

However, the resolution as passed previously does not take into consideration the extensive amount of debt that can be built up to a young family who takes over a family farm after several generations.

I think, Mr. Speaker, if you look at it, try to assess what might happen over a period of several generations, where a young person takes over a family farm, we'll say in the

year 1975, to give an example, and passes this on to his family in maybe the year 2000. There you have 25 years. At that time he not only assumes what the one who took over in 1975 has built up as a possible capital gain, but he will also assume what has built up as a capital gain in the year 2000. Mr. Speaker, if you carry that on to several generations, I submit that certainly there is a tax liability or a tax payment that could just wipe out what the last holder of that farm could hold.

I submit here, Mr. Speaker, that there can well be cases, three, four, five generations down the road, where that young person who has taken over the family farm through some illness, through some family matter, is unable to carry on. So I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that because of this, consideration should be given to carrying this resolution, supporting this motion before us, and making representation to the federal government so that we don't put a young person who is involved in farming into a position where he gets a tax load that may well wipe out anything he has.

I think the young people today, in starting farming or any other industry as far as that goes, certainly sit down and assess much more closely than they have ever done before the matter of, what am I subject to in the years that lie ahead? I submit, Mr. Speaker, that one of the things which is going to help maintain the family farm is passing a resolution such as this and thereby hoping the federal government will amend the necessary legislation so that that young person is not faced with a liability.

Mr. Speaker, many examples could be given. But I think the basic principle involved in this resolution is simply that the evaluation date be moved from December 31, 1971, to the date of the last transfer of the farm within the family, whether that be 20 years down the road, whether it be 40 years, 60 years or any combination. It could even be 100 years down the road from here.

I would submit that if the members of this Assembly support a resolution such as this, certainly this will assist and will encourage some of our young people to continue farming, whereas if they don't have this tax, shall we say, have this opportunity to have the tax eliminated, they may look at it differently.

So with that, Mr. Speaker, I would ask that all members of this Assembly support this resolution.

MR. SPEAKER:

Are you ready for the question?

MR. MOORE:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make some remarks with respect to this resolution. But not having realized it was coming to the front so quickly, I move we adjourn debate.

MR. SPEAKER:

May the hon. member adjourn the debate?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could just say a word or two on this motion before the adjournment is called?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Agreed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No.

AN HON. MEMBER:

The motion has already been called.

MR. DIXON:

The motion has already been put, Mr. Speaker. I realize that. But I was wondering if the House would go along with me saying a few words on this motion? If they don't, of course, the ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Upon which the hon. member just adjourned? It would require the House to reverse a motion which it has already passed.

MR. HENDERSON:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I think, provided the hon. member, Mr. Moore, who made the motion does not lose his right to speak on the motion, it seems rather ill-advised to jump to another motion at this time on the Order Paper. I would certainly suggest we allow the Member for Calgary Millican to speak, provided it doesn't deprive the member, Mr. Moore, of the right to adjourn the debate and speak to the resolution.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

I would suggest, without wanting to create a precedent and without having had any opportunity to consider the matter, that with the unanimous consent of the House there would be no difficulty in doing what the hon. Member for Calgary Millican proposes.

Is there any objection to the motion of the hon. Member for Smoky River being rescinded and the hon. Member for Calgary Millican continuing the debate?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

It is unanimous and I would therefore call on the hon. Member for Calgary Millican.

MR. MOORE:

Mr. Speaker, with the condition, I presume, that I would not lose my right to speak?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member's motion was not defeated.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words on this motion, and they are going to be short. I am just wondering - it is a special, privileged motion as I see it - if the hon. member who proposed the motion had in mind the last day the farm was transferred? Well, you would have difficulty there because you can transfer it the week before and then put through a sale the following week. This is one of the points bothering me. I would like to encourage the hon. member, when he starts talking about 30 or 40 years from now - I would think I can say with fair security that I don't think there will be any privately owned farms in Alberta 30, 40 or 50 years from now, the rate things are going.

There has been a tremendous increase in the government getting into assisting farmers in every direction, getting into a lot of debt which ...

AN HON. MEMBER:

Are you against it?

