

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Thursday, October 11, 1973

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

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

NOTICES OF MOTION

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to give the House notice that tomorrow, Friday, October 12, the hon. Minister of Manpower and Labour will introduce a bill, being The Workers' Compensation Act, 1973.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask leave of the House to introduce at this time some 16 government bills. I am sure hon. members will wish to have them introduced at this time not only so they can have the greatest amount of time to review the bills prior to second reading, but also so the public and citizens can review them and have input to MLAs prior to their being proceeded with in the House.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce six bills.

Bill No. 64 The Human Tissue Gift Act

The first one will be The Human Tissue Gift Act. This Act will provide for the giving of inter vivos gifts of parts of human bodies, in other words, live transplants, and changes existing legislation in that respect.

Bill No. 65 The Vital Statistics Amendment Act, 1973

The second one, Bill No. 65, a proposed amendment to The Vital Statistics Act, would introduce the necessary change to make it possible for registration of sex changes. As well, this bill would make for easier research into family trees by interested people, through the Vital Statistics department.

Bill No. 67 The Public Health Nurses Repeal Act

The third one, Mr. Speaker, would be Bill No. 67, proposing to repeal The Public Health Nurses Act. The registration of nurses previously done under that Act is now done under other acts and there is no continuing need for that legislation.

Bill No. 75

The Child Welfare Amendment Act, 1973 (No. 2)

The fourth one, Mr. Speaker, would be a proposed amendment, Bill No. 75, to The Child Welfare Act. It is meant to make more workable the provisions in regard to future religious upbringing people would like for the child proposed to be placed for adoption.

Bill No. 76 The Health and Social Development
Statutes Amendment Act, 1973 (No. 2)

The next one is a general one, Mr. Speaker, and would cover four acts that relate to health and social development statutes.

The Provincial General Hospitals Act, a change in the board; The Pharmaceutical Association Amendment Act, some changes in regard to structures that have been requested by the association; The Hospital Services Commission amendment, in relation to changing the number required for a quorum in the Hospital Services Commission; and The Maintenance and Recovery Act, making some changes in regard to security that may be required in regard to the filing of maintenance orders against property.

Bill No. 77 The Mental Health Amendment Act, 1973

The sixth bill, Mr. Speaker, will be Bill No. 77, proposed amendments to The Mental Health Act. This would be an updating of certain procedures with particular reference to the practice of receiving patients in general hospitals for the purposes of The Mental Health Act and, as well, for providing for treatment during the period of examination during the first 24 hours after a patient arrives at such a facility.

[Leave being granted, Bills Nos. 64, 65, 67, 75, 76 and 77 were introduced and read a first time.]

Bill No. 66 The Alberta Lord's Day Amendment Act, 1973

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave, seconded by the hon. Provincial Treasurer, to introduce three bills, the first being The Alberta Lord's Day Amendment Act, 1973. The purpose of this bill is to pass to municipal governments the jurisdiction to determine whether they wish to have such sports on Sundays as horse racing, dog racing or boxing contests which are now provided for in The Lord's Day Act.

Bill No. 71

The Attorney General Statutes Amendment Act, 1973 (No. 2)

The second bill, Mr. Speaker, is The Attorney General Statutes Amendment Act, 1973 (No. 2). The purpose of this bill is to amend a number of the statutes by removing those provisions which may be in conflict with The Bill of Rights or The Individual's Rights Protection Act.

Bill No. 73

The Attorney General Statutes Amendment Act, 1973 (No. 3)

The third bill, Mr. Speaker, is The Attorney General Statutes Amendment Act, 1973 (No. 3). The purpose of that bill is to amend a number of the Statutes of Alberta, including The Infants Act, to provide the authority for the court to approve settlements of infants' property; The Juvenile Court Act, to provide for an improvement in the system of laying complaints; The Legal Profession Act, to provide for students to be articulated to certain members of the judiciary within the province; The Mentally Incapacitated Persons Act, to provide for authority in the court to authorize settlements of law suits; and lastly, Mr. Speaker, The Summary Convictions Act, to provide for the issuing of uniform traffic tickets under The Off-Highway Vehicles Act.

[Leave being granted, Bills Nos. 66, 71 and 73 were introduced and read a first time.]

Bill No. 68

The Public Service Vehicles Amendment Act, 1973 (No. 2)

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a bill, The Public Service Vehicles Amendment Act, seconded by my colleague, the Minister of Industry and Commerce.

The purpose of this bill is to provide legislation whereby Alberta can enter into prorationing and reciprocal agreements in licensing and fees.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 68 was introduced and read a first time.]

Bill No. 69
The Department of the Solicitor General Act

MISS HUNLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave, seconded by the hon. Attorney General, to introduce a bill, being The Department of the Solicitor General Act.

Its purpose is to create for the first time in the Province of Alberta a Department of the Solicitor General.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 69 was introduced and read a first time.]

Bill No. 79
The Alberta Property Tax Reduction Amendment Act, 1973

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave, seconded by the hon. Minister of Public Works, to introduce a bill being The Alberta Property Tax Reduction Amendment Act.

The purpose of this Act, Mr. Speaker, is to keep within the present Act the renter credits for senior citizens and transfer to The Alberta Income Tax Act renter rebates for those citizens who are not senior citizens.

One other amendment in the Act is a provision for municipalities whereby, when they are seeking municipal assistance and taking a census in order to do so, they would take their census at a specified time of the year.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 79 was introduced and read a first time.]

Bill No. 72
The Department of Telephones and Utilities Act

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave, seconded by the Minister without Portfolio in charge of Northern Affairs, to introduce two bills.

Bill No. 72, The Department of Telephones and Utilities Act, is a bill to structure this department in the manner that other departments are structured.

Bill No. 74
The Alberta Government Telephones Amendment Act, 1973

The second bill is The Alberta Government Telephones Amendment Act, 1973. This tightens up procedures for apprehension of people who are illegally wiretapping or using other electronic devices attached to the telephone system. It empowers a peace officer to confiscate such equipment and it increases the penalties.

[Leave being granted, Bills Nos. 72 and 74 were introduced and read a first time.]

Bill No. 80
The Alberta Income Tax Amendment Act, 1973

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave, seconded by the hon. Minister of Education, to introduce a bill, being The Alberta Income Tax Amendment Act, 1973.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is a first for Alberta in that its purpose is to recognize that renters pay property tax indirectly through their rents. It thereby provides - we have now received the agreement of the federal government for tax credits to renters.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 80 was introduced and read a first time.]

Bill No. 82
The Alberta Opportunity Fund Amendment Act, 1973

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave, seconded by the hon. Minister of Consumer Affairs, to introduce Bill No. 82, The Alberta Opportunity Fund Amendment Act.

This amendment, Mr. Speaker, will remove certain restrictions imposed by the Act and allow greater opportunity for the development of industry in Alberta.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 82 was introduced and read a first time.]

FILING RETURNS AND TABLING REPORTS

MISS HUNLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to table an answer to Question No. 250. It was asked by the hon. Member for Calgary Bow on May 8, 1973.

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to report on Motion 153, a motion by the hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc. That motion deals with correspondence between the federal and provincial governments which is still under discussion. As soon as a decision has been reached the appropriate return will be filed.

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to report on Motion for a Return No. 248 requested by the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

It involves a fair amount of correspondence and we haven't as yet received the concurrence of all the parties involved for tabling. But we expect to have it shortly and I'll table it at that time.

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to file Sessional Papers 185, 224 and 242. There are two further orders for return, Mr. Speaker, which are outstanding in my name and I anticipate filing those tomorrow.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to table a reply to Written Question No. 249.

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to table two Motions for a Return, No. 133 having to do with correspondence between the Government of Alberta and the Alberta Association of Broadcasters, and No. 206 having to do with the Regional Economic Expansion Agreement, 1972-73 in the Lesser Slave Lake Special Area.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to file returns in respect to Question No. 146 regarding grants available to community-minded organizations during the period inquired about.

Return No. 196 is with reference to public moneys paid out for methadone drugs and methadone clinics.

Return No. 232 is in regard to the number of child welfare workers working in the area of child abuse.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to file the annual report for 1972 of The Alberta Hospital Services Commission.

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table Sessional Paper No. 179.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to explain that Sessional Paper No. 141 has not as yet been prepared for tabling as we are awaiting a response from British Columbia in terms of approval for tabling these letters.

MR. FOSTER:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to table a reply to Question No. 227 concerning the Priority Employment Program.

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to table returns to Orders Nos. 116, 148, 154 and 158. The Motion for a Return No. 177 will be replied to shortly.

MR. ADAIR:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the replies to Motions for a Return Nos. 137 and 241.

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the following documents in regard to the Syncrude tar sands project. The first is the Alberta government letter to Syncrude Canada Ltd. regarding the environmental requirements of the Syncrude project, dated July 13, 1973.

The second is the permit to construct under The Clean Water Act, issued by the Department of the Environment to Syncrude Canada Ltd., under date of July 12, 1973.

The third is the permit to construct under The Clean Air Act, issued by the Department of the Environment to Syncrude Canada Ltd., under date of July 12, 1973.

The following are the Syncrude Canada Ltd. environmental assessment documents:

Syncrude Canada Ltd. Environmental Impact Assessment

- Volume 1 Overview
- Volume 2 Consideration of Resources Development Alternatives
- Volume 3 Base Line Information
- Volume 4 Supporting Studies

Fifth, Syncrude Criteria, issued by the Alberta Department of the Environment, January, 1973

Sixth, Guide to the Athabasca Oil Sands Area, issued by Alberta Research

Seventh, Environmental Research Monograph 1973-3

Eighth, Migratory Waterfowl and the Syncrude Tar Sands Lease: A Report

Ninth, a mimeographed list of all the documents tabled in the House during the spring session on the tar sands development project.

I might add that there are still two documents to be tabled shortly. One will be the archeological study of the Syncrude site and the second will be the site plan study.

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the report of an inquiry into the rights of individuals in amateur sports, the hearings of which are being held tomorrow in Lethbridge, on Saturday in Calgary, a week from tomorrow in Grande Prairie and a week from Saturday in St. Albert.

I would also like to table, pursuant to Chapter 35, Paragraph 20, of the Glenbow Alberta Institute Act, the annual report of the Glenbow Alberta institute.

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to table a report prepared for the Bureau of Public Affairs by Social Systems Limited, Calgary, Alberta entitled, The Media and the Bureau of Public Affairs.

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to table a brochure distributed throughout the province this summer which explains the new system of licensing lotteries within the Province of Alberta

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to table a map referred to by the hon. the Premier yesterday in his excellent address to the hon. members of the Assembly. The map outlines the bituminous sands leases receptive to strip mining. It shows the recorded leaseholder, the date of the lease and the rental paid.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Human Rights

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, there are two questions I would like to pose.

First, I would like to ask a question of the Premier. In light of the fact that it was during the session a year ago that The Alberta Bill of Rights and The Individual's Rights Protection Act were approved by this Assembly, has the Human Rights Commission been appointed?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, it has not as yet. We are in the final process of completing the appointments involved. I would hope that, before at least the end of the calendar year and perhaps before the end of the fall session, we would be able to announce those appointments.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Premier. Would the Premier explain to the House the reasons why the commission has not been appointed to date?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I am sure the answer to that is relatively obvious. We are attempting to select a commission which we think would be most appropriate in terms of the nature of the assignment, the people and cross section of Alberta involved.

As we have done with other appointments in this administration, we will make them as quickly as we can, as was the case with similar questions with regard to the Workmen's Compensation Board a year ago. In my view, the most important thing is, when we do make these appointments, that they be the most effective people we can possibly get for the responsibilities in the province.

