

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTATitle: **Thursday, October 13, 1977 2:30 p.m.**

[The House met at 2:30 p.m.]

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: **INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS**

DR. WALKER: Mr. Speaker, it's a distinct privilege for me to introduce to you today, and through you to the members of this House, three very distinguished gentlemen from the United Kingdom. They represent British Airways, which I'm glad to say is moving its reservations office from Montreal to Vancouver next January, and has also opened offices in both Edmonton and Calgary. I'm also assured by them that the Concorde will arrive this afternoon in Calgary at 4 o'clock.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Basil Bampfylde, controller of route divisions, British Airways; Mr. Geoff Bridges, manager for Canada; and Mr. David Savage, district manager for northern Alberta, are seated in the members gallery.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure today to introduce to you, and through you to the members of this Assembly, 40 students from Alberta Vocational Centre. They are accompanied by their teacher Diane Harskamp. They are seated in the public gallery, and I would ask that they stand and be acknowledged by the members of the Assembly.

head: **ORAL QUESTION PERIOD****Bilateral Trade Negotiations**

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the first question to the Premier. In light of the Premier's statement yesterday that he's not too optimistic about GATT negotiations, I'd like to ask whether the Alberta government intends to continue to push for provincial participation in these negotiations.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, yes we definitely do. I didn't want to give the House any impression that we will in any way let up on strong efforts to assure that the Canadian position on the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade reflects a western and Alberta point of view. The recent meetings in Ottawa with the federal government, attended by the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Business Development and Tourism, reflect that point of view, and continual work will be done by officials. I was merely putting a position forward that we shouldn't rely on anticipating that through the General Agreement on Tariffs

and Trade, there would be some significant breakthroughs, and we should use other approaches such as bilateral negotiations.

But I want to assure the hon. Leader of the Opposition we do not intend to restrain in any way our efforts to assure that an Alberta and western position is fully in the minds of the Canadian negotiators as the negotiations develop.

MR. CLARK: A further supplementary question to the Premier. The Premier also indicated Alberta would continue to push for bilateral negotiations with the United States, and that Alberta would play a prominent role in those negotiations. Will that prominent role involve joint federal/provincial representation to the United States? Or is it the intention of the government to have direct Alberta government representation to various governmental agencies in the United States?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I think we've made it clear on a number of occasions that if we think it's in the Alberta public interest to take any direct action in terms of discussions with people in the United States that might improve access for our farmers in particular, we intend to take that action directly. Of course in all these cases we will advise the federal government and the appropriate federal officials that we're doing so. The approach, though, in terms of these bilateral discussions is hopefully in co-operation with the federal government. But it won't always be strictly a co-operative federal/provincial effort; there will be times when we'll take some provincial initiatives.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Premier. Has the Alberta government made representation to the federal government with regard to Alberta ministers or Alberta representatives making up a portion of a federal/provincial negotiating group with the United States?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, with regard to matters that affect Alberta and might ensue as a result of any proposal that develops for a prebuilding of the Alcan pipeline, the answer to that question is definitely yes. And that's the understanding with the federal government.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, then a supplementary question to the Premier. Was there Alberta ministerial representation in the negotiations at Ottawa and later in Washington prior to the announcement made by the Prime Minister of Canada and the President of the United States about the decision to go ahead with the pipeline?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, yes. As I mentioned in my remarks yesterday, there was full co-operation. The negotiating team came to Alberta and met with officials of the Alberta government. There was ministerial discussion by a number of the Alberta ministers. There was direct discussion on those negotiations by myself with the Prime Minister.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I might rephrase the question so the Premier might be able to give me a more direct answer. Who was the Alberta minister involved in the discussions in Ottawa and Washing-

ton when the negotiations on the pipeline were taking place between Canada and the United States?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I believe the hon. Leader of the Opposition perhaps does not understand my answer.

MR. CLARK: I understand it very well.

MR. LOUGHEED: Let's wait to make sure. What occurred and what I think was the appropriate position was a recognition that this was a negotiation between the federal governments of Canada and the United States. The letter of July 29 that I tabled in the House set forth a number of Alberta concerns. What occurred was full co-operation and full liaison — and we have no cause for complaint with regard to it — between the negotiating team of the Canadian government and the Alberta government. We were fully aware at all levels as to what was occurring. There were frequent telephone conversations. There was no attempt on our part to impose ourselves within the negotiating arena.

But there was a clear understanding by the federal minister involved, Mr. MacEachen, as to the Alberta point of view on each and every item in that negotiation. I don't know how you can have better federal/provincial relationships than that. We don't get it in a lot of other cases.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, one last supplementary question to the Premier on this matter. Did the Alberta government request of the Prime Minister that an Alberta minister sit in on those negotiations in Ottawa and Washington?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I do think the level of our concern with the federal government has reached an ebb where we're not prepared to take undertakings by the federal government that they won't take certain positions without clearing them with us. I don't see how the Leader of the Opposition can have it both ways: on one hand taking the point of view, or implying, that we should not take direct initiatives on our part, then suggesting we should force our way into meetings. It simply isn't a consistent position. What we've done is the perfect position for Alberta. We've established a clear position of co-operation with the federal government, we've kept open our channels with the United States government, and the people who are going to benefit are the people of Alberta.

Hospital System Reorganization

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a second question to the Premier. Has a final decision been made on the question of the Alberta Hospital Services Commission and the Alberta health commission being disbanded in order to create a single-line department of hospitals and medicare?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I thought I dealt with that in my remarks yesterday. The answer is yes.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Premier. Does the appointment of Dr. Bradley as a special adviser to the Premier indicate that a

permanent medical advisory position is being created within the Executive Council?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I think I have said on a number of occasions that in addition to the applied health research that's now within the appropriations of the capital projects division, we are in the process of attempting to work out with a ministerial group that involves the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower, the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care, the Minister of Social Services and Community Health, and myself, an approach to long-term pure basic medical research.

Dr. Bradley is working directly with me on a contract for a period of two years to develop the structure where we may have what I think will prove to be one of the finest, if not the finest, medical research plan on a pure research basis that would exist in a country.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister, the hon. Mr. Miniely. Is the minister in a position to indicate whether he has advertised for applications for the position of chief deputy minister or deputy minister of this new department?

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Speaker, I will be saying a great deal more about this entire subject with respect to the decision which I and my colleagues have made to disband the commissions. The principle of not carrying on the commission form of government referred to by the hon. leader as a buffer, which we know was a predisposition of the Social Credit Party in Alberta ... I'll be making lengthier remarks during the course of debate on the bill.

The answer is that concurrent with departmentalization, the Premier and I are advertising nationally for the best possible person we can get to fulfil the role of the hospital side of the portfolio, which will be a very key and important role in this largest of public expenditure areas, being the hospital system in Alberta and deputy minister of hospitals.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, then one last supplementary question to the minister. Would the minister like to give a commitment to the Assembly today that one Jackson Willis, who is a consultant to the minister, will not be the new deputy minister of that new department?

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. leader is making a submission of his personal view — that the special adviser who has worked on a consulting basis with me in the portfolio, and who has made a major contribution to analysing certain areas in terms of where we're getting in the portfolio to this point — is making a personal reference and submission as the hon. leader that he has something personal against Mr. Willis applying for the job, we would accept that as a submission.

Certainly I would say that from the beginning Mr. Willis has indicated to me, in connection with his contract responsibilities as special adviser to the portfolio, that while he was interested in working on that basis to provide assistance at my direct request as the minister in assessing certain areas to help the portfolio reach this stage — and in my view has made an outstanding contribution to the portfolio in getting it

to this stage — [he] has never been interested in a long-term public service career as deputy minister.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, just one last question to the minister. Mr. Minister, in the last portion of your answer you indicated a long-term career as deputy minister. My question is: will you assure the Assembly that he will not be deputy minister at all?

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Speaker, from my perspective as minister, what I am trying to say is that if he would be prepared to accept the deputy minister role, I think he would make an outstanding candidate. But he's not prepared to accept it.

Calgary Annexation Proposals

MR. GHITTER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to find out what the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs has been doing over the summer, and ask him first whether or not he has received the report from the Local Authorities Board relating to the Calgary annexation proposals.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I have not received those reports.

MR. GHITTER: Mr. Speaker, would the minister advise then as to when he anticipates he will be receiving these long-overdue reports?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, as the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo should know, the LAB will be in Calgary in November holding some final hearings with respect to the Local Authorities Board proceedings on certain annexations there. Three or four of them have not yet been heard and, as you know, the city of Calgary has made application for an overall hearing. If the hon. member would care to review the whole process, he would see that we would like to see all the hearings held before we had an opportunity to deal with any one of them.

MR. GHITTER: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Being aware of the Local Authorities Board hearing on November 18 in the city of Calgary, is it the government's position that they do not wish to receive the reports from the Local Authorities Board until these hearings are completed?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, the very fact that the LAB has not presented it to Executive Council means that they would like to weigh fully the overall position brought down in June 1977 by the city of Calgary. We think the city council's position in weighing the overall direction of growth for the city of Calgary is a very important position, since the decision with respect to boundary adjustments at this point will affect the future of that city for some 15 or 20 years.

MR. GHITTER: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister advise whether or not it is the government's position that the role of the Local Authorities Board is to be the adviser of government rather than an autonomous body making reports to the Legislature of the province of Alberta?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, currently that would require me to interpret some of the legislation. The LAB is now set up under three different pieces of legislation. Its responsibilities and role in dealing with intermunicipal disputes with respect to land, rural to urban, are clearly spelled out in that legislation.

MR. GHITTER: Mr. Speaker, I'm not asking for an interpretation of the legislation. I'd be more interested in the minister's view as to the role of the Local Authorities Board. However, if he doesn't wish to answer, possibly one final question: I'm wondering when we might expect the report. When you receive it, will it be released at that time or will it be held by the government for consideration by the government prior to its release to the public?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I think there is a certain amount of supposition in that statement that I may not agree with. But let me state that when the board order is received by Executive Council, we will within a very short period deal with the overall recommendations for the seven or eight annexation proposals which are there. In terms of a time frame I think we would probably be able to deal with that late this fall or certainly by the end of 1977.

