

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

head: INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Title: **Tuesday, May 26, 1987 2:30 p.m.**
Date: 87/05/26

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

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

PRAYERS

MR. SPEAKER: Let us pray.

From our forests and parkland to our prairies and mountains comes the call of our land.

From our farmsteads, towns, and cities comes the call of our people that as legislators of this province we act with responsibility and sensitivity.

Lord, grant us the wisdom to meet such challenges.
Amen.

head: INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Speaker, I take a great deal of pride today in introducing a constituent of mine who is seated in your gallery, a grade 6 student by the name of Kristen Schamber from the St. Dominic's school in Cold Lake who was co-winner of the 1987 parliamentary essay contest. Kristen's essay was entitled "What the Legislature Building Means to Me." I had a chance to quickly read it, and she described it as a symbol of democracy and went on to discuss the various freedoms we enjoy in a democracy, the various services provided by government to Albertans and to her own community of Cold Lake, and very skillfully wound into it the future recreation potential of the beautiful lake she and her family live on. I'm sure, Kristen, that with your help and the help of others, we will soon convince all my colleagues that there should be a significant announcement related to Cold Lake.

Kristen is joined in the Speaker's gallery by her brother Darren; mother, Bonnie; and father, Wilf. I'd ask that they stand and receive the warm welcome of the Assembly.

MR. KROEGER: Mr. Speaker, in the same vein and sharing in the same contest and prize, from the constituency of Chinook, the community of Veteran, Alberta, we have a young lad who also did a number on this building. But he was quite innovative; he projected himself into age 95 and then looked back. Sometime in the next year I would like to have a conversation with him and have him explain to me how that looks from where he is at age 95.

I think it's very commendable, Mr. Speaker, that you and your association sponsor these kinds of exercises for young people. It's certainly very commendable for Deryk Thulien and his mother and father and sister sitting in your gallery to encourage and to participate.

Thank you very much. They're standing now.

Bill 5

**Gas Resources Preservation
Amendment Act, 1987**

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce a Bill being the Gas Resources Preservation Amendment Act, 1987.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the amendment is to provide enabling legislation that will allow the government to ensure that natural gas removed from the province does so under a uniform set of terms and conditions.

[Leave granted; Bill 45 read a first time]

head: TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS

MISS McCOY: Mr. Speaker, I rise to file a copy of a discussion paper on the Alberta Securities Commission. The discussion paper was released today and outlines some recommendations given me by a ministerial advisory committee composed of and chaired by Professor David Jones, assisted by Mr. Bill Grace and Mr. Chip Collins.

MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to section 19(5) of the Legislative Assembly Act, I am tabling copies of Members' Services orders made by the Special Standing Committee on Members' Services.

head: INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS

DR. CASSIN: It is my pleasure today, Mr. Speaker, to introduce to you and through you to the members of the Assembly, a very special group of 27 students from my constituency who attend the W.O. Mitchell school. They are attended by two teachers, Mr. Broadhurst and Mr. McCabe, as well as 11 parents: Mrs. Kirkpatrick, Mr. Olson, Mrs. McGavern, Mr. Sentes, Mrs. O'Connor, Mrs. Spackman, Mrs. MacNeal, Mrs. Christensen, Mr. Courtney, Mrs. Mah, and Mrs. Robertshaw. They are in the members' gallery. I'd ask if they'd stand and receive the customary welcome of the Assembly.

MR. CHERRY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce to you and through you 57 students in grade 6 from the Kitscoty elementary school. They are accompanied by two teachers, Mrs. Harris and Mrs. Gordon. The name Kitscoty rings a bell, as the former member for many years resided and is still residing in Kitscoty, Bud Miller. I would ask if they would rise and the Assembly would give them a cordial welcome.

MRS. BETKOWSKI: Mr. Speaker, seated in the members' gallery are 32 students in the grade 6 class of St. Paul school located in the Edmonton Glenora constituency. They are accompanied by their teacher Mrs. Jane Warren. I would ask them to rise and receive the customary welcome of this Assembly.

MR. ALGER: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the minister of technology, Mr. Young, the Member for Edmonton Jasper Place, I would like you to know that a lovely pair of senior citizens have joined us today in the members' gallery, both of whom have been very active in helping me in my special line of endeavour in the world of senior citizens. I present, Mr. Speaker, Sheila

and Bill Croyne. I would ask that they rise to receive the plaudits of the Assembly.

head: **ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**

Government Borrowing

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the first question to the Provincial Treasurer. On August 14, 1986, the government gave itself authority to borrow some \$2 billion through the sale of short-term notes to the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. On May 7, 1987, the government passed an order in council increasing this amount to \$2.3 billion and rolling over the previous notes for six months. In the Heritage Savings Trust Fund Committee on October 28, the Treasurer at that time said he would

not want to reduce the fund. I can probably give you that one variable measure, that one point; that is, I would not contemplate our encroaching on the capital.

My question to the Treasurer: why has he changed his mind so dramatically since last October?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I've not changed my mind.

MR. MARTIN: Well, Mr. Speaker, the words say differently. The fact is that you have. Let me go on, though, and say that because of this, we're up to \$2.3 billion. Will the Treasurer advise the Assembly the extent to which the government has borrowed from the heritage fund in support of current operating expenditures by the government? Is the \$2 billion gone at this particular time?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I think it is appropriate to ask why the order in council is required, and it is of course in the context of a very sound financial plan which this government has for the use of the heritage fund money that required us to make that adjustment. Since we successfully announced and launched the two major programs to stabilize the interest cost both for farmers and for the small businessmen -- some \$3 billion of unmatched, unparalleled assistance to those two sectors -- we have now found that in terms of the balancing of our portfolio and the best judgment we have with respect to the repayment schedule on those two funds approved by this Assembly, we can now use some of the heritage fund money on a short-term basis to match retirement of that debt.

MR. MARTIN: Well, Mr. Speaker, whatever the reason, it's still using it for the operating part of the provincial budget. That's a reality, something you said you wouldn't do. The minister said just as recently as March 27

that with the current strong financial position of the government and the fact that we do have the heritage fund in place, we are able to borrow money, for example, on the New York commercial paper market right now at approximately just under 6 percent, whereas we can invest that money here and make a larger return for it and work on that spread.

Flowing from that answer back at that time from the Treasurer, my question then is: why are we now borrowing up to \$2.3 billion from the trust fund and in the process losing millions of dollars to the provincial Treasury?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, it might take me at least an

hour to sort out the confusing statements by the Member for Edmonton Norwood. His clear lack of understanding with respect to financial management is now evident. It's been evident over the series of questions, and it continues to become clearer, that the Member for Edmonton Norwood knows very little about financial management.

Now, what we have, Mr. Speaker, is an opportunity, in terms of the financial clout of this province, to use the resources which are available to us, both in terms of the borrowing power of the province itself, because just recently Standard and Poor's and Moody's both confirmed that in fact as a result of the strong fiscal plan announced in this budget, the credit rating of this province has not changed since the adjustment in the fall of 1986. That means we can use the tremendous strength of this province in terms of borrowing on international markets to secure prime rates.

Mr. Speaker, it should be known that there are several rates available on the market. There are those rates which are short-term rates; there are those rates which are long-term rates, and depending what the market structure is, we tend to enter the market on a variety of rate structures. Sometimes we borrow short term, and it is those short-term borrowing rates, the 6 percent rate, that were referred to in my comments. If you want to borrow long term, as we tried to explain before, the rates obviously tail up. Currently the long-term rates, although the market is now somewhat unstable, would approach 9.4 or 9.5 percent.

Now, the appropriate question here is not what is happening to the money, because the money is being well invested. We're generating a strong use of that money, and the money is not essentially being used for the General Revenue Fund, although there is a small portion of the heritage fund being used for general revenue purposes. As I've indicated before, an opportunity for us to use, as a barometer effect when the market is going against us, the Heritage Savings Trust Fund money on the current operating rates. That puts money back into the trust fund. It is not reducing the capital value and providing the substantial cash flow for the heritage fund as opposed to having that interest flow offshore or into other international markets. Sound fiscal management in my view, Mr. Speaker.

Moreover, when the market does adjust against us and we do not always have the flexibility to enter the market with respect to the best time, we have to use that fund for that purpose. That's essentially what we do. We use the liquidity. I've announced that in the House before, and as we put in place a longer term strategy to balance our borrowing portfolio, we then must respond to the market. And we're doing just that.

Now, the other use of the heritage fund . . . Mr. Speaker, he started the question, not I. The other part of the heritage fund is being used to fund, on a short-term basis, part of the requirements for the new farm credit stability program and the small business assistance program -- that 9 percent money. Obviously, if you know anything about financial management, you will know that there's going to be some repayment of capital, some repayment of the principal of that loan as the annual payments are made. We have to make some judgment as to how soon that's going to . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. minister, the Chair has to make some judgment also. Final supplementary, Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, it always is confusing when I quote the Treasurer's own statement here. The fact is, we don't know how long this is going to go on. You've already extended

it six months. What is short term? What is long term? If this economy stays dormant, is it not possible that this government may never pay the heritage trust fund back from the operating expenses?

MR. JOHNSTON: More misleading statements, Mr. Speaker. I can assure you that if I wanted to take the marker right now, I could fully finance any requirements of this province, but we have to judge that very carefully.

What we know here is that the people of Alberta understand very clearly that we have presented a sound position, one which deals with the question of the downsize of the government, the new realities in terms of the income flows, using the strength of our borrowing capacity in the General Revenue Fund, providing the opportunity to use the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund, that surplus amount of money which is sitting there -- and some people say it isn't around, but the Member for Edmonton Norwood just said there's \$2.3 billion sitting in the fund -- and to use that money for opportunities for Albertans.

We have argued, Mr. Speaker, all along that we will turn to that fund wherever necessary, tap it when it's needed, and use it for the people of this province. That's essentially what we're doing. We're fulfilling our commitment, using the heritage fund for that purpose. And I know that those shameful socialists across the way would spend that fund. We're investing it.

MR. MITCHELL: Lofty sentiments, Mr. Speaker, but departing seriously from reality. How can the minister stand in this House and say that he is capping the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, when he is proposing capital fund expenditures of \$140 million this year, when he has made no provisions for inflation, and when in fact any losses under the agricultural loan stability program and the small business stability loan program will be borne by the Heritage Savings Trust Fund? Could he please clarify that for the House and for the people of Alberta?

MR. JOHNSTON: To the contrary, Mr. Speaker. It seems I have to clarify it for the Member for Edmonton Meadowlark first. What we have -- and I know a three variable is too complex for the member across the way to understand -- are three funds here. I'll generate the first fund as being the loan portfolio fund for the farm and for the small business purposes. That's a separate fund passed in this Legislature. I know the Member for Edmonton Meadowlark probably didn't pay much attention to it, because it was too powerful for those sectors. It was too much of a good government response, and I know he doesn't like to hear it, but it was a very successful plan. Secondly, we have the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, and thirdly, we have the General Revenue Fund.

Those are three separate funds which are accounted for in this Assembly. We have said before, Mr. Speaker, that in terms of the heritage fund itself, we are not going to detract from the capital of that fund: \$15 billion worth of money at work for Albertans. Now, the member across the way tends to forget -- even the Keynesian argument shows, which I know is a school that the member came from -- that as the interest rate goes up and you have bought bonds at that rate, obviously when the interest rate goes down, the capital must go up. A simple formula.

Now, we have \$1.9 billion worth of bonds invested in other provinces. They're invested at about 16 percent on average. What has happened to the \$1.9 billion, Mr. Speaker? It's now worth dramatically more. So any arguments that the Member for Edmonton Meadowlark in his naive economic approach sug-

gest in fact are absolutely abstruse. The value of the fund has gone up. There's no erosion of capital; it's working for all Albertans.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. member. Red Deer South.

MR. OLDRING: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the Treasurer. Could he please advise the Assembly what percentage of the total provincial expenditures in this year's budget will be earned or generated as a result of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund?

MR. JOHNSTON: That's a good question, Mr. Speaker, and that certainly is in the context of how the fiscal plan fits and articulates between the General Revenue Fund and the Alberta heritage trust fund. It is clear that we are transferring the income flow from the heritage fund into the General Revenue Fund: \$1.6 billion in 1985-86, \$1.3 billion this past year. That's the income flow; that's the return from the investment. That is saving tax dollars and allows us to afford the lowest tax regime in Canada. That's the performance of the heritage fund, and that's how it's working today to save Albertans from the difficult period we're in.

MR. SPEAKER: Second main question, Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to designate my second question to the Member for Edmonton Centre.

Health Care Cuts

REV. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Since the hospitals minister's surprise announcement last week to deinsure contraceptive counseling and other medical services for women related to their reproductive care, a number of groups, including Edmonton Planned Parenthood, Calgary community health services, and now the government's own Advisory Council on Women's Issues, have denounced this move and raised a number of critically concerned questions. Will the minister announce today that he will stop and review this decision, or is he just going to sit back and have more groups and individuals mobilize an opposition against it?

MR. M. MOORE: First of all, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is incorrect in his suggestion that the women's advisory council has denounced this particular move. Indeed, I'm meeting Thursday afternoon at 3:30 with members of the women's council and their chairman to discuss a number of issues relating to the matters that were dealt with last week. I expect after that meeting, they indeed will have, after having had an opportunity to discuss the matter with me, a better understanding of what is being proposed. So it's completely inappropriate and unfair for the hon. member to suggest that that organization has taken a particular position; thus far they have not.