MR. CLARK:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In light of the importance placed on the appointments, will there be public advertisement so that Albertans may let their names stand in that manner?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, we have already entered into correspondence with a number of organizations requesting that they submit suggestions for the Human Rights Commission.

I have made remarks, on a public occasion here within the debates of the Legislature, or, if it wasn't here, I am sure on two or three public occasions, that we would welcome suggestions from any quarter in the province and from any member with regard to the Human Rights Commission.

In this case, though, I would have to urge that we receive them within the course of the next ten days at the latest, in order for them to be adequately considered.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, so that I don't misunderstand the Premier's answer, there is going to be no public advertisement then?

Just one last supplementary question in this area, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask the Premier, under what authority then was the director of the

Alberta Human Rights Commission appointed, when, in fact, there is no Alberta Human Rights Commission at this time?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member's question is a mixture of a legal question and argument.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, then we will try to remove the argument and rephrase the question. Might I say, has a director of the Alberta Human Rights Commission been appointed when there is no Human Rights Commission?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I think that would involve an interpretation of the Act. It is our view, certainly an interim point of view, that a reasonable interpretation of that Act would permit the Executive Council to take such action pending the appointment of the commission.

CSA Job Reclassifications

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Manpower and Labour. Can he report to the Assembly on the meeting he held yesterday with the public service of this province on the question of reclassification? Was the matter settled?

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, I would hardly call the experience that I had yesterday on the steps of this august Legislature Building a meeting.

But I did meet with over 300 tradespeople and I gave them the same assurances I gave to the President of the Civil Service Association of Alberta. That was that a committee constituted from the membership of the Civil Service Association and of the government, represented by the office of the Public Service Commissioner, would examine the eight points of concern of the tradesmen and recommend to the government what action may be feasible and reasonable to take.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Mobile Photographic Units

MR. DRAIN:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Highways. I was wondering if the hon. minister could give consideration to a mobile photographic unit that could travel throughout my particular area.

As a matter of information, Mr. Speaker, the people in the west end of my constituency are having difficulties because the license bureau is open from 9 to 12 in the morning and from 1 to 4 in the afternoon. It is closed on Saturdays and the people are on shift work. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

If the hon. member could rephrase his ministerial announcements in a slightly different way.

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, we have a licensing camera at Pincher Creek, and we are looking at the possibility of having either a mobile unit or some facility that would be more satisfactory in that particular area than the one that is there.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc, followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Millican.

Syncrude Investments

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the Premier or the Minister of Mines and Minerals if he can advise the House as to whether the government is contemplating any financial investments or contributions toward either the Syncrude pipeline or the Syncrude utility plant, other than what they would be making through the Alberta Energy Company in the form of purchase of equity stock in those two particular operations.

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, having regard to the fact that that question deals with the Alberta Energy Company, I'd like to refer it to the hon. minister, Mr. Getty.

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, the answer is no.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

McDougall House

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question today to the hon. Minister of Culture, Youth and Recreation. Does the government plan to cooperate with the City of Edmonton and other groups to preserve the historic McDougall House, either at the present site, or at a new site?

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Speaker, the government is very seriously interested in the heritage of our province, proven, of course, by the recent passing of The Alberta Heritage Act. In fact, a special warrant, the day before yesterday, of over \$80,000 put into effect The Alberta Heritage Act, especially, of course, to consider sites like the McDougall House and others around the province - in Calgary, in Fort Macleod ...

AN HON. MEMBER:

Just answer the question.

MR. SCHMID:

That's what I'm trying to do. In Fort Macleod, and thereby making sure that our heritage is being ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Would the hon. minister please come directly to the answer if he intends to answer.

MR. SCHMID:

As I have said, we are doing our best to consider the preservation of any historic site in this province.

AN HON. MEMBER:

He doesn't know.

MR. DIXON:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Have there been any negotiations at all carried out regarding the present McDougall site? It has great historical value to this Legislature.

MR. SCHMID:

No negotiations have been carried out, Mr. Speaker, regarding the McDougall House. In fact, the previous government gave that site to the YWCA. It is

listed now under The Alberta Heritage Act as one of the sites to be considered for preservation.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Used Car Business

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Consumer Affairs. Can the minister advise what the current status is regarding the investigation into the used car business in Alberta?

MR. DOWLING:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I can. The investigations were carried out by the Department of Consumer Affairs, the Consumer Affairs Branch. They were successful. They resulted in satisfaction being guaranteed to several consumers in Alberta who did have problems.

The matter expanded beyond what we thought it was in the beginning. The matter was referred to the Attorney General and I understand it is in his able hands at this time.

MR. WILSON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Consumer Affairs. Will the results of the investigation of your department be tabled in the Legislature?

MR. DOWLING:

No, Mr. Speaker, the matter of the results have been referred to the Attorney General, as I said, and I understand the matter is being taken up in the courts.

I should say, as well, that we have now prepared a ministerial order to license all sales of cars. It hasn't been processed, pending further consultation with the retail trade.

MR. WILSON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. the Attorney General. Is it anticipated that charges will be laid as a result of the investigations by the Department of Consumer Affairs?

MR. LEITCH:

I anticipate, Mr. Speaker, some charges being laid. I don't know if it is accurate to say they are being laid solely as a result of the investigation of that department, because there were other persons involved in investigating the matter.

MR. WILSON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. the Attorney General. What is the nature of the charges being prepared?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I think it would be quite improper for me to say what charges are being contemplated, due to the simple fact that while any number of charges may now be contemplated by members of the department, it may be that they will not be laid. I think it would be quite wrong for me to discuss in this House prior to the charges being laid those under consideration.

MR. WILSON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Might this be the last supplementary on this topic.

MR. WILSON:

A supplementary to the hon. Attorney General. Would the Attorney General please indicate when the final decision might be expected on the number of charges and the nature of the charges; for example, would it be this month or next month?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, that involves an answer as to when the entire matter might be resolved and I certainly wouldn't be able, at this time, to comment on that. But I anticipate that in the very immediate future there will be some charges laid.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Synchrude - Labour Relations

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question either to the hon. Premier or to the hon. Minister of Manpower and Labour. By way of explanation, it deals with Condition (a) of the memorandum of agreement between the government and Synchrude, the condition that relates to labour matters.

My question is, does this cover all the workers by one contract who will work for a specific period of time - will they all be covered under this agreement?

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, this goes a bit into the area of conjecture beyond the agreement itself. One of the considerations before the principals in the project, Synchrude and its representative, with respect to labour relations and other matters, Canadian Bechtel and the Alberta Labour Trades Council will be to attempt to get that kind of agreement. This is generally referred to as a site agreement and would cover the employees on the site for the period of time that the site will take. I should explain, because it is important, that most of the building trades, except for probably three, have contracts with the employers that will run to the end of March, 1975.

MR. NOTLEY:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister. Can the minister advise the House, in view of the fact that this is listed as one of the conditions in the memorandum of agreement, whether the on-site agreement will be as a result of free collective bargaining and negotiation or whether the government is prepared to introduce legislation to enforce it if necessary?

DR. HOHOL:

The answer is that free collective bargaining is the approach to this at the present time. Months have already been spent in the matter of developing the principles, the method and approach to obtaining a site agreement for the Synchrude project. The onus on the parties to reach that kind of agreement is certainly clear, it being one of the conditions of the agreement.

MR. NOTLEY:

A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker, for clarification. Has the government given any consideration to the enactment of legislation if free collective bargaining fails?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member's question is clearly hypothetical. Perhaps it could be asked at a later stage.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, if I could pose another question then. Could I ask the hon. minister, in view of the fact that the on-site agreement is one of the

conditions, whether or not there was any formal consultation with either the Alberta Federation of Labour or the Building Trades Council?

DR. HOHOL:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, there were extensive negotiations - not in the sense of collective bargaining with all parties. Certainly the Federation of Labour was aware of that. It was one of the items I initiated in discussion with them when we met to discuss other considerations. I met with the president of the Building Trades Council and senior officials of my department to discuss the matter of the labour relations we will be looking forward to at the Syncrude project.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Calgary Correctional Institute Inquiry

MR. HO LEM:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question to the hon. Solicitor General. I wonder if the hon. minister would care to inform the House which official of the Calgary Correctional Services Department had been on the phone to Warden Jackson, indicating his concern over the warden's testimony and other testimony given by his staff at the Calgary Correctional Institute inquiry?

MISS HUNLEY:

Mr. Speaker, to my knowledge there has been no official of my department doing that. Until I receive the report from Mr. Harradence which might confirm it, I am not prepared to accept that as being factual.

MR. HO LEM:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. What is currently being done to curb the deterioration of morale amongst the staff as well as prisoners at Spy Hill as a result of this inquiry?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Order, order.

MISS HUNLEY:

Mr. Speaker, they are making assumptions. I am waiting to hear from Mr. Harradence for an assessment of what the situation really is. Whatever the report conveys, certainly I'll be taking some action in the matter.

MR. HO LEM:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is there, in fact, a shortage of staff, as is indicated by the testimony, and what is being done to bring the staffing up to a satisfactory level?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Order, order.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. minister has indicated, with regard to this whole matter, that the hon. minister is anticipating a report. Possibly after the report has been received the member could pursue this line of questioning further.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, supplementary to the hon. minister with regard to the allegation or testimony that pressure is being brought to bear by Edmonton officials on Warden Jackson. Has the hon. minister, Miss Hunley, received any indication of this happening prior to it being raised in the Legislature now?

MISS HUNLEY:

The first indication was raised to me by the newsmen and that is the only indication I have. I spoke to the director who indicates to me he has not spoken to Warden Jackson in the past two weeks. That's all the information I have at this time.

MR. LUDWIG:

Has any kind of inquiry been launched to determine the truth or otherwise of the allegation by the hon. minister?

MR. SPEAKER:

With great respect, it would appear to the Chair that the question which has just been asked was just answered.

MR. WILSON:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. the Attorney General. Is the 1973 approved budget for the operation of the Calgary Correctional Institute less than the amount requested by the administration of that department?

MR. LEITCH:

No.

MR. TAYLOR:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the hon. Solicitor General have any idea when Mr. Harradence's report will be received?

AN HON. MEMBER:

When it's finished.

MISS HUNLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I presume the report will be forthcoming as soon as Mr. Harradence has completed his investigation. I feel reasonably sure that he will be inquiring into the other allegations that have been raised in this House and by the press.

MR. WILSON:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Might this be the last supplementary on this topic.

MR. WILSON:

Has application for increased staff at the Calgary Correctional Institute been refused?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Yes.

MISS HUNLEY:

I don't have that information at the moment. I'm under the impression that there are vacancies on the staff which have not been filled.

I have scrupulously refrained from discussing it while the matter is under inquiry by Mr. Harradence. I am most anxious to look into all aspects of it and I can assure this House that I'll be doing so.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask one more question on the matter of Warden Jackson's information which I think is very important. Would I be permitted to ...

MR. SPEAKER:

It so happens that the hon. member is next in line for asking a question.

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

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, in light of the fact that the testimony by Warden Jackson, a most reputable servant of the Crown, raised such a terribly serious matter, would the hon. Solicitor General request that the information concerning this particular part of the investigation be brought to this House as soon as possible and not delayed for three, four or six months? Would she consider getting an advance report on this particular aspect of this rather sordid development?

MR. SPEAKER:

I realize this may be a sensitive topic and that's no reason for the Chair to intervene, but we really have no authority at all to engage in debate during the question period.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, then I will reword the question slightly. Is the minister going to ask for an advance report on this particular aspect, and I am referring to the testimony by Warden Jackson, that he may have been warned about what he says. Will we get an advance report, or are you going to let this stay until it comes around in due course?

