

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA**

Title: **Thursday, October 18, 1984 2:30 p.m.**

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

**PRAYERS**

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

**head: INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS**

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased today to introduce to you and to members of the Assembly the Canadian Ambassador to the Federal Republic of Germany, His Excellency Donald MacPhail. I ask that Mr. MacPhail, who is in your gallery, rise and receive the welcome of members of the Assembly.

**head: INTRODUCTION OF BILLS****Bill 220****Public Ambulance Act**

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill No. 220, entitled the Public Ambulance Act.

The Act would ensure provincewide uniform and adequate standards in training for personnel, equipment, communications, and other essentials of good ambulance service. Through the power to license, the minister responsible could ensure that no substandard ambulance service would operate in the province of Alberta.

[Leave granted; Bill 220 read a first time]

**head: TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS**

MR. SPEAKER: I am tabling the interim report of the Electoral Boundaries Commission, which was received when the House was not sitting; also the final report, which was received today.

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the financial statements for the Crown hospitals for the year ended March 31, 1984.

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the annual report of the Alberta Art Foundation for the year 1983-84.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I'm tabling the annual report of the Alberta Securities Commission for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1983.

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table the response to Written Question No. 176 of this session.

**head: INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, it's not very often that I have the pleasure of introducing students from my constituency to members of the Assembly. Perhaps the students could have chosen a little better day to be here; nevertheless they are welcome. Along with 30 students from the Spirit River elementary grade 6 class, we have Mr. James Brandon, the principal of the school, Miss Patricia Cavasin, a teacher, Mr. Lee

Smithson, Cliff Dolhan, Linda Dika, Beth McLane, and Carol Sellin. They are seated in the members' gallery. I ask them to stand and be welcomed by members of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: May I draw the attention of hon. members to the presence in the Speaker's gallery of two gentlemen who have joined the service of the Assembly: Mr. Charles Eliuk, the new chief of Administration, and Mr. David Greer, the acting Editor of *Alberta Hansard*. I ask them to stand, and ask the Assembly to welcome them to this Chamber and to the service of the House.

MR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Speaker, I'm very pleased to introduce to you, and through you to members of the Assembly, some visitors who, through their endeavours and philosophy, bring joy and happiness to countless numbers throughout the world. These are young citizens who bring enthusiasm, excitement, and positiveness to all of us who know them. I'm referring to the organization called Up With People.

This organization began in 1968, primarily as an international education organization. The Up With People cast with us today have men and women aged 18 to 26 years from 13 different countries. Since their inception, Mr. Speaker, they have travelled and performed in 47 countries throughout the world. It is so popular, in fact, that over 10,000 apply to be members each year and only 800 are accepted into the organization.

The cast here today is being sponsored by the Alberta Children's Hospital Foundation, and they will be performing two performances this Sunday at the Jubilee Auditorium. I would like members to welcome 50 members from the Up With People organization, including group leaders Ann Chriswell and Sally Hawks. They are seated in both galleries. I ask them to now rise and receive the warm welcome and best wishes of this Assembly.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you and to members of the Assembly some 16 members of the adult career development class of Grant MacEwan, situated in the constituency of Edmonton Norwood. They are here with their group leader, Don Whalen, and are seated in the members' gallery. I ask them to stand so that members can give them the traditional welcome of this Assembly.

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to introduce to you 14 students from the Alberta Vocational Centre that is situated in Edmonton Centre. These students are learning English as a second language. I had the opportunity of having a conversation with them prior to coming into the Assembly, and I was most impressed. Two of the students have only been here for nine and a half months, and the way they have mastered the English language is to be admired. Accompanied by their teacher, Michelle Tracy, they are sitting in the public gallery. I ask that they please rise and receive the warm welcome of this Assembly.

**head: MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS****Treasury Department**

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce two new tax initiatives designed to broaden the base of the Alberta economy, create jobs, and increase manufacturing and processing.

Although the harvesting, extraction, and sale of our basic resources will continue to be fundamental to our economic strength for foreseeable decades, since 1971 Alberta has made significant strides in economic diversification and job creation. Progress has been especially rapid in petrochemicals, agricultural processing, forest products, telecommunications, oil and

gas equipment technology, financial services, engineering services, and tourism facilities. The value of all Alberta manufacturing shipments rose from almost \$3 billion in 1973 to more than \$12.7 billion in 1983. Since 1971 almost half a million new jobs have been created in Alberta, many in the manufacturing and processing area.

