

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Title: **Tuesday, May 10, 1983 2:30 p.m.**

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

PRAYERS

[Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair]

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of privilege to state the following. Having participated in the debates and deliberations of the Members' Services Committee at its last two meetings on the evenings of Monday, May 2, and Monday, May 9, and having thus been able to observe at first hand the process which led to last night's committee decision with regard to funding levels for the two opposition caucuses, I find I can no longer in good conscience continue to serve as a member of that committee.

More than any other, the Members' Services Committee must conduct itself as the utterly impartial servant of the members — all the members — on whose behalf it pursues its deliberations. However, on the basis of its last two meetings, I've become convinced that the Members' Services Committee has become a mere tool with which members of the government caucus have chosen to pursue their own partisan aims. As such, its proceedings are a sham and its conclusions foreordained.

It is with regret that I am therefore forced to the conclusion that my continued presence as an opposition member on the committee would serve merely to legitimize what I can only view as the illegitimate functioning of the committee. Accordingly, I wish to advise you, Mr. Speaker, and the chairman of the committee that I will no longer serve as a member of the Members' Services Committee, effective immediately.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I too with great regret rise on a point of personal privilege. As a member of this Assembly for 16 years, I genuinely looked to serve on the Members' Services Committee. As a matter of fact, I requested from my colleague the hon. Member for Little Bow that I be given the privilege of serving on that committee. As a member with many years of experience, I felt that if we could really structure a genuinely impartial committee, we could serve the members of this Assembly and serve them well.

The hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood has indicated that it seems to us that impartiality has been removed from that committee. As a member of this Assembly, I feel badly when I see that we do not genuinely look at the picture as presented, when we did not, as a member of the committee on elections and privileges, genuinely look at the question that was before us in that committee. With great regret, Mr. Speaker, I too say that as of now, I resign as a member of the Members' Services Committee of this Legislative Assembly.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would also like to give notice that in Notices of Motions, my colleague the hon. Member for Little Bow will be providing an alternative to this Assembly.

head: NOTICES OF MOTIONS

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to give oral notice of a motion:

That the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, Standing Orders and Printing be directed to consider the advisability of striking a permanent board of internal economy, to be responsible for the funding of all members' offices other than Executive Council.

Mr. Speaker, that motion will be presented in written form and brought to the Legislature for consideration of the members.

head: INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill 37

**Department of Public Works,
Supply and Services Act**

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill No. 37, the Department of Public Works, Supply and Services Act. This being a money Bill, His Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor, having been informed of the contents of this Bill, recommends the same to the Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is necessary in order to facilitate the amalgamation of the Department of Public Works, Supply and Services, and the former Department of Government Services.

[Leave granted; Bill 37 read a first time]

head: INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS

MR. HIEBERT: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the real Speaker, the hon. Member for Edmonton Meadowlark. [interjections] I would like to introduce to you, and through you to members of the Assembly, 46 grade 6 students from Rio Terrace school. They are accompanied by their teachers Mrs. Millions and Mrs. Chase. I ask them to rise in the members gallery and be accorded the traditional welcome of the Assembly.

MR. PURDY: Mr. Speaker, this afternoon it's my pleasure to introduce to you and to hon. members of this Assembly some 26 students from Brookwood elementary school in the town of Spruce Grove. They're accompanied by their teacher Mr. Broda and by parents Mrs. Schaefer, Mrs. Kivill, Mrs. Markham, and Mrs. Giesbrecht. They're in the members gallery, and I ask them to rise and receive the welcome of the House.

MR. JONSON: Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to introduce to you, and through you to members of the Assembly, 39 ladies and gentlemen from the Ponoka Senior Citizens' Drop-In Centre. Their tour leader today is Mrs. Sutherland. Later in the afternoon, they will tour the Provincial Archives and Museum. Among their many activities and projects, the Ponoka senior citizens' group is in the process of planning a new drop-in centre. They are seated in the public gallery, and I ask them to rise and receive the traditional welcome of the House.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce to you, and through you to the rest of the Assembly, 26 students from the Rocky junior/senior high school in that

beautiful constituency of Rocky Mountain House. With their teacher Mr. Mike Whitby and their bus driver Mr. Bill Nelson, they are seated in the public gallery. I ask them to rise and receive the welcome of the Assembly.

head: **ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**

AOC Loan

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the first question to the hon. Premier. It's a follow-up to questions yesterday with respect to the ministerial statement of April 6, 1982. I quote page 524 of *Hansard*:

... to the limited extent that corporations, groups, or organizations have hired or may in the future hire former cabinet ministers to make representations, it is my firm view — and I concur with Mr. Justice Brennan — that any preferential approach should not be allowed, and that it is unfair to other citizens or interests.

In light of the Premier's firm view on April 6, 1982, can the Premier advise the Assembly why he agreed to accept representations on behalf of Ram Steel from former Attorney General Mr. Foster in July last year? And is the Premier telling the House that the access granted Mr. Foster would be equally available to any other citizen of this province?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, two things: access would be equal, and there was no preference or priority given to representations by Mr. Foster in this particular case.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Is the Premier in a position to advise the Assembly when the government was first approached by Mr. Foster on behalf of Ram Steel, as distinct from the meeting the Premier referred to in July, when the Premier was approached by Mr. Foster?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I could not shed any light on that particular matter, but the Minister of Economic Development might be able to.

MR. PLANCHE: Mr. Speaker, if my memory serves me correctly, Mr. Foster never approached us in isolation of others. As shareholder and solicitor, he attended a meeting that was requested by the other principals of Ram Steel. But he never approached my office individually or in advance of his colleagues. Perhaps the Minister of Tourism and Small Business could supplement that.

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, my response is exactly the same. The member referred to was in the accompaniment of members of the board of directors of the Ram Steel Corporation at the one and only meeting we had together.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to either hon. minister. Can the Minister of Economic Development advise the Assembly when that meeting occurred?

MR. PLANCHE: I'd be happy to. I don't have the date with me. Perhaps my colleague does.

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, I have the date. It was November 25, 1982.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, can the hon. Minister of Economic Development advise the Assembly when he received the letter from Mr. Peckham which the Premier referred to yesterday, a copy of which the Premier was given but which I believe had been directed to the government? When did the government receive that letter?

MR. PLANCHE: Mr. Speaker, if he'd just hold on for a minute, I'll go through my notes here.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, while the Minister of Economic Development is attempting to find that information, could the Premier advise the Assembly whether any member of the Premier's staff, but more specifically Mr. Dutton, held any meetings or met with Mr. Foster on this matter?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I would have to check in that regard. They may well have. I just want to reiterate and make it absolutely clear to the Leader of the Opposition that as far as I'm concerned, former ministers of this government are clearly entitled to make representations, in the capacity in which they may be involved in the private sector, to the ministers or the government.

MR. PLANCHE: Mr. Speaker, the letter referred to by the hon. member was received in my office on April 23, 1982.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Since the Premier and the Minister of Tourism and Small Business were approached and the Minister of Economic Development was at a meeting with Mr. Foster, is the Premier in a position to advise the Assembly whether any other members of Executive Council were approached by Mr. Foster in any capacity, with respect to the Ram Steel proposal?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I don't know. I would have to check that information and provide it to the House.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Economic Development. Was the April 23 letter from Mr. Peckham based on a request for direct investment by the Alberta government, as opposed to a loan from the Alberta Opportunity Company?

MR. PLANCHE: Mr. Speaker, the contents of that letter are commercially confidential. I wouldn't discuss the contents at all at this time in the House, other than to comment that on this kind of initiative from the private sector, we get letters many times a week. In that context, there's nothing unusual at all about this one.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to either the hon. Minister of Economic Development or the hon. Minister of Tourism and Small Business. Could either minister advise the House whether the initial representation from Mr. Foster and his colleagues in Ram Steel, including Mr. Peckham, was with respect to an Alberta Opportunity Company loan or whether the Alberta Opportunity Company loan was in fact a proposal made by one of the members of Executive Council?

MR. ADAIR: To my knowledge, Mr. Speaker, my first contact was relative to an application that was made to the Alberta Opportunity Company by the officials of Ram Steel.

I might clarify a point relative to the request for a meeting with me as the minister responsible for the Alberta Opportunity Company. That request came from the board of directors of Ram Steel. They indicated that they would be bringing their solicitor along with them. It did not come from Mr. Foster.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to either hon. gentleman. Can either minister assist the House in determining whether the proposal from the company was originally a proposal for direct government involvement, which was then superseded by the recommendation that a loan take place from the Alberta Opportunity Company, or whether it was in fact a recommendation from the Alberta Opportunity Company as a result of initiatives taken by Ram Steel in approaching the AOC? Was it a bottom-up loan or a top-down venture?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure what bottom-up or top-down is, other than if you've got a convertible, I guess you put one up and the other one down.

I think it should be clarified, Mr. Speaker. I was alerted by the Alberta Opportunity Company that they had a query about the possibility of a loan. My involvement as the minister responsible would be that they had just alerted me that an application was coming in. I can't respond to the other. My colleague may want to respond to that.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the minister received a letter that the Premier referred to — a letter obviously important enough that it was brought to the Premier's attention in July — I'm sure the hon. Minister of Economic Development would want to advise us as fully as possible, to assist the House in this matter.

MR. PLANCHE: Mr. Speaker, if you'd spare me a minute, perhaps I'll go through the thought process around what was subsequent to the receipt of this letter.

Mr. Speaker, in Canada there is the capacity to produce steel behind a tariff wall that would satisfy all the requirements for almost every conceivable use of steel in Canada. In the past in Alberta, entrepreneurs have brought forward the beginnings of businesses that have flourished or foundered over time. But in any event, they have become a permanent part of the mosaic in Alberta and have become serious and large employers of people. I refer to Edmonton Steel Fabricators, which eventually became Stelco in Edmonton and is now an enormous employer of people, and Prudential Steel, which was later purchased by Dofasco and is an enormous employer of people in Calgary. In both cases, without entrepreneurial endeavor, the products they're producing would continue to have been produced in central Canada for consumption in Alberta. Ram Steel is indeed another instance of exactly that same case.

To add further to the validity of our deliberations — in spite of the allegations from across the floor from the Member for Spirit River-Fairview that something in terms of favoritism may have been caused by a dialogue with Mr. Foster, there's simply no substance to that at all. The fact of the matter is that the people of Red Deer are equity investors in this project. For the first time in

Canada's history, I believe, up to 85 per cent of the machinery for steel making was designed and manufactured in Alberta. Those were both integral parts of our deliberation.

The Department of Economic Development does not have the capacity to grant but does have the capacity to guarantee. Obviously, Mr. Speaker, a guarantee would be out of the question if the debt couldn't be serviced. The unfortunate part about Ram's history is that between the time of its conception and the time of the completion of manufacture, the market turned dramatically and so did the fortunes of that company. We would be hopeful that through the assistance the government appropriately supplied to Ram Steel, the original shareholders would indeed continue with their activities and enjoy the prosperity of their inventiveness. If the market place doesn't dictate that, in any event the facility will remain and will employ Albertans. In my judgment, that's an appropriate place for us to be active.

MR. NOTLEY: That's a touching little speech that I'm not sure the 70 people in Red Deer who've been thrown out of work by Ram would appreciate. [interjections]

Mr. Speaker, my question to the minister, however, is to go right back to the original question: is the minister in a position to tell the House, in the letter of April 23 — we now know the date — from Mr. Peckham, what the nature of that request for assistance was? Did it involve a direct investment in one way or another by this government, was it in fact a guarantee or, at that point, was the question of the AOC discussed by the government with officials of Ram Steel?

