

towards crime, then such an attitude will develop in the child and will be retained throughout the adult years.

While the report does not mention it directly, I have read that many crimes of violence are the result of persons needing money to buy hard drugs. If a person is addicted to the use of such drugs, apparently he will commit crimes of violence in order to obtain them. If a young child is in a home where the use of drugs is tolerated, or indeed accepted, then the need for such drugs might well lead to crime, and I expect there will be a very undesirable influence on the child which will be reflected in his actions in later life.

In its report the committee finds that there is not a single, simple solution to the problem it has studied—nor, I suppose, did it expect to find one. It is not a simple problem; consequently, there is not a simple solution. I rather suspect that the committee hopes that its recommendations, of which there are 27, will serve as guidelines for future action rather than as an aid in the implementation of immediate policy.

I may say, however, that I was surprised by the third recommendation, found at page 17 of the report. To me, the wording of that recommendation appears in part to be completely out of line with the general policy outlined in the report. I refer to the recommendation which advocates the payment of an allowance to a pregnant woman. I think that is a good idea, and had the recommendation stopped there it would have been well received by me, at least. However, the recommendation goes farther than that. Paragraph (a) states that the allowance should be paid "as soon as possible after the confirmation of a pregnancy and the decision not to terminate it." I object to the words "and the decision not to terminate it." To me those words suggest that the committee is accepting the advocacy of the theory of abortion on request, abortion as a matter of routine. If the committee has accepted that theory, even by implication, then, by that very acceptance, it is promoting the theory, and promoting or advocating an action which is repulsive to many people.

Honourable senators, if such an allowance is to be paid, undoubtedly an application form will have to be filled out on which the question will be asked whether a decision has been made not to terminate the pregnancy. I am sure a great many women would regard such a question as a gross insult.

Turning to another aspect, I feel that the fourth recommendation, which is found on page 18, needs further explanation. It reads:

We recommend that the medical profession place more emphasis on early diagnosis of potential "high risk" parents and that these parents be encouraged to seek special counselling where indicated.

I should like to know just what is meant by this special counselling that such parents should seek.

In my view, the most important general recommendation is contained in paragraph 169 on page 62. In part, it reads:

We are fully convinced that early childhood experiences can condition a child towards violent behaviour. We believe multi-disciplinary research is needed. Since such

[Senator Macdonald.]

research is of the greatest urgency we recommend that, in order to conserve public funds and to improve the quality of life in Canada by preventing violence, an organization to be known as *The Canadian Institute for the Study of Violence in Society* be established.

The paragraph then goes on to show the value of such an organization and what its duties and responsibilities would be.

Honourable senators, I can say without any doubt that the report entitled "Child at Risk" is a valuable contribution to the solution of a problem which is growing more acute as time goes on. It is obvious that the members of the committee did a great deal of work in hearing witnesses and studying briefs and other matters before this report could be prepared. The members of the committee have earned the thanks of the Senate for their work, although, as I mentioned, there are two recommendations to which I take vigorous objection.

On motion of Senator Frith, for Senator Thompson, debate adjourned.

● (1530)

ENERGY

GOVERNMENT POLICY—DEBATE ADJOURNED

Hon. Hazen Argue (Minister of State for the Canadian Wheat Board) rose pursuant to notice of Tuesday, November 18, 1980:

That he will call the attention of the Senate to Prime Minister Trudeau's constructive energy policy, in particular

1. the advantage to Canadians of having prices for oil and gas in Canada lower than O.P.E.C. prices;
2. the advantage of Canadianizing the industry;
3. the advantage of the provisions to encourage large numbers of Canadians to invest in the industry;
4. the advantage to Canada of the provisions concerning conservation; and
5. the advantage of other aspects of the policy.

He said: Honourable senators, I placed this inquiry on the order paper because I feel that the government's energy policy should be debated in this chamber, and because I feel that it is a good policy which can contribute a great deal to all parts of Canada. It is true that after the policy was announced there was a feeling of surprise in western Canada. One element of surprise came about because the government did not impose an export tax on natural gas. I take it that was a welcome surprise for many people.

There has been a lot of opposition to this policy—and very strong opposition. The opposition has come, in some measure, from large oil companies. It has certainly come from Premier Lougheed of Alberta, and Premier Blakeney of Saskatchewan. While Premier Blakeney does not seem to make his position absolutely clear, he does seem to lean toward the Lougheed position. As far as Saskatchewan is concerned, with respect to the debate on the energy policy and the debate on the Constitution their position is most unclear. It is a wait-and-see policy.