

Legislative Assembly of Alberta

Title: **Tuesday, May 11, 1993**

2:30 p.m.

Date: 93/05/11

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: **Prayers**

MR. SPEAKER: Let us pray.

O Lord God, keep us mindful of the special and unique opportunity we have to work for our constituents, our province, and our country, and in that work give us not only wisdom but also strength and all of Your support.

Amen.

MR. DINNING: Mr. Speaker, I have received certain messages from His Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor, which I now transmit to you.

SERGEANT-AT-ARMS: Order!

MR. SPEAKER: The Lieutenant Governor transmits estimates of certain sums required for the service of the province for the 12 months ending March 31, 1994, and recommends the same to the Legislative Assembly.

The Lieutenant Governor transmits estimates of certain sums required from the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund for the 12 months ending March 31, 1994, for the purpose of making investments pursuant to section 6(1)(a) of the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund Act in projects which will provide long-term economic or social benefits to the people of Alberta but which may not necessarily by their nature yield a return to the trust fund and recommends the same to the Legislative Assembly.

Be seated, please.

head: **Presenting Petitions**

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Gold Bar.

MRS. HEWES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I beg leave to present a petition from 31 citizens of the town of Eckville requesting the "removal of the Eckville Health Care Centre Board and the Administrator."

head: **Reading and Receiving Petitions**

MRS. B. LAING: Mr. Speaker, I move that the petitions for Private Bills that I presented to the Assembly yesterday be deemed to now have been read and received.

[Motion carried]

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Strathcona.

MR. CHIVERS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Might the petition that I presented yesterday be now read and received?

CLERK:

We the undersigned residents of Alberta urge the Legislative Assembly to call upon the Government of Alberta, immediately and before the next election, to reduce pension benefits which will be payable to MLAs and Cabinet Ministers leaving office at or before the next election to a level comparable to other pension plans.

head: **Notices of Motions**

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, I wish to give oral notice of the following motion:

Be it resolved that the debate on third reading of Bill 66, Members of the Legislative Assembly Pension Plan Amendment Act, 1993 (No. 2), shall not be further adjourned.

MR. DINNING: Mr. Speaker, I too wish to give oral notice of the following government motion:

Be it resolved that the debate on second reading of Bill 67, Deficit Elimination Act, shall not be further adjourned.

head: **Introduction of Bills**

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Stony Plain.

Bill Pr. 21

Shelly Simone Komant Adoption Act

MR. WOLOSHYN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I request leave to introduce Bill Pr. 21, being the Shelly Simone Komant Adoption Act.

[Leave granted; Bill Pr. 21 read a first time]

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Edmonton-Kingsway.

Bill Pr. 17

Cory Brad Irwin and Shawn Lee Irwin Adoption Act

MR. McEACHERN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I request leave to introduce a Bill being Bill Pr. 17. It's the Cory Brad Irwin and Shawn Lee Irwin Adoption Act.

[Leave granted; Bill Pr. 17 read a first time]

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Gold Bar.

Bill Pr. 18

Gerald Edwin Crabbe Adoption Act

MRS. HEWES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I request leave to introduce a Bill being Bill Pr. 18, the Gerald Edwin Crabbe Adoption Act.

[Leave granted; Bill Pr. 18 read a first time]

Bill Pr. 27

Calgary Chinese Cultural Centre Association Tax Exemption Act

MRS. B. LAING: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill Pr. 27, being the Calgary Chinese Cultural Centre Association Tax Exemption Act.

[Leave granted; Bill Pr. 27 read a first time]

head: **Tabling Returns and Reports**

MR. MUSGROVE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table the annual report of the Senior Citizens Advisory Council. It is the activities of the council over the past year, and it also includes 19 recommendations to different government departments.

MR. DINNING: Mr. Speaker, I am filing with the Assembly today copies of the annual report for the Alberta Securities Commission for 1991-92.

As well, Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure for me to file with members of the Assembly copies of letters from the following people in support of Bill 68, the Public Sector Pension Plans Act (No. 2), which I introduced yesterday: from the president of the Alberta Union of Provincial Employees; from the president and chief executive officer of the Banff Centre in support of the universities academic pension plan; from Mr. Bill Zwerman, president of the Confederation of Alberta Faculty Associations; from the commissioner of finance and administration for the city of Calgary regarding the special forces pension plan; from the business manager of the Edmonton Police Association in support of the special forces pension plan; and from the vice-chairman of the Local Authorities Pension Plan Board.

MR. SPEAKER: West Yellowhead.

MR. DOYLE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Today I'd like to file petitions from over 900 residents of Hinton and area in regards to reopening

discussion and eliminate the restrictions regarding Mountain Park, Cadomin Ridge, Drummond Ridge, west of Seabolt and Athabasca Ranch, or, [they] formally request the plan be scrapped, and initiate a change to the zoning of the integrated resource plan itself.

head: **Introduction of Special Guests**
2:40

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Dunvegan.

MR. CLEGG: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's a pleasure today to introduce to you and to the Legislative Assembly 10 young adults from the Fairview College transitional vocational program. They are accompanied by teachers/instructors Dianne McDonald and Lorraine Yerxa. They are seated in the members' gallery, and I would ask them to rise and receive the warm welcome of the Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Innisfail, followed by the Provincial Treasurer.

MR. SEVERTSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure to introduce to you and through you to members of the Legislature 34 grade 6 students from the Innisfail John Wilson elementary school. They are accompanied by their teachers Mrs. Layden and Miss Graham and parents Mrs. Taylor, Mrs. Miller, Mrs. Dell, Mrs. Haner, and Mr. Bruce Baldry. I'd ask them to all rise and receive the warm welcome of the Assembly.

MR. DINNING: Mr. Speaker, it's not often that I have an opportunity to introduce people from the constituency of Calgary-Shaw, but it's my pleasure today to introduce a bright, young entrepreneur from the constituency of Calgary-Shaw: Mr. Murray Kobe. He's sitting in the members' gallery, and I'd ask all members to give him a warm welcome to the Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER: Stony Plain.

MR. WOLOSHYN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to introduce three members of the executive of the Woodbend community league who are here to discuss ways to replace their community hall, which unfortunately burnt down on February 26. I'd ask Glenn Smith, Bob Davis, and Marc Gallop to rise and receive the warm welcome of the Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER: Calgary-North West.

MR. BRUSEKER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It gives me great pleasure to introduce to you and to members of the Assembly 35 young Albertans that are here visiting the city of Edmonton. These young adults are visiting Edmonton as part of the Forum for Young Albertans, and they're here meeting with MLAs, leaders of the different parties to learn about the political process and to find out about both municipal and provincial governments. It's been my pleasure to serve as a trustee of the Forum for Young Albertans along with the Member for Edmonton-Kingsway and the Member for Banff-Cochrane. I'd ask the students to rise in the gallery, and I'd ask all members of the Legislature to give them a warm welcome.

MR. SPEAKER: Three Hills.

MR. MacDONALD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my privilege today to introduce to you two of the main boosters of the rural industrial capital of Alberta. That's Linden, Alberta. Dennis and Joyce Penner are the main boosters, and they're in the public gallery. I'd ask them to rise and receive a warm welcome.

head: **Oral Question Period**
Provincial Budget

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, yesterday in question period we began to get some idea of the government's four-year plan and what it will mean: massive cuts in education, health care, and social services. The Treasurer didn't deny that. He made it clear that this is the direction they're going. Now, besides dismantling these needed people services with their budget, the other side of it is that thousands of teachers, thousands of health care workers will be laid off and put out on the dole. That's the reality of it. It's a terrible human price that we're going to have to pay for this budget of the Tories if they're re-elected. Clearly there has to be higher unemployment as a result of this budget. My question to the Treasurer is simply this: recognizing that unemployment will grow under his budget, how can the Treasurer still continue to say that he can balance the books in four years under these circumstances when clearly the welfare budget is going to skyrocket? Those people aren't going to be paying taxes, and they certainly won't have purchasing power.

MR. DINNING: Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is clearly wrong. If he would listen to what Albertans in the health business, in the education sector have said – I note that they've said to him and they've said to all members on the government side of the House and they've said to Jim Dinning: "We know where to find the savings in the health care business, in the education business, at our universities, at our colleges. You set the targets, and we can help you achieve the savings that you need to find in order to balance the budget by 1996-97." We believe in those Albertans who've said to us that they could help us to do that, and I take them at their word. They've never let us down before. I believe in Albertans. I know my colleagues on this side of the House believe in Albertans, that they can help us to achieve those savings.

MR. MARTIN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't know who the Treasurer is listening to. It must be every right-wing businessperson around the province. It's certainly not coming from my riding. They haven't said: you know, cut 27 percent from education and health care; throw more people on welfare. I haven't got that information back at all.

The Treasurer said that he was going to be more specific and come forward with information. I want him to tell us, in that four-year projection that he's looking at, how many Albertans are going to lose their jobs over that four-year period because of this budget, not only in government but also in the private sector.

MR. DINNING: Well, Mr. Speaker, I sense that the hon. member has been reading his own literature a little too much. In fact, I'd suggest that he open his eyes and look across this province and look indeed across the country to others who are saying things about this province that many on this side of the House strongly believe in.

The Conference Board of Canada came out this morning and advised all Canadians that Alberta is going to be the fastest growing economy in the dominion of Canada this year, that Alberta would grow at a rate of 4 and a half percent economic growth. In our budget, Mr. Speaker, we've taken a conservative approach. We've said that we're expecting growth more to be in the order of about 3 percent so as to downplay the impact on our budgetary revenues so that we're not wildly or overly optimistic.

Mr. Speaker, I look at comments by the vice-president of the Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers, who said in Toronto yesterday that well completions in western Canada and particularly in Alberta during the first half of this year increased at a remarkable rate, almost 100 percent of what they'd expected this time last year.

MR. MARTIN: A conservative approach, very conservative, ultra conservative, ultra right-wing. That's the point. These figures just don't add up.

I come back to the Treasurer to say that he's talking about a quarter of the budgets of health care, education, and social services gone, Mr. Speaker, and he's saying that there'll be no impact on people at all. That's absolute nonsense. I want the Treasurer to tell us how he's going to do this and not lay off thousands of people out of these areas, how they're going to keep paying taxes, and how he's going to balance the budget. He's not Houdini.

MR. DINNING: You're right about that. I'm the Treasurer of the province of Alberta, and I intend to continue to be.

Mr. Speaker, I can tell hon. members that one more piece of good news that I wasn't quite able to get in there is housing starts. When I look at the housing starts this March over last March, for the first three months of '93 over '92, we see nearly a 10 percent growth in housing starts. That is another sign of economic activity and job creation in this province.

I'll go back, Mr. Speaker, to the province's economic strategy, which Premier Klein announced about two and a half weeks ago. In that strategy it spells out very clearly that we are not going to take the NDP approach which suggests that government is the only one who can create jobs. We don't believe in that approach because we have faith in Albertans, in Alberta entrepreneurs, like the one I introduced today, who are going to create industry-led economic development, industry-led job creation. This government is committed in its budget to getting out of the way of business so that they can get on with the job of business: creating jobs with a strong infrastructure that this government will support and a highly competitive taxation system that will lure business to this province and allow businesses in this province to make investments and create jobs.

2:50

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, to continue with the Treasurer. I would have thought I was going back in history. I thought I saw

R.B. Bennett over there dealing with the depression. That's the same old rhetoric Tories have used forever. The trickle-down economic theory that didn't work then is not going to work now.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let's look at specifically where the jobs of the future are going to be created. The government's own records say that by the year 2001 over 60 percent of the jobs will require some form of advanced education training. That's the government's own figures. There is a little bit of increase this year, but if we look at what's going to balance the books, there would have to be well over a 20 percent cut in advanced education, precisely where the jobs are going to be created. I want to ask the Treasurer simply this: how can the Provincial Treasurer justify huge cuts to the advanced education system over the next four years when most jobs that will be created will come from that source?

MR. DINNING: Well, Mr. Speaker, in the hon. Leader of the Opposition's preamble he talked about economic theory. If he would like to stand in this Assembly and promote the economic theory and the economic policy of the NDP government of Ontario, he's welcome to do so, because that province is in a very serious state of financial and economic affairs. It would be an absolute travesty for the Leader of the Opposition to be standing on this side of the Assembly doing to Alberta what the NDP government is doing to Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, when I spoke recently with the president of the University of Calgary and with the vice-chairman of the University of Alberta board of governors, they both said and others have said to my colleague the minister of advanced education, who may want to supplement, that the approach we're taking to set targets, to be clear about our priorities is the right way to go. They have said that they know where the savings can be found in their institutions, that they want to go to work to make sure that we balance our budget, but that we keep in place a first-rate postsecondary education system in this province.

MR. MARTIN: Well, Mr. Speaker, those fat cats were appointed by the Tories. They're not the ones that are going to be going to university. It's the young people that are going to be going to university.

If he wants to fight about Ontario, I'll compare their per capita deficit with this one and this mismanagement any day, Mr. Speaker. Any day. Call the election. And we have the figures on that. [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. MARTIN: Look at them get excited, Mr. Speaker.

Well, let's go back to Alberta, and let's talk about education. Let's talk about the students that are going to go there, not about the governors. To deal with these massive cuts, either there are going to have to be total cuts across the board or much higher tuition fees, Mr. Speaker. So let's look at the one side of it. How high does the Treasurer expect tuition fees to go in the next four years?