MR. PLANCHE: Mr. Speaker, the question deserves two answers. The first is that in the Leader of the Opposition's vast business experience, he would know that if there's no demand for a product, you can hardly employ people. I explained that we are now in that kind of hiatus in oil field activity, and therefore there were layoffs to balance their inventory with their receivables and their projected sales volumes. I have already answered the second issue. This is a commercially confidential letter, and I wouldn't disclose its contents in the House.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could just add to a previous matter that was raised in the House. I have been advised that there were no conversations between Mr. Joe Dutton of my office and Mr. Jim Foster of Ram Steel.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the second question to the hon. Premier. It's with respect to Mr. Peckham, the chief executive officer of Ram Steel. It also relates to the question of the authorization of Alberta Opportunity Company loans. When they authorized the largest loan in the history of the AOC — specifically given the vast business experience of the Minister of Economic Development — did the government of Alberta take into account the fact that on December 20, 1977, a loan and guarantee in the amount of over \$1 million was given to a company started by Mr. Peckham, Mustang Machinery Ltd., which went bankrupt one year later? Was that matter formally reviewed by Executive Council when it made the second loan to Mr. Peckham's company?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I refer that question to the Minister of Tourism and Small Business.

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, in my discussions with the Alberta Opportunity Company, they were aware of the previous application and the results of that loan made to a company under the directorship of the person mentioned. It should be mentioned that Ram Steel Corporation was a consortium of business people from the city of Red Deer and surrounding area. It was based on the entire shareholder position of the company that the loan was discussed by both the Alberta Opportunity Company and, eventually, Executive Council.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Then can the minister advise the Assembly whether this information with respect to the interrelationship of the two loans — the chief executive officer in both cases — was discussed by Executive Council when the authorization was made for the \$8 million Ram Steel loan?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, we were aware of it.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Can the minister advise the House whether any concerns — any concerns — were registered by the Alberta Opportunity Company, concerning the wisdom of the \$8 million loan to Ram Steel?

MR. ADAIR: I wonder if the hon. member would redirect the question, please.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, to the minister or any of the ministers. Can this government advise the House whether any concerns — any concerns — were registered by the Alberta Opportunity Company at any time prior to the authorization by Executive Council of this \$8 million loan to Ram Steel?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, maybe I should take a moment to go into the process of a loan application to the Alberta Opportunity Company. Where a loan is over the \$1 million mark, that loan application may be made initially to a loans officer who, in turn, through the process of the management of the Alberta Opportunity Company, will then proceed, with that loan, to the management committee who, in turn, will make a recommendation, with or without concerns or conditions, to the board of directors of the Alberta Opportunity Company. Mr. Speaker, the board of directors are private-sector businessmen in the province of Alberta, located anywhere from Lethbridge to Grande Prairie, from north to south and from east to west. I don't have them all at my fingertips right now.

In the process of a loan application, we receive a recommendation from the board of directors, the group of private-sector businessmen that I referred to a moment ago. On the basis of that recommendation, we deal with it. As the minister responsible, I take it forward to the finance and priorities committee and, should it be approved at that level, eventually to cabinet.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Can the minister advise the Assembly whether the government received any expression of concern by officers of the Alberta Opportunity Company, as opposed to the formal process that the minister alluded to?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure whether the intent of the question was concern relative to the formal process or relative ...

MR. NOTLEY: Concern relative to the wisdom of this loan.

MR. ADAIR: I guess the only concern I can recall at the moment was the size of the loan. I can recall when the first large loan above the \$800,000 level went to the \$4 million level. There were concerns expressed about going to that level and whether we were meeting the intent of the Alberta Opportunity Company. I guess it comes back to the board of directors then looking at that particular loan on the basis of what government policy is and what their particular policies were. They recommended that loan to us for approval.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. In the package of material, did Executive Council canvass the views of the board of directors, including any concerns the board of directors might have had in view of the size of this loan and the uncertain market, which was certainly a strong possibility in November, when this loan was approved?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, I can't respond for the individual members of Executive Council. But the normal process is that the package that comes to us from the board of directors is provided in sufficient time to be reviewed by the members that are in fact going to be making the decision, and this did take place at that time.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to either hon. minister. At this stage, can the government tell the House what proportion of the \$1 million AOC loan to Mr. Peckham's former company — or at least the company he started, Mustang Machinery, the company which went bankrupt — has in fact been recovered by the Alberta Opportunity Company?

MR. ADAIR: I can't, Mr. Speaker, but I will take that question as notice and respond.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to follow up with questions to the Premier with regard to Ram Steel. Mr. Foster is one of the directors on the board of Ram Steel. On page 60 of his report, Mr. Justice Brennan expressed concern about former cabinet ministers

speculating or being associated with companies which speculate in a financial way on decisions to be made by the Government.

My question to the Premier is: why did the Premier not draw this point from the judicial inquiry report to Mr. Foster's attention when Mr. Foster approached him about Ram Steel?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I think that was fully answered by me in the House on April 6, 1982.

MR. MARTIN: I will ask another question to the Premier. On page 58 of his report, in reference to a meeting between the hon. Mr. Johnston and Mr. Foster, Mr. Brennan said:

Had Mr. Johnston been ... aware of those personal interests of Mr. Foster, I am certain he would not have allowed the discussion to go as far as it did and most probably, would not have allowed any discussion whatsoever on that subject.

Was the Premier aware in July that Mr. Foster was on the board of Ram Steel and hence had a very personal interest?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I was aware that he was on the board, and I was aware he was the solicitor. I welcomed his representation and will continue to do so.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question to the Premier. The Brennan inquiry was ordered in July 1981 at the specific behest of the Minister of Housing and Public Works at the time, the hon. Member for Edmonton Calder, and the Minister of Municipal Affairs at the time, the hon. Member for Smoky River.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Could we get to the question, please.

MR. MARTIN: I quote the government's news release:

... a concern with statements that ... former ministers of the government made representations to members of the present cabinet ... thereby having had an [effect] upon [the] decision.

My question to the Premier is: at the very least, will the Premier request an examination by the Public Accounts Committee into the Ram Steel affair, for the same reason? As chairman of Public Accounts, I assure him we would look favorably on the request.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I see no justification whatsoever for that.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question to either the Minister of Tourism and Small Business or the Minister of Economic Development. Will they request that the Public Accounts Committee meet to clear the air on this matter?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, my response would be the same as the Premier's.

MR. MARTIN: We seem to have a very cavalier attitude here.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Would the hon. member please ask the question without general preambles.

MR. MARTIN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. What action will the Premier undertake in order to ensure a full airing of all the facts regarding Ram Steel?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I think the first point I'd like to make — and the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood is well aware of it — is that he has a different point of view of it than I do. The point of view was debated in this Legislature last spring, and that's the role and the position on representations by former ministers of this government. We're of the view that they would not be placed in any purgatory, that the only qualification we will have with regard to them is that they not have any priority or preference with regard to representations. We feel that very strongly. It was an issue that was debated last spring. It was an issue that formed part of the differences between the points of view expressed by the hon. member and the points of view of the party I represented, and which, to some degree, I'm sure formed part of the decision-making process of the citizens last fall. [interjections]

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question to the hon. Premier. Is the hon. Premier telling us that he rejects the main findings of the Brennan inquiry?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, again I refer the hon. member or his researchers, or both of them, to the April 6, 1982, *Hansard* reference that I made.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to either the Premier or the Minister of Economic Development. Will the government attempt to gain consent of the Ram Steel people to release the letter of April 23? Will the obstacle simply be a decision by Ram Steel, and will the government itself be prepared to release this letter should the company so agree?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, speaking on behalf of the government, we'd have to give some consideration to that. We view the public policy issue here, which has been responded to effectively by the Minister of Economic Development, as the full and valid reason for our decision. It's a clear part of the economic diversification attempts of our government, which I thought the hon. Leader of the Opposition would want to encourage.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Tourism and Small Business would like to supplement an answer.

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Leader of the Opposition raised a number of questions regarding the diversification loan by the Alberta Opportunity Company to Ram Steel of Red Deer, which I would like to expand on. I have reviewed my file and can advise the member that as part of their review of the Ram Steel application, in August 1982 the Alberta Opportunity Company commissioned Woods, Gordon consulting to do a market analysis and assessment relating to the future of Ram Steel. In view of the fact that Ram Steel would be only one of three producers in western Canada, the study indicated that Ram Steel could achieve sufficient market penetration in the western Canadian market to allow it to break even or operate at a profit. This information was included in the material on which Ram's loan approval of October 5 was based.

As I previously indicated, I became aware of Stelco's participation in mid-November 1982. Stelco's participation in Ram ownership and management was viewed as strengthening Ram's possibilities of success.

Performance guarantees are not a normal requirement of the Alberta Opportunity Company, as a high-risk lender of last resort, and could be detrimental to the long-term provision of jobs. Mr. Speaker, the survival of Ram Steel is the best guarantee for the provision of jobs in the long term and is a diversification initiative for the best long-term growth and performance of any business. The owners and managers must be allowed to react to market conditions in order to minimize losses or maximize profits and thus ultimately provide the best employment possibilities.

The Alberta Opportunity Company and Executive Council were aware of the indebtedness of Ram Steel to the Canadian Commercial Bank. Again, this is not unusual, as most businesses borrowing from the Alberta Opportunity Company have indebtedness to other lenders. I cannot comment on the specific figures used by the hon. Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, as this information is viewed by the Alberta Opportunity Company as commercially confidential.

Mr. Speaker, I should expand on that point of commercial confidentiality. Information requested by the Alberta Opportunity Company is of course confidential

between the company and the client. Any outside or independent assessments requested by AOC of a consulting firm or consultant are considered in the normal process as commercially confidential between that company and that client.

Mr. Speaker, I also took as notice the member's question regarding tax evasion charges against one of Ram's shareholders. Charges of tax evasion against an individual who owned a company which is a shareholder of Ram Steel were not known until published in the media in November 1982, after the initial approval of the Ram loan. These charges had no direct relationship to the Ram proposal, as the individual in question takes no active part in the day-to-day operation of the company and represents a minority position — and I'll repeat that, a minority position — not the "largest shareholder", as the member opposite stated in his question yesterday.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. The minister made reference to the Woods, Gordon report of August 1982. Will the minister be prepared to table that report in the Legislative Assembly?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, as I said just a moment ago, that particular report commissioned by the Alberta Opportunity Company is considered commercially confidential between the Alberta Opportunity Company and the client. That is the only way you can get the kind of information you are requesting from a firm that is going to provide you with an assessment or a study of the facts of any particular application or loan.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. So there would be no question of the commercial confidentiality being used for the government to evade its position, would the minister give the Assembly the undertaking that he would contact both the Ram Steel firm and the Alberta Opportunity Company and, should there be no objection, he then would table the Woods, Gordon report in the Assembly?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, I have some difficulty with the request of the hon. member, for two reasons. The first, particularly, is that if that should happen, the future of getting the kind of information the Opportunity Company, or any business firm seeking some understanding as to what it is they're attempting to do by way of the terms of reference they are asking for, would be jeopardized by the fact that at some point that could be made public. Thus, Mr. Speaker, I respect the confidentiality of that report for the Alberta Opportunity Company on behalf of both the company and the client.

MR. NOTLEY: Isn't that convenient, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to ask the minister: prior to the approval of the AOC loan and in that package of material the minister indicated he'd given to his colleagues on Executive Council before they authorized the largest loan in the history of AOC, was a complete audit of that company's financial position prepared and provided to Executive Council?

MR. ADAIR: I would have to take that question as notice, Mr. Speaker. I can't respond as to whether it was complete or whether the audit, as far as the company was concerned, was in that particular documentation.

MR. NOTLEY: With the vast business experience of this government, I would have thought the minister would

know that.

Mr. Speaker, could I ask the minister a supplementary question. Could he outline to the Assembly the assessment the government has made of Ram's liabilities-to-asset ratio and whether that assessment was made last fall? To date, between local shareholders in the central Alberta region, AOC, Stelco, and other financial institutions, some \$50 million has been put into the company, while the chief executive officer, Mr. Peckham, estimates its assets at \$35 million. Was that assessment made by Executive Council?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, I would have to take that question as notice. It went into too much detail for me to respond at this particular moment.

MR. PLANCHE: That's certainly not the right number, Notley.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

head: MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

203. Moved by Mr. Szwender:

Be it resolved that the Assembly urge the Attorney General to rigorously enforce the policy that in a case involving assault on a spouse, where it is considered that there is sufficient evidence to commence a prosecution, it be commenced by the Crown and not by private prosecution.