MR. DIXON:

Yes, I'm definitely against it. The hon. minister has asked me if I'm against it. I'm against some of these schemes that put a lot of young farmers into debt with no hope of ever repaying it. I'm against that. I'm sure - what I'm trying to get at, Mr. Speaker, is that I think we have to take a serious look at this. Are we going to continue our private enterprise system and a system that is going to ensure that private property is going to remain in the hands of private individuals? The more governments get into schemes, the greater will be the cry, well, if it's that good and the government is putting in the money anyway, they might as well own the farm on behalf of all the people of the province.

You may laugh at that suggestion. Some hon. members may think, well, it's not too serious. But I think if you really stop and analyse it, the government has come along and is so anxious to put a lot of our young farmers into a lot of debt which may have to be repaid in conditions that may not be as rosy as they are today. I think all we have to do, Mr. Speaker, is look at the present cattle situation today and hear that packing plants in our province are stating they've got so much beef on hand they're not even looking for new supplies. That definitely - in my reasoning at least - is going to mean lower prices.

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I have to remind the honourable gentleman that he should try to stay relatively close to the truth. His recent statement with regard to the processors in Alberta is just not true.

AN HON. MEMBER:

That's not a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Deputy Premier is perhaps overlooking the fact that a dispute as to facts between hon. member is not a point of order.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, if I may on a point of order. The hon. Member for Calgary Millican's submission to us in the last several minutes has been quite out of order, in my opinion, as being irrelevant to the resolution at hand. I don't dispute his desire to talk the clock but I do think that he ought to relate it somewhat more closely to the resolution, and it just wasn't relevant.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I realize that the hon. Minister of Agriculture starts working up a nervous condition every time an urban member gets up to talk about farming problems. This is just one of the sacrifices that he, as the Minister of Agriculture, has to be faced with. I'm sure that after I get through, in a few year's time he may say, well, that fellow at the time, I thought, didn't realize what he was talking about but now what he was saying was at least partially correct.

As far as the hon. member ...

AN HON. MEMBER:

That's what they call an escape hatch.

MR. DIXON:

As far as the hon. member - well, Mr. Speaker, if anybody should know about an escape hatch it's the hon. Minister of Agriculture because he'll need plenty of them when he's making a few excuses a year or two from now.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, in regard to the hon. Member for Edmonton Jasper Place and his point of order, he said words to the effect, Mr. Speaker, that I was speaking off the motion. I would like to remind the hon. member that I'm speaking about the family farm. I'm saying that if we don't look at the fact that we're putting a lot of our young people into debt to purchase some of these family farms at very high prices there will not be any family farms. The government will own them all, either by foreclosure or by people, Mr. Speaker, saying, well, if the government has all the money invested in farms they might as well own them all in the right of the people of Alberta. I can see the day where we will have state farms. Now whether the hon. members wish to agree with me in April, 1974 or not, I think some of them who were bragging a little earlier that they were born since the last war will certainly be around to see that.

MR. YOUNG:

Well, Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, all I requested from the Member for Calgary Millican is that he relate the livelihood and likelihood of continued survival of family farms to the precise point of the resolution here, which is that the evaluation date be moved from December 31, 1971 to the date of last transfer of the farm - a point, Mr. Speaker, which, as far as I've heard his debate in the last couple of minutes, hasn't crossed his lips since he made his opening comment when he was reading the resolution.

MR. WILSON:

You've been talking longer than he has.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I have to take exception to the comments of the member opposite. I think the point the member from Calgary is trying to make is that if the government is loaning all these moneys, foreclosing on all the mortgages and so on, the question of the transfer becomes academic in the sense of private enterprise. So I would suggest, in all sincerity, that the member's comments from Calgary are quite relevant to the subject and besides which I don't think anybody wants to go on to the next resolution anyway.

MR. DIXON:

Well, Mr. Speaker, apparently there is a shortage of help on farms in Alberta but you certainly can call on much help here on both sides of this House whenever an hon. member gets up to speak. I appreciate it. The hon. Member, once again, for Edmonton Jasper Place couldn't have heard my earlier remarks because I related them directly to the fact that there may not be any family farms to argue about with the federal government as far as capital gains are concerned.

So, Mr. Speaker, I'm going to rest my case there. I just thought this was a wonderful opportunity to ...

AN HON. MEMBER:

Have you started?

MR. DIXON:

... it's a wonderful opportunity to remind the hon. members opposite in their rush to state socialism that they have some second thoughts.