MR. DINNING: Mr. Speaker, I know my colleague the minister of advanced education has a direct comment on that, but at our budget round table in Red Deer there were representatives of the students there, and they made it clear that it was also their objective to make sure the burden of debt and deficit was not going to cripple them or hobble them in trying to build a better future for this province. They are supportive of trying to find ways to eliminate our deficit. They, too, said that they know where to find the savings, and we will rely on students, profes-

sors, faculty, boards of governors, and senior administrators at those institutions to help us accomplish that task.

Mr. Speaker, as for tuition fees I know my colleague the minister of advanced education has a supplementary comment.

MR. SPEAKER: All right, briefly. [interjections] Well, now we've got three of us standing, so two of you sit down. Perhaps on the supplementary advanced education might take it, but it depends on what the final question is.

The Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MARTIN: Yes. Mr. Speaker, this Treasurer doesn't seem to understand that a well-educated, healthy population is going to be the future of this province, not massive cutbacks, not putting people out of work. That's precisely what this budget is going to do. I want to ask, then, the minister of advanced education. He wants to get up, so we'll ask him. We don't get any answers from the Treasurer. Will the minister of advanced education tell the Assembly how many Albertans will be turned away from the doors of higher education because this government doesn't have the foresight to properly fund one of the most important areas of government spending? How many kids are going to be lost?

MR. ADY: Mr. Speaker, I really welcome the question from the Leader of the Official Opposition. Let's be clear about what has happened in this budget as it pertains to Advanced Education and Career Development. There is an increase in the budget of this department, one of only two departments centred in education, and that's the priority for the government: \$1.26 billion is going to advanced education in this province this year . . .

MR. MARTIN: I'm talking about over a four-year period.

MR. ADY: . . . an increase of \$48 million flowing through to that department, all directed in an effort to take care of . . .

Speaker's Ruling Interrupting a Member

MR. SPEAKER: Forgive me, hon. minister. Order. I'll allow the minister to continue, but hon. Leader of the Opposition, you did ask your three supplementaries. Please don't shout across. Let's at least hear.

MR. MARTIN: Point of order, Mr. Speaker. If he's going to answer a different question, what's the point? [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Order in the whole House. I know it's a nice day. Everybody would like to be outside in the sunshine.

MR. MARTIN: This is more fun.

MR. SPEAKER: This is more fun. All those in favour of the motion "this is more fun," please say aye.

The other point, hon. members, is the fact that there's too much racket going back and forth. Let's allow the minister to be able to get his question answered.

Mr. Minister.

Provincial Budget (continued)

MR. ADY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The hon. Leader of the Opposition put a question pertaining to tuition and the level of tuition. Let me be clear. There's a policy for tuition in this

province that is in place which puts a cap on tuition of 20 percent of operating costs to be passed on and absorbed by students. That is in place in today's world. That tuition on average is less than 13 percent. So there's quite a spread before they get to the cap of 20 percent. The students are protected by virtue of a policy that precludes the increase in tuition being more than \$200 per year per student in a university and \$100 per year in a college and an institute. I feel that we have an excellent proposal and an excellent program in place to protect the students, and when I visited the institutions, the students were well onside with that policy.

MR. DECORE: Mr. Speaker, I draw the attention of the Treasurer to pages 52 and 54 of his budget. On those pages it identifies the fact that the government is showing further losses in GSR, Myrias, Northern Steel, Dial-Guard, and Golden Gate in Lodi, California. The Treasurer and I were on a talk-back program yesterday together, and the Treasurer indicated that there would be no financial support for businesses in the future. This conflicts with the statements made in this Assembly by the Premier, who said that there will be a reduction or elimination of financial assistance to business. My question to the Treasurer is this: is it now clear on the government's part that it is a complete elimination, that there will be no financial assistance to business?

MR. DINNING: Mr. Speaker, we have in place programs of loans and loan guarantees and other forms of investments to a variety of Alberta businesses with the sole intent of diversifying and broadening the economic base of this province so that there are jobs, so that industry-led economic development can be created. What the Premier said in his statement of two and a half weeks ago in Seizing Opportunity was that clearly it is no longer the government's role or intention to be involved in direct subsidization, direct intervention in the economy as far as loans or guarantees go. My colleague the minister of economic development could perhaps supplement, but it is clearly our intention not to be involved in the business of business any longer and, as time goes on, to be able to withdraw from these kinds of investments and allow for industry-led economic development in this province.

3:00

MR. DECORE: Mr. Speaker, I think it's important to debunk the theory that the investment of millions of tax dollars into these corporations created jobs and diversified the economy. Mr. Treasurer, tell Albertans how many jobs were created from the millions of dollars invested in GSR, Myrias, Northern Steel, Dial-Guard, and Golden Gate in Lodi, California.

MR. SPEAKER: Motion for a return, hon. member. Motion for a return.

MR. DECORE: How many jobs were created?

MR. DINNING: Mr. Speaker, I'm hearing a comment from you, sir. Are you passing judgment that I should wait?

MR. SPEAKER: You can answer however you want, hon. minister, but it's too detailed a question for question period, and the member posing it knows it.

MR. DINNING: Mr. Speaker, clearly the hon. member has asked for detailed information that I'm sure my colleague might provide in a motion for a return.

Given that the hon. member has appointed all members of the Assembly to go to pages 52 and 54, I'd note the nearly 1 and a half billion dollars in loans under the Farm Credit Stability Fund Act – loans to how many farmers, Mr. Minister of Agriculture? An incredible number – loans to students under the Students Loan Guarantee Act, \$190 million worth of taxpayer supported, taxpayer backed loans to those people.

Mr. Speaker, the leader of the Liberal Party has made it clear in some of the election material that I've seen dropped at doors around this province that he's going to get out of the business of loans and loan guarantees altogether. He says that he's going to stop those loans. He's no longer going to provide that support to farmers under the farm credit stability fund. He's no longer going to provide student loans under the Students Loan Guarantee Act. We know the hon. member's position. It's in his election material, and as long as all Albertans know it, then that would be very good.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Thank you.

MR. DECORE: Mr. Speaker, every time I try to get the Treasurer to identify and to prove his own budget, he passes off the question to some other minister or some other person. Why doesn't the Treasurer answer these questions himself? Let's try the last time, Mr. Treasurer. [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Order. [interjections] Order.

The hon. member has put his question; I guess the Treasurer can answer it.

MR. DINNING: Mr. Speaker, I can tell the hon. member why. It's because on this side of the House budget making is not under the sole purview of the Provincial Treasurer; it is a team responsibility. Under the leadership of Premier Ralph Klein my colleagues in agriculture, my colleagues in economic development, my colleagues on the front bench of this House, my colleagues in all corners of this House have been fundamentally involved, integrally involved in the preparation of this document. It's our responsibility through the four standing policy committees of the government to make sure that those programs are vetted, that Albertans have the opportunity through public hearings to appear before those committees and have their views expressed. So it is a team responsibility.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. [interjection] Thank you. [interjections] Order.

Highwood, followed by Edmonton-Calder.

Llama Breeding

MR. TANNAS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My questions today are to the minister of agriculture. Alberta's agricultural industry has for many generations led our dominion in innovation and progress through diversification. Part of this diversification has included the introduction of new varieties, new crops, new breeds, and new domesticated species. Many of the llama breeders in my constituency are concerned with the restrictions that have been placed on so-called exotic animals. To the minister: could he please explain why animals like llamas, which have been domesticated for over 2,000 years, are still considered exotic animals in the province of Alberta?

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Speaker, currently the policies in this province permit the farming and the transfer to agriculture only of animals

that are indigenous to the native habitat. We continue to work with fish and wildlife on this issue and with the llama and also the alpaca producers to try to sort out that situation, but at this point in time it is not yet resolved.

MR. TANNAS: Mr. Speaker, my supplementary is again to the minister of agriculture. Llamas are indigenous to the Americas and have been raised in Alberta for many decades. The question, then, arises: when can these animals be taken off Alberta's exotic list so that animals such as llamas may be sold and transported without the bureaucratic hassle that exists today?

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Speaker, the simple answer is: at that point in time when enough Members of this Legislative Assembly support that shift and we negotiate it with the Minister of Environmental Protection.

Social Workers Contract Negotiations

MS MJOLSNESS: Last Thursday on the steps of Government House the Minister of Family and Social Services agreed to meet with the negotiating team of local 6 of the Alberta Union of Provincial Employees to discuss outstanding issues such as job security and workload standards. Since Thursday, Mr. Speaker, local 6 has been trying to set up a meeting with the minister, but so far he has been unwilling to meet with them. We know that the minister is busy, but these negotiations are not going well, and this is a very serious matter. So my questions are to the minister. Given that political decisions have to be made in order that the government negotiators have some direction, will the minister now agree to immediately meet with negotiators of local 6 so that he can at least understand the seriousness of these issues that are on the table?

MR. CARDINAL: Mr. Speaker, as you are aware, this minister is open to deal with the social workers, the frontline workers, the management staff, and others in that department, and I have on an ongoing basis. I just indicated to this House that my department had set up a meeting for yesterday, Tuesday, of department officials with that division, and I will get an update on that particular meeting. If the meeting does not resolve the issues out there, then I am willing to sit down further with my department officials and a group that represents their people.

MS MJOLSNESS: Mr. Speaker, just to clarify what the minister has just said, is he, then, willing to notify local 6 negotiators and actually have a meeting with them immediately? Is that what he is saying?

MR. CARDINAL: Mr. Speaker, all I said was that a meeting was set up for Tuesday with my department officials and division 6 representatives, and I don't have a report of that meeting yet. I will get it as soon as it is ready and determine at that time if there is a need for future meetings immediately. If there is a need for future meetings, then, yes, I will sit down with the group.

MR. SPEAKER: Calgary-McKnight.

Advanced Education Funding

MRS. GAGNON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The government is telling Albertans that there is a \$48 million increase to advanced education funding. We heard it again today. However, \$32 million of this increase is merely an internal transfer from social services, and \$17 million has been allocated for a long overdue

increase to the student aid system. In the end this budget is a mirage and does not address the overall decline in Alberta's advanced education system. It is clear to many that education is not a priority of this government. My question is to the minister of advanced education. How can the minister justify this fogged-in, do-nothing budget when there are real needs he is failing to address?

MR. ADY: Mr. Speaker, I really can't understand how the member opposite could take that approach when this government has set education as a priority. Out of 17 departments in this government the two departments that received additional funding this year were the two education departments: \$1.2 billion to advanced education, more money flowing through to the students that need additional money, for the Students Finance Board. Certainly that has to indicate a responsible position to give students an opportunity to access our postsecondary education system.

MRS. GAGNON: Mr. Speaker, even the increase to student aid is an illusion. For those students requiring the maximum student loan amounts, the increase in the student aid ceiling of \$350 per year will be almost entirely consumed by tuition increases. My second question is: why is the minister claiming that student loan living allowances will be raised by \$40 a month when the actual increase for a U of C student would be about \$17 a month after the tuition increase of \$213 is accounted for? It's a sham.

3:10

MR. ADY: Mr. Speaker, let's be clear that there are only 5 percent of the students who make application to the Students Finance Board who bump up against the annual cap of funding that's available to them of some \$8,300, an increase from \$7,950 in the previous year. Let's be clear that we have a needs-based program, a program that's based on a student making an application to the Students Finance Board, an assessment being done thereby allowing them to make application for the funding that they require, not just carte blanche funding that moves across to the student but on a needs base. We only have 5 percent of the students who are bumping up against the cap on an annual basis. That tells me that with the \$40 a month increase in living allowance and the allocation that's in there for the increase in tuition, we have served the needs of the students quite adequately.

MR. SPEAKER: Olds-Didsbury, followed by Edmonton-Strathcona.

Interprovincial Trade

MR. BRASSARD: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Recent reports indicate that Alberta's trade with the U.S. is up 40 percent since the free trade agreement has been put in place, but at the same time here at home we're still struggling with the removal of trade barriers between provinces. To the Minister of Economic Development and Tourism: what steps is Alberta taking to remove existing barriers and allow free movement of goods and services, people, and capital between provinces right here in Canada?

MR. SPARROW: Mr. Speaker, this government has for years promoted the dismantling of the barriers within Canada to free trade. On March 19 at a meeting in Montreal all the ministers of trade across Canada agreed to a process that over the next year or year and a half they would each assign a chief negotiator and do a process within Canada similar to what took place with NAFTA

and the U.S. free trade agreement. We appointed a very talented individual as our chief negotiator. He has represented me at the meetings in Montreal and at several meetings since. That chief negotiator is our MLA for Medicine Hat. Numerous meetings will be taking place in the future. On May 18 and 19 the chief negotiators are getting together again. On June 7 and 8 there's a ministerial meeting again, and on June 9 there will be another key meeting.

MR. BRASSARD: With due respect, Mr. Speaker, there does appear to be some hesitancy on the part of some of the players. Could the minister inform this Assembly if he's concerned about the determination on the part of all governments in Canada to proceed on this very critical agreement?