In addition, I should say, Mr. Speaker, that there are a number of other opportunities that exist within the medical care fee schedule for general practitioners to bill for contraceptive counseling. The member should also be aware of some major studies that have recently been released in this province that point very definitely to better methods.

REV. ROBERTS: Well, speaking of being inaccurate and un-

fair, I wonder if the minister has spoken to the registrar of the College of Physicians and Surgeons, Dr. Leroy le Riche, who says that he has no information or any studies to prove the physicians involved in counseling are abusing the fee schedule. Will the minister now back up his allegations of last week, on the basis of which he made the cuts, and name the names of those physicians in the medical profession who he says are badly abusing the fee codes to pad their own pockets? Will the minister please explain who these people are and name their names?

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. minister, there were three questions in that supplementary, so take your pick.

MR. M. MOORE: Well, the answer to all of them is no.

REV. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I don't know how often we have to put up with ministers who make statements and not back them up with any background or information on them.

The only minister that has some integrity is the minister of community health. I'm wondering -- given the report put out last week by the Alberta community health services who say that the most likely explanation for high teenage pregnancy rates, particularly in rural Alberta, is the ignorance and difficulty in accessing birth control -- will this minister not convince his colleague the minister of hospitals to reverse these cuts which will only exacerbate a very bad situation, particularly in rural Alberta.

MR. DINNING: Mr. Speaker, I don't believe the hon. member has read the document, because the document suggests that that kind of counseling, those kinds of services for young teenagers in this province are the least effective method of providing for family planning, for teenage pregnancy, for contraception, or any nature of that kind of counseling. The best way to do it is through our health units, through our family planning programs located in Calgary and Edmonton and other parts of the province, through a human sexuality program within the schools of our province, grades 7 to 9 and 10 to 12.

Those are the kinds of efforts that we've got to make to make sure those programs are in place so that our young people are fully familiar with all of the resources they need, all the knowledge they need, so that they can prevent pregnancy and live a normal kind of existence in the province.

REV. ROBERTS: We do have a lot of compassion with this minister, Mr. Speaker.

The report also points out, in contradiction to what the minister says, that only two out of the 27 health units have anything remotely close to a full family planning clinical service, and they are wanting them, particularly in the rural areas. Will the minister now convince his cabinet colleagues and get the additional funding that is needed in addition to other programs which may enhance family planning services, but to have full clinical services at all 27 of the 27 health units throughout the province?

MR. DINNING: Again, Mr. Speaker, I have to restate -- as I did last week -- that those decisions on programs are made by local boards of health. We will encourage them again to reset, relook, at their priorities and recognize that this is a concern, that this is a problem, and encourage them to take on the program and mount it and offer it in their health unit.

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member for Edmonton Centre has made some accusations that are totally inappropriate with regard to not only what's contained in the report that's entitled *In Trouble -- A Way Out*, It was recently completed for the directors of Alberta's Community Health System. That report . . . [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: To the minister. The Chair wonders whether this should be raised as a point of order at the end of question period because of the allegations. Perhaps we could address it at that time.

ANHON. MEMBER: It's supplementary information.

MR. SPEAKER: All right. Well, hon. minister, quick finish.

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, the suggestion was made by the hon. member that the report in question gave the impression somehow or other that we ought to reinstate this fee for contraceptive counseling for medical practitioners, and the report says quite the opposite. In fact, it says:

Studies have demonstrated that teens are embarrassed to go to their family physician not only because he/she is familiar with the family but also because they fear . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Hon. minister, thank you. You've made the point that your perception of the facts is radically different from the member. Thank you. The Member for . . .

[Several members rose]

MR. SPEAKER: Perhaps all members would like to sit down for a while. The Chair recognizes Edmonton Gold Bar, followed by Calgary Glenmore.

MRS. HEWES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to go back to ask a supplementary to the original question regarding the minister's statements about doctors badly abusing the plan and padding their incomes. Did the minister ever raise this abuse issue in any discussions with the A M A or the College of Physicians and Surgeons? Surely this is a case where the college should be policing members if abuse is in fact taking place.

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, the particular fee schedule in question only exists in two other provinces besides Alberta. In all other cases general practitioners are expected to bill . . . [interjections] Well, do you want to hear the answer or not?

MR. SPEAKER: Hon members, especially in the opposition ranks, there's been a fair amount of chitchat back and forth today, even more than usual. If it's going to start to turn into heckling at someone, then they have every right, of course, to sit down, and we go on to the next series of questions. Minister, continue.

MR. M. MOORE: In all other provinces, practitioners are expected to provide contraceptive counseling and advice under other fee schedules that I've explained in this House, like the annual examination during the course of prenatal and postnatal care of women under the maternity benefit and a variety of other areas.

Mr. Speaker, so that members understand exactly what the

government view is on this entire matter, I'd like to file with the House a copy of a letter addressed to Dr. Kennedy, president of the Alberta Medical Association, signed by myself, that points out in some detail the areas of the fee schedule where doctors should be expected to provide contraceptive advice when it's requested by their patients and also goes on to point out what the real problems are in this province with respect to teenage pregnancies and how we believe we can effectively deal with them. This letter I think speaks for itself in terms of our position in this entire matter.

I just conclude by saying we certainly recognize that there is a very difficult problem here, and the way to resolve it is not to reinstate contraceptive counseling into the fee schedule when there are plenty of opportunities that doctors have had for a long time to provide that advice.

MR. SPEAKER: Calgary Glenmore.

MRS. MIROSH: Mr. Speaker, thank you. To the Minister of Community and Occupational Health. There's been an establishment of a women's resource centre in Calgary by the Grace hospital. Can the minister tell me if this resource centre gives contraceptive counseling to women and teenagers, and is it funded by the government?

MR. DINNING: Mr. Speaker, the Grace hospital women's health resource centre is an excellent centre that provides just that kind of advice, and it's in partnership with the Calgary board of health and other agencies in the city. It is providing a broad range of services for women to go and get counseling on any matter relating to female medical matters. We were very fortunate to be able to provide them with a \$5,000 grant in the past fiscal year, and I hope to be able to provide them with more support in the days ahead.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to designate my question today to the Member for Calgary Buffalo.

MR. SPEAKER: Member for Calgary Buffalo.

Sex Education

MR. CHUMIR: Thank you. This is to the Minister of Education, Mr. Speaker. With two-thirds of Alberta teenagers sexually active by age 18, with teenage pregnancy rates 40 percent above the national average, and with the incidence of sexually-transmitted diseases 60 percent above the national average, something's badly wrong in this province. Yet the Minister of Education still refuses to make sex education, including education about AIDS, a compulsory part of the junior and senior high school curriculum. Is the minister aware of these statistics, and does she realize that the failure to educate school children on sexuality matters has long-term major costs to society and individuals in terms of disease, pregnancy, and related social problems?

MRS. BETKOWSKI: Yes I do, Mr. Speaker. I also respect the right of some parents in a matter as personal and intimate as human sexuality to choose to educate their own children in those matters. But I would counsel those parents to be sure that in fact they are teaching their young children about human sexuality and particularly about the public health risk of which we are now aware in terms of sexually-transmitted diseases.

MR. CHUMIR: The problem is not with the parents; it's with the schools. Does the minister consider it acceptable that many of our schools, including all 14 Calgary senior high schools and many junior highs, have no sex education whatsoever, and many students are being left in total ignorance?

MRS. BETKOWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I know the matter is in fact before the Calgary board of education tomorrow night, and I believe they are in fact concerned about the absence of human sexuality education in their senior high schools. However, I would point out that the province has moved with respect to the secondary curriculum review. The first and foremost major curriculum change we will be doing will be taking effect this fall when we introduce the new health and personal life skills curriculum in the junior high level and the following year, the fall of '88, into the senior high level.

MR. CHUMIR: Everything the minister and her predecessors have done is optional. Why doesn't the Minister of Education accept her responsibility to society and our young people and mandate that sex education, including education about AIDS, will be available to each and every junior and senior high school student, unless the parent of course refuses permission? But why aren't the courses there?

MRS. BETKOWSKI: Well, the courses are there, Mr. Speaker. Certainly there is a question with respect to boards implementing and having to opt into the human sexuality portion of the curriculum. I am very carefully monitoring school boards throughout the province, and it may well be that the province has to move in a way different than we have in the past. However, I want to protect the right of parents, which I think is fundamental, and to respect their right to withdraw their children from the human sexuality component if they so choose.

MR. CHUMIR: Well, the courses aren't there, and the minister in the past has used the local autonomy excuse for the failure to set standards on sex education, on user fees in schools, and on learning disabilities. Where exactly is the line at which the provincial government will set policy pursuant to its constitutional responsibility and mandate?

MRS. BETKOWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure what the hon. member means by a constitutional responsibility. I think there is certainly a human responsibility to have the best possible curriculum that we can within our school systems, and perhaps the hon. member would like to review the curriculum. I think he would find it to be in fact some of the best in North America, and I would include the human sexuality curriculum in that too.

As I have said, the mandatory improvements in the secondary curriculum will start to take effect this fall. They are on an optional basis right now, and many schools are in fact availing themselves of that curriculum. But again I would say that I will monitor those boards. If we have to move in a way differently than we have, fine, but I want to respect the right of parents, which I happen to believe is very important in this matter.

MS LAING: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Education. Good course content is not enough. What training is the minister providing to teachers who will be offering these courses, which have as their subject matter very difficult and sensitive areas? And what monitoring of the teachers presenting these courses will she be doing?

MRS. BETKOWSKI: In fact, some of the best in-service training that we've been able to provide, which is in keeping with the whole purpose of the secondary curriculum and changes that will be taking effect starting in the fall -- much of the in-service with respect to the junior high health curriculum has already in fact been done. We are as well looking, as I indicated during my estimates when the member raised the matter there as well, at ways to improve the way in which we in-service teachers across this province to do it in more efficient ways, more effective ways. As well, we are encouraging and, as part of the health curriculum, bringing in other professionals from the community into the schools to ensure that there is as comprehensive an addressing of the issue as is possible.

MR. SPEAKER: Member for Vermilion-Viking.

DR. WEST: Yes, to the Minister of Social Services. Many of the programs set in place today help young teenage mothers or young single mothers to make it easier to address a pregnancy, rather than the responsibility of preventing it. Is the minister looking at any programs that could put a greater responsibility back onto society, the home, and the parents, in addressing this responsibility of preventing these pregnancies?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member raises a very difficult question, and while there may be a little bit of giggling across the way in the Opposition, I believe this is probably one of the most serious matters that comes across my desk -- that, along with family violence, particularly as it affects children. I think it's fair to say that I view it as children having children. The type of support we have been putting in place in fact has been described by some people as almost entrapping them into the idea that they can gain an independent life-style by having a family.

It's a very serious matter, Mr. Speaker. I don't have an answer for it, and I certainly hope that all members of the Assembly as well as society as a whole will give a serious look at this question, because certainly it is my view that there is not much thought given to the consequences of the actions that many of our young people are now taking.

Industrial and Regional Development Grants

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Economic Development and Trade, and it's with regards to the industrial and regional development grants of the federal government. I understand that the minister's assistant deputy minister made remarks to a Commons committee as of last week that indicated concern over the tiered system of these grants and their application in Alberta but as well indicated that Alberta is guaranteeing certain loans for companies in the province, without this information being made available to a broad base of companies in the province.

Could the minister indicate at this time whether those comments are accurate and whether there is some discrimination going on with regards to the granting of guarantees in the province of Alberta?

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, the representative of the department was requested, through my office, to appear before a Commons committee that was examining some of the DRIE programs, in particular the IRDP, which is the industrial regional development program. I agreed to the official from my

department attending because Alberta has had for some time a concern with that program and the way it's structured, where certain parts of Canada are tiered and as a result of that tiering, Alberta historically has received far less a proportion of the funding available than other parts of Canada.

In the course of the discussions the representative of the department did respond by saying that the government has found it necessary from time to time, in order to support industrial expansion and diversification in this province, to provide loan guarantees when other financial support mechanisms are not in place.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. With regards to the IRDP grants, could the minister indicate whether any progress has been made and whether the federal government has indicated at this time that they will make a change in the application of policy? I know that the date of July 1 is a target date, but is there any preliminary information at this time?

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, we have had a number of federal/provincial meetings and discussions. As well, I've continued to discuss with my federal counterpart and express our view on the IRDP portion of the DRIE programs. Alberta has indicated on a number of occasions that we prefer that portion of that department's activities that are described as ERDA, or economic and regional development agreement process, where there are actual subagreements entered into, where the conditions of the programs are clearly spelled out, and they are cost shared. We have requested that the IRDP be suspended until a thorough review is undertaken. Tomorrow I will be leaving for a federal/provincial ministerial meeting of economic development ministers in Whitehorse, and this item will be on the agenda.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. In terms of the loan guarantees, the comment was made: new companies with merit. Could the minister indicate what the criteria are for merit and why some companies are unaware of the loan guarantees and others are not?

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, through the course of a year departments of government that are involved in economic activities -- such as the Department of Forestry, Lands and Wildlife; the Department of Tourism; Technology, Research and Telecommunication; and my own department -- receive many inquiries from Alberta entrepreneurs who are searching for ways to expand their operations or to develop new business opportunities. And in the course of working with these companies, we advise them of programs that are available to them such as the Alberta Opportunity Company, Vencap, the small business equity corporations, and a variety of other programs that the government has established to encourage economic diversification.