Alcan Pipeline — Taxation

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Premier. It relates to the impact of the Alcan pipeline in Alberta. With respect to the Premier's letter of July 29, is the Premier in a position to advise the Assembly what the position is with respect to the ability of local governments to tax the pipeline as it goes through individual municipalities? Has the government been able to determine as yet whether that sort of taxation would be okay, or would it be a breach of the pipeline treaty between Canada and the United States?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, the pipeline will be under the jurisdiction of the federal government, being an interprovincial pipeline. Hence the same rules will apply with regard to taxation as would occur under any interprovincial pipeline. The undertaking given by the federal government under the document that's been made public is that there would be no discriminatory taxation, and of course the municipal governments would have to respect the federal law.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Premier for clarification. In view of the fact that there is municipal taxation of most pipelines, is it the government's interpretation of the pipeline treaty that normal assessment of the pipeline as it proceeds through the province would be in order, or would it be considered discriminatory taxation?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I would presume that it would be normal taxation. But again it's a matter, in terms of interpretation of the legislation, that the hon. member and others will have to draw their own conclusion as matters evolve and as the provisions are spelled out.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Premier. In view of the importance of this issue to municipalities along the pipeline route, is the government of Alberta prepared to determine whether or not in fact they have the power to tax? Perhaps the Premier is not able to answer the question. I direct it to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to make it clear, with the emphasis on the hon. member's question, that we have many interprovincial pipelines in this province; we've had them for a number of years. This is another interprovincial and international pipeline. It should be treated accordingly, and the provisions that have ensued with regard to other pipelines should apply here.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question, this time to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. Will the minister give the House an undertaking that, in fact, local governments lying along the course of that part of this pipeline in the province of Alberta will be able to tax it in the normal manner?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I can't see any reason why the municipalities cannot. Our information is that they can. We have certain research which is being completed to show the amount of potential tax which could be raised on that pipeline, similar to other pipelines in the province.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question to the hon. minister. Can the minister advise the House whether or not that research has taken into account the pipeline treaty, and that there is no doubt in his mind that the terms of the pipeline treaty which relate to inordinate or unfair taxation, or taxation in this country that would not take place in the United States, will not in fact apply to the pipeline in Alberta?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I think that is somewhat of an unfair question because I haven't seen the treaty, nor do I have the information to deal with perhaps some of the international subtleties you are referring to.

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question to the hon. Premier. Can the Premier advise the Assembly whether the Department of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs has in fact reviewed the treaty, and that that provision in the treaty concerning the *quid pro quo* on taxation will not affect the ability of counties, municipalities, and what have you in the province of Alberta to levy a tax?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I thought the answers had already been clearly given. It's a normal situation. It will be treated in a normal manner. The provisions with regard to non-discrimination obviously apply. As matters evolve, federal interpretation of those provisions may vary from ours. But as we see it, it's an interprovincial, international pipeline under federal jurisdiction, and the situation in municipalities will be the same as it is under all the others.

Cooking Lake Study Area

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of the Environment. Is the government considering a freeze on the sale of land in the Cooking Lake study area?

MR. RUSSELL: No, Mr. Speaker.

Edmonton International Airport

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Provincial Treasurer. In light of a recent announcement made by the federal Treasury Board — not his, but the federal Treasury Board — I wonder if he has considered the possibility of loaning to the federal government moneys out of the heritage savings trust fund at a conventional rate of interest, a preferential rate of interest, or interest-free in order to make improvements to the air terminal at the Edmonton International Airport.

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, we only consider loans when we've been asked to lend, and as yet we haven't been asked to lend to the federal government.

MR. KING: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is there any indication that the position of the federal government is predicated upon their belief that having agreed to undertake the construction of some local air terminals in Alberta, the improvement of the Edmonton International Airport should properly be the responsibility of the provincial government?

MR. LEITCH: I've had no such indication, Mr. Speaker.

MR. KING: One final supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Business Development and Tourism. Has the minister expressed his regrets to his federal counterpart, the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce, that that hon. gentleman was not better able to make the case of the province of Alberta for improved air terminal facilities at the Edmonton International Airport?

MR. DOWLING: Mr. Speaker, not on that subject, but perhaps on others.

Education — Indian Reserves

MR. KIDD: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Education. I'd like to ask him what obligations the Department of Education has towards providing educational facilities and/or access to educational facilities for those non-native, school-age children living on Indian reserves in Alberta.

MR. KOZIAK: Well, Mr. Speaker, as hon. members are aware, responsibility in this area rests with the federal government. As a result, The School Act and the provincial legislation in the area of education do not apply within the physical boundaries of an Indian reserve. Of course what could be arranged for residents of a reserve is: neighboring jurisdictions could accept students from the reserve and provide educational services within their schools, receiving from those incoming students such tuition fees as the local

board may charge, pursuant to the requirements of The School Act.

Crime Rates in Alberta

DR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Speaker, a question to the hon. Solicitor General. In view of statistics that show Alberta has the highest violent and sexual crime rate, is the minister planning a review of the issue, with the possible introduction of new programs to deal with the matter?

MR. FARRAN: Mr. Speaker, I should begin by cautioning the hon. member and other members [about] taking assumptions too rapidly from statistics, or they might fall into the same trap as the editors on the desks of at least two Alberta newspapers in reference to this story.

Statistics Canada said the arrests for violent crime had increased in Alberta. Arrests have nothing to do with the crime rate. That just means the police have been more active. Of course one would expect them to be more active, inasmuch as during that year we contributed some \$17 million extra towards law enforcement in Alberta. In point of fact, of course, this is an encouraging statistic when one considers that in North America overall, the solution rate for run-of-the-mill crime hovers around 30 per cent. So if your arrest rate goes up, you're making gains against the tide.

The primary reason for the increase in arrests was that drug offences — which are not reported, of course; they operate in a different fashion — there were more arrests for drug offences, particularly for enforcement of the marijuana laws. And with the opening of rape crisis centres in both cities, there has been stricter law enforcement in the area of sexual offences.

DR. PAPROSKI: One supplementary, Mr. Speaker, for clarification. Is the minister saying it's true that part of the statistics are due to excellent police action and reporting?

MR. FARRAN: Correct, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CLARK: One further supplementary question for the minister. Does the minister have any figures on recidivism rates for the various kinds of offences committed in and under the jurisdiction of the province?

MR. FARRAN: Mr. Speaker, it would take some time, probably more than this question period would permit, for me to go into the rate for every particular type of crime. But perhaps I could give the hon. leader a rough guide. Mr. Speaker, is that satisfactory?

During the particular year to which this story refers, 1976, the overall crime rate reduced in Calgary by about 0.8 per cent, just under 1 per cent. In Edmonton there was an increase in the overall crime rate of about 6 per cent. The RCMP figures are very difficult to interpret. But they report a reduction in overall crime in the Sherwood Park area, which they attribute to crime prevention. Under the provincial contract, that is the area they are policing most intensively.

One must recognize that our population is going up

much faster than the population of any other area in Canada, so it would be extraordinary if there wasn't some small percentage increase in the crime rate in almost every section of crime. The one that concerns me most of all is the increase in violent crime connected with sexual offences and in overall breaking and entering, minor property offences, theft of less than \$200.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could rephrase the question to the minister. The question dealt with the rate of repeaters in provincial institutions. Does the minister have figures which deal with this question of the rate of repeaters?

MR. FARRAN: Mr. Speaker, I apologize. I've got such a cold that I'm finding it difficult to hear without this hearing aid.

By and large the recidivism figure in Alberta is around 60 per cent, which is similar to other jurisdictions. I have no detailed breakdown on it, but we consider it a gain and an achievement if the recidivism or repeater rate drops to 55 or 56 per cent. You're gaining ground. The benefit to society is enormous, because these crimes are often committed by the same people over and over again. If it goes above the 60 per cent norm figure, you're not doing so well. Ours is around 59 per cent according to my latest information.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Is it the intention of the minister to introduce some new programs in provincial institutions that would aim at getting that rate down from 59 or 60 per cent?

MR. FARRAN: Yes, we're doing this. I should point out, Mr. Speaker, that the pessimistic figure of the constant 60 per cent recidivism rate applies, whether you take a hard or a soft line, in all jurisdictions. Recently in the United States it has been taken as a reason for abandoning progressive rehabilitation projects. I personally think it is no excuse to give up trying. Therefore we are pursuing projects in the rehabilitation line as they occur to us — trying everything. We have the wilderness challenge school at Nordegg, we have work-for-fine projects going throughout the province, we've introduced more work projects and bush camps in the correctional institutions, and up to August this year we have some 6,000 prisoners serving one-third of their sentence in the community on one rehabilitation program or another.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, just one last question to the minister. Has the minister considered introducing legislation which would require that drug addicts undergo special medical treatment, as has been done in British Columbia?

MR. FARRAN: No, Mr. Speaker, although we're watching the new initiative in British Columbia with great interest. Of course it is not yet in place in British Columbia. It is mostly talk of following the lines of the Japanese model, where compulsory treatment for drug addicts has reduced the incidence of heroin addiction to almost nil. It's being suggested in British Columbia that they should do the same: that it would be an offence to be a drug addict, and that

you would be picked up and given compulsory cold turkey treatment by being incarcerated. If British Columbia actually goes ahead with this — which is a big departure from any law practice under the British system as we know it — then of course we would have problems if we didn't stay in step, because the drug addicts would then come across the mountains to Alberta.

DR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister would indicate to the House whether he has statistics or information to indicate the number of police officers per capita in Alberta relative to other provinces.

MR. SPEAKER: With great respect to the hon. member, that would seem to be eminently suited for the Order Paper.

Gasoline Tax

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. Is the government considering a program that would exempt all gasoline used solely in municipally owned vehicles for municipal purposes?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, not that I'm aware of.

Food Processing Industry

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Premier. Could the Premier indicate to the Assembly whether the government is developing an overall policy with regard to the food processing industry in Alberta?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I think the policy really has been established by evolution over the course of the last number of years. It reflects, first of all, an attitude towards financing that's apparent through the Agricultural Development Corporation and the agribusiness section there. It's the feeling of the government that it's important that risks be taken. There's a recognition that there will be losses in the agribusiness area. So the first part is the financing side of it.

The second part is working with the Department of Agriculture. It is an approach the Department of Agriculture has, and perhaps the minister may wish to elaborate, in assisting the development of new agricultural processing in the province, and research into areas in which there can be both new products [and] new opportunities in the market place within Alberta and in the export area. That is a function of the Department of Agriculture.

Thirdly, of course, are the overall initiatives I mentioned in my remarks yesterday about trying to see to an improvement in the markets for processed agricultural products. Fourthly, of course, are our efforts to improve transportation. The rapeseed meal and oil case, which the hon. member is aware of, is one example that has been raised.

Finally, during the course of this year I've personally been involved in attempting to convince Albertans that there should be higher consumption of Alberta-made agricultural products to the exclusion of imported and processed products from other areas, which I think would certainly help a lot of the fledgl-

ing companies that are beginning to develop in this area and need the market support by the 1.9 million people in Alberta.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. Is his department carrying out any assessment of which areas of Alberta could support more food industry processing plants?

MR. MOORE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I believe it's fair to say that assessment has been carried out on a regular basis. It's not just a matter of assessing once what areas of our province can support additional agricultural processing entities, but rather updating it from time to time. Throughout the period from 1972 to the present, we've been doing that in a variety of ways.

Uranium Oxide Plant

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of the Environment. Is the minister in a position to advise the Assembly what provincial studies have been done on the proposal by ESI Resources to construct a uranium oxide extraction plant in Calgary?

MR. RUSSELL: No I'm not, Mr. Speaker. I'll have to take that as notice and report later.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could obtain the unanimous consent of the House to propose a motion, seconded by the Leader of the Opposition, with regard to a message to Her Majesty.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

head: GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Leader of the Opposition, that this Assembly send to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II a message of congratulation, appreciation, and loyalty on the occasion of this Jubilee year of Her reign.

Secondly, that the message be in the following words:

We, the Legislative Assembly of Alberta, offer our sincere congratulations on the completion of the twenty-fifth year of Her Majesty's reign.