MR. SPARROW: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Since the agreement on March 9 there have been several incidents. One between New Brunswick and Quebec with retaliation on labour issues and contracting. The *Financial Post* just had an article about Ontario and Quebec looking at other problems. I think they all are determined, though, to maintain and make sure the process for negotiation of free trade within Canada takes place. We're very, very fortunate in having an excellent Member of this Legislative Assembly, the MLA for Medicine Hat, to represent us in all of these negotiations. It's very, very key that Canada and the union of Canada is key on this issue. We must have free trade within the provinces.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Strathcona.

MLA Remuneration

MR. CHIVERS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In 1983 the government passed an amendment to the MLA Pension Plan Act to allow income earned by MLAs for serving on boards and commissions to be pensionable earnings. Immediately after the passing of this amendment, the total amount of fees collected by MLAs for sitting on boards and commissions almost doubled, and it has doubled again in recent years. The figure in '92 was \$539,000. Would the Deputy Premier release before the election this year the figures for the total paid to MLAs for sitting on boards and commissions so that the public can be aware of the true extent of MLA remuneration?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, the Deputy Premier does not have access to that information. It's my understanding that just in recent days the Provincial Treasurer has released information by way of the public accounts with respect to this matter. That is the normal way that information is provided, but it's not difficult for the hon. member to access that. He might ask all of his various colleagues within his own caucus how many days they have served on Public Accounts Committee and if they have accessed a \$100 per day fee for sitting on that. He might ask the Member for Edmonton-Highlands and he might ask the Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place how many meetings of the Members' Services Committee they have attended. They receive a hundred dollars, I believe, per day for attendance at such meetings. He might ask the Member for Calgary-Forest Lawn, who is the chairman of the Public Accounts Committee, to provide that information. I think the hon. member receives a stipend on a monthly basis; I believe it's \$350 per month. Twelve times \$350 per month would give us, I guess, \$4,200 a year. It's not a difficult situation to deal with.

MR. CHIVERS: Mr. Speaker, the truth of the matter is that we have the figures for '92 but not for '93.

Mr. Speaker, in the Peat Marwick report we do have some indication of what the extent of the fees for 1993 will be, but they averaged it over all MLAs. However, the truth of the matter is that the government MLAs collect almost three-quarters of the total. In 1992 the average government MLA received over \$8,000 for sitting on boards and commissions. Does the Deputy Premier think it is reasonable for government MLAs to get an average bonus of over \$8,000 above their MLA salary?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, let me get this straight. The hon. member in his first question asked me to provide information. Then he said that to be honest he had the information. I don't understand why the hon. member would ask me to make public information on 1992. We're now in the 11th day of May in 1993, and normally that information is provided at the end of either a calendar year or a fiscal year. There's no doubt at all.

In terms of the fact that government MLAs get three times as much in terms of total dollars as opposition MLAs, well, if you look at the configuration of the House, you will find that there are now, I think, 15 members in the NDP caucus, I think we've got 57 in the government caucus, and we have nine in the Liberal caucus. It would seem to me if X amount of dollars are available, then you calculate and apportion it on the basis of how many there are per caucus. It shouldn't be a very difficult thing to calculate I would think, Mr. Speaker.

Alberta Resources Railway Corporation

MR. DOYLE: Mr. Speaker, in last Thursday's budget the Provincial Treasurer announced the government's intention to either sell or shut down the Alberta Resources Railway Corporation. This railroad between Grande Prairie, Grande Cache, and Hinton is of vital importance to northwestern Alberta and to the industries of forestry, mining, and farming. Given the economic importance to my constituents and to northern Alberta, can the Treasurer specifically explain what the government intends to do with Alberta Resources Railway and within what time frame?

MR. DINNING: Mr. Speaker, I know the hon. Minister of Transportation and Utilities has a lengthy response for the hon. member's question, and I'll take the question as notice for when the hon. member returns to the House.

MR. DOYLE: It was the Treasurer's budget, Mr. Speaker.

Given that under its operating agreement with Canadian National the government has been required to contribute an operating subsidy most years in order to keep the Alberta Resources Railway in the black, how does the government propose to be able to sell the railroad without the need for more taxpayer subsidies?

3:20

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, the Alberta Resources Railway was built and completed, I guess, in the 1960s by the Social Credit government. Since that time this government has attempted to in fact have the Alberta Resources Railway get into the black on an annual operating basis. It's my understanding that we've arrived at that fact in 1992. Now having seen the Alberta resources railroad operate in the black rather than the red, the first time in some 30 years, then in essence there is no need for additional annual operational subsidies from the province of Alberta.

MR. SPEAKER: Calgary-Buffalo.

Young Offenders

MR. DICKSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It may be Crime Prevention Week but the confidence of Albertans in the criminal justice system continues to erode, particularly in that part of the system that deals with young offenders. The number of youth at the Edmonton Young Offender Centre has exceeded 200 since January. The design capacity is only 170. To the Minister of Justice: when will this government get serious about using community sentencing panels and alternative measures programs and work with communities to prevent crime instead of relying on an expensive revolving-door system that simply doesn't work?

MR. FOWLER: If the member opposite expects that the criminal justice system or this government all by itself and of itself is going to cure all of the difficulties out there that society is experiencing because of a great many problems in society, it just is not going to happen. This minister is not overly concerned at all about two youths occupying the same cell on two beds. That is not a difficult area at all for this minister.

The difficulty we have in youth crime is partially in the Young Offenders Act, which is federal legislation, Mr. Speaker. Secondly, we require a much more overall attack on youth crime and criminality than just from the one department. In fact, this is occurring in four pilot projects in Alberta, which will be taking place very quickly.

MR. DICKSON: Well, Mr. Speaker, the difficulty that I think most Albertans have is that the Young Offenders Act has been in force now for over six years. In places like Manitoba they've developed 60 community sentencing panels. My supplementary question to the Minister of Justice is: will the minister expand the scope of alternative measures groups like those operating currently in Strathmore and Airdrie so that they can perform a sentencing function like the model in Slave Lake?

MR. FOWLER: Mr. Speaker, we are very interested in sentencing panels and youth commissions. However, our experience confirms to us that these must start at the community level; they cannot be imposed from the top down. Unless the community is interested and shows an interest, they are not going to be very effective or last very long. We are extremely anxious to move in and assist any community on these community panels. The hon. member is correct: they are working where they have been implemented. We want to see many more of them in Alberta as soon as communities are ready to take on this responsibility.

MR. SPEAKER: Redwater-Andrew, followed by Edmonton-Jasper Place.

Foreign Qualifications

MR. ZARUSKY: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question today is to the Minister of Labour. Last year there was considerable discussion around the subject of immigrants to our province having difficulty having their professional and occupational status evaluated. There was a commitment made at that time to look at the possibility of a foreign qualifications centre being established in this province. My question to the minister is: can the minister indicate if this initiative has been forgotten, or is there any action being taken on it?

MR. DAY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm happy to say that it's far from forgotten. The report of the task force, Bridging the Gap, was out last year. It made some recommendations. The govern-

ment followed up with a business plan. There were two main parts of that plan: there'd be one unit developed for standards and information that would evaluate procedure and evaluate how an agency would work; the second recommendation was that an actual centre be set up. The standards and information development unit is set up, and it is operating. In Calgary and Edmonton we now have steering committees looking at the actual setting up of the foreign qualifications centre. It's the result of the work of a lot of people. Incidentally, the Minister of Community Development was very instrumental in getting that whole initiative started. So it is well on the way.

MR. ZARUSKY: Mr. Speaker, supplementary to the minister. That's good news, and I think all Albertans will certainly appreciate it. Many areas of the province need people with different occupations, but there's the subject of funding. Somebody has to pay for this. I know that the Citizenship and Heritage Secretariat committed \$250,000 of lottery fund dollars to this project, but I think it will take a little more than that. To the minister: where is the remainder of the funding going to come from?

MR. DAY: Well, the member is correct in that there were dollars designated from the multicultural commission. Also, career development was responsible for approximately \$110,000 and, in terms of ongoing operation, about \$160,000 from the Professions and Occupations Bureau. The exciting part that I see coming from the steering committee, Mr. Speaker, is that they are reporting now that there will be significant funding coming from sectors other than government, so this will not in its final shape be totally government funded. The government will hit the point of providing some administrative support, some facility support, but the users of the system themselves – businesses, the private sector, training institutes, educational institutes, and immigration groups – will be significantly funding this operation.

Northern River Basin Study

MR. McINNIS: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Provincial Treasurer. At the time that the Alberta government approved the Mitsubishi Al-Pac project, it was done against the wishes of an environmental impact assessment panel. At the time, the government promised that it would conduct studies into the northern rivers system, and shortly thereafter a three and a half year, \$12.3 million jointly funded study was announced. The minister of the environment at the time, who is now the Premier, swore that if those studies showed there was a problem, Al-Pac would not be allowed to operate. I would like to ask the Treasurer why on page 77 of his budget he's cut funding for the northern river basin study program.

MR. DINNING: Mr. Speaker, I know that the hon. Minister of Environmental Protection, when back in the Assembly, would happily answer that question either during question period or during Committee of Supply debate. I will advise him that the hon. member is interested in finding out the answer to that question.

MR. McINNIS: Actually, Mr. Speaker, that minister has a great deal of difficulty in answering questions when he is here.

My supplementary. Yesterday the minister told some people that the funding for the study was not cut. The budget says it is cut. Maybe he'd at least tell us which one is correct: the minister or the budget.

MR. DINNING: Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is looking for detailed information. I know the hon. Minister of Environ-

mental Protection would happily be able to provide him with that detailed information that would be useful for his analysis.

MR. SPEAKER: Westlock-Sturgeon.

Predator Damage to Livestock

MR. TAYLOR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the minister of agriculture. Also it's to do a bit with the budget. The Provincial Treasurer announced the termination of the livestock predator indemnity program, but in the most recent annual report of the Farmers' Advocate, Mr. Minister, there was a statement made that the number of cases of livestock damage is increasing. Now, the question to the minister is this: now that the farmers will no longer be receiving compensation for predator damage, what steps is the minister taking to allow farmers to try to protect their livestock?

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Speaker, so that the hon. Member for Westlock-Sturgeon does not become confused, the livestock predator program that we have eliminated is related only to damage caused by coyotes. Wildlife other than coyotes are still compensated for through the budget of the hon. Minister of Environmental Protection. We will continue to provide information and educational programs to farmers, particularly of cattle and sheep, to manage their livestock in such a way as to reduce predation by coyotes.

3:30

MR. TAYLOR: Thank you. Mr. Speaker, I knew our coyotes were smart, but I didn't know that the government could send them some reading material that would cause them to slow up a little bit. It's nice to know the education process is ongoing.

To go on a little bit further on that. Farmers are also very upset – this is in tandem with this – that their forage in a lot of areas cannot be protected from deer and elk damage due to the government's laws against shooting or taking care of any of the animals that arrive uninvited. Has he got some sort of a publication he could send them too?

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Speaker, as a former teacher I think I could probably do a better job of educating a coyote than the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon.

MR. SPEAKER: The time for question period has expired. However, I've received notification that the Minister of Justice wishes to supplement information raised in question period by the Member for Clover Bar.

The Minister of Justice.

Proposed Women's Prison

MR. FOWLER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On Thursday last the Member for Clover Bar asked whether I had raised the possibility of siting the proposed federal women's prison at a 48-bed unit in Fort Saskatchewan jail, which was in fact built under a federal/provincial agreement. I wish to advise the Assembly that I have in fact suggested this unit to my federal counterpart, first in 1991 but more recently in meetings with the Hon. Doug Lewis, Solicitor General of Canada.

The use of the Fort Saskatchewan facility has been rejected by Corrections Canada on the basis that it is inconsistent with the recommendations of the Task Force on Federally Sentenced Women. I would also advise the member and the Assembly that I have forwarded copies of a document in opposition to the Castle Downs proposal prepared by the North Edmonton Taxpayers'

Association. Finally, I have raised the matter of citizen concerns expressed to me about the site proposal to Mr. Lewis directly at a meeting I had with him on April 24 of this year and after that in a telephone conversation since that date. Mr. Lewis has consistently responded that there has been no final selection site.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. GESELL: Well, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the efforts that have been made by the minister and that the reasons cited for rejection of the Fort jail was the task force report. I assume that that had to do with security. I would ask the minister: would it not be more appropriate to make other security arrangements or security modifications rather than build a new jail? I know it's a federal responsibility, but that submission could be made to the federal government.

MR. SPEAKER: Minister.

MR. FOWLER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The rejection of the Fort Saskatchewan site was not a matter of security at all. It was a matter of design in respect to a specific women's prison.

head: **Orders of the Day**

head: **Written Questions**

MR. DAY: Mr. Speaker, I move that the written questions on today's Order Paper stand and retain their places.

[Motion carried]

head: **Motions for Returns**

MR. DAY: Mr. Speaker, I move that the motions for returns on today's Order Paper stand and retain their places, with the exception of the following motions for returns: 184, 270, and 305.

[Motion carried]

Telus Corporation

184. Mr. McEachern moved that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing copies of all documents detailing the amounts of revenue forgone by the government as a result of the carrying costs from selling both offerings of Telus Corporation shares on installment.

MR. DAY: Mr. Speaker, the government will reject Motion for a Return 184.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Calgary-North West, speaking to the motion for a return.

