

## Legislative Assembly of Alberta

Title: **Tuesday, April 10, 1990 2:30 p.m.**

Date: 90/04/10

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

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: **Prayers**

MR. SPEAKER: Let us pray.

Our Father, keep us mindful of the special and unique opportunity we have to work for our constituents and our province, and in that work give us strength and wisdom.

Amen.

head: **Reading and Receiving Petitions**

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

[Motion carried]

head: **Notices of Motions**

MR. McINNIS: Mr. Speaker, I wish to give verbal notice under Standing Order 40 to move at the end of question period that this House is aware of the importance of National Wildlife Week, April 8 to 14, in the battle to preserve our natural habitat and that the House hereby lends its support to the Endangered Spaces campaign of the World Wildlife Fund and the Canadian Parks and Wilderness Society.

I have copies for all hon. members.

MR. SPEAKER: Perhaps the first copy could come to the Chair, thank you very much.

head: **Tabling Returns and Reports**

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased today to table the Achieving a Balance report of the Ministerial Advisory Committee on Residential Tenancy along with its executive summary.

MRS. BETKOWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to table with the Assembly the annual report of the College of Physical Therapists of Alberta for the years ended February 28, '87, and February 29, 1988. I'm also tabling the annual report of the Alberta Registered Dietitians Association for the year ended April 30, 1989. Copies will be distributed to all members.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

head: **Introduction of Special Guests**

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure, sir, to introduce to you and through you to Members of the Legislative Assembly a group of students from the Strathcona Christian Academy in the constituency of Sherwood Park. They are joined by their teacher Mr. D. Zook and the bus driver Lorraine Anderson. They're seated in the members' gallery, and I would ask if they would rise and receive the warm welcome of this Legislative Assembly.

MR. WOLOSHYN: Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to introduce to you and through you to the members of the Legislature 35 exchange students from Germany. They are visiting Woodhaven junior high school. They are accompanied today by their teachers Anna-Luise Ehren, Harald Pries, Detlef Neumann, and parent Woody Murray. I'd ask them to rise and receive the warm welcome of this Assembly.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure to introduce to you and through you to members of this Assembly a four-member delegation of college administrators from Thailand. They are accompanied by Mr. Bill Knibbs from Medicine Hat College. This delegation is visiting various colleges and schools in Alberta. They are seated in your gallery. I would ask them to rise and receive the warm welcome of this Assembly.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure this afternoon to introduce delegates from Saskatchewan and Manitoba that are attending the rural/community development ministers meetings here that we held this morning and last evening. I'd like to first of all introduce those from Manitoba, led by the Hon. Jack Penner, the minister: Gerry Forrest, deputy minister, along with executive assistant, Scott Ransome. From the province of Saskatchewan: the Hon. Neal Hardy, Minister of Rural Development; Bill Reader, deputy minister; Glennys Perkins, ministerial assistant; Dennis Webster, ADM of Rural Development; and Keith Schneider, ADM, Urban Affairs. We welcome them to our province. Certainly I've been very encouraged by the support and the co-operation that we have had between the provinces. British Columbia had to leave to attend to other responsibilities, but we have committed ourselves to co-operating for full western . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. minister. I'm sorry; we're not . . .

Edmonton-Whitemud.

MR. WICKMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It gives me a great deal of pleasure to introduce to you and through you to Members of the Legislative Assembly the student leaders, members of the student council, of Harry Ainlay high school. They are headed up today by Kim Wallace, president of the student council, and also accompanied by Gane Olsen, student council advisor. I would ask that all members of this Assembly, upon their rising in the members' gallery, acknowledge these individuals who were kind enough to give me two hours of their time.

MR. GIBEAULT: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to introduce to you and the members of the House this afternoon some 46 students from Meyokumin school in the constituency of Edmonton-Mill Woods. They're accompanied today by their teachers Wanda Green, Maureen Von Tigerstrom, and Vlad Eshenko. I'd ask them now to rise and receive our very warm welcome.

head: **Oral Question Period**

**Landlord and Tenant Policy Study**

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. I see that we finally do have the committee report. It's been a long time coming. We have mentioned

first of all that in the report there are some very good recommendations. It suggests, frankly, a number of changes that tenants have been asking for for years. I think it's deficient in one respect: in not asking for a rent review board. But, again, there are some good recommendations. I noticed in the press release, however, that the minister says that he needs some feedback, Mr. Speaker. I would have thought he'd had lots of that already. But I'd say to the minister that none of these recommendations are particularly radical. Surely now all the tenants of Alberta need is a government with the political will to give them the changes that they need. I want to specifically ask this minister: rather than a lot of feedback over a lot of years, will the minister assure the tenants of Alberta that changes will be made in this spring session?

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, with respect to the report which was released yesterday by the committee on residential tenancies, consisting of landlords and tenants, I would say to the hon. leader that I am pleased to look at changes and recommend such to my own caucus as soon as we have the response from landlords and tenants. The leader, if he's had a chance to look at the report, would note that there are some fundamental changes. In fact, the report suggests throwing out the entire Landlord and Tenant Act as it exists, doing away with current landlord and tenant advisory boards, establishing something called a residential tenancy commission: all of those. We should at least have the response from those people it would affect so fundamentally.

MR. MARTIN: Well, Mr. Speaker, there may be some recommendations in there that do require study, but a lot of these things seem to me to be self-evident. I'd remind the minister that we've been studying this for a long time. This committee was set up in early 1989, Mr. Speaker. We do have a crisis with vacancy rates in Calgary as low as .7 percent. So in view of the minister's answer, could he be a little more specific? He wouldn't talk about the spring session. When does the minister hope to come back and act on some of these recommendations? Will you give us a time frame?

MS BARRETT: Do it soon, Dennis.

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, the hon. leader has rightfully pointed to the vacancy rates that exist in Calgary and Edmonton, although I would draw his attention to the statement in the report itself that indicates that despite the fact that there are low vacancy rates, "even with the current round of 20% to 30% rent increases, the rental rates are still below" that of 1980-81. This is from the report's executive summary. In addition, it does indicate that the long-term effect of rent control would be to reduce or stifle that development. So we have to look at those items too.

I would, though, commit to the hon. member and to all hon. members that as soon as we can get a response, and I'm asking for one as fast as possible from landlord and tenant groups and from the advisory boards, we would look at the very fundamental changes and the number of innovative and excellent ideas that are in this report.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, the fact that rents are less exorbitant now than they were in 1980-81 is frankly irrelevant to renters that are facing some very stiff rent increases.

My question again to the minister. He says: as quickly as possible. I think I'm asking the question that renters in this province want to know. As quickly as possible can mean different things to different ministers. Can he be more specific and tell us when he will be reacting and bringing in changes? Will it be this year, will it be 1995, or when?

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, the report is fundamental in terms of its change in our total system of operating that Landlord and Tenant Act or balance of fairness between the landlord and the tenant in the province. I don't know if the leader is suggesting that we should implement this without that kind of input from both, making those changes without that consideration or not.

I should make one point clear, Mr. Speaker, and that is that even with the changes suggested, there would not be, in fact, a stopping of the rent increases that the member and I are both concerned about. That has to be dealt with, as is indicated in the report, by a market circumstance in which we have enough accommodation to supply the competition necessary to keep those down. Nonetheless, the report does point to a number of areas, in fact to a total review of our system of balance of fairness between the landlord and tenant, and we are committed to looking at that balance and to doing what's necessary to continue a fair and honest marketplace.

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

MR. MARTIN: I just hope we're not asking these questions next spring, Mr. Speaker.

### Alberta-Pacific Project Report

MR. MARTIN: I'd like to direct the second set of questions to the Premier to follow up from yesterday. We know that the government has decided to spend between \$300,000 and \$400,000 of taxpayers' money to review the proposed Al-Pac project. The Premier made an interesting statement yesterday in the House. He says, "Let's have balanced assessment, and then let's make a balanced judgment." That's precisely why we're raising these questions: because we wonder about the balance. The company hired to carry out this unnecessary review, we say to you, is biased. It has a long and profitable association with the pulp industry. As I mentioned yesterday, it recommended the Athabasca region for an Al-Pac type project back in 1983. We don't believe it has credibility to cover this, Mr. Speaker. I want to again ask the Premier: how does he justify spending hundreds of thousands of taxpayers' dollars on an unnecessary report prepared by a biased company?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I'd just draw again to the attention of the hon. Leader of the Opposition the government's position, which I announced when the report was first received. At that time I said:

All departments [of the government] that are impacted by the report of the Review Board will start a comprehensive review of its recommendations right away. In addition, an independent assessment of the scientific data . . . will be launched.

And then I went on to say that

the independent assessment will use recognized world experts.

Mr. Speaker, that's what the government is doing.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, it's hardly an independent assessment when you have the same company going back over the recommendations they made in 1983. That's precisely the point. I want to ask: does the Premier really believe that this company is going to report back and say that their recommendations were wrong in 1983? Why doesn't he admit that they were hired to thrash the Al-Pac review panel, and be honest about it?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, it is remarkable that the hon. Leader of the Opposition would now talk about the government who appointed this board thrashing that review panel. I mean, let's look at the hypocrisy of that statement. If you just look in *Hansard* on June 7, 1989, the hon. Leader of the Opposition:

The [Al-Pac] committee he's talking [about] has been handpicked by the government . . . How in the world can he say that this is a fair process and expect Albertans to believe him?

Or his opposition critic, on July 12:

Some of them stand to benefit financially from a favourable ruling. How can he justify [that committee]?

Or the member of the Liberal Party:

It's now absolutely clear that the newly appointed Al-Pac environmental review board is a complete disaster.

Now, just with advice like that, Mr. Speaker, you'd think we had better assess the report.

Or to go on with Mr. Mitchell:

The environmental impact assessment process for the . . . pulp mill is seriously flawed . . .

They'll be unable to report.

Mr. Speaker, the government has been taking the responsible position. We appointed people, they came down with a report, we thanked them for it, I congratulated them for it, and now we're doing an assessment of it.

MR. MARTIN: It's certainly nice that the Premier's learned how to read in the last little while, Mr. Speaker, but the reality is that they were forced, kicking and screaming, into holding this review to begin with. They expected to get certain answers, and they didn't get them. That's why they're bringing in a biased company to try to overturn the results. Could the Premier at least do this, at least do one thing, Mr. Speaker? Because they're going to be looking at this behind closed doors, will the Premier have the Minister of the Environment table the terms of reference for the review so Albertans will at least know what their tax dollars are being wasted on?

MR. GETTY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I come back to the hon. Leader of the Opposition's comments that I referred to earlier. Now, how could we be wasting money, having been told by him that this committee

has been handpicked by the government . . . How in the world can he say that this is a fair process and expect Albertans to believe him?

He said that, not me, Mr. Speaker. He said it. So we are doing an assessment. You'd think he'd be thrilled that we were doing the assessment, from the way he and Mr. McInnis described it.

MR. MARTIN: That's unparliamentary, Mr. Speaker. He has to learn the rules the same as anybody else.

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has raised a request that I'll review with the Minister of the Environment to see whether we can't provide him what he'd like.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

There was an accurate catcall across the way indeed. We have no member in this House by the name of McInnis; nor do we have a member of the House by the name of Dennis, which was called across.

Leader of the Liberal Party, the Member for Edmonton-Glengarry.

### Goods and Services Tax

MR. DECORE: Mr. Speaker, my questions are to the hon. Premier. Today marks the final day on which the Conservative majority in Ottawa puts the final touches to GST legislation. To use the Prime Minister's own words, Alberta is about to be hosed but good. The provincial government has been long in rhetoric in this area, claiming to be a leader amongst provinces in opposing GST, but yesterday we saw the situation where the government refused to have this Assembly pass a motion condemning the debating process with regard to GST. Today I'd like to find out just how far the provincial government is prepared to go in leading opposition to this GST legislation. My first question is this: will the Premier call on the Senate to exercise its power by doing everything it can to stop the GST legislation?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, obviously the Parliament that we have will deal with legislation before it. I might say this: if the various Liberal governments that appointed most of the members of the Senate had ever thought like our government and the people here in Alberta, that Senate would be filled with elected people who had some credibility and could stand up to the House of Commons.

MR. DECORE: Mr. Speaker, unfortunately the Premier must not have understood the question. We have the opportunity to stop this thing cold in its tracks. Will the Premier agree to ask the Senate, the Conservatives and the Liberals and the NDs in that Senate, to put the kibosh . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: There are no NDs in the Senate.

MR. DECORE: There are none; that's right. And they'll never be appointed or elected there anyway.

Will the Premier agree to ask all members of the Senate, whatever political persuasion, that they kibosh this GST that's bad for Alberta?

MR. GETTY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I just dealt with the matter. I might recall for all members of the House that the hon. leader of the Liberal Party back in 1988 was one of the supporters of the GST.

MR. DECORE: It's clear that we're not going to get leadership and we're only going to get rhetoric from the hon. Premier on this point. My last question is the most important, Mr. Speaker, hon. Premier. [interjections] Now, wait for it. Now, wait for it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. [interjections] Order.

MR. DECORE: Mr. Speaker, will the Premier commit his government to passing a resolution in this Assembly asking that the Senate kill the GST legislation?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, it is not the intention of the government to follow that course of action. Much better that we follow the course of action that we have, which is to rally all Canadians behind the government of Alberta, including all other provincial governments. That way we've been able to bring the pressure to bear on the federal government.

MR. WICKMAN: But, Don, the Senate . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. You get your turn later.  
Calgary-Fish Creek.

#### **Landlord and Tenant Policy Study** (continued)

MR. PAYNE: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could follow up on the questions directed to the minister earlier by the Leader of the Opposition. It has to do with the recent landlord and tenant relationships report. The most frequently raised objection or complaint by tenants during those committee hearings was the failure of landlords to maintain the properties that were being rented out. Now, the current Act, as I understand it, places no duty whatsoever on the landlord to maintain premises during the term of tenancy. My question to the relevant minister today is: does he have a preliminary policy position with respect to this recommendation from the committee to enact this additional landlord obligation to in fact maintain the premises?