Exemplary warmth, sincerity, and devotion to duty, so evident to Albertans during visits here, have endeared Your Majesty and members of the Royal Family to the people of this province.

In giving assurance of our continued and affectionate loyalty, we ask Divine Providence to grant Your Majesty a continuation of health, vigor, and a happy reign.

Thirdly, that Mr. Speaker be directed to make a copy of the message available to future citizens of Alberta now attending Alberta elementary schools.

Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the motion I merely want to say it would be timely and, I think, appropriate on the eve of Her Majesty's arrival in Canada at the capital city of Ottawa for this message to be

endorsed by the Alberta Legislature. If it is endorsed, hopefully I might have an opportunity over the course of the coming weekend to pass on the context of the message personally to Her Majesty during her visit.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I second the motion congratulating Her Majesty the Queen on this, the twenty-fifth year of her reign.

I really can't let this opportunity pass without looking back with nostalgia on the year 1951 when, as a young schoolboy, I waited in front of the Greyhound bus station in Calgary and got my first glimpse of Her Majesty. I'm tied with the strings that many Canadians share of having had the first glimpse of Her Majesty as princess at that time, later becoming the Queen of our country. I certainly felt a closeness on that particular occasion, and I'm sure that closeness has been shared by literally thousands of Albertans during the many visits the members of the Royal Family have made to this province.

I'm pleased, Mr. Speaker, to have the opportunity to second the motion, and do wish Her Majesty a long and happy reign.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'm very pleased to rise on behalf of my constituents and indicate that I fully support the resolution before the Assembly today.

Mr. Speaker, when one looks at the last 25 years, there is really little doubt that Her Majesty has carried on her duties with a great deal of ability and distinction, and has won the hearts of people around the world.

I think it's also worth noting, Mr. Speaker, that in the operation of the monarchy we have a symbol that says more than just the monarchy itself. It's a symbol of our parliamentary system, a system that in my view, notwithstanding its shortcomings, is still the best way in which democratic government can operate. I think of the many instances when the Royal Family has come to Alberta. Several months ago Prince Charles was in Calgary, and in the middle of a rainstorm showed the kind of wit that, I thought, had it been displayed normally in the Legislative Assembly, he would easily be the best debater in the entire House.

Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned when I began, I have every intention of supporting this resolution, which I trust will be unanimous and, by being unanimous, will indicate to Her Majesty that the people of Alberta, regardless of their political perspective, are proud of the last 25 years and wish her many, many happy years in her reign ahead.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, I would also like to endorse the resolution. I think it's very timely, and I too hope it will be unanimously accepted.

While I'm on my feet, I would like to congratulate the government on the beautiful portrait of Her Majesty that now adorns this chamber. I think it's a tremendous portrait of both her and Prince Philip, and whoever was responsible should be highly commended.

[Motion carried]

head: **WRITTEN QUESTIONS**

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

- (1) Did the government purchase a duplex at 12218 - 86 Street in Edmonton to house mentally handicapped children, and will the duplex be used for that purpose?
- (2) If not, what are the long-term plans for the duplex?
- (3) How long has the duplex been vacant?
- (4) Why has the government not rented out the duplex?
- (5) How much did the duplex cost, and how much money has been spent to remodel it?
- (6) How many mentally handicapped children are being accommodated in houses of this size in Alberta?

head: **MOTIONS FOR RETURNS**

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, I move that motions for returns 158 and 159 stand and retain their place on the Order Paper.

[Motion carried]

head: **MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS**

1. Moved by Mr. Diachuk:

Be it resolved that the provincial government give consideration to introduction of legislation amending The School Act to provide for the distribution of corporate assessments on a per pupil basis for those corporations that are unable to determine the religious faith of their shareholders.

[Adjourned debate March 31: Dr. Backus]

DR. BACKUS: Mr. Speaker, much water has flowed under the bridges since this motion was first introduced into the House, especially in the Peace River country, but on the metaphorical water that has flowed through this House have floated several amendments to legislation, which have gone a long way to resolve the problems put forward in the motion.

It is therefore with regret that I must deny this House the pearls of wisdom I had prepared for them in the spring, and simply stress that the object of this motion was to assure a fair distribution of the assessment between various school authorities, and I hope the government will continue its obvious endeavors to do this.

[Motion carried]

2. Moved by Mr. Taylor:

Be it resolved that the Legislative Assembly of Alberta request the government of Alberta to give consideration to establishing industrial training schools to which juvenile delinquents may be committed under the Juvenile Delinquents Act of Canada.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, this resolution has been on the Order Paper for some time, and I think, contrary to what happened in the last resolution, it's even more timely now than it was when I first put it on the Order Paper.

First of all, I want to define one or two terms in connection with this resolution. It says:

... establishing industrial training schools to which juvenile delinquents may be committed under the Juvenile Delinquents Act of Canada.

Since this motion was put on the Order Paper, the hon. Minister of Social Services and Community Health has brought in a bill containing some very important amendments, and establishing some very important principles. I want to deal with just one of those.

For many years the juvenile delinquent [act] in this province was under a theory that you should not confine young people. We were working under a program of not confining offenders. Consequently many of these offenders came before the juvenile courts time and time again. Some would even come after seven, eight, nine times, and I understand some of them even 35 or 40, having committed more than 100 offences, in a spirit of mirth because the judge could not do anything about it. This is really a denial of justice.

The principles that I feel it should be based on include a number of items, but certainly the guiding principle is that young offenders should have responsibility for any criminal act they perform. That is the underlying principle of this whole resolution. We do a young person, a boy or a girl, no kindness when after they commit a criminal offence we say to them that we're not going to do anything about it, you try to be good the next time, and tap them on the wrist and away they go.

This is essentially what we have been doing for many years. Actually this is encouraging a young person to commit another offence. In parts of the province we have had offenders as young as nine years of age who break into a store, make a mess of the premises, and cause hundreds of dollars of damage. Because they are of tender years, the courts simply say, that wasn't nice, don't do it any more, and away they go. Some of these young people under the age of 15 have appeared on this type of offence several times. This, I say, is simply building criminals for tomorrow.

If a young person destroys somebody else's property, they should learn at the earliest possible time that they have to bear the responsibility for that act. If that is the case, a young person soon learns that they cannot destroy other people's property without ever making restitution or paying society for it in some way, shape, or form. So the underlying principle I want to establish on this is that young offenders should bear responsibility for their criminal acts.

Under the new legislation, young persons who do commit an offence may be committed by the director for up to a number of days or by the courts up to a three-month period. This is giving the courts at least the weapon with which to try to reform or rehabilitate that boy or that girl. That is the objective. It's not to punish; it's to rehabilitate. Sometimes rehabilitation is carried out only through some type of punishment.

Young people who have broken into ... I have one instance in mind — a garage. All of them under the

age of 15 and down to an age as low as 11, they took a truck, started it up, ran it right through the wall of the building, and caused hundreds of dollars worth of damage. Absolutely nothing happened. They got away with it. They were told it was naughty and not to do it again. Those young people actually are laughing at the courts. That is not a proper position to put our judges in.

Surely our judges should be able to deal with cases based on the merits. I'm satisfied that every one of our judges — I don't know them all, but certainly the ones I know and two that I know in Edmonton — is an exceptionally fine man who is determined to the best of his ability to try to rehabilitate our young people.

Many of our young people make one mistake and that's the last. They don't want to appear in court again. Certainly that type of person should not be confined. But when young people — and there are some young people who make up their minds that they are going to be criminals and are going to spend a life in crime, they are not going to work for their living, and they are going to steal what they want from those who do work — when they make up their minds that way, then more drastic action has to be taken in the interests of that boy or that girl. I feel that the courts now have been given a new way of dealing with our young people that's going to help to rehabilitate them.

Now that brings me to the point of how this is going to be done. The period in which they may be confined is relatively short at the present time, but I believe that even a 30-day or three-month confinement will awaken many of these young people to the realization of what kind of life they're going to live, and they will not want to continue in criminal activity. If it does that, all well and good, they can then become useful citizens and worth-while people in our country.

The systems that have been used throughout the world are many, and the words "industrial training school" sometimes have a bad connotation. There have been many training schools. This isn't a new thing; these training schools have been in operation in many countries for many, many years. Some have been successful, some have not been successful. Consequently the name "industrial training school" sometimes creates a bad impression as being a workhouse, a poorhouse, or a place where they're simply confined and don't learn anything. I think we have to be very careful that when we're setting out the name we try to establish a name that is going to be meaningful and yet not have a connotation from the past.

I used the words "industrial training schools" for one purpose: to make sure that people knew what we had in mind. I would not want them necessarily to be called industrial training schools.

A few days ago I had the pleasure of visiting the Youth Development Centre, which has about 100 boys and girls who are there for various reasons, and they're now preparing for the new legislation which will put some in complete confinement. When I look at the young people there and realize what life holds for them, it does make you feel very, very sad. But I think it can be a new course in life for these young people. I was impressed with what is happening in the Youth Development Centre. I saw young people who are learning a few things but taking their school work, looking after themselves, learning that if you

commit an offence you pay for it. If they can once get that into their minds, it will go a long way toward rehabilitation.

The name — and I want to deal with that for a moment — could be a development centre. I like that. Some places have used the words "a little commonwealth", where they have put their students in the form of running an area, with their mayor, their councillors, their workers, and so on. Some have called them training institutions, some training schools. One place in the United States has called their little area "an enchanted village", where the young people are given an animal to raise on the basis that most young people like animals and they will then become interested in not only looking after that animal, seeing that it's not hurt, but will come to the conclusion they shouldn't be hurting other human beings either. I'm not particularly worried about the name we give it.

A few years ago I visited Father Flanagan's Boys Town in the United States. I was highly impressed. First of all, the young people who came there were highly delinquent. It was normally the last resort. When I asked one big Negro boy about his stay in Father Flanagan's Boys Town, he said in his southern dialect that he loved it there; it had made a new man out of him.

This young boy was destined for the electric chair when he went there. Everybody had given up hope for him. He told me that when he arrived at Boys Town, Father Flanagan met him at the gate, shook hands with him, and said, welcome. I'm sure glad you've come to our Boys Town. We need you here. He said to me afterwards that that was the beginning of the change in his life, because nobody had ever said to him before that they wanted him, that they would welcome him into their home. He said, even my father didn't want me in the house, but here I was wanted. He said, I started to take a new look.

In Boys Town I saw that the boys were running the town just like a small town in our country. They had their mayor, their councillors, their people who were getting paid working on the streets. They had their schools, their printing press, their bake shop, their school for industrial development — auto mechanics, welding, electric training, and so on. The attitude those people had was just amazing.

I asked about the percentage of those who were reclaimed from a criminal life, and this percentage was very high. They stated that sometimes they didn't want to leave Boys Town. They were happy there. They wanted to stay and help other boys who came into that institution. Others would leave when they reached a certain stage. Some were holding high jobs as chefs. Some were in the business world, the industrial world of plumbing, printing, auto mechanics, and so on.