MISS HUNLEY:

I don't have an answer to that at the moment. I want to consider it. The only report I have at the moment is what I read in the papers, and I don't always believe everything I read in the papers.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Is there any allegation that she does not believe Warden Jackson - because I do?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please. Order.

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

Expo '74 - Spokane

MR. TAYLOR:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have a question for the hon. Premier. Has the provincial government decided to accept the invitation of the Prime Minister of Canada to join in the construction of a Canadian island park at the Spokane '74 world exposition?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I believe that matter is on the agenda for the Executive Council next Tuesday, and I don't think a decision has been reached.

MR. WILSON:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Minister of the Environment. Could the minister inform the House if Expo '74 has invited the minister or the Government of Alberta to participate in the fair in view of its theme of the world environment?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, we have been giving some consideration to this for months and a decision will be made by the Executive Council shortly.

MR. TAYLOR:

Supplementary - Oh, I'm sorry, the minister isn't here.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Motor Vehicle Inspection

MR. SORENSON:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Highways and Transport. Is the government planning compulsory vehicle inspection in the near future?

MR. COPITHORNE:

No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SORENSON:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the minister. What plans does the hon. minister have for removing clunkers from our provincial roads and highways?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, there is no forcible plan but there is a voluntary plan of the clunkers clunking out.

MR. HO LEM:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Has the hon. minister received communication from the City of Calgary requesting that his department deal with the implementation of compulsory inspection?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. I read this in the newspaper. There is nothing stopping the City of Calgary from having compulsory automobile inspection.

MR. HO LEM:

Will it be at the cost of the provincial government or at the cost of the municipal government?

MR. COPITHORNE:

It will be at the cost of local autonomy, Mr. Speaker.

DR. BUCK:

Supplementary to the Attorney General, Mr. Speaker. How much enforcement is there in his department toward keeping cars on the road safe?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, any legislation that applies to the condition of vehicles on the highway is enforced the same way as any other legislation. I think the hon. member would have to clarify his question a bit before I can give a more definitive answer.

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, I think if the Attorney General would have a look at some of the stuff in his department he would find that the RCMP have the authority ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Is the hon. member asking a question?

DR. BUCK:

... [Inaudible] ... so I'm telling him.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. The hon. Member for ...

DR. BUCK:

May I rephrase my question? Have the police been forcing cars to keep in a safe condition? They have this power. Have they been enforcing this section of the Act?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. minister has answered that the existing legislation is being enforced.

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

Highway Signs

MR. MANDEVILLE:

Mr. Speaker, my question is also to the hon. Minister of Highways. In light of request from the citizens of Bassano, following a series of accidents on the No. 1 Highway at Bassano, has the hon. minister given consideration to putting a speed zone on the highway at Bassano and also erecting traffic lights? It's not even safe for clunkers on the No. 1 Highway at Bassano.

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, as a rule we do not like to restrict the speed limit of a highway such as the Trans-Canada Highway, a primary highway past a community, but certainly we will be considering their representations.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Medicine Hat-Redcliff, followed the hon. Member for Lethbridge East.

School Construction Guidelines

MR. WYSE:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Education. Is the minister planning to revise the guidelines for new school construction? Specifically, are the plans to lower the present 30 pupil per classroom capacity to 25, 26, or 27?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I met with a number of interested school boards last Friday and indicated to them that we would be prepared to make a number of modifications to the existing holding pattern.

However, looking at the facts of lowering the pupil population for the next eight years, the fact that we have something over 90,000 vacant spaces in the school system of Alberta; the fact that some 35 rural schools have closed recently; we don't intend to move away from the general policy of trying better to utilize the taxpayer's dollar. The modifications will be in the line of encouraging more flexible design, modular school construction and community use.

In connection with the second question, we are now looking at the 30 loading factor, which the hon. gentleman mentioned, to see whether or not changes might be made. However, if we did make changes, we'd then be counting the ancillary classrooms, the gyms, the vocational space and that sort of thing. We're the lowest in Canada.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister.

Has any consideration been given to modifying the per capita amount given to rural school boards as compared to urban school boards, because rural construction costs tend to be higher? Has any consideration been given to modifications in the grant structure?

MR. HYNDMAN:

This subject was brought up by the school boards last Friday, Mr. Speaker. Certainly the Reid Crowther study on school costs, some years ago, indicated that there are no closely definable bases for suggesting that there are different construction costs although, certainly, the boards have argued that this is quite clearly the case.

In some cases however, Mr. Speaker, areas outside of, and remote from, Edmonton and Calgary have come in with lower costs than Edmonton and Calgary. But as I mentioned to the boards, we are looking at that with a view to seeing what adaptations and changes might be necessary. Before the end of October I hope to make a statement to the House as to the variations, or selective changes in the existing holding pattern, which will continue in principle.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Cattle Embargo

MR. ANDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Agriculture. Is the minister aware of the demands of the feeders of cattle in southern Alberta, and in my constituency, for an embargo on cattle imported from the United States?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, I'm aware that certain cattlemen and certain organizations would like to see an embargo on cattle coming in from the United States. I think, personally, that this would be a mistake at this time.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Lethbridge West, followed by the hon. Member for Stony Plain.

School of Optometry

MR. GRUENWALD:

Thank you Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Advanced Education - it's being neglected again this session. Since the recess of the Legislature in the spring, has the Minister of Advanced Education had any discussion with Ottawa or with other ministers of education of the western provinces, regarding the feasibility of the school of optometry for Alberta or for the western provinces?

MR. FOSTER:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have; principally with my colleagues of the other three western provinces, along with a number of other items.

As a matter of interest, Mr. Speaker, representatives from the departments of advanced education - or as they may be known in other provinces - and health, attended a conference at the University of Waterloo on this subject. It's currently before this authority. At the present time the Province of Saskatchewan is doing some more exploratory work on the matter.

MR. GRUENWALD:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Do you intend to pursue it further with an eye to having such a school located in Alberta?

MR. FOSTER:

Mr. Speaker, as I have said before in this House, I have no specific designs for locating special facilities in this province. I think our first concern is to establish a need in western Canada for certain special facilities and to come to some arrangement with the other provinces if that is acceptable, both in terms of operating costs and capital costs and determining in consultation with my colleagues where would be an appropriate location in western Canada.

Obviously, as a member of the government of the Province of Alberta I'm interested in promoting the best interests of this province. If it is felt that that includes a strong position in support of special facilities for this province, then, of course, I would be pleased to take it.

MR. GRUENWALD:

One further supplementary. Are there indications at this point in your discussions that there are at least substantial capital grants forthcoming from Ottawa?

MR. FOSTER:

No.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Snowmobile Insurance

MR. PURDY:

Mr. Speaker, a question to the hon. Minister of Highways and Transport. Will any consideration be given to changing the present legislation in regard to snow vehicles so that farmers will not have to purchase a licence or insurance if they want to use the snow vehicle for a couple of days hunting in the fall or in similar instances?

MR. COPITHORNE:

No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PURDY:

Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Minister of Consumer Affairs. What are the rates on snowmobile insurance and is any rebate available this year for cancellation?

MR. DOWLING:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, as a result of discussions with the industry by the Alberta Automobile Insurance Board the rate is effectively reduced by approximately 50 per cent to a maximum of \$30 for minimum coverage, including passenger hazard. Also, there can be no additional charge for any sleigh or anything that is towed by the snowmobile. There will be a refund for the months of January, February and December of 25 per cent, and in March of 10 per cent and November of 15 per cent.

MR. TAYLOR:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Will the overcharges made by the industry last year on snowmobiles be reimbursed?

MR. DOWLING:

I would suggest to to the hon. member, Mr. Speaker, that if cases such as that exist, the insured contact his insurance agent and make representations to him.

MR. NOTLEY:

A supplementary question. Could the hon. Minister of Consumer Affairs tell us by what rationale the percentages for refunds was arrived at?

MR. DOWLING:

First of all, the one I don't understand totally is the November one. The one that I understand totally is the March one, that is 10 per cent because the season is almost over. The balances are 25 per cent based on \$15 minimum coverage remaining and the other \$15 being the portion that could be dealt with by way of refund. So I understand the December, January and February portion is the largest portion, 25 per cent. Of course, there is a high administrative cost establishing a policy and that is where the 75 per cent goes.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question for clarification. Does that mean that the insurance companies will in fact be able to keep 75 per cent of an overcharge on last year's premiums which has now been found by the Alberta Insurance Board to be an overcharge?

MR. DOWLING:

Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member is reading a great deal into what I am saying. What I'm saying is, effective as of now, for anyone insuring his snowmobile for this year these rates and refunds will apply.

License Plate Manufacturing

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the hon. Solicitor General. I would like to know if the minister could inform the House of the reason for the decision behind closing the license plate manufacturing plant in the Fort Saskatchewan Correctional Institute.

MISS HUNLEY:

Mr. Speaker, there are several reasons. One is that the present equipment is obsolete and to replace it would require several hundreds of thousands of dollars.

The second is that I am interested in the future of Fort Saskatchewan and what facility might be there. It seems as though it would be inappropriate to invest money in a license plate manufacturing effort if we do intend to rebuild Fort Saskatchewan.

The third is that it has not proven to be a very rehabilitative occupation. The officials at Fort Saskatchewan tell me that it does not really provide the incentive, which we would like to see, for those who are engaged in that occupation. We would like to see them learn a meaningful trade. When they are discharged into society there is no occupation for them similar to the work they have done in creating licence plates, so they really haven't learned anything. I am very anxious that the inmates in the correctional institutes be given every opportunity to learn something which will assist them when they return to society.

DR. BUCK:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the hon. minister indicate to the House what steps the government is taking to relocate the outside people who are in charge of the licence plate operation?

MISS HUNLEY:

I don't have that information at the present time. I will be pleased to look into it, though, and advise the hon. member.

DR. BUCK:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the hon. minister inform the House what consultation the government had with the John Howard Society and related societies when you reached the decision to close the licence plant?

MISS HUNLEY:

I personally was not involved in any consultation with the John Howard Society. This didn't happen to be one of my responsibilities at that particular time. The officials in the department did consult with them, although I can't guarantee that because I haven't asked.

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, would the Attorney General be able to answer that question?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I didn't personally have any consultation with the John Howard Society, although that matter and the whole rehabilitation program within the correctional institutions was discussed on a number of occasions with the

Advisory Committee on Corrections, with representatives of the John Howard Society, and other groups who were interested in the rehabilitation of persons within the correctional institute system.

In addition, I reviewed the matter at some length with members of the department and I really don't recall anyone speaking in favour of the licence-producing operation as a rehabilitative force within the correctional institute system.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Bingo

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. the Attorney General. Is the Attorney General aware that some community associations are being required to provide monthly audited statements of their bingo operations?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I doubt that the hon. member is quite accurate when he says "monthly audited statements". Under the new system we have for licensing of raffles within the province, a part repealed the 10 per cent amusement tax which the former administration had imposed on these charitable and religious organizations. That was substituted by a licensing system which is designed merely to pay the administrative costs of the system.

In addition, we required some information with respect to the administration of lotteries, largely to ensure that they are run honestly. It has been our view that that is extremely important because there are a great number of religious and charitable organizations which use this system for raising funds for their work. We feel it is important that the government take needed steps to ensure public confidence in all these raffling events.

I believe what we have asked for, Mr. Speaker, is a statement of the total receipts, expenses, and the amount given to the charity. That, I am sure, Mr. Speaker, is something that each of these organizations keeps as a matter of their own record. I am not personally aware of any requirement for a monthly audited statement, although there may be a requirement for a statement in respect of certain large bingo operations at the end of their licence period.