MR. BRUSEKER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Motion for a Return 184 deals with carrying costs from the selling of the offerings of Telus Corporation. One of the concerns that the Liberals raised at that time was that although the government was involved with the sale of Telus shares, the shares would be carried by the government for a six-month interest-free time. The volume of shares that was sold and the dollar amount associated on a per share basis multiplied together amounts to a substantial amount of money. For this government to casually say that they're not interested in how much money they lost on this I think shows the cavalier attitude that this government has with respect to balancing the

budget and being responsible with the taxpayers' dollar. I think it's a real sign of the times that they're not prepared to prepare these kinds of documents for the House and prepare the information for the taxpayers of the province.

MS BARRETT: You know, Mr. Speaker, maybe you'll agree with me. I think it's awfully funny that this government introduces closure on its second attempt for MLA pension reform Bill, introduces closure on its Deficit Elimination Act so it can have its agenda ready before it calls the election, but isn't introducing closure, in fact isn't even calling up the new access to information Act that the Premier seems to be so proud of. I wonder why.

I'll tell you why, Mr. Speaker. Because they don't want to have to fess up. It wouldn't even be legislators asking this question. It's a simple question, by the way. It would be the public of Alberta. They wouldn't even have to come to the Legislative Assembly and put a question like this on the Order Paper. They'd have the right if we had access to information legislation existent right now in this province, and people would be in droves. We lost \$650 million in that stupid transaction, and now they don't want to tell us how much we lost in revenues.

Isn't it funny that the Liberals stand up and want to talk about this? They advocated privatization. I remember the day the Bill was put on notice, Mr. Speaker. I think I was acting leader that day. I saw this Bill and I said, "I'm going to ask questions about this Bill." It was called the AGT Reorganization Act, and I said, "Isn't that a euphemism for privatization?" Oh, the minister of technology went real mum on it. We found out the next day when they finally brought it in for first reading.

We lost money not only on the sleazy and sloppy transactions that those people used to try to sell off our publicly owned telephone system, which by the way made money year after year; we lost money when these guys went to every small cellular operator that they could find in the United States and tried to buy them off, using taxpayers' money tried to get them to subscribe to our system. What an incredible disaster. I still don't think the public understands all the details of that entire transaction. Then for the government to stand up and glibly say, "We reject the question, Mr. Speaker." How arrogant can you get? Good grief, we lost a company that was making money for Alberta taxpayers. The whole selling off was a total scandal, one of the worst in Alberta's history, and now they don't even care how much operating revenue they lost by their whole mess. Shame on 'em, the lot of them.

Speaker's Ruling Parliamentary Language

MR. SPEAKER: Perhaps the hon. Member for Edmonton-Highlands would be kind enough to withdraw the word "sleazy." I know that in your enthusiastic presentation of your argument that word fell in. Perhaps you'd be good enough to withdraw it. It's one that's been ruled out of order in the House.

MS BARRETT: Mr. Speaker, with pleasure. I withdraw the word "sleazy" and replace it with the words "unconscionable" and "unaccountable."

MR. SPEAKER: That's two words.

MS BARRETT: That's two words.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, sort of.

Debate Continued

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, to get back on the subject, which was the carrying costs of the loan, I can appreciate the Member for Edmonton-Highlands' high dudgeon about the actual sale itself, but sometimes when you lose a battle, remember that you have to sit down and go after what you can retrieve.

What the government seems to be hiding is the fact that they went through some fancy shenanigans in the financing of the shares. Simply put, when you sold the shares, it would have been easy to say, "Okay, Joe, if you haven't got any money, pay me later, six months from now, with a little bit of interest," and do your own banking.

I smell a bit of a rat here – or should I say coyote now? – because something's going on over there. I suspect, Mr. Speaker, after having been involved with a few public issues in my life, what they've done is made an arrangement with a brokerage house to carry these people, for them to put up money. Well, a brokerage house doesn't do anything for nothing, and I have a hunch that if we were to examine the papers – and maybe we'll get a chance in a month or so, if they don't get their shredders going too fast – we'd be able to find out that they allowed the brokerage house to grant the credit.

3:40

Now, when a brokerage house grants credit, it means that they deduct something like 15 to 18 percent from the amount of money you get from your share. They pay you cash now, yes, but the purchaser has to pay about 18 percent interest, and that means that the seller, or the government, was short about probably 18 percent from what we sold the shares for. Whereas if we'd just directly sold it, it would have been all right, because we'd only have been short maybe about 8 percent. Bear in mind, Mr. Speaker, that this was a cozy deal, remember, between the government and some hand-selected ex-MLAs who had brokerage houses.

So I would think that the financing of the shares was a little bit like when you buy a used car: you make money selling the car and you make money selling the financing. I suspect – and this is why the government doesn't want to come up with the answer, and I think they should – that not only did the agent get a good commission for selling the shares for the government, but they got another commission for doing the financing. This could be why they look at the floor now and turn pink and every other colour. It must be that they've put out a heck of a lot of money that shouldn't have gone out just in order to keep their little friends happy that had retired early. After all, they didn't have the chance of having a huge pension, Mr. Speaker, so we had to look after them in other ways.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Kingsway, summation.

MR. McEACHERN: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The government has again refused to release information that of course should be public knowledge. It's a simple enough question. I'm just asking them to indicate the carrying costs for selling shares when they sold Alberta Government Telephones. On the first sale, which was about half of the value of the company, we estimated that the carrying costs could be as much as \$10 million, and it's quite a significant number for a government that's embarking on the kind of a cutback program that these guys are talking about and the need to quit wasting money and spending a lot of money. So they sold the shares on a sweetheart deal for anybody that could afford to buy the shares, and they sold a Crown corporation that was doing a perfectly good job of providing telephone services to this province and had been doing so for over 80 years.

I might add, Mr. Speaker, it's rather amusing to hear the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon say that sometimes you lose battles, so then you have to try to recoup what you can from the pieces. I didn't notice that the Liberal Party actually argued with the Official Opposition that AGT shouldn't have been privatized. As I recall it, they started the debate on the Bill by saying: well, we're not necessarily against privatization, but you've got to prove to me that this is a good privatization. We then proceeded for several days of debate in which we showed that it was not a good privatization. I mean, what government in its right mind would sell a profitable utility company that has a monopoly – and it's a natural monopoly – and then retain in the end NovAtel, the high-risk, high-tech company with no buffer or protection between them and the taxpayers?

Although we raised all the objections and did our research and found five or six examples around the world of how that was really a rather stupid idea, nonetheless the Liberals said: well, I guess the Tories must have won the argument. Although they never did answer any of our questions, other than just promise that although they were abandoning the protection of Albertans in terms of telephone services to the whims of the market and whatever might happen next with the Unitel application for long-distance competition and all those things – nonetheless, they had no guarantees other than to say: there will be no job losses, and there will be no increase in local rates, both of which have already happened. Yet these guys on the Liberal side sat here and ended up voting for the privatization, and now they're trying to rescue something by jumping on the government along with us. [interjection] Well, the privatization was a disaster from the first. We said that it would be a sweetheart deal to sell shares to those that could afford it and that the taxpayers and the general population of Alberta would be the losers, and that has proved to be the case.

Now this government, which claims to be so open and honest and is going to provide all the stats and all the figures, is refusing to tell us what they spent or what it cost. By the way, you had to pay half the cost of the shares down and then the other half a year later, not six months later, as the Liberal for Calgary-North West said a few moments ago. It was not a six-month holding and waiting for the second half of the payment on the shares; it was a full year. We think the first sale of shares cost at least \$10 million, and the second one probably cost nearly as much. I don't understand how the government can have the gall to just sit there and say: no, we're not going to release this information. It's information that we should have.

As to how the various agencies that sold the shares were treated, that is the subject of a second question, Motion 185 on the Order Paper in my name, and the government isn't even willing to bring it forward and have a debate. They're prepared to reject the dozen or so motions I've had on the Order Paper, obviously, one at a time every now and again. Some open and honest government. There are some important questions there that should be answered. It's the same old business as usual: just refuse to give out the kind of detailed information that the taxpayers should have a right to because it's taxpayers' dollars. You'll pay for it in the next election.

[Motion lost]

NovAtel Communications Ltd.

270. On behalf of Mr. Decore, Mrs. Hewes moved that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing documents outlining the details of the severance packages and any other payments provided as a result of the termination of employment by NovAtel Communications Ltd. to former president

John Burrows, former chief operating officer Sandy Moore, and former vice-president and group controller Bob Varma.

MR. DAY: Mr. Speaker, the government will accept Motion for a Return 270.

[Motion carried]

Myrias Research Corporation

305. Mr. Bruseker moved that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing documents showing details of supplies and services, fixed assets, and others, including the purpose of expenditure, of Myrias Research Corporation as reported in the supplementary volume of the 1989-90 public accounts.

MR. DAY: Mr. Speaker, the government will reject Motion for a Return 305.

MR. McEACHERN: Mr. Speaker, this is just one of the many disasters that this government perpetuated on the taxpayers of this province where the government tried to pick a winner. They sort of looked around and said that they could find companies that had some little niche or some bright idea of how they're going to get into the international, competitive, high-tech industries in the world competition and thought that somehow they could put a few million dollars in and turn a company into an international winner. I remember raising questions in the House as to why the government would put \$20 million into this company and then back out on the company. My argument and the question I raised was something like this: why would you sit down to a poker game without enough money in your pockets to play the kind of stakes that the people around you have? After Myrias went under, I remember the minister of technology, research and telecommunications saying: well, what you've got to realize is that the German government put \$140 million into a parallel computer company in Germany; so that's what we're competing with. Well, then why are you putting \$20 million in and then backing out on it?

Mr. Speaker, it was a silly idea for this government to put money into Myrias on that kind of scale. I'm not against helping small companies get started, but what the government found themselves doing was putting some money in and then deciding that, oh, well, it needs a little bit more. Then they started to get embarrassed at the amount they were putting in out of the minister's office, so they sent them around to the Alberta Opportunity Company for a couple of million and then around to the export loan guarantee program for a million and then to Vencap for \$7.5 million. What they ended up doing was not only showing that they couldn't pick winners out of the minister's office, but they ended up making the bottom line for the agencies that the government had set up, like Alberta Opportunity Company, look worse as well. Left to themselves, Alberta Opportunity Company might not have put any money in, or Vencap might not have put any money in.

3:50

So what we see here is a classic example of the kind of disaster of the Tory economic policy, and if anybody thinks they're going to change after the next election, they're kidding. The same with the Liberals who are saying: no money from taxpayers' dollars into individual corporations after the next election. What we'll see is that they won't be able to resist, and they'll get in on an ad hoc basis. It's clearly the ad hockery and the ministers trying to

pick winners that are the problems. Alberta Opportunity Company as such may need some revisions and some changing, but it doesn't necessarily need disbanding, and that may be true of some of the other agencies of government like the export loan guarantee program that we should look at, maybe look at how it might be fine-tuned or changed but not necessarily and automatically disbanded like you should automatically disband the idea that ministers can pick winners from out of their offices. The trouble with that is that they can't pick winners even if they try to do it in an honest sort of way, and too often I think they try to pick their friends to make them into winners. So those are the kinds of problems you get into.

I think this motion for a return is a logical one. There's no reason in the world why the government shouldn't make the money available, but as usual they're being their usual secretive self. They're saying that the people and the taxpayers of this province have no right to know and that they're just not prepared to divulge this kind of detail. It's totally capricious and shows that the new management is just nonsense; it's just a facade of pretending to be different. They'll pay for it in the next election.

MR. SPEAKER: It's starting to get repetitious here.

Let's hear from the Member for Lethbridge-West.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, with regard to Motion for a Return 305, I support the government primarily because of the terminology used in the motion for a return. I have some difficulty when I read, "showing details of supplies and services, fixed assets, and others." The hang-up I have – and it would, I think, be a precedent – is: what does "others" mean? I don't know; I haven't the foggiest idea. "The purpose of expenditure, of Myrias Research Corporation": surely the government could probably answer that, but when you get into words like "others," it becomes so all-encompassing. What exactly is the hon. member after? Perhaps in closing debate he could express that, because I frankly think it's confusing, asking to have information to fit a category of "others." [interjection] Member for Edmonton-Kingsway, please. I gave you the floor. Would you do me the same?

Mr. Speaker, I think if it were worded in a different way – and perhaps someday it will; I don't know – the government or certainly the minister could probably respond in a more definitive way. But to use the word "others" frankly leaves me at a loss as to how either the minister or the government would ever answer it.

So therefore I would oppose it.

MR. SPEAKER: Calgary-North West, summation.

MR. BRUSEKER: Certainly, Mr. Speaker. In answer to the previous speaker, the government has, for at least my tenure in the Legislature, always introduced in the House a supplementary volume of expenditures that have been paid to either individuals or corporations. Beside the name, whether it's an individual or a corporation, there is simply a dollar figure. The purpose of Motion for a Return 305 is simply to say: what did you spend the money on? There's a dollar figure there, and to be honest, I don't remember that dollar figure right off the top of my head because this motion for a return has been on the Order Paper for some time.

What we're looking for here, Mr. Speaker, and what the government is supposing to support with their access to information Bill is the idea that government can, should, and must be accountable not only to this Legislature but to the taxpayers of Alberta. Myrias Research Corporation, as mentioned in this

particular motion for a return, is one of the many ventures that this government has involved itself in with respect to putting cash directly into this corporation that has now been lost to the people of Alberta. So the purpose of this motion for a return, along with many others that I have on the Order Paper, is simply to say: give us an accounting. So "others" is an all-encompassing term that simply says: if you spent \$10,000, tell us where the \$10,000 went. Or if it's \$10 million or whatever it is, what did it go on?