That is the type of thing I would like to see in the province of Alberta. I would like to see attached to the Youth Development Centre in north Edmonton a school where those young people could learn auto mechanics. At the present time I believe they have one welder, and only one boy out of a hundred can go and take that type of training. You can't learn enough in that type of school. Their carpenter shop was more impressive. There they could do better work, and I think the work they were doing was excellent. Their beauty parlor, cooking school, and so on were good,

but not sufficiently advanced that they could step out into the world, find a job, and become self-supporting. That is really the answer. A young person who leaves these institutions, which are somewhat sheltered, has to have had enough orientation that he can compete in the rough and tough everyday world. I found that some of those who left the Edmonton youth training centre got jobs as waitresses, but they didn't last. They were not used to public contact, and the public is sometimes pretty demanding in our restaurants. So they would give up and commit another crime to get back into the place of shelter. If the training is sufficient and good, then a carefully supervised orientation period in the outside world would be a wonderful thing.

What does it cost to keep a boy in an institution like the Edmonton Youth Development Centre? I haven't got the figure, but I imagine it probably costs \$70, \$80, or \$90 a day. If we're going to spend that much money, surely we should advance them to the place where they can become self-supporting, because that is one of the major things when they get in the outside world. Then their attitude has to be gradually dealt with.

There are many ways of dealing with attitude. I was delighted with the methods being used by the teachers in the Edmonton Youth Development Centre. There they have an understanding of the problem. They have an understanding of what some of these young people have gone through. Many are from broken homes. Many are from single-parent homes. Many have been raised in delinquent areas, and it takes a lot of patience, a lot of understanding, and a lot of time to change a boy's perspective when he has been brought up under terrible environmental conditions.

So I believe Alberta has an opportunity of establishing a unique type of training school where the young people can learn to cook — it's surprising how many young men, young boys, want to be chefs — where they can learn beauty treatment, so they can step out and establish a beauty parlor; where they can learn enough about plumbing and auto mechanics, so they can come out and apprentice and, for a while, come back and forth. They will help to pay their way. And if we can afford to spend X dollars per day, not knowing the exact figure, to keep a boy in one of these institutions, surely we can afford to spend one-half of X dollars to help to pay his wages with an employer who is going to train him. The employer won't take him otherwise. The employer in the world today has to compete. He can't afford to pay someone who is not trained, who is learning, who is slow, who is hesitant. But if part of that wage were paid and the other part paid by the employer and gradually increased till the entire wage is paid, when they would then be able to take their place in that industry, then a much better value for every dollar spent would accrue.

I think we have to look at our schools for the delinquent across this country. In most of them, the boys and girls come out just as badly prepared to face life as when they went in — almost as badly, sometimes worse, if the criminal element, the under surface, is moving in that school. It's not sufficient just for the staff to have sessions, to teach the right thing, and so on.

One prisoner in this province, a young man, told me

that the best learning process that was going on in that penitentiary — a federal penitentiary — was the quiet teaching by the inmates. That was becoming more effective in his mind than what was being done by the guards and by the institution for rehabilitation. He said, I've learnt more since I've been in this institution about how to become a better criminal than I've ever even dreamt of. He said, I've never dreamt of some of the things I'm learning, incidentally, in a quiet way among the inmates. I was amazed, because I thought here, that teaching in the quiet way was having more effect on that boy's mind than what he should have been learning. I hope that the young man is not going to come out of that area determined to be a criminal. But that is the danger.

How do you overcome that type of thing? There are a number of methods. I'm not going to go through all of them, but I am going to go through a few, because I think it's important.

There's a straight disciplinary system, with the daily routine of rewarding good behavior and punishing bad. It has its effect, but unless there's something more than that the quiet teaching going on among the boys or girls of the school is undermining what's being done in that disciplinary system.

Then there's what is called the progressive staircase section or degree system, where there's a flexible variation of discipline systems, where reward for good behavior is increased privileges. They say, as in society, if you work hard and make money, you can do things that other people can't do: you can go on trips, you can have better holidays, you can have a house, you can have a car. So they introduce that system in the institution by saying, if you perform properly we'll give you special privileges. They may be "out" privileges, reading privileges, listening to television, but they're privileges. That has some effect, but again it doesn't get to the bottom where the underlying methods are being used.

There's a system that people have called the homogeneous system, based on a strong, continuing relationship with a single person. That can be very effective. If the boy or girl going into an institution can work a relationship with the head of that institution to the degree where they will trust him to the point of discussing their innermost problems, that can be an excellent system.

Sometimes groups are diversified, mixing ages and sexes in substitute families to make it look like a family, with a father- or mother-type at the top. It's called the heterogeneous system. It has an effect.

In the socio-pedagogical system, the institution should reproduce the structure of the outside community. One can get nothing without working for it. One can achieve a leading position by working. That is having its effect on many institutions across this continent.

Another one is the individual pedagogical system where the entire emphasis is on the child, endeavoring to draw from the child his own solution to his own problems, [providing] tolerant understanding, attempting to bring in parents. This is the very opposite of the discipline system which says you have to do this and, if you don't, you're going to be punished. That's what they have had many times in their homes — no love, no understanding, just discipline. That just doesn't work, whether it's in the home or in an institution.

Finally there's the eclectic or differential pedagogical system, which picks out various aspects of the above and tries to put them all together.

I personally prefer the individual pedagogical system, where the emphasis is placed on the child and his needs. One of the things that one of the instructors in Father Flanagan's Boys Town told me was that when he was teaching he never, never, never would say to a boy who needed extra help, stay in after the others go, because then the boy became marked. When he went out they all wanted to know, what did he want, what did he want to say? The boy became self-conscious about it and either made up excuses or decided I'll never want to go through that again. One instructor said, if I want to talk quietly to a boy and get his co-operation and really get down into his heart and his mind, I do it incidentally, perhaps when we're walking along side by side with no one else within hearing distance; we just have our conversation. He said the effect has been tremendous because they've learned to trust him, and they try to create plans where they can be together and discuss the boy's problem.

I think that is what we want to do in our training institutions in this province — place the emphasis on the child, find out from the child, draw out from him; not necessarily telling him what's wrong with him, but draw out from him what the problems are, the real underlying problems; draw out from him what he thinks the solutions are. I know this takes more time than simply saying, you either do this or you go into solitary confinement or are punished in some other way. But this helps the child to solve his own problems. It takes a lot of understanding. It takes a far better instructor to teach in this way than to have a straight disciplinary action.

Many institutions that use this system bring in the parents, because many times they are part of the problem. I don't know whether to accept it exactly the way it comes out, but Father Flanagan said to me, "In my philosophy there are no bad boys, just bad parents." You know, there's a lot to that.

I saw a big white boy — huge biceps, as strong as an ox — and I could understand why he was in trouble in the outside world. He used his strength to bully, and he got away with it. He went into Father Flanagan's Boys Town. He was about 16 years of age, a big boy. I saw him one year after he was there, carrying a crippled boy on his back to a ball game. I said to him, "How are you doing?" He said, "Oh, I get so much happiness now out of helping people, not hitting them in the eye and bloodying their nose." I thought, whoever is instructing here has learned the real merits of pedagogy. That boy was a changed person, and was talking about going out.

There's one other thing I want to mention. We've gone education crazy with regard to our outside schools. You can't get into NAIT to be a chef unless you have a grade 11 education. I was in one institution where they showed me a cook who does excellent work but can't be bothered reading and writing. He's only had a grade 7 education, but he can cook as well as, or better than, anyone who has a degree in psychology or has learned trigonometry and algebra. I think we have to be practical — and I say that to the Minister of Education — in these outside training schools for those who aren't problems. Inside we should certainly make sure that we're sensible in the

educational requirements for those who are going to be plumbers, auto mechanics, chefs, beauty technicians, typists, or stenographers.

I say to the hon. minister — I am intensely interested in helping the delinquents of this province — let's not stop at confinement. That is good when a boy reaches the stage where everything else fails. When he's confined, let's use the individual pedagogical method to the greatest degree possible, so that young man can, in a very short period of time, come out determined to make a contribution to society — determined to be the type of man that he has learned to want to be through good teaching, through understanding, and through a lot of love.

MR. FARRAN: Mr. Speaker, I rise to take part in the debate on this motion by the hon. Member for Drumheller, because I believe I have some useful information to bring to the attention of members, and because I believe this Legislature and government should consider the possibility of such a facility. No subject in the social and law-enforcement areas is more important than this one. I commend the hon. member for bringing this before us. His work over the years among youth, particularly at Camp Gordon, and his personal contribution to the building of character among young people is well known.

It's an important area because the foundations of a society are laid with its youth. If attitudes, ethics, and principles are not passed on from one generation to another, if the torch of civilization and civilized responsibility isn't passed on from father to child, if parents in the broad sense of a parent society neglect to instruct children in the social mores of our civilization, then it's just built on shifting sand, not on solid rock. It can't endure that way. No nation is any better than the people who make it up. A nation isn't a law book, a constitution, or a colored diagram or map. It's an attitude, a frame of mind, a community of ideas, and a common loyalty to fundamental principles.

I come from Calgary. Many Calgarians will tell you that being a Calgarian is an attitude. It's not a place of origin; it's a frame of mind. If there's not this common attitude, then the nation will be weakened. We've emerged now from decades of woolly-headed liberals into a more practical age. The time has come to examine whence we came and where we're going. We should do it because it's not only the adults who are beginning to suggest we've strayed from the highway; it's also the thinking youth.

Here in Alberta we began with the best possible examples. Less than a hundred years ago settlers came here from many lands and carved out homesteads. The father of a farmer I stayed with over the weekend, out in the Halkirk area, was typical. He settled on the prairie east of Stettler, having come from Iowa in 1903. He arrived with a horse and cart, a young wife, three children, one cow, and \$7. Only fortitude, courage, endurance, determination, and self-sufficiency could have enabled that family to survive. It was brought home to me, because it was pretty cold on Saturday out in the Halkirk area. I was thinking of this chap as I was attempting to shoot a goose. There were no invidious class distinctions then, no crying towels for those early pioneers. They believed in work, thanking God for His mercies, honesty, and the sanctity of family life.

Would you believe that within two or three generations of such noble forefathers we could have moved into an era when all those homesteader values are being questioned. False prophets over the past years have ridiculed the work ethic and placed a premium on leisure. They tell people not to be satisfied with the 40-hour week and to press for a four- or even a three-day week, as if that was the route to happiness. They tell our children that they should only do what comes naturally, only work at what they enjoy. In other words, they're saying to the child, to earn your living by the sweat of your brow is no longer honorable, and play is more important than duty.

They've questioned all the time-honored virtues. No Ten Commandments for the new liberal age. They preach, with serious faces, what they call the situation ethic. Honesty, they say, is not a firm principle; it's something that should vary according to time and place. Gluttony and greed is not really gluttony and greed if you're doing what comes naturally. Animal instincts are the things you really should follow. Fill yourself up with drugs and booze. Find a new nirvana, because that's all pleasure, and pleasure is the same as happiness. They've insinuated to the new generation that licence is the same as freedom. All that stuff about chastity being a virtue, marriage being a sacrament — all those old fogies have preached that for 2,000 years, but it was outdated by the pill. Take the easy route to happiness, they say. Abandon yourself, let yourself go, get rid of all those inhibitions. All that business about self-control and moderation and restraint is not the new world, they say. Be a flower girl. Be a swinger. Be a hippie. Even soap's old-fashioned. So is cutting hair.