But if the hon. member has some instance of hardship or inconvenience of these procedures imposing on of these organizations, if you will just give me the particulars, I'd be delighted to take a look at it. Mr. Speaker, we've gone to great lengths to try to ensure that this system is effective and doesn't impose any undue hardship or difficulty on any organization.

MR. HO LEM:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Does the hon. minister intend to review the government's regulation in this regard in view of the many protests and submissions from various groups?

MR. LEITCH:

I assume, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is referring to the licensing fee.

MR. HO LEM:

Yes.

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, in that respect the complaints, I believe, have risen almost totally out of a misunderstanding of the licensing fee system. I found recently, on reviewing the applications, that a great number of them had mistakes in the calculation of the amount of the licence fee. Cheques for several hundred dollars had been sent when, in fact, the fee was \$10 or \$20.

I think really the concerns that the hon. member speaks about flow from a misunderstanding of how it actually operates.

MR. HO LEM:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, regarding the application for the permit. In the case of Calgary, for instance, will it revert to the Calgary police rather than having the citizens of Calgary submitting it to your department in Edmonton?

MR. LEITCH:

Under the new system, Mr. Speaker, we have the applications coming in to the Attorney General's Department rather than going to the police.

Essentially there were two reasons for that. First of all, under the old system most of them, the largest percentage, came here anyway.

The second defect in the old system was that there were different tests being used by different members of the police force as to what was a charitable or religious organization and therefore, whether they were qualified to obtain a licence. That led to a good deal of ill will throughout the province with one organization finding that in one part of the province a similar organization had been licensed, whereas in their part of the province they weren't licensed.

For those two reasons we've endeavoured to change the system to issue all the licences from the Attorney General's Department. Again, we will watch that very closely. If it appears that it is imposing an undue inconvenience, we'll endeavour to find an alternate system.

MR. HO LEM:

One final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Will the minister advise what revenues are anticipated for the province as a result of this new fee?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, our preliminary estimates indicated that it would be significantly less than \$100,000 under the licence fee system, with the two major lotteries being run by the exhibition boards in Calgary and Edmonton paying about half of that. That compares, Mr. Speaker, with our estimate of the revenue that would have been brought in by the tax imposed by the former administration of something in the order of \$1 million, or in the high hundreds of thousands.

MR. SPEAKER:

The time for the question period has elapsed.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MINISTERIAL ANNOUNCEMENT

MR. DOWLING:

Mr. Speaker, as the members all know, negotiations with the federal government have been undertaken by representatives of the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Consumer Affairs relative to the price Albertans pay for milk.

I am now pleased to inform the House that these negotiations have been successfully concluded. An agreement has been reached with the federal government regarding milk prices.

Alberta consumers will on Monday, October 15, pay 5 cents less per quart of milk. On that date Alberta milk consumers will pay 35 cents for a quart of homogenized milk. The agreement is in effect for 12 months. This will stabilize the consumer price on milk to comparable levels with other parts of Canada and will have no appreciable effect on the producers. These current prices received are competitive with the rest of Canada.

It is the largest roll-back of milk prices effected anywhere in Canada to date, Mr. Speaker, and is another effective method we are using to combat prices in this inflationary period.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, we on this side welcome the announcement made by the Minister of Consumer Affairs. We are indeed pleased they have been able to negotiate with the federal government so that this federal program will apply here in the province of Alberta.

I would simply say this, I note with some concern that this program goes for 12 months. It will be my sincere hope that at the end of 12 months, should the federal government get cold feet in this area, the province of Alberta would have warm feet and pick up the slack to protect the Alberta consumers.

MR. DOWLING:

Mr. Speaker, just one further point, the saving to Alberta ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Please. We are going to be getting into a debate. In fact, we've gotten into one.

WRITTEN QUESTIONS

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

What has the government done concerning the following recommendations in the Report of the Royal Commission on the Status of Women in Canada which have been further recommended by the Alberta Citizens' Advisory Board to the Executive Council for action? The recommendations referred to are as follows:

- (1) That a special educational committee be established to check carefully school textbooks that may perpetuate many male-female attitudes, considered detrimental to improving the status of women;
- (2) That training in all fields of endeavour should be available to male and female alike;
- (3) That Family Life Education should be considered at all levels from the lowest grades to adult educational classes with respect given to the needs of the specific age groups concerned, and that these should include: (a) home money management, (b) child development training, (c) domestic training in preparation for leaving home, and (d) pre-marital emotional counselling;
- (4) That special programs to upgrade the status of women should be considered at all levels of communication from workshops to radio and television programs; and
- (5) That family planning facilities be enlarged and the information available through them increased.

MISS HUNLEY:

I agree with the question, Mr. Speaker, and I herewith table the answer.

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

Has the Minister of Agriculture received a copy of a motion passed at a meeting of some 300 citizens at Mossleigh, Alberta on Wednesday, May 9, 1973 with regards to the Alberta Bill of Rights, The Communal Property Act and the role of the liaison and advisory committee on communal properties.

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, the answer to the question is yes.

MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

1. Mr. Young moved, seconded by Mr. Appleby.

Be it resolved that the Government of Alberta reconsider the decision to enter into an agreement with the Canadian National Railways to repair the

flood-damaged portion of the Alberta Resources Railroad until such time as a complete investigation:

- (a) of the flood characteristics of the Smoky River,
- (b) of the effect of the development of the coal industry on the Alberta Resources Railroad,
- (c) of the estimates of the cost of repairs demonstrates that benefits outweigh costs.

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, speaking on the motion still before us, the correspondence referred to on page 26-1177 of Hansard, March 22, 1973 has been tabled. I am now going to table the agreement between the Alberta Resource Railroad Corporation and the National Railway Company, made on January 31, 1973 and approved by Order in Council 661/73 May 1, 1973.

I know that we have discussed in some detail events leading up to the signing of the agreement I am tabling today, but I should like, for the information of the House, to review and make some comments on the circumstances which led up to its signing, what has been achieved and the benefits that will ensue to the people of the Province of Alberta.

The original operating agreement was ambiguous and extremely unsatisfactory, especially in relation to the handling of matters of the allocation of costs between the government and the CNR. The unsatisfactory arrangement immediately became apparent to the new government when it took office, and steps were taken to examine the whole situation. Discussions were started with the CNR officials as to the propriety of certain capital charges that had been made and were proposed to be made to the government, also the possibility of amending the agreement to clarify those ambiguities and thus make it workable.

However, before these matters were resolved, the floods of 1972 occurred and dramatically changed the picture. These floods resulted in washouts along 37 miles of track adjacent to the Smoky River and the closure of the north half of the railway between Grand Cache and the Procter and Gamble plant near Grande Prairie.

Subsequent to the floods and the movement of the export of grain from the Peace River country to Vancouver, and traffic to and from the Procter and Gamble plant south of Grande Prairie, the House was well aware that they did not suffer in any way, since a detour arrangement was made via the NAR which went into effect at that time.

Now, due to the unsatisfactory and ambiguous nature of the original lease agreement with the CNR, the responsibility as to the whole, as to who should bear the cost of the restoration of the line washed out by the 1972 floods could not be agreed upon between the government and the CNR. It thus became necessary to negotiate with the CNR to amend the agreement which would resolve the unsettled outstanding moneys that had been expended, to settle the cost allocation of restoration of the washed-out line and to spell out clearly the responsibility of each party for future maintenance and capital costs.

During negotiations the possibility of the sale of the railway to the CNR was explored, but no offer was received that could be accepted in the best interests of the people of Alberta. Likewise, the merits of abandoning the line from Grande Cache to the Procter and Gamble plantsite were examined. It was concluded that the only reasonable decision was to rebuild.

Some of the benefits of the new agreement are as follows:

(1) The ambiguous and unworkable sections of the original agreement have been eliminated.

(2) The CNR has agreed to restore the railway to its 'as was' condition before the floods at their sole cost, the government to contribute \$2.5 million only to the cost of what is considered to be additional protective works by our engineers against future floods. Although the actual cost of the additional work will exceed that amount, we, as the Province of Alberta, are only responsible for the \$2.5 million. The original agreement was quite clear that the capital cost of additional protective works would be the sole responsibility of the government.

(3) The outstanding disagreements pertaining to capital cost were expanded for 1971 and 1972 and were resolved by this new agreement. These costs were well in excess of \$750,000.

(4) The industrial parklands in Grande Prairie are being turned back to the provincial government and the control of any future lease revenue will accrue to this government.

(5) The previous government agreed to accept 50 cents a ton for coal shipments as against \$1.40 a ton as provided in the original agreement. This was done without an authorizing Order in Council. However, we have now restricted that reduction to apply only to the existing McIntyre Porcupine contract.

(6) The previous agreement had no payment to the government for the use of the railway by the CNR to haul freight between two points on the ARR line, that is local traffic, or for situations that might arise where the CNR used the line as an intermediate carrier to haul freight between two points off the line. A rental rate payment to the government for this freight was agreed upon.

(7) The clause allowing inspection of the railway by government officials or representatives was expanded.

(8) The previous agreement was interpreted in such a way by the CNR and accepted by the former government that the ARR was totally responsible for all capital costs. The new agreement provides that, after the railway is put back into full operation to the government's satisfaction, any portion of the ARR damaged or destroyed is the CNR's responsibility up to a period of seven years, provided the estimated cost of such restoration does not exceed \$3 million. If that restoration exceeds the \$3 million occurring in that seven-year period, restoration then will be based on public convenience and necessity. If damage occurs after the seven year period, restoration by the CNR is to be based on public convenience and necessity. After the occurrence of any future damage, the government is only responsible for the cost of additional protection if it is required after the CNR has restored the railway to an 'as was' condition at its cost. The government, if in agreement, pays 50 per cent of the cost of any additional protective works.

I wanted to cover some of these benefits because I think it is important for the House to know what the agreement did: in essence, take not only the ambiguity out of the previous agreement, but define and limit the liability of the present government in regard to the operation and future continuation of the trackage as operable between the mainline of the CNR and Grande Prairie.

Finally, a new schedule for costs, chargeable as overhead, was agreed upon which clearly delineates overhead charges to be borne by the CNR.

In summary, the government, at the start of negotiations, would have been responsible for the full cost of restoration of the washed-out railway and totally responsible for the cost of future capital works.

At the conclusion of negotiations, the government's position was approved to the extent that we, the government, are responsible only for the difference between existing capitalized costs and any new capitalized costs, and in some cases only 50 per cent of the difference. We are not responsible at all for the cost of restoration. In short, the negotiations have revised an agreement that was very poorly written and permitted interpretations that were unfavourable to the government. This government has now executed a contract with the CNR which can be administered on a businesslike basis and will re-establish the railway in full operation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to briefly inform you of the present situation in regard to the restoration of the washed-out sections of the railway.

The original schedule of restoration prepared by the CNR was to have the railway in operation by April 1974 on a slow-order basis, and in full operation by June 1974. Daily work was ahead of schedule up to the end of September, but has since been delayed due to heavy rains in that area. Track laying and riprap protection work are somewhat behind schedule due to the recent railway strike. However, the progress of the work will greatly depend on the weather in that area in the next few weeks.

We, as a government, have examined how that debt can be relieved in regard to the ARR. The accumulative debt of the ARR is over \$134 million. We are all aware of the interest charges on that debenture debt which exceeds some \$7 million set in 1972. This figure certainly will increase each year.

There are two ways to relieve this debt burden in our opinion. One is to begin now to pay off the portions of this debt on an annual basis from the general revenues of the province by means of a sinking fund. In this way the capital cost of the construction of the railway will eventually be paid by future generations of the people of Alberta. The second approach to paying off the debt, and possibly it's coupled with the first suggestion which we are doing, is to take all steps possible to increase revenues.