To boost job opportunities and make more secure the employment of those with jobs, it is now timely to initiate added incentives which will encourage both a larger and a more diversified range of manufacturing, processing, and upgrading in the province.

In 1980 Alberta brought back home its responsibilities for corporate tax, and the system is now fully operational and functioning smoothly. Today I am pleased to announce two business tax initiatives that will encourage diversification and job creation for Albertans:

- Firstly, the existing general corporate tax rate of 11 percent will be reduced to 5 percent on all manufacturing and processing income earned in Alberta.
- Secondly, the existing small business tax rate of 5 percent will be reduced to zero for companies with manufacturing and processing income earned in Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, I will propose legislation early next spring to implement these rates for a five-year period beginning April 1, 1985.

These initiatives will encourage manufacturing and processing activity by a wide range of businesses and industries in Alberta, by stimulating not only the expansion of existing firms but also the setting up of new operations. The five-year tax holiday for small manufacturing and processing businesses will assist entrepreneurs and create new employment.

These two new tax moves parallel the government's major youth employment initiatives of October 3, which resulted in \$.5 billion now being committed to job creation and training assistance for 80,000 Albertans. The challenge facing the private sector is to use both programs to create long-term jobs.

With the Alberta economic recovery in progress and firming up month by month, private-sector decision-makers are now considering manufacturing and processing investment decisions for 1985 and onwards. They now know that these significant new tax incentives will be in place effective April 1, 1985, and can plan accordingly. The two tax reductions will assist a total of more than 3,200 Alberta companies, of which some 2,500 are small businesses.

With these new tax incentives, Alberta's new tax rates on manufacturing and processing become the lowest in Canada. This move is yet another signal to investors that the Alberta government welcomes and will facilitate decisions by entrepreneurs to carry on manufacturing and processing and create jobs here. The average rate of provincial corporate tax on manufacturing and processing in the other nine provinces is now about 14 percent.

Following existing policy, Mr. Speaker, these measures will be implemented in the simplest possible way. Definitions already existing in the tax system will be used. Small businesses whose activity is primarily manufacturing and processing will not be required to separate out that income from other activity.

The cost of the program, in terms of forgone tax revenue to government, is estimated at approximately \$65 million for a full year.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, these job creation initiatives reflect item 2(b) on page 58 of the Alberta white paper entitled *Proposals for an Industrial and Science Strategy for Albertans, 1985 to 1990*. During public discussion over past weeks, there has been widespread support for this diversification proposal.

## head: ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

### Agricultural Assistance

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the first question this afternoon to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. Yesterday, on the question of farm bankruptcies, the Premier made the comment — I think it's on page 7 of Hansard [Blues] — that going from memory and [subject to] checking into the figures, "a very small percentage of farm bankruptcies" . . . Today, of course, we had the president of Unifarm indicate that as many as 15 percent, or some 8,400 Alberta farmers, could be in trouble.

My question to the Minister of Agriculture is simply this: what special action is the government going to take to deal with not only the issue of bankruptcy but forced sale by many farmers in Alberta?

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, there's no doubt that farmers are going through a difficult time with the cost/price squeeze and a number of other factors. But I think we have to recognize and put into context that the Premier's statement yesterday was accurate in that a very small percentage of farmers are in difficulty. The health and viability of the agricultural sector are of major concern to our government and have been since 1971, and we have been making a significant number of moves. I refer the hon. member to a recent publication on the government of Alberta drought assistance programs, which I know I sent to his office and which outlines some of the moves we made lately.

With respect to financing, we have made a number of moves with the Agricultural Development Corporation, recognizing that with the change in the policy of the banks to loan on cash flow rather than equity and also the high rates at the Farm Credit Corporation, the Agricultural Development Corporation has to play an even larger role in helping our producers. We have done that and will continue to look at those programs.

In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, I refer hon. members to pages 20, 64, and 65 and Appendix A of the white paper, which outline some of the moves we've made to assist farmers. In addition, it also states some new initiatives we're looking at.

This past July, at the ministers' conference in Winnipeg, the top item of concern among all ministers was the financial situation of farmers. At that time we established a task force that would work and report to ministers at a special meeting in Toronto in the first part of November. It will look at all new areas of helping and creating new pools of capital and trying to assist agriculture. But not waiting for that, we have made a number of moves and are looking at other areas where we might be able to enhance and improve our programs.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. What directive, if any, has the minister given the Agricultural Development Corporation to evaluate the recent announcement by President Reagan in the United States that the Farmers Home Administration will defer up to 25 percent of farm debts — at no interest, I might add? What direction has the minister given Alberta agencies to review that initiative?