It was not the instant formula for happiness, as so many children have tragically discovered since that awful period of the '60s that we're now coming out of. No rules at all are much worse than having irksome rules, because then there are no signposts to guide you, no highway to which you can return when you stray. When everyone is straying, the sheep are truly lost. The tragedy is that so many children don't know the way back.

They were never told the right way from the beginning. They were never told that there is only one way to happiness, that their grandparents were not talking nonsense when they quoted old proverbs like: the devil finds work for idle hands; when you sup with the devil use a long spoon; spare the rod, spoil the child; early to bed and early to rise makes a man healthy, wealthy, and wise; count the pennies and the pounds will take care of themselves. All that homespun philosophy is just as true today as it was 100 years ago.

The permissive society has much for which to answer. Let me illustrate the philosophy. Since doing what comes naturally is the basic principle, and learning, they say, should be by experience, let's propose then that we teach children to swim by throwing them in a swimming pool, or inviting them into a swimming pool. You wouldn't throw them in. That's not permissive enough. You invite them to go in. It works with dogs, so why is this not the natural way to teach children to swim? I guarantee that if they do that, some will learn to swim and learn to swim well — a very small percentage. Most, without any instruction in the basics, will learn to swim and swim badly. Some will drown.

Now I'm concerned, as is this motion, with those in danger of drowning. Not only did the permissive philosophies of the Dr. Spocks and the Professor Deweys permeate education with their materials, research, experimental projects, open classrooms, word recognitions, and new math, but they particularly infected the semi-science of social work. Just as waves of educators and teachers perpetuate their breed because the unenlightened teach the other unenlightened to teach, so are the philosophies perpetuated in the social sciences. We not only need a back-to-basics in education; we need a back-to-basics in social work.

Today we have a very high crime rate: an increasing intolerance for the person, reflected in violent crime; and an increasing disregard for private property, reflected in theft and vandalism. People argue whether this is due to television, affluence, or poverty, whether it can be blamed on the home, the school, the church, or the peer group. Few will argue that it doesn't begin with juveniles. If I could summarize the problems in this law enforcement area in two words, I'd give them to you: booze, juveniles.

Few of those juveniles who eventually grow up to be adult criminals are born with defects or are inherently bad. Almost all of them have been spoiled at an early age by bad training or lack of training. It's probable that as much as 70 per cent of our house-breaking, car theft, and shoplifting is done by juveniles under the age of 18. I'm not talking about technical juveniles now; I'm talking about school-age children. Some are my responsibility, my department, some the Hon. Helen Hunley's department.

Often the career of crime begins as early as the age of 12. We'll assume that character building by home, school, or church has been absent, and that at a very early age training has been abdicated to the idiot box known as television. The kid commits his first offence, maybe breaking windows or shoplifting a bar of soap on Mother's Day as a present for his mother. Gradually the seriousness of the offences increases, but nobody really says stop. Nobody says, that's enough. Nobody says, if you go on fooling around like that you'll be a dead beat with no future, no trade, no hope. They get counselling — they get a very large part of the government services devoted to counselling, to say nothing of the volunteer agencies, churches, and teachers also in the counselling business — but no accountability and no firm quick punishment. There's not even any punishment for breaking the rules in school. There's just no correction.

Every wayward child is, in accordance with the prevailing philosophy, and indeed with the law, to be treated as a misguided, neglected child. No one says, buster, you're an individual with a God-given freedom of choice, a choice between right and wrong, you can make it yourself. No use blaming your parents or your home or society. You're responsible and accountable yourself, and if you do that again, you'll be punished sharply and promptly.

Under the present system they get counselling, loose probation, or are shifted to foster homes. People weep over them and say they've been denied mother love, that for some reason they lack self-respect. Some go to group homes with an open-door policy, and they run away when they feel like it. Everything is covered with a veil of confidentiality.

The police pick them up, and before you can say Jack Robinson they're out on the streets and at it again.

Eventually they reach the legal age of majority. They commit an offence. The first go-around they are treated leniently. They get bail, suspended sentence, probation — the same old treatment. The judge thinks they're first offenders; they may have records as long as your arm. They do it again. They're incarcerated. They serve one-third of their sentence if they're good. They get one-third remission. They serve one-third, and they get one-third temporary absence to go to school, or something like that. There's no hard labor. There's little work, because the prisons are understaffed and overcrowded, and there's more counselling. Somehow or other we always seem to find funds for counsellors. But at least they've been stopped at long last and the law has been underlined. Sixty per cent of them go on for more, as I said in the question period, whether the treatment on conviction is hard or soft. About 60 per cent of them will be repeaters. Gradually, as they get over the age of 25, most drop out of the criminal statistics and there are very few criminals left over the age of 47. They seem to retire three years before the Mounted Police.

Let me give you some statistics, remembering that in this province the Solicitor General, except through indirect responsibility through the police, only becomes responsible when they reach 16. Thirty-seven per cent of our prison population is under 21. Thirty-seven per cent of our prison population is native. Seventy per cent of all convicts are sentenced to 6 months or less. Forty per cent are incarcerated for alcohol- or drug-related offences. There are 1,600 inmates in provincial prisons — and I haven't got the figures for federal penitentiaries — 1,600 inmates in Alberta correctional institutions, and 6,273 are on probation at any one time and 120 on parole. Another 6,000 were on temporary absence for the first half of this year.

Basically there are two conflicting philosophies in the field: that of child welfare, which follows the neglected child route; that of corrections, which follows the accountability route. And I don't believe the philosophies are necessarily exclusive to each other, although some people do. In Canada only Ontario and New Brunswick retain both philosophies. By special agreement with the federal government they've always run shared-cost training schools or reformatories for the toughest of delinquents. In the west training schools were abandoned completely, except Manitoba ran one for a while. In fact there was a time when Alberta hard core delinquents were sent on a contract to the one institution that operated in Manitoba.

But here, in B.C., and in Saskatchewan total emphasis was placed on probation and foster homes. Saskatchewan did have youth camps, but in B.C. and Alberta the philosophy was not accountability-oriented at all. Bowden went out of the youth business in 1970. Now both B.C. and Alberta are belatedly coming to the conclusion that some sort of closed facility is necessary, at least for about 150 to 200 hard core juvenile delinquents in each province. Officials from B.C. openly admitted the other day that their completely soft, neglected-child, open philosophy had been a total failure. We haven't been quite as frank as that, because perhaps we didn't go quite as far as

B.C. in that we still did have closed detention facilities for juveniles for short term detention.

Effective October 1 a judge can once again sentence a juvenile in Alberta to a term of imprisonment up to 90 days. Alberta has already been partially moving toward the mixed philosophical approach, with some secure units, whether they are called detention units or not, in various places in the province. The Youth Development Centre was also moving away from its totally permissive open door policy, where there were more runaways than total capacity of the institution itself.

No really significant change can take place until the federal government amends or replaces the Juvenile Delinquents Act. Their first effort to introduce realism to the scene was contained in a paper called Young Persons in Conflict with the Law. It took a hesitant step forward toward realism and then, afraid of its own temerity, it took a step back again. Under their first proposition a judge could sentence to a closed institution, but a new screening agency would divert as many as it possibly could away from the judge. After sentence there would be reviews, very, very frequently, by all sorts of people, breaking the continuity.

A second effort now has been made by the federal government and is a little more realistic, but they are still nervous as if they are embarking on some horrible retrogressive step. Through the pages of all the federal proposals I can detect the same dichotomy of thought, the same philosophical conflict between the bleeding hearts and the hardliners; between the child welfare people and the correctional; between, if you like, the social worker approach and the approach of the police.

Sometimes they have introduced the concept in these papers of the citizen children's aid society, which went out years ago and was replaced by civil service children's aid departments. There has even been an inference that they should go that direction, reintroduce those volunteer societies. It's the same mixed-up conflict between the two philosophies, which is probably also contained in the responses from the provinces. We're not all that clear on the subject either.

There's a fundamental difference of opinion on philosophy, then, between people in my department and the people in child welfare. Why should there be a difference? Why won't people realize that probation will work for some and not for others, that humans are not all identical, not all the same? There's a tremendous range of different kinds of cases. A tough boarding school is the answer for some boys, and there's nothing wrong with teaching a boy a trade in such an institution; nothing wrong for some boys with discipline and team spirit and physical challenge, with stoicism and cold showers, if you like, and the stiff upper lip. Some of our wealthiest citizens send their children at great expense to schools with the same philosophy. This is especially true in the modern era of children from wealthy but broken homes. Why do our woolly-headed liberals deny that the approach has merit for some types of boys? Also for some girls, for that matter. Why do socialists in particular sneer at the system?

I've seen the arguments. Many products of the Ontario training schools graduate to prison. Well of course they do. There's a 60 per cent recidivism rate

overall. Most inmates of our correctional institutions graduated from the loose system too. That means nothing. My friends, even more of the products of our open, permissive probation system graduate to the prisons, in my opinion.

Recently I went to Britain to see for myself how the liberals and socialists had destroyed the Borstal system, once regarded as the world's best. I saw the Holseley Bay Colony in Suffolk, which is still run on the lines of the original Borstal system and is doing a good job. They're teaching building trades, with maximum discipline and team spirit, over a three-year course. It was working well.

In that country, which has a reputation for having extremely militant unions, all the courses have been put together with the co-operation of the unions and were being regarded with full credit for apprenticeship. Each 16-week course was acknowledged by the unions as equivalent to one year of apprenticeship for a trade. If they can do it in that country, where the unions are supposed to be so militant and difficult to get along with, why can't it be done here?

I saw others that were Borstals in name only where, because of volume, pressures, and doubts, they were just getting 36-week sentences, with instruction in the trades. Volume alone had turned these places into simple youth prisons. The fundamental philosophies of the Borstal system were gone completely. They weren't there long enough. Character building principles had gone. Certainly they had cut their hair, they wore blazers, and they marched around in a column of threes, but there was no team spirit. Nothing lasting was being achieved, because they were being regarded as prisons rather than schools.

I want to try an old-fashioned Borstal-type reformatory in this province for 16- to 18-year-old boys. I want to teach them a trade, with maximum character building and an accent on sports and discipline. But you need at least two years to work on boys. Ninety days — that's ridiculous. You can't do anything in 90 days. It means you've got to equate it to the school year. I'd let them go home for holidays. Short sharp sentences are no good for that sort of exercise, for character building. They may have their point in the prisons, but not for this sort of exercise.

You know that we're working on a wilderness challenge approach at Nordegg. That kind of operation is extremely expensive. Teacher/pupil ratios have to be low, instructors soon get burned out running tough boys up and down the mountains, living cheek by jowl with convicts in pup tents day after day. I think it's a worth-while approach. But adventure school leaders are rare birds and hard to find. They're not the usual kind of civil servant. They're neither social worker nor guard, but a bit of both. And they have to lead by individual personality. They're hard to find, so we have problems there and shortage of staff. There's a limit on how many we can take into that exercise.

Having said all this, let me say that I see signs of hope. I believe the permissive society is on the wane. The best crop of youngsters for many years is moving through junior high and entering the high schools. Anybody in the business will tell you that they're as different as chalk from cheese compared with the kids of the '60s. The new crop of university and tech. college students are more manly and realistic than for many many years. They want to change themselves.