The ARR has met with coal producers - literally all around the world, and certainly the coal producers that control leases within the area and who are potential buyers and producers - and with them explored the possibility of developing their leases and conveying their coal to the railway. This will allow their production to become part of the revenues of the ARR. This approach is in its early phases of research and I would point out to the House that some progress has been made.

Also, McIntyre Porcupine coal production has increased recently and we have renegotiated some contracts with them, both in Japan and the United States. These have helped the revenues in regard to production from their mine.

Procter and Gamble started production in August and are presently shipping six to eight carloads daily of wood pulp such as bleached, semi-bleached and unbleached kraft. We are looking at moving to the ARR some 15 carloads daily, within one year, which should produce a revenue for the ARR of \$1 million.

We have renegotiated rates to improve the revenue position of the ARR. For example, shipments of coal to the U.S.A. via Thunder Bay were made at a rental of \$1.40 per ton, compared to the present 50 cents. Arrangements have been made for shipments to the U.S.A. via Vancouver at a rate of some 75 cents a ton and negotiations are proceeding to substantially increase the tonnage rental rate to the ARR for all shipments, not only to the U.S.A. and Japan but to Europe and South America.

Mr. Speaker, I thought it necessary to review very briefly the events leading up to the signing of this agreement I now wish to table, and also to convey to the House some of the progress we are making on the repair of the ARR and renegotiations of rates.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in the debate on the motion that is before us, I confess that I was trying to prepare my material based on the talks that were given when we were last in session.

I want to say at the outset, Mr. Speaker, that I am particularly pleased with the report the hon. Minister has given today. I want to say to him that, in my view, it is a very positive report. It takes definite action and it deals with a matter I am sure has cost him a great deal of concern in the months he has been in office.

I must say that as I listened to the arguments I had great difficulty in understanding why the motion was placed on the Order Paper in the first place. I was certainly left with a feeling that the backbenchers certainly did not have liaison with the front bench, and did not have the kind of information that would have given them a greater insight into the situation brought forward for discussion by the motion presented by them and is now under discussion.

I was puzzled by the motion being brought before the House in the manner in which it was.

Number one, we have the hon. Minister of Public Works, the Member for Grande Prairie, defending the railway and stating in no uncertain terms that he wanted it to be continued. We had the hon. the Premier, on nearly every trip he made into the North, indicating that he was not against it. Certainly it was a situation he did not dare to be against because of the strong support it received in the North from all sections of the Peace River.

I get the feeling from the previous debates that there was an attempt to show the mistakes that had been made by the previous government. Certainly I would have to say very quickly I have no objection to that being done. However, as I have said on a number of occasions, I think it is important, when we try to criticize a venture, that we try to relate our criticism to the information available at the time a decision was made. In other words, I think that every one of us can have excellent hindsight, and by using the information available to us in 1972 or 1973 it would certainly be possible to look at various aspects of this particular project and say, why was it done?

Having that in mind, I did a little research myself. For example, I have read with a great deal of delight the book, *The National Dream*. In there, for example, I marked the CPR contract for the building of the road from Port Arthur through to the coast. If ever a contract gave excellent benefits to the company it had to be that one. If we want to evaluate it in a matter of dollars, it amounted to many, many millions of dollars. It is not my intention today to go into that contract, although I expected to read the contract to the members of the Legislature.

Then I thought, too, of a number of other projects carried out by Conservative governments in more recent years. I thought of the heavy water plant in Nova Scotia and the subsidies that have been made to it. I thought of the Manitoba Hydro. I'm sure the hon. minister had some of that in his mind. Maybe this was why he was trying to give this particular project the close scrutiny he did. Maybe he also had in mind some of the present investigation going on in regard to Ontario Hydro. Again, I don't know what was in his mind, but it did give me the impression that the approach being used was one of looking back rather than looking forward.

Through you, Mr. Speaker, I want to say to you, hon. minister, that I am very pleased with the approach you took today in outlining, in brief, concise terms, the changes made in the agreement itself, which in your opinion, and I am inclined to share it with you at this point in time, will be for the benefit of Albertans in the future.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that in my view there is no agreement made that cannot be improved upon, and I'm sure that even though we recognize that we have learned men who draw up the agreements for us, that there are times when problems result because of ambiguities or unclear statements contained in them. I am not particularly critical of it except that I am sure the hon. minister understands by now that he himself must depend to a great extent on the legal profession to ensure that the wording of the agreement is such that it will be clear to both parties concerned.

So when it was suggested that we had a poor agreement, all I can say is that I suppose a certain amount of the responsibility will have to reflect back to those who are trained in the art of drawing up agreements for us.

I noticed the last part of the resolution, Mr. Speaker, dealt with the matter of the estimates of the cost of repairs, demonstrating that the benefits would outweigh the costs. As I have been thinking about this for a matter of days and months, I cannot recall a single road built as a result of a cost-benefit analysis made in regard to it. It seems to me that the criteria of determining whether a road is to be built or not is whether it will serve the people, whether or not it will have an impact on a particular region and will lend itself to the improvement or the development of the area it will serve.

To me, that is a rather important objective and a rather important principle, because if we were to look at the building of roads or the building of railways I'm sure that my hon. friend, the hon. Minister of Industry and Commerce, would quickly agree with me that we would not be building railways very quickly; we would not be building roadways into many of the areas where we have built them, but we would be standing pat and saying we're not going to go ahead.

I take my hat off to those people who in the early days had the intestinal fortitude to make the decisions to go ahead with the building of some of our railways, in spite of the fact that it has cost us millions of dollars, that we are continuing to subsidize them today and maybe will for a long time to come.

The hon. minister has said on a number of occasions that transportation is vital to Alberta. I think all of us accept that statement. It is a vital factor relating to the future development of this great province of ours.

I was very interested to hear the hon. the Premier, when he was talking yesterday, refer to the excellent position in which Alberta finds itself. This is not an accident and I'm not going to go back, Mr. Speaker, to try to review the accomplishments of a Social Credit government. History will record it. But I simply want to say that by making the right decisions at the right time we are in a position today to take advantage of new developments in many areas which will make Alberta one of the leading provinces for a long time to come.

Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I had thought that I might very briefly make about four or five points.

Number one, the Alberta Resources Railway was an integral part of resource development. In much of the discussion we have had up to this point, coal has been chiefly dealt with as being the main item about which we were concerned to have transported across this railway. But, Mr. Speaker, we thought of several other mineral resources within the confines of that particular area; gypsum, sulphur, pulp, iron, and of course, as has been mentioned today, a more direct outlet for the produce from the Peace River country to the market areas of the coast and other places.

I'm sure that it will be a direct supply route to untapped areas that we may not even be thinking of at this particular point in time. I am not sure, hon. minister, through you, Mr. Speaker, as to what the role of the railway may be in the development we see within the immediate future in the far north. But I rather suspect that if properly handled it can be a very important link in that particular development.

A great deal of interest has been expressed in the area of tourism. Again, I think we would have to agree that within this area lies some of the greatest tourism potential we have in the province, or as great a tourism potential as we would have anywhere along the line.

Secondly, at the time of building, it certainly provided numerous jobs, which I think is always important.

Thirdly, the rail line was a promise of the Liberals and the Conservatives as far back as the federal election in 1929. It was felt that it was going to be an election issue at that particular time. It didn't turn out to be an issue because both parties at that time said the railway had to be built. All I can say is that in 1965 we came through with a promise made by other parties as far back as 1929, and I think it was the right decision.

Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to belabour the particular resolution except to say again that one government had the responsibility of making a decision and drawing up the best agreement it was able to get at that point in time.

Another government is in power now. It is charged with the responsibility of continuing a project we hope will be there for a long time. We had confidence in the area that it would serve, and we still have. I would like to throw out the challenge to the hon. minister and to the government that they look forward and not back. We are not afraid to admit that mistakes may have been made, but no progress, Mr. Speaker, is made without mistakes.

All I can say is, let's not look backward. Let's look forward. I agreed with the hon. Premier when he said there were great possibilities within this province of ours for development of all kinds. This particular area, I feel confident, will have great potential for secondary industrial development. I think it will lend itself to developments we cannot visualize at this point in time.

All I can say is that we, from this side of the House, will do all we can to help the progress to go forward and to see that we take every advantage of this project in the years that lie ahead. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few brief remarks with regard to this resolution and the remarks that have been made to date.

It is interesting that coal has become very important in the last short while, and it may be a time when this very province may be dependent on coal for energy. Therefore, the whole purpose of the railway becomes more significant.

It has never been said by this government that it would perhaps not have built one. If it is to make progress it will have to have expenses. But one of the aspects of the whole development that has never been put forth, and this government - and I would like to urge the minister - has a responsibility of putting this one aspect to the people, for the people have a right to know.

We would like to know the total number of jobs which have been created by the overall project of that railway. I don't mean just those persons who were hired on railway construction, but the multiplier effect and the hundreds of millions of dollars of money that have been earned in wages alone. I include those who provided material to build the railroad, the taxes that were paid, and the cash that accrued to this province as a credit, to the criticism that was levelled against this big project, and the jobs that are still present today.

We can't overlook the fact that there was tremendous pressure on all sectors of Alberta's economy to provide more jobs. I would like to throw out the thought that perhaps this investment produced more jobs per dollar than many government make-work projects that have no lasting capital benefits whatsoever, or very little. On a dollar for dollar basis, on the total number of employees and the returns, perhaps the job-producing aspect of this venture has to be considered.

I know that the government will sometimes make job programs just to provide jobs. I am not against these things when the situation is desperate, but I wonder whether this would not turn out to be a tremendous factor. The many things that the government does sometimes on job creation is an important factor. That is just one aspect. So I think that the Minister of Industry and Commerce has the facilities, the staff and the knowledge to provide this kind of information.

I believe that the hon. member, Mr. Strom, did a tremendous job in the remarks he made. I was impressed with the fact that he stated that in the past governments have had to sometimes bribe companies and bribe them so dearly that it still hurts the whole country to build. So in comparison, there may have been in hindsight some better ways of doing something.

Even in the construction of a house, an ordinary house, after it has been built two or three people will tell you that it could have been done slightly better and slightly cheaper. But hindsight is always a convenient resort.

I'm not stating that the hon. minister has not done an excellent job in pointing out the debit side of the development, but I would wonder whether this government, in office only slightly more than 24 months, would say they will never build a railway or build anything of any lasting benefit, because should there be a flood or even an earthquake, they might be blamed. Who thought of building a railway there? There was a flood. There are cities built in areas which are flooded 30 or 40 years later. So that is hollow argument - someone should have foreseen.

One can probably say that the engineers are negligent. This happens all the time. Some of the finest engineering companies in the world will build the most expensive bridge. Someone walks across that bridge and it collapses and kills him. So somewhere somebody has to suffer the political consequences.

I would like the minister to take the remark about providing some kind of resume of jobs produced per dollars spent and then, on top of that, to give us a present estimate of the capital worth of the whole railway and not what was started 15 or 20 years ago. I understand that one of the parties testifying before the commission has indicated that if that railway had to be built today the cost would be almost beyond estimate because of the escalation of costs.

This government will also learn that if they embark on any project that is more than a small project and one that takes three, four or five years to build, that is a multi-million dollar project, the estimates are never adequate to cover the projected cost. Even on a small matter like the museum in Calgary, the government has hardly started building and yet they have already revised their estimates upwards. So it is easy to say there was lack of foresight, but this happens all the time and everywhere. It happened to a great extent with the tar sands project in McMurray with GCOS. And I'm sure it would not be surprising if the estimates given by the hon. Premier with regard to the Syncrude development, when he talks about \$700 million, would turn out to be far in excess of a billion looking back five years from now.