In some cases an appropriate economic development tool is a loan guarantee or a partial loan guarantee. We've used it effectively in encouraging exports of Alberta products to other countries, and our estimate of the volume of business that has resulted from those export loan guarantees is in excess of \$50 million. So export loan guarantees and other guarantees are used when appropriate, when other financial mechanisms are not available, or this applies in a way that would be helpful to the Alberta economy.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Could the minister indicate the general value of the loan guarantees in the current fiscal year?

MR. SHABEN: I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, I didn't hear the question.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, could the minister indicate the value of the loan guarantees since the inception of that program?

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, since that's a question of some detail, I'd have to take it as notice, or the hon. member might like to put it on the Order Paper.

MR. SPEAKER: Calgary Mountain View, followed by Westlock-Sturgeon.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Given that businesses cannot learn about these loan guarantees because the government won't inform them, does that mean that this arrangement is just one more example of how government largess is only available to friends of the government?

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, I fail to see how the hon. member could come to that kind of conclusion. It's obvious he wasn't listening to either the questions or the answers.

Loan guarantees. The hon. member should know that on a number of occasions, it's been made public in the public accounts which are released each year by the Auditor General. There's a listing in detail of the loan guarantees that are provided by the government. It is not a secret. It is an appropriate economic development tool that is used at times that it is required.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. It's back to the original part of the question, about the IRDP and Alberta not qualifying in the past mostly because of using Alberta as a whole unit when the federal government comes to analyze whether the area is depressed enough to help on IRDP. Has the minister made any presentation to the federal government to reduce the size of areas under consideration when it comes to measuring whether or not the federal government will put loans out under the IRDP system?

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, we have. There are three basic criteria that the federal government uses in determining the tiers that qualify for different levels of federal support. Generally speaking, we don't subscribe to the tiered system, period. As I'd said in response to the earlier question by the Member for Little Bow, we support the use of ERDA subagreements between the federal and the provincial governments where it is clearly spelled out, the criteria and the range of support programs that are available. So our initial approach has been to the federal government: shift the funds that are available under IRDP to the ERDA programs and negotiate agreements with the provinces, because Alberta essentially believes that we should build upon our natural strengths across this province, and those natural strengths can best be described and identified by the provincial governments in consultation with the federal government, leading to agreements that would spell out the terms under which that support could be offered.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton Kingsway, followed by Edmonton

Gold Bar, followed by Calgary Forest Lawn if there's time.

Credit Union Stabilization

MR. McEACHERN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This government has treated North West Trust and the credit unions differently even though they both faced similar economic difficulties caused mainly by the collapse of the real estate markets. Apparently, 100,000 Edmonton-area credit union members organized in a democratic manner do not have the same influence with this government as some of their friends in North West Trust.

To the Treasurer. Why was North West Trust's capital base restored to \$50 million with no requirement that it be paid back, yet Capital City Savings & Credit Union will have to redeem the preferred shares held over its head by the Alberta government?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, if the member wants to pursue either of those questions, I'd be glad to, but to have them in that juxtaposition is almost impossible to respond to.

MR. McEACHERN: That's right, because there's no good answer.

Why did North West Trust receive full face value for its non-performing real estate holdings while by contrast the stabilization corporation reduced the value of the land holdings of the credit unions and then compensated those credit unions under those slashed prices?

MR. JOHNSTON: First of all, Mr. Speaker, I'm glad to finally find out that the Member for Edmonton [Kingsway] has discovered that something's happened with respect to credit unions. The issue has been here for approximately eight or nine days. Moreover, when that member speaks, I think we should have a card that says: Parental Guidance -- These Scenes May Contain Coarse Language.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, let me say with respect to the credit union movement that the credit union movement has been saved by this province, an unheard of assistance which back-stops \$1.7 billion worth of deposits in the credit union movement right now. This government undertook in September 1984 to provide that commitment to ensure that those deposits were guaranteed. Moreover, as part of a rehabilitation movement which I think saves the credit union movement in this province, we have put in place a very sophisticated program which will ensure the efficacy of the credit union movement across this province, a plan which deals both with the real estate assets, which have been touched on by the member in an abstruse way, but moreover deals with the long-term financing of the credit unions themselves.

Now, part of the plan, which was contemplated and outlined by this government -- and a plan moreover which was supported by the credit union movement itself -- dealt with that problem, putting in place a \$335 million to \$350 million bailout proposal.

With respect to the Edmonton Central problem, Mr. Speaker, there are times in government when you must accept the obligation of being in government. There are times when a government is called upon to accept its responsibility. This government has never shirked that responsibility. And this government, when considering all the facts, dealing with all the alternatives, and dealing with the program which is intended to save the credit union movement, is asked to act, then in fact there are cases when the responsibility of government is such

that you shall have to act.

MR. McEACHERN: Mr. Speaker, the required repayment of the preferred shares to this government will force Capital City Savings & Credit Union to set an unrealistic spread between what it pays and what it charges for money. Why has the minister forced the credit unions into a compromising and uncompetitive position, unlike North West Trust?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, let me make it again very clear that when it comes to the North West Trust arrangement, which the member talks about and I know I've attempted on at least 30 or so occasions to explain this both to the socialists, who lack the fundamental understanding of business policies . . . In fact, the North West Trust arrangement was an arrangement which did the following things. First of all, the real estate assets and the lack of profitability in North West Trust allowed us to negotiate a very favourable arrangement with the Canada Deposit Insurance Corporation, wherein over \$277 million worth of federal money -- federal money -- was transferred to the province. And that money was at the heart of the assistance program for North West Trust.

From that the province received the following. We received the control of this trust company, which is important to stabilize the financial institutions of this province at a time when traditional financial institutions are not aggressively pursuing loans. Secondly, it rehabilitated that trust company to ensure its profitability, and that annual report has been tabled showing first quarter profits over \$500,000. Moreover, we the province, the people of Alberta, ended up with over \$300 million worth of real estate assets, of which we have exactly nothing invested. Mr. Speaker, it seems that's a good deal, and that's a deal which bets on the future of this province and one that I am pleased to support.

Now, with respect to . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, hon. member. It's a good deal to have the final supplementary.

MR. McEACHERN: Will the minister confirm that most of the free \$275 million of CDIC funds went to pay back the Treasury Branches for its bad loans in North West Trust, while with the new credit union we'll have to pay back the government for its takeover?

MR. JOHNSTON: Again, Mr. Speaker, in all fairness I should have a very long period of time to put aside the misleading statements of the member from coarse language across the way.

But let me now just deal with the question of preferred shares. Preferred shares in the credit union are a unique way to provide for the redemption of the preferred shares in the credit union itself. What we have done through the Credit Union Stabilization Corp. and the Central Federation of Credit Unions themselves is to buy a so-called zero coupon bond worth approximately \$30 million. Now, I know that's too complex for the member to understand, but what'll happen in 25 years is that there's going to be approximately \$300 million there that'll have to be paid back on a balloon basis.

So you see, Mr. Speaker, the preferred shares and the debentures are used to finance the deficit position, some \$300 million of deficits in the credit unions, and at the end of the period it'll be a washed transaction. You'll have \$300 million in this zero coupon bond. You'll have \$300 million worth of liabilities in

credit unions. They wash. What happens is you have rehabilitated, restructured, and eliminated the debt from the credit unions. That's a grand financial plan, in my mind, and one which assists the credit union movement and we fully back-stop that idea.

MR. SPEAKER: Unfortunately, the time for question period has expired. Might we have unanimous consent to continue with this series of questions?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed?

AN HON. MEMBER: No.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair heard a negative. The Chair indeed heard a negative. The Chair also recognizes a point of order. Edmonton Kingsway, followed by Edmonton Highlands.

MR. McEACHERN: I just wonder if the hon. Treasurer would like to retract his statement that I was misleading the House with my question.

MR. JOHNSTON: Oh, I thought he was going to ask me to retract for calling him the member for course language. But if it's with respect to misleading, misleading is not nonparliamentary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, therefore no withdrawal. Member for Edmonton Highlands.

MS BARRETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Referring to Standing Order 22 and *Beauchesne* citation 233, both of which have to do with points of order, and referring also to an all-party agreement announced by the Speaker on the first day of the Assembly last summer, I would like to point out that in the middle of question period today the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care attempted through an unsolicited fashion to interject his own interpretation of the facts subsequent to a ministerial response to a question, which was not invited.

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, the all-party agreement as announced by you in the Assembly last year called for an agreement that (a) points of order will not be raised during question period no matter how pressing they are, and (b) ministers have the right to make supplementary information available at the end of question period. And then the fair thing would be that the member who originally put the question to the minister may ask a final supplementary question in response to the supplementary information. In light of all that I believe the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care should (a) stop trying to bully his way through question period and (b) offer an apology to this Assembly for having broken the agreement which was agreed to by all party House leaders and by the Speaker.

Thank you.

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order. The original question today from the hon. Member for Edmonton Centre was directed toward myself, and then a supplementary in the middle of that line of questioning was directed toward the Minister of Community and Occupational Health. During the

course of the preamble to that supplementary the hon. member made reference to matters which had been directed to me in the original question, and the reference that the hon. member made with respect to the report entitled *In Trouble -- A Way Out* was in my view very misleading to the Assembly. I thought that if that information had been provided when the original question was asked, I would have responded at that time.

Mr. Speaker, there is absolutely nothing that I am aware of in the rules of this House that prevents a minister from responding to a question in a supplementary way during the question period when it relates to his or her portfolio. That has been the practice for all the time I've been in the Legislative Assembly, and nothing changes that.

I have no intention, Mr. Speaker, of apologizing to the hon. member in any way, shape, or form.

MR. SPEAKER: All right, thank you.

MS BARRETT: Mr. Speaker...

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member, on this point -- one only gets to generally speak once on a point of order, and the Chair understood that the Member for Edmonton Centre wanted to speak to this point of order. Is that correct? It's not correct. All right, Edmonton Highlands. Thank you.

MS BARRETT: Yes. Well, on the point of order, Mr. Speaker, ordinarily the practice is that where one minister believes it would be appropriate for another minister to supplement the information from the first minister, that indication is given to the House. In the second place, though, and I think more importantly, despite the comments from the Member for Lethbridge East, the fact is that the minister was not responding to a question but rather to an item that he believes his interpretation of the facts is correct. In that case, the member originally putting the question, according to the theory of fairness -- which I think we all agreed to -- would have the right to make a responsive question to the minister. In that instance I believe it's appropriate that the minister make that additional information available at the end of question period, which is the procedure to which we all agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: On this particular point of order, indeed observers of the House and the -- what did occur was that the Chair did indeed try to bring the minister to order after the minister had at least been allowed to get into what he was giving as supplementary information, and then was indeed requested and had to sit down and did not finish the line of information he was supplying to the House.

Indeed, it's been a concern for the Chair that from time to time when hon. ministers of the Crown look towards the Chair to see whether they're going to get a chance to jump in and give extra supplementary information, more often than not they're seeing the Chair do this. Because really it's a matter for some additional supplementaries to be able to get in and to glean the information that needs be. Again, part of it is somewhat along the line of the length of supplementaries, the length of answers, and the amount of dialogue or interchange or baiting or whatever you want to call it that's going on in the House. Therefore, time moves on in terms of question period and frustration increases in all parts of the House.

I think in this respect that the conversation has been very useful and the Chair trusts that all parts of the House will take it

into consideration. But in actual fairness the Chair does believe, as in this case, supplementary information at the end of question period, which would then allow the member who originally raised the question to respond, and then for the final word to be given by the appropriate minister of the Crown.

Additional points of order? The Chair first would like to recognize a very significant event in the life of at least one member of the Assembly. I'm sure all members of the House would join in extending congratulations on his 56th birthday to the Government House Leader.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Speech.

MR. SPEAKER: We can't set that precedent.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: Might we revert briefly to the Introduction of Special Guests.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Associate Minister of Agriculture.

head: INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS (*reversion*)

MRS. CRIPPS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure to introduce to members of the Assembly 26 grade 6 students from the Breton elementary school in my constituency. They're with their teacher, Ron Flanders. I'd ask that they now stand and receive the warm welcome of the Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER: Birthday boy.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, when I was 53 I always used to say, "I'm either 53 or 35 and can't remember which." Now that I'm 39, it's no longer a thing I can say. Mr. Speaker, I thank the members for their good wishes and would move that the question and the motions for returns stand.

MR. SPEAKER: All those in favour of the motion as made by the Government House Leader, please say aye.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed, please say no.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. SPEAKER: Motion carries.

head: MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

216. Moved by Mr. Stevens:

Be it resolved that the Legislative Assembly urge the government of Alberta to advise the government of Canada on the need for increased collaboration among governments and public and private organizations to attack drug abuse problems in our society.

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Speaker, my purpose in introducing this

motion today is threefold: to reaffirm the commitment of the Alberta Alcohol and Drug Abuse Commission and this government to addressing the problems of drug abuse and misuse, to respond to public concerns on these issues and to offer perspectives on what many people view as the present drug crisis, and thirdly, to convey the importance of a collaborative effort among all levels of government and our communities. We need to address these problems in a balanced manner along many fronts, whether it's treatment, prevention, community action, law enforcement, or the courts.

All of us have an important role to play in this serious problem, but federal government leadership and support are vital to the success of these efforts. I mention now with a sense of excitement and expectation the announcement yesterday by the Hon. Jake Epp, minister of health and welfare, of a national drug strategy for Canada. Now, I'm excited, Mr. Speaker, because the national drug strategy promises to be a way for us to build on our achievements in Alberta and throughout the country. The minister's announcement strengthens my belief that we are headed in the direction now of dealing more effectively with Canada's alcohol and drug abuse concerns over the long term.

[Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair]

Our views of the current drug situation are strongly affected by how we take a look at it, by what the perspectives are that we use. We can look at drug problems as a crisis perspective, but I say to members that this is a very narrow perspective and what happens is that we tend to focus on the acute and often tragic nature of the problem: the drug-related death of a sports figure or the death and injury caused by an impaired driver. We also know that there are localized pockets of acute drug problems in Canada. But if we view drug use and misuse from a broader perspective, we can see a much different picture in Canada.

We're debating today and we have the national drug strategy developing this week, but ironically public interest and attention in the issue of drug use is occurring at a time when the consumption of many drugs, most notably illicit drugs, is actually moderating or is in decline. This is true in Alberta as well as in the rest of the country. For example, tobacco. Over recent years the proportion of individuals who smoke tobacco is declining significantly. Nationally, the percentage of regular smokers aged 15 years of age and older decreased from 41 percent in 1970 to 31 percent in 1983, and that's a similar situation now in Alberta. Sadly, many young women are smoking even more heavily, however. The popularity of marijuana appears to be moderating. Indeed, a survey of the 11- and 12-year-olds in 1986 in Canada found the proportion of those who reported ever using marijuana had not changed over the previous two years, yet within Alberta a recent study reported that the number of teenagers who reported using the drug often had declined remarkably from 7 percent in 1981 to 2 percent in 1985.

So, Mr. Speaker, when we take a step back from these incidents we read about or see or hear, and look at the broad pattern of drug usage, we find that the illicit drug problem is not as large as many would have us believe, though I don't want to mislead the House at all. I don't want the House to think that these drugs do not pose serious problems. They do, and we must not afford to lose sight of them. We have a drug problem in this country -- and it extends beyond the range of illicit drugs -- that captures the public's attention.

You see, despite these promising trends, Mr. Speaker, the

abuse of the common and socially acceptable psychoactive drugs such as medications, such as alcohol or tobacco or caffeine -- these are the ones that are creating the most damage and draw the most heavily on our limited resources. It is AADAC's view that it is with these substances I've just mentioned that the major drug problem in this country lies. Alcohol abuse remains by far the single most common reason an individual sought help from AADAC. During 1985 to 1986 nearly 80 percent of all our clients -- over 12,000 cases admitted for treatment -- had alcohol diagnosed as their major causal problem. Indeed, in Canada, members of the Assembly, 600,000 people are alcohol dependent, and the total costs to Canadian society exceed \$5 billion. Alcohol is a significant cause of mortality. In each year in Canada over 3,000 people die from medical disorders directly attributable to the use of alcohol. It's a contributing cause in the death and injury of so many Canadians through suicide, homicide, fires, accidents, and so on. It's a causal factor in 30 to 50 percent of all our traffic fatality collisions. It was estimated recently that over 160,000 deaths and 4,400 injuries in Alberta are a result of drinking and driving crashes. Indeed, in Alberta we have something like 80,000 alcoholics out of a population of about 2.4 million people.

Mr. Speaker, alcohol abuse is an important contributing factor to the admissions of our hospitals and to our inpatient psychiatric institutions, adding significantly to the health care costs in the province, possibly some \$170 million to \$200 million a year. Tobacco use remains the major cause of preventable disease and suffering, premature death and associated cost to our country. Over 2,900 Albertans died last year as a result of a tobacco-related illness. Smoking adds a similar amount of cost to our provincial health care.

While not of the same magnitude as the costs of the substances I've mentioned, prescription drugs and their potential for misuse and abuse is an ongoing concern. Six percent of Canadians use tranquilizers for medical purposes, and 8 percent of the population uses barbiturates for similar reasons. Two years ago in Alberta we had a survey done of youth aged 12 to 17. We found that 4 percent reported using amphetamines, and 1 percent had used barbiturates at least once during six months prior to the study for medical or nonmedical reasons.

This government and AADAC have had a longstanding commitment to address the problems of drug abuse. The provincial addictions agency, now known as the Alberta Alcohol and Drug Abuse Commission, or AADAC, had its origins a long time ago, and I compliment the former government, the Social Credit government. The alcoholism foundation of Alberta was established in 1951 and its first treatment began in 1953. You know, apart from being hospitalized at that time, the only other form of help was the fellowship of Alcoholics Anonymous, available to persons seeking help with an alcohol problem. In 1965 the foundation was absorbed into the provincial department of health as a division of alcoholism. But six years later, in light of the growing problems of alcohol and drug abuse, the provincial Legislature passed an Act which established the commission in its current form. As members know, there are 12 citizen members including myself, who have the privilege of serving as chairman, and all of this falls under the jurisdiction of my colleague the hon. Minister of Community and Occupational Health. The commission has undergone constant growth and change as it tries to cope with an ever-increasing diversification of its responsibilities.

In addition to the staff of some 370 and the budget of \$26 million, treatment is provided through four institutions and 23

outpatient offices located across this province. Yet 25 percent of our budget, Mr. Speaker, is used to support 28 private community-based agencies, each in their way serving their communities, serving their fellow Albertans. AADAC is also responsible for several specialized functions including, as I mentioned earlier in the House this sitting, two impaired driving programs: the Alberta impaired driving course for first-time offenders, and for the repeat offender the impact program. In addition, there is the Impaired Driving Countermeasures Coordinating Committee which is now having a more significant role in our nation. In total, 270,000 individuals in 1985 and 1986 in some way received education or treatment services provided by AADAC or through the agencies we help fund.

Yet the demand for the services, Mr. Speaker, is steadily increasing. In 1985-86 there was a 10 percent increase in one year to 18,665 admissions. And admissions to the funded agencies, registrants to the impaired drivers courses, are also experiencing tremendous increases, particularly the impact program which has now identified so many repeat offenders.

I compliment the Member for Lethbridge West, sitting in the Chair at this moment as Speaker, for the work in ensuring that this program began. I also compliment the Member for Little Bow who, as the minister of the government of that time, was strongly supportive of AADAC and its predecessors.

Mr. Speaker, if we are going to develop a focus, it surely must be on prevention. We must develop not only a range of treatment service, because that's an important step when we address problems, but we have to understand in the health field that we're limiting our effectiveness when we concentrate only on treatment. If we concentrate only on treatment, if we only wait for people to become sick before we address the problem, we cannot tackle this problem. We have to move ourselves and our individuals and our organizations to an upstream position to intervene in the chain of events that lead to a full-blown, tragic addictions problem. So this calls for a preventive approach. The government of Alberta, through AADAC and other departments, has made a major contribution to prevention. One example is our adolescent program which promotes in our adolescents the development of a healthy life-style not dependent on alcohol and other drugs. That's had considerable impact in Alberta. We can all be proud of that and the response of our young people.

In evaluation, both the primary group of adolescents we've aimed the program to and the secondary target, if you like, of the parents now demonstrate a high level of awareness of the theme of the program and its messages. Over two-thirds of our teenagers reported that the AADAC messages had helped them better understand and better handle pressures to drink or to smoke or use other drugs. Indeed, the percentage of teenage drinkers in Alberta has declined from 55 percent, over half, in 1981 to less than half, now 47 percent in 1985. That's a greater decline than in those other areas we survey where programs of this nature are not in effect.

Another interesting statistic, Mr. Speaker, is that the age young people start drinking has increased from 12 years and a month in 1981 to nearly 12 and a half years in 1985. That's a small amount of time, but it's quite a significant amount of time in the life of a young 12-year-old. The use of other drugs has shown a similar decline: teenagers who smoke cigarettes dropping from 28 percent in 1981 to 21 percent in 1985. The percentage of teens using cocaine in the six months prior to that survey had dropped by half, from 4 percent to 2 percent. So progress is being made, and it's a slow, steady, expensive, diffi-

cult problem. But the growth, the solutions, the efforts AADAC is making, all the things that are giving AADAC a leadership role not only in the addictions field in Canada but perhaps internationally, are a direct reflection of the resources and the commitment of this government and of the people of Alberta to tackling alcohol and drug abuse problems.

Yes, AADAC has gained a great measure of experience and a great measure of expertise and is prepared to share this, but there are limits to what we can do at the provincial level. There are limits to what we can do in Calgary or Edmonton or in Canmore or Peace River. To the very real extent that these problems are international and national in scope, we need national and international measures and structures and initiatives to address them. There is a foundation that exists with existing treaties, and there are international conventions talking about and dealing with international drug control, but there's so much room needed and much room available for continued development. First, Mr. Speaker, there is a fragmentation of effort. The federal government has been an important player in education and the prevention of alcohol and drug abuse. There have been a number of important national initiatives taken on. For example, members may remember the Dialogue on Drinking campaign of the late 1970s, and now the current Break Free campaign which encourages young people to make the decision not to smoke. There are support materials and guides for smoking cessation. There is a recently announced long-term national program on impaired driving directed at young people aged 16 to 24. And I recall recently in the Assembly questions and responses about insurance for young drivers. It is the young driver 16 to 24 who is the greatest risk in Alberta -- the largest number of accidents, the greatest problem with impaired driving. Federally, there are publications of pamphlets such as Stay Real on marijuana and various other matters, and there are educational programs developed by Health and Welfare Canada such as peer assisted learning.

In the international context, we can recognize the extent and scope of international trafficking. Drug money is being used to finance terrorist actions and regional wars. There's a destabilizing effect of trafficking on the economies and political structures of the source and transit countries. There's no question that there's laundering of drug funds. They're security risks. There's corruption inevitably associated with the drug trade, and it's guided by a powerful international criminal element. And there are limitations on how we traditionally try to reduce the demand, because if we reduce the demand, we have other problems. You push here; there's a problem there. We need to recognize that intensive efforts to reduce drug supplies through interdiction and enforcement have probably reached the threshold of effectiveness, so further investments in this area are not likely to bring results. At the same time as we reduce supply then, we need to reduce demand.

So now we begin to strengthen our strategies. We take a new perspective. We become aware that we need a realistic view of addiction problems because they are very complex problems that are part of our basic pattern of living as individuals. These are legal substances. There are laws that permit us to drink in certain ways; they are legal substances. So they involve all of us -- all our communities, all our institutions, all our country. Realistically, these problems will never disappear completely, but we can seek effective intervention, reduction, and containment at a reasonable cost, given our available fiscal resources.

So AADAC focuses on several key premises, and I want to

share these with the members of the Assembly. We need to focus, as AADAC does, on people and not on the substances themselves, because there are factors that give rise to addiction problems. But they're not uniquely different from the factors that give rise to other behavioural problems with possible damaging effects; for example, smoking, eating disorders, compulsive gambling, the workaholic, and other maladaptive behaviours. To some degree all of us experience the stresses and demands of living, but in AADAC's view the key point is that persons who possess the basic capacities to respond flexibly to those kinds of stresses that are inevitable, those kinds of demands, will be far more likely to make decisions in the most constructive, healthy, and satisfying way possible. You see, Mr. Speaker, by developing a sound approach to how you manage your life, you can avoid drug addiction and many other problems.

So we're convinced that the solutions, like the problems, are complex but they're achievable. So we advocate taking a health promotion approach which involves viewing health as an enabling resource for everyday living. And we want to expand the focus beyond those immediately at risk to include the whole context of everyday life. We want to enhance people's capacities to anticipate, to interpret, to control their own environment, to make their own decisions, to strengthen health-enhancing conditions and weaken or remove health-compromising conditions. To do this, we need a mix of diverse but complementary methods and approaches. Fortunately across this country there are national, provincial, and community agencies now focusing on health promotion. Now, the current heightened anxiety, Mr. Speaker, and awareness around drug problems give us a strong mandate to proceed. We can do much to extend awareness and build on it in positive ways, but we can't do it ourselves. AADAC can't do it itself; the province of Alberta can't do it itself. We need effective intervention at all levels and concerted co-operation by all sectors. So there is a very critical leadership role for the federal government.

Addictions represent one set of issues in the health field. Now, although health matters in Canada fall within provincial jurisdiction, the federal government is a very significant player in establishing broad Canadian health policies and in providing provinces with critical resources. The federal government can provide necessary leadership. And really, only the federal government can provide the co-ordination for programs at the national level and at the international level. Indeed, Canada health and welfare has already contributed significantly in advancing health promotion by co-sponsoring in 1986, along with the World Health Organization and the Canadian Public Health Association, the conference resulting in a declaration of the Ottawa charter for health promotion.

Yesterday we saw a new resolve by our federal government to act on drug issues, the announcement by the Hon. Jake Epp. It's been our position, Mr. Speaker, that a national drug strategy would have to be based on several fundamental principles for it to be a truly national and not a federal drug strategy with realistic chances of achieving its potential. Now, there are many stakeholders involved in this problem, so the national drug strategy must be built on a strong foundation of federal/provincial consultation and co-operation. It must recognize and draw on our addictions expertise in the areas of primary prevention, program research and evaluation, and training. It surely must be built on positive health promotion principles. Those are complementary strategies in a framework that endeavours to empower individuals to live better lives. It must have an appropri-

ate focus on youth, for after all, if our youth would make those wise decisions about alcohol and drugs, then the magnitude of the problem will decline in the future.

The program must maintain a suitable balance between enforcement efforts to reduce the supply and demand reduction initiatives involving treatment and prevention and public education. Somehow it must be broad in scope and flexible enough to address the problems of psychoactive drugs, alcohol, tobacco, street drugs, overuse and misuse of medications and so on. And it needs to be supported by resources, resources to address treatment needs, education needs, prevention initiatives and, very importantly, support for the community, the community programs across this country, the individuals who are concerned and those organizations that want to help. Mr. Speaker, I'm very happy to report that as unveiled yesterday, the national drug strategy appears to generally embody these important principles. Of course, we will gain a firmer sense of its potential after we have a detailed examination of its content.