The drug cult — less strong, although there are woolly-headed liberals around preaching that Hefner life style, telling abominable lies about marijuana and saying it's harmless when in fact the humblest Egyptian or Persian can tell you it's far more harmful than alcohol, which God only knows is harmful enough, so harmful that it's destroyed at least one race in history. Any Arab will tell you that.

There are early statistical indications of a change. Crime prevention squads say there is a small drop in the crime rate. It may be a flash in the pan; I hope not. But it's encouraging. They think that juvenile crime is down everywhere in North America. The RCMP says it's down in Sherwood Park, and the city of Calgary is claiming a drop in Calgary. We'll watch the trend carefully. But it is true that the United States is also claiming some drop in the crime rate.

The accident rate on the roads is down. People are really talking about discipline in schools again, stricter law enforcement, and so on. We're getting back to common sense. This motion is another indication. It comes from a very common-sense member, for whom I have tremendous respect. People are beginning to wake up from the nonsense dream they have been going through for the last 20 or 30 years.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. McCRAE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to participate for a short while in this very worth-while motion. I must admit I don't have the scholarly or expert knowledge that the previous two speakers had, whether of a philosophical or historical bent, based on the personal experience of the hon. Member for Drumheller at Camp Gordon or the experiences of the Solicitor General in his assignment.

The motion is a good one, Mr. Speaker, and I would like to congratulate the mover. I would also like to say that I share many of the viewpoints of the previous speaker. I even had a few proverbs written down that I would like to have used, but I think he's gotten to all the important ones. The only one I have left is an apple-a-day sort of thing, and I'm not sure that . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I regret to interrupt the hon. minister but, this being Thursday afternoon, the limit permitted for this debate is one hour and we are just about there.

MR. McCRAE: Mr. Speaker, in that event, might I beg leave to adjourn the debate?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

head: **PUBLIC BILLS AND ORDERS**
OTHER THAN
GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS
(Second Reading)

Bill 223
The Water Fluoridation Act

MR. MUSGREAVE: Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak on second reading of Bill 223, which is a very simple bill that provides for the fluoridation of public water supplies, I would like to approach this in perhaps a different way.

I'd like first to highlight many of the accusations that have discredited this beneficial treatment with some of the counter-arguments. Secondly, I would like to give the House some up-to-date material on experience in the United States, as well as to touch on one of the most exhaustive studies ever made in the world on fluoridation, conducted by the royal commission of the state of Tasmania, Australia; finally, to give brief information on the findings of our own research people in the province of Alberta.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I would like to deal with some of the accusations. First, mass medication — you'll hear this being used quite frequently. This is incorrect in that it rests on the assumption that fluoride is a drug, which it is not; and that it is introduced into the water for therapeutic reasons, which also is not the case. Fluoride in ionized or inorganic form ranks 17 among the elements in order of abundance. It is a natural part of the environment and may be found in natural fluoridated water. Interestingly enough, it is very hard to find elements around us that do not have fluoride in some form associated with them.

Adding sodium fluoride to a water supply is similar to enriching the product, such as the addition of vitamin B complex to flour or vitamin A to margarine or butter. Perhaps a better example: I notice [that] many of the members drink milk — it's similar to the addition of vitamin D to milk.

Another charge you'll hear, Mr. Speaker, is that it restricts an individual's liberties, it's unconstitutional, and it's expressive of totalitarian methods. The Ontario committee of inquiry and the Australian royal commission could not find any restrictions on freedom. Some Canadian cities have had fluoridated water for over 10 years. I'm sure our legal profession in Canada by now would have found some infractions of our legal system if they had thought it was an infringement of our rights. In the United States several court cases have arisen, and they have not found any restrictions of freedom.

An interesting quote from A. E. Leek of the International Institute of Cellular and Molecular Pathology is as follows, and this was stated in the Tasmanian report:

Whereas he and I and you, sir, are prepared to [respect] individual freedom, others are not. If they are willing to eat too much sugar, and prepared to forego brushing their teeth, that is personal freedom. It ceases to be when their children are encouraged, if only by example, to do the same. It . . . impinges on my freedom when they take up more than their fair share of my dentist's time, [particularly] when he is called upon to mend the errors of their ways; it [also] impinges [on my freedom] when this extra treatment is paid . . . out of the Exchequer and insurance premiums [that I have paid].

I would also like to say, Mr. Speaker, that water delivered by a public water system is not an individual right. It's something that has been accomplished through the combined efforts of the community.

Another charge, Mr. Speaker, is that it imposes extraordinary risk on certain individuals who, by reason of occupation, environmental circumstance, state of health, dietary habits, are already exposed to a relatively high intake of fluoride. Numerous studies examine the various concerns with occupation, envi-

ronment, diet, et cetera. None of these negates the fluoridation of the public water supply. A good example is where a person dialysing on an artificial kidney cannot use fluoridated water without harm. In reality, a kidney patient does use special equipment, called de-ionizing tanks, to filter out the water being used. The reason is that the water is passed over a membrane opposite the person's blood and, due to the water's lack of ions, attracts the impurities from the blood stream. The kidney patient then needs all the ions to be taken out of the water. These ions do not only include fluoride; they also include calcium, sodium, et cetera.

Another charge made is that fluoridation is a communist plot to weaken the democratic nations. As of 1975, the U.S.S.R. was reported to be a large user of fluoridation. Mr. Speaker, a large user is any country serving over one million people. The project was started in the U.S.S.R. in 1960 and presently serves a population of over 30 million people.

Another charge will be that it only benefits children. Dental decay is a progressive disease, and an increasing number of teeth become affected with the passing years. Dental benefits of early fluoridation persist into adult life. Dental caries may not be completely prevented by fluoride, but their incidence is greatly reduced. Most studies show at least a 50 per cent reduction. Surveys in the United States and England have shown that the effect of fluoride is maintained at least into middle age.

Another charge quite often used by, I would say, an irresponsible press is that sodium fluoride is rat poison, as opposed to nature's calcium fluoride. Now as I mentioned earlier, fluoride is plentiful in nature. It's bound to many different elements. In the case of fluoridation a soluble fluoride is introduced into the water supply. When introduced into solution a soluble fluoride compound loses its bonds and becomes a free-floating ion. That is, Mr. Speaker, if you put calcium fluoride and sodium fluoride into a pot of water, you would not have two compounds in water. You would have particles of sodium, particles of calcium, and particles of fluoride. If you were to boil the water until the pot was dry, you would be left with sodium fluoride and calcium fluoride. These fluorides would not differentiate between the calcium and sodium; it makes no difference what they were bound to before. The main point is that the fluoride is in a free state once it is in water; it is not sodium fluoride.

Another point is that the amount of sodium fluoride used is nowhere near the toxic level. A dental officer explains that the acute dose for a 165-pound man is in the range of 2.5 to 5 grams. One quart of water fluoridated at one part per million contains one milligram of fluoride ion. In other words, it would be necessary to consume at least 625 gallons of water to obtain a toxic dose. After you drank this much water who'd need to worry about whether or not it was toxic?

Another suggestion, Mr. Speaker, is — and I quote from a consultant's report on dental health services prepared for our government — that fluoridation could be taken care of by parents using tablets. The problem with this is that parents have to remember to use the pills every day. Clinical trials suggest that after one, two, or three months this process usually stops because the mother has too many other prob-

lems to worry about.

There are many alternatives to community water fluoridation, and some are inexpensive. But it must be emphasized that none is as effective in reducing dental decay as fluoride provided daily in the water, or as a supplement during the 15 or more years of tooth formation.

It's quite possible, Mr. Speaker, that you'll hear this afternoon that fluoridation contributes to or affects the following: acne, allergy, anemia, bladder stones, blood coagulation, blood pressure, boils, constipation, coronary disease and on, and on. Worst of all, Mr. Speaker, is that you'll continually hear there is a correlation between cancer mortality increase and fluoridation. This was raised again earlier this year by Dr. Dean Burk in Toronto. Dr. Burk's statement was refuted by Lloyd H. Bowen, fluoridation officer for the Canadian Dental Association, and significantly, I think, by Dr. R.M. Taylor, the executive director of the National Cancer Institute of Canada.

Going back to the United States for a minute: in January 1975, 105 million people were using fluoridated water. Here are some of the U.S. cities that use it: New York, Chicago, Detroit, Washington, Seattle, Denver, San Francisco, Los Angeles, Jacksonville, and El Paso. Two cities, Houston and San Jose, have either partly or all natural fluoridated water. Some of the states in the United States that require fluoridation of public supplies are Georgia, Nebraska, Alaska, Indiana, and Florida. It's interesting to see the organizations in the United States that support it: the American Heart Society; the American Legion; the American Water Works Association; the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare; the U.S. Defence Department, and the AFL/CIO.

I mentioned earlier the royal commission report of the Hon. Peter Crisp of the Supreme Court of Tasmania. This is a world-famous study which came down conclusively in favor of fluoridation. It studied exhaustively such matters as death from use of heavily fluoridated water. It had as consultants experts from all over the world, and dealt very extensively with allergies; the onus of proof that it was safe; morbidity and mortality between fluoridated and unfluoridated water supplies; periodontal disease; the fluoride and cell metabolism in cancer; the effects on the kidneys; the effects on the thyroid gland; enzymes in pregnancy; benefit to adults; interference with religious freedoms; palatability, taste and smell; cooking and food processing; and the problems involved in water engineering. These were just some of the matters studied by the commission, which, as I mentioned earlier, used people from all over the world.

It's interesting that in May 1975 the Minister of Health of the province of Ontario congratulated Brantford on its thirtieth anniversary of fluoridated water supply — the first in Canada. [Here are] some interesting figures on the report of the city of Toronto in 1976. Fluoridation has cut tooth decay by 50 per cent in children aged 5, 7, or 9, who were born after the program started. For those born before 1973, when it was brought in — after a great dispute — tooth decay had declined in the 13 year olds. The costs, Mr. Speaker, were less than 25 cents per person.

Unfortunately, in spite of the finding of the Kittering Institute, which has appraised over 8,500 scientific reports, some professional people still form societies such as The Canadian Society for the Scientific Study

of Food, Water and Air Contamination. These groups usually oppose fluoridation. They are usually few in number but very often are very vocal. Their yellow journalism prints pictures of rusted pipes. The word "cancer" is always worked into their headlines.

But now, Mr. Speaker, to Alberta, and the Zier Report. Many times we hear members of the opposition question the state of dental health, particularly in rural Alberta. It is not as good as it could be. Seventy-nine per cent of Albertans used piped water, which could easily be fluoridated. If Calgary, particularly its weekly press, showed leadership, and our city had fluoridation, 75 per cent of Albertans would be served. For each dollar spent on fluoridation, we would have saved \$65 on dental treatment — with no pain. The entire system for our province could be installed for a little over \$2 million.

Under present law, Mr. Speaker, a simple majority plebiscite is necessary to fluoridate water. If it fails, two years must pass before another is held.