So the same reasoning applies here. I for one feel it was a timely project. I do not believe that this side of the House needs to make any apology about the project. I believe that this government has a responsibility to show that it can manage the affairs of this province. The opportunity to make that a viable operation is here. Failure to do so, and to give all the support and all the recognition due to it may well fall on the policy and the management of this government.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, I want to make just a few comments on a remark made by the hon. minister. The minister pointed out that the government would not be paying one cent of the restoration cost, and I want to commend the minister for that attitude. I think it would be a grave mistake if we now bailed out the railway for a mistake that it made and shouldn't have made regarding the location of this railway bed.

When the railway was being located, several engineers in the Department of Highways were very concerned about where it was going. One of our engineers who was well acquainted with the area and located in Grande Prairie even made a boat trip down the Smoky to re-establish what he thought was a very serious error. Other senior engineers in the Department of Highways had comments to make and these were taken to the railway. But the railway took the attitude that highway engineers didn't know how to build a railway, that they were experienced in railway building and that they needed no advice from engineers in the Department of Highways.

I think this was a grave error on the part of the railway. Few people should have been very surprised when the railway washed out, as it was predicted at that time by at least one of the engineers in the Department of Highways, and brought to the attention of the railway at that time. The railway, stubbornly in my view, decided on a location it was evident to people who were well experienced in road building - that would be in danger once the river rose.

So I say the railway should pay for its own mistakes. They should not be charged to the people of this province. I commend the minister for his statement that not one cent will be paid from the general revenue of this province for the restoration of that road bed, which was a bad mistake in the light of all the engineering information that was available to the railway at that time.

MR. DOWLING:

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

MR. SPEAKER:

May the hon. minister adjourn the debate?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

2. Mr. Cookson proposed the following motion to this Assembly, seconded by Mr. Harle:

Be it resolved that the Alberta government consider ways of balancing the impact of the DREE program in Alberta.

MR. COOKSON:

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, in view of the time whether we could go to the next order?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

It was moved by the hon. Member for Lacombe, seconded by the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo that we proceed to the next order. Would all those in favour please say aye?

[The motion was carried.]

PUBLIC BILLS AND ORDERS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Bill No. 208

An Act to Provide for the Protection of News Sources

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, if I might then speak to Bill No. 208. I regret I was having some discussions with regard to the comment of the hon. Member for Lethbridge about the cattle situation. I bring that up, Mr. Speaker, intentionally,

because there is a relationship between the press, the kind of people who operate in the news media and cattlemen. Both are fairly independent kinds of people. Neither don't like too much government interference.

Therefore, in my opinion, the bill should be defeated because of that simple fact. Once you ask government to protect you on one side, you have to expect that government might inspect you on the other. I am sure those of us who have been involved in agriculture can speak, I think, with some authority on that, that once you get too much government involvement, you can have all kinds of things happen.

I am sure the people I know in the news media would tend to agree that they want to remain as free as possible. To keep that freedom means that they shouldn't and wouldn't ask, on their own, for government interference or protection.

So I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the bill be voted down as it's not required by the news media in Canada or in Alberta.

MR. SPEAKER:

May the hon. member conclude the debate?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, the most significant contribution of the Deputy Premier to this thing is that he now is against government interference. That's a tremendous statement, and I'm going to hold him to his commitment because I understand he is a man of his word. But the disaster will come when his Bill No. 57 comes up, because that happens to be a bit of handiwork of government interference in a sinister manner that has never been attempted in this province. So we'll square off on that one. But I like the minister because sometimes we do stand together.

Since this bill was first raised in this House the issue has become a lot more significant. A lot of things have happened in this province, in the United States and elsewhere. We now find that governments will tell you as much as they possibly can of what they want you to know, and they will tell you as little as possible, to the extent of suppressing information, if they don't want you to know something.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Past experience.

MR. LUDWIG:

I haven't put the finger on this government yet. I'll come to that, because I'm now suspicious that one day we'll wake up in this province and instead of the publicity bureau and all the dozens of high-ranking officials we'll have a commissar of propaganda. That is not exactly remote from what is actually happening.

But in the United States the press's view on this matter of protecting reporters, primarily, from the necessity of disclosing the source of their information has shifted to where they were indifferent. Some were opposed. A poll conducted after the imprisonment of a reporter in New Jersey, called Bridges, showed that the majority of the public was in favour of not imprisoning reporters who refused to disclose information they received from a confidential source. So public opinion has shifted.

We had the opinion of two very esteemed and very experienced newsmen in this Assembly, but I believe they are considerably behind the times. I'm not saying that their opinions are not worthy of serious consideration because they represent small papers, but I say that they fail to apprise themselves of what is actually going on.

Since these two gentlemen have us an opinion, the press held a conference in eastern Canada where, almost without exception, they voted in support of some protection being given to reporters. The issue has become entirely different because it was proven in the United States recently - and I'm not going to point my finger at the Watergate affair because there are many other smaller

incidents, equally important - that it is much better to perhaps err on the side of giving the press additional protection than take the chance that perhaps some information the government wants to conceal will not be revealed.

I don't want to approach this issue with the negative view that we are giving somebody power that maybe they don't want or may never exercise. I'm taking the position that the public has a right to be informed, and sometimes the press has to resort to devious ways to get this information. But I'm sure that the people of America today are a lot happier that somehow the press broke one of the most unusual stories that has ever been broken in the Watergate affair than they would be had this been concealed. So the people have nothing to fear of the press even abusing that privilege. There is never any problem of the public suffering because the press may have had someone somewhere who abused the privilege of protection. The threat is that the public may not receive the information that it must have.

Now I'm going, but briefly, to bring this picture back to Canada and to Alberta because something happened in this province that I believe has not really happened elsewhere in Canada before, using public means for the purpose of supplying government information - I'm not accusing the government of giving false information to the people. The press might have to find that out sometimes and it will if the government gives a story that isn't true to the press or to the people.

But quite often a story that comes out from our our publicity bureau may appear to be true but it's only half true and everyone, every politician knows that a half truth is a lot more dangerous to the public than a complete and utter lie. It is known that a half truth given in court can do more damage than someone swearing falsely. So this is a problem.

This government has now moved in a big staff, a tremendously well-organized and well-controlled information bureau. Now I think perhaps that I was a little extreme in saying that one of these days we'll wake up and have a commissar of propaganda, but in some sense of the word that office exists today. It's there. I'm getting bundles of information as fast as I can read it. I read it and throw it away. And they talk about conserving paper in this province. I understand that if anybody will cause a shortage of paper in western Canada it will be this government. They have one of the most sophisticated and well-controlled information propaganda bureaus in the western world and it's getting better and bigger and more controlled as time goes by.

Now I wouldn't say that they hire people primarily to do a little image building for some of the ministers because even that is a necessity sometimes. I watch their advertisements. They are advertising for some kind of public relations manager for the Minister of Public Works. When I inquire and I find out that you have - the information people are anxious to tell you everything that they can tell you regardless of - and I can't disclose names because it's sometimes confidential and I mustn't breach a trust. But sometimes they tell you these publicity managers they advertise for are to help to give the department and primarily the minister a better image. I understand they hired one for the Department of Highways. Now in these two cases I gave, Mr. Speaker, there is some justifiable excuse because I can't think of any two ministers who need their image boosted more than these two.

Nevertheless, even if their image will look better, will it be a true image or false image? Because we know what they do and what they can't do, and what they say they'll do and don't do, but they're not concerned about us here. This is for the public. So they are going to take what one might sometimes even assess as some pretty obvious deadwood and touch it up and blow it up out of all proportion and say that you've got a real mover here, that you've got a minister that if it weren't for the Premier he'd be the best, so we're caught in this kind of thing.

Now one can say that that may be a distorted image of a minister, but if they were happy with his image they wouldn't be spending public funds. I understand that bureau had a tremendously fat budget but they're spending well in line with if not ahead of their own budget. I'll be surprised if they're under it, but let the Provincial Treasurer tell us, are they not heavy on propaganda in this province, perhaps heavier than ever before.

But in any case the move by the government to tell you what they want and perhaps not tell you any more is, in my opinion, rather obvious. And I haven't made the accusation, Mr. Speaker, that they are going to deliberately withhold information, but they're not obliged to tell you the whole thing. Even when the hon. Premier speaks sometimes, he will not tell it. He will talk about the side that pleases him and not say anything about the side that may make him look

better. So the principle and the attitude and the intention is there, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please. The Chair is having increasing difficulty in connecting the relevance of the hon. member's remarks to the bill which is under debate.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, might I explain that if perhaps I may have gone slightly remote, I don't think I was as remote as the hon. Deputy Premier. He started with cattle, and if there is significance in the product of the cattle industry, sometimes there is significance in the product of the politician. But I thought he was remote.

I will restrict myself to the relevance of news disclosures by the government, the threat of not giving us the whole truth and nothing but the truth, and the responsibility of the press. There is a direct relationship between the necessity of a reporter going into the publicity bureau - and there are various ways of seducing information out of that bureau - and they get from a confidential source information he may not want to reveal. If he tells, Mr. Speaker, there may be a firing and there may be an embarrassment. I see that the minister of propaganda is blushing already and I haven't even lit into him yet. So the relationship is there, Mr. Speaker. I know the hon. minister has recognized the relationship, so I would like to proceed in this vein.

The complete approach to this issue has changed. When I first brought in this bill somebody accused me of politicking. It was unpopular to bring in a bill like that. Many people who told me they liked this and this and this, the numerous things I do, didn't like this one. So it was not a matter of what someone said, that it may have been political mileage. I believe one of the newsmen said that. That was untrue, and I believe since then he has recognized it. I don't think he'll get a chance to speak again on this bill, not in this session anyway.

But public opinion has now changed. In my opinion, it has changed considerably because of the image of politicians, particularly in the United States, and the need, no matter how, for the press to come up with the goods. Even though we are not in any way comparing what's happening here to what's happening in the United States, it can happen in this province. Because of the manner in which news is being screened and prepared by professional newswriters, by professional image makers, and is going to the public, the threat is here. It is no use closing the barn door after the horse is stolen.

It is an opposition member's responsibility to warn, caution, criticize and expose the possibility of the government creating the impression that it's telling you everything. But it will tell you only what it wants to tell you and no more.

Somehow the people can be lulled into believing that because these people are very PR oriented - and that might even be an understatement in view of what has happened in this House, even in the last day - that image is important and anything that might detract from the image might be suppressed. The press in this province should be allowed to seek its information in whatever manner it can as it has done, without the threat of having to reveal that information. I believe that maybe in Alberta at the present date they really don't need this yet. Perhaps this is advanced reasoning and this bill may be a bit ahead of what the Conservatives generally would think.

But things are moving awfully quickly in this day and age, not as they used to in the '30s and '40s. A lot more can happen in a month now as compared to what used to happen in ten years. This has been shown to be so in the United States where as late as two or three days ago the Vice-President was denying everything and the press held the evidence in front of him and he backed off.

So, Mr. Speaker, I feel that the hon. Deputy Premier did not do his homework. He doesn't know what is happening in Canada at the present time on this issue, that the press even though they are individualists, and some may object, some may disagree - has by and large shifted its position. Saying that the press doesn't need protection in this regard, they don't want government interference, is an innocuous approach to the whole issue because there is a threat. There is a threat of government propaganda. There is a threat of concealment. There is a threat of misleading by packaging.