[Adjourned debate March 22: Dr. Carter]

DR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, like other members who spoke in this debate, I congratulate the Member for Edmonton Belmont for bringing this motion forward to the House for discussion. Quite obviously, it touches on a very sensitive issue in terms of the whole fabric of our society.

As I begin debate, I wonder if I might beg the indulgence of the House to read two short paragraphs from a book called *Alternative Social Services for Women*, edited by Naomi Gottlieb and published in 1980 by Columbia University Press. This deals with definitions, incidence, and patterns of abuse.

The terms used to label the problem (and used interchangeably here) are many: *battering, wife beating, wife abuse, wife assault, wife thrashing, domestic violence*. The physical acts involved are as varied as the strength, imagination, and inclination of the abuser. A man may use his hand to slap a woman, his fist to sock her, or his foot to kick her. He may hit her once, several times, or a hundred times. He may strike any part of her body, although the face, head, and abdomen are particularly common targets. Depending on his size and hers, an abuser may pick her up and throw her to the floor or against walls and furniture. A frequent pattern is for the physical abuse to begin with slaps and shoves, to progress to hitting and throwing, and once the woman is down, to advance to kicking, choking, and a literal "battering" of the woman's head against the floor or wall.

Some men also use implements for beating women. Knives, guns, clublike objects, belts, bottles,

and pieces of furniture are among the most familiar, but women have also been hit with telephones, potted plants, books, rocks, musical instruments, coathangers, golf clubs, and toys. Women are strangled with cords or scarves; smothered with pillows or blankets; burned with lighters, cigarettes, or stoves; drenched in water or other liquid; forced to eat, drink, crawl, or beg. In some cases, women are tied up and mutilated, frequently about the genitals and breasts. Women have also been thrown down stairs and out windows as well as locked up in rooms and closets.

That's the end of the quote, but unfortunately not the end of the problem.

With respect to the wording of the motion, it's interesting that it refers to assault on a spouse. Therefore, with respect to my comments on this issue, I remind the Assembly that we're speaking about a wife or common-law wife. The other thing that has occurred quite often, and is a growing concern, is women battering their husbands or common-law spouses. It's not simply a one-sided affair although, in all fairness, the majority of it does take place against females.

As chairman of the Social Care Facilities Review Committee, I would like to point out that facilities for battered women and children fall under the jurisdiction of that particular committee. There are nine shelters presently operating within the province of Alberta, and they have 215 spaces. As of May 2, 1983, the Social Care Facilities Review Committee has made 18 visits to these facilities in the course of the last two years, and we do visit these shelters on a regular basis. As a matter of fact, on the Easter weekend, the Member for Cypress, who is also a member of that committee, and I visited the Medicine Hat facility for battered women and children.

The shelters throughout the province are located: two in Calgary, three in Edmonton, one in Fort McMurray, one at Grande Prairie, one in Lethbridge, and one in Medicine Hat. It's my understanding that the communities of Red Deer and Lloydminster have similar projects under study and consideration. With respect to the capacity of these facilities: in Calgary, the Women's Emergency Shelter has 30 spaces; Discovery House has six. In Edmonton, there are three facilities: Hilltop House, with 20 spaces; WIN House, which has space for eight adults; and the women's emergency shelter, which has space for 75.

Mr. Speaker, it's interesting to note that while a number of action groups call for more and more shelters to be put in place and say there aren't enough spaces, one has to assume they're referring primarily to the larger centres of Calgary and Edmonton. By way of example, I relate to the Assembly that in 1982, when we last visited the Fort McMurray facility, there were 10 spaces but only two residents occupying space at that time. In Grande Prairie, there were 21 spaces but only 10 persons. In Lethbridge, there was space for 13 and only two there; and in Medicine Hat, 32 spaces and no one in the facility. Well, that's good. We'd like to keep it that way. But I do point out that the real pressure for this type of accommodation and space — you need it when the emergency arises, but it also seems that we need it in the larger centres in the province.

I mentioned earlier that the Member for Cypress and I visited the facility in Medicine Hat. I would like to commend the volunteers in that community who put together that facility, because it serves not only Medicine Hat but the surrounding rural area as well. They have

served women and children from as far away as Calgary, people who wanted to get away from the city of Calgary and the incidents that led to their battering. The physical plant in Medicine Hat is a very new building. It probably was built as a four-plex, so it has been fully integrated. It is in very good condition. The program is quite good. The relationship in terms of the community and with respect to the police department in particular, is really of fine quality and a great encouragement.

Obviously, when any community is going to look to form an emergency centre for battered women and children, they oftentimes have difficulties with communities: whether a community residential area wants to accept this type of accommodation in their area. We find that in terms of social services with respect to group homes, whether it be for physically or mentally handicapped persons, all too often too many of us in our communities are quite willing to have the facility, but we sure don't want it next door to us. So there are problems, even with respect to emergency accommodation for battered women and children. This whole issue of community acceptance — you must have a facility that you can find, yet it must have a low profile in the community. As mentioned, it must have an excellent working relationship with the local police, and it also must have security; a certain anonymity but a certain security, so we don't have the husbands showing up to break down the doors to get at their spouses for one more smashabout.

The matter of funding: the provincial Department of Social Services and Community Health has been funding these various projects with 80 per cent funding. Of course, we then expect the local communities to supply other sources of funding in addition to volunteer assistance. I think that is only appropriate because, after all, it makes for a better participation rate, a better understanding and, in the end, a better organization with respect to the local community and the province being there in partnership, attempting to meet this need.

The matter of incidence within the province of Alberta. The most recent statistics we have at hand would show that in Edmonton in the period 1978 to 1980, WIN House, for example, helped to deal with 452 families, which included 1,300 women and children. My understanding is that they also had to turn away a considerable number of women and children. In Medicine Hat in 1979 — this is before the shelter was established — police records show that in one year, they had 175 cases of wife beating. In Calgary in '79-80, the stats show that 2,023 persons were assisted, but 2,083 were turned away because there was no room. In Canada it's estimated that in 1981, half a million women were beaten in this nation of ours, and we regard ourselves as being a fairly enlightened people. In Alberta in 1980 to 1981, we were in the midst of a rapid in-migration to the province. There was great family upheaval, because some families stayed behind while the father moved on. But there was great mobility within the province to various communities. For example, in terms of oil and gas activity and servicing expansion, this also meant great mobility and oftentimes long hours working on the rigs. Then, when it came time for rest and recreation, unfortunately oftentimes they would take to drinking a bit too much and then going home and smacking somebody around. Now we have a different economic climate in the province, and wife battering has not really changed or decreased significantly. In terms of an economic downturn, what happens is that we find other people who are unemployed, who find frustration at their inability to find employment and then go

home and decide, in their anger, that they'll slap her around.

The other thing, of course, is that in terms of our whole society in the western world, but in North America in particular, we have various images projected upon the macho male, whether it be through advertising, radio, television, newspapers, or in girlie magazines. So we have these other kinds of approaches which seem to almost encourage, in a subliminal as well as an overt fashion, that in order to be male, you really have to be dominant. If the sequence logically continues, to be dominant you really have to exercise your dominance. One way of doing that is to have the upper hand on someone. If the other person doesn't want to receive the upper hand verbally, then you're darn well going to give her the upper hand in another way.

In terms of striking out at other people, all too often we need to examine our own motives. Those of us who have not been given to beating anyone realize that oftentimes, in our own anger and frustration, we get cranked up enough that we want to strike out, we want to lash out. Oftentimes it's because of our own inability to deal with our own needs and frustrations. Such is also the case in other areas with respect to the battering of a spouse.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to very briefly refer to another book. It's called *Wife Beating: The Silent Crisis*, written by Roger Langley and Richard Levy. Under a chapter called Why Does He Beat Her, these nine causes are listed:

1. Mental illness.
2. Alcohol and drugs.
3. Public acceptance of violence.
4. Lack of communication.
5. Sex.
- or the lack of it
6. Poor self-image.
7. Frustration.
8. Change.
9. Violence as a resource to solve problems.

Some statistics show that in 80 to 90 per cent of situations of battering, alcohol is one of the major factors involved. There is an excellent publication put out by the Canadian Advisory Council on the Status of Women, and I would recommend it to all members of the Assembly. It's a short booklet, written by Linda MacLeod, entitled *Wife Battering in Canada: The Vicious Circle*. It was published in 1980. In it are some sobering statistics, such as this: since 1978, 40,000 to 50,000 women in Canada suffered sufficient physical and mental abuse to seek outside help. In the same year, 20,000 divorce applications included physical cruelty in their grounds. Those of us who over the years have been involved in trying to counsel marriages that have been in difficulty or the inevitable drift towards divorce, realize that sometimes the grounds as given in a divorce proceeding may or may not necessarily be the truth. But it would appear that in '78 — this study comes up with this — 20,000 divorce applications included physical cruelty in their grounds. In Canada each year, one in 10 women, whether married or living in a relationship with a live-in lover or common-law, is battered. It's interesting that 70 per cent of the occurrences seem to be between 5 p.m. and 7 a.m. And every aspect of our residential fabric in the province or in the country is touched by this situation, whether it be in cities, towns, villages, hamlets, or farms and ranches. One of the sad things is that oftentimes the battering takes place while the woman is in a state of pregnancy. An acting out of anger, frustration, and jealousy is involved

in those attempts.

In 1978 the average profile was this: the woman was 28 years old; she'd been married for seven years. She was a Caucasian, a homemaker. The family income was roughly \$10,000. And this is an interesting stat: she had left that home at least once before because she had been battered before. On average, the family had two youngsters, the woman was pregnant and had been battered when pregnant, and she had a grade 11 education. Mr. Speaker, I suppose one of the damning statistics, and one of the most frustrating, is that with respect to the frequency of being beaten or slapped about, 31 per cent of the women were beaten weekly, and 26 per cent were beaten at least once per month.

In one of my recent visits to one of these facilities, I discovered that not every lady fits the profile. There was at least one shelter in this province that recently had concern, because a 76-year-old lady came to the shelter. Her husband was beating her up, because she wouldn't have sex with him as frequently as he wanted.

Who does the beating? Unfortunately, it could be any one of us here, male or female, but probably male. In one 1977 study in Winnipeg, it would appear that the worst groups were truck drivers, police officers, and doctors. I don't know whether they meant medical doctors, doctors of philosophy, or what. Another study, in Toronto, indicated that the worst offenders were lawyers, doctors again, and business executives. So you see, there's a different profile developing in Winnipeg and Toronto. The other thing is that the whole issue has not been subjected to that much study across the country for any length of time.

It would appear that for most of the wife beaters on which the analysis has been done so far, though, 50 per cent of the men who indulge in this form of violence had themselves been beaten as children. That in itself gives great concern to child care workers and social workers throughout the province, and I'm sure causes the Minister of Social Services and Community Health great concern. How does one not only try to apply band-aids to the physical wounds but try to deal with the ongoing mental abuse and the ramifications which take place generation after generation? It also seems that 34 per cent of those involved in wife beating have had a criminal record and have reached about a grade 11 education.

I understand that of the first 10 murders that have taken place in the city of Calgary in 1983, four involved women who were beaten to death by their husbands. I also understand that across Canada, of the women who were beaten to death by their husbands or lovers, 90 per cent had called police on the day they were murdered — a rather sobering statistic. This obviously puts tremendous pressure on our police departments and the constables on the beat.

[Mr. Purdy in the Chair]

One encouraging thing is happening, in addition to the shelter programs in our province. I understand that the Calgary General hospital now has sessions for wife beaters to go and work out some of their problems, their anger, and their frustration. Unfortunately, as of this time, the courts have not been all that co-operative in sentencing some of these men and directing them to take part in these rehabilitation programs. At any rate, I place the Calgary General hospital into this debate as being one example which is worth commendation, because obviously some people are starting to work with some of these

people to try to help them deal with their behavioral activities.