But, Mr. Speaker, getting back to the main point that I am making, when the hon. Member for Wainwright closes his debate, I would like him to explain to me how you are going to control this in any meaningful way. I think you would have to have some other sort of stipulation in there that would say the family farm would have to be sold within the last three or four years rather than just say, to the date of the last transfer of the land. I'm saying that you could transfer the land to your son the week before and then he could sell it the following week, therefore avoiding what you and I would consider - if it's the law of the land - rightful taxation.

I wish to thank you, Mr. Speaker, for being so patient with all the interruptions.

MR. SPEAKER:

May I assure the hon. member that he hasn't taxed the Speaker's patience one iota.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak to the motion, I believe it is very timely and an issue that concerns a lot of farmers. I'm surprised that with the motion being on the Order Paper for so long, the hon. members opposite, especially the hon. Deputy Premier, seem to display an air of indifference towards this major issue.

I think the hon. Member for Wainwright raised a very timely and very good point that should be considered and supported. I'm surprised that they still like - even when we were dealing with the farm motion they still like to play dirty pool and would like to let this drop to the bottom so they don't vote on it. There aren't very many members on the other side who are not in support of this idea. Even though the motion may be revised and improved for a more accurate meaning, the intent is that this is a motion to aid farmers in the transfer of lands from having to pay capital gains. The estate tax that was abolished in this province by the previous government saved an awful lot of farms, a lot of them. They prospered and some day they'll pay more taxes in a different way rather than having these farms wiped out by a tax that perhaps the family selling can't pay. This is intended to help those people preserve their farms or preserve their estates a bit longer than they would under the circumstances.

But I'm rather disappointed that there isn't a person on the other side, in spite of the fact that they're completely farm oriented no matter where they come from - at least they're dominated by the arch spender in the House.

[Interjections]

We shouldn't be bandying technicalities. He knew what I meant, Mr. Speaker.

And when we talk about proper the arch spender, I am saying that perhaps if these farmers ran their farms the way the Minister of Agriculture runs his department, I agree with the hon. Member for Calgary Millican that there won't be too much to worry about in the near future. But for the present time, everybody is prospering, even though they have more money borrowed than they have money produced.

This motion ought to be given a respectable hearing in this House, Mr. Speaker. Let some members opposite get up, stand up and be counted. This business of playing footsies with a motion of this nature, Mr. Speaker, is very obvious. They will perhaps be raising this motion themselves next year if they wake up in time. Their main resentment is that this motion is a good motion. It is a motion intended to do what the government is doing now, spending hundreds of millions of dollars to do, to preserve the farm estates. They are saying it is a good motion, Mr. Speaker, but we don't want to really support it because it came from the wrong side of the House. This often happens in this place. I know that I can't accuse the hon. members opposite of being partisan politically except the hon. Deputy Premier, because he admits it. He is rather proud of this fact, Mr. Speaker, and I have to give him number one ...

MR. SPEAKER:

With great respect the Chair recalls a recent reference to relevance.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker ...

MR. MOORE:

Will the hon. member permit a question, Mr. Speaker?

MR. LUDWIG:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to entertain a question from the hon. member.

MR. MOORE:

Thank you. Mr. Speaker, I am wondering if the hon. member can inform the Assembly what is the exact amount of the capital gains tax charged by the federal government with respect to the passage of this farm from father to son?

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, that's asking for a legal answer ...

[Interjections]

... and I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that the capital gain [tax] is 50 per cent of the net profit on sales, in most capital gain instances. Now, I believe that the hon. member should ask somebody from this side because I doubt whether he can find out from anybody on that side.

MR. MOORE:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. The only reason that I ask the question is to get the hon. member's ignorance recorded in Hansard. Thank you.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. If the hon. members don't want to speak to the motion, I would be pleased to speak to the motion.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I submit that my remarks are just as relevant to the motion as is the ...

MR. HENDERSON:

Point of order, Mr. Speaker, I meant to include the questioner in the comment as well.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I believe that my remarks are just as relevant to the motion as most debates in this House, with regard to motions and bills in debate in this House in the past.

When I mentioned the Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Speaker, I suppose that is getting a little too remote from the issue of farming. Perhaps on that particular point I ought to be brought back a little closer to the motion.