I am saying, Mr. Speaker, that this is a timely issue. It will become more evident as the months roll by that this bill ought to be supported. We will lose nothing by giving the bill sanction and putting it into law in this province. Alberta has shown leadership in many issues of reform in the past and our Premier is almost obsessed with the idea of wanting to be first. Here is a chance to move ahead of the common everyday thinking and show there is some reform orientation in the government. Move ahead of the times and establish a bill that can do very little harm but can be the vehicle of a tremendous amount of good, Mr. Speaker.

[The motion for second reading was defeated.]

Bill No. 211 An Act to amend The Child Welfare Act

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, on March 29, 1973 I had the opportunity of introducing this bill. Subsequent to that, on May 4, 1973, the government introduced Bill No. 21, The Child Welfare Amendment Act under the sponsorship of Mr. Calvin Lee, the Member for Calgary McKnight.

May I first say that because the objective in introducing my bill was to bring greater attention and awareness to the serious and tragic problem of child abuse, I greeted the introduction of the government's bill, which was very similar to mine, with a positive and encouraging response.

There were four main reasons for this, Mr. Speaker. The first was that, although many children-oriented groups and the medical society had been aware of the problem and had set up a registry on a voluntary basis, there was no full-time person in the entire province of Alberta working or dealing exclusively with the problem of child abuse. And that feeling was confirmed today by the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development when he tabled the answer to Question 232 on the Order Paper wherein he said in part "There are no employees who are working exclusively in the area of child abuse." To me the introduction of the bill was a commitment to provide full-time trained staff to deal with child battering.

Secondly, the previous and existing Child Welfare Act, although requesting the reporting of the knowledge of child battering, had no mandatory provisions. Clearly that system was not working adequately. Although I do prefer a voluntary system, I felt that the government bill had considerable merit in the commitment to ensure maximum success in a preventive way and I had felt that the bill should have been launched long ago.

My third reason, Mr. Speaker, was that citizens generally and people aware of the problems specifically, had no previous mechanism in which they could deal with the problem effectively. In fact, there have been reported cases where incidents of child abuse have been reported to the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. It seemed strangely odd to me, that although we provide for protection of animals, we had no vehicle set up specifically for the prevention of ill-treatment of our most valuable human resource, the child.

My fourth reason, Mr. Speaker, and probably the one that was the most encouraging, was that from the time I had introduced the bill to the day in which the government introduced its bill, I had received over 70 letters and submissions from individuals and organizations throughout the province expressing their support for this type of legislation. And I might add, Mr. Speaker, that I am still receiving letters encouraging the implementation of this system. Clearly then, the Legislature and the government, in my mind, had a strong and sincere mandate from a wide cross section of Albertans to deal with this problem decisively and quickly.

A number of the organizations that we received feedback from included the Boy Scouts of Canada, the Soroptomist Club of Medicine Hat, the Independent Order of the Daughters of the Empire, the provincial employees. We received letters of support from the Alberta Women's Institute, from churches of all denominations, from school boards, from aldermen, from the Alberta Council on Child and Family Welfare, and the Alberta Human Rights and Civil Liberties Association, as well as many others.

Mr. Speaker, if this information that I have received would be of any help and assistance in encouraging the Minister of Health and Social Development to get on with the implementation of the legislation that has already been passed in this Legislature this year, I would be happy to make my file available to him, so he can see the length and breadth of the support that is encouraging the implementation of the existing legislation.

So you can see, Mr. Speaker, I was very optimistic when I first introduced my bill and when the government introduced their bill, about the possibilities of solving this perplexing and complex problem. But I do not share that enthusiasm at this time because I am disappointed that the government has done virtually nothing to implement the bill since it was approved last spring.

Mr. Speaker, the government bill provided for the establishment of a central registry. To date, as near as I can determine, no central registry has been established. The government bill provided for a full-time staff person to look after the matter. At this date we do not know if any staff person has been appointed.

Mr. Speaker, in the proposed Bill No. 21 that was passed a reporting system was promised. To date no reporting system has been established and no Zenith phone number has been selected or implemented.

At the introduction of the bill, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member for Calgary McKnight proclaimed proudly his government's commitment to protecting the human rights of the child. Yet today we are no closer to solving the problem than we were five months ago.

Just recently the Department of Health and Social Development was called by an individual who asked to speak to the person in charge of the central registry. Five telephone transfers later it was realized that no central registry existed.

Mr. Speaker, just one month ago today I spoke to a prominent Calgary physician who was active in the Canadian health field in the child abuse area. He expressed surprise in learning that the government had, in fact, passed the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of questions that I must ask the government. The first one that I would ask is for someone on the government side to stand up today and give a clear answer as to what has been done, if anything, in implementing this legislation.

The second is with regard to the Parents Anonymous groups that have been set up in Calgary and Edmonton. How will the government handle the legislation in regard to the operation of these groups? I would be most interested, as would several others in the province, to know how the Parents Anonymous groups' knowledge of child abuse can be applied to the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I would also invite the government to advise today who are the members of the advisory committee that was to be established, and when can we expect them to start functioning if they haven't as yet?

Also, Mr. Speaker, the government indicated that rehabilitation, treatment and education would be part of the ongoing program both for the battered child and for the child batterer. I would be interested to learn what the government has done in the past five months in this regard and what they plan to do in the future.

Mr. Speaker, a provincial family court judge recently indicated to me, during discussion of this issue, that it would be far safer to return battered children to their parents than to place them in foster homes because he suggested that the incidence of child abuse is ten times higher in foster homes than in private homes. Now this gentleman shocked me a great deal, but until we get the central registry and the reporting system going we will not have the statistics to confirm or deny such an opinion. I think it is very, very important that we should get on with the job.

Now, Mr. Speaker, another question that I would invite the government to respond to would be with regard to the central registry. Once a child batterer, for example a parent, has had his name listed in the central registry, are there any conditions under which he would ever have his name removed, such as having had psychiatric treatment or whatever was required? I would like to know of the government's opinions in this regard and how they propose to handle that situation.

Further, Mr. Speaker, I would like the government to tell me whether or not a person whose name has been entered on the file will be advised that his name is on the central registry as having been suspected of child abuse or battery?

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to remind the government that while we sit here today discussing the matter, children and babies are being subjected to cruel and severe treatment by parents and others. Perhaps through the proper

implementation of the spirit of the legislation that was approved last spring some of this might be prevented.

Mr. Speaker, I challenge the government to answer the questions and get on with the job.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I certainly welcome the opportunity of saying a few words in respect to the hon. member's bill, Bill No. 211, and respond to his invitation to do just that.

I want to comment first on the extraordinary way in which he has chosen to present his bill. In the course of making his remarks today, one would have thought that it was a government bill and that he was directing questions at me that I would answer when I get to the point of making my remarks. Instead, he debated a bill that had already been passed, as he pointed out, earlier this year and did not say all that much about the bill that he was proposing. I can understand that there would be reasons for that because it's not a very substantial bill when compared with the one that was passed in the spring. It covers only part of the ground. He did not, for himself, build a case for the bill at all. However, I will speak to the bill itself, Mr. Speaker, and say that the need for the passing of it has indeed ceased to exist as of the month of May this year. That by itself should settle in the minds of all hon. members what to do with this bill.

However, I don't want to fail to take the opportunity of saying a few things in regard to the subject matter generally which, I think, can be properly related to the broad subject matter raised by the bill and in that sense is still appropriate for me to remark upon.

I think I should say to the hon. member that I have no difficulty in acknowledging on his part a keen and intelligent interest in the subject, and one that no member of the House would quarrel with. The work he has done in this respect is certainly in keeping with a fine sense of responsibility for the welfare of children and I don't want to take anything away from him in that respect. At the same time, I think it's not fair to indicate to the government that an effort to produce a workable system to follow up the important principle that was declared in the legislation passed this spring has not all of a sudden triumphantly succeeded in bringing into effect every stipulation of a bill only a few months old.

Hon. members know the legislative process well enough to know that as far as this legislation is concerned, it rates well with any in the country on the subject. The implementation process is a matter important enough that the proper working out of the arrangements to bring them into effect is a normal consequence of any bill passed on any subject. When we are in the month of October and talking about legislation finalized in May, I don't think the suggestion that there is an unwarranted delay is one that will stand up or be considered valid by anyone.

I think the very people who have been in touch with the hon. member and certainly with me, and no doubt with other members to comment on what has been enacted in this field in the government bill that was submitted by the hon. Member for Calgary McKnight earlier this year, understand that what we are really trying to achieve is a correct and careful and full treatment of the type of difficulty that has long existed and had not been treated for many, many years. If, and as I will shortly indicate, probably within the next couple of months, what we would call a full implementation will be achieved, that is progress unprecedented in this field.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the comment I made about Bill No. 211 not having gone perhaps as far as it should, I thought that I would refer to the punishment proposal section. In that sense, I think it's the wrong approach at the present time.

The hon. Member for Calgary Bow noted in his remarks that the government had opted for a system which would be more oriented towards education of the public generally and potential child batterers, rather than the fierce type of reaction that sometimes emotionally one would want to see when he knows of a particular case, a particular child battered on a particular occasion.

I just wanted to say that we have to keep our heads at times like this. It is very easy to get worked up and say that immediately there should be fines and imprisonment, but careful and cool contemplation will tell you that the real problem is not usually solved by lashing out at unfortunate people who have

family or emotional problems. The way it is resolved is by people knowing the causes of this type of thing happening, beginning to understand themselves a little bit in respect to it and gaining a little bit now and then in their understanding of children and their problems and why these things happen in a family.

Therefore the prospect of better education of both public and parents individually who may find themselves in a situation of being or developing into a child batterer is far more important than the provision for prompt prosecution.

It is our intention, as I believe I expressed to the House before, that there be no prosecutions under this Act for failure to report. Of course, the reporting system is the one of the important new features of the bill, but an educational program is considered to be superior to that. We will review it over a period of time. If the government is forced to the conclusion that one of the essential ingredients in making the new system work in the reporting of offences - making that workable - is that a prosecution clause of a stronger nature is required, well then, we would regretfully take that step. But we think there are other solutions that are better and that will come ahead of that.

The only other reference to the bill that I might make is simply that Section 41(1) as proposed by the hon. member is not that different from the clause relating to Section 41(1) that appeared in the government bill. I don't think there need be any disagreement or any further change in that type of wording at the present time.

The hon. member has criticised the government for not taking certain steps in regard to the establishment of the registry and bringing it fully into working order. But at the same time, the bill as submitted by him, of course, had no reference whatever to the establishment of a registry. We think that is a very important feature of it. It is certainly considered one of the contemporary steps to take in this field at the present time. We do believe that the work to be done, difficult as it will be to get it properly established and introduced and workable over a period or time, will have good effect over the years and will, in fact, be a contributing factor in saving at least some children from the personal tragedy in their lives and the lives of their parents that is now occurring when a battering takes place.

Mr. Speaker, with the indulgence of the House, I think I will perhaps add a few words in regard to the progress in bringing the new bill into effect. The answer I gave the hon. Member for Calgary Bow yesterday indicated that the necessary approval of funds by the cabinet for the introduction of the new registry had been accomplished during the summer, following the legislation passed in the spring, and that recruiting was underway.

I indicated to him at that time that I did not know who was taking the responsibility for the directing of the registry. The presumption was and is that the director of child welfare has the overall responsibility for it, but the registry will, in due course, have its own supervisor. I hoped that there would be no difficulty over the fact that in the terminology we've used we have been referring, I think, on both sides to the director of the registry. So I just draw that clarification now. Whether he's called the director or not, it is a position that will be under the jurisdiction, of course, of the appropriate branch of the department. He will be a supervisor of an office that will not and need not be large.