I mentioned the police and the pressure put on them at all times and from all quarters. I know that we in the Assembly commend our various policemen throughout the province as they cope with the various pressures on them. We realize that some of the situations in which they find themselves are not only situations where brutality has taken place but, over the long haul, situations of a brutalizing nature are in turn brutalizing and desensitizing for the policemen who have to deal with this on an ongoing basis. In a somewhat similar vein, I know our firefighters have to go to scenes of accidents or deal with fire situations. For these kinds of situations, you have to put up your own ego defence in order to be able to help other people.

The same thing is true for police. Often they are subjected to so many different types of pressures that they inevitably have to appear on the surface to be somewhat less sensitive than need be, just in terms of trying to keep their own sanity. It seems to be a fairly common acceptance among police enforcement officers that you have to handle domestic disputes with great care and caution. All too often, the animosities and emotions run so high that it can well erupt into a murder situation, then a striking out at the law enforcement officers and others who might be there attempting to help settle the dispute. I think a number of members in the House have seen the recent film version of the *Pirates of Penzance*, by Gilbert and Sullivan. One very happy chorus in there reads: a policeman's lot is not an easy one. That's entirely true, Mr. Speaker. But on the other hand, the lot of the victims of wife beating and child abuse is also not an easy one.

So once again, Mr. Speaker, I commend the Member for Edmonton Belmont for bringing forth the motion. I agree that it's been a useful motion to have before the Assembly, in terms of an information disseminating vehicle. I also hope we might be given the necessary means to pass this motion.

Thank you.

MR. SHRAKE: Mr. Speaker, I too would like to congratulate the Member for Edmonton Belmont. I think that what we are attempting to do here is get the message out to the public that wife battering is not acceptable. Only when we have the police get tough will some of the offenders, some of the people who, through ignorance, batter their spouses — only when we prosecute a few and they hear of it, will society realize that we don't accept wife battering. It's an unacceptable thing.

At this point we are spending government funds to build homes, picking up the operating costs. It's so bad in the city of Calgary that there are communities that don't wish to accept one of these homes. They have the fear that the police will not prosecute, the fear that the offenders are going to come into the neighborhood and disturb them. I've been at meetings where they say: we don't want this in our neighborhood; what if the man comes in here? Well, phone the police. But will the police respond vigorously to this or only push it off? It's a very tragic thing for the policeman who has to go out to these types of domestic scenes. I guess we've had a fair number of policemen actually killed while intervening in domestic disputes. But we must get the message to the public that this is no longer acceptable.

I know the bleeding hearts in our society figure that punishment is not a deterrent. But to some people, it is a deterrent. I don't agree that punishment is not a deter-

rent. When a man knows he will be punished, he will think twice about battering his spouse. Maybe that's the only way we can get it through. Maybe — just maybe — he'll be more rational and not resort to violent attacks on his wife. Of course, some men and women are going to have fights. This has gone on since time began. These are not the people we're after; we're after those who, through ignorance and stupidity, commonly and often resort to battering their wives. They send the wives out, and it falls on the public to support them, to look after them. We must get a message out to these people.

If our little efforts, our little debate, deter one person — if just one lady, one mother, one wife is spared a beating because of our deliberations — then our time here is not wasted today. I hope we have a unanimous vote in favor of this motion.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WOO: Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to speak in debate on the motion presented by the hon. Member for Edmonton Belmont. I would like to take this opportunity to commend him for bringing forward a very timely motion.

The motion itself focusses on an area of current concern, Mr. Speaker. At the same time, I believe it raises a number of serious questions with perhaps much broader implications, which, in my judgment, perhaps require a broader assessment in terms of our changing society, our present moral and social values, a greater awareness of what is occurring around us and a need to examine all of this within the context of our present justice system. The motion itself, plus the comments of members who have spoken before me, have raised a number of questions in my mind. In this regard, I certainly believe the motion and the issues it raises are very sensitive and complex.

First of all, I think we need to better understand family assaults of this nature, both in terms of causes and effects, and how they are currently being handled. Mr. Speaker, perhaps there's a need to understand the problems associated with the way we deal with current situations, and how we might improve the system and, hopefully, prevent or reduce the incidence of spousal assault.

Our life styles have changed dramatically over the past years, and certainly these changes have affected our homes, our families, and our attitudes. This is a normal course of events, as our standards and values are altered. Certainly within the new societal framework, we suddenly have a different set of values, concerns, and social circumstances, which in themselves create new problems. It appears to me that our automatic reaction is to immediately develop new strategies and programs to address these problems. In this instance, Mr. Speaker, the nuclear family can't help but be further affected as a result of the influence of new and changing programs, from the point of view of perception and our mental attitudes toward them.

In the case of spousal assault, I think it is safe to say that within limits, the incidence of assault is cyclical in nature, given a number of conditions. In so-called normal times, I think it will always happen but perhaps more often when times are bad and less when times are good. These are economic considerations as apart from social or cultural reasons or influences. Certainly differing social and cultural values are not, in the majority, direct causes. Because they are rooted in much deeper personal frameworks, to some degree they do influence or contribute to family assaults.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to take a moment to look at the

issue before us from the viewpoint of the police officer, and to make a couple of observations with regard to the Criminal Code of Canada and provisions contained within that code in terms of how it deals with assaults of this nature. In this respect, I perceive two major concerns where the police officer is required to act. Firstly, police training in the area of domestic disputes or dealing with marital conflicts is quite limited within existing police training syllabuses. However, the training they receive is usually sufficient to defuse a negative family situation.

What happens after that? There's no follow up. A policeman is not a social worker, nor do I think he should be. The concern here is obvious. There's a need to follow up the officer's visit with trained and experienced social workers. The officer's part in such actions is temporary. The important link here, Mr. Speaker, is the need for liaison between police and social services.

The second concern is that in such disputes a police officer has no legal authority to be in a private residence except on invitation of one of the spouses. Even if he is invited in and action is requested by one of the spouses, the officer cannot take any action unless there are visible signs of a criminal offence. This leaves the police officer in a very precarious position. On the other hand, if one spouse invites the officer in and the other refuses entry, where does this leave the police officer?

In almost one hundred per cent of cases of domestic dispute, these situations occur in a highly emotionally charged atmosphere where rational thinking has gone out the window for whatever reason. Is it any wonder that statistics point to the fact that the most dangerous situations, where a peace officer is most often exposed to violence upon his person, occur in domestic disputes. It's sort of like walking into a mine field blindfolded.

I'd like to give you three case examples to further illustrate a number of almost impossible situations that police officers dealing with marital conflicts find themselves in. These are taken from actual cases. In the first case, we have a situation where the wife makes a complaint and requests the presence of the police. The police arrive to be met by the husband, who refuses the police entry into the house and advises the police officer that the wife is okay. But the officer does not see the wife, because she is hiding from her husband in some other part of the house.

A second situation is where the wife requests the removal of the husband, there's evidence that the husband has committed an assault on the wife, and the husband refuses to leave. The police officer has to use force to effect the arrest and, in doing so, the accused receives injury and, in some cases, even the police officer is subject to injury. After the incident has calmed down and the husband is in the slammer, the wife refuses to lay a charge against her husband and, in fact, wishes to complain about the treatment given her husband by the police.

In a third case, the police officer has the wife lay the charges or lays them himself and prepares all the court-related documents. When it comes to court, the wife refuses to testify and wants charges withdrawn. This has used courtroom time where, in some cases, it takes six weeks for a trial to come to court, and generates numerous police man-hours that are absolutely wasted. These are only three basic examples; there are many more and just as many variations of each.

An observation I would make now relates to an interesting situation which develops as a result of recent amendments to the Criminal Code of Canada. It is now

permissible for a wife to testify against a husband in an assault case. But it is also my understanding that in such a case, a wife is not a compellable witness. In other words, she cannot be forced to testify. If on the other hand, as a result of modifying the law, a spouse is put into a situation where he or she becomes a compellable witness and the action is proceeded with, does this action in effect diminish or terminate an opportunity for a reconciliation? Do we end up with a greater social problem within our society? I believe this particular question is worth thinking about.

I would like to make one more comment, Mr. Speaker, and it is the observation that I thought my hon. colleague from Lethbridge West might have made. His comments, regardless of subject, are always interesting and, more often than not, I find agreement in his very pragmatic approach to the issues which come up for debate in this House. My comment is this, and I make it as a balance on the scales of justice. Although I appreciate the complexity of the issue at hand and am supportive of the motion before us, I am disturbed by the fact that in our anxiety to correct a bad situation, we are seeking more government intervention that holds implications for what I believe to be a major public challenge to a very major right, the right to privacy, the sanctity of the home and of the family. In effect, this motion could imply that we're prepared to sacrifice this right for what we may perceive to be a greater good. I think we should consider this and make the argument on both sides, if only to strengthen our position in support of the motion.

Occurrences and cases such as this, Mr. Speaker, point to a number of gray areas in our legal justice system which I believe require further clarification or specific definition. Given the current situation, from the policeman's point of view, his involvement in circumstances of spousal assault or family conflict puts him in a no-win situation. As matters stand, assault is within the federal jurisdiction and is dealt with under provisions of the Criminal Code of Canada. The question arises of whether the province has the right to legislate in that area or to make regulations pursuant to the Criminal Code of Canada. I don't know, Mr. Speaker. I'm not a lawyer. But I do believe that in order to satisfy the intent of this motion, the Attorney General can assist the police by spelling out, by way of directive, how to interpret, proceed, and enforce the law as contained in the provisions of the Criminal Code in matters relative to spousal assault within our provincial boundaries.

Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, we have before us a very serious motion which addresses a very serious problem, a problem which deserves our full attention and one which begs a resolution. In a way, the motion asks us to make a judgment by defining whether this is a matter of social or criminal consequence. I see it as a combination of both. Depending on one's individual interpretation, where the crossover takes place still remains a fine line. In my mind, it also begs the question: how much should government assume, should government assume and, if so, how should it assume that specific responsibility? In my opinion, it is an important factor to consider before we move as the motion suggests.

As I indicated previously, Mr. Speaker, and as all members have in this Assembly, this is not a simple issue. I'm not sure that a simple adjustment to our present laws will serve to solve the problem in its entirety. In supporting the motion, perhaps I would go one step further by calling on the government to establish a task force or create an advisory council on women with the specific

task of investigating not only the narrow parameters of marital conflict but all aspects of women in crisis within a much broader framework, to include matters of social, economic, cultural, and human rights consequences. I firmly believe that if we take this approach, set time frames to the conduct of the task force or council, and make a commitment for progress, we will have taken the first step in really understanding what this motion is all about.

Thank you.

MRS. FYFE: Mr. Speaker, there were some excellent comments on Motion 203 during the first hour it was debated some weeks ago and again today. We've received a tremendous number of comments and statistics that support the motion as it was put forward by the Member for Edmonton Belmont. I too would like to congratulate him for bringing forward this issue, which is very serious and obviously a very deep concern not just for members of this Legislative Assembly but for many, many people within our province and country.

When we hear statistics such as one in 10 Canadian women are battered or 20 per cent of all homicides in Canada involve a spouse killing another spouse, they probably don't mean that much on a personal basis unless we have had some experience on a first-hand basis of knowing an individual who has been caught in a wife-battering or family-violence situation. Statistics tend to roll off us. You have an initial shock: my goodness, how could there be so many?

Firstly, there's usually a sense of disbelief that the statistics probably couldn't be correct. Because most of us, who have not lived in a family where there has been violence, find it very difficult to perceive that there are families where this type of violence takes place. This is precisely the kind of attitude that faces the battered wife, the head in the sand attitude: well, it sure doesn't happen in my family, so I just can't imagine how anyone could do that. If you have your head in the sand, ask a professional.

The last several speakers have commented on the difficulties that police officers face in going to a home where there's family violence. Undoubtedly, it's one of the most volatile situations a police officer can face. It's well known that it is one of the most difficult aspects of policing. Ask a medical practitioner of the number of cases he sees where members of the family come in with bruises, of women and children with bruises that are perhaps explained in another way but that the professional knows were placed there by violence from another person.