Mr. Speaker, the record of AADAC, of other agencies, other community groups, shows that we have made important strides in addressing alcohol and drug abuse problems in Alberta. What I've outlined today is a perspective and some of the essential elements of a national framework for action which show great promise to more effectively address these problems than ever before. Mr. Speaker, I know you must be very pleased. I know all members, all parties will be pleased at the efforts announced yesterday, and further announcements are expected this coming week. I believe it's approximately \$210 million of new funds committed by the federal government over the first five years of a long-term program to develop a national drug strategy. I firmly believe, Mr. Speaker, that the way to maintain our progress is through co-operative and co-ordinated efforts among the stakeholders at all levels.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, we must continue to advise the government of Canada of the need for ongoing collaboration among governments and other organizations in the fight against substance abuse in our society. I hope all members will support Motion 216.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hon. Member for Edmonton Centre.

REV. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Very interesting comments from the Member for Banff-Cochrane on this motion, the general thrust and the intent of which I think we can all support. No doubt any thinking or compassionate person is concerned about substance abuse and drug abuse, both legal and illicit. It is a problem at all levels and needs the perspective and the comprehensiveness which the member begins to speak about. Certainly all of us know either at personal levels or in our families or extended families -- I know through my parish work and others no doubt through their own businesses -- people who are afflicted by alcohol problems or drug addiction problems of other sorts, a very, very difficult situation and handicap to deal with and to work through.

Mr. Speaker, today I'm pleased to have in the gallery here, though, one of my constituents who is a resident in one of the group homes, in a rehab program here in Edmonton Centre at the Jellinek House, Mr. Glen Zimmerman, whom I have spoken to a couple of times about his journey through it all, his rehabilitation program now and the work in the group home that he's doing, and the future that he's looking forward to with continued support and rehabilitation at all levels. I'm glad Mr.

Zimmerman is here to witness and hear the discussion this afternoon on this motion.

It does concern me though, Mr. Speaker, that the real solutions to this problem continue somehow to be elusive of either economic or political structures. I read something -- I wish I could have found it again -- but it was a report from Britain that was comparing the amount of revenue the British government took in on the sale of alcohol and cigarettes, the amount of revenue through taxes that they brought in from those drugs, and the amount of money they spent in comparison on prevention and awareness programs, I think it was something like 200 or 300 to 1 in terms of the amount that governments make in taxes off people who have addictions and the amount that governments put back in to help in an awareness of prevention programs. So you wonder what sort of catch-22 a lot of governments get themselves into.

Now we hear, of course, Mr. Speaker, members of this Assembly who want to throw open the drinking hours and make it much more accessible and free to people to have access to, as well as on the gambling and casino side of things, to get revenue from those sources. How much is going to be put back into people who become addicted, to people who have problems because of government scrounging around to get money from people through these taxes?

[Mr. Musgrave in the Chair]

So this motion today is not hypocritical at all, but it does, to me, have a sense of questioning the real priorities of government generally and this government in particular. No doubt the word the member wanted to stress was the word "collaboration." Motion 216 says:

... increased collaboration among governments and private and public organizations to attack [the] drug ... problems in our society.

And as the member has thankfully pointed out, in fact if anybody is doing a whole lot on this in terms of increasing their funding, increasing the resources, increasing the program and the attention to it, it's the federal government at this point.

So maybe the motion can stand as is in terms of increased collaboration. But it must be kind of difficult, you know, if you're sitting in Ottawa there, Mr. Speaker, and hearing provinces complain about the need for collaboration when in fact the federal government is increasing its spending and provincial governments are cutting back on their spending for these programs. What sort of collaboration can go on in that kind of funding inequity between the various levels of government? Certainly we can congratulate the minister of health and welfare, the Hon. Jake Epp, and the fact that he has brought forward these numbers of programs now and this new national health strategy.

But, Mr. Speaker, may I point out to members of the Assembly and people throughout Alberta that in fact this, as a program, has a lot of teeth because it has a lot of resources that have a financial tag to them. In contrast -- and I really don't want to be too terribly critical in opposition -- it's glaring to see that the same Member for Banff-Cochrane and AADAC in this province, everybody knows who's been through the budget debate, has been cut down, cut back by 9 percent in funding from last year. "Well," they say, "we have difficult times here in Alberta and the deficit, you know, and these people have their problems; it's probably their own fault. Everyone else is cutting back, so we'll cut AADAC down 9 percent."

Well, then to hear the member talk about the need for health promotion, illness prevention, education programs, and awareness programs -- to hear that from the member, Mr. Speaker, we applaud him and congratulate him -- and then to turn to the budget books and see that education and prevention programs for AADAC in this province have been cut back by 24.2 percent, a full quarter of what they had last year. I don't know what went on in cabinet over there. It's nice to have the outline of the program, and talk is cheap, Mr. Speaker, but the member did talk about the resources that are necessary. In government and in the Legislative Assembly we know that the prime resource is money and that you can't do a lot of programs without the funding behind it. And what do we have here? The budget reveals what the member didn't say, and that is that AADAC generally is down 9 percent and the very prevention education programs he's talking about being so necessary have been slashed 24.2 percent.

Not only that, Mr. Speaker, but I wonder about some of the real treatment centres that are trying to carry on their work. Certainly with unemployment continuing to plague the economy, with people having problems in a whole array of lifestyles and so on, that the number of people -- though not growing in quantum leaps -- that the need is still there of people who have the problems, despite prevention efforts.

And so what have we done with the treatment centres, Mr. Speaker? I've talked to various people who work in treatment centres around the province. Henwood people feel as though they can partially manage, though they feel a great number of increased needs and cases they have to deal with up there at Henwood. I don't know what's happening at Grande Prairie. The treatment centre there seems to be really cut back, and I've heard of difficult situations in Calgary. So where is the real commitment of this member and of AADAC to -- I mean, so you're going to skimp on the prevention side; what about the treatment programs that are really needed to deal with the people that are having the difficulties right now? And even there they are being cut back or maintained the same, and the status of several of them in question.

Mr. Speaker, it's appalling to me. It really is quite appalling to think that here in this province we have AADAC, which, as the member has outlined, has had such a progressive and forward-looking thrust and has been doing excellent work along the line in a very, very crucial and vital area of our public life, and yet despite the rhetoric, despite the talk, despite the history and background, the budget this year shows clearly that something has gone wrong in the priorities of this government. To have been cut back 24 percent in provincial programs itself is just shameful and two-faced in terms of trying to support this motion.

The federal minister's program, based as it is on a former health minister's -- Marc Lalonde's, I understand -- health promotion strategies and the World Health Organization's input generally, has been a leader and has developed some major strategies, as the member spoke of: the impaired driver program and now the national drug strategy program announced yesterday. And as the member rightfully pointed out, there are a whole lot of concerns, not just with illicit drugs and trafficking but also with prescription drugs and people who are just over-medicated generally and who have, through the good graces of the major pharmaceutical houses, been drugged right up, and with a little consumer criticism around it. So a whole lot is going on out of that program, as I understand it -- I haven't got the details yet myself, although I've ordered them -- that that kind

of leadership is coming from the federal government.

But, Mr. Speaker, again may I ask: does the federal government have a deficit? Is the federal government in difficulty in this country in terms of its financial planning? And yet the member already said that this is \$210 million of new funds that somehow Jake Epp has got out of his cabinet for a brand-new program in national drug strategy during difficult times when they're trying to cut down the federal deficit and all the rest. Well, somehow they don't even have a Heritage Savings Trust Fund to fall back to federally, and they don't have other resources that we have here in the province of Alberta, but somehow they have the courage of their convictions and their priorities straight, to bring out a brand-new program at the cost of 210 million new dollars out of a deficit-laden federal government. Sometimes when people are in real need you just need to develop some new programs and get the funding behind it, despite the federal deficit. This is one of those areas, and this is something, it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that this government just does not understand.

Some have cynically said, "Well, Brian Mulroney just had to do it because of Ronald Reagan's campaign last year about drugs. He wanted to hop on that bandwagon that President Reagan had started." In fact, I might quote -- or at least one person commented to me that "Prime Minister Mulroney had said a few things about it, so now he had to in fact do something about it." It seems to me a sad day when just because a politician is caught saying something, the public says: "Well, maybe they have to put something behind it in terms of funding priorities." You'd think that the Prime Minister would have developed this program before he announced his interest in it, but rather it seems that he wanted to get on the Reagan bandwagon and then they had to find Jake Epp a way to bail him out and get some program behind it. That's a cynical approach. I like to think that they're more enlightened up there in Ottawa. But it seems that despite their enlightenment, the enlightenment here is of a pretty dim level.

Certainly AADAC has brought forth a number of areas of pioneering effort and work and, Mr. Speaker, I must absolutely disagree with the member when he said that there is a limit to what we can do. In fact, there may well be a limit to what AADAC can do, but I would suggest and submit that we haven't even begun to reach the limit of what AADAC can do in this province. To begin, as I think the member is trying to do, to unload and offload from AADAC onto public and private agencies, onto the national and international governments, the responsibilities of what AADAC can and should be doing here in the province -- to me, we haven't even begun to reach the full potential of the kinds of both prevention and treatment programs that AADAC is about.

What about them, Mr. Speaker? If the member is so keen on the national program, what is going on in Alberta on this national drug strategy? What is the national drug strategy here in Alberta that's going to be in parallel to and in conjunction with the federal program announced yesterday? Is there 2 million new dollars of provincial government money that's going to support in a collaborative way with Jake Epp and the federal new program just announced? What is the real commitment of this member and of AADAC and the community health minister and of this government to match the federal program? Or is it, as I don't want to believe but see to be the case, that in fact what is going on is a member who may well not have any weight within the cabinet and is having to offload, unload, and downsize AADAC, being cut back 9 percent overall -- 24 per-

cent in prevention programs -- and is hoping against hope that they can get some help from other levels federally and private and public organizations?

Mr. Speaker, though I haven't addressed as much as I'd like the real human cost and the human aspect of this motion, it does seem to me that politically something is going on here which disturbs me. Perhaps in the further minutes of the debate hon. members might be able to add to it and prove to us and to all Albertans that yes, AADAC is serious; AADAC is going to work in collaborative effort with the federal government; here's some new money, some new programs that we're going to do to further establish our commitment to it for the betterment of Albertans who have drug abuse problems.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Member for Cardston.

MR. ADY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to make some remarks today relative to Motion 216 as it pertains to drug abuse and its effects on our society.

I think we're all very fortunate that the federal government made a commitment to a national drug strategy last September in 1986. This makes it obvious that our Prime Minister had some sincere concern about the effect drug abuse is having on our society, and in fact on our family unit. But before I go any further, I'd like to deal for just a moment on some of the comments the Member for Edmonton Centre made, and of course it has to do with the reduction in budget. There was a lot said about the 24 percent figure, when in fact AADAC's budget has been reduced by 9 percent and they have a commitment that no person will be turned away from AADAC services when they come for help. The reduction that he spoke of is primarily centred in the media buy time, not in the services that are offered by AADAC. Certainly, we anticipate that our provincial programs will tie in and be able to tap some of the funds that will be committed by the federal government, because that's the objective of what the federal government is doing; it's trying to correlate with the provinces and their programs.

The hon. Member for Banff-Cochrane has outlined the federal government's commitment in broad terms. I'd just like to add that I have some serious reservations that any program to combat this very difficult problem will be very successful unless all levels of government are able to come up with an effective campaign initiative at the grass-roots level to educate the public about the dangers of drug abuse.

We know that we have a drug problem in our province and in our country at the school age level. I recall an article in the *Calgary Herald* which reported that up to half of the city's high school students were regularly using marijuana or LSD. This is truly a disturbing finding. What is even more disturbing is the fact that many of the students using drugs at the junior and senior high school level actually began using them in elementary grades, which means somewhere around 10 to 12 years of age. We also know that teenagers will respond to peer pressure, be it good or otherwise, better than they will to written material or rhetoric from adults or drug-use prevention agencies, who are perceived to be preaching at them.

We also know that the drug problem is not isolated to just teenagers, but its use is considerable among married adults ranging up and into the 40s. One drug in particular, cocaine, appears to be quickly becoming a favourite among this group of usually well-paid, double-income professionals. In Edmonton, for ex-

ample, police officials have witnessed the amounts of cocaine involved in seizures increase from 650 grams in 1984 to over 8,000 grams in the first half of 1986. Again, community programs will have to be organized so that people can relate to the information that is available and not be made to feel that the information and the message is for someone else.

[Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair]

I'm not sure that I need to go on at length about the devastating effect the excessive use of nonprescription drugs can have on one's life. I'm sure all of us have had the experience of having someone we know adversely affected by drug abuse. I personally have known more than one young person who have literally ruined their lives with drugs, even to the point of being a suicide victim. A Gallup poll commissioned in 1985 found that compared with nonusers, cigarette, alcohol, and marijuana users all tend to experience more problems with all of the important things in life such as family, friends, school work, health, driving injuries as a result of using these drugs. I think that most of us, if we stop to think for a minute, know we have enough adversity in our lives without going out and asking for the problems that the abuse of and the use of drugs and alcohol can bring into our lives, and on top of that, paying an exorbitant price for it.