The people of Alberta in my constituency are demanding from me and, I'm sure, from all hon. members in their respective constituencies an accountability for the dollars that this Legislature expends. Last year's deficit, Mr. Speaker: \$3.2 billion, a staggering amount of money. People are saying: where has the money gone; what has happened with all of the money? So the Liberals are saying: provide us the information. We would not have made a loan like this to Myrias Research. I guess the Member for Edmonton-Kingsway purports that he would continue to do that. He seems to take objection to that, so I can only assume that he thinks the strategy of picking winners or at least attempting to pick winners is the right way to go, but we certainly don't advocate that position at all.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of Motion for a Return 305 is simply: tell us what happened. It's a number of years ago. Certainly the idea of confidentiality, which we've heard many times, or business trading or whatever is no longer an issue. Let's have the facts so people know what the government did with respect to Myrias Research Corporation.

[Motion lost]

head: **Motions Other than Government Motions**

Prostitution

242. Moved by Mr. Schumacher on behalf of Mr. Shrake:
Be it resolved that the Legislative Assembly urge the government to ask the federal government to explore with all the provinces and territories alternative means of dealing with the social problems caused by prostitution.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Drumheller.

MR. SCHUMACHER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move Motion 242 in the hope of persuading the government to look at alternative means of dealing with the social problems caused by prostitution. Prostitution has been referred to as the world's oldest profession. Governments have been attempting for hundreds of years to deal appropriately with prostitution in their society. It is one of the most complex issues we face, second maybe only to abortion in the extremes of feelings it arouses.

Dealing with prostitution involves very complex and contradictory values. Prostitution currently sits in a legal gray area, and our feelings towards it range from humour and contempt to moral outrage and indifference. It is my view that the people whose interests must be looked at first are those of the prostitutes themselves.

The lives of prostitutes are not easy ones. They have to contend with the perception of themselves as objects that can be bought for a price. Street prostitutes tend to lead extremely unstable and transient lives. They are constantly exposed to violence and abuse. They run a severe risk of becoming drug abusers or contracting sexually transmitted diseases such as AIDS.

At the same time, there are a number of community interests that must be taken into account. Residents of communities that are plagued by prostitution have reasonable concerns: passersby

and children are often harassed, noise and litter increase, property values decrease in areas frequented by prostitutes, neighbourhood traffic also becomes congested and unmanageable. Most importantly, though, citizens in residential areas where prostitution occurs complain that they and their children lose the ability to enjoy the benefits of their property. It must be very difficult and a little frightening to raise children in an area where they are surrounded by prostitution. Often residents don't really blame the prostitutes themselves but still have legitimate concerns about the trade going on in their area. These residents are really in a double bind. Even though they often empathize with the plight of the prostitutes, residents have to worry about the well-being of their children and their own quality of life.

Often these residents live in lower income areas, where they simply lack the time and the means to express their concerns effectively. On the other hand, many businesspeople don't have that problem. Prostitutes often wind up plying their trade in residential areas because they have been forced out of the commercial areas. Businesses are far more able to organize and make their concerns with prostitution heard and acted upon. For that reason, they are usually successful in having the prostitution trade moved out of their areas. It's a classic example of the NIMBY syndrome. Although many groups say that prostitution is best left in commercial areas so that the residential neighbourhoods are not affected, these businesspeople also have a legitimate concern. They worry that prostitution in their areas will have an adverse effect on their businesses and wind up attracting the criminal element to their areas. There is another point of view that has to be taken into account in dealing with this problem. So we can see that there are a number of divergent interests that have to be accounted for in discussing this issue.

4:00

All of these interests serve to take the focus away from where it should be if we are really to work with the problem; that is, on the prostitutes themselves. There is a real and valid question as to whether the law has been effective in dealing with prostitution. The Criminal Code of Canada prohibits communicating in a public place for the purposes of prostitution. This law was introduced in 1985, replacing an outdated law prohibiting solicitation for the purposes of prostitution. When the federal Department of Justice researched the impact of the new law on prostitution, the results were really not very encouraging. The research showed that the new law had a very minimal impact on preventing prostitution. Only two cities in Canada – only two – could report even a minimal change in their prostitution statistics before and after the new law was proclaimed.

AN HON. MEMBER: Which two?

MR. SCHUMACHER: I don't know which two. I don't think that either was in our province, and that's one reason why this motion should be dealt with in a serious manner today. What we read in the papers indicates that certainly in Calgary and Edmonton this problem is not decreasing.

Municipal bylaws across Canada have had similar problems. Many municipalities have tried to enact bylaws prohibiting prostitution locally. Most of these laws have proved either ineffective or have been deemed to be unconstitutional. It must seem like an exercise in futility to try to make a law dealing with prostitution that doesn't do more harm than good. The federal law is a good example of this. Although it aims to apply equally to prostitutes and their clients, research indicates that far more prostitutes than clients are arrested under the law.

Rather than addressing the problem, the federal law instead gives prostitutes the added problem of lengthening criminal records. This is no help to a prostitute who is trying to get off the street and back into society. In addition, the law gives out punishment in the form of fines. When we consider that many women are forced to turn to prostitution by their economic situation, making them pay fines does not seem like the most sensible way to help them get off the street and out of that line of business. They often have to return to the street to turn more tricks in order to pay the fine. The means of punishment by a prostitution law will have to be far more considerate of prostitutes, of their real needs, if it is going to do any good in alleviating that problem for our society. The law and the way we look at prostitution will have to be changed if we are ever to reduce the number of prostitutes on the street rather than simply moving them from neighbourhood to neighbourhood.

To take real action on prostitution, we have to consider why people become prostitutes. Prostitutes tend to be female. Street studies show that female prostitutes outnumber males 4 to 1. Many come from lower income families but not all of course, and many tend to be runaways. Prostitutes mainly lack the education, skills, and training that would make them otherwise employable. The vast majority of prostitutes, male and female, can recount being physically and sexually abused during childhood. Many prostitutes hit the street to escape abusive or dysfunctional home lives. On the street they often find a substitute family in the form of a boyfriend, older prostitutes, or pimps. Our society is only just beginning to learn the crushing effect that physical and sexual abuse can have on children. Children can be left with a low self-esteem and feelings of worthlessness that make them ready victims to be turned into prostitutes.

Another problem is substance abuse, common in the lives of prostitutes and young people on the fringes of society. Often, prostitution becomes the only means to get money to finance a drug habit. Once there, young people are caught in the trap of being addicted to drugs and having to prostitute themselves in order to afford them. Studies show that street prostitution is not a very lucrative profession. Prostitutes who have to set aside a large amount of money or a portion of their income for drugs and have a pimp taking most of the rest do not have sufficient resources to get themselves off the street.

So there are a number of focus areas that should be examined as effective alternative means of fighting the problem. The first is strong action on child abuse, spousal abuse, and sexual assault. This government has been working hard on action to help victims of abuse. One of the most progressive measures is a new rule announced by the former solicitor general, now Minister of Justice, requiring police officers to press charges in cases where abuse is determined to have occurred. Officers and victim services workers are getting increased training to help them deal sensitively and effectively with victims of abuse. If the police are better trained to respond with sensitivity, victims will be more disposed to seek their assistance.

Another issue that is an asset in dealing with both abuse and prostitution is greater involvement between the community and the police. There is currently a need for better communications and closer contact between the police and the communities they serve. This must also include agencies dealing with families, youth, and prostitutes. The police are taking action on each of these issues. As I mentioned, police are receiving improved training to deal with abuse victims. The police are also working very hard to form closer ties with the community with foot-patrol officers and the like. These are hopeful signs, and I hope that they are continued and enhanced in the future.

In addition, we are beginning to know more and more about the trends that start people towards prostitution. Abuse at home, missing school, and drug abuse are all indications that would show a decline into prostitution. We need to improve our intervention tactics to spot earlier the children who may be headed towards a life in the street trade.

There are certainly broad issues in our society today that we could definitely work on. We live in a society that glamorizes violence through the media. It seems almost impossible to go to a movie or watch television these days without seeing a lot of distasteful violence. At the same time, many attitudes in the media tend to devalue women in society and make them little more than sex objects. I know that these values themselves are inherent in our society and would be difficult to target for specific action. At the same time, if the violence and negative attitude towards women that we are constantly subjected to in the media were to change, I think that societal problems such as abuse and prostitution would improve.

4:10

At the same time, there are some very specific actions we can take on behalf of women. Enact strict rules to enforce payment of maintenance and child support payments, and in so doing we alleviate the economic situation for many single women and their families by providing them with funds that are rightfully theirs. Another method which would have definite results is enhancing social welfare programs to catch some of the women who are falling through the cracks and turning to prostitution. This would not necessarily require more money; rather, we could simply apply it in a more sensitive and comprehensive manner to the women who need it.

I have dealt with all of these remedies to the social problems caused by prostitution in a very general manner. They are very complex and need to be worked on extensively by people with expertise in their own areas. Governments can help at the federal, provincial, and municipal levels by working together to pool their resources and to share information. There is a huge body of information out there to help us understand who prostitutes are and what motivates them. It is now the job of government to begin to share that information and to use it to take real action to get prostitutes off the streets.

We can work with the committed groups out there helping prostitutes in the field. There are a number of them working in each city. In Edmonton they include such groups as the Boyle Street co-op, the Elizabeth Fry Society, Crossroads outreach services, and the University of Alberta student legal services. Local school boards and boards of health can also be of assistance.

An excellent example of using your resources to come up with real action on prostitution is happening right here in Edmonton. The city of Edmonton has formed the Mayor's Task Force on Safer Cities to review a number of social problems and make recommendations for their solution. A subcommittee of this task force is the action group on prostitution. This subcommittee has been given a mandate to develop an integrated strategy on prostitution that will involve all levels, from provincial government departments to public interest groups. They have received a number of submissions from groups dealing with prostitution in the city to make their recommendations, which will come before Edmonton city council for approval. This is an excellent means to really look at all aspects of the prostitution problem, which is particularly interesting in its focus on an integrated approach. A problem like prostitution that is so complex will require such an integrated approach on the part of government if we are really going to help anyone out there. More studies like the mayor's

task force, that recommends strong and integrated action for governments, are what we should be looking at at all levels of government. The more all governments work together, the sooner we can effect real change.

This approach has never been more timely. We are being plagued by sexually transmitted diseases that are threatening our society like never before in the form of AIDS, herpes, and others. Currently AIDS is spreading among heterosexual women faster than any other group. This is partly due to prostitution that is occurring in our society, with diseases transmitted between the prostitutes and their clients, then out to spouses and other partners. The intravenous drug use common to prostitution makes the problem worse. We need to tackle prostitution if we are to slow the spread of these deadly diseases.

New approaches at all levels of government to prevent prostitution would be beneficial to our society. In the long term they would result in a lessened burden on our health, criminal justice, and social welfare systems. They would vastly increase the productivity of a segment of our population. Most importantly, they would help young people who are victims of abuse and poverty to turn away from a life on the streets.

For these reasons, I urge you on behalf of my hon. friend the Member for Calgary-Millican to support Motion 242.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Avonmore.

MS M. LAING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I welcome the opportunity to speak on this motion. There is not much that I can disagree with in what the Member for Drumheller has said. However, I would like to broaden our understanding of this issue and of our concern. As the member has said, prostitution has been considered the world's oldest profession. I would suggest that it's in a line with things like rape and battering of women and children. It has been around for a long time. We not only have to look at the victims of those activities; as well, we need to look at the victims of prostitution or sexual slavery or sexual exploitation. We understand that it is indeed a complex issue that generates many strong feelings. Certainly I have heard that from many people.

I would note, however, that the government has done a couple of task forces into the area: the federal government one on pornography and prostitution and, also, another task force into child sexual abuse. What is required now is the will to act on this issue, to take it seriously, not accept it as part of the way things always have been, because that, then, in some way says: well, what can you do; it's human nature. I suggest that we need the will to change what has always been, because what we are talking about is an age-old exploitation of women and children.

[Mr. Moore in the Chair]

Mr. Speaker, there are many social problems that arise out of prostitution, as we have heard, but I think we have to look at the social problems that give rise to prostitution. To deal with the issue of prostitution rather than looking at the causes is to deal with the symptom rather than the cause of problems. We have to look at actually three groups of people, and we have to ask why they are involved in the way they are. How is it that they came to be there, and what is the payoff for them?

We have, first of all, the prostitutes. Most prostitutes become prostitutes as juveniles or adolescents; 80 percent, people estimate. Seventy-five to 95 percent have been child abuse victims. So we have some things to deal with as a society. We have to say: why

are there customers? Why are there johns? What are the cultural images? What is the cultural support for the buying of sexual behaviour? What is involved for johns that they turned to prostitution? I would like to focus particularly on johns that engage street prostitutes, the ones that are out cruising around.

The third group that hasn't been mentioned here is the pimps, Mr. Speaker. They are, I would suggest, the most exploitive of all, because they flourish on the vulnerability and the neediness of young prostitutes. They take advantage of the customer's need, whatever that need is, however ill-advised, however dangerous, however damaging.