I think we as legislators have to become pretty adept at trying to understand the problems that our constituents face. Often it's difficult to determine what the constituent is really trying to express. We have to make value judgments on whether the person contacting us on a particular lobby or concern represents a legitimate concern that represents the viewpoints of many others within our constituency or is an isolated case that has no substance. As an elected person, I have often tried to take the approach of following the old cliché, walk a mile in my shoes — by trying to put yourself in that other person's position, to understand what they're really communicating to you as an elected representative.

I think we can use the same parallel in considering the attitudes toward battered wives. What if you were that person who was being assaulted? What if it was you who was in the home? Often, battering does not just happen

on the first day of marriage or the first day that a couple decides to live together. It is often an increasing situation. Increasing violence grows over a number of weeks, months, years. It's a situation where great emotion is built up. There's normally the emotion of love between a couple, the feelings of love. Then the feelings of fear, dislike, and perhaps even hatred develop. These strong ties don't exist in an assault case that may happen out in the street or the back alley. It's an unusual type of assault. This is what makes it so difficult, firstly, to recognize and, secondly, to deal with. So by trying to put ourselves in the position of the person who's being battered, maybe we get a bit of perception of what it's like to live in fear.

The first question that is usually asked is, why would anyone in their right mind stay in a situation like that? Well, that's a good question. Why would they do that? Fear does great, funny, and strange things to individuals. The fear may be a threat: if you leave, this will happen to you, your children, and other members of your family. That may sound far-fetched, but I have been told by a person in this situation that that is the reason she can't leave. She is afraid of the threat. She's afraid to call the bluff. So fear becomes one of the factors.

Another is economic. In many cases, the battered wife has no alternative source of income. So in addition to the emotional and family ties, there's an economic tie. That is often used as an economic threat: if you leave, you'll have no source of support. Or maybe it's not even verbalized; that threat is simply there. That's where institutional facilities in communities have been helpful in the past, but only for certain individuals, as we have not been able to meet the need of those women and children who require emergency and intermediate service.

I am extremely supportive and have spoken previously in this House of my support for the Minister of Social Services and Community Health when he announced additional support for the WIN houses in the Edmonton area. I have had representation from several church organizations interested in developing intermediate accommodation that will allow a woman who is able to get out of a dangerous situation a chance to get her own life together, not just on that temporary three-week basis but where she can look at alternatives in education, try to deal with counselling and all the pieces that have to be built up to try to resolve the dilemma she faces. So attitudes and economics are two of the ties that keep battered families together.

Unfortunately there is a third one, and that is a legal problem. Often it results from lack of knowledge. Often women caught in a home where there is battering lack the knowledge of the legal process. They are afraid to go to a lawyer, perhaps because they don't have funds to pay for a lawyer. They are maybe not aware that they could get some assistance through legal aid. They hadn't thought about discussing it with their physician, because it's often one of things people try to hide; there's something wrong, and maybe they had some role to play. There are those guilt feelings. Often it simply results from an ignorance of the legal process. Each individual in our society is entitled to be protected from violence.

In my opinion, it's essential that we have better communication with families, such as the line of communication we've had with battered children. The Zenith number and the advertisements we've had for protecting a kid have been truly great. I believe they are very effective. The advertisements done by AADAC in changing attitudes towards drugs are also equally effective. In the long

term, over a number of years, it will be interesting to look at the statistics to see whether the results of those advertisements have, in effect, been as successful as I think and hope they have been. But this situation equally merits a type of information program that can provide women with basic information on what their rights are and what services are available to them.

In the past, there has been a reluctance of the courts to recognize wife battering as a crime similar to any other crime. I think this is slowly changing. But in my opinion, it's imperative that the courts consider wife battering as any other assault and that the penalties given by the courts emphasize and express the abhorrence our society as a whole feels for this type of violent behavior.

Another problem the battered wife has is psychological damage. This damage, I believe, probably prevents many women from seeking assistance in the first place. But if they do seek assistance, a long-term goal the person has to work for is to recover from the psychological battering, the psychological damage that has occurred over the years that individual has suffered. There is a sense of isolation because, in most cases, the battering has been kept a secret. There has been protection of the family unit. The battered person has developed a low self-worth which is often reinforced by the lack of support she perceives in society. It could be that she perceives a lack of support from the police, the doctors, or the courts.

Wife battering is truly a dangerous crime against women. I think we also have to include a dangerous crime against children, because often they are the victims. But, as was mentioned by the Member for Calgary Egmont and other members, one of the greatest crimes of physical abuse in the home is that it perpetrates a new generation. Children learn by seeing; they learn by the example set in the home. If they see violence as commonplace and accepted by a parent, if they see that the mother isn't really loved and respected the way society expects she should be, then that child has values reinforced that this is acceptable. If you get really mad, you've had a really bad day, you're out drinking or whatever, it's really okay to hit mom; she'll recover. Those values are reinforced. In addition to the violence in the immediate family, the worst crime to me is that it often sows the seeds for violence in subsequent generations.

So we have to consider very seriously that any dollars we spend at a provincial level are dollars spent in prevention. Preventive dollars, in my mind, are the best dollars we spend. If we can prevent further cruelty and violence in future generations, in other families, then we will have set priorities that are worthy of the budgets we consider each year, worthy of the dollars we put into them.

I think that this motion the member has brought forward is very positive, because it suggests that we take away one of the problems wives who have experienced battering have. That is, how do they proceed with pressing charges against a family member? Not everyone is as brave and courageous as to simply go out and press charges against a family member. That really takes a lot of courage. That's a very, very difficult task because of all the reasons we've covered in this debate.

If that responsibility could be assumed by the prosecutor, it would greatly assist in setting a climate where those who are going to take out their frustrations on their families will recognize that it's not the wife or the children they're going to continue to intimidate; it's society. And society will not stand for it. We will press charges, and those individuals will be prosecuted with the proper

support systems that we have. We will not stand for this. We as a society believe this is wrong, and it must end. Those people who break the law will have to suffer the consequences.

I think it's imperative that we as legislators support the concept within this motion. The passage of this motion would provide an onus on the legal system to take the responsibility to ensure that in a situation where a family has gone through violence, where professionals have been called in — police officers — charges have been laid, the situation not just be allowed to drop and say, well, I guess we'll be able to get along now. And the wife goes on living in fear. It's imperative that action be taken, that there be a concern that if these kinds of actions persist, we as a society will take responsibility and will not allow or condone this type of action any further.

Mr. Speaker, I conclude by congratulating the member again for bringing forward this very important motion. I urge support by all members of the Assembly.

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to participate briefly in this important motion this afternoon. I would like to add my congratulations to the hon. Member for Edmonton Belmont for bringing this issue to the Legislative Assembly. I believe it's particularly important that we debate this kind of issue from time to time as part of our responsibilities in governing the province of Alberta. It isn't often we that get a chance to deal with the emotional issues that people are feeling directly. We're so often encumbered by budgets and legislation that's so all encompassing that we have difficulty relating it to specific instances and problems. This motion allows us to do that, as the hon. Member for Calgary Egmont did so very well earlier in this debate.

I think he properly emphasized the emotional. He quoted several paragraphs which indicated the feelings and end results of spouses who've been battered. I think he brought to all of our minds an image of that terrible event taking place; allowed us to see it, feel it, understand it, as well as to theoretically deal with the question of whether we should consider stronger enforcement of the laws governing that kind of crime.

It is indeed a crime. As the motion indicated, it has been a problem for police officers to move into a domestic situation where they don't necessarily understand immediately all the facts, where they can't quickly ascertain guilt, where the solution is most difficult because emotions between husband and wife, between parents and children, are involved to a very great degree. So I believe any police officer would tell us, it is one of the most difficult areas of responsibility in that particular dimension of our society.

I agree with the debate that's taken place both today and formerly on this motion, when members have indicated that we as a society must ensure that we stand strongly against this kind of action, that we underline that it is not acceptable as far as society goes, and that we are willing to make that known by having the instruments of the Legislature — in other words, the police officers who carry out the laws that are made — enforce this kind of provision. There is, though, another side that I think we have to look at as well. We have to speak to the very important question: why? Why is someone still driven to use violence in this community?

Since we consider ourselves civilized, since we as a society consider ourselves to be fairly sophisticated in our development, in our abilities to communicate and resolve difficulties, why do we still have situations where individ-

uals feel it necessary to use violence on those very individuals they purport to — and in most cases, I believe, do — love and care for? Mr. Speaker, I suggest it's because of a lack of understanding of alternatives. I reached that conclusion from the statements that have been made today and those statistics which are evident, which indicate that individuals who engage in this kind of activity are to a very large extent individuals who suffered under the hand of someone who used violence against them as well.

I think you can find those kinds of statistics with respect to recidivism in families, if you will, when it comes to child beating, to a lack of ability to gain work in society, to issues such as drug abuse and alcoholism. All of those have recidivism rates within a family unit, one to another, speaking to the lack of understanding of options in the history of one particular family or a group of families, a lack of atmosphere which would allow one to find other, acceptable means of communication — I suppose that word "communication", a lack of ability to communicate other than through that frustration evident in violence.

As well as dealing with the enforcement aspect of this difficulty, I think we have to address ourselves continually to the kinds of approaches the hon. Member for St. Albert mentioned — that is, prevention — by educating people as to options, that this is not acceptable, that society stands against it; even more, that their frustrations can be relieved in another way, that the answers are as easily found in another more acceptable way that would involve the family unit more and would reach a conclusion without violence, through discussion. Education in our school system certainly is an important aspect of that.

As we develop educational curriculums, we have to ensure that we work toward developing an individual in our society who, despite the family upbringing — we speak so often of the importance of family in education, and we still have the situation where these difficulties evolve. We have to teach individuals in our school system that despite what family history they may have, communication is something that can take place not only to explain your belief in a certain thing, your need in terms of a job, or your desires in working toward an end solution but to explain your emotions and reach some conclusion from doing that. It's a nebulous concern. It's a difficult thing to teach, a difficult attitude to bring into a society, especially into a school system. But when developing our curriculum, I think we must be ever mindful of the need to do that.

As well, I think the kind of education program that has been run by the Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission, which in fact doesn't tell potential abusers of alcohol and drugs that that's a problem, they should not be doing that, it is bad and against what we believe in society, even though all of those things may be true — they recognize immediately that most people know that and try to give options in life styles, indicate what other directions one might channel energies.

I believe that program, initiated with the assistance and guidance of the hon. Member for Lethbridge West, is indeed the kind of approach we have to look at in dealing with many of society's ills — this one and child abuse, in particular, which are inevitably drawn together. In the not too distant future, we should take a look at the possibility of making the public in general aware that there are options that are best for all individuals, that in the end this violence hurts all involved, most of all the victim but also the family and the perpetrator of the

event.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to make the points that prevention, education, and changes in attitudes are necessary, as well as an enforcement aspect and us showing our distaste for this kind of treatment of spouses in society. I again congratulate the member. I think it's an excellent motion. When we deal with this motion in terms of passage or defeat, I hope we do in fact pass it but keep in mind those alternatives as well.

MR. LEE: Mr. Speaker, it's a privilege to join in this important debate. I say it's a privilege because I've been very impressed by the calibre of the facts, figures, and evidence brought forward on such an important issue. I'm particularly impressed by the forum here and the level of sincerity and commitment that is being expressed by hon. members who are speaking on this important subject.

In a sense, I believe politicians, members of the Legislature, are viewed as individuals who tend to speak to economic issues, issues that relate to politics, matters of dollars and cents, and not to moving, important social issues. While it's important that all members of the Legislature address the important issues of the economy and ensure that we create a society that does not become dependent on government but on itself, I think it's also important that government show its human face. Certainly hon. members have done so in the debate.

Mr. Speaker, I want to particularly acknowledge the initiative of the hon. Member for Edmonton Belmont in bringing this subject forward. I believe the hon. member has done the issue a great service by providing this important forum and recommending the initiative being proposed. I was particularly impressed — as expressed by the hon. Member for Calgary Currie — by those who have participated in the debate today. I want to single out the hon. Member for Edmonton Sherwood Park who brought a different perspective, that of the police officer, to this important debate. I think that was useful.