I don't think that we know just how much drug abuse contributes to the deadly disease of AIDS in our country. This is a disease that has many of us quaking in our shoes for fear that there may be some unknown means of contracting this disease quite innocently. We have dentists wearing rubber gloves. We have radio station commentators who won't put someone else's headphones on. And then we have another faction of our society who are not concerned enough about it. This is obvious, because I just recently heard a documentary on the subject that there are in excess of 50,000 Canadians infected with the AIDS virus presently in Canada -- that's not to say that there are 50,000 who have the disease; just carriers of the virus -- and there are in excess of 1,000 cases of the AIDS disease in Canada at the present time, 59 of them being in Alberta. As it stands today, those 1,034 who have contracted the disease of AIDS have received the death sentence, as there is still no known cure. Some of these people, and I don't think we can tell how many of them, will have contracted this disease, at least in part, by alcohol and drug abuse. Certainly intravenous drug users who are in the habit of exchanging contaminated needles risk the chance of unknowingly infecting themselves with the AIDS virus, my point being that I don't think we should overlook the contribution that alcohol and drug abuse makes to the spread of this deadly disease.

The substance most commonly abused in society today, of course, is alcohol. In our province, our citizens spend \$857 million on this substance and, on average, consume 126 litres of alcohol annually. Here are some of the side effects of such a binge. Over 25,000 Albertans a year are convicted of impaired driving, and only a portion of those who practise impaired driving are apprehended and convicted. Two hundred people a year are killed in alcohol-related highway accidents in our province. Approximately 10,000 people a year are hospitalized for treatment of alcohol-related illnesses, each staying in the hospital an average of 4.7 days at a cost of \$12 million to the taxpayers. Alberta has an estimated number of 82,000 alcoholics, roughly the population of Medicine Hat, Grande Prairie, or Lloydminster.

Perhaps we should calculate the loss of production in this case. Alcohol plays a part in 50 percent of the suicides in our province and is a factor in one in every 10 deaths. The use of alcohol is no respecter of persons. It is prevalent in all segments of society, from the unemployed to the white collar worker, and I'm sure that all of us have been touched in some way by the abuse of alcohol. I personally have had the misfortune of losing two good business friends and associates to a suicide after having become alcoholics and then not able to cope with the conflict in their lives. That is to say nothing of those who have had their lives shortened by the abuse of this substance.

Just this past week I read an article in the *Kainai News*, a weekly publication, the story of an artist who was rated by his contemporaries in the artistic field as being one of Canada's best. He finds himself on the streets in Vancouver in an uncontrolled, alcoholic condition selling his valuable sketches for \$40 each, which enables him to buy enough alcohol for his daily needs. Repeated efforts by those who know him and respect his talent, his friends and his associates, to get him into a treatment centre have been without avail. A terrible waste of human talent.

A year or two ago AADAC put out some figures that indicated that 20 percent of our hospital beds in Alberta were filled with people with alcohol- and drug-related illnesses. If we want to save money on health care costs, let's deal with the cause of the problem and take measures to reduce the instance of alcohol and drug abuse. This has the potential of saving almost half a billion dollars in health care costs. I somehow feel that this would be more effective than just strapping people into their car seats, which isn't even going to approach that figure in health care savings.

It is estimated that alcohol is a factor in one-third of all child abuse cases, a factor in one-half of all divorces granted on the grounds of physical or mental cruelty, and was a factor in a high percentage of violent crimes in our province and country.

We certainly have a prevalence of abuse of prescription drugs. I remember the Member for Lethbridge West quoting the number of households in which Valium was in daily use a year or two ago. I've forgotten what it was, but it was shocking. We have an increase in so-called sniffing among our young elementary school-age children, be it from glue to nail polish to gasoline.

We have a problem with the controversy over drug testing in the workplace. Certainly it has to be a concern when we consider the fellow workers who may be jeopardized, be they a passenger or a fellow worker in the workplace.

I just listened to the news report this morning about the announcement from the federal government that the Member for Banff-Cochrane has just outlined. The news commentators had taken a survey among some of the provinces across Canada. It was interesting to see the reaction of some of the people who were supposedly experts in the field of alcohol and drug abuse. Some admitted that it deserved the emphasis the federal government has put on it by announcing such a program. Others were reluctant to admit anything more than an acceptable social problem in their province, and even indicated that perhaps the federal government was overreacting. Perhaps what we have seen in Canada is a conditioning process, where we have come to accept the kinds of things in our society that alcohol and drug abuse has placed among us. I personally think it is past time for us to address this problem, decide best how to cope with it, put some programs in place that will be effective, and remove the difficulties from society that have become prevalent by such

abuse.

Mr. Speaker, because of the importance of this issue, I urge all members to support Motion 216, and call for the question.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question on Motion 216, moved by the hon. Member for Banff-Cochrane?

All those in favour, please say aye.

HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Those opposed, please say no.

It is so ordered.

218. Moved by Mr. Schumacher:

Be it resolved that the Legislative Assembly urge the government to take measures to ensure that young Albertans reject the use of tobacco.

MR. SCHUMACHER: Mr. Speaker, I rise to move Motion 218. In so doing, I think I probably should say a word or two about my 'bona fides' or my background in relation to the use of tobacco. I can't say that I have been a complete abstainer all my life, yet I think maybe enough time has passed that I am not speaking as a newly converted person.

I did smoke cigarettes for the space of 15 years, but that habit ceased almost 23 years ago. I did have a break of complete abstinence for about 5 years, but in 1969, I guess it was, I took up the habit of cigars, which seemed to cause me more difficulty in certain quarters than cigarettes did. Largely at the urging of my daughter, who is now 16, I stopped smoking cigars a little over two years ago. So there was a period of almost 15 years of cigarettes and about 16 years of cigars.

ANHON. MEMBER: Yes, but you're still chewing, Stan.

MR. SCHUMACHER: No, but I have to say that I haven't gone for the smokeless tobacco.

Seriously speaking, hon. members, I know there are a few of you who are tempted to stop smoking now since we're paying -- I don't know -- 5 cents or 6 cents a cigarette in tax; something like that. It's a lot of money, and it is affecting some of us more than others. But I would urge anybody who is attempting to quit to do so. And I would like to congratulate the Minister of Agriculture, who I think has now been off the weed for about five or six weeks. He's reached a real watershed in that regard, and I think he is to be commended.

[Mr. Musgreave in the Chair]

But the magnitude of the industry, Mr. Speaker, is a large part of the problem that we face. Ninety thousand retail outlets market cigarettes in the country. There are 30,000 vending machines. In the province of Ontario there are 2,000 farmers who are engaged in growing tobacco. In Ontario tobacco is the second-largest cash crop in that province, and the industry does employ some 6,800 people in the processing, manufacturing, and marketing of the product. So there are a lot of people concerned and involved in this industry. In 1985 Canadians spent some \$6.1 billion on tobacco products, and of course the largest single beneficiary of that expenditure was the federal government and the various provincial governments who managed to

obtain some 64 percent of that sum, or \$3.8 billion, which has added to their general revenue funds.

Now, that may seem like -- and I've heard it said by people that their smoking is really their contribution to the total tax take of the governments and that if they stopped smoking the governments would be hard pressed to carry on their operations. But, Mr. Speaker, there is a great cost to that, and it is in fact a negative for the government. So this great windfall of \$3.8 billion to various governments is certainly no great benefit to them, because amongst the costs, first of all, it's been shown that the use of tobacco products kills some 30,000 Canadians each and every year between the ages of 35 and 84. And that represents 25 percent of all the people dying in those age groups.

On the expenditure side the governments, both federal and provincial, spend some \$7.1 billion on health care and fire losses. I should say governments don't spend all that; governments certainly spend a large portion of that on health care, but the economy spends the balance on fire losses. I don't think you can say that the governments are responsible for all the fire losses caused by smoking. But society as a whole expends some \$7.1 billion, so there is a billion-dollar shortfall on this whole mess. In addition to that, how do you put money value on a healthy, disability-free life? I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that there's no way that that can be measured in dollars.

Statistics. Of course, statistics can show anything, prove anything a person wants with them to, but the numbers would seem to indicate that the number of people smoking in Canada is declining. The trouble with those numbers is that they are probably as a result of people like me, people like the Minister of Agriculture, and I guess maybe the Member for Calgary Fish Creek. I think he used to smoke at one time.

ANHON. MEMBER: A long time.

MR. SCHUMACHER: In any event, he is one of those of us who stopped and who helped bring about the statistics that there's declining use of tobacco. But the scary part of the statistics is the fact that in the area of young people -- and that is the group that this motion is directed at -- they are now increasing. Their rate of participation in the use of tobacco is increasing, and that doesn't bode well for the future. For example, in the area of young women between the ages of 20 and 29, in 1983, 36 percent of that age group used tobacco products. In 1986, only three years later, 45 percent used tobacco products. Now, to me, Mr. Speaker, in a space of three years, to find some 9 percent increase in that age group using tobacco is a very serious and worrisome statistic, and it deserves some attention.

Of course, speaking about the problem and the magnitude of the problem, it is well to remember that the industry spends some \$100 million to associate the use of tobacco with attractive life-styles, pleasure, independence, and sporting activities -- things that are attractive. So they use their advertising dollars to associate tobacco with all those nice things, and apparently this advertising is having its effect, particularly in the area of young females.

I guess, Mr. Speaker, reverting to the personal again, this is one of the main reasons why I was happy to be able to bring this motion before the Assembly today. It is of direct personal concern to me because that very same 16-year-old daughter who harangued me for so long into giving up cigars is now a user of tobacco in the form of cigarettes. I don't seem to get too much result speaking to her at home. Maybe she'll read *Hansard* and it might have some more effect on her; I don't know. But I do

think that more steps have to be taken. I hope I'll be more persuasive in the Assembly than I have been on her.

Mr. Speaker, there has been, I'm sorry to say, no direct or comprehensive response by the government of Alberta in respect of this problem. We have just heard the chairman of AADAC give a very good exposition of the activities of that commission, particularly in respect to drugs and alcohol, but I would submit that the use of tobacco is certainly an addiction. I don't think anyone would deny that it is an addiction, and I would submit that it is not giving the appropriate priority to the use of tobacco as it is to other activities. I've also heard him say that there are certain budgetary constraints, and maybe they would like to give more attention to stopping the use of tobacco. Nevertheless, as far I can see -- now I may be wrong -- at the present time there is really not much going on in AADAC or any other government department of this province to discourage the use of tobacco. AADAC approved a policy statement in 1982 committing it to develop programs aimed at smoking. Some four years later, in early 1986, an antismoking campaign was prepared by AADAC and presented to the government for implementation, but the government did not act in response to that suggestion. Therefore, Alberta at the present time, as far as I know, does not have a single government-sponsored program of any kind aimed at discouraging the use of tobacco by teenagers.

Now, there are certain things that I think should be done. In particular, I'd like to refer to one, and that is the peer-assisted learning process. I would like to make the suggestion that AADAC adopt that approach, because at present there exists a number of readily available antismoking campaign programs which could, given appropriate funding, be implemented on an Alberta-wide basis, programs such as the peer-assisted-learning smoking prevention program, which in fact was devised by the federal government Department of National Health and Welfare.

This program is designed for use by school-age children aged 10 to 13, and that, Mr. Speaker, is the age where you really have to be active in heading off the use of tobacco by young people. Several years ago young people used to start smoking at age 16; I guess that's what the figures tell us. Now that age has dropped to 12. So this peer-assisted learning program directed to children of age 10 to 13 would be hitting the problem where it should be hit and heading it off before it begins. This program has been proven successful in field tests that have been conducted in the province. Field tests were included in Lethbridge, and evaluators found consistent evidence that when taught as designed, peer-assisted learning can prevent students from smoking.

Peer-assisted learning has been designed in a way so as to be as practical as possible for adaptation to all classroom settings. There is no requirement for special equipment or outside resources, nor must the teacher have previous experience in smoking prevention instruction. The implementation of this program in Alberta could be co-ordinated through the existing infrastructure of the Alberta Alcohol and Drug Abuse Commission. As AADAC already provides services directed towards the treatment of addiction for citizens in Alberta, it would seem to follow that any campaign against tobacco use or addiction should be incorporated within their mandate.

Well, Mr. Speaker, as I pointed out, there is AADAC. I think it's also fair to point out that the Department of Community and Occupational Health also has an interest in this area and in this present budget year has allocated the sum of \$150,000 towards antismoking advertising. Reference has been made ear-

lier this afternoon, in relation to the debate on Motion 216, that we are spending in excess of \$25 million through AADAC, but that has to do with chemical drugs, alcohol, tobacco -- the full area. And I would suggest that if the industry is spending \$100 million a year and we're about 10 percent of the economy -- I suppose \$10 million of that goes into Alberta -- a budget of \$150,000 is really not adequate to approach this problem. I would like hon. members to consider this matter seriously.

As I pointed out and as the chairman of AADAC, the hon. Member for Banff-Cochrane, has pointed out, AADAC is in place. It has offices and locations throughout the entire province; there is a good infrastructure there. I would urge the government to organize its efforts to attack this problem by devoting something more than \$150,000 towards this problem and also direct that that money be spent through AADAC, so that we can make use of the existing network of the infrastructure to bring the most effective possible measures to bear in discouraging the use of tobacco by young Albertans.

Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Member for Red Deer South.

MR. OLDRING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to begin by thanking the Member for Drumheller for bringing this motion forward. I think it is most appropriate and most timely.