4:20

So we have to look at what the problem really is. I was happy to hear the Member for Drumheller say that we have to talk about the prostitutes themselves. We also have to talk about the johns and the pimps.

Point of Order Clarification

MR. GOGO: Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Point of order, Lethbridge-West.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, I don't mean to take this personally, but I constantly hear my name being referred to with regard to the hon. member's discussion of this resolution. I happen to be a John, and I would hope that the hon. member would clarify that there was no intent of looking across the aisle.

MS M. LAING: Well, Mr. Speaker, I've actually had to deal with this question in my own caucus inasmuch as we have a member here and one staff person who are called John. No, nothing personal intended. In fact, I often try to move away from the vernacular and into the more correct "client" term.

Debate Continued

MS M. LAING: Mr. Speaker, I point out that prostitution in and of itself, the buying and selling of sex, is not illegal. It is not against the law. It is the soliciting and the communication for the purposes of prostitution and living off the avails of prostitution that are against the law. So prostitution, the act, is not in itself against the law. Negotiating the price, the time, the place: that is against the law. Exploiting other people who are involved in prostitution is against the law.

Most of the concern about prostitution that we hear is about street prostitution because of where it occurs, often in neighbourhoods, and the fact that many prostitutes are juveniles. In this city children as young as nine and 10 are known to engage in prostitution on the street. There are other problems, and I would suggest that these problems arise not out of the behaviour of the prostitutes but out of the behaviour of their customers, their clients, who harass women and children. I have never heard a man say that when he saw a young prostitute on the street, he was terrified that she would drag him into an alley and rape him and beat him and kill him. That is the fear that women feel about the customers of prostitutes – it's very hard to talk about this without using that word – the clients of prostitutes. They represent the real threat to safety and well-being in communities, to the women and children that live in communities. The prostitutes in and of themselves do not; it's the people that would come to seek their services.

Other dangers in the streets and in the neighbourhoods are the used needles and condoms found in back alleys and open spaces

and school yards, in the areas frequented by prostitutes and johns. I know that here in Edmonton there is a needle exchange program, and there is also, I believe, a program to pick up used condoms or turn in used condoms. So in that way we're attempting to deal with the real threat that comes as a result of the prostitution activity being carried on.

We have to talk about the customers or the clients, Mr. Speaker, because if we're going to deal effectively with the issue of prostitution, we have to ask: why are there clients; why are there customers of prostitutes? The clients, the customers, come from all walks of life, from every socioeconomic background. The customers that seek out street prostitutes are often violent and sadistic. Many people are mistaken in their belief that prostitution is about the buying and selling of sex. Particularly that which occurs on the street is more about power. Customers rape, brutalize, and murder prostitutes. We know from our news that this is not an uncommon reality. Any woman that has walked on a street the customers of prostitutes frequent, drive their cars around, hears the profound contempt and hatred that these men have for women. The language is harsh and brutal and vicious. The sexual activity, the sexual act, is an instrument of humiliation and degradation. These are men who may be obsessed with sex, have contempt for sex, and have many sexual partners including their wives and children.

I was glad to hear the Member for Drumheller speak about the spread of disease. I have worked with the children of men who are obsessed with sex, have multiple sexual partners including their children, and have transmitted their diseases to their young daughters or sons. That is the real danger. I would suggest that if we're going to deal with the issue of disease as well as prostitution, we must address the issue of the customers or the clients or the men that turn to prostitutes.

Mr. Speaker, we have to say: who are the prostitutes? Eighty percent of prostitutes start in the business as juveniles or adolescents. That means somebody is committing sexual abuse of children. Their first customers are child abusers. The majority, 75 to 95 percent, have histories that include sexual abuse, violence. They often feel that sex is their only avenue of escape from abusive homes. I've heard young prostitutes say: "I'm not good at anything except sex, and that's how I can earn a living. That's how I can escape this violence." On top of that, prostitution is a way of taking control of their sexual activity. One was noted to say, "Now that I am on the street, I get paid for what I did before for free when my father was assaulting me."

They may turn to prostitution on the street to work through the feelings of powerlessness and victimization that they felt in their own homes. They may be paying back a parental abuser, because they are saying to him: "Finally, I am free; I am free of your control. You can no longer control my sexual behaviour. I will have partners that you object to. I will pay you back." Or they may be paying back all men for the man who was entrusted to care for and nurture them, for his betrayal of trust – their trust, our trust, society's trust – and for his abuse.

They may be on or turn to drugs and alcohol to deaden the pain of their lives. Many turn to drugs and alcohol because they cannot bear what they live with. On the other hand, they may be given drugs and alcohol by pimps or their dates, as they call them. There's a better word: dates. Some, however, I would suggest may be drawn to the streets by the excitement of living on the edge, which is provided on the streets, but more often it is an economic solution in the absence of education, job skills, and, most importantly, self-esteem.

Mr. Speaker, in 1985 we did have more severe and restrictive soliciting laws and enforcement, and these measures simply

further endanger and entrap street prostitutes by limiting their ability to assess bad dates, or customers, known to be suspected of violent, sadistic, or insane behaviour. Most prostitutes, I would suggest all prostitutes, report being raped. Law enforcement agencies do not take them seriously. The police do not take them seriously. Society does not take them seriously, because we still at some level say: "If you sell it, then what's the problem? Maybe you just didn't get paid." The reality is that street prostitution involves violence, sadism, hatred, and contempt, so strict enforcement of soliciting laws makes prostitutes vulnerable. In addition, if they are charged and fined, then they may have to turn a few more tricks to pay their fines or else they rely on pimps to pay their fines, so they are further entrapped in the life of prostitution. Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that we need to understand that the law will not deal with this issue because it deals with symptoms; it does not deal with causes.

4:30

We've heard a number of solutions. Some people call for red-light districts and cite Vancouver and Holland as examples. Well, Mr. Speaker, since Vancouver successfully established red-light districts or zones of tolerance in 1985, 35 prostitutes have been murdered. In a recent exposé on TV of prostitution in Europe, Holland, which is held up as the example of red-light districts, revealed the sexual enslavement of foreign women who are lured to these countries by promises of jobs as waitresses or entertainers.

Mr. Speaker, red-light districts merely serve to marginalize and endanger prostitutes. They take in and put outside the view of everyday society our most vulnerable people. I would suggest when we talk about red-light districts for prostitutes that we have a similar image in regard to reservations, which were built for, it was told, the benefit of Indians, or the townships in South Africa. All they do is marginalize and impoverish and endanger the vulnerable.

The appeal of red-light districts, of course, is that they allow the customer, the client, the date – whatever word you want to use – to seek the services of prostitutes free from the fear of disclosure and publicity about their activities and so that so-called decent citizens do not have to confront the violence or the violent people in their midst, because the dates, the customers, the clients of prostitutes come from every level of society, the most violent sometimes from the highest levels.

We talk about licensing and testing the health of prostitutes. Licensing, I would suggest, implies that society condones prostitution and is willing to live off the avails of prostitution. I don't think that's something we would endorse.

Mandatory testing for sexually transmitted diseases, including HIV, may serve as an educative function to the prostitutes but, I would suggest, gives a false sense of security in which a prostitute may test negative in the morning, have sex with an infected date at noon, and then be able to pass on the disease. I think if we're really serious about health testing, then we would test every date, customer, or client of a prostitute before he engaged in the act, because that's where it comes from.

I was at an international conference very recently, and I heard about the women from the Philippines who were so angry at the American military because the American military brought AIDS to the Philippines and about the women in Cambodia who have demanded that the UN not send in peacekeeping forces because with the peacekeepers come prostitution and AIDS. Mr. Speaker, it is not prostitutes that cause disease. They may be infected and then pass it on, but we have to remember that there are two in this equation. To demand testing of only one is wrongheaded. We know that customers, clients, or dates will often pay more for sex

without condoms or may refuse to wear them, so that is where the real risk is.

We have to look for solutions, Mr. Speaker. We have to recognize that sex with underage children is child abuse and see these young prostitutes, as young as nine and 10, as children in need of protection by the director of child welfare, the minister responsible for Family and Social Services. I remember working with young abuse victims who we knew were going to go on the streets, and we could not – absolutely could not – get the director of child welfare to see that these were children in need of protection.

We also need to recognize that, as I've said, these children, these young people have histories of child abuse. In the seven years that I have been in this House, I have seen treatment services being dismantled for families in which child abuse and violence has occurred, so there are no service centres and those people that provide it on a fee-for-service basis have long waiting lists and short treatment periods. So our government is failing the people, the children that may move into prostitution by failing to work through with them their pain and the very causes for which they go on the streets.

Mr. Speaker, we need safe halfway houses and avenues of escape and protection for the young people that are on the streets, protection, I would suggest, from pimps and customers. We need substance and abuse treatment programs that will meet their very real needs and will help deal with their pain, the pain that took them into drug and substance abuse. We need education and training and employment opportunities that will meet the needs of these young people and are offered in ways that allow for their dignity and sense of self-worth to develop. They have lived lives on the edge, lives of great risk. They are not going to go and live in a structured environment with great ease. We have to make it possible for them to move gradually into a more healthy life-style. We have to give them the skills with which to survive in this society, and those are emotional and intellectual and spiritual skills.

We must deal through the criminal justice system with intervention, with children and adolescents who are subject to sexual, physical, and emotional abuse. We have to work also with the offenders, the perpetrators of this violence, because, as I said, those that are violent on the streets are often violent in their own homes. We have to provide services to adolescent and adult survivors of violence, sexual or physical violence. Again, there are no programs, no funded programs in this province for those people.

We need to address the social and economic and political inequities faced by women. Pay equity legislation, training, and child care opportunities must be put in place if we are going to see women as equal partners. Part of the violence and exploitation of women and children results from their unequal position in this society. We need to face the reality that customers, dates, or clients more often than not act out of a need to dominate, control, and hurt women, and that is their primary motivation for seeking out street prostitutes.

To deal with that, we have to understand the cultural messages and images that we still live with, one of them being that prostitution is the oldest profession. We need to deal with the issues of sexuality and interpersonal relationships, I would say, in our education systems. We need to challenge our stereotypes about men and women, a stereotype for men that it's through sex, if not war, that they demonstrate power and control and competency. We have to challenge the myths that have led in the past to rape, the myth that women simply want to be persuaded, that they like to be overpowered. We need to teach men the impact of their

sexual behaviour on those who are in their control or upon whom they act out their sexual behaviour.

Mr. Speaker, we have to look at the issue of pornography. It was raised earlier. Pornography lies about how sexual relationships should be lived out. It links violence and power, and it indicates that both the perpetrator and the victim of that power, that violence, and that sex are pleased by it. In fact, it is destructive; it is destructive to both. We need to challenge our understanding of sexual behaviour. We have to challenge our understanding of how it is that men and women shall live together, and we need to challenge the understanding that we have of children. We need to see their vulnerability, and we need to advocate on behalf of their rights.

At this time I would just like to draw attention to the fact that Alberta still has not ratified the UN convention on the rights of the child. That demonstrates to me that we are not yet ready in this province to take the rights and needs of children seriously, to make it a priority. If we're going to deal with the issue of prostitution, we know what the problem is. Now we have to have the political will to put into place those kinds of initiatives and programs that will deal with the problem once and for all so we can say that prostitution is no longer a profession, that it no longer exists, that all sexual behaviour is consensual.

Thank you.

4:40

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Calgary-Millican.

MR. SHRAKE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. For two decades now I've represented the area in Calgary where most of Calgary's prostitution is. Over two decades I've heard a lot of sanctimonious gobbledygook regarding the issue of prostitution. For over two decades now I've seen many of the governments, when there was pressure or problems arose, do something, usually nothing effective. No way would they ever want to admit that prostitution is going to be here for a while. The news media through the years have been very irresponsible on this problem. For two decades I've watched girls get killed. I've heard a lot of sorrow expressed, and then occasionally I hear the hard-hearted say, "Well, what did they expect?" Well, I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, it's a pretty horrible way to die, to be killed in the backseat of a car or a pickup truck, strangled or stabbed or beaten to death. These girls on the streets are often robbed by customers. They often end up with sadists or in some pretty awful situations. Even the pimps who have control over them are often brutal, have no regard for the girls. They take their money. They beat them.

Yet no government anywhere, anyhow has really wanted to tangle with this issue. I can see why. I put this motion on the Order Paper a few years ago. Some of the letters I got were pretty awful, and some were really bad. I had some letters suggesting that I wanted to legalize prostitution. Our ridiculous news media often say: "What is it you want to do, Gordie? Do you want to legalize prostitution?" I think: where have they been? Are they stupid? Do they not understand that the Supreme Court of Canada has said it's legal? Prostitution in the province of Alberta is legal. Please believe me, news media. Mr. Speaker, I hope everybody realizes that fact as a starter. At least we have a base point to start with. It is illegal to discuss it or talk about it on the street though. So if the prostitute can figure out a way to communicate with her customer and get in the car, communicate without discussing it and get the fee set, then it is not illegal. It's only illegal to talk about it. Only in Canada, I think, would we have a Supreme Court of the land come out with a law such as that, which is so confusing. I do not understand.

There were some girls killed in Calgary last year – I'm sure there were some killed in Edmonton – and the year before. I promise you this: next year there'll be some more girls killed. We will have probably some more sanctimonious gobbledygook come out and skirt the issue and talk around it.