Certainly the hon. Member for Calgary Egmont documented the extensive initiative taken by the private and public sectors thus far in coping with the problem. It's certainly evident that in the major urban areas we have a long way to go in that regard. I was particularly very swayed by the hon. Member for St. Albert, who really brought a human note to this discussion and placed in its proper context what a difficult and tragic incident this is.

We've listened to all hon. members get into the painful, cold, and frankly embarrassing and humiliating statistics of our society that we as members of society are all accountable for: one in 10 Canadian women are battered — shocking to think that when we attend a meeting with 50 women present, five of those 50 have experienced some form of battering. Twenty per cent of Canadian homicides involve one spouse killing another; eight of 10 seeking help for spouse battering are pregnant — to my way of thinking, a shocking statistic indeed. So we've heard the facts. We've certainly heard the reasons. There are a good 10 or 11 major causes of this problem. We've looked at the evidence of why it happens and, particularly, the evidence of what this government and individuals who are dedicated to helping others have been doing in the private sector. We've heard some very touching examples of the impact of this problem on people.

I guess the question might arise: why would a member of the Legislature who is a bachelor participate in such a debate? I'm not married. I haven't been married. I haven't had the experience of a spouse. I suppose one could say, you're so far removed from this problem, to what extent

could you participate in this debate? As a member of the Calgary Police Commission for three years, I certainly had a first-hand opportunity to deal with the practical realities of police officers coping with family disputes and family situations.

Through an extremely progressive police commission, in my opinion the Calgary police have taken a number of steps to educate police officers on how to deal with marital and family disputes. I think police officers today are dealing with a more complex, very demanding, challenging job description. Responding to a family dispute almost requires training as a social worker, but there's no time to train police officers in all the fields they're required to be trained in.

So I had a chance to see the difficulty that occurs when women become so absolutely dependent on their spouses that even given the most cold and difficult situation, they remain in it because they are so dependent. The confusion that that creates for them, certainly the fear that creates — I can recall a phone call at 2:30 in the morning from a constituent who had just locked her husband out of the house after a very brutal evening, and becoming involved in that. Sometimes your constituents at a local level don't realize that you don't go out and actually respond to that complaint; you send others to do so.

I guess the perspective I want to offer to this debate — I think the spouse, the wife, the battered woman has been well spoken for — but I particularly want to talk a minute about the effect spouse battering has on the children of the family. In a sense, we're not dealing with the problem of spouse battering; we're dealing with the problem of family battering. While the object of the violence might be the wife, the result is that it creates an incredible situation for young children growing up in an environment like this. My contribution to this debate, in a sense, is my own personal experience.

Mr. Speaker, when we think of childhood, we think of happiness. Before they reach the age of six or seven, children are happy. They haven't acquired all the traits adults have, or they haven't learned to posture themselves to gain acceptance. They haven't determined that they have to adopt certain life styles to be accepted by others. All they know is how to love and how to be loved. It's a wonderful time. Do you ever watch children play? They can take the simplest object and have a wonderful time.

They can do it by themselves or with a friend. So they haven't gone through the process of developing all these cultural traits that lead people to unhappiness. They are happy, and it should be a time of happiness. So what an unfortunate situation it is when their youthful innocence is fractured by a mother and a father who can't get along to the extent that we see the result of violence.

I recall, as I was growing up in Winnipeg — I grew up with my mother and father and my twin brother, Bruce; we were happy. I thought the world was perfect. I didn't know there were any problems. Something happened around the age of six and a half. I noticed my parents were arguing. They used to do it occasionally, but it became more frequent. Then arguments led to fights, and fights led to my father leaving for a lengthy period of time and returning extremely drunk. I can recall waking up and hearing fights turning into very brutal affairs.

When I heard the first events of my mother and father physically fighting, I remember the sense of helplessness, the absolute sense that there was nothing that could be done. As a child, you want to run in there and stop it: there's something wrong here; for heaven's sake, why are you doing this to us; can't you get along? Well, you

cannot stop them; you can't do anything about it. All you can do is stand by and listen. What a tragedy that is.

Eventually those fights and that sense of helplessness ended because my mother and father parted ways. We moved to Calgary, and father remained in Winnipeg. But I just say that my own personal experience dramatizes for me how often this happens, and what a sadness it is that we as legislators find it so difficult to find answers for such real problems. We fund social services to the tune of billions of dollars, and we really are here to help others. But when we get into these personal situations, it seems so frustrating. We can stand up and give speeches, but what can we really do about the problem?

Well, we can throw more money at it, I suppose. We can make sure that the police are better equipped to deal with marital disputes and that social workers better understand the problem. We can fund halfway houses and second-stage houses. We can bring greater attention to the problem. But this is really a problem of society. We cannot, with a stroke of a pen, pass a law and change things. The greatest tragedy is that we can't, by our collective will, end this sad situation tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, I believe one of the solutions is to create a context where women who are living in these situations get that it's okay to talk to other people about the problem, to share their experiences with other women. Two months ago I spoke to a constituent who was so excited. She was telling me how she remarried and she and her new husband had bought a home, and how happy she was to be away from a situation of living for three years with a husband who beat her. I said, isn't that wonderful; how many friends have you told about it? She said, I could never talk about the problem to anybody. I said, by talking and sharing your experience with 10 other women, is it possible one would get that it's okay to leave in a situation like that, that you don't have to remain and there are places to go for help. I agree in principle, she said, but I'm not going to be the first one to do it.

It's important that we as legislators, particularly the majority who are men, get the message across that it's okay to talk about this problem. It's not something we hide behind closed doors or something only social workers talk about. If we set the tone that it's okay, I believe others in society will get it. And when others get it, perhaps more women in these situations will help others and share.

What could they share? First of all, I think they could share the danger of remaining in a household where wife battering continues. Secondly, we could talk about the symptoms. The hon. Member for Calgary Currie mentioned earlier how close this problem is, in a sense, to child battering. I think it's important that teachers in the education profession be aware of symptoms to look for, for example, with children — and women with women. With one person talking about her sense of dependency and showing that things can change, I think there will be a sense of hope shared with others. And finally, talk about the alternatives — and there are alternatives.

Mr. Speaker, if we did nothing else during the two days of debate — on March 22 and today — but get the message out that it's okay to talk about this problem, there's some value being created here. From a practical point of view, government can take some initiatives that will help. The hon. Member for Calgary Egmont pointed out the tremendous demand for women's shelters in the large urban centres, that there is a tremendous waiting list. I believe there were 2,000 days when existing shelters

couldn't serve people who needed help.

One of the practical problems is that these emergency shelters provide accommodation for only three weeks. After that, the spouse and children must either return to the dangerous environment or go out on their own. What we need is more second-stage housing. Where can they go from there? I believe that's the next step we have to look at, because these problems that are created in one, five, or 10 years aren't solved in just three weeks.

Another initiative that can be taken is one that has been suggested by the Canadian Mental Health Association: that where these situations have been identified and reported by the police and prosecution has taken place, there be mandatory counselling for the offenders. Now, how do you counsel someone when they don't want to be helped? Certainly that's difficult, and there's no easy solution. But I believe there are ways, and we should look further at the need for mandatory counselling, very much in the same way that we require those with suspended licences to take re-education programs.

[Mr. Appleby in the Chair]

Mr. Speaker, more than anything, I believe we have to make sure there is an added focus on the concerns and needs of children in the family during these situations. There's a whole range of ways we can do that. I simply mention that we must do more. One profession that is acutely aware of the problem, but I believe is complacent in many respects, is the legal profession. In many ways, they see these situations evolving firsthand through their clients. I think they must be more informed about the problem, the alternatives, and some of the solutions.

In closing, I'm pleased to have had the opportunity to participate in this debate. Again, I acknowledge the hon. Member for Edmonton Belmont for initiating this. If this motion is passed — and I hope there's time, but if there isn't, I'm certain it will come forward and be passed — I see this as a solid, practical initiative that can be taken. It's serving notice to the offenders that they won't get off scot-free. Secondly, it's my hope that this will spur action in other areas by promoting public awareness. Who knew about child battering 10 years ago? Who even talked about it? In many respects, I think we are in the same place today as the province was 10 years ago. We're becoming aware, more action is being taken, and greater public awareness is going to result. I think that's good.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate those who have participated in the debate, and I trust some constructive and useful action will take place as a result.

MR. ZIP: Mr. Speaker, I wish to adjourn debate.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You've heard the motion by the hon. member. Are you all agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is so ordered.

210. Moved by Dr. Carter:

Be it resolved that the Assembly urge the government to continue its efforts to develop transportation systems and infrastructures to increase the trade in Alberta products and expertise with Pacific Rim countries.

DR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, just to give some broad parameters to the scope of the debate, I would like to

point out that obviously the government is already very much involved in promoting the sale and exchange of Alberta goods to the Pacific Rim, as well as to other countries throughout the world. But I happen to believe that special emphasis has to be given to this whole matter, especially in the next few years, if we're to have broad and generous results over the next two, three, or four generations. Obviously we have various departments involved, primarily the ones headed by the hon. Mr. Planche and the hon. Mr. Schmid. Also, the Department of Agriculture is very much involved, as well as Tourism and Small Business to some extent.

I believe a special word of thanks and commendation should go to the people within the Department of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs, in particular the staff who represent us in the Hong Kong office, which was established in March '82 and has made tremendous progress, as well as the Tokyo office, established in 1970 to deal with trade, investment, and cultural interests in both Japan and Korea. Without these front-line people, it would be very difficult for the government to carry out any kind of aggressive policy with respect to the development of trade opportunities between this province and other parts of the world, in particular the Pacific Rim of southeast Asia related to this motion.

The motion also relates to the development of transportation systems. I'd like to stop there, before we get to infrastructures. Of course we talk about transportation systems in terms of roads, rail, and air, but also pipelines, port structures, and overseas shipping facilities. It doesn't stop in terms of just rail, roads, and air. In terms of examination of the motion, we have to look at developing infrastructures.

The infrastructures in the motion should not be narrowly interpreted to mean such things as port facilities and pipelines, as I've mentioned before, but should also deal with financial infrastructures — banking, both overseas as well as here — the matter of interpersonal contact between various countries involved, as well as this province and this country, and the matter of communication which hopefully is going to flow between not only governments and companies but individuals as citizens. Therefore, in terms of infrastructures, we should deal in terms of co-operation with our federal government and with Canadian embassies and their personnel.

The motion includes the words "to increase ... trade in Alberta products". I'm certain all members of the Assembly are well versed in the great spectrum of products we have in this province. I look forward to hearing from various members because of the special interests, concerns, and emphasis they might bring to this debate from their knowledge of their own constituencies, as well as their own interest areas throughout the province. There's the whole spectrum there, whether it be raw material, timber, coal, gas, agricultural products, or semi-finished goods.

The motion also talks [about] increased trade with respect to expertise. Canadians are pretty good at selling themselves short, in terms of a world economy, that we have expertise. For example, in this province we have world-class expertise when it comes to the matter of petrochemical plant construction, as well as the petrochemical industry. We also have expertise with respect to all sorts of natural gas pipeline construction and various other areas.

So I hope various members of the Assembly will take some note that they do have expertise within their constituencies, whether it be in the area of construction,

engineering, planning, awareness of a greater role of financing, or the whole ability to put massive projects together and see them through. Then we in this Legislature might have a better understanding of the type of expertise that truly is here for Albertans to use in terms of their relationship with the whole world, as well as with emphasis on the Pacific Rim.

Of course Canada is part of the Pacific Rim. The United States is also part of that definition, and we can go down to South America. But for the purposes of this motion, one thinks more particularly of countries such as Japan, South Korea, Hong Kong, the People's Republic of China, Thailand, Malaysia, Indonesia, the Philippines, New Zealand, and Australia.