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, I'm going to want to review the report in some detail, as I'm sure the hon. member would. With respect to that specific provision, it does put an onus on whatever government agency or organization is responsible for looking at the landlord and tenant relationships that's much greater than we currently have in the Act. It would require that there be some mechanism to ensure that that property is maintained and to judge whether or not that in fact is taking place. In the provisions of the report, at least the way I read them, the committee suggests a residential tenancies commission, which would be funded by deposit interest on the accommodation. That would provide the staff. I don't have a specific position regarding this and would not take one on various elements of the report since they should be taken as a group, and I was advised strongly to do that by the chairman in a discussion with him yesterday just before he released the report.

MR. PAYNE: Well, on the other side of the landlord/tenant equation, Mr. Speaker, the committee agreed with the landlord who requested a reduction in the length of notice required if the tenant in fact is guilty of a substantial breach of the renter's agreement. Does the minister have a preliminary policy position on this proposal, to strengthen the landlord's position?

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, whatever we do with respect to a final decision regarding the Landlord and Tenant Act or, as the committee suggests, the new residential tenancy Act, it has to have a fair balance between the rights of the landlord for his property and the investment that he's put in place and the rights of the tenant for that place where they must live and have some security for. The proposal not only sets out the one the hon. member suggested but a series of possibilities with respect to having a tenant vacate for various reasons and various time frames and for having a tenant able to secure their length of stay by requiring a reason from the landlord as well. There are a

number of specifics that I'm sure the House will want to review in some detail, as I will, over the next few days.

MR. SPEAKER: Stony Plain, followed by Calgary-McKnight.

#### **Smoky Lake Poultry Plant**

MR. WOLOSHTYN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday in response to my question the Premier stated that I had raised a very serious matter. Given that the Premier should have by now had the opportunity to look into this matter and to acquaint himself with the information that is readily available, will the Premier tell Albertans whether or not he finds the actions of the Member for Redwater-Andrew in this matter . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Order please. [interjections]  
Order. Order, hon. member.

MR. McEACHERN: What's the problem?

MR. SPEAKER: The question is entirely out of order.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Why?

MR. SPEAKER: Because the matter is being raised as a point of privilege by the Member for Redwater-Andrew.

MR. McEACHERN: That's his problem. Let's hear the question.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Kingsway, please be quiet.

Due notice has been given to the Chair with respect to a point of privilege. The same notice was given to the Member for Stony Plain, who is well aware of the fact that this issue will be dealt with after question period this afternoon.

The Chair now recognizes Calgary-McKnight.

#### **Advanced Education Enrollment Limits**

MRS. GAGNON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Advanced Education insists on perpetuating the myth that the postsecondary education system in this province is adequately funded. Because his department indicated to the University of Alberta that they would not get extra per student funding if their enrollment went up, the General Faculties Council at the U of A has decided to put a ceiling on total campus enrollment for next year, resulting in 400 or 500 qualified Albertans being prevented from attending the University of Alberta. Although the minister has said that there's room at the University of Lethbridge and there are many college transfer programs, our research indicates that the fact is that these institutions are full. To the minister. What does the minister have to say to parents today who have worked very hard to provide a college or university education for their children and who will find that there is no room for them in Alberta?

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, the University of Alberta, which has some 29,000 students, is a very successful institution, and I will recognize the interest of both students and parents in Alberta wanting to attend that institution. The fact of the matter is, however, which is somewhat contrary to the hon. member's question, that we have some 29 institutions in Alberta, many of which offer university training programs. My information is that

there is sufficient space in the system this year for those who wish to enroll.

The day of those students wishing to attend the institution of their choice and taking the program of their choice, with respect, Mr. Speaker, is rapidly changing. I have not had any official notice from the University of Alberta as to what their new policy is. I would expect that in due course the board of governors, which by law are the people responsible for setting admission standards, would inform me as to what their decisions and recommendations are.

MRS. GAGNON: Mr. Speaker, I find it quite alarming that the minister would say that the day of choice is over in Alberta, choice of program and choice of institution.

My second question to the minister is: was the minister advocating in his comments yesterday that universities should have a fire sale of their assets to pay for operating budgets and to provide quality education?

MR. GOGO: Well, again, Mr. Speaker, I don't know quite how to take the hon. member's question with regard to fire sale. I'm certainly not the author of any statement. I would point out that if one looks at the billion dollar commitment of this government to the postsecondary system in terms of advanced education and looks at the fact that if Alberta's not at the top it runs very close to the top in per capita funding, then surely institutions are going to have to look at other sources of revenue with which to maintain their institutions.

I would point out that the University of Alberta is very unique. It has assets of about \$1.8 billion, and it has a tremendous amount of agricultural land within the city limits of Edmonton. Whether the board chooses to utilize some of its assets by converting them to income such as leasing their land and producing that revenue is a decision of the board. My responsibility as minister is to see that Albertans who have the ability plus the desire to get a postsecondary education have that opportunity, not as a right but as a privilege, and we will do everything within our power to see that happen. So, quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, the reference to having a fire sale or to anything similar to that is certainly alien to the thinking of this minister.

MR. SPEAKER: Grande Prairie, followed by Edmonton-Highlands.

### **Oldman River Dam**

DR. ELLIOTT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. When it's springtime in the Rockies we have snowmelt and runoff and soil erosion throughout much of Alberta because of the slope of this land. Those of us in the north live on soil that's extremely sensitive and fragile and very easily abused, but it's even worse in the southern part of the province because of the slope, where water comes out of the mountains and goes across the province very quickly. Water management is more vital there than most places, and that's where we have the dam project on the Oldman River. We've recently had federal people from Ottawa visiting us in that part of the province, and I was wondering if they were instrumental at all in hastening the progress of that dam or whether they are proving to be an impediment. I was wondering if the Minister of Public Works, Supply and Services would bring us up to date on that.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, as a result of a lot of interest with respect to the Oldman River dam in recent weeks, there was a visitation delegation out from one Member of Parliament who did visit the Oldman River damsite in recent days. In talking to a number of representative groups from southern Alberta, the individuals in the southern part of the province of Alberta determined that they should lead a delegation to go to Ottawa. That delegation is accompanied by petitions, submissions, resolutions on behalf of well over 300,000 individuals in this province who declared their interest and support for the continuing construction of the Oldman River dam. That delegation was in Ottawa yesterday and is in Ottawa today. Joining that delegation are two Members of this Legislative Assembly: the Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest and the Member for Cypress-Redcliff. They will be extending an invitation to the federal Minister of the Environment, the Hon. Lucien Bouchard, to come and visit the most important environmental enhancement and mitigation construction project under way currently in North America.

DR. ELLIOTT: Again to the minister, Mr. Speaker. Would he have any information on the time frame for this important project and whether delays will continue?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, as we stand here today, the Oldman River dam is on target by way of a construction schedule that was defined for it in the early part of 1986, and it's within the budget announced by myself several years ago. The conclusion time frame for the fill of the reservoir will be the fall of 1991, and construction is under way unabated, continuing the schedule that was outlined earlier. Hopefully all things will be in place to ensure that the people of southern Alberta will have an opportunity to have security with respect to water, wildlife will have a place to find feed, municipalities, towns, and villages will have a secure water supply, industry will be in place, and the quality of life for the southern part of the province of Alberta can equate with that which is provided to the citizens of Edmonton and Calgary.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Highlands.

### **Advanced Education Funding**

MS BARRETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The University of Alberta's been suffering overcrowding and underfunding consistently for the last eight years. In fact, only in election years have their grants gone up to even meet or slightly surpass inflation. Now they're looking at locking out some 400 to 500 qualified students. They've had to raise the entrance requirements year after year. That hasn't worked. They're going to raise tuitions next year. That hasn't worked. The fact of the matter is that these kids work hard, and they're being shut out of university. I'd like to ask the minister this. Seeing as how the government has known for years that this crunch was coming – it was anticipated seven years ago – is the minister's answer to these students that their number one priority, so-called, for education has changed or is he going to argue that this backlog of five years is just a temporary problem?

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, the government's priorities have not changed.

MS BARRETT: Well, Mr. Speaker, if the government's priorities haven't changed, why is it that this government is asking students to pay more and get less? Will the minister explain why it is that students are being asked to pay an extra \$15 million a year in tuition fees, the institutions are being underfunded compared to the rate of inflation, and this minister says that there is no access crisis? What's he going to do to solve it?

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, I can't answer all the questions the hon. member has asked, but I'll respond to one of them. Tuition fees in Alberta are the second lowest in the nation. There seems to be general feeling amongst most people, including the student leaders I've met with, that quality of education is most important. One of the ways that perhaps we should move is to encourage the students to have a vested financial interest in their own education. The government announced on January 3 that the institutions were able, not compelled, to do certain things. One of those ways was to increase their revenues by as much as \$15 million via tuition fees. Added to the \$23 million I announced, that came to a 5 percent increase. Surely if we expect the health care system and other institutions to get along at 3 and a half percent, then I would suggest to the hon. member that a 5 percent increase to the U of A, which is only one of 29 institutions in Alberta, is probably a pretty good deal.

MR. SPEAKER: Calgary-Mountain View, followed by Edmonton-Whitemud.

#### **Goods and Services Tax** (continued)

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Albertans are angry and fed up with the Mulroney Conservatives for shoving the goods and services tax down our throats. What seems to have been lost on this government is that Albertans are also angry with them for failing to seriously oppose their federal chums over this tax. Other than write one brief a few months ago, they've done nothing serious to fight it. So my question this afternoon is to the Premier. He had a chance at last weekend's Conservative convention. Did he tell Alberta Tory MPs that he and his MLAs will work to defeat every one of them who votes yes for the GST?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, we certainly made sure that all of the representatives of the Conservative Party in the House of Commons know how strongly we and all Albertans feel about the GST.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Mr. Speaker, Albertans are serious about fighting this tax. One hundred and sixty thousand of them voted no, and they haven't finished counting all the votes that were cast yesterday. On the other hand, this government has turned down every request that's been made to them by us and by others to fight Ottawa on this tax. They have one last chance to show Albertans whose side they're really on. The Premier has two or three hours before they start counting the votes in the House of Commons. Is the Premier prepared to do even this little bit: go into his office, start to phone Alberta Tory MPs, and tell them that if they vote yes to the GST tonight, Alberta

Conservatives will work for their defeat at the next general election?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, the question he just asked is similar to his first question. I've already explained to him, and I'm prepared to do it again: this government has led the fight in Canada against the goods and services tax. [interjections] The hon. members may not like it, but that's a fact of life. We have rallied all of the provinces together against the goods and services tax. We've pressed the federal government at national forums. We've pressed them throughout Alberta. We've caused them to change their plans. We've caused them to cut the size of the tax. Now, Mr. Speaker, they make a decision, and they're responsible to the people who elected them.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Whitemud, followed by Highwood.

#### **Housing Rent Increases**

MR. WICKMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Report of the Ministerial Advisory Committee on Residential Tenancy that was released today has a number of fine recommendations that I hope will be addressed very, very promptly. However, the emerging crisis that continues, that's out there today, that's out there right now, is the concern being expressed and the impact being felt by the substantial rental increases faced by tenants, and I'm talking today. Mr. Speaker, the Premier has previously responded within this Assembly that this matter is under review and some action may be forthcoming. May I ask the Premier: when will this government take steps to address the rental crisis in Alberta that we are faced with today?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs has been dealing with the matter in the House already today. Perhaps he or the Minister of Municipal Affairs may want to respond to the hon. member. It has been dealt with already in the House and considerably over the past period of time.

MR. WICKMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, my question didn't relate specifically to the report. My question related to the rental crisis that's occurring. So I'll direct my question, then, to the Minister of Municipal Affairs, responsible for housing. Will the minister, through you, Mr. Speaker, tell this House once and for all: is he prepared to take steps such as the renters' rebate to give the comfort, the relief that tenants deserve today?

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I made a commitment to this Assembly and to the hon. member and other hon. members that we would monitor the situation daily with regards to rental increases. We've been doing that. Last week in the House I pointed out to the hon. member that we reviewed some 40,000 rental units to see what the situation was. Just to update the hon. member again, the rents are settling down, 6 to 10 percent at the current time. I indicated that there were some pressures re low-income people and social assistance recipients. That policy we are reviewing and intend to use rent supplements and other means to deal with it. So, yes, Mr. Speaker, we are acting on it and in a very responsible way.

MR. SPEAKER: Highwood, followed by Edmonton-Jasper Place.

### Mobile-home Owners

MR. TANNAS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask a question of the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs on the topic of the day, the report of the committee on the Landlord and Tenant Act. With respect, Mr. Speaker, the question that I would ask is a little different than the preceding questions. There are some tenants in this province that are in a unique situation. There are a number of mobile-home parks, particularly in my constituency of Highwood, where the mobile-home owners are in fact tenants in the mobile-home parks. My question, then, to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs is: will the minister consider the rights of mobile-home owners when he reviews the recommendations contained in this report?

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, the answer to that would be yes, though the report doesn't specifically address the number of citizens in mobile homes that the member refers to. In fact, the current Landlord and Tenant Act does apply to any person renting a mobile home, and the Mobile Home Sites Tenancies Act does apply to those who would rent the sites themselves. It would be my intention to consider any changes that would be made in this area to apply as well to those who would rent accommodation, and any recommendations I would make to our government in that respect would include both.

MR. TANNAS: Okay.

Mr. Speaker, the supplementary question would be again to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. Could he give this House some assurance that there will be a timely address of the mobile-home owners' tenancy rights in support of their unique situation in tenancy?

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, I can only repeat that certainly any changes that would apply to other renters in the province should also be considered in terms of the people who rent accommodation in mobile-home sites. That would require a change to the Mobile Home Sites Tenancies Act as well as possible changes to the Landlord and Tenant Act or a substitute Act as the report suggests. I would be happy to look at both of those and, in fact, to hear from the hon. member or his constituents regarding specific or unique circumstances that might apply particularly to mobile-home site owners.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton Jasper-Place, followed by Westlock-Sturgeon.