They tell me, Mr. Speaker, that the only thing worse than a nonsmoker is a reformed nonsmoker, and I think the member made it very clear why that statement is out. I, too, have to confess to being a reformed smoker, and as I look back at when I started smoking, it was at the ripe old age of 11 or 12. I was out with the neighbourhood gang, and I think we were on army patrol that night, Mr. Speaker. We had just heard from our four-star general. He was Tommy Hickes' grandfather, and he used to share war stories with us from time to time, WW I. He had told us earlier that day that things were pretty tough down there on the front lines and that cigarettes were in rare supply and they used to have to be pretty creative in finding methods of producing cigarettes. He suggested that one of the things that worked for them on the front line was to take a little bit of toilet paper, crumple up a few leaves, put them all together, and you roll them and put a match to it and it works just fine. That seemed to make a lot of sense to 11-year-old boys at the time.

As I say, we were out on army patrol that night. It was the fall and there were lots of leaves around, so we decided we had better put this theory to the test. As the leader of the gang it was up to me to try it first, so we collectively put the cigarette together and I put it to my mouth and somebody lit a match. There was one big poof of flame and smoke. I backed away and dropped this flaming torch out of my hand, and of course it singed my eyebrows and my eyelashes.

MR. ALGER: And your hair turned red.

MR. OLDRING: And my hair turned red. I went home that night, and my mother, being the observant person she was, as much as I tried to sneak past her and up the stairs into bed, observed that my eyelashes and eyebrows had been singed. She looked at me and she said, "You've been smoking." Rather than telling her what I had really been doing, I confessed I had been smoking. Of course, that meant it was time for a meeting with my father; we frequently had those meetings in those days. He sat me down to discuss the merits and demerits of smoking, and being the fair man that he was, he felt that I deserved another

opportunity. After going up one side of me and down the other, he suggested that if I were ever caught smoking again, he was going to sit me down and insist that I smoke a box of cigars right in front of him. As a young boy, that never seemed all that bad, and it was very tempting at times to try on that box of cigars, but the wrath of my father in crossing that boundary a second time -- it just wasn't worth the chance. So although I didn't smoke for 15 years, my smoking career was very short.

Mr. Speaker, as has been pointed out earlier today by the Member for Banff-Cochrane and by the Member for Drumheller, the single most important preventable factor related to the major health problems facing Canadians today is tobacco use. More than 30,000 Canadians die each year from tobacco-related illnesses, clearly making this public health enemy number one. And for what? Why are we allowing this to continue to take this kind of human carnage? The Member for Drumheller addressed it in part already. You have to look at the economy, and you have to look at the tobacco industry itself and the power that they have.

It's interesting to note what a unique position the tobacco industry is in in the marketplace today. If we really thought about it, if somebody were to discover or invent tobacco today, if we hadn't had it on the marketplace for all these years, could you imagine what would happen? There's absolutely no way we'd allow tobacco products to be put on the marketplace today if they weren't already there. There's no way, knowing what we do today. Having the evidence and the scientific proof that we have today, there's no way that we would allow it.

But we have a situation today where we have a tobacco industry that employs 6,800 people. We have a tobacco industry that's providing livelihood to over 2,000 farmers. We have consumers that are spending in the tobacco industry \$6.1 billion in 1985 -- \$6.1 billion. As pointed out by the Member for Drumheller already, the biggest chunk of that is going to provincial and federal and territorial governments: \$3.8 billion of it, or 64 percent. Blood money, Mr. Speaker, and at what cost? At what cost to society in terms of premature mortality, in terms of disability and hospitalization and physician services and fires attributable to tobacco use? I've seen those things estimated as high as \$7.1 billion in 1982. I would suggest that it would be a lot higher than that in 1986 and 1987. Those are only the economic costs, and obviously they are great.

But what about the very real cost, the 30,000 Canadians that we mentioned that are dying every year in this country, 30,000 over the age of 35 annually? It's interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that that accounts for 25 percent, for one-quarter of all the deaths within that age group are attributable to use of tobacco. That doesn't take into consideration heart disease, where heart disease here in Canada is 25 to 30 percent tobacco related. If these diseases aren't bad enough, smoking is directly linked to a variety of upper respiratory infections, chronic bronchitis and emphysemas, cancers of the mouth, esophagus, kidney, throat, bladder, and pancreas. Talk to some of the physicians that are performing this surgery. Talk to them and ask them what it's like when they have to, first of all, meet with the patient and advise him and, secondly, meet with the family and tell them what's happening. They'll tell you they take no pleasure in having to perform those operations.

Mr. Speaker, to be very blunt, I'm not as concerned about the adults, the adults in this Assembly and the adults in this world, that are smoking. They're doing it by choice. It's encouraging, though, to see that there are more and more adult smokers quitting. I'm sure that pleases the minister of hospitals;

I know it would help his budget considerably if we had fewer smokers. But what does concern me, and I think it was the direction that this motion was intended at, are those young people. If you look at the statistics, annual surveys prepared for Health and Welfare Canada from '82 to 1986 indicate that the age of onset of smoking remains fairly constant at 12 to 14 for both boys and girls, 12 to 14 years of age when they're making that decision to smoke. It's also interesting to note that girls at this age are more likely than boys to smoke daily, but by the age of 18 to 19, 37 percent of all teenagers are daily smokers. Other concerns that are being revealed today: it's estimated that the number of young women aged 20 to 29 who smoke daily has increased from 36 percent in '83 to 45 percent in '86; 45 percent of young women aged 20 to 29 are smoking daily. Not only is there increased tobacco use in this age group of young teenagers, but they're smoking heavier now at a younger age. The usage is up considerably.

Mr. Speaker, my heart aches when I go through these statistics, when I see kids at the age of 12 and 13 and 14 making the decision to smoke, when I hear about the hon. Member for Drumheller's daughter at 16 making that decision to smoke, when I used to drive to work each day and I'd go past the local corner store and see the kids -- and they are just kids, 11, 12, and 13 -- hanging out at the neighbourhood corner store, smoking.

And why? I mean, what chance do they really have? When you look at it, when you start deciding why, we have tobacco manufacturers spending \$100 million a year promoting smoking -- \$100 million a year. And look at the things they promote: you know, a glamorous life; great things are going to happen to you if you smoke. They show all these beautiful models and macho men and athletes and assure these young people that it's cool to smoke. And the new marketing techniques: the 15-cigarette packaging, or kiddie packs, as they're referred to, so that we can make sure that it's still affordable for these young kids to be able to keep up with their smoking. In fact, there are corner stores that I'm aware of -- and I know it's illegal -- where they're actually selling cigarettes individually because these kids can maybe only afford 20 or 25 cents, so they buy one cigarette as opposed to a pack.

It's interesting for me in a recent survey that I did in my own constituency on restricting the sale of cigarettes to young people. There is legislation in effect that says that you have to be 16 years of age to smoke, and it's obviously not being enforced, as the Member for Drumheller pointed out earlier. We have 90,000 retail outlets and 30,000 vending machines making sure that these cigarettes are available to anybody with the dollars on a 24-hour basis. But in my constituency, in the survey that I did, 79.5 percent wanted age restrictions on purchasing cigarettes, and they felt that it should be 16 years of age or older. So 79.5 percent wanted it restricted to 16 and over, and it was interesting to note that out of that 79 percent, there were 29 percent who felt it should be 18 years and over.

Now, on one hand, Mr. Speaker, we have the tobacco industry assuring us that their intentions aren't to encourage young people to smoke, that they're really competing for the existing marketplace of existing smokers. Well, I think the statistics and the numbers clarify that point in a hurry. Adult smoking is on the decline; teenage smoking is on the incline. Again, 37 percent of all teens are smoking, and it's not surprising when you see an industry spending \$100 million a year promoting it.

Mr. Speaker, it's interesting to note that there are studies out that show that if young people can make it to the age of 20 years

without smoking, they are unlikely to ever start the addictive habit. So if we can somehow help our young people, through the schools, through educational programs, through our own media advertising . . . Let's take some of that \$3.8 billion that are being generated in additional taxes and spend it on our media advertising, encouraging young people to look at other alternatives.

[Mr. Gogo in the Chair]

The Member for Drumheller suggested that perhaps AADAC might be able to take on some additional responsibilities in this area. Although I hate to jeopardize or take away from the good work that AADAC is doing already, I'd have to agree that the infrastructure that is there and the institution that is there, combined with the excellent reputation they've developed in this province over the last few years, the positive reputation and the rapport they have with the young people in the schools -- I think with some additional funding, AADAC would be a logical choice to start working with our young people in a positive way to dissuade them and discourage them from smoking. They have 26 resource centres located throughout the province already. Their experience in understanding drug and alcohol dependency problems would obviously be a tremendous asset in developing smoking cessation programs for tobacco users. They have that background; they're used to dealing with people that are fighting an addictive substance. They have extensive experience in community-based treatment programs that again could be utilized and adapted to work on smokers. Finally, Mr. Speaker, they have an antismoking campaign. It would be very much in line with the overall philosophy of AADAC, that of promoting a healthy addiction-free life-style.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I hope everyone will give full consideration to supporting this motion. It's geared at our young people, for the future of this province, as we've so often heard. I think anything that we can do to encourage these young people to not smoke or not consider smoking until the age of 20, then perhaps we'd have a lot fewer smokers and a lot fewer problems in our hospitals.

Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hon. Member for Edmonton Mill Woods.

MR. GIBEAULT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to have an opportunity to participate in the debate on Motion 218, urging the government "to take measures to ensure that young Albertans reject the use of tobacco." Of course, I support that wholeheartedly; it's a tremendous idea. But it seems to me that it is unfortunate that the issue is coming before the Assembly in this form, in the form of a private motion, because really what we need here is something that has some teeth in it, a government Bill that calls for a smoke-free workplace in this province.

MR. TAYLOR: Including the Legislature.

MR. GIBEAULT: Especially in the Legislature. We've got to show some leadership to the young people in this province, Mr. Speaker, and we should start right here in the Legislative Assembly of Alberta, I would suggest.

Now, the government likes to remind us frequently about how Alberta is number one in so many things, and in many ways we have a lot to be proud of, of course. But there are

some areas, including the protection of nonsmokers' rights, where we're way behind others. For example, in the state of Maine they've got a statute called the Offences Against Public Health Act, passed in 1985, some years ago. And they say there is to be no smoking permitted

in the State Legislature and its committees and subcommittees, any board or commission of any state agency, the Board of Trustees and Administrative Council of the University of Maine System and the Maine Maritime Academy and their committees and subcommittees and any board, commission, agency or authority of any country, municipality, school district or any other political or administrative subdivision. The [only] exception is if all members give their consent for others to smoke.

Now, that's something that's got teeth in it, Mr. Speaker. That's something I wish the government members on the other side, the government, would introduce -- the hospitals minister perhaps or our Environment minister. I'd be the first one to support that one. But this wishy-washy little motion here, as much as it has a good intent, doesn't change things one iota. It doesn't set a better example for the young people of this province. Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the government education caucus is a smoker. What kind of example is that? Our Minister of the Environment continuously polluting the environment: what kind of an example is that to the young people of this province?

The only thing I can suggest -- I want to commend the government for two actions in this area. I understand that the minister for hospitals and health care and the Minister of Community and Occupational Health have both got smoking bans in their departments, and I commend them for that. I only want to ask: how long is it going to be before the other departments get on board, Mr. Speaker? We want to have an example and some leadership here for the young people and the not-so-young people of this province, because we know the kind of damage that is done by this hazardous product of tobacco.

Now, we've got some action from our federal counterparts, Mr. Speaker. You can see that they recently came through. The hon. Mr. Crosbie, the Minister of Transport, said that on flights under two hours there will be a complete smoking ban, and I commended him for that; I wrote him a letter commending him for that. It still has not been put into effect, Mr. Speaker, because I've been on the airbus a number of times and been assaulted by the fumes of those who have no respect for the rest of us who would like to breathe clean air. But I understand that's coming, and I appreciate that.

There was another initiative by the federal government: the Hon. Jake Epp and others talking about a ban on cigarette advertising. Absolutely commendable, Mr. Speaker. That's going to go a whole lot further discouraging young people from getting into this habit and perhaps hopefully discouraging others who have taken it up than anything that has come forth from the provincial government.

The Member for Drumheller was perfectly correct in saying that he has not seen any initiative coming from the provincial government on this matter and the marginal resources that have been allocated to nonsmoking or smoking prevention or discouragement through AADAC. So we've had examples at the federal level of some initiatives. We've had examples at the local levels: the school boards in this province, a number of the postsecondary institutions have come up with smoking policies. Why is it, Mr. Speaker, that we can't get some provincial leadership and initiative in this area? I've said that we already have those two departments, and I commend them for those smoking

bans. But why can't we come through with a Bill like so many other jurisdictions in North America -- and I want to review just a few of them here -- that have come through with some real legislation that protects the rights of nonsmokers to breathe clean air?

the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care has not missed an opportunity to impress upon us the costs in his department and how they've been escalating, and I can empathize with that. But I would be able to empathize a lot more if we could see some real leadership in terms of a smoke-free workplace that would eliminate a lot of the emphysemas and the cancers and related diseases that cost so much when people have to go to the hospitals to get that damage repaired.

Now, there's just a few other jurisdictions. I mentioned Maine, for example. Minnesota has introduced the Minnesota Clean Air Act of 1975. Mr. Speaker, that was 12 years ago; Minnesota is ahead of Alberta. And they said that

smoking is not permitted in a public place or at a public meeting except it does not apply where the entire room . . . is used for a private social function and under the control of the sponsor . . . not the proprietor.