Mr. Speaker, in the rotunda of this Legislature Building, a display has been mounted by the Public Affairs Bureau. There are some posters down there which were produced by grade 7 students in Hokkaido, Japan. Hokkaido is the big northern island of Japan. Grade 7 students were chosen in our sister province of Hokkaido because in that country grade 7 is the first year English is taught as a mandatory subject. Now I'm not about to advocate that we ought to have Japanese as a mandatory second language in the provincial education system. [interjection] That's fine, but we can bump up our exports to the Ukraine as well, and the hon. minister over there can look after that in his spare time.

I use it as an example. If we're going to have trading partners throughout the world, we as Canadians have to stop being so smug, self-satisfied, and complacent that English is the only language to be spoken. We have to have greater versatility with respect to language capability; we have to have a broad diversity. While we do have some persons in this Assembly who have great facility in Ukrainian as a second or a first language, others in the Assembly and those people who represent the province should be able to deal in the language of the people. That makes for a tremendous amount of catching up for all of us — perhaps impossible for most.

I want to refer again to the posters in the rotunda of the building. I hope all hon. members will look at some of those posters, because not only are they interesting in terms of art work, but it's interesting to see the concept of linking between Alberta and the twin province of Hokkaido in Japan. There's one poster there that I hope no one from the federal government will look at too closely. It shows all of Canada in yellow, and all of Canada has a new name, Alberta. It's shaking hands across the Pacific with Japan. In terms of a major role and function of trade over the next number of decades, Alberta has to be in the forefront, and the time is now. Some of us in the Assembly are quite familiar with the phrase "now", but certainly in terms of export to the rest of the world, and in particular the Pacific Rim, now is the time to get moving.

Another example I would use actually relates to the High Level Bridge. As hon. members are coming to the session and freight trains go by, those of us who've grown up on the prairie should keep an eye on railway traffic. But a new development has taken place. It's the whole matter of containerized shipments of goods. There are more and more flatcars carrying these specialized containers, so that in addition to looking at various special grain cars from the Canadian Wheat Board, or better yet, the province of Alberta, one can also observe other types of traffic. It gives you an idea that we're in touch with the rest of the world.

A few blocks away, at the corner of 104th Avenue and

110th Street, there is a depot for containers. I went by there on Sunday. These are just a few of the names which are there for us to see, and they're reminders that we are in some kind of developing relationship with the Pacific Rim countries: Japan lines, Canadian Pacific ships, Orient Overseas Container line, the Showa lines, Mitsui OSK, Neptune Orient, Dart. If you were listening closely, most of those were firms representing Japan, Korea, or Hong Kong. In fact, while I was wandering around that yard on Sunday morning, I realized there was only one firm from the United States and one from the United Kingdom. That was an interesting example that much of the development in containerized shipments really takes place under the direction, guidance, and financial development of companies in southeast Asia.

I'd like to make at least one comment with respect to transportation infrastructure as an example. The Prince Rupert terminal is one I'm sure other members might wish to comment on. I for one am proud to be part of a government which has taken such a strong position in terms of developing this port on the Pacific coast. I understand that the project is still due to be completed by the end of 1984, and that hopefully the first grain shipments will be flowing westward in the spring of 1985. When completed, the terminal will be the most modern in Canada, and it will have on-line cleaning capacity and a high throughput capability. One can only hope that the Canadian Wheat Board is out there trying to sell the blinking product.

The evidence I had from a recent trip to the Pacific Rim was that in all too many cases — Korea is an example — representatives of the Canadian Wheat Board have been there only once in the last seven years. With respect to another country which is not on the Pacific Rim, representatives from the Canadian Wheat Board have been to Egypt only once in the last 12 years. So I sympathize with rural members when they get a bit concerned about what's really going on with the Canadian Wheat Board.

To return to the matter of the Prince Rupert terminal, though, having gone off on another little voyage of my own: the Canadian National Railway is in the process of doing the double track from Edmonton to Red Pass Junction, and that will help with the movement of product via rail lines to Prince Rupert. But in terms of trying to move goods of any kind, there's still a substantial amount of trackage from Red Pass Junction all the way through Prince George to Prince Rupert.

The last figure I have for the cost of the Prince Rupert terminal is \$275 million, with 80 per cent funded by the Alberta government through loans and the Heritage Savings Trust Fund and through participating debentures. The capacity of the terminal would be 200,000 tonnes. That would increase the west coast capacity by something like 30 per cent. Again, as a back-up to this system, a few years ago the Alberta government purchased the Alberta Terminals, located in Edmonton, Calgary, and Lethbridge. Hopefully, they will be part of the rationalization of the whole system in terms of moving various grains to the west coast and on to world markets.

In terms of infrastructures, I mentioned earlier that there's the matter of pipelines, roads, rail, air links, and port facilities. I understand that in the Department of Economic Development a project is under way with test facilities in Japan, whereby we're examining the possibility of carrying coal in slurry form, perhaps methanol slurry, to the west coast for transshipment to the Far East. In all likelihood that would fit in very well with

Korea. Of course it also means other kinds of switchovers from a petroleum base to a natural gas base in the refining processes.

To move product to the west coast by road is a difficult proposition, just by the sheer fact that you can carry only so much product, even if you use twin trailers. It's also a very slow means of getting there. It can be very cumbersome. We also have difficulties developing the highway infrastructure because of the bottlenecks in the national parks, over which we have no control in terms of the highways. In addition, we have the matter of public concern from the citizen at large, who travels the same highways as a tourist, towing his trailer behind him and making sure that nobody, but nobody, is going to pass him on the way to the coast.

I mentioned that the CNR has been busy doing some upgrading, double-tracking to Red Pass Junction. The Canadian Pacific railway is also doing work with respect to the spiral tunnels. Hopefully, they'll also keep putting some money into the system — no matter what happens in Ottawa with respect to the Crow rate — in terms of not only improving their track capacity but also developing new cars.

Air links to the Orient are obviously of prime concern to us. To my mind, this is something the federal government needs to pursue a bit more aggressively. At the moment, our major carriers, Canadian Pacific Air Lines — and as of last week I believe, Cathay Pacific, owned by private persons in Hong Kong, has opened up a new flight system between Hong Kong and Vancouver. Having flown on, that air line, I think CP Air is in for a lot of trouble. Cathay Pacific is obviously well run and aggressive, and they intend to deal in terms of the market to southeast Asia. That's a two-way air street, if you will, because a tremendous number of people from the Orient want to come to Canada to do business. So I think Cathay Pacific will do quite well.

When I was in Vancouver about three weeks ago dealing with some economic development matters, I was interested that a young Chinese Canadian, who had grown up in Hong Kong and is now a resident of Vancouver, has developed a whole new product exchange to Hong Kong. This goes to show you how adaptable one needs to be. Most of us here are not the greatest enthusiasts for eating chicken feet. Most chicken feet in this country get thrown away. This young fellow in Vancouver now buys chicken feet for something like 18 cents a pound. He ships them, containerized and chilled, all the way to Hong Kong. I won't tell you what his markup is, but it's considerable. It ain't chicken feed; it's chicken feet.

Again, a product exported from this province — some people from Calgary associated with Dvorkin Meat Packers and Centennial Packers were in Hong Kong last weekend, following up with the high-class restaurant trade. They were taking samples of Alberta boxed beef with them. This obviously is one means. You have to go over there. You have to see the site and be aggressive in trying to sell the product. After all, we're in world-class markets here, and we just can't wait for the world to come to us. In this present economic downturn, which we're now through the worst of, we've learned that we have to get out there and sell ourselves, whether it be product or our expertise.

I mentioned the infrastructures of banking before. In conversations I've had in the last two months, I have some concern that the five major banks in this country really aren't taking the Pacific Rim as seriously as they ought to. I'm also concerned that in western Canada,

when it comes to trying to do transactions in the Pacific Rim, whether you're in Calgary or Edmonton and you go to your banker, he's still going to have the decision made for him in Toronto.

What I'm saying in this motion, in terms of the next two to three generations of Albertans trading in the Pacific Rim areas, is that this is another one of the areas of infrastructure that we really have to develop, and [we have to] encourage our major banks in this country. Now is the time for them to upgrade their expertise and decision-making processes, not only in Vancouver but also in Calgary and Edmonton, for the kind of joint venture situations and financial ventures that we hope will indeed take place. Of course in that area we also have some class B banks, I believe it is, such as the Shanghai bank, who already have operations here in this province.

The matter of port facilities should give all of us concern. I'm glad this government is working so hard with respect to the Prince Rupert terminal. I know that since 1979, and perhaps before, the government has been trying to take an aggressive and co-operative stance with the British Columbia government and the federal government with respect to Ports Canada, the harbor facilities in Vancouver.

I remember another Sunday morning — for a clergyman, I seem to be working a lot of Sunday mornings, but not in a pulpit — when we were in Hong Kong. That would be early February. [interjection] At least in church they don't argue back as much. I want to supply this example in Hong Kong. In Hong Kong there's such a hustle and bustle of traffic — water traffic, road traffic, people traffic — that the air just crackles with electricity, the electricity of the entrepreneur. Everything is going full tilt.

For example, a freighter will come into the river and immediately will be surrounded by about four lighters on each side of it. They don't wait to pull it into some docking facility to start unloading with cranes. They start to off-load immediately. It's off-loaded on both sides. That freighter will come in one day, be unloaded that day, loaded the next, and it will be gone.

We don't have all the nonsense we often see in the outer approaches to Vancouver harbor: all those vessels sitting around chalking up demurrage charges, which get charged back to you and your farmer. The other thing that happened in the off-loading was that as soon as those lighters left the ship, they went over to the shore. Immediately you had about 25 dock workers swarming to off-load that. As suddenly, the trucks were loaded and gone, and other trucks were coming in. Then two weeks ago when I was in Vancouver and did a tour of the harbor, what a contrast!

So those rural members who get concerned about how slow it is to move grain through the port of Vancouver should join with the rest of us and be concerned about issues like worker productivity, whether it be with grain, potash, coal, or any kind of product moving slowly out of the port of Vancouver. The whole matter of labor relations is there. In the port of Vancouver, they have now realized that indeed they have to obtain more cranes specialized for the off-loading of containers. Again, the comparison with Hong Kong is enough to make you feel very demoralized at being a Canadian, worried about how we will ever be able to shift the product from here and get it anywhere. In the port of Hong Kong, there are more cranes for containers than there are in all of Canada. That's another section of the larger harbor environs of Hong Kong, where they show us up for produc-

tivity, speed of turnaround, and service.

The people at Ports Canada are concentrating on trying to upgrade the facilities for the transshipment of containers. But one difficulty is that Vancouver has just three cranes in its main basin to move containerized shipments. At the moment, Seattle has 22 and Portland has 12. Every time there's another strike at our port of Vancouver, more and more of the shipping sails right on past Victoria, moving on down to Seattle, making sure they then do the transshipments via truck into Alberta or British Columbia.

One thing that needs to be done is networking of information. In this regard, Mr. Speaker, I know that our galloping Minister of International Trade does a fine job of going around the world trying to promote Alberta and Alberta products. So we must have even more trade missions throughout the world as well as in the Pacific Rim. We need to have some of our people going there so they can have that first-hand, on-site inspection to get some kind of feeling of the atmosphere to be able to work with it, and also to have trade missions come over here.

I understand that in the next few weeks the mayor of Calgary, together with the mayor of Vancouver, is going to Hong Kong and the People's Republic of China on this whole matter of trade relations. I'm also pleased that the Calgary Chamber of Commerce is organizing a trade tour to Japan and Hong Kong in October of this year. In the last couple of weeks, on behalf of the Minister of Economic Development, I hosted a meeting of about 18 Korean businessmen in Calgary. They represented the export/import bank of Korea, the dairy co-operative, hydro-electric companies, and other corporations. They were just a small group on the way to a larger conference of Korean businessmen being held in Toronto later in the month of April.