### Mercury Contamination

MR. McINNIS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My questions concern the important subject of mercury contamination of freshwater lakes, rivers, streams, and fish populations. Recently a very sizable blob of mercury was discovered 300 metres west of the Trans-Canada Highway bridge in the city of Medicine Hat. I wonder if the Premier would ask his Minister of the Environment if he would interrupt his travels to drop in here and tell us what he's doing about the mercury situation in Medicine Hat?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, hon. member. Inappropriate.

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member knows that the Minister of the Environment is not here. If he wants to put his

question as notice, then we'll certainly draw it to the attention of the Minister of the Environment, and he will respond to it when he returns. I also ask the hon. member to show some credibility by certain manners in this Legislature.

MR. McINNIS: I thank the Premier for his kindly advice.

While he is at it, perhaps he could convene a meeting of the Ministry of Forestry, Lands and Wildlife and the Minister of the Environment. I've been trying to get an analysis done of some fish samples from the Wapiti River for mercury contamination. I've two letters signed by the Minister of the Environment saying that the fish samples are in the freezer and that they'll get around to testing them when there is time and money, and another one from the minister of forestry saying that they threw the fish samples in the garbage. I wonder if the government could possibly figure out whether the fish are in the freezer or in the garbage so that we can get to the bottom of this.

MR. GETTY: I would say this, Mr. Speaker: if they're in the garbage, the hon. member would have found them long ago.

MR. SPEAKER: Westlock-Sturgeon.

### Water Management

MR. TAYLOR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Minister of Agriculture. In the last two weeks two very important items have happened with respect to water resources in western Canada. The first was with respect to allowing oil companies to take up to one-half the potable or usable water out of any water reservoir to enhance oil and gas recovery. The second was that Manitoba was the first province to institute the regular testing of aquifers to see if any chemicals are leaked through from the surface, either from industrialization or overuse of farm chemicals. The first question is: why were not public hearings held at which farmers and farm organizations could put forward their opinions when you unilaterally decided to give away half the potable water in this province to the oil companies?

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Speaker, I believe the hon. member has misdirected another question. I will see that it reaches the right minister.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, I think the Premier should look elsewhere to his garbage to get some of the answers here.

The second thing, then – and I don't know where he's going to go for this one – seeing he's shown such alarming guts and perspicacity in defending the farmer's loss of water, what is the Minister of Agriculture going to do to make sure, as the Manitoba government is doing, that farm aquifers in the future are not polluted by chemicals?

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Speaker, I will carry that question on for the hon. member as well.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

The Member for Vegreville.

### Agricultural Assistance

MR. FOX: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We on this side of the House have raised concerns repeatedly about the Department of Agriculture predictions that net farm income in Alberta was

going to drop by 54 percent in the 1990 year. The Minister of Agriculture, in his curious way, stood up and responded to the Leader of the Official Opposition and said: it's not 54 percent; it's only 48 percent. Now, I don't know how long it's going to take for that good news to filter out to the country, Mr. Speaker: net farm income isn't going to drop by slightly more than 50 percent; it's going to drop by slightly less than 50 percent. In response to that sad situation, the federal government is offering \$80 million to \$100 million of assistance to grain farmers in the province of Alberta, and I'd like the Minister of Agriculture to stand in his place and tell us what specifically he is doing to make sure that farmers in Alberta get that money and get it soon.

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Speaker, maybe I again should clarify for the hon. member and some of his colleagues that Alberta Agriculture makes no prediction on upcoming farm income. The figures that he likes to keep referring to are projections made by Stats Canada, not by any provincial agency. In direct answer to his question, I think I've shared with the House before that we are in discussions with the federal government, saying: it is time you assisted agriculture in the prairies in a stronger way.

We have taken a number of actions over the last years that are addressing the same problems you're expressing concern over now. I would recount again for the hon. member's information that our farm credit stability program, announced by the hon. Premier in 1986, this year is costing the Alberta government \$60 million to \$70 million, but the net benefit of that program to Alberta farmers is \$130 million. That makes that program alone a greater contribution to the health of our agricultural industry than the \$80 million to \$90 million that the hon. member is identifying out of the federal government's recent announcement. I can add to that program, Mr. Speaker, the Ag Development Corporation, which also protects our industry against the high interest rates perpetuated on the industry by the federal government and adds another \$50 million to \$60 million. We can go on and deal with our farm fuel distribution allowance.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. minister. Thank you very much. I knew you wouldn't run out of gas.

Vegreville.

MR. FOX: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The minister might make light of this situation, but it's serious. I'd like to remind him that it takes money to plant crops, not a bunch of cheap talk. I'd like to ask him how long he's prepared to have Alberta farmers stand waiting for this promised assistance while he and his federal counterpart argue back and forth about who did what, when. Go down to Ottawa and get the money.

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would repeat again to this House that the Alberta agricultural industry is diversified, it's got a certain resilient strength in it, and I don't detect hundreds of farmers out there saying, "We can't seed unless we get some immediate money." I do detect farmers out there saying, "Hey, we want to be treated equally by our federal government to farmers across the prairies." That's a commitment that I've made to this House: we will ensure that our farmers get fair and equitable treatment with other farmers in the prairies.

I close, Mr. Speaker, at the risk of getting cut off again, by saying that we've done a substantive number of programs. I could go on and list a few more, but I hesitate to do it, from the looks I'm getting.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

The Chair recognizes the Member for Edmonton-Centre.

REV. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There are many times in this Chamber when on behalf of the legitimate concerns of our constituents, we passionately feel the need to enter debate. Last evening I felt this need very strongly, as well as my keen sense of frustration that certain rulings seemed to cut off that debate. However, anger and frustration can have more effective means of expression in this Chamber than being named by Mr. Speaker, and I will endeavour in the future to be challenged in directing my energies and my feelings on behalf of my constituents in ways that represent honour and integrity in this Chamber.

Thank you very much. [applause]

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. member.

#### head: ~~Motion~~ under Standing Order 40

MR. SPEAKER: A request under Standing Order 40 by Edmonton-Jasper Place, speaking to urgency.

Mr. McInnis:

Be it resolved that this House is aware of the importance of National Wildlife Week, April 8 to 14, in the battle to preserve our natural habitat and that the House hereby lends its support to the Endangered Spaces campaign of the World Wildlife Fund and the Canadian Parks and Wilderness Society.

MR. McINNIS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There are in Alberta 17 widely recognized ecological zones. There are only two which have really substantial wilderness protection; both are in the national parks, Wood Buffalo and the mountain park region. A third is very close to being well protected.

The World Wildlife Fund and the Canadian Parks and Wilderness Society have launched a very public campaign called the Endangered Spaces campaign to draw public attention to the need to preserve and protect what is precious in our great outdoors, what is necessary and essential to the survival of many endangered species in our province.

Her Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor has sent a message endorsing the Endangered Spaces campaign. I will quote just briefly from her letter. She says:

As Canadians we still have great opportunities to preserve for future enjoyment our environment and the various species which still exist. Hopefully this major conservation initiative "Endangered Spaces" will encourage each of us to do our part to ensure that future generations are not deprived of their rightful heritage. After all, we do not own the earth, we have only borrowed the space we presently occupy.

Those are the words of Her Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor.

The urgency is that in each day that passes some portion of these spaces passes from a place where it can be preserved into the nonpreservable category. Unfortunately the ecological reserve program has become stalled, and there are some signals from the government which have led people to become quite concerned about the campaign in the province of Alberta. For this reason, I think it would be timely and urgent that we take the opportunity of National Wildlife Week for this Assembly to lend its support to the Endangered Spaces campaign.



MR. SPEAKER: Standing Order 40, hon. member. The request under Standing Order 40 for unanimous consent. Those in favour of granting unanimous consent, please say aye.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed, please say no.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No. [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: It fails. Thank you. Without calling out, hon. members. The request fails.

Perhaps we could have unanimous consent to revert to Introduction of Special Guests.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed? Carried. Thank you.

The Minister of Public Works, Supply and Services.

**head: Introduction of Special Guests**  
(reversion)

MR. KOWALSKI: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and to the members of the Assembly for that permission. In the members' gallery today are 27 young students from Neerlandia elementary school. Neerlandia is north of Edmonton. It's a Dutch word referring to New Holland. Accompanying the students today are their teacher Jim Bosma and a number of parents: Andrew Tuininga, Shirley Wierenga, Angela Tuininga, Sandra Olthuis. Philip Bosma and Irene Baker are with them as well. Philip Bosma is six years old, Mr. Speaker. I would ask them to rise, and I would ask all of my colleagues in the Assembly to extend them the normal and warm greeting.

**head: Question of Privilege**

MR. SPEAKER: A matter of privilege. The Chair recognizes the Member for Redwater-Andrew.

MR. ZARUSKY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This afternoon I rise on a point of privilege regarding the questions and comments the hon. Member for Stony Plain raised in this House yesterday. Implicit in his questioning and comments were allegations regarding the integrity of a member of this Assembly and the propriety with which I conduct the duties of my office. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member discussed certain lands near Smoky Lake, Alberta, which he believed my company owned and incidentally which is on record with the Legislative Assembly.

The lands in question until recently were owned by Harvest Gold Developments Ltd., a company my wife and I formed in March of 1978, and this was for the purpose of purchasing land. In June of 1985, prior to my becoming an elected representative, Harvest Gold became the registered owner of the lands in question, although in actuality the ownership of these lands was a partnership between Harvest Gold Developments Ltd. and Mr. Orest Tychkowsky of Smoky Lake. Each of us gave personal guarantees to the Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce in Smoky Lake for a mortgage which was registered against the land's title. I wish to table certified copies of this title. In late 1989 I retained legal counsel to prepare the necessary documen-

tation pertaining to the sale of the lands to Mr. Tychkowsky, which incidentally was completed on March 2, 1990.

Mr. Speaker, I categorically state that I at no time used my position as a Member of this Legislative Assembly to exert, influence, or to persuade any town or municipal officials with respect to future development of the subject lands. I was sensitive to the potential perception of some individuals that my company's ownership of the lands and my being the Member of the Legislative Assembly could be viewed as suspicious. With this concern I commenced steps to dispose of the lands over one year ago. The allegations of exercising improper influence which were implicit in the hon. member's questions yesterday are without foundation and have undermined my ability to carry out the duties of my office. These allegations have jeopardized my position as an MLA to deal with town councils and constituents in my constituency. The hon. member is unable to substantiate his allegations, simply because there is no basis in fact for having made these allegations.

Therefore, on a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I request that you rule that a breach of my privilege has taken place.

Thank you. [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. [interjection] Order.

The Member for Stony Plain.

MR. WOLOSHYN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If you refer to the record in *Hansard*, my statements are quite clear there. I stated:

The Member for Redwater-Andrew has been actively lobbying the town council of Smoky Lake to approve the location of a chicken processing plant on a commercial site in which the member has a financial interest.

In view of the fact that he has disassociated his interest from it just a month ago, I would be prepared to delete "has a financial interest." However, two members of the Smoky Lake council, in consultation and communication with my staff, have reaffirmed that there was active communication to in fact have some influence with respect to the said plant. These two councillors were so sure of their ground that they permitted their names and phone numbers to be released to the press . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: To the press. [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Order in the whole House. Thank you.

MR. WOLOSHYN: . . . and the public, I might add.

I went on to question the Premier with respect to the conduct: if that was acceptable to him. The Premier then made the statement that this was a serious allegation. All of the statements that were made in the preamble have appeared at some place or other, again, through the local press bits and March 4 in the *Journal* and subsequently in yesterday's papers, so there appears to be a large degree of substance to the statements that had been made.

With respect to the business of a conflict of interest I can categorically state that I did not accuse the member of a conflict of interest. I said there was the appearance – and I stress again, the appearance – of a conflict of interest. That is a far cry from accusing a member of being involved in it. I also went on to request the Premier . . . [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Hon. member, I'll allow you to continue in a moment. Please take your place.

The matter of privilege is sufficiently grave that there should be silence in this Chamber except for the member speaking.

Stony Plain.

MR. WOLOSHTYN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I also went on to request the Premier to investigate the matter and report his findings to Albertans and this Legislature. That kind of investigation, if it would take place, would do more to clear the air than anything else.

So I find very, very hard to accept that I have in any way breached the said member's privilege. All the statements that were made in this House, with the exception of one bit of information that we didn't have our hands on, the fact that he had divested himself of his financial interests in the property as late as March 2, 1990, have been substantiated and supported by the members of council, who are the ones who are alleging the persuasion or lobbying.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. The Chair has listened attentively. The Chair will review the Blues and hopefully report back to the House tomorrow.

head: **Orders of the Day**

head: **Written Questions**

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, I move that all written questions appearing on the Order Paper, except . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, in the galleries. There's no need to be running, hon. members of the media.

Deputy House Leader.

MR. GOGO: . . . 234, 243, and 246, stand and retain their places on the Order Paper.

[Motion carried]

234. Rev. Roberts asked the government the following question: What is the government policy with respect to expanding the nursing transfer program so that nurses at all diploma based nursing schools, not just Red Deer and Mount Royal colleges, can have access to a baccalaureate nursing degree in Alberta?

[Question accepted]

243. Mr. Doyle asked the government the following question: With respect to the transfer of St. John's hospital in Edson from the Sisters of Service to hospital district No. 86:

- (1) What consultation process was undertaken by Alberta Health?
- (2) What parties and what boards did the department consult?
- (3) Where and when did these consultations take place?
- (4) When will this transfer take place?

[Question accepted]

246. Mr. McInnis asked the government the following question:

- (1) What was the original budget estimate for grouting contracts on the Oldman River dam?

(2) Has this estimate been revised? If so, by how much and why?

(3) What was the original contract price for grouting work contracted to Nowsco Well Service Ltd.?

(4) Has Nowsco Well Service Ltd. submitted a bill to the prime contractor for an amount greater than the original contract price? If so, how much and why?

MR. GOGO: Reject, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

head: **Motions for Returns**

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, I move that all motions for returns appearing on the Order Paper, except 153 and 201, stand and retain their place on the Order Paper.