I wish to state, Mr. Speaker, that we ought not to play games with it. The farmers have representatives here. They have an issue. They are concerned about it and they are asking us, what do we do about this? So we will have to go back when this motion is dropped to the bottom and tell them the Conservatives were laughing at this thing. They would much prefer to try to lend money to you and give it away to get support, rather than do something meaningful for the farmer, Mr. Speaker.

Now that I've made my remarks, I invite the hon. Deputy Premier to stand up and say something on this issue. This happens to be his pet subject, Mr. Speaker. Why is he quiet?

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make one or two brief comments on the motion if I may with the indulgence of the hon. member opposite.

Mr. Speaker, I look at the motion and I must confess that it looks to me like one of these motherhood exercises, you know. I think if we are going to go this way let's move the evaluation back on every item the capital gains tax applies to. Really the question of the capital gains tax is in principle the issue that maybe should be contained in the motion.

But I'm under the impression that the motion really says that if a farmer wishes to sell the farm outside the family - because if it is inside the family I didn't understand that there was any capital gains tax on it - so if it is going to be sold outside the family, a farmer should have special consideration relative to application of capital gains.

It doesn't apply to any other citizen with any other ... [Inaudible] ... of capital gain, and quite frankly while I'm sympathetic to the cause, I really can't see why the farmer who is selling an asset outside the family should be singled out for particular attention. Why shouldn't all capital assets, the sale of them for capital gains purposes, be dated back to the date they were acquired instead of evaluation day? While there may be merit in the resolution as far as it goes, I find it difficult, even though I come from a farming constituency, to understand why an individual selling his farm outside the family and selling off a capital asset should be tendered or recommended for special consideration over and above any individual who is selling an asset who must pay a capital gains tax.

Therefore I suggest that all members of the Legislature should seriously consider the implication of voting for such a resolution. Quite frankly I question the principle of it, the desirability of it. If the tax is going to be applicable, it should be applicable to all people on equal terms. Within the family it isn't relevant. I think there is some confusion over the issue that voting for it is voting for some consideration to improve the capital gains tax within the family. But it isn't applicable within the family.

Mr. Speaker, I think the resolution itself needs either an amendment or voting down because I suggest it would be highly discriminatory against all the other individuals in the province who own assets, who may sell them and are going to be subject to a capital gains tax. I think that's a matter completely unrelated to the question of not having a capital gains tax within the family, which is now the policy of the federal government.

HON. MEMBERS:

Now! Now!

MR. DRAIN:

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

MR. SPEAKER:

May the hon. member adjourn the debate?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, will Resolutions 3, 4 and 5 hold their places on the Order Paper?

MR. SPEAKER:

My understanding is, although there may be some possible implication of a conflict between subsections 1 and 2 of Rule 40, I would read subsection 1 of Standing Order No. 40 as saying that these three motions now disappear from the Order Paper.

MR. TAYLOR:

On a point of order, could I submit that if the member had a logical reason to be away and has informed you of that reason, it would be proper to hold it in place on the Order Paper. If he has not given you a reason then, of course, I agree with the ruling.

MR. SPEAKER:

The Chair could certainly not undertake such a thing. It would require the unanimous leave of the House, or they could be restored to the Order Paper by a new notice in which case, of course, they would have the same position as if they had come to the Order Paper for the first time.

MR. HENDERSON:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, unless the motion is made to retain it on the Order Paper at the time the issue was dealt with, I fail to see how a private communication to the Speaker could be at all meaningful as relative to the absence of a member. The way I interpret it, as the Speaker says, it should be dropped from the Order Paper with the provision for the motion to go back on the Order Paper again if the individual wishes to resubmit it.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, as to business on the next sitting day which will be Wednesday, April [17] we would move into Committee of the Whole beginning with Bill No. 1, The Queen's Counsel Amendment Act, 1974, and then follow down the list as found on today's Order Paper.

The first subcommittees after the Easter break will meet on Thursday evening, April 18: Subcommittee A, Department of Health and Social Development; Subcommittee B, Department of the Environment; Subcommittee C, Department of the Attorney General, and Subcommittee D, Department of Municipal Affairs.

Insofar, Mr. Speaker, as we passed the motion yesterday that when we adjourn today we would adjourn until next Wednesday at 2:30 p.m., I would move the House do now adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

I wish all hon. members a happy Easter. The House stands adjourned until next Wednesday afternoon at 2:30 o'clock.

[The House rose at 5:30 o'clock.]