When we have these tours from overseas, I think there's a bad thing going on. I see that the minister of overseas development is hosting a meeting with overseas journalists this week in Calgary. I hope they're not having the same type of program as the Korean businessmen. Because they brought them over, sat them in a stuffy hotel room for the day, and had very good speakers come from various industries in our province to talk to them about the developments here in Alberta, the type of expertise we have. They talked about having some joint ventures in Korea, here, or other parts of the world. But the trouble was that they didn't get them out of that room, run them on a bus tour, and take them to a local feed lot and the beef finishing plant to see the quick-chill facilities there. They didn't take them out to an oil rig. They didn't take them on-site so those people could see what it's all about. Let's face it; when you get a load of businessmen on a bus — you can hire a bus that's got a PA system — you can do a lot of talking to them while you're driving from site to site. They get a chance to really see what it's all about.

Another thing that can take place is the matter of educational tours and exchanges, the whole promotion that can take place through our chambers of commerce. Just by way of example, from a meeting we attended at the Hong Kong general Chamber of Commerce, I have a little pamphlet they put out for their members called Enquiries for Exporter Members. They give information centres, types of equipment, goods and services, and all the rest of it. But in this one little four-page flyer, just to give an example of what goes on in terms of relationships in the Far East and the dynamism that is there, they relate to 45 different countries. That's just one monthly

issue. Now that's some kind of pace for the rest of us to have to keep up with.

As I said, we have other areas of products and expertise, whether it be cattle, agriculture, the oil and gas industry, highway and railway engineering and technology. We have mechanisms in place with our twin provinces in Korea, China, and Japan. We need to do even more work in this area.

The reason for bringing the motion forward, Mr. Speaker, is simply to raise an item of concern which is there. It affects every constituency in this province. It will affect the people of this province, as I mentioned before, for at least the next two to three generations. It's a time when we have to develop. We cannot be afraid of such terms as "technological impact of computers", "mini-computers", "robotics", and "satellite transmission of information". What we do have to worry about is having quality education, management, promotion, and a willingness to work hard, barter, negotiate, and get ourselves involved in what trade in the world really means in its impact on people in Alberta.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. KROEGER: Mr. Speaker, reading the motion and then hearing the first address, what I read and hear is one word: sell. Having spent most of my life in the field of selling, the motion interested me. But I want to talk about what we ought to be selling.

I guess the subject breaks into three parts: what is it that we have or want to sell; who do we want to sell it to; and the transportation component, how do we get it from here to there? The resources we have are pretty visible. Everybody knows about those: the natural resources that you can cut or dig, or the resources we can grow on our soils, such as cereal grains. To a lesser degree, we have equipment we manufacture. To an even lesser degree, we have technology.

The markets: I guess the major potential market could or ought to be Japan, but the others have been named. I'm not going to run through the list again; they all exist. A major part of the world population is serviceable from the Pacific area. How we do that converts into going out and doing a good sales job. I will talk a bit about the transportation component.

What I find interesting though, Mr. Speaker, is that we seem to be satisfied to ship in bulk and buy back finished products. We've just had the interesting exercise of listening to arguments on the Crow rate. Presumably we produce cattle, half finish them, and ship trainloads of them east on a congested rail line. We turn around and follow that with trainloads of feed barley which we grow here and load up the transportation system further. Then someone at the other end, who presumably is smarter than we are, puts those two elements together and sells that stuff back to us.

I think about technology that will relate to what I want to touch on for a few minutes. At one time countries like Japan were importing technology from North America, and they got very serious about it. They used to buy finished products from North America such as equipment, automobiles, and so on. Then they discovered that they were smarter than we were, because they could haul shiploads of ore 8,000 miles across the Pacific, follow that with shiploads of coal, manufacture steel, develop their technology, build something, ship it back the same distance, sell it to us, and make money. I really wonder at that.

Specifically, let's take a look at an automobile. What is

it? An ordinary automobile now weighs about 3,000 pounds. We buy a lot of them from overseas, specifically Japan, and I have no problem with that. But we pay about \$3 a pound for a new automobile. If half an hour after you buy that automobile you take it out and roll it over a bank, all the components are still there, and you can then sell it for about 1 cent a pound. You can get about \$30 for it. But everything is still there; nothing has been removed.

Why is that important, or what does that mean? It simply means that the difference between the \$30 you can sell the new car for and the \$8,000 you paid is something else. I want to talk about that difference. You take all the raw material we have, you ship it away, and then you permit the interest of people — the willingness to work and to learn, and the technology they have — to convert that into the \$8,000 item weighing 3,000 pounds. They get paid for that, they send it back and sell it to us, and we have to be great spectators. We sit here with all the benefits of having it right on site, ship it out, pay someone else to convert it, to learn, and thereby to advance themselves, and then wait for it to come back to us. We figure out how we ought to do things so we can afford to buy it. It seems to me there's something wrong with that.

So I want to raise some questions as to what we should want to sell. I suggest that what we should want to sell — whether it's what we grow, what we dig, or what we cut in a raw form and then congest the transportation system shipping it that way. Then we have to spend a great deal of money to upgrade our transportation system so we can afford to ship it at all or sell it at all. Or should we now reverse the process the Japanese went through: go over there, start buying back some technology, learn about production, and think about doing the conversion right here where we have the room. If you took two major world producers like Japan and West Germany and dropped them into Alberta, you'd have a lot of room around those two countries. Yet they are doing marvelous things without the resources we have. I just want to raise the question that surely there's enough expertise, experience, and intelligence around to look at developing this for ourselves. I guess the thing we're lacking is desire, and that desire ought to be part of what we learn, part of what we teach. But as long as we insist on doing it the way we're doing it, we have to think about upgrading the transportation system which ties these two elements together.

Anyone that has gone over our transportation system — and while the Member for Calgary Egmont suggested it wasn't only rail, but it was air, pipelines, roads, and all the rest of it, nevertheless the major part of these bulky goods has to move by rail. And it has to move over a system built 100 years ago, or thereabouts. The capacity hasn't changed very much since then.

I guess you, as members of our society, own 1,000 hopper cars. Because the province did that and because you're a shareholder in that sense, it doesn't worry you too much. But how would you like to take your own money, go out and buy a hopper car, lease it out, and try to make money with it, keeping in mind that the unit is going to be sitting still 92 per cent of the time? It isn't going to be doing anything; it's going to sitting there.

If you want to see inefficiency, it's exemplified there. That's the sort of thing we have with the present transportation system, and it's something that has to be addressed. Because while that's going on, grain producers of Alberta are having to store the cereal grains they produce

on their farms, pay interest on them, and so on. So really this transportation system does have to be addressed.

I guess you could move a lot more commodities over one corridor or the other — whether it's through Calgary to Vancouver, or Edmonton to Vancouver — if you put those two lines together and ran trains one direction on one and the other direction on the other. Your capacity would improve considerably. The program of double-tracking is very important. It will be proceeded with. The railways are now looking at spending \$16 billion to develop that, and it will be very effective. But it's also going to be extremely expensive.

I would like to leave the subject, Mr. Speaker, by inviting some thought to not only should we sell — I think we should sell. In the business I worked in most of my life, we used to use the very ordinary phrase that nothing really happens until somebody sells something. I would like you to think about that, because not very much actually does happen until somebody sells something. So I agree that we ought to be doing what the resolution calls for. But I would like to invite some thought to what form those goods we have ought to be sold in, to get the best advantage for the people of the province.

Thank you very much.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to participate in the debate today and congratulate my colleague from Calgary Egmont for bringing this important motion before the Legislature. I would like to read into the record Motion No. 210:

Be it resolved that the Assembly urge the government to continue its efforts to develop transportation systems and infrastructures to increase the trade in Alberta products and expertise with Pacific Rim countries.

I'll be a little different than the previous two speakers, Mr. Speaker. Maybe we can deal to some degree in statistics which are very important to Alberta. I think it's interesting to note that Alberta's growth in exports has been phenomenal in the last few years. In 1978 Alberta exports totalled approximately \$4.6 billion. Since then they have more than doubled to \$9.8 billion, which represents an average annual increase of just over 27 per cent. Export growth from 1980 to '81 was 23.6 per cent, or an increase of 18 billion, and for the sake of comparison, Canada's total exports grew by only 9.4 per cent. This disparity has allowed Alberta to gain an increasing share of the total exports for Canada.

It's interesting to note Canada's place in world bulk trade. In forest products it ranks number one as an exporter; in grain, number two; coal, number six; potash, number one; and sulphur, number one. This is a very interesting statistic. In 1981 Alberta exported over one-fifth of its gross domestic product, and by the end of 1981 Alberta's share had increased to 11.6 per cent. Mr. Speaker, in the past, exports from Alberta were destined mainly for the United States and Japan. In '81 these two countries were the only ones to receive more than 1 per cent of Alberta's total exports. The United States accounted for 88.3 per cent, and Japan 3.2 per cent.

However, the proportion of exports destined for the U.S. and Japan has declined due to successful export penetration of other markets. I suppose Japan is a good example. In 1978 it accounted for 6.8 per cent of Alberta's exports. It should be noted that although the percentage share has dropped, the value of exports has increased 5 per cent over 1979. There's a tremendous

potential for expansion of Alberta exports, which was so eloquently put by the Member for Calgary Egmont.

This goes into the Pacific Rim countries, such as Australia, New Zealand, southeast Asia, China, Korea, Japan, Hong Kong, Taiwan, and smaller countries bordering on the Pacific. Over the last decade, this area has experienced an average annual growth rate of 6 to 9 per cent, and it's expected that in the '80s it will enjoy a much better growth rate than most parts of the western world. Trade with Pacific Rim countries has increased dramatically, but still it represents approximately 10 per cent of our exports.

Export opportunities for Alberta are seen in energy, agriculture, and petrochemical sectors. Products which could be and are being exported include coal, oil, and gas-related equipment, technology, and services; and farm machinery and technology, breeding stock, forage seeds, canola, and fertilizers in the agriculture sector. At present, Japan is our second largest trading partner. It imports coal, grains, canola, and foodstuffs. So there is real potential for Alberta to expand into manufactured goods, petrochemicals, and forestry products. In '81 exports, Japan rose 16.27 per cent to \$302.3 million, which is very significant. That was an increase of \$42 million.

Our trade relations with another country in the Pacific Rim, China, have primarily centred on grain. However, we are interested in the development of stronger agricultural and energy educational links. A protocol of understanding was signed in September of 1981, which has resulted in co-operation in the areas of agriculture, petroleum technology, forestry, culture, and recreation. As strange as it may seem, Australia, which is very similar to Canada, is probably Alberta's most rapidly expanding market. In 1981 alone export sales increased nearly 140 per cent. Alberta shipments to New Zealand increased 128 per cent in 1981, due to demand for sulphur and organic chemicals. Of course with the slowdown in the economy, we're finding that there could be some problems in the sulphur industry.

As I mentioned earlier, there is great potential in the Pacific Rim, and the challenges faced by Albertans regarding transportation of goods is a very real one. The

problem we have is the fact that Alberta is landlocked. This creates a problem because transportation, particularly as far as rail traffic is concerned — and certainly the previous member elaborated on the problems we're going to have with regard to transportation of our goods to tidewater. In order to make sure this transportation is resolved, we have to continue to urge the expansion of existing port facilities.

Of course with Prince Rupert, we have the construction of new ones. To further this goal, an agreement was signed with a consortium of grain companies on October 22, 1981, to construct the Prince Rupert grain terminal. This facility will have a capacity of about 3.5 million metric tonnes per year. This, combined with facilities at the port of Vancouver, which can handle 11 million metric tonnes, will result in a west coast grain export potential of about 15 million tonnes by '83-84.

In early '81, petrochemical producers in the province requested that the government become involved in the development of a new petrochemical terminal facility on the west coast. On June 29, 1982, Transtec-Simon T. R. consortium was announced as the successful proponent. However, due to the downturn in the economy, the project is on hold.

In view of the time, Mr. Chairman, I beg leave to adjourn debate.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You heard the motion by the hon. member. Are you all agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is so ordered.

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, tomorrow it's intended that the House go into committee to study the estimates of the Department of Housing, and following that, if there's time, the Department of Municipal Affairs.

[At 5:29 p.m., on motion, the House adjourned to Wednesday at 2:30 p.m.]