[Motion carried]

153. Mr. McEachern moved that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing copies of all studies and reports paid for by the government of Alberta, or done by its employees, which formed the basis of the government's conclusion that the Canada/U.S. free trade deal would be good for Alberta, as well as those which showed there would be negative consequences.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, since this particular motion refers to the responsibilities which I hold relative to dealing with international trade negotiations, I am urging hon. members of the Assembly to reject this motion. I refer back to a motion moved in the Assembly last July 25 by the hon. Member for Edmonton-Kingsway, and while it's true that this is a lot tidier motion than the one last year which asked for such things as minutes of meetings with staff and so on, it's still unacceptable to the government because it asks us to provide "copies of . . . studies and reports paid for by the government . . . or done by its employees." Obviously there are many studies and reports done for the benefit of ministers and for the government which provide a series of alternatives for choice, and based upon that advice, decisions are made.

Now, I know what the opposition is trying to do. They are trying to obtain all the arguments which may have been advanced by employees of the government against taking a certain course of action so that they could then adopt those as their own and, quite frankly, do the work that they should be doing themselves; that is to say, advancing their own reasons. We're not wishing to have a certain course of action adopted by the minister or by the government. It's quite clear, Mr. Speaker, that internal advice provided by employees of the government to ministers for the benefit of ministers is just not made public. What is made public, obviously, is the decision itself and documentation which flows from having made decisions. That information has been shared with the members of this Assembly and with the public in this province. Every household mailing that went out during 1988, which some members of the opposition objected to, nonetheless was put out so that people of Alberta would have the benefit of knowing the decision the government had made and the reasons in such documents for having made the decisions. Therefore, it's been perfectly clear.

I offered to provide to the hon. Member for Edmonton-Kingsway copies of the speeches I made in support of the free

trade agreement, some 60 or 70 in number, if he promised to read them. Well, I didn't get any such undertaking, but the offer still applies. Of course, not only were speeches made by myself outside the Assembly but within the Assembly during the course of my estimates, and of course it was a matter of some considerable debate. That's fine, and that's what should take place. But, Mr. Speaker, it's just not possible or acceptable to provide all the opinions and advice that we as ministers get from our departmental employees and our staff with respect to making decisions or recommendations that I then take forward for my cabinet colleagues' consideration and for consideration by our caucus prior to adopting official positions.

I think that's well understood, and I would ask hon. members to reject the motion.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Mr. Speaker, with this government the public just pays and pays and pays. The public was forced to pay for this government's propaganda during the free trade debate and the federal election. The public never gets to know whether the money they paid to get reports and studies done was accurately and fairly reflected in the material that this government distributed during the last federal election in order to get their Conservative chums elected to Ottawa.

[Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair]

Now the public in Alberta is paying in the form of lost jobs as a result of this agreement. They're paying due to lost investment. They're losing and paying because of lost opportunities to be economic masters in our own house. The public ends up paying and paying and paying. No wonder the government doesn't want to let us know what analysis they did prior to the last federal election before the adoption of the free trade agreement. No wonder they want to keep this hidden from Albertans, because if Albertans ever found out how their tax dollars are being used and misused and being redirected by this government, they certainly would not be happy with the way this government has managed.

You know the material they sent out during the federal election. It was so well done that they had to withdraw it and reprint it before it ever got distributed. That's how good it was. I'd be ashamed to release any documentation if I were the Government House Leader and I had that track record going for me, Mr. Speaker. I wouldn't expect him to agree to this motion for a return too; his government's done such a poor job. I mean, if their research was as faulty as the material they first distributed, no, I wouldn't want the public to see it either. They'd make a very clear decision about the quality of it. They know how faulty it would be if it was as poorly done as the material they distributed during the federal election.

No, Mr. Speaker, we don't want rhetoric from this government; we don't want its propaganda. We want all of the work that was done by this government prior to the ratification of the trade deal. We want all the studies, all the analyses that said yes, it's a good deal, and no, it's a bad deal, and then we'll let the public judge for themselves. We'll put it all on the table. Let's put it all on the table and let the public judge for themselves whether they got good value from this government, whether this government made the right decision and followed the right course and accepted the right advice. Let's have it out on the table – unless you want to hide, of course. Maybe the government realizes now that the advice and the analysis they got that said no to the deal was, in fact, the proper and correct analysis

of what's taking place. Maybe that's why they don't want the public to see it. But if I had made the right choice as a government, if I'd made the right decision, I wouldn't mind putting it all out to see both the positives and the negatives, the rights and the wrongs, the pros and the cons, and let the public make up its own mind. Let's see which side history is going to prove was the correct analysis.

But, no, this government is not willing to do that. They're afraid to do it, Mr. Speaker. That's the reason the government is not giving us these motions for a return. They don't want us or the public to know what was done and said to this government prior to the ratification of the free trade deal.

Would we find out, perhaps, Mr. Speaker, that the interest rates that our Premier so valiantly and so hopelessly fought, going down to Ottawa to fight high interest rates . . . Would we find out that it's part of the free trade deal that we keep interest rates 5 percentage points above the American rates in order to prop up our Canadian dollar now at a crucial time during the implementation of that deal? Is that what we'd find out? Is that what the analysis holds? Then we'll let the public judge if this government is serious about fighting interest rates or whether Mr. Crow is serious about fighting interest rates and fighting inflation, or whether Mr. Crow is really implementing some arrangement or agreement that Canada has accepted under the trade deal. Maybe that's what this government is trying to hide: that their fight against the GST is a bogus one just as much as their fight against interest rates is a bogus one. Perhaps that's the real reason why we're not being given this motion for a return.

Sure, I understand, Mr. Speaker, that there was a wide variety of debate that went on during the run-up to the ratification of that deal, and there was all kinds of speculation about what effect it would have on this and that and the other industry in this country. I respect that within a government civil service there'll be differences of opinion. In fact, even the economists couldn't agree: some said it would do this; some said it would do that. We know that, Mr. Speaker, and if we had the honest and straightforward analysis, people then could judge for themselves. I'm not afraid of that. If some economist did a report for this government, or some bureaucrat for this government did an analysis that said that the free trade deal would be good for Alberta, I'm not afraid for the government to put that on the table. I'm not afraid at all. I'd be quite happy to see it, if, at the same time, this government would put the other on the table as well. Then we would see who's right, who's wrong, and let the public judge. That's all that this motion for a return is asking, Mr. Speaker.

The problem is that by refusing it – the public paid dollars for this government to commission those reports. The public paid dollars for them to commission those studies. The public paid dollars for them to put out propaganda to influence people during the free trade debate in the federal election. The public paid and paid and paid. The public has a right to know whether they got value for their money, Mr. Speaker. That's what this motion is about, and that is what this government is really denying to us this afternoon.

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Additional speakers?  
Edmonton-Kingsway, summation.

MR. McEACHERN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This motion for a return is somewhat similar to the last time around, and I wanted to address that question myself. The minister did raise it. The last time we asked for all possible documents, and the reason we put minutes and memos and those kind of things was not because we really wanted all of that paper – I really don't want to cut down all the forests to get an avalanche of paper from the government on this particular issue – but because I was quite sure by the time that motion got on the floor that the government didn't have any studies. So I thought, well, they could at least look through what they did have, the internal memos or something, and find some papers that might just be worth releasing. I really don't think they had any. I really honestly believe that this government went into the free trade deal based almost entirely on the information that came out of the Economic Council of Canada, that group of Tory friends that are the front for policy for the federal government, who said that the free trade deal was a good one, predicted that some 500,000 jobs were going to be created almost immediately that we get into the free trade deal, then realized that the . . . Oh, and by the way, the Alberta government did put out a document, but it was not a study or a report about analyzing the benefits of the free trade deal. They put out a booklet saying that it was a good deal for us. There's quite a difference.

I'm not asking for the propaganda to sell the free trade deal. I'm asking for the studies done in an honest and a reasonably scientific manner. I know there's a certain amount of guesswork in predicting what the future holds when you go certain directions; nonetheless, I was looking for some kind of gathering of facts and figures and some kind of a study, some kind of analysis that had been done by some kind of credible people in the department or hired by the government or whatever, that might be able to say that the free trade deal was good for us in certain areas and not so good in other areas. That's the kind of document I was looking for, not a propaganda pamphlet to put out to the population.

But this government did put out a propaganda pamphlet for the population, basically bragging about how many jobs were going to be created based on this Economic Council of Canada study. Unfortunately, the Canada Council realized that they had based their figures on the idea that the service industry of this country would not be at risk under the free trade deal. They sort of assumed nobody would be stupid enough to go into that kind of a deal, and when they found that out, they had to go back through all their work again, and even using the most optimistic projections they possibly could, came up with a few jobs – I think it was 200,000 instead of 500,000 jobs, which of course has not worked out. But that's nonetheless what happened there.

The reason I asked last year for all those documents, then, was because I don't believe this government ever set up one credible group of people, paid them, and asked them to study the effects of the free trade deal on this province. Not once did they do that. Now, the Member for Red Deer-South, I believe it is, one time in a forum did try to say that they had their studies. I said: "Not one, not one; you haven't released one study in the House. You show me one study your government has done." And he couldn't answer me; he didn't have one. So I don't believe they have one thing that would be called a study or a report worth the name. In wording this motion for a return, I was very nearly tempted to ask for one study, because I don't believe you have one. I don't believe the government ever did their homework on this issue. For ideological reasons they decided free trade

was good for us, and they went into a free trade deal based on ideological reasons. They have no documentation, no study worth being called that name, no report worth being called a report that gives the pros and cons of the advantages and disadvantages of going into a free trade deal, and yet they took us into it.

When you consider, Mr. Speaker, that they knew right from the start that the free trade deal wasn't just a free trade deal – it's kind of an economic union with the United States. When they knew that we were going to reform our tax system and that some kind of a consumer tax would be part of the free trade deal, a consumer tax that eventually evolved – it wasn't going to be a national sales tax. Then they talked about an MSST, a multiple-stage sales tax, a number of VAT taxes like Europe has. Whatever the name was going to be, they knew right from the very first there was going to be a consumer tax as part of the free trade deal.

One of the reasons I put the idea of any studies that might show the negative consequences was that you would assume that this government would have the foresight and the understanding to at least do an analysis of the benefits of the free trade deal. And if they believe they're all going to be beneficial, great; I can put up with them sort of kidding themselves about that for ideological reasons. But they could not have helped but have known that the GST, which was an inevitable part of this deal – it was said right from the first that we were going to get rid of the manufacturers sales tax because it made our exports noncompetitive in the American market. What the heck good is a free trade deal if you can't sell your exports into the United States? And if those exports are uncompetitive because of a manufacturers sales tax, you've got to change that to a consumer tax, which is exactly what the government did. We knew you were going to get a GST, and you still didn't – is this what you're telling me? – you still didn't do a study indicating the bad effects of the GST, knowing that we were going to get one, knowing that you weren't going to be able to stop Ottawa from bringing in both parts of the free trade deal: the trade deal itself and the goods and services tax.

I just find that incredible, Mr. Speaker. I do not understand how this government could not have done a study at least looking at the kinds of tax changes that might be brought about because of the free trade deal and that a consumer tax would be an essential part of that. I mean, Mulroney said it right from the first; Wilson said it right from the first. They embarked on this tax reform, they call it. I mean, they've made the tax system worse in the last few years. They're shifting taxes from the wealthy and the big businesses onto small businesses and to ordinary people. That's what the consumer tax does. But you knew it was part of the deal right from the first. How could you not do a study? How could you not have some documents that tell you what the effects would be? And then now you go through this charade of fighting the goods and services tax and yet saying you want the free trade deal.

If I were your federal cousins, I'd feel like you'd double-crossed me, as I suggested yesterday in question period. I mean, you were with them on the free trade deal. You spent money getting these guys elected, and now they're giving you the second half of the very thing you should have expected, you should have known would happen. I mean, I knew it. Anybody that was following and reading what was going on in the free trade negotiations knew it. You mean you guys didn't follow, didn't know? So halfway through you back out on your federal cousins. I mean, you've doubled-crossed them. They should be

really upset with you. The fact of the matter is that the whole idea of the free trade deal and the goods and services tax was wrong for Alberta, and what really happened is you not only double-crossed your federal cousins but you sold out Albertans. You brought a free trade deal that they didn't need, that's going to make it harder and harder for us to control our own economy, more and more just leaving the economy to the whims of the big multinationals and the oil industry; for instance, to OPEC.

So then you suggest that you have studies but you're not going to release them. I just don't believe you have any studies. I don't think you did your homework. As to the speeches of the hon. minister, I've read quite a few of them. I've heard him in the House. I know his basic arguments. I know the propaganda side of it. What I would like to see is some factual studies, some reports that show that some group of competent people had actually analyzed what we could expect out of a free trade deal and a goods and services tax and what the effect would be on Alberta. So no, I don't want your 60 or 70 speeches. Save a tree. For heaven's sake, in this day and age of being concerned about the environment, we've got to cut down the amount of paper we throw around that doesn't really say anything much or just puts out an ideological position which we already know. I accept the give and take of an ideological debate, and I understand that you put out your propaganda and you've had your say and we've had ours. But I would like to see if there was ever, on the part of this government, a report put together by a competent group of people, whether they be deputy ministers and top echelons of your civil service or whether they be a hired consultant group or somebody that put together any kind of a study indicating what the effects of the free trade deal and a VAT tax or a goods and services tax would be on the province of Alberta, so that you could have some rational information on which to base your decision rather than just some ideological whim that says you must leap through this window of opportunity and land God knows where – into an economic union with the United States – without really considering the consequences.

So that's why, Mr. Speaker, I put this motion on the Order Paper. I say to the minister: if he has one study that gives some pros and cons, that is based on some rational analysis, some competent research, some fairly independent thinking on the part of anybody about the pros and cons of the free trade deal and its attendant goods and services tax and the effect that would have on the province of Alberta . . . Like my colleague from Calgary-Mountain View, I can't help thinking that the government is somewhat reluctant to put out that basic kind of information and let the people of Alberta have a good discussion on the issue, to analyze that information and debate it among themselves and then help the government make the decision. Instead, the government, if they ever did any studies, keep all that to themselves, discuss it in secret, and put out the propaganda part. It's a style of governing they seem to have gotten into that is very closed-minded, very secretive, very afraid of democratic debate. Why are you afraid of democratic debate? Why shouldn't you put out the basic facts as people can best analyze them on the free trade deal and the goods and services tax that goes with it, and say to the people of Alberta, "What do you think?" Let's have a provincewide debate. You know, we could do it on the heritage trust fund, but you're afraid of doing that too. We could do it on AGT before you get around to privatizing it. It's the way a government should work, and particularly in a deal like this free trade deal and the goods and services tax. By not doing that, you see the problem they got into. When

they found out that two-thirds of Albertans didn't want the goods and services tax, they backed out on their federal cousins and told the people of Alberta that they were against the goods and services tax. But the flimflam of their arguments and the reluctance to vote yesterday or today so that they could be counted would show that. . .