I've had, strangely enough, a few people of European ancestry say, "Why don't you go ahead and get those girls off the street?" They're out there right now on 3rd Avenue in the city of Calgary. They'll be there tonight. They'll be there again tomorrow. It is legal for them to stand on the street. If they were to go into one of the older hotels, maybe one of the old watering holes down in Calgary, take the upper floors and be in there, they could charge and put in jail the owner of the hotel. That's the law, yet it's so silly. This is crazy. We say it's legal, but they have to be out on the streets and be in danger of getting into vehicles with crazy people, sex fiends, or some pretty bad people. They will get killed, and we know they're going to get killed, yet we seem to do nothing about it.

In city council years ago I remember we were so happy when we brought in a by-law and went after the massage parlours. My only comment as this thing came in was: when we shut down these massage parlours – we know what's going on in the massage parlours – we'll put them out on the streets. They'll be out on the streets instead. I would rather have seen them stay in the massage parlours; at least they weren't getting killed. But we did that, we were very proud, and of course they're out on the streets now in both Edmonton and Calgary. I don't know about the smaller centres.

I think back to an area in Montana, Miles City. There's a boat lake on the edge of the downtown over by the Yellowstone River, and there are two old houses down in there. They had prostitutes in those old houses. Everybody knew they were there, didn't dare go near there, scared somebody would recognize their car and think they were going there. I was a high school student at the time, and we used to think it was really neat to drive by there, you know. In fact, I drove by there one night, and one of the kids with us laughingly said to one of the girls with us, "Isn't that your dad's car?" It was.

I remember in the newspaper here that Calgary got really tough on this. "Busted" is the terminology on the streets. "Busted: 150 johns." I thought, oh, we've really solved the problem. We arrested all these people, got all these people going to court. We've heard suggestions that maybe we should put their names in the paper. I'm sure that would do a lot of good: good for the family, good for the children. Really, what good would it do? Is that going to really solve anything? Is anything going to be solved by any of the suggestions we keep hearing?

The only thing I can think of, in my limited ability to deal with this type of problem, is that we've got to get serious and look at how it is handled in the state of Montana, the state of Nevada, how it's handled in Holland or Germany or wherever. They are not getting killed in a motor vehicle and their body dumped along a street somewhere on the edge of the city. They have a better system than us.

I suggested this one time on Collister's phone-in talk show. I remember that a little professor from the university was most incensed, saying that I wanted to enslave these girls. I had made the comment that perhaps if they were in a building, in a place, they'd have security there and could also be checked for disease on an ongoing basis by the health department so they would not spread gonorrhoea, syphilis, and these types of diseases. There was almost an anger at me, saying, "Well, you just want to clean these up so that the customers will have clean girls." I thought, no, that's not what I want. If I could and had a magic wand or

something, I'd say we'll ban it, make it illegal, and there'll never be another prostitute on the streets of any city or town in Alberta. But we know that's not going to happen. We know it won't work. We have to face the reality that the Supreme Court has said it's legal but it's illegal to discuss it, so we have them on the streets and they will get killed year after year.

When I was an alderman I wished I could have done something about it, but I thought it was not the business of the city council to handle prostitution. Now I'm an MLA and I still don't seem to be able to do anything about this. It's a serious problem. It's not a frivolous thing that will come and go.

The only thing I can really see is that we take a hard look at, say, the old hotels, the old watering holes as we refer to them. Maybe have a separate entrance. Most of them have the parking lot out back, so there's an entrance coming in. You'd have to go upstairs, and they would have a security guard, preferably a very large fellow that can handle himself. At least we'd know where they're at. They'd know they are secure, they're not going to get robbed, beaten, or killed. We would be able to try to check for disease, and heaven forbid for even mentioning this, but perhaps they would pay some taxes. There would be at least some cleanliness and some protection for these girls, because if they were in there, at least we would not have the stroll, the drive.

If you go down 3rd Avenue in the evening and you wonder where all this traffic is coming from in the late evening, they're not coming from the football game and they're not coming from the hockey game. There are a lot of people driving uptown there to look at the prostitutes, and a lot of them are picking up the prostitutes. If they're off the streets and the police do see a young girl, the numbers will be down where the police can at least check with them.

4:50

As the hon. member from the opposition was speaking earlier, we should go beyond that. We do have some programs that are not adequate but are the best we have right now in trying to get the girls off the streets, back in the mainstream of life. But there are those who want to go into that profession for the money. There are. Believe me, they're not all there because of a social problem. They have knowingly made a choice to do this. Well, fine. We have them in the buildings or the structures, and the people know where to go. Then if we do see the young girls on the streets, the police can get them and try to get them to cooperate and go into the programs we have to get them back off the streets.

I think of Montana, and this I've mentioned earlier: the two houses down by the boat lake. We had a crusading political-type county attorney. This county attorney, in his zest to maybe be governor of Montana someday, shut down the two houses, the two houses of ill repute, or the red-light district, as some people like to call them. He was so proud, and a lot of people thought well of him.

There was a local girl that got raped by a serviceman from the radar base in the area. Rape is a very traumatic thing in a small town. It was a high school girl, a very nice girl. The local citizens actually got incensed; they were outraged. Montana people being a practical people, they often do practical things. Here they demanded that the two houses reopen, and the county attorney, feeling the political heat from the local citizens, reopened them. I think he gave up his idea of being governor, because he had become very foolish and silly and went very political and created more problems than he solved. To this day he never did make it as governor, but to this day the two houses still operate.

I look at the little town of Miles City with 10,000 people, and I look at the city of Calgary with 700,000 people. Here our laws are such that the girls have to be on the streets. We can't control them. We can't get them off the streets. We arrest them sometimes. We fine them. I think: we're punishing them for what? We should be helping them, not punishing them.

So on this motion I would sincerely hope today – it's a motion that's not going to cause any major problems for this government. We won't fall because of it. This motion is so loosely worded and so watered down that it doesn't say much other than we should look into the problem. And I don't think there is any member of this House sitting here today, Mr. Speaker, who doesn't agree that we should look into this problem. I'm hoping, sincerely hoping, that we will later have another speaker or so on it before the time runs out and will put this thing to a vote. I know prostitution is not a nice thing to even discuss in the Legislature, but it is out there. It's a problem. Young girls are dying very horrible deaths, and I think it's our job as elected people to go ahead and address this today.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Calgary-Buffalo.

MR. DICKSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I've appreciated the opportunity to listen to the members for Drumheller, Edmonton-Avonmore, and Calgary-Currie.

AN HON. MEMBER: Not Calgary-Currie. Calgary-Millican.

MR. DICKSON: Sorry. Calgary-Millican, sir. The boundaries change so frequently that it's hard to keep track of constituencies.

I should indicate, Mr. Speaker, that in fact the constituency represented by the last speaker abuts Calgary-Buffalo. In fact, after Calgary-Buffalo is redistributed, it will include a good part of what is now in Calgary-Millican and will include three of the four identified strolls in that city.

As the last speaker said, clearly there have been a number of women in the city of Calgary who have been murdered, women working the stroll, and a larger number of women not only in the city of Calgary but in other areas of Alberta who have been brutally assaulted. We've seen in the past in our cities in this province efforts at what I'll call social control techniques, which means the police attempting to close down one stroll and move the prostitutes someplace else. We've certainly seen these efforts long enough to know that they provide really no solution at all. All we do is move the prostitutes and the resulting traffic and nuisance to another area, perhaps only for a period of time. They may be moved to an area that's less suitable than the original stroll area.

I'm encouraged to some extent by Motion 242 because I think it's clearly a recognition that our legal-based solutions or approaches haven't done the job. They simply haven't worked. I think it's a recognition that we have to go much further and try and deal with it in a more holistic way. I think, in fact, it picks up nicely on a recommendation from the Fraser commission report. I just quote from page 525 of volume 2 of the Fraser commission report on pornography and prostitution in Canada:

The analysis of the legal system and its effect on prostitution practises has been the focus of our attention, but we know that prostitution cannot be addressed solely through the law. It is apparent from all the information we have considered that the current practise of prostitution in Canada is also related to three interdependent factors: (a) the pervasiveness of sexism in Canadian society; (b) our partial recognition of the complexities of sexuality and sexual preference; and (c) the failure to develop educational and social programs to assist young Canadians in dealing with problems of

sexism, sexuality and sexual identity in a responsible, confident way.

These are conditions which are much more likely to be susceptible to long range social planning than transitory legal expedients.

I think what's clear from the three speakers that have gone before me is an acknowledgment that we're not going to find the answer in the Criminal Code; we're not going to find the answer in municipal legislation. We have to do something that's going to have some long-term, salutary effect.

Just in terms of the problems as I see them, sir – and many of these have been identified by the previous speakers. Firstly, the public nuisance associated with prostitution. Secondly, the physical abuse of prostitutes. Thirdly, differential treatment of prostitutes and customers, a double standard that continues to exist. Four, specific concerns and problems dealing with juvenile prostitutes, who to some extent end up being double outlaws. On the one hand, there are the sanctions that they're susceptible to by reason of soliciting, but the second way that they become tagged or outlawed has to do with the fact that they in effect are run-aways under child welfare legislation, and there's always the issue of whether criminalizing activities of young prostitutes is counterproductive. The police stress arrest and conviction, which I guess is to be expected. Social welfare professionals focus on the harmful personal consequences of arrest and conviction, problems with stigmatizing the women involved.

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

It should be noted, sir, that while we're discussing this here, Alderman Bev Longstaff from the city of Calgary is chairing a two-day conference in that city described as a national meeting on prostitution. She was quoted in one of the daily newspapers this morning as saying that everyone agrees that something different has to be done.

My trepidation, I guess, or concern with Motion 242 is in calling for another exploration. There's a concern that we simply add one more study and one more report to a long list of studies and reports that have already been undertaken. In August of 1984 Dr. Robin Badgely had undertaken and produced a committee report on sexual abuse of children. In April of 1985 Mr. Paul Fraser produced his report; he'd investigated prostitution and pornography. In 1985 Mr. Crosbie, the then Minister of Justice, introduced Bill C-49. This was a revision of the soliciting law. It didn't deal with nuisance per se; it attempted to focus on identifiable public behaviour. It also provided for a review within three years of the legislation coming into force.

5:00

In May of 1987 the federal Department of Justice commissioned studies in the centres of Calgary, Regina, and Winnipeg. Sir, I had the opportunity to serve as a member of the advisory committee appointed by the Department of Justice, and, as I say, the study looked at those three cities of Calgary, Regina, and Winnipeg. The report produced in 1989 entitled *Street Prostitution: Assessing the Impact of the Law* was actually quite a thorough review of the extent of the problem and an examination of a host of past strategies that had all proven to be ineffectual.

In 1987 the Vancouver city police department recommended to the national Association of Chiefs of Police that the soliciting law hadn't done the job. In 1986-87 the Canadian Association of Elizabeth Fry Societies conducted a mail survey and concluded that Bill C-49 didn't reduce the high level of physical abuse of prostitutes. Bill C-49 simply drove prostitutes to more remote locations where they were at even greater risk of harm. In 1987 the national consultation on adolescent prostitution sponsored by

the Canadian child welfare association again discussed problems with criminalizing the activities of young prostitutes. What we find is study after study after study and substantial inconsistency in the summaries and conclusions in those studies.

In the city of Calgary it's true that the municipal council had seen a gap or a perceived gap in terms of dealing with the problem in the criminal law and attempted to enact a municipal bylaw. The Supreme Court of Canada struck down the bylaw and in effect said that this is clearly within the jurisdiction and exclusive legislative competence of the government of Canada because it's criminal law. But I think the point again is that if municipalities can't deal with it because it's a matter of criminal law and we've seen the criminal law is ineffectual, where do we go from there?

In terms of the extent of the problem, I'd just indicate, sir, that when the Street Prostitution report was done in Calgary, it was found that the mean age of prostitutes was 22.8 years for women and 21.1 for men. The median age for men was 20 years; for women it was 22. Other studies showed that about 42 percent of females are in the 16- to 20-year age range. The educational level found in the Calgary study was surprisingly high; half the women had completed grade 12 and had some postsecondary education. The job experience there was overwhelmingly in marginal areas of employment: little formal skills, casual labour, unskilled service-sector work. The most common rationale in the Calgary survey, and Winnipeg and Regina, was that women were involved in it for money.

There is a theory – and it's been mentioned by several – that there's a direct link between prostitution and incest and child abuse. I think many professionals still feel strongly that there is that connection, but to ensure that we be as accurate as possible, it should be noted that Robin Badgely's committee surveyed it and reported that there were no greater levels of sexual abuse among juvenile prostitutes than in the general population. There was a study done in Edmonton by Chris Bagley and Loretta Young entitled *Juvenile Prostitution and Child Sexual Abuse: A Controlled Study* reported in the *Canadian Journal of Community Mental Health* in 1987. It did identify higher levels of sexual abuse in prostitutes than in the general population. In the study I had some involvement with in Calgary, it was found that over half the prostitutes had been victims of sexual or sexual and physical violence. I think an increasing number of young girls between 14 and 16 are reported to be now prostituting in Alberta. I don't think there's been a formal survey done, but I understand that's the report from agencies that work in the field.

I understand there's a particular problem, Mr. Speaker, with young women 16 and 17 years of age who in effect are living on their own. They can sign off by proving they don't require psychiatric care or other provincial assistance, and they decline a guardianship agreement.