Fair enough. We've got the Montana Clean Indoor Air Act of 1979, some eight years ago. Mr. Speaker, It talks about restricting smoking in public places, and it defines public places as meaning

any indoor area, room or vehicle used by the general public or serving as a place of work, including but not limited to restaurants, stores, offices, trains, buses, educational or health care facilities, auditoriums, arenas, assembly and meeting rooms open to the public,

Nebraska has passed the Clean Indoor Air Act of 1979, New Jersey has passed An Act Controlling Smoking in Government Buildings. The purpose of that Act. and that was passed in 1985,

is to protect the interests of the nonsmoker by prohibiting smoking in government buildings or portions which are owned or leased by a government entity and includes all schools, colleges, universities, professional training buildings, health care facilities and premises used for sporting events or recreational purposes.

Now, that's leadership, Mr. Speaker, and that was two years ago. Where are we here in Alberta? What's taking us so long here to come up with a smoke-free workplace Act with some teeth in it?

What about the state of Utah, not known for being particularly progressive, well known for being conservative. But in 1976, some 11 years ago, they passed the Cigarettes and Psychotoxic Chemical Solvents Act, which prohibited smoking in public places as defined as

any indoor area used by the general public or serving as a place of work, including but not limited to restaurants, hospitals, medical and dental clinics, public conveyances, retail stores, offices, and other commercial establishments, nursing homes, auditoriums, theatres, arenas, meeting rooms, and commercial kitchens, and buildings constructed, maintained or otherwise supported . . .

and I underline this, Mr. Speaker,

. . . by tax revenues in whole or in part.

Another state that's got an excellent, excellent law on the smoke-free workplace, and here again, we in Alberta, as the Member for Drumheller so clearly indicated, are behind the times.

What about in our sister province of Quebec, for example, and this is one of my favourites, Mr. Speaker, because they just passed An Act Respecting the Protection of Non-Smokers in Certain Public Places in 1986. The Act came into effect on January 1, 1987. and the person responsible for enforcing this is the Minister of the Environment. I hope our minister is paying attention to that. I think that's admirable, and I would like to see something similar in the province of Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, there is also at the federal level a Bill that was introduced in the last session, the Non Smokers Health Act. Bill C-291, which was given first reading on June 25, 1986, and was unfortunately allowed to die on the Order Paper. But I'm certainly going to be lobbying my federal representatives to press this, to bring it forward again. In that Bill they referred to the smoke-free environment, meaning

an office or other enclosed work space whose air contains during working hours a maximum daily average concentration of 0.75 micrograms of tobacco tar per cubic metre of air or such lower concentration as may be approved by the Governor in Council by regulation.

And it says here in particular in this Bill that

every employer is to provide a smoke-free environment for their employees.

Not shall or maybe or will or if it's convenient, but every employer "will" provide a smoke-free environment. The employer can designate a smoking room for smokers. That's fine, but if the employer does not comply with this provision 12 months after coming into force, then the employer is guilty of an offence and is liable to a fine of \$10,000. Now, that's the kind of fine that companies understand. They're going to be very prompt at getting together and getting in place regulations for a smoke-free workplace.

We've got to get serious about this, Mr. Speaker. We've got serious fines for people who pollute the environment, and we haven't got many convictions yet from our current provincial government in that regard. But the laws are there, and I would like to see something similar for a smoke-free workplace so that we can really bring into full fruition, if you like, the meaning of Motion 218, so that at every workplace young people go to, are served by, participate in, there's no smoking and we don't get that bad example that smoking is a macho thing to do, that's it's cool to do, because it's certainly not.

At the federal level another initiative that has gone along this line was the efforts of Physicians for a Smoke-free Canada last year, who filed a statement of claim on May 5, '86. with evidence to suggest that tobacco products contribute to the deaths of more than 30,000 Canadians a year and that tobacco advertising fails to warn that health hazards are associated with smoking. There's no question about that, and I once again would commend the federal government for its most recent proposal to prohibit the advertising of cigarettes and smoking products, certainly a step in the right direction.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the Member for Drumheller for raising this issue. I think young people and Albertans of all ages are coming closer and closer to the view that smoking is simply not acceptable in public places. It's going to be the kind of activity that you will relegate to behind closed doors, just like some other private activities, but not in public places, not where other people have to be present.

The only thing I can say is that it's unfortunately sad, as the Member for Drumheller pointed out, that we are simply not getting any leadership whatsoever from the provincial government on this issue, and I throw that challenge to the government.

Let's have an effective, strong Bill introduced soon for a smoke-free workplace, one that's got teeth in it and an Act that will protect the rights of nonsmokers in the province of Alberta.

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to speak in favour of the motion proposed by my colleague the Member for Drumheller, who has urged that we approve the government's taking "measures to ensure that young Albertans reject the use of tobacco." There is over time no question that public views are changing, and tobacco use is now an increasingly unacceptable behaviour. There's a spectrum of issues including smokers' and nonsmokers' rights, the health effects of passive smoking, productivity and smoking in the workplace, advertising and promotion of tobacco products, agricultural practices, international marketing and, most importantly, recruitment of youth as tobacco consumers.

Mr. Speaker, I want to just take a few minutes to concentrate on that area, the recruitment of young smokers. The tobacco industry, of course, would never say that they actively and intentionally promote their products to young people. They will never say that. Yet any of us -- and all of us are bombarded with thousands of ads a day -- if we see these ads and look at them, look at how they depict smoking, it clearly suggests that the industry has one target. More often than not these ads attempt to equate smoking with the theme of fitness, health, success, beauty, the wild west, independence, and other common aspirations of young people. Equally disturbing is the subtle attempt to portray the use of tobacco as an essential part of initiation into adulthood: you've come a long way, baby.

The reason behind this interest in recruiting youth is not difficult to understand. You see, the percentage of smokers is dropping, so the tobacco industry has to move now. It has found the void and wants to fill that void created by those who have quit. Given that smoking is a very difficult habit to give up -- and as the Member for Red Deer South indicated recently in his remarks, I'm a converted smoker, so I know that I'm preaching now.

AN HON. MEMBER: A confession?

MR. STEVENS: It's a confession. But it is a difficult habit to give up, and we have to give comfort and help and assistance and advice to those who smoke and who are trying to wean themselves of the habit.

MR. WEISS: How about those who smoke pipes?

MR. STEVENS: And smoking pipes or cigars. I put them all in the same category, Member for Fort McMurray.

But given that it is a difficult habit to give up, the young consumer then is viewed by the industry as a potential long-term consumer, and in my view these recruitments work with distressing effectiveness.

There's another thing that's happening as the Hon. Jake Epp is developing a strategy to eliminate advertising for smoking over the next two years. What is happening now is that the industry is moving very rapidly into the performing arts sponsorship area and moving rapidly into the sport area and moving into the Olympic movement. Now, I can't imagine anything that makes such little sense as to see one of our top-performing athletes racing down a ski hill or doing an incredible performance on the new Canada Olympic Park facilities and then refreshingly lighting up a cigarette. The two things do not make

sense. So, as we've learned from many of the contributions this afternoon, there is a great deal of concern.

My last comment, Mr. Speaker, before I take my place is that, as I mentioned earlier in Motion 216, I am very concerned about the degree to which young women are being recruited to smoke; 34 percent of females aged 15 to 17 smoke daily, compared to about 25 percent of their male counterparts. Yet as we age, as young women and young men grow older, the percentage of daily smokers is now increasing in the female age group. By age 20 to 24, over half of our female population is smoking. In light of the fact that for society as a whole only one-third of adults smoke, the magnitude of the problem among young people, particularly young females, is most distressing and most disturbing. So I very much support the motion by the Member for Drumheller.

MR. TAYLOR: Just a couple minutes, Mr. Speaker. [some applause] Thank you very much. It could go to my head.

I'm supporting the motion here, and I'm just going to make a couple of quick points. I agree with members that have stated that the government hasn't been providing enough leadership, and I thought I had a couple of suggestions I would like to make, particularly to the hon. minister of health, who we've been fighting with quite regularly because he wants to put a surcharge here and a surcharge there, deinsure this and deinsure that. It seems to me that one of the easiest things he could put in is some sort of deterrent factor in the premiums paid for those that smoke. On the other hand, after a certain age if they're still smoking and it seems that they want to commit suicide, why should you worry about funding their hospital and other care? At least that's a possibility that you could be thinking about. It is probably one of the few areas where you can deliberately go out to maim yourself and the state will come along and pick up a hundred percent of the costs of trying to put you together. If you do nearly anything else, you get declared a weirdo and are put off in some sort of a home or institution where you cannot harm yourself. Admittedly it costs some, but at least you're out of the way of society.

I think the hon. Member for Smoky River could be giving some thought -- and he might be surprised that for a change when he brought up the suggestion in the Legislature, he would get a great deal of support. Right now all he gets is snowballs and brickbats when he comes up with suggestions that save money, rightfully so, of course, because I think they are all harebrained. So I offer this thing to him free of charge with the guarantee that probably the opposition would support him. Unless that causes a heart attack in return if we all start slapping our desk and praising him, he could try it.

The second area which the hon. Member for Banff-Cochrane hit on is so very, very good, and it's so very, very obvious that this government could do something about it and does nothing. I don't know if most members realize that every dollar that a tobacco company spends in trying to convince people, the youth -- your youth, everybody's youth -- to smoke is deductible from their taxable income. We have the right to make our own corporation tax laws here, and we could take the leadership even if the national government hasn't got the guts to give up that source of revenue and to get rid of the antiquated rule, the antiquated law, based on the idea that all consumption is good. It may be fine to buy more cars, to buy more shoes, to buy more wheat, that advertising is right to be a full deduction against taxable income. But to deduct against taxable income the cost of advertising cigarettes has to be one of the most backward antediluvian ideas

that we still retain in our society. The Alberta government still could within its own ambit announce tomorrow, if we can get the Treasurer cornered and not so happy about selling his 8.5 percent bonds, to change the tax laws to say that any company that is filing for expense deduction on their Alberta income tax, it will not be allowed, that as far as the Alberta government is concerned the deduction for advertising for cigarettes will not be allowed in calculating their taxable income.

That suggestion I give to you. It's very easy to do. It's the easiest thing to do because the tax people are allowed and from time to time decide what you can deduct and what you can't deduct. You can't deduct taking your wife out to dinner as a business expense, but you can deduct buying an ad to advertise cigarettes to warp and ruin the younger generation, talk them into smoking.

Those two very quick suggestions, Mr. Speaker, to a government that seems to be sadly out of ideas and imagination, I offer free of charge, and I will wait to hear what they say.

Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hon. Member for Calgary Glenmore.

MRS. MIROSH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have to rise and just give a couple of comments regarding smoking, since I'm the one that's always lecturing my colleagues about their habits -- smoking habits, that is.

AN HON. MEMBER: You have to clarify that.

MRS. MIROSH: Yeah, I have to clarify that just in case the *Sun* is here.

Our own caucus used to be three-quarters smokers and the rest nonsmokers, and now . . .

MR. TAYLOR: A hundred percent of our caucus doesn't smoke.

MRS. MIROSH: What can I say? You're so wonderful.

AN HON. MEMBER: A hundred percent of nothing is nothing over there.

MRS. MIROSH: A hundred percent of nothing is nothing.

Now in our caucus there are only, I think, about 12 left that smoke, and in the last year three have quit [interjection] Eleven? One more has just quit. Takers? Halvar will probably be next.

But actually I think that this is a sign of excellent leadership when our own government members are quitting, and it should show our children a sign of leadership. I feel that I've learned from raising three teenagers that it doesn't pay to nag and consistently give them positive feedback about nonsmoking, be-

cause I have two of them in my family that are smoking. But I think that it's because of the girls. I have only sons, and I see these ads in magazines, as the Member for Banff-Cochrane alluded to, with these girls with nice bathing suits on with a cigarette in their hand. Of course, the boys see this and they're encouraged to smoke. Now, I can't stop them from seeing girls, so I have to talk to the girls. I really feel that it is peer pressure, a peer thing. The way that we can help our young adults to quit smoking is by showing leadership. The Canadian Lung Association is a good example, where they have that yield sign that says: lungs at work -- no smoking. I think those kinds of subtle signs are really encouraging to our young adults.

I really feel, as a medical person, that it is something that I certainly have to endorse and know that, as the Member for Red Deer South alluded to, it does create serious diseases and upper respiratory infections. I'm sorry that the House leader from the NDP isn't here, because she's showing signs of emphysema. However, there's nothing we can do about her; she isn't showing true leadership. I really enjoy my colleague in charge of Environment. He always says, "Do as I say, not as I do." I bet his children don't smoke, because they probably can't stand the smell of it. They're learning from him. The Deputy Speaker sits there and smokes on his pipe; I bet his children don't smoke, because they probably can't stand it.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hon. member, the Chair is having some difficulty reconciling the . . . [interjections]

MRS. MIROSH: I have to take this opportunity, because I don't get it very often, to lecture my colleagues who smoke.

We talk about the teachers giving education; tell our children not to smoke. I was at an Alberta Teachers' Association meeting today and half of those teachers are smoking. How can they teach our children to quit smoking? So it has to come from the leaders, and we're the leaders right here in this room. We're getting better at it.

Mr. Speaker, in spite of the fact that you may call me out of order, I really feel this is a very serious situation and we do have to encourage our young people. I think that we have to encourage them by continuing education from the home and from the signs.

In light of the hour I'd like to move for adjournment.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Moved by the hon. Member for Calgary Glenmore that we adjourn the debate on this item. All in favour, please say aye.

HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Those opposed, please say no. Carried.

[The House recessed at 5:27 p.m.]