MR. SPEAKER: Could we come back to this motion for a return?

MR. McEACHERN: Well, the goods and services tax is a part of the free trade deal, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: No. Order, hon. member. Such a statement is not in order, and the member knows it. Could we come back to the motion for a return?

MR. McEACHERN: Well, you'll see, Mr. Speaker, that what I said there was that I wanted reports or studies that show the good and the bad sides of the free trade deal. Perhaps you weren't here at the start of my remarks . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. member. Take your place. The GST came long after the signing of the Canada/U.S. free trade agreement. Please get back to this particular motion.

MR. McEACHERN: But, Mr. Speaker, you need to understand that the goods and services tax was just the final . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. member. Your time is used up. Take your place.

[Motion lost]

201. Mr. Bruseker moved that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing a copy of the itinerary showing all meetings and their purposes and participants for every visit by the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs to New York since March 20, 1989.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I have circulated an amendment to this motion. I'd like to indicate to hon. members of the Assembly that it is my intention to supply the information requested, basically, by the hon. member, but in addition I want to supply more information, which is really important to note. I think it's important that in my responsibilities as Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs, it's necessary for me to travel to eastern United States destinations, and any visits to New York have also been accompanied by visits to Washington, D.C., or other eastern United States destinations. So I'll supply the information relative to the nature of all meetings and functions.

The reason I can't comply specifically with the request by the hon. member relative to the original motion is that I cannot give a list of all the participants and all of the events that I attended because on some occasions there were several hundred people, and I don't have the names of all the people who were there. But I will certainly supply the hon. members of the Assembly an outline of the nature of all meetings and functions that I participated in on behalf of the people of Alberta. I hope that the hon. Member for Calgary-North West will find the amendment to be acceptable, because the information will certainly be provided. The original intent of the motion, I believe, will be

served, as well as the additional information which I will volunteer in the amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

Speaking to the amendment, the Minister of Advanced Education.

MR. GOGO: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I have noticed with great frequency motions for returns being made by hon. members of the opposition. I think today, with the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs proposing an amendment to it, it shows the co-operation of the government in attempting to respond to sincere requests for information from the hon. members of the opposition. I would hope that hon. members who ask for this information recognize the spirit of goodwill by members on the government side. So I support the amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

Call for the question on the amendment? Calgary-North West, speaking to the amendment.

MR. BRUSEKER: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Just speaking to the amendment, I thank the hon. minister for expanding, in fact, upon the answer that I requested. I certainly appreciate the efforts that the government is making on his behalf on this particular motion for a return.

Just speaking to the amendment briefly, what the amendment wants is "an outline of the nature of all meetings and functions of." In my original motion, which was for "participants," and now the proposed amendment here, basically what I'm looking for is the information as to why is the minister going and the nature of the people that he is meeting. So if that in fact is the intent of this motion, then this is perfectly acceptable.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Call for the question on the amendment. The amendment has been circulated.

[Motion as amended carried]

### head: **Motions Other than Government Motions**

205. Moved by Mr. Day:

Be it resolved that the Legislative Assembly urge the government to adopt a policy whereby no school shall offer any sex education program as part of its curriculum unless there is sufficient statistical and expert evidence that the sex education program will not increase the incidence of sexually transmitted diseases and teenage pregnancy and that the program will not be responsible for any increases in sexual activity among students receiving the instruction.

MR. DAY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I rise this afternoon, I feel a little bit like the censor giving a warning about some types of movies, but I do feel I should give a warning here that some of the information covered may be surprising to some, may be shocking to some, and may be difficult for others to really come to grips with. But, in fact, I have been diligent to assess the flow of information that has come to me on this particular area regarding sex education. It has been massive in terms of the information and literature that's out there. I've seen in the last few weeks that it's just the tip of the iceberg. It's interesting

to note that the information that's been offered on the other side of this motion – even to some of my own colleagues – which I've looked at has suggested that there is not much empirical evidence by which to evaluate sex education. In fact, the evidence is massive. The particular information that's been distributed to some of my colleagues has suggested that there is very little detail in these areas.

[Mr. Jonson in the Chair]

It does name six particular studies, which suggests that there are six studies of some substantive nature – they're out there – that could be looked at, but they're really not that conclusive. I intend to use those very six studies and the very information that has been circulated and has been discussed as being not conclusive and show that it is conclusive. I will use studies from organizations such as Planned Parenthood that are proponents of comprehensive values-neutral sex education. I will use their own studies to conduct my remarks today and to guide my remarks.

I'd first want to clear something up: in case anybody has any doubts, I am not against sex. My wife is willing to fill out an affidavit to that effect if there's any doubt on that. But looking at some of the editorial comments that I've seen around the province on that particular subject, I'd like to say that the reporters which have covered this topic in the media have been very responsible and have covered this adequately. It's been interesting to note, though, that the editorial opinion around the province in various newspapers has been shamefully unprofessional in terms of the reaction, in terms of judging this motion and condemning it before seeing any of the facts or any of the statistics. So that's been an interesting process.

I'm also not against sex education, Mr. Speaker. I'm against certain types of sex education, especially the comprehensive values-neutral type of education. But I do agree that certain facts within certain frameworks need to be presented. People do need to know the facts.

AN HON. MEMBER: Slow down, Stockwell.

MR. DAY: I can't slow down, hon. member, because there's a pile of stuff to go through here, and I don't want you to miss any of it.

I also would like to say very clearly that I'm not on a witch-hunt today. I will not be mentioning specific schools or specific teachers, though I have very specific examples from both schools and teachers. I feel that most of our teachers and instructors in this province are responsible people. I feel that a few of them, maybe with good intention, are actually doing a lot of damage, and I will point to the types of damage that can be done by the wrong types of sex education.

Basically, there are two approaches to sex education. There's the comprehensive data-based values-neutral approach, which we see in most of our schools today. Then there's a values-based approach that has extensive documentation and covers areas like positive addressing of the areas of ethics and morals, positive direction for students, self-esteem, and talking about self-control, areas of abstinence, the monogamous heterosexual relationship, and other such values. Those are the two types of models that are out there.

What prompted this, Mr. Speaker, and this whole study was a report on a seminar that was given some months ago in my own constituency to educators and to resource people who were

invited. These people were involved and are involved in teaching sex education in schools in the province. The techniques that were used, as was reported in a very detailed report back to me, correspond very clearly with approaches laid out in Planned Parenthood manuals in terms of teaching sex education, and in other similar models.

Various techniques – first of all, desensitization was a technique that was used. The people taking this course were subjected to a variety of films with such illustrious titles as *Five Women Masturbating*. It wasn't just shown on one film, but in fact they watched this for quite a period of time on a number of films being shown simultaneously. The three days consisted of heavy bombardment in terms of desensitization, and then another technique of using peer group pressure to minimize the concerns and objections that any one person might have. Role playing is another technique that is used extensively in terms of getting people to put themselves into confusing situations and then trying to react.

But one of the areas and techniques that was promoted which particularly causes me concern and even some anger was when the instructor was very clear in indicating to the recipients of the programs that they had to be very careful in certain areas and on certain items not to let the parents find out what was actually being taught. The instructor went into some detail explaining that in some communities you have to be careful to hide the information and specifically used the phrase: to tuck the information in around the edges so that the kids get it but it doesn't come back to the parents. So that's just an example of that.

Here's a program that's used internationally, and here's a caution in the start of the program. It says, and this is verbatim:

How to begin the program:

Caution: Participants should not be given . . .

MR. PASHAK: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. PASHAK: The hon. member is so quick to . . .

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Citation, please.

MR. PASHAK: *Beauchesne* 473. The hon. member is so quick to bring it to the attention of the House when other people are reading from notes or reading speeches. I'd just like to bring to the attention of the Speaker that the hon. member appears to be doing precisely what he cautions other people against doing. I'd be more tolerant in the case of any other member, but it's just because this particular member is prone to rise on 473 himself that I think I'd like a ruling from the Chair.

MR. DAY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As this type of material is extremely data based, I have the data in my hands, and you'll notice I look down when I'm referring to data. It is totally irresponsible of that member, and I would hope that the minutes which he has consumed of my debate would be added on to the clock.

I will now go on to quote in the particular . . .

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. The Chair will try and attend to your concern. I had not noticed that he was quoting from just one document at great length.

MR. DAY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Neither did anybody else.

It goes on to quote very specifically – and I read this because I haven't memorized all the data. It says:

Caution: Participants [in the program] should not be given extra copies of the form to show to their parents or friends. Many of the materials of this program, shown to people outside the context of the program itself, can evoke misunderstandings and difficulties. The particular program is one by Deryck Calderwood: *About Your Sexuality*. It has widespread use and is published by Beacon Press.

So when I hear about very specific measures of deceit being built into a program, that causes me concern. Then parents began calling me after the situation in Red Deer about not just seminars but in fact what was happening in the schools themselves right here in our province. I've received to date from around the province – not in an organized way, not in a petition or form letter way – over 200 calls and letters from teachers, university professors, parents, doctors, students . . .

MS M. LAING: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. A point of order.

MS M. LAING: I would like to challenge the member opposite under *Beauchesne* 498 to name the writer of this document and to table this document in the House.

MR. DAY: Mr. Speaker, *Beauchesne's* very clear that a member, first of all, does not have to cite documents, but I am citing the documents. I am giving every single reference, Mr. Speaker, and I really am amazed at the intolerance of the member opposite, who is the great champion of tolerance and understanding. I'm citing every single document quoted.

I will go on, Mr. Speaker.

MS M. LAING: A point of order. I asked for the tabling of a document, and I would ask the member . . .

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. We're having the doubling up on points of order at the moment. It is the Chair's view that information is being provided, quoting the source and so on, on which the member is commenting. To this point in time I've not found anything out of order in these recent remarks. Once again I will listen carefully to the speech, but I would just comment from the Chair, if I might, to the Assembly that there seems to be a tendency early in this debate this afternoon to use points of order perhaps to interfere with the topic rather than in the usual way. I would rule that there is no point of order at the moment.

MR. DAY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If the member would read *Beauchesne*, she will see there are references to cabinet ministers; none to members. Documents do not even have to be cited by members. I, however, am citing every single one.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hon. member, please proceed with your speech.

MR. DAY: Thank you.

Over 200 calls – parents, policemen, students – on a variety of different subjects and bringing things to my attention which I have subsequently followed up and done research on and checked out. For instance, grade 6 students in an elementary class were told that 99 percent of the population masturbates.

Grade 4 students were shown a film which describes the female clitoris and how it produces pleasure and orgasm. A teacher, in response to a question from the question box in her sex education class, spent the better part of the class describing the three stages of orgasm to 13-year-olds in grade 8. The list goes on and on, Mr. Speaker, and what is constantly being brought out is the same pattern of techniques that are used: the answer box, the peer groups, the desensitizing, the compromising of values, and the role playing that puts students in confusing situations.

One call I received after the article was in the paper was from parents who had seen the article and asked their child in grade 8 if they were receiving any of this type of education and what exactly was going on in the sex education studies and the study on human sexuality. This grade 8 student then told that they had received a graphic demonstration of the application of spermicide foam into the model of a vagina and had also seen the application of a condom onto a wooden phallus. The parent was shocked at this and said, "Why didn't you tell me about this?" They said, "First of all, I was too embarrassed, and secondly, you signed the thing that said I could go to these classes and it was no problem." The parent was absolutely overwhelmed. This is just representative of some of the 200 calls and letters which I have been getting.

This type of thing is happening, Mr. Speaker. The young grade 4 son of a doctor rushed home from school... This is another report that I got. There are people who are documenting these reports; some of these parents go into the classrooms to view some of these items. This student had come home, run upstairs, slammed the door, run into their room, and a few minutes later came out and put a copy of a poster that they had quickly made up on the door of the room. I have a copy of that poster, photocopied, if the member would like to see it. The student had written on there: if I ever sex, I will kill myself. That was when the parents went down to the school and talked to the teachers. They found that they had just come from a class which was called the CARE unit in which very explicit and graphic demonstrations and discussions of sexuality were being discussed. I could go on with case histories that have been sent to me, Mr. Speaker, by counselors in the school system - I mean counselors who have been in the system for 25 years - who are sending me case histories of the types of difficulties they are running into with this type of discussion and this type of education.

What we need and what this motion is all about is for parents, number one, to clearly understand what is being taught, and for parents to have a choice of the two models that are available in terms of sex education. The one is the comprehensive values-neutral type of model, and the other is the values-based model that I have referred to before. But parents need to be aware, and most parents are not. Especially they're not when they're being in some cases deliberately misled with the type of information in terms of what's going to be taught. The junior high curriculum in Alberta in many cases is detailed and graphic, teaching about everything from the variety of sexual relationships that can be had to contraceptives. It attempts to cover all the bases from a neutral standpoint, not suggesting whether students should or shouldn't be sexually active. For instance, the grade 9 program, Theme V, Human Sexuality; on page 222, students are presented with a list of 10 contraceptive methods, one of which is abstinence. At the start it is quickly and summarily dismissed, and greater emphasis is clearly placed on information and comprehensive data. The junior high curriculum is couched

in neutral phrases that talk about the student's state of readiness, and that comes from Theme V again, Junior High Curriculum Guide for Health Programs and Personal Life Skills.

So we need to ask ourselves regarding the first model, Mr. Speaker: does it work? Even Planned Parenthood's own publication, *Family Planning Perspectives*, admitted that "more teenagers are using contraceptives and using them more consistently than ever before. Yet" - and here's their quote - "the number and rate of premarital adolescent pregnancies continues to rise." That's from volume 12, number 5, page 229, *Family Planning Perspectives*.

We've all heard the figures that say sex education leads to fewer teenage births. That is quite true, but it's also misleading; there are fewer births because, in fact, there are more abortions. That comes from a study by Olsen and Weed, 1986, that found a direct relationship between the Planned Parenthood type of sex education and an increase in teen pregnancies, with a reduction in births but a rise in abortions. That's from Olsen and Weed, *Effects of Family Planning for Teenagers on Adolescents Birth and Pregnancy Rates*, *Family Planning Perspectives*, 1986, pages 151 to 170.

Another example of misleading facts comes from a 1987 Alberta study that was prepared for the Alberta community health system called *In Trouble ... A Way Out*. That study says that teen birth control clinics reduced teen pregnancies from 1976 to 1981, but in fact that was only true among married teenagers, and when you separate out the single teens, you find that the rate of pregnancy actually increased in that period. That report was analyzed in a six-month study by doctors of this province and found to have many inconsistencies and holes in it. In the area of pregnancy and abortions, the number of teen pregnancies in North America is increasing by more than a million a year; the number of teen abortions is rising to half a million a year. That's from a report by McDowell and Day - and it's no relative of mine - published at San Bernardino, California, in 1987; that's page 23. North American figures show a 483 percent increase in teen pregnancies and a 133 percent increase in abortions over a 10-year period from 1971 to 1981. During that period, funding for this type of sex education increased 306 percent. That's from the Richard report, *Has Sex Education Failed?* - study period, 1971-1981; that's on page 5. Reported cases of STD during this same time period rose more than 140 percent within the same time frame. That's a report by Zelnik and Kantner: *Sexual Activity, Contraceptive Use and Pregnancy Among Metropolitan Area Teenagers, 1971-79*. *Family Planning Perspectives* is from the Family Planning Report, volume 12, number 5, pages 233-4.

There is also, Mr. Speaker, a correlation between sex education and pregnancy. In 15 states with similar sociodemographic characteristics and similar rates of teenage pregnancy in 1970, those with the highest expenditures on family planning between 1970 and '79 showed the largest increase in the abortion rate and the rate of premarital births among teenagers during those very years. A Planned Parenthood survey - this is Planned Parenthood's own survey - conducted in 1986 by Louis Harris and Associates found that teens who have taken comprehensive sex education in the Planned Parenthood style have a 50 percent higher rate of sexual activity. That's Louis Harris and Associates, the Planned Parenthood Poll, *American Teens*, New York, Louis Harris and Associates, 1986.

Another study shows that "since 1970 pregnancy among American women fifteen to nineteen years of age has climbed by 32 percent," although prior to that time, Mr. Speaker, it had



been falling. That's based on data from the National Center for Health Statistics and abortion data from the Alan Guttmacher Institute. The Alan Guttmacher Institute is the research arm of Planned Parenthood. The growing prevalence of abortion, however, more than doubled between this particular time period: those were recorded in the same reports.

The evaluations that have been done in this area, Mr. Speaker, have ranged from simple surveys to elaborate statistical analyses. Again, the Guttmacher Institute, which was created by Planned Parenthood, makes some evaluations. They found in one of the earliest evaluations that after sex education more students regarded sex before marriage as "easy." That comes from a study of Philliber and Tatum, *The Impact of Sex Education on Students* . . . , November 79; that's on page 11.

Some of the more sophisticated studies, Mr. Speaker, have shown that young people who have received sex education have acted on this change in attitude, demonstrating a higher tendency to engage in premarital sex activity than those without this instruction. A 1982 study of 1,888 young women aged 15 to 19 found that 17-year-olds who had had sex education were markedly more likely to begin sex activity than girls not having the instruction. That's from a major report, one which was sent out to my own colleagues here, the Dawson report, called *The Effects*. By means of elaborate statistical techniques . . .

MR. McINNIS: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. Point of order, Edmonton-Jasper Place.

MR. McINNIS: Under our Standing Orders of the Legislative Assembly, section 23(d):

A member will be called to order by Mr. Speaker if that member  
(d) . . . refers at length to debates of the current session or reads unnecessarily from Hansard or from any other document.

That member has read from the same document from the very beginning. We'd like to know whose words are being read into this Assembly record, so the member should either be called to order or table it.

MR. DAY: Mr. Speaker, I don't know how I can be clearer when I am reading from a variety of studies from something that I have prepared. It's the document of Stockwell Day. Now, do you want me to . . . It'll be in *Hansard*. I am quoting every single study. [interjection] Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

By means of elaborate statistical techniques performing backward step regression – you know, the member who is so intent on environmental impact studies, it's very strange that he doesn't want details on this type of thing.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Table it.

MR. DAY: I'm quoting a variety of sources. If you've got a wheelbarrow, I'll table all the reports.

The Dawson report goes on, Mr. Speaker, to very clearly indicate the same tendency among 14-year-olds. The Dawson report concludes – this is done for Planned Parenthood – that prior contraceptive education increases the odds of starting intercourse at 14 by a factor of 1.5. What that increase means is that girls of age 14 who have had sex education are 40 percent more likely to begin than girls without it. These are substantive reports which are being used by Planned Parenthood themselves. That particular report, which is called *The Impact*, is done by

Marsiglio and Mott, and I'm quoting them as carefully as I can, members:

had eliminated the possibly confounding effects of other factors such as race, family characteristics, and religious influences, so that the figures represent the net effect of sex education on sex activity.

Mr. Speaker, the Louis Harris poll which was commissioned by Planned Parenthood in 1985 resulted in figures indicating that young people aged 12 to 17 who had had sex education had higher rates of sex activity than their peers without sex education. In that same issue of Planned Parenthood's *Family Planning Perspectives* that published the Dawson and Marsiglio results, they carried an article on the disappointing effects of sex education. That's their own material; this is all Planned Parenthood materials and studies. The Harris study, Mr. Speaker, goes on to say that of the young people who had comprehensive sex education, a greater percentage of them were engaging in sex without using contraceptives than those who had not had the comprehensive sex education. That study again – I've quoted it already.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on for quite awhile. I'd like to move to some figures which show that in the whole area of condom research and condom instruction, states that have required that parents be notified when their minor children are given contraceptives or abortions have reduced their rates of adolescent pregnancy. In 1980 the state of Utah passed a law which required parental notification of condom distribution. What happened there? Rates of pregnancy and abortions fell among girls 15 to 17. The number of pregnancies among girls under 18 fell by 15 percent when the state of Massachusetts passed a law saying that parents had to be informed if their students were receiving contraceptives. In 1981 Minnesota passed the same law, and the abortion rate among girls 15 to 17 fell by 21 percent between 1980 and 1985. Do you know what Planned Parenthood did in that state? They took the state of Minnesota to court and said it was unconstitutional for parents to require information and notification of their kids being supplied with contraceptive devices, and yet that's with a 15 percent pregnancy rate drop when those particular laws were enacted.

It's important to talk about another case, and it's mentioned in some of this information that was distributed to my colleagues on the other side of the equation. There's something called the Baltimore case which is waved around as being proof of the value of comprehensive sex education. In fact, in Baltimore they had a school-based clinic, and they said there was a drop in the pregnancy rate. But what the study did not take into account, and the superintendent in that area has now done an ordering of the entire study, was the number of girls who dropped out of school due to pregnancy. It's amazing that the girls who got pregnant between the survey time and dropping out weren't interviewed, although they were interviewed at the start. There was a 33 percent decline in the number of girls surveyed between the first and last studies. In fact, that school, which had the school-based clinic, had a drop-out rate three times higher than that of the schools without clinics, and the girls who dropped out were not even interviewed.

I want to quickly wrap up by talking about the other model on the other side, which is a values-based model promoting values: also giving students the facts but strongly promoting values and positive direction and self-esteem. That type of curriculum was pioneered in '83-84. A San Marcos high school reported 178 pregnancies, which is a staggering amount for the population of that school. This type of program was then put in place. The comprehensive sex education program was moved out and the

sexual component was added to the end of the program. The pregnancy rate plummeted from 147 in 1984 to only 20 in 1986-87. The state of Illinois brought in a values-based approach called Sex Respect. Students were asked before the curriculum, "Is the sex act all right as long as no pregnancy results from it?" The answer no was given by 35 percent of students. But after the program 64 percent said no, the sex act was not all right before marriage. This was not done in a guilt-ridden way but with positive reinforcement and a corresponding rise in self-esteem and self-control. The program and the results were so positive there that the program was later piloted in 25 mid-western schools, and now some 1,000 school districts use the curriculum in 41 states. Another program, called AANCHOR, was introduced in 13 school districts in California, Utah, New Mexico, and Arizona with similar results.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on and on. I've got the facts here, but time is running out. What I've presented here are two schools of thought on how to approach the topic of sex education and the two models that are used to get the message across. Both sides feel very strongly about their approaches, and both sides trot out their respective bodies of statistics, surveys, and studies. Naturally I feel my case is stronger because I've used the statistics of the people on the other side. I've used Planned Parenthood statistics in order to show the devastation that can be caused by the wrong type of sex education. But despite that, I'm sure the other side will still try to somehow disown or discredit the facts I've used, Mr. Speaker, so the debate will rage on.

But I ask myself: where is it all leading? As sex education becomes more and more comprehensive, more and more graphic, where is it all leading; what is it leading us to? Things that are acceptable today were not acceptable 20 years ago. In a quote from that sexuality seminar that was held in Red Deer, one of the people giving the program said very clearly that what was unacceptable a generation ago or a few years ago we now must move to make acceptable.

Mr. Speaker, what is unacceptable today? We've accepted a wide variety of sexual mores that we never accepted before. What is still on the taboo list? Pedophilia, sex with children, is still on the taboo list. I mentioned the movie called *Five Women Masturbating*. It took a long time and a lot of hard research to get somebody to claim who had ordered the movie, where it had come from, or who had anything to do with it. Nobody wanted to claim it. We did track down the source. It comes from a movie publication company in San Francisco called Edan Publications. We sent away and got the catalogue of the movies. In their movie catalogue there's the movie *Five Women Masturbating*, and do you know what it says in there, Mr. Speaker? It talks about one of the women involved in the movie and how she has come to accept the self-pleasuring practices of her two and a half year old granddaughter. I am gravely concerned, first of all, that any dollars or anybody in this province would have anything to do with that type of publication and that type of resource material.

I want to encourage those who don't like what's going on in the schools – and only in some schools, not all schools. As I've said before, some teachers are very responsible in this area. Over 200 have phoned me to speak up and do what is right, and I encourage parents to demand of the school boards the choice of program they want. This is a great era of choice. We all want choice. Do parents want a comprehensive data-based program that is values-neutral, or do parents want a program that is values-based and steers people toward a healthy approach

to sexuality and looking down the road at the healthy aspects of a monogamous relationship?

All I'm asking for in this motion today, Mr. Speaker, is choice. We've got the two bodies of facts, and we can bombard each other all day long with those two bodies of facts. What I'm talking about here is choice. I encourage parents in this province to exercise their choice and to demand of their school boards what choice they want. I present to you today that if the choice of the two types of programs I've talked about today were offered, I have a feeling which classrooms here in Alberta would be full. It would be the values-based program that would be full, Mr. Speaker.

I would encourage us to think of legislation that was passed in 1988 in the state of California and in three other states that requires abstinence-based sex education, very specifically listing in detail the number of things that must be actively promoted, not with a sort of casual, general nod of assent the way it's done in our theme 5 sexuality program here in Alberta, but actually listing the values, the strong family values. Because the studies are here, they're very clear and very extensive in terms of the positive effect, and we're talking about what's good for kids.

Mr. Speaker, I happen to love children, and I'm concerned when I get the number of calls and see the number of studies, psychological and otherwise, of the effects of comprehensive, values-neutral sex education. I think we have a way of turning that around. It's been turned around in other jurisdictions. Let's not follow the tendency we do so often in the education field, where we see a program in the United States, it looks trendy, and by the time it's already failing in the States, we grab on to it and start to promote it. We refuse to look at the information from either stateside or here in Canada. We make all the mistakes ourselves, we have all kinds of disasters, and then we give up the program 10 years after it's been given up in another jurisdiction.

Mr. Speaker, Winston Churchill said that the only thing we learn from history is that we don't learn from history. I'm encouraging parents to learn from history on this and ask their government officials for legislation and policy that promote values-based sex education in their schools.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Member for Edmonton-Avonmore.

MS M. LAING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to make a couple of comments in response to the hon. member's address. The first one is in regard to the letters he received about the education sex educators were receiving and the viewing of the film of women masturbating. I would suggest that the hon. member may need to learn something about how one educates educators, and I would remind him that what he was talking about was educating educators. People would be shown films about masturbation so they would not be shocked out of their socks when a couple of students came in and talked to them about it. They would go through role playing and be subjected to peer pressure so they would have a strong understanding of what young people go through when they are in adolescence, so that as a counselor and an educator they could help that student deal realistically with those feelings. Many people, in trying to deal with someone who is falling prey to peer pressure, have no understanding of the strength of that pressure and how values can be pushed aside by that pressure.

I would suggest that if teachers are telling their students that they should not be telling their parents what is going on in sex education classes, then those teachers have not been properly prepared and are not comfortable with the subject matter. I recall the days when the teachers that could not teach were made the counselors and counseling was a joke. So what he is reporting on is a failure of the Department of Education to ensure that all teachers that are teaching about sex education are adequately prepared and monitored and assessed in their ability to teach this subject matter, a most difficult and sensitive matter, I would say.

[Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair]

Secondly, in regard to his research citations, I am not frivolous in my request that that research be tabled so I can study the research design, the subject matter, the questions that were put, the analysis that was applied, and how the conclusions were drawn and what the fullness of the conclusions were. I would like to draw the member's attention to a pamphlet I saw some years ago put out in regard to . . .

MR. DAY: Point of order.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. The hon. Member for Red Deer-North on a point of order. Citation, please.

MR. DAY: Yes, citation out of *Beauchesne* 473 in terms of citing documents. I have cited very carefully every single document I quoted, and you're absolutely welcome to get yourself a wheelbarrow and start going through them, as I've had to do for the last month or two.

MS M. LAING: If he'll bring them in, I'll go through them.

I saw a pamphlet a number of years ago that reported that rape victims could not get pregnant when they were raped because they were in shock. The reason they drew this conclusion was that women in concentration camps were routinely raped and never got pregnant; therefore, that proved that women that were raped could not get pregnant as a result of the rape. In reality, 12 percent of rape victims do become pregnant as a result of the rape. In reality, women in concentration camps do not become pregnant as a result of rape because they are so emaciated that they are no longer menstruating, ovulating, and therefore cannot become pregnant. So simple sentences taken out of research mean nothing unless one can see the research design and see how the conclusions were drawn.

Mr. Speaker, I would now like to turn to the matter of education, the matter of this debate. I believe education is about knowledge and developing decision-making skills, about gathering information and assessing what different choices would mean, and that includes the ability to see options and alternatives, the ability to step back from the intensity of the moment and assess the impact of different choices. In some cases that means foresight, seeing what could happen in a situation that may come up, the kinds of pulls and pressures one may be subject to, as I would suggest peer pressure is. Education helps develop a sense of self, of who I am, what I value, and what I want to be and do, and how different decisions will support or alter those values and those chosen goals. It gives a sense of power and control over one's own life and actions, and that is the basis of self-esteem and the ability to withstand pressure from others to go against oneself, be that pressure from another

individual or one's peers or whoever. At the same time as one develops true self-understanding and self-esteem, one develops an understanding and respect for other people, and that is the basis for healthy interpersonal relationships. Mr. Speaker, these are the values in so-called sex education in the schools.

In addressing this motion, I would make a number of points. Sex education does not occur only in schools or through parents. Children are bombarded by messages about sexual behaviour on TV, in the print media, at the corner grocery store's pornography stand, and through involvement with one's own peers and older family members. Of course, much of this information is incorrect, incomplete, founded on myths and stereotypes, and sometimes is just plain wrong. Really honest dialogue may be hampered by shyness, embarrassment, fear of appearing ignorant or unsophisticated or being laughed at, overall feelings of vulnerability, or an inability to understand changes in one's own body and one's own feelings.

Sex education as it is presented in the schools is not simply about the sex act itself but is about information and human development, be that development physical, psychological, or emotional, and the intensity and rapidity of change during puberty and adolescence. Sex education is about human interpersonal relationships and decision-making in the context of those relationships. Sex education is about the impact in one's own life and the lives of persons important to one of different choices and alternatives that face young people in regard to their sexual behaviour. Sex education is about the varieties of sexual activity. Sex education is about the reproductive processes and the possible outcomes that result from engaging in a variety of sexual activities, including feelings about oneself and others, how one will be viewed by others, pregnancy and disease, and how one can prevent negative consequences from sexual activities, including the prevention of pregnancy or the transmission of disease. Sex education is about making choices about one's own behaviour and taking control over one's own life. Thus, sex education is about empowering young people to make informed decisions through examination of the alternatives available, including abstinence, including feelings, impact on others, the possibility of pregnancy and disease.

Sex education is about aiding the development of self-control and responsibility for self, for it is in making decisions that deeply affect one's own life and being able to withstand pressure from others that we come to know ourselves and to value ourselves. It is about understanding human strength and frailty, success and failure, and the ability to talk about feelings arising out of these experiences and to develop self-understanding and determine the course of future actions. In addition, such examinations and explorations lead to understanding of and compassion for other human beings.

If sex education fails, it fails all too often because teachers are ill-prepared in an open and honest way to deal with their students' feelings, questions, and experiences. Teachers trained through videotape presentations are not assessed for this openness, their comprehension of the issues their students may bring to them. I would return to when counselors were first introduced into the schools. It didn't work. This course the member opposite condemns was a course to make sure that doesn't happen in this most important area at this most important time.

Mr. Speaker, sex education courses are difficult to teach, as all true education is, because it is the drawing force in the development of the human person, and that takes energy, intelligence, and compassion. In addition, parents must have a right to be

involved, to be briefed, to understand what sex education is about. Sex education is about choices and empowerment. It is about the development of autonomous individuals who act out of self-understanding and concern for others. As I said earlier, we must be very careful about how we interpret research. It is easy to make snap judgments or pull parts of sentences out of a report. What is more important are the changes that occur over time. I would respectfully suggest that sex education leads to more responsible behaviour, higher self-esteem, a greater sense of control over one's own life. These are the attributes of a healthy human being. To hold people in ignorance, to deny them information, is a mark of profound disrespect, for it fails to provide the basis for responsible behaviour and true adulthood.

Thank you.

MR. PAYNE: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could begin this afternoon by observing that I think in Alberta, perhaps even North America, there's an editorial tendency to cast critics of modern sex education into the same category as book burners and prohibitionists. The *Calgary Herald* columnist Charles Frank, for example, wrote a recent column about the emotion we're debating today. The headline in the *Calgary Herald* proclaimed, "Dark Ages threatening a comeback." It strikes me, Mr. Speaker, that one should be able to have some reservations about the way sex education is being taught without winning instant eligibility for membership in the flat earth society.

Before proceeding further, I think it might be useful to define the term "sex education." When I talk about sex education, I don't mean the bare-bones facts about how babies are made. That's a natural outgrowth of the health curriculum. With the term sex education I'm including the moral components of the curriculum. Let's send kids messages about good and bad sexual behaviour. I doubt that I could define the term much better than former U.S. Secretary of Education, William Bennett. Secretary Bennett said it well when he said:

Sex education has to do with how boys and girls, how men and women, treat each other and themselves. It has to do with how boys and girls, how men and women, should treat each other and themselves. Sex education is therefore about character and the formation of character.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that a sex education course in which issues of right and wrong do not occupy centre stage is an evasion and an irresponsibility.

I doubt that any member of the Assembly believes that keeping our children ignorant about sex education topics leads to abstinence. On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, I don't believe sex education can be adequately taught without some kind of grounding or foundation in morality. I have some very serious concerns about teaching kids and teenagers about their own sexuality without teaching them about the morality of sexual activity. Now, I understand that the Department of Education here in Alberta tries to keep morality issues out of the schools. I haven't read the rationale for that, but I'm sure it's probably founded in the fact that we have a very pluralistic society. But the neutrality line of reasoning is that teachers and counselors act as catalysts of discussion to help students discover their own values. Students are taught that it's okay to say no, not that they ought to or should say no. Now, on the surface this is an appealing approach. It sounds objective, detached, and academic, and we might infer that parents are the ones to add the moral component. But let's be honest in the House this afternoon. Sex education cannot be neutral or objective. [interjection] There's an appeal from the NDP benches for me

to be honest. I'd like to assure them that has been my lifelong style.

To repeat, Mr. Speaker, let's be honest: sex education can't be neutral or objective. It's philosophically and intellectually impossible to be morally neutral and still openly answer in the classroom every question kids are likely to ask in this sensitive subject area.

Now, maybe we can sit down a class of 13-year-old boys and show them what contraceptives look like, where they can buy them or how to get them free, even how to use them, without giving them an idea about whether we think they should engage in premarital sex. Still I submit we send a powerful message that will likely stimulate curiosity about how to do it. Now, maybe I'm on the wrong side of the issue this time. Maybe Alberta's curriculum is the one that will radically reduce teenage pregnancy and the transmission of sexual diseases.

MR. McINNIS: Who's saying that?

MR. PAYNE: I'm saying maybe. That's one conclusion one could draw from the Alberta curriculum. The fact is no one can show me that there's a good chance the existing curriculum will do that.

Now, the hon. sponsoring member today has read at great speed a great number of statistical sources, so I'm reluctant to add to the body of statistical data today. I did have several pages' worth, but I think I will just pull out one or two.

The first is a conclusion drawn by the Human Life Research Institute, an eastern Canadian research group that focused on ethical issues. In the course of doing that, they surveyed all 10 provincial departments of Education, including our own, and 240 school boards. That was done two years ago. Here is their interesting conclusion.

To our knowledge, there has never been a methodologically rigorous longitudinal study of the impact of sex education on human behaviour conducted in Canada.

Accepting at face value that conclusion based on what appears to be a rigorous study – and I am very sensitive to the Member for Edmonton-Avonmore's caution that we be very careful and very rigorous and very objective in reviewing our research data. I'd like to assure her that I am sensitive to that caution. But despite that, I would like to suggest that we don't really have a whole lot of reliable statistical data of our own here in Canada or certainly in Alberta. Therefore, we're forced to look elsewhere. I suspect that's what triggered the statistical comments of the sponsoring member today.

I think the only one I'll refer to is the one that goes back the longest. I guess the granddaddy of sexual education, geographically speaking, is Sweden. I'd like to go back 34 years. In 1956, when Sweden mandated comprehensive, graphic sex education, the illegitimacy rate, which had been declining, rose for every age group except the older ones, who didn't receive this special education.

Now, as I mentioned, Mr. Speaker, I have a lot of other statistical data. Rather than put that into the debate today, I will simply retain it and be more than happy to discuss it with government and opposition members when another forum presents itself, because I do want to make some additional points that go above and beyond the citation of statistics.

It's been said that a neoconservative is a liberal with a daughter in high school. Now, maybe some of you in the House today can relate to that. I'm a pretty small "I" liberal when it comes to sex education in general. But you know, when my kids hit high school – and I've now put seven through high school –

I began to take a hard look at what they were learning and how it compared with what Mom and Dad were teaching them at home. Now, when I look at statistics on sexual behaviour among kids in Alberta today, I feel that liberalness waning again. In *Trouble: A Way Out*, a 1987 study on teen pregnancy and sexually transmitted diseases in Alberta, reveals some startling figures, and I suspect most of the members today are familiar with those. Our pregnancy rate here in Alberta is 37 percent higher than the national average, abortions are 24 percent higher than the average, and gonorrhea runs a startling 87 percent higher. These data were prepared for a meeting of directors in the Alberta community health system in May of '87.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I really question whether or not a teacher can teach about how to prevent these things better than a parent. The biological facts are, of course, necessary, especially for those kids whose parents won't discuss sexuality in the home. But do they really need the rest of the information, that could affect their attitudes toward their sexuality, from a classroom teacher? A few days ago I received a phone call from a constituent whose daughter is in grade 11 at Henry Wise Wood high school in Calgary, very concerned about the question of who's doing the classroom teaching. She reported to me that the teacher of her daughter's sex education class was, in fact, not a school teacher but rather a counselor from the Calgary Birth Control Association, whose approach to the subject was described by this parent as trivializing and biased against the option of just saying no.

I'd like to ask, albeit rhetorically, Mr. Speaker, this question of the members: just how viable is the option of saying no? Is this simply an old-fashioned, out-of-touch question? Or does it have startling currency? A number of cities are turning up evidence that most youngsters are in fact looking for an excuse to abstain. This will be my last statistic, but it's one of the best, and I hope it'll be acceptable to the Member for Edmonton-Avonmore. In 1980 the teen services program at Atlanta, Georgia's, Grady Memorial hospital interviewed 1,000 girls under the age of 16, of whom the overwhelming majority, 87 percent, indicated they wanted to learn how to say no without hurting anyone's feelings.

Professional sex educators agree that when it comes to guidance, parents are the best source. This is probably the first generation in the western world of parents that believe sex is normal and natural, and that leaves plenty of room for the moral question: when is it right, and with whom? I happen to believe that caring parents are entitled to their own views, Mr. Speaker, and to pass them along to their own children. Now, I know that members on both sides of the House have misgivings – and I share them – that many parents are embarrassed and reluctant to talk about sexuality at home. So maybe we'd be better off focusing on parent education, offering courses and at-home literature to parents on how to teach their kids about sex. They'll have to know the basic facts, and we can help them make sure they've got those straight. Then they, the parents, can get on with teaching the kids the rights and wrongs of sexual activity.

But, Mr. Speaker, if we in Alberta are to persist in relying on the classroom teacher to teach human sexuality in the classroom, then I would argue that it should be done within the context of existing courses of health, science, social studies, home economics, reading, and literature rather than as a separate class. With this approach, students as a group would receive sexual information in a natural, topical setting as the students are physically, mentally, and emotionally ready. An integrated program would

also offer reinforcement of information and concepts throughout a student's entire educational experience.

Mr. Speaker, maybe the material our kids are getting in Alberta does not have the effect that seems apparent in the studies I've been given. Maybe the new Alberta curriculum is the material that will reverse the trend which has given us among the highest pregnancy and STD rates in the nation. But maybe not. The fact is that nobody in this Chamber knows the definitive answer. Until we're sure, we simply can't say we're giving our kids the best sex education possible. Now, as a government we have made education our number one priority. It seems to me that until we've removed all the uncertainties from our sex education methods and materials, they don't square with education as our top priority, and the motion sponsored today by the Member for Red Deer-North, in my view, has a lot of merit.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Gold Bar.

MRS. HEWES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the comments that have been made by hon. members and the Member for Red Deer-North, who sponsored this motion. I have no doubt as to his sincerity. But I think it's a most unfortunate motion, and I won't support it. I think the motion introduces ideas, makes inferences, very suggestive kinds of ideas. In fact, the member himself used the term "witch hunt." I believe they are in error. There's no empirical data I have seen, no evidence that supports the theory that in Alberta sex education classes are contributing to the increases in teenage pregnancy or STDs.

Mr. Speaker, I think we all have our little bits of information that we read from today, and I'm no different from any of the rest of them. Just to read from a book put out by Canada Health, which is in our library, in the introduction:

Sexuality is an affirmation and expression of the whole person – of his/her biological, psychological, and sociocultural self. Sexuality is also a concept that has been suppressed for centuries. The present controversy over the actual need for sex education programs is in part a direct result of the negative influences of these repressive attitudes.

That's in our library for all of you to read and study.

Mr. Speaker, where is it that young people learn? Do they learn in school? Where do they learn? Well, they learn from songs, they learn from books, and they learn from television and all other media. They learn from magazines. They learn from comic books. They learn from their peers. The information is often distorted and often frightening. What is it that we want in our sex education programs? Well, we want benefits to our young people and to our communities. We want our young people to learn responsible behaviour, a respect for self, a respect for one another, and to have a healthy understanding of human sexuality.

Mr. Speaker, what does the member want to happen? I believe he does want those things to happen for our young people. I think that's a sincere desire. But what are the options here? Well, the options are to do nothing, and we know that ignorance, that doing nothing, doesn't work. Maturation occurs even if the young person is intellectually ignorant.

There have been some suggestions, some nice ideas from the Member for Calgary-Fish Creek about educating parents, and I respect that idea. But, Mr. Speaker, parenting is probably the most important task any of us ever do in our lives, yet there's nothing that we take more for granted. It's extremely difficult

to encourage young people embarking on parenthood to pay attention to the significance of that function. The idea, while a wonderful one and one that many of us have tried for years to encourage through a variety of institutions and organizations, isn't one yet that has caught on with those parents who perhaps have the greatest need. We can, of course, leave it to the family, and in our school systems that's permissive. Of course, all parents involved aren't interested in this kind of teaching with their children. Sometimes, I submit, the teacher in a classroom may be the only mentor, the only adult who appears to care for the young person and to whom the young person relates easily and comfortably at that time in their life.

Mr. Speaker, it's important that we continue to provide accurate information that is accessible, that is permissive. Of course we want parent involvement in it. But I gather that the mover wants either to change dramatically the curriculum or simply abandon it. Now, as far as I'm concerned, that flies in the face of the information we're getting all across this province and elsewhere in our country and abroad. Just some quotes from Dr. Bonham, the medical officer of health in Calgary, September 23, 1989:

While Bonham sees things improving within the next five to 10 years, particularly if sex education is made universally accessible in Alberta schools, there are still problem areas.

It goes on to say:

Countries which have successfully reduced teenage pregnancy, he says, have done it through sex education and contraceptive counselling.

Bonham gives the example of the Netherlands which has the lowest rate of teenage pregnancy. There are strong Catholic and fundamentalist Christian communities in Holland, yet he says they have realized they can't afford to have pregnant teens so have focused on education and clinical services.

That's our own medical officer of health in Calgary, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: Former.

MRS. HEWES: Former – I beg your pardon – but well known to many of us.

Mr. Speaker, I can also quote from studies from Prince Edward Island. This one goes back to 1980. In the executive summary:

Nowadays, with the influence of home and church waning, and the influence of society in general increasing, the children are left with very little on which to base a value judgment for their own conduct, and few people are helping them.

Further, from the same document:

Both parents and teachers feel that sex education should start as early as grades four to nine so that the children will have a basic knowledge of anatomy and physiology when they reach high school.

That's Prince Edward Island.

Mr. Speaker, Ontario says that the

Ontario study has shown that for every dollar spent on birth control education, \$10 of social service spending is saved.

That's from a current study in Ontario.

Another member has quoted from Sweden. I have a document; it's not quite as far back as the other one quoted from. This is 1984. It's on Swedish sex education and its result.

The main argument in favour of this instruction is that the traditional embarrassed silence on the subject and modern commercial exploitation of sex both give rise to grossly mistaken ideas and attitudes. Instead families and schools must provide frank, positive and responsible information about sexuality and the part it plays in close human relations.

Further in the same report, Mr. Speaker:

Between 1965 and 1970, there was a disturbingly rapid rise in the incidence in Sweden of gonorrhoea, a sexually transmitted disease, among men . . . and women . . . The situation attracted a great deal of publicity and . . . school information measures about gonorrhoea were vigorously intensified. After 1970 the incidence . . . in these age groups declined by about 40 per cent in five years, a reduction without parallel in any other country.

It goes on, Mr. Speaker, regarding teenage pregnancy.

Low and declining rates are probably at least in part due to a close partnership between the schools and the family planning services.

That's a relatively current report from Sweden.

Mr. Speaker, in Quebec, a quote from the *Calgary Herald* of January 30, 1989:

Quebec – the only province with mandatory sex education – boasts the lowest teenage pregnancy rates in the country.

I have a couple of other very excellent reports from the province of Quebec as well.

Mr. Speaker, I would be very interested to hear the comments of the ministers of Education, Health, and social services in Our own government, because I believe their thoughts and ideas on this subject would be very germane to this debate and probably very helpful to members. It is my belief that this subject is taught with understanding of values in our schools, of responsible behaviour, of the psychological and social consequences, as well as the physical consequences of certain behaviours, and I believe it is taught in that way in our schools. While I don't have any students in elementary or high school at this present time, I do have grandchildren, and I am confident the teachers in our schools and the system itself do, in fact, monitor very carefully the information that is being given and how it's being given.

Mr. Speaker, just finally, I find this motion to be somewhat inflammatory. I believe it will produce more fear and anxiety, more defensiveness than it will help people to deal with what is a very sensitive subject. I think it is a regressive motion, and I would surely like to hear from our ministers of the Crown who are dealing with the subject. I believe it's a great pity to destroy and discredit the excellent work that is being done in our schools.

Thank you.

MR. TANNAS: Mr. Speaker, I'm not a minister of the Crown, but I certainly would like to speak to this issue. Like the hon. Member for Red Deer-North, I'm concerned that sex education not increase the incidence of sexually transmitted diseases nor that it promote teenage pregnancy. Nevertheless, I am opposed and unable to support Motion 205.

I want, first of all, to state that Alberta Education does not advocate nor does it condone premarital sexual intercourse. The Department of Education in its documents is very careful not to supplant or subvert the primary responsibility of the parents to deal with this most important dimension of human existence. The anecdotes cited by the hon. Member for Red Deer-North are certainly examples of inappropriate classroom lessons that are contrary to the Alberta curriculum. One only needs to reflect back a few years ago to a very important case here in Alberta where a teacher was removed from a teaching position because he continuously strayed from the curriculum to areas that were not approved. My suggestion is that if there's inappropriate classroom behaviour, it be reported to the school authorities and they have the power to deal with that.

I do believe that the government of Alberta is following a responsible approach to this sensitive issue. The direction by the department is clearly moral. It talks about it in a variety of ways that I want to go into. First of all, I want to share with you a little bit of the experience I had as a principal and as a teacher in the Foothills school division. We based our theme 5 on the units provided us by the Edmonton Roman Catholic separate school district, very definitely values oriented, no doubt about that. There's no doubt in my mind that the Foothills school division program is very much values oriented.

If I may read bits and pieces from the background document supplied by the Department of Education on this issue. The government of Alberta through its Department of Education has considered and addressed the teaching of human sexuality very carefully. The government maintains that, one, in the area of morals and values education schools must play a supportive role to parents, churches, and community agencies; two, parents must retain the right to decide whether or not they wish the school to assume the responsibility of teaching their children about human sexuality and related topics; and three, human sexuality programs should meet the needs of the students in the community.

A provincial program on human sexuality is available through the elementary health program in most schools from grades 4 to 6, in some of the Roman Catholic separate schools from grades 1 to 6, and, of course, in the junior high schools from 7 to 9 and in the high schools at the grade 11 level, called the CALM course. The goal of the provincial health program is to provide all students with the knowledge, skills, and positive attitudes they need to lead healthy, constructive lives. It has been designed to help students make well-informed decisions and understand how the decisions they make will affect their own well-being and the welfare of others. The program promotes the importance of personal and family values and addresses many topics, all of which have been organized carefully in the program to meet the needs, abilities, and interests of students at different ages and different stages of their personal growth.

The provincial program on human sexuality emphasizes the importance of family values and decision-making and promotes among all students desirable personal characteristics. The provincial program has been designed to enlist the participation of parents, the churches, and community agencies.

I want to talk a little bit now about history. The germ theory of disease, which was developed in the last century, arising out of some of the work of Louis Pasteur, holds that certain minute living organisms, bacterial or viral, caused many of the diseases common to man in previous centuries as well as this century. As this germ theory became known, people were empowered to make choices about their personal behaviour to avoid becoming stricken by such killers as diphtheria, smallpox, rabies, cholera, bubonic plague, dysentery, tuberculosis, typhoid fever, polio, and on and on.

Knowledge of these diseases and their causes, coupled with an understanding of prevention, has been the prime factor in easing the misery that those diseases once visited upon mankind. This knowledge, as it became more widespread, has indeed been a factor in raising the average life span of human beings all over the globe. Knowledge itself is not dangerous. Knowledge is this instance has been a tremendous benefit to mankind.

The health courses offered in Alberta schools deal with the germ theory and the related concepts of personal cleanliness and public cleanliness. All one has to do is to travel to some Third World country, where the germ theory is not as well established

among all parts of the population, to see the disadvantage of such a lack of knowledge.

So, Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on this private member's motion on the firm point that knowledge and understanding allow one to make appropriate choices. If all homes had parents who undertook to impart knowledge, understanding, and values on sex and human sexuality to their children, there would probably be little need to offer a sex education program in the schools. However, reality in this, the last decade of the 20th century, is quite different. Far too many children will receive little or no formal information on the fundamental change of life known as puberty or adolescence.

I'd like to address this issue using the document, if I may, the curriculum guide for Alberta Education, Elementary Health, and we can go through it. This is an important part of sex education. I don't think that in any way it causes people at this level to go out and engage in untoward sexual activity. Two themes in theme 5 are puberty and reproduction.

With the onset of puberty and the difficult period of adolescence, students need information and an opportunity to process that information – to weigh it, clarify it in terms of their own values and those of their family.

This unit should involve the home as much as possible. Parents should be aware of the materials covered – not just for information's sake, but in order that they may carry on the discussion at home (where the student's values originated).

The instructions for teaching this part of theme 5:

Experience has shown that implementation is smoother and community acceptance is greater when the following conditions have been met prior to introducing the theme:

- a parent information night to meet the teacher, and to review media and teaching concepts.

Indeed, such is the case that many school boards have made this parent night a mandatory item, and parental permission then is sought for each child, to attend these kinds of classes.

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

It is also recommended to the teacher by the curriculum guide that they "invite guest speakers well in advance," and the suggestion is "public health nurse, physician, or other trained personnel from the community." In the school division in which I work, we consistently had doctors and nurses in who helped the teacher with this and other dimensions of human sexuality.

I could go on for a prolonged period of time – indeed, I intended to – but I'll dispense with that. I also could have gone through the junior high one with a number of appropriate markings. The main point is that parents be involved, that they stick with the idea that parents have the primary responsibility, and parents always have control in that they may withdraw their children if they wish at some time along the way, or they may choose to teach the children at home and have the child not take part in any of the classes. That's firmly part of Alberta Education's provisions.

I think we need to consider sex education in the school in the context of the whole child and the child's environment: the home, the school, the church, the peer group, our current society and its values. We also need to take into account current values as expressed on television, in popular music, in current teenage literature, in popular magazines and movies. Children must be given information appropriate to their ages, related to their need to know at that age. This information needs to be given in a caring atmosphere that minimizes the child's embarrassment, that addresses responsible behaviour, is mindful of

inappropriate behaviour and the consequences of such inappropriate behaviour, and that helps each child to develop personal strategies to cope in a healthy way with their own sexuality.

This information should be given in the home. However, as mentioned before, evidence suggests that it does not occur in the majority of homes. To that extent the Alberta school curriculum guides emphasize over and over again: the school must communicate with the parents about its program, involve parents in all the details of the program, and provide every parent with the power to withdraw their children from any or all of the theme 5 instruction.

Mr. Speaker, I'm unable to support this motion because all parents in the province of Alberta have the choice to take responsibility to impart their values and understandings to each of their children. Parents may have the school assume the task and responsibility if they so choose. Finally, I think the Department of Education is realistic, as it realizes that parents do not exercise this responsibility in all instances. If they do not, their children will gain a flawed understanding provided by movie and TV images, the wisdom of the locker room, conventional peer myths, stereotypes, and the perversions of the smut merchants. The bottom line must be that if parents don't teach it and the school is not permitted to teach it, it will be taught in the streets. Sex education is too important to be left to the hazards of the street.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Cardston.

MR. ADY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have just a very few moments, but I would like to make a few comments on Motion 205 and would certainly like to say that I favour the intent of Motion 205 and would like to clarify that I don't believe the motion makes any suggestion that sex education should not be taught in the school; it's the manner in which it should be taught. All of the opposing members have indicated that the motion speaks to it being totally removed. I'd just like to say that sex education has been a long time coming. It's been an evolution. I remember living in Calgary in the '60s when they said that our children were certainly going to be misinformed and uninformed if they didn't have sex education. Now, these many years to 1989, we have mandatory sex education in our schools in Alberta, as of September 1989.

I don't have a problem with teaching young people about basic physiological and emotional changes, but I find it difficult to believe that at age 8 we have to start teaching kids some of the things about how to make love. For centuries parents have been able to take care of that, and we haven't really needed teachers to be in at that young age. I think that at the age of 10, we all know, children are very impressionable and they often

take on the attitude that the teachers know more than the parents do. How often have we heard our own children come home and say, "That's not right, Mom, Dad; teacher says"? And if teacher says, that's the last word. So there is the impression at a very young age. Age 10 is too young for that concept to be taught in the schools.

Let's look at what a teacher has to say these days. By grade 5 – that's 11 years old – teachers have told them all the mechanics of sexuality, how babies are made, changes in puberty, using the current curriculum in our schools today. They're told that the only requirement for having a baby is physical maturity and then money and the ability to cope with having a child. No mention of marriage, monogamy, or whether or not sexual activity is a good idea for use. The material here is strictly neutral as it's presented in our curriculum today. By grade 6 the mechanics of making babies is transferred into intercourse, and kids are learning things, for example – well, let me say it's the sort of things they're learning in detail that Adam and Eve got busy and covered up with a fig leaf. Nevertheless, still no requirement about mentioning whether or not they should experiment with this pleasure, no mention of monogamy or values: everything is strictly neutral. The child is to make his or her own decision. The 11-year-old is to make his or her own responsible decision. Why don't we have them make those same kinds of decisions about stealing or lying? But no, we're busy teaching morals and values about that.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the time, I move that we adjourn debate.

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

HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed, please say no. Motion carries.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, the business of the House tonight will be Committee of Supply, dealing with Family and Social Services. I move that when we reassemble this evening, we do so in the Committee of Supply.

MR. SPEAKER: Having heard the motion, those in favour, please say aye.

HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed, please say no. Motion carries.

[The House recessed at 5:29 p.m.]