Many members of the House oppose fluoridation because they use natural water. Many areas in our province could be excluded from this legislation, as they have more fluoride in their water than the recommended dosage. Some of these localities are Alix, Alliance, Beaverlodge, Didsbury, Lacombe, Nanton, Sexsmith, Stettler, Three Hills, Two Hills, and Wildwood. All have adequate fluorine in their water to prevent tooth decay in their children. Unfortunately, many communities that have passed fluoridation but are not yet fluoridating their supplies are: Canmore, Raymond, Smoky Lake, Sexsmith, Elk Point, Spirit River, Tilley, and Wainwright. Under the Alberta municipal waterworks assistance program, the following communities have voted for assistance for fluoridation: Camrose, Rainbow Lake, Fox Creek, Smoky Lake, Hardisty, Lamont, High Level, and Viking.

An interesting report, put out by the city of Edmonton, shows that in 1966 every child in the city of Edmonton had an average of 2.67 decayed teeth. Ten years later, in 1976, this had dropped to 0.863. I hope the citizens of Calgary would be interested in this comparison between condition of the teeth in their city to those in the capital.

For purposes of education of hon. members, Mr. Speaker, it might be interesting for them to know that in other provinces the following prevails: in the province of Quebec all public water supplies must be fluoridated. In Ontario, municipal councils may pass the necessary by-law for fluoridation; however, if 10 per cent of the voters request a plebiscite, it must be held. In Manitoba and Saskatchewan the local councils may pass the necessary by-laws.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very simple act. It would require no staff other than that already working for the Department of Social Services and Community Health. It would remove from local councils the burden of making a decision on this vital health measure. It's usually debated more in the yellow press than in the councils of their elected representatives.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of this bill for two very simple but very excellent reasons. First of all, it improves the health of our children in a significant manner, eliminating unnecessary pain and suffering. Most important, Mr. Speaker, it would save hundreds of millions of dollars we are spending in the

training of dentists, dental assistants, and all the medical support staffs. I think our Legislature has to concern itself more with preventive health measures than building extensive medical facilities as we seem bent on. We have to pay more attention to preventing these causes rather than curing the results of our inattention in the earlier stages.

MR. FARRAN: Mr. Speaker, emotions run very high — often irrational — on this subject, as I have discovered over the years. Those who criticize the proposal are called crackpots and faddists for daring to speak out, and sometimes insinuations have been made that the proponents are either part of a conspiracy to dispose of waste products for the aluminum industry or agents of some Red plot. One of my colleagues said that if I was going to speak on this subject I would certainly be mentioning communist rat poison. Well, I'd like to avoid these extremes, but I know from experience that it's unlikely I'll be treated so kindly in return.

First I'd like to give you the argument from the viewpoint of civic rights and why I so strongly oppose this proposition. In basic principle, I put it to my fellow members that every citizen in a free country should have the right to choose what he eats and what drugs he takes. We were discussing earlier, in the question period, the proposition that B.C. should follow the Japanese model and have compulsory treatment for drug addicts. That would be a really revolutionary change in our way of life. Perhaps it has to come. But at the moment I'm saying that until that change takes place we should be able to choose for ourselves. That right to personal guardianship of one's body is a fundamental right even for minorities. It would be a breach of human rights to make a Jew or a Moslem eat pork. It would be a breach of fundamental rights to force a blood transfusion on a Jehovah's Witness, though some people think that should be done.

Putting it in simple terms, I believe we should respect the right of every citizen to buy his medicine from a drugstore and not to have it forced upon him. Now if some socialists want to give him those drugs free — like free fluoride pills — or pay his bills at the drugstore, okay, but they shouldn't force him to have it. You see from that remark that I have reservations even about the majority voting to force medication upon the minority, which is the present system in fluoridation. But at least when this is done it's done by conscious act, and the opposing factions have the right to argue their case before the plebiscite. At least that has some semblance of fairness.

There are exceptions. My hon. colleague here has been saying, what about chlorination? Okay. Chlorine is added to the water supplies to kill contagious disease, to kill bacteria. Since when has tooth decay been contagious? Even though recent studies point to some undesirable side effects of using chlorine as a germicide — there have been recent reports in the newspapers about studies in the United States — surely the public danger from such contagious diseases as typhoid warrants the risk. There are some others. There's pasteurization of milk and honey, although that's not quite the same as the universal addition of a chemical to the water supply — it's only raising the temperature to kill germs. Salt is generally iodized, I know, to fight goitre — quite

prevalent in some parts of this province — but non-iodized salt is available to people on diets who cannot take too much iodine. They have an alternative.

The special conditions pertaining to chlorine used as a germicide do not pertain to fluoridation. Tooth decay is not contagious. No germs are being killed. The object is to change the chemical composition of tooth enamel by affecting the body metabolism, thus making the tooth enamel more resistant to refined sugars. There are arguments about how effective this is, and whether it's worth the risk of side effects; but there can be no semantic argument, even though it's often made, that this is anything other than mass medication. It may be medication aimed at prevention of tooth decay, but it's still medication.

My second argument springs from the premise that all dangerous drugs should be prescribed, and dispensed in exact quantities. No educated person argues that sodium fluoride or sodium silica fluoride are not dangerous and toxic chemicals. Everyone knows they are. They're admittedly toxic at much, much lower levels than are now claimed for saccharin, which has recently been banned by the Food and Drug Administration. There is an argument that fluorides are safe at this lower recommended concentration of one part per million with water, although many studies show they are extremely toxic at levels of two parts per million and up, because it's a cumulative poison. Now medicine is an inexact science...

AN HON. MEMBER: Agreed.

MR. FARRAN: ... but it doesn't normally try to adjust dosages or drugs to minimize side effects — it does, it normally does. But how can adding one part per million to the water supply be a scientific dose unless doctors also prescribe the amount of water one should drink every day? I mean it's so unscientific. They put one part per million into the reservoir and then don't tell you how many glasses of water to drink. Actually the target is children under 12, I'm told, and it's admitted that fluoride can have little or no effect on adult teeth. Why then is there so much antipathy to the much more scientific method of free fluoride pills, fluoride drops, fluoride tooth painting, or adding fluoride to milk, often drunk more frequently than water by children? Actually the antidote to fluoride poisoning is calcium, so many believe that fluoride in milk would be less hazardous — just as natural fluorspar or calcium fluoride, a compound found in many rural water wells, is less hazardous than the sodium fluoride by-product of aluminum and the by-product of a phosphate rock industry, which is where we get our supply. It's admitted that even at one part per million some people will suffer from mottled teeth. These teeth are brittle and can break more easily than healthy teeth. Anyone who's lived in Alberta for 20 to 30 years must have seen the odd person with mottled teeth coming from a rural area where there's a high concentration of fluoride in the water supply. Of course the best way to avoid tooth decay among children is to give them milk, to make them brush their teeth, and to limit their intake of pop and candy. But nobody's brave enough to do that. They'd rather force me to take a poison I haven't asked for.

Now it's only fair that I should tell you this: when

the proposition is mandatory fluoridation at the whim of local councils — I have to tell you this — that opinion about the safety of fluoridation is not unanimous. That's why so many jurisdictions have voted against fluoridation throughout the world, and that's why even countries differ. Some prohibit the measure altogether. If Calgarians don't want fluoridation, they have a perfect right to refuse. If Edmontonians think they have lower dentist bills than Calgarians, I'd like to see someone prove it. All the dentists in Edmonton seem to me just as prosperous as the dentists in Calgary.

AN HON. MEMBER: There are fewer of them.

MR. FARRAN: Fewer dentists? I'd like to see that demonstrated too. I haven't noticed that there are any fewer dentists in Edmonton than in Calgary. Let's have a study on that. Before you make your proposition you should do the research, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CLARK: Let's bring in a consultant.

MR. FARRAN: The idea begins with observations apparently made in Hereford, Texas, during a study of the ill effects, strange to say, of fluorosis, a well-known disease caused by excessive fluorine intake. That's how it all started; somebody was studying the poisonous effect of fluorine. It was observed — and here we're dealing with much higher concentrations of natural fluorine than one part per million — that although the population of Hereford, Texas, had various bone ailments they had remarkably good teeth.

Since then the argument has gone back and forth, statistical arguments always including deciduous or milk teeth as well as permanent teeth — and of course they never tell you it is a known fact that all children by the age of 12 have lost their first set of teeth. The argument has centred about controlled cities, fluoridated and unfluoridated. A Nobel prize winner, Hugo Theorell, said that fluorides destroyed essential enzymes and that sodium fluoride was not an essential nutrient. Dr. George Waldbott, the Detroit allergist, said he'd done double-blind tests which proved that some people were allergic or poisoned by fluoridated water.

There are others who have claimed sodium fluoride was carcinogenic, or cancer producing. They apply that argument to almost everything — tobacco, saccharin, pop...

AN HON. MEMBER: Sex.

MR. FARRAN: ... so I'm not totally sold on it, but they do include sodium fluoride in that long list of carcinogenic poisons. Others have attributed mongolism to heavy fluoride concentrations in parts of India and South Africa. There have been arguments that fluorides corrode pipes and tanks, that the approved machines find it hard to control at a concentrated concentration of one part per million. Once, years ago, I proved that was so in Red Deer by taking samples from the taps of the public schools, and finding that the concentration was far above one part per million.

There are insinuations that fluoride combines with calcium to form excessive concentrations of pipe

bends in joints. There have been claims that fluoridated water kills fish and chinchillas. They had to close down a plant. It's very, very important to give fish and fur-bearing animals like mink and chinchillas water good enough that it doesn't kill them. That's very important to a farmer. They closed down the plant at Garrison, Montana, that was exporting phosphate rock to Alberta because so many farmers lost cattle from fluoride poisoning. It was closed down completely — just across the border at Garrison, Montana.

I don't know the truth. The fact that the World Health Organization promotes fluoridation impresses me but doesn't convince me. I believe there are more scientific ways than putting it in the water. It's a question of freedom of choice to me.

For some years now in Alberta we've left it to a majority of the people in each jurisdiction to decide. Edmonton fluoridates its water; Calgary doesn't, despite several plebiscites, all of which were defeated by big margins. In my riding people voted four to one against fluoridation in successive plebiscites. In this position at least they're like the people of Los Angeles. I therefore vote against this bill.

MR. GHITTER: Mr. Speaker, I was wondering if the hon. minister would permit a question.

MR. FARRAN: Certainly.

MR. GHITTER: Mr. Speaker, I'm wondering if the hon. minister would like to comment on the suggested inconsistencies of what we've heard from him this afternoon, where, in his first speech freedom of choice meant nothing, but in his second speech freedom of choice meant everything.

MR. FARRAN: Mr. Speaker, I don't follow that. I think I have to be consistent that I believe in back to basics, and the basic principle of a water supply is to supply safe and potable water and not medicine.

AN HON. MEMBER: We liked your first speech.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to commence my remarks this afternoon by stating my position first, so there's absolutely no confusion in the House as to where I stand on the matter. I'd like to do that by reading a motion which I had prepared for the Order Paper before I realized that the hon. member had prepared a private bill. The motion was to the effect: the Legislative Assembly directs the government of Alberta to undertake a program of mandatory fluoridation treatment of drinking water for public supply systems throughout Alberta, in recognition of the proven benefits deriving from the fluoridation of drinking water to the preventative dental health of the children of this province.