Little has been said of the Fraser commission report this afternoon, sir. A number of specific recommendations were set out there, and I think much of that is still useful. Recommendation 56 said that

special police . . . units should be established, and adequately funded . . . to investigate and prosecute violent and abusive procurers and pimps.

I think the need for that kind of initiative is as powerful and important now as it was at the time of the Fraser commission report. On page 531 the note is that we still unfairly focus on prostitutes, because they tend to be more visible, rather than on their customers. The prostitute is typically

visible, known, and less likely to be subject to embarrassment if charged.

I think we as a community still haven't addressed the fact that the focus has to be on dealing with customers.

Sir, I'll take the admonition of the Member for Calgary-Millican and leave sufficient time so others may speak or at least this matter may come to a vote. I'll simply say there's a great deal of work to be done to try and address this problem in a way that's more meaningful than anything that's happened in the past.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Calgary-Forest Lawn.

MR. PASHAK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, too, spoke earlier today with Alderman Bev Longstaff, who hosted that conference, which was a national meeting on prostitution that took place in Calgary. It followed up a meeting that took place earlier in Halifax. Just as the Member for Calgary-*Buffalo* inherited parts of the old riding of Calgary-Millican – well, after the next election he may inherit parts – I will be running in an area called Calgary-East, and that riding, too, will inherit parts of old Millican. It's an area in which there's been a lot of focus on the question of prostitution, particularly in Inglewood and Ramsay. They've been meeting regularly on a community basis to try to address what they perceive and what I think is really a serious problem in their community. It centres largely around an older hotel in the community. It's estimated there have been some 200 different prostitutes working around this particular hotel at different times, not just at night but day and night. It's not just localized around the hotel either. It begins to spread into the community, and that's where the community residents have become very disturbed about the issue. As I say, they've had a number of meetings. They've been working with the city of Calgary police, with their local aldermen, and with the Member for Calgary-Millican to try to find some resolution to this conflict, as I understand it.

During the month of April the police embarked on a zero tolerance program. They put up all kinds of barriers around this particular hotel, stopped a lot of the motorists that were driving through the area whether they were soliciting prostitutes or not. It caused a lot of consternation for the hotel owner, but it did reduce the problem of prostitution in that particular location to zero. The problem, of course, is that the prostitutes just left that part of the city of Calgary and moved to another area. I believe they're operating in another part of Calgary-Millican that will be in the new riding of Calgary-*Buffalo*. That's typical.

Alderman Longstaff told me in our conversation today about a study that had been done in Vancouver where the police had centred their activities in various areas of the city trying to control prostitution in a given locale. You could almost trace it on a map. They'd control it in one area of the city, but the prostitutes would move to another area. They'd move to the other area and reduce the population in that area to virtually zero. It just began to establish a pattern of mobility, and prostitution in terms of its total impact on the city of Vancouver wasn't lessened at all. It might have been lessened in a given area, but the prostitution just cycled through different communities. So policing in itself doesn't seem to provide any sort of solution to the problem.

5:10

If we're going to look at prostitution in any kind of serious way, I think it's important to try to look at what gives rise to prostitution in the first place. What are the roots of the problems? I can remember from my early days in sociology looking at something called social problems. I guess some early sociologists tried to identify prostitution as a particular kind of crime, a crime without a victim. There was an assumption – I don't agree with this

theory, by the way, Mr. Speaker – that prostitution, like abortion, maybe like marijuana use, really involves a willing buyer, a willing seller. What makes it a crime is that you've got a moral authority out there that judges this transaction as being somehow illicit or illegal.

You can see it in the case of abortion. If your society is going to condemn abortion as an illegal act, just because it's defined that way in moral terms, that doesn't necessarily mean it's . . . Let me back up and start again, because this is a kind of complex argument. It's just that in a certain sense it's not illegitimate for a woman to pursue an abortion, for health reasons or whatever other kinds of reasons. But if you make it a crime, you often create a condition whereby a woman's health is put severely at risk. In another time and another place, that might not be so defined as a crime.

Marijuana. Again, a lot of young people I knew when I first started to teach got some fairly serious criminal records because they were picked out for smoking marijuana. Then the middle class started to smoke it in a rather significant way; the police began to relax their control over the use of marijuana. In fact, the federal government set up a commission of inquiry called the Le Dain commission that legalized the use of marijuana. The same thing applies to prostitution. From a certain perspective, people think: "Well, what's the matter with prostitution? There's a person willing to sell a service and someone else willing to buy it."

In actual fact, I think that sort of definition of the problem defies the real reality. The real reality is that there's a lot of violence and other crime associated with prostitution. I think my colleague from Edmonton-Avonmore mentioned that in Vancouver alone some 35 young girls have been killed in the last few years. In the last year and a half eight young women have disappeared off the streets of Calgary. I believe in Edmonton there's another six. It's not just the deaths. There have been many, many beatings, and serious beatings, of young girls in the trade. Nationally, there has been a growing concern to try to look at this because of course these problems are not just peculiar to Calgary and Edmonton and Vancouver; they're peculiar to cities all across North America.

I think the major area of concern here is the young girls that are brought into the trade, juvenile girls. There's a clear recognition that the Criminal Code doesn't work very well to protect these young girls. It is an offence to buy sex from a juvenile, but as I understand it, this charge is infrequently laid. I think there's only been one charge laid under section 212(4), in the city of Calgary. There was a conviction, but I think it's currently being appealed. There are many reasons why young girls are inducted into a life of prostitution. Some see it as a kind of glamorous activity; they're attracted to it. Movies like the one recently involving Richard Gere, *Pretty Woman*, contribute to the problem. I mean, that was a clear dramatization of prostitution as a kind of fun act, a fun thing to do, and there are no problems associated with it. You can be a happy, free-spirited person and be a prostitute, and who cares? I think people can get seduced by that kind of image of what it means to be a prostitute.

Mr. Speaker, I think there's another way young girls, teenage girls, are brought into prostitution, and that comes through disruptive families. My colleague from Edmonton-Avonmore and others have mentioned that a lot of these young prostitutes come out of situations where there's a lot of abuse in the family. Maybe it's just conflict within the family. The young girl leaves home; she runs out and goes down on the streets. There's always a welcoming crowd there to associate with these young girls, to bring them to their level of activities. Usually some charming

young fellow strikes up a relationship, seduces the girl or whatever. Pretty soon he's sleeping with her on a regular basis, and not long after that he puts her out on the street to earn money. Well, as my colleagues have mentioned, the way to deal with this problem – at the provincial level at least, we could do some things with the Child Welfare Act. But if we're serious about dealing with the issue, it's really important that we find ways of providing other alternatives for these young girls through counseling and all the rest of it. That would deal with the problem in terms of the young people and the way in which they're inducted, or at least it would begin to address the issue.

With respect to the other problems that were raised by the Member for Calgary-Millican in his recounting of stories about Montana, I believe there are some people looking at the possibility of finding some way of legalizing prostitution, but not in such a way that you create red-light districts. Whenever you have areas of cities or communities that are set aside, that seems to lead to increasing levels of violence. I know some groups are looking at the possibility of, say, issuing licences to prostitutes and registering all the clients so you can keep track of who's using the service. Not only that; everybody gets tested so we reduce the possibility of making these diseases that are rather lethal even more communicable than they already are in terms of numbers of people who come in contact with them. As the Member for Calgary-Millican pointed out, that's one way we can increase city revenues. Apparently there is a legal view that it might be possible for municipalities to do this, to legalize prostitution in the terms I've just described.

Mr. Speaker, undoubtedly it is a serious issue. I know it's of real concern especially to people who live in the areas of Ramsay and Inglewood in the city of Calgary. They're fearful that although the police through their activities have brought an end to the problem at the moment, as soon as that zero tolerance policy is set aside for any period of time, prostitution will come back into the area. So as a community they're looking at ways they can establish procedures that would prevent this from occurring. I think that probably in the final analysis that's the only way we really can take measures that would be successful in dealing with this problem. It has to be seen as a community problem. We have to find ways of preventing young girls from getting inducted into it, and if that should happen, we have to find ways of providing them with alternatives that will allow them a reasonable choice for moving out of that kind of life.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Speaker's Ruling Consuming Food in the Chamber

MR. SPEAKER: Before the Chair recognizes the Member for Highwood, I realize that from time to time members like to have candies to freshen their throat while they're speaking. However, in the last 10 minutes the Chair has observed one member chewing so copiously and so obviously, I can only assume he didn't take time for lunch. Perhaps he'd be good enough to look at *Beauchesne* 331.

Member for Highwood, please.

Debate Continued

MR. TANNAS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The topic of prostitution is one that most people in our society, as in others, find all kinds of reasons to avoid. So the motion before us:

Be it resolved that the Legislative Assembly urge the government to ask the federal government to explore with all the provinces and territories alternative means of dealing with the social problems caused by prostitution.

Of course, reference has been made to the fact that it is sometimes called the oldest profession. Certainly there's biblical reference to it. What we're talking about is that sexual intercourse is conducted by humans under a variety of relationships. In marriage it's a reaffirmation of the commitment of two individuals to each other. It is of course the act required for reproduction of our species. If it's an unwanted and forceful act, it constitutes one of the most horrifying crimes, called rape, for which most societies provide severe penalties. It is most acceptable when it is an act of love.

5:20

All major religions, however, condemn the selling of the act of love, which we call prostitution. There is a passage in John where a woman was brought before Jesus. She was accused by the Pharisees and scribes as being an adulteress, and they brought her before Jesus to test him and demanded, according to the law, that she be stoned. He said that famous phrase, "He that is without sin among you, let him cast a stone at her" – or as it's often been translated now, "cast the first stone" – and they left her alone.

I think the aims of this motion, Mr. Speaker, are deserving of support by the Legislative Assembly. We can see how every level of government in some ways is forced to deal with the prostitution issue: the federal government through the Criminal Code, the governments of the provinces and the territories and, of course, the municipalities where this act occurs. Governments should combine their efforts and their resources to deal with the issue.

Social engineers would commend us all to work on the idea of prevention, and someone who might study history would wonder if that's possible. It's been said many times that an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure, and in the issue of prostitution this is certainly true. Mankind is searching for ways to get a clearer understanding of the societal forces that cause people to take up lives of prostitution.

Various members of the Assembly have referred to some of the factors that lead to prostitution: people growing up in abusive relationships, abusive homes, poverty, the lack of options, and we've had references made to the power of pimps who recruit by deception and betrayal and bring people into prostitution. So governments would need to look at that if we want to combat prostitution. We need to address some of the underlying factors.

There are a number of studies which could be disseminated and used to formulate unified policies for government to deal with the young people who are at risk to this profession, and one of these we could cite is the Mayor's Task Force on Safer Cities here in the city of Edmonton. They have commissioned an action group on prostitution to look at the problems in depth and make recommendations. The Member for Calgary-Buffalo mentioned the initiative taken by Alderman Bev Longstaff in the city of Calgary. The action group in Edmonton commissioned input from a number of groups who in their conduct deal with prostitution: the Edmonton board of health, the Elizabeth Fry Society, community groups, school boards, the police. The Member for Edmonton-Avonmore mentioned these. These groups were well equipped to deal with the discussion on the prostitution issue.

Some of these groups, like the University of Alberta student legal services, are versed in not only the legal aspects of prostitution but the social and community aspects, and their input was of benefit to the understanding of the problem. The recommendations made by the action group are aimed at global unified action.

A number of these recommendations deal with the economic side of the matter. Economic problems are often the reason for young people to turn to prostitution. All too frequently prostitutes tend to be undereducated, unskilled, and, as we've mentioned before and others have mentioned, come from economically disadvantaged families. Some of them have drug habits which require them to obtain money, and this is an easy way. Others are driven to drug habits by the activities they are forced to carry on.

These people are often victims of abuse. They suffer from low self-esteem, and prostitution is for many of them, particularly the younger ones, the only way they can make a living. As we have heard before, so often in these situations pimps are the great parasites and take most of the earnings of the prostitutes.

Prostitutes are often burdened by criminal records, and this prevents them from making a transition to normal society. Lack of money, employment, and options makes it hard to exit prostitution and even harder to stay away.

Young people try to leave prostitution and are faced with few prospects and no money. They have nowhere to go but back into the life-style that kept them. There is a brief window of opportunity for child welfare workers to get people off the streets and keep them off. Once prostitutes decide to try and leave the streets, they have to be provided with a place to stay and the means to survive. As Edmonton-Avonmore mentioned, Crossroads outreach services is a good example of an agency which aims to help these people. Often these kind of agencies are frustrated by the lack of services for juveniles, for the young.

The action group recommends making supports for independent assistance available to children under the age of 16. This would help children to receive real assistance and keep them from falling through gaps in our social welfare programs. However, a major problem constrains assistance for such youths attempting to leave the street, because they lack parental consent, which is required for them to obtain child welfare status and receive benefits.

I reluctantly stop here, Mr. Speaker. The clock indicates that it's time to adjourn debate.

MR. SPEAKER: A motion to adjourn debate. Those in favour, please say aye.

HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed, please say no. Carried.

MR. DAY: Mr. Speaker, I move that we reconvene at 8 o'clock tonight to consider various second readings and possibly Committee of the Whole on Bill 66.

[The Assembly adjourned at 5:30 p.m.]