Then the authorization for the recruiting of staff includes six new social workers, four clerks and one regional office unit supervisor, as well as the supervisor of the registry itself. The advertising for that specific position will take place this month and we expect that it would possibly be filled by December 1, but let us say that the target date will be the end of the year. The Zenith telephone number, to which reference had been made, will appear in all of the new directories that come out in the spring. It has been worked out with the telephone companies that it will appear in the front sections in the next editions as they come out.

After the supervisor is on the job, as early as possible during the month of December the beginning stages of the education program that I referred to will be undertaken. That will involve circulation throughout the province to doctors, public health nurses, schools and hospitals of information in regard to the program. There will likely be some newspaper advertising at the same time.

The hon. member asked me yesterday one other question in regard to whether or not, as a result of the legislation, there might have been an increase in the

number of reports. I say again the reports at the present time are being handled in the way that such reports had always been. The department is able to handle the reports as they come in, which they have been, pending the actual appointment of the supervisor. The answer to that particular question is that apparently there has been a slight increase in the number of reports received, no doubt partly as a result of the publicity given to the new Act when it was passed. That, I'm sure, will be of interest to hon. members. It's certainly of interest to me, and I think when the end of the year is reached, and the steps I've outlined have been taken, we would expect quite a lot of activity in that subdivision of the Child Welfare branch of the department.

So, Mr. Speaker, those are the remarks that I wanted to add on a general discussion of the subject which was covered by the hon. member's Bill No. 211. I say again that, interesting and important as the area is, since the passage of the bill in the spring the events in the meantime make it unnecessary to proceed with Bill No. 211 at the present time.

I thought when the hon. member got up today it might be possible that he was going to make that remark and withdraw his bill and he didn't do that. He may perhaps still want to do so. There is no need to have it voted on. It would be confusing to vote on it at the present time if it was passed, because the very subsections that were passed in May are not, of course, worded precisely the same as the ones the hon. member proposes. So it would leave the members on this side with little alternative other than to vote against the hon. member's proposal on the grounds I've mentioned, that the time has gone past when this particular bill is still required.

So, Mr. Speaker, I have no formal suggestion to make to the hon. member about withdrawal. I just want to say that I was glad to have the opportunity to at least discuss the subject generally.

MR. SPEAKER:

It would appear that the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development has, in a very kindly phraseology, raised a point of order. There is some grave doubt in my mind as to whether this bill may be voted on for second reading. I must confess to a lack of alertness in regard to the similarity of the text and, subject to argument or representation from the members, of similarity in principle of this bill with sections of the bill which was passed this spring.

I wonder if there are any members who would like to express an opinion on this particular point of order.

MR. LUDWIG:

I don't want to take issue with your recommendation but since the debate has progressed and a minister of the Crown has participated in a debate and has raised matters that may need to be - I'm not sure if anybody else wants to participate - even though it may have been an oversight it's not one that's detrimental to any business of the House.

I would like to recommend that this debate continue if any hon. members wish to participate because it would be unfair to permit two people to indulge in a debate, no matter what the circumstances and then say, the rest of us shut down. I don't think that is fair. I don't think that this exchange of expression of opinion by the minister and the mover has in any way been a detriment to the proceedings of the House and allowing the opportunity for anyone else to express himself would be the preferable decision.

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, speaking to the point of order, it is my concern that if we allow the present bill on the Order Paper to come up for a vote, we are going to put the House in an almost impossible position. I don't think we have to refer to the passage in Beauschiesne that once a subject matter has been dealt with in a particular session, it is very specific that it cannot be dealt with again.

I would suggest that as the mover and the minister have both had an opportunity to express their views, further discussion should not be allowed and the bill should, in fact, be withdrawn.

MR. BENOIT:

Mr. Speaker, if I may, I would like to raise another question which may only confuse the issue. If subject matters are brought up in this House, I'm wondering if they ought not to be dealt with in the order in which they are

brought up. In this particular instance, the government bill was in the House after this bill and yet this bill is receiving consideration after the government bill.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make one or two comments on the point of order. I think the point of order is well taken. There is certainly much overlapping as was pointed out by the mover and by the hon. minister. However, it is not completely covered in the motion, that is, in the Act. There are some differences and it seems to me that it does provide the vehicle to discuss child abuse which may lead to the deletion of certain clauses in the present bill in the Committee of the Whole and the addition of other clauses that will complement and supplement the present Act.

Consequently, since it is not completely similar, I would suggest also, since the debate has been permitted to go this far, that it should be continued through the second reading. If there are no amendments in the Committee of the Whole that would supplement or complement the points of differences in order that the hon. members may debate same or vote on same, then I believe the bill could properly be withdrawn. But since there is not a complete similarity at this stage, I believe it would be a mistake to declare the bill out of order.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, speaking on the point of order. I would suggest that it would be well for the Assembly to continue the debate.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that there is at least one important difference in principle here between Bill No. 211 and Bill No. 21. That is the fact that Bill No. 211 suggests or states that there must be mandatory reporting, for as the minister has quite properly pointed out, in Bill No. 21 much more emphasis is placed on education. So it seems to me there is a significant enough difference in this basic part of the principle of the bill that it would be well for us to continue the debate. And just to add to the comments already made, since we've spent the better part of half an hour already debating it, it would be well if we conclude the afternoon on this subject.

MR. SPEAKER:

There is undoubtedly, as all members are aware, a rule which is well known, and that is that the Assembly may not at the same session debate the same matter twice, particularly when it has been brought to a conclusion.

Now it would seem to me that the principle of this bill has already been adopted in the adoption in principle of the bill which was passed, and that the slight differences which there are between the two bills are not so fundamental that the intent of the bill which is before the House could not have been achieved by an amendment to the one which was already passed.

Under the circumstances, and in view of the somewhat doubtful situation that we are in, I would respectfully suggest if the House agrees, we might continue the debate until the conclusion of this afternoon's sitting and then perhaps I might refer to the matter again next Tuesday.

MR. CLARK:

With regard to your comments saying that you will refer to the matter next Tuesday. I could make one additional point for your consideration. I would ask you to consider the particular circumstances under which this bill was introduced. The bill came in, later on a government bill came in, and to a very great degree took several portions out of this bill and, in fact, it became law.

I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that in making a decision in this area you would keep in mind the effect that your ruling would have on private members' day and, in fact, on bills introduced by private members. I think that is crucial, especially now that we have the two sessions. I'm sure no member of the Assembly would want any ruling to mitigate against the effectiveness of private members' bills which are discussed during this hour once a week.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, speaking to the point of order, I agree with your decision that we should carry on today because private member's day and the debate has started.

I think you are wise in saying that you are going to have to make a ruling because we are going to be faced with the same decision when Bills No. 203 and 204 come before the House. They are in a similar category, so I think the House is going to have to decide, through you, Mr. Speaker, just how we are going to handle these situations. Hon. members introduce bills, then a few days later or a few weeks later - whatever the time may be - at least within the session, bills are being introduced.

I think it is important that we do get a decision, particularly in light of the fact that two other bills in a similar category are going to be debated, if allowed to, in the next few days.

MR. SPEAKER:

Having regard to the effect which a ruling might have on the proceedings of next Thursday afternoon, I'll endeavour to reach a decision by Monday, and make it known on Monday so that members will be able to anticipate what may happen when the matter comes up again.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make one or two comments on the bill. I think the principle of child abuse is something that is important to every hon. member, something that crosses all partisan or political considerations. Any child who is abused certainly will not be able to make the contribution he normally could make in later life.

To think only of the physical abuse of a child, I think is putting it in too narrow a category. Most of us think of the abuse of a child as somebody battering them or ill treating them physically. Of course this is to be deplored, and I think the action that is contemplated by the bill that has been passed is very good. I like the positive approach of this section, put in after this bill came in, because it does give the opportunity to do something about it, to find out why the person, the abuser, is mistreating a child. I think it's very important to make sure the child isn't abused physically, but also important to find out why that abuse was being carried out. It may not only help the child, but rehabilitate the abuser of the child. I think that is important too. The main thing I'd like to speak about today is, that in my view, the abuse of a child should not be limited to physical abuse.

I have in mind a boy at a camp who once said to me when he was going home, "I hate to go home." Well, any boy scout camp or any camp that is properly run tries to instill into the child a greater love of parents, a greater love of home, so that child appreciates home and mother and dad more than he ever did before. When a child hates to go home there is something that needs looking into. I said to the boy, "Why do you hate to go home? You should love to go home and appreciate your mother and father more." He said, "But I never see my mother and father. They are always in the beer parlor and I have to be home all alone and make my own meals," and so on.

Well, Mr. Speaker, even though the boy was 11 years of age and perhaps able to look after himself to a degree, this in my view is abuse. It had an effect on the mind of that boy to the extent that he hated his own home. While this type of abuse may be difficult to deal with, more difficult than physical abuse, I think it is just as detrimental to the future of a child, maybe even more so than physical abuse.

I have in mind another boy who, I think, illustrates another type of abuse. This isn't common but it does happen. This boy was supposed to be the terror of his town. When I was told about the boy and he was pointed out to me, my remark was, "You mean that little kid is abusing the town?" They said, "Yes, don't let his nice face and his tender years fool you." Well, this was at a camp also, and at the end of camp everyone was amazed at how this boy responded, at the way he had contributed to the success of the camp. On the last day I said to him, "Do you mind if I ask you a personal question?" He said, "No." I said, "How come you have so much trouble in your town?" He said, "Well, everybody down there thinks I'm a crook. When there is a store broken into the police come to my home first. Whatever happens in the town that's bad, they always come to my house. Everybody thinks I'm all bad. So what's the use of trying to be good in an environment like that?" I said, "Well, out here you didn't act that way." He said, "No, because everybody out here treated me right and I wanted to make the camp a success."

I think, with all respect that most of them do this, occasionally constables on every police force like to head to one place when something happens,

particularly in smaller towns and hamlets. I deplore this type of action. I know several lads on whom this had a very detrimental effect.

I visited a boy in Bowden several years ago and asked him how come he ever got into a place like that. He had been a wolf cub, as a matter of fact in my own pack, a splendid lad from a splendid home. His reply was, "I stole one car. I made a mistake. I was never going to do it again." He said, "After that my dad wouldn't talk to me. He didn't talk to me for three years. Everybody thought I was completely bad. So what is the use of trying to hit your head against a wall?"

Mr. Speaker, I feel that abuse is not limited just to physical abuse. I think we should also in the department - and I hope the department is doing - pay attention to some of these other types of abuse that have a detrimental effect on the disposition and thinking of a boy or girl. As they grow up with the wrong thinking they begin to think everybody is against them, and they then can't make the proper contribution to society that they otherwise could make.

MR. BENOIT:

Mr. Speaker, I have only one comment on this bill, and that is the fact that it would be pretty difficult in some circumstances for those who are determining whether they are going to report or not, to determine whether the child is being abused or being corrected by the parent. There is a great deal of difference in the opinions of people as to what constitutes a method of correcting a child and what constitutes abuse. Some people do not believe in using any kind of physical force whatsoever to discipline their child, whereas others are old-fashioned enough to believe that you spare the rod and spoil the child. It could easily be that there are some people who are simply correcting their child and they would be reported as having abused the child.

For this reason I think that if this bill were put into effect a great deal will depend upon the persons who are responsible for accepting reports as to how they will deal with them and what will constitute the difference between correction and abuse.

MR. DIXON:

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

MR. SPEAKER:

Has the hon. member leave to adjourn the debate?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I move that we call it 5:30 and the House do now adjourn until tomorrow afternoon at 1:00 o'clock.

MR. SPEAKER:

The House stands adjourned until tomorrow afternoon at 1:00 o'clock.

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