Mr. Speaker, I think in view of the course this debate has run so far I should perhaps begin by commenting on some of the arguments we've just heard from the hon. minister. Mr. Minister, without making any insinuations, as you had anticipated at the beginning of your speech, I would say that I did not find it as vigorous and challenging; nor did it reflect the disciplinary approach of your first contribution this afternoon, nor the suggestion that there's a

higher authority that knows better than some of the less capable, less controlled individuals in our society.

MR. SPEAKER: Would the hon. member apply a strong dose of fluoride to his use of the personal pronoun in addressing the minister.

MR. YOUNG: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To begin with the hon. minister's first argument, the question of civic rights. The argument as I understood it was the basic principle that every citizen should have the right to choose what he eats, what he drinks, the drugs and the medication he takes. I advance in counterpoint to that argument, Mr. Speaker, the suggestion that we already pay out of the general revenue of this province, which is derived — at least in part in our very affluent province — from the taxes each of us pay. We provide part of the dental care because we do it for everyone who is on social assistance and asks for dental care. So we are already part way into a state program of dental care. If the hon. minister's constituents are similar in opinion to some of mine, there is some feeling among the citizens of our province that dental care provided free to all citizens would be just a wonderful thing to have.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that in the decisions we make we should be careful to maintain as economic an approach to the treatment of social problems as we can. The minister says it's a violation of a basic principle. I say it's a violation of a basic right that I have, to have to pay my taxes to repair damages caused by individuals who will not take care of themselves, who will not apply to themselves the same discipline I apply to myself. That is a violation of my civic right. Hon. minister, I think that the argument drawn this afternoon about the question of civic rights and basic principles is more a question of degree, a question of at what point does one civic right have to give way or be compromised by another right.

AN HON. MEMBER: It's woolly-headed liberalism.

MR. YOUNG: Well it certainly isn't the strong Progressive Conservative statement of principle that I heard earlier in the afternoon, whether it's woolly-headed liberalism or not.

Mr. Speaker, I submit to this Assembly, on the matter of economics, that we ought all to be concerned about the best way of dealing with the problem of the health of our citizens, of assuring that those citizens have the most care that can be provided. The hon. minister asked about research. I have in my hand a report of the Committee on Dental Service to Rural Areas from the Senate of the University of Alberta, published in September 1976. In their conclusions they say:

Fluoridation of public water supplies is unquestionably the most economical, most effective single means of major improvement in the dental health of Albertans, and implementation of fluoridation should be an essential part of any preventative program.

I suppose we can dismiss it and say that there are problems, that not everything is proven beyond doubt, as the hon. minister has tried to do. But I submit that the kind of research undertaken — the compilation of reports and review of research literature to which this

report refers — satisfies me and should satisfy anyone who has any faith in our scientific community, that the fluoridation of water is not, if properly done, a harmful program for any citizen.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. minister goes on to argue that all drugs should be prescribed. I agree. The system we have for the fluoridation of water supply is controlled and prescribed. The minister says there is some variation. The hon. minister can find variation, as the hon. member who moved this bill indicated, in the water supplies in many communities, because fluoride is a naturally occurring substance. In some of our communities it occurs in quantities greater than would normally be recommended. It occurs naturally in that form. But I submit that the shallow argument that it should be prescribed is not at all a substantive argument. It is an argument that falls on the very nature of the way we in this province — where it has been undertaken — have proceeded to fluoridate the water supplies. The suggestion is that the target is children under 12 years of age. The research I have read indicates that in fact is where the greatest benefit can accrue. But it is not where the only benefit can accrue. Mr. Speaker, I submit that to argue that tablets should be provided because that's where the greatest benefit can accrue is not at all a sufficient or sustainable approach.

Mr. Speaker, reference was made to various problems of poisoning, with the suggestion — as I interpreted the hon. minister's remarks — that fluoridation can be likened to a form of poisoning. I haven't checked with the hon. minister about what water he drinks when he lives in the city of Edmonton. It may be that with his election and removal from the city of Calgary, he has been poisoned for these six years plus, because if he's drinking from the public water supply in Edmonton he is in fact drinking fluoridated water.

AN HON. MEMBER: He's dying.

MR. FARRAN: No alternatives.

MR. YOUNG: Oh yes, Mr. Speaker, the hon. minister has an alternative. He has the same alternative a few hard-headed individuals who had different points of view chose to exercise when Edmonton began the fluoridation of water. They could go down to the publicly provided tap and get water that had in it only the poison chlorine. No fluoride at all, and they could carry it home with them. He has that opportunity. Where's the tap? I believe the tap has been turned off. I'm not sure. I think people lost interest in doing that.

From my perspective, I suggest to the hon. members of the Assembly that we're speaking here of one facet of a social concern, and that is the cost of dental care. I leave quite aside the problems of the pain, suffering, and inconvenience which accrue to persons who have not had adequate dental care. I suggest that if one is concerned about economy and efficient provision of services, one ought to be concerned with the economics of providing dentists to take care of caries, a dental problem which is quite unnecessary and quite avoidable at a minimum cost. The report I have suggests that to provide the dental work that should be undertaken, we would require more dentists than we can presently provide through

our provincial educational institutions. The report suggests that in 1974, had we chosen to meet the demand that some people believe exists, we would have had to provide a new dentistry building, at that time at a capital cost of \$17 million. It would have had an annual operating cost in 1974 dollars of \$4,709,000. In 1977 dollars we'd be looking at considerably higher figures than that.

Mr. Speaker, I rest my case with a strong plea to the members. Unless we consider the scientific evidence before us and act on it in the least costly and most efficient manner known to us — which is the fluoridation of public drinking water supplies in the province — we are doing somewhat less than justice to our responsibility. We are in fact allowing persons to suffer from poor dental care needlessly. We are incurring on their behalf, as individuals, and on the provincial purse, higher costs than need be in the provision of dental services. I think, Mr. Speaker, that unless stronger evidence of the so-called harmful effects can be brought to us, we should ignore emotional speeches.

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to participate very briefly in this interesting debate this afternoon. I think it's fortunate that the debate is taking place here in the Assembly. There have been discussions about how emotional this sort of topic becomes. The reason I say it's fortunate is because thus far only the terms "hard-headed" and "fuzzy-headed liberal" have been used to describe those who oppose the measure. I've heard other expressions used as well. But this afternoon the debate has been well conducted thus far.

I find Bill 223 a curious piece of legislation, in that the member who has introduced it represents part of a community that on four occasions has soundly rejected the measure. So I have some difficulty reconciling in my mind the manner in which we as legislators are responsible for representing the views of our constituents. I think it's important that we keep in mind what democracy is. I might state that Thomas Jefferson many years ago, when speaking of democracy, said:

All will bear in mind this sacred principle that though the will of the majority is in all cases to prevail, that will be to rightful, must be reasonable; that the minority possess their equal rights, which equal law must protect, and to violate would be oppression.

I think it's important that we keep in mind that minorities have rights. I know when I was a young fellow growing up, one of the lessons my father taught me was that you can have 10 men in a room and ask them a question, and if nine men give the identical answer it doesn't necessarily mean that that tenth man is wrong.

I think it's important for us to keep in mind, when statistics are rolled out, the names of groups who are in favor of a certain measure or opposed to a certain measure. We must measure the quality of their research and whether they are parroting one another. In many cases on this particular issue, those scientists who have done extensive double-blind tests are being ignored, where those who were copying the literature, that has been repeated here very ably this afternoon, and keep copying one another — this by sheer weight of repetition we assume to be fact, or at

least many people assume to be fact. I think we must be careful in that area and on any other subject that simple repetition of an item doesn't make it a fact, and the voice of a minority who has done a careful research on the subject should be heard.

On the scientific nature of the measure, I don't think anyone would argue — and I certainly wouldn't — that good dental health is important. It's most important. It's most important to overall health. It's important that our children do have good sound teeth, and no one would argue against that premise. But there is the other and very important factor: how far does the state go in assuring good health? Do we legislate that we must put a certain element in the water supply? It's been stated here that it's not a drug. It is a drug because if you go to the drugstore and ask for sodium fluoride you cannot purchase it without a prescription. You simply can't. But in the water supply it's termed a mineral nutrient or some other item.

But the point I'm trying to make is how far do we go as a government in legislating the health of our children? What is the responsibility of the parents to teach their children good dental hygiene, to teach them to brush their teeth, to teach them to eat the proper foods? One of the things I find difficult in looking at this subject is that a water supply is fluoridated and the parents make certain assumptions. One of the assumptions is that simply because the water supply is fluoridated you can have terrific teeth, no matter what you eat or how you look after your mouths. That's one of the negatives of this particular measure.

So I think that all of us have a responsibility to bear in mind that we as legislators can only go so far in legislating the health of our citizens, and it has to be reasonable. This particular measure — and it's been debated for the last 15 years — of using the water supply, the communal water supply to carry, whether we call it a drug, a mineral nutrient or a natural element, but added artificially to the water supply to help a certain segment of the population, is a real departure from our historic system. One of the things I think it's important to realize is that we shouldn't be using our water supply as a vehicle for treating individuals. I agree wholeheartedly with treating the water either with chloride or with alum in order to avoid the spread of communicable diseases and to protect our citizens. But to use it as a vehicle to carry medication or a mineral nutrient to our citizens is just contrary to the feeling I have about what that system is designed for. It was designed to carry water to our citizens.

I don't really want to get into the debate of whether fluoride is good for you, or bad for you, or whatever. But I would like to question for a moment the scientific value of saying, okay, the optimum dose for a child up to 12 is one milligram per day, and you would get that if the water was fluoridated at the rate of one

part per million, and you would achieve that by drinking one litre of water a day. Well, by golly, that's not very good medicine. That's not very close prescribing. Surely we can do better than that. The suggestion by the hon. minister that it be administered by tablet in exact dosage is far better. It's more reasonable to me in every way, shape, and form.

So, Mr. Speaker, I simply can't support this bill because I feel it violates our freedom of choice, and though it may be a minority, I believe the rights of minorities must be respected. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

[Mr. Speaker declared the motion lost. Several members rose calling for a division. The division bell was rung]

[Three minutes having elapsed, the House divided]

For the motion:

Backus	Musgreave	Walker
Gogo	Notley	Warrack
Kidd	Taylor	Young
Little	Tesolin	

Against the motion:

Adair	Foster	Peacock
Ashton	Hansen	Planche
Batiuk	Harle	Purdy
Bogle	Hunley	Russell
Bradley	Hyland	Schmid
Chambers	King	Schmidt
Chichak	Koziak	Shaben
Clark	Kroeger	Thompson
Crawford	Leitch	Trynchy
Doan	Mandeville	Webber
Donnelly	McCrae	Wolstenholme
Dowling	McCrimmon	Yurko
Farran	Paproski	Zander
Fluker		

Totals	Ayes — 11	Noes — 40
--------	-----------	-----------

MR. FOSTER: In the absence of Dr. Buck, who could not be with us this afternoon, and since we cannot proceed with Bill 224, and in view of the hour, I move, Mr. Speaker, that this House do now adjourn until tomorrow at 10 a.m.

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Assembly stands adjourned until tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock.

[The House adjourned at 5:16 p.m.]