MR. SPEAKER: At the moment the question should probably be permitted, but it's a very, very thinly disguised effort at making a representation and saying: this is what another jurisdiction is doing; what's going on in this jurisdiction? It's really not a true question, to simply find something that's going on

somewhere else and say, what study is the minister making of it?

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, just on a point of order, if I may. It certainly would have some effect on our farmers. But the more important question is whether or not, in the ongoing administration of a very large department of this government, there is monitoring of events that impact on farmers elsewhere and might have advantage to farmers in Alberta. My specific question is, has there been any direction from the minister's department to evaluate that program?

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, the answer to that question is no. However, I don't think the thought should be left in anyone's mind that we aren't making all moves we can with the Agricultural Development Corporation. In fact you could say that in some way there's been an unofficial moratorium on agricultural debts through the corporation, because we have been trying in every way possible to work with all our clients and even some who aren't clients of ADC. They're welcome to come to ADC, and our counsellors will try to help them to work out their financial difficulties. So there really wasn't any directive needed to try to enhance what ADC is always doing, because I really think the Agricultural Development Corporation is the best friend the farmers have in Alberta.

MR. NOTLEY: Maybe a better friend than the government.

Mr. Speaker, my question to the minister: is the minister telling the House that in spite of actions by other jurisdictions, including the United States, the government's position at this point in time is that the programs in place by the ADC are adequate to deal with the present financial plight of Alberta farmers?

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, I said in my comments that we always are looking at ways we can enhance that. There is a need for creation of new pools of capital. Two were identified in the white paper: agribonds and the Alberta agricultural credit bank. There are new pools of capital necessary for Albertans and for the farm producers and processors in this province, and we're looking at all of them.

Of course, I think the task force report that will be made to the ministers of agriculture in November is pretty key also in looking at new areas where we can be of even greater assistance. We have that good, solid strength in our agricultural community. We want it to continue, and we'll look at all options that are open to try to meet that challenge. And it is a challenge. It takes all of us working together — farm organizations, banks, the government, and the federal government included.

Mr. Speaker, we will continue to monitor, study, and work to try to improve and enhance our programs so that agriculture in Alberta remains strong.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Apart from looking at other options down the road, has the minister any program in place, beyond the programs already identified, to deal with the debt crisis faced, according to the president of Unifarm, by 15 percent or some 8,400 Alberta farmers, many of whom are in very, very serious trouble?

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Leader of the Opposition can quote Unifarm, but there are two other farm organizations in the province that have done a study. Their review indicates that while there is a serious problem for some farmers, there is no crisis yet for all farmers. I don't know whether the 15 percent figure the hon. Leader of the Opposition

used is accurate or not, but certainly a number of producers have some difficulty with their cash flow. That was one of the reasons we moved to put in a trade account debt consolidation through the Ag Development Corporation and made some other moves to try to be of assistance.

We will do all we can to try to assist our producers. We have to remember that all our programs, including the Agricultural Development Corporation programs, are to provide every opportunity and every break for people to be involved in agriculture and to succeed, but there is no guarantee of success.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. The minister indicated the situation with respect to some farmers and not others. Following that along, could the minister advise the Assembly whether the government gave any consideration to a program similar to the Saskatchewan northeastern flood compensation program, where acreage payments were made to farmers in those areas where there was very serious rainfall during spring seeding? The minister is well aware of problems in pockets of northern Alberta. Why was no program announced in Alberta, when one was announced in Saskatchewan?

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, I'm aware of the program, and I believe that's a joint program between the federal government PFRA and the province of Saskatchewan. I have asked for a review of that program and what impact it may have on any pockets in Alberta that may be of concern. I know about the program, and I've asked for an assessment. If a way could be identified to help any area of Alberta, I certainly would like our producers to have that opportunity. So I'm looking at it.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Could the minister tell the House why the government is looking at it, when Saskatchewan has in fact acted upon it?

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, we have to remember that there's been a different mix of agriculture in Saskatchewan and Manitoba and a different relationship with the Prairie Farm Assistance Act in those provinces. It was one issue I raised on October 1, when I signed the drought agreement on behalf of the province of Alberta with the federal minister.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question.

MR. SPEAKER: Might this be the final supplementary in this series.

MR. NOTLEY: Given the very serious problem snowfall has created for unharvested crops, particularly in northern Alberta, where spring seeding conditions were very bad, could the minister advise whether this government is prepared to look at any contingency program to provide cash inflow for farmers who may not be successful getting their crops off, with as much as a foot of snowfall in the last few hours?

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, I can't answer on what may or may not be done. I regret that we ended up with a snowfall like this, but my report is that the majority of the crops in Alberta are completed. There are certain pockets that have some difficulty. I've asked the department to give me an assessment of how broad the range of concern is: how big an area is impacted, and how much of the crops are actually out. So we're monitoring the situation, Mr. Speaker.

### Oil and Gas Revenues

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the second question to the hon. Premier. It's with respect to the sessional paper his colleague the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources released yesterday, showing that rather than the \$64 billion anticipated from the energy agreement the Premier signed in 1981, it will be \$27.6 billion, or about 60 percent less. Could the Premier advise the Assembly what assessment the government has made of the whole process of forecasting in estimates, as a result of this obvious significant difference between the expected amount and what now in fact seems to be the most recent forecast?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I'm delighted to be asked about that matter. The real question that I believe has to be discussed in the Legislative Assembly is the revenue flows to both the industry and the government that would have occurred in relationship to the provisions of the national energy program of October 28, 1980, compared to the revenue flows that are now flowing as a result of the agreement of September 1, 1981.

The forecasts that were contained in that agreement came about as a result of intense discussions involving both the federal government and the Alberta government during the spring of 1981. The forecasts that were in fact presented by the federal government were by far the highest scenario of price forecasts. At the same time, we canvassed industry representatives during that period of the spring and summer of 1981, and their forecasts were relatively close to the federal government. Ours were not as high as either but certainly were much higher than what in fact occurred. About 99.2 percent of forecasters were roughly close to the average of the forecasters in the spring and summer of 1981 on world oil pricing. I have difficulty even remembering who that exceptional case might be.

The interesting aspect that has to relate to that forecast — because I remember the negotiations very clearly — is that the higher the forecast that was placed in the agreement, the better for the province of Alberta because the more quickly the price increases accelerated. We were quite prepared and quite satisfied with a forecast that had an acceleration, because it moved us to world oil price more quickly than would otherwise have been the case with a lower price forecast. So having a higher forecast worked out very well for the people of Alberta, the province of Alberta, and the industry.

The really important question is a 20 percent increase in revenue flow, I believe — and that's into many billions of dollars — both to the industry and to the province as a result of the agreement of September 1, 1981, compared to the national energy program of October 28, 1980. [some applause]

MR. MARTIN: They're clapping because they lost money.

MR. NOTLEY: I think they've lost the train of the Premier's answer.

A supplementary question. Given this drastic reduction from \$64 billion down to \$27.6 billion and the listing here of eight steps taken by the government — and we know that on April 1, 1982, the Premier very nicely gave us an estimate of \$5.4 billion over the lifetime of the agreement — could I ask the hon. Premier if this government has any estimate as to the total cost of the eight initiatives identified by his minister in the sessional paper yesterday?

MR. LOUGHEED: I refer the question to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources.

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, the document that was tabled indicated events that have occurred since signing the September 1, 1981, agreement and subsequent to the imposition of the NEP — with the support of the NDP. I'm not sure whether the hon. leader of the NDP is referring to those specific calendar date references. Perhaps he could be more specific.

MR. MARTIN: Pay attention, John.

MR. NOTLEY: Yes, I'm sure the minister is paying attention now.

MR. MARTIN: He's trying to be funny again.

MR. NOTLEY: Not successfully. Nevertheless I put to the minister whether there has now been a complete inventory and estimate of the cost of all the incentives and decisions made subsequent to the April 1982 economic resurgence announcement in this House, where a figure was given. Do we have a total for all the changes that were made subsequent to that?

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, for each of the incentive programs that have been announced — and most specifically the oil and gas activity plan — the revenue and cost implications were identified at the time they were brought forward. I'm sure if we want to go through the arithmetic exercise of compilation, that would be a matter ideally suited for the Order Paper and could be placed there.

Mr. Speaker, what's very important to note is that the factors outlined in the supporting documentation tabled in the answer to the question relate in a very significant way to the subsequent measures which have been successful in pushing back the boundaries of the NEP, outlining instance after instance where the government of Alberta, working with industry, has been able to cause the federal government to move back the boundaries of the NEP, to allow more oil to qualify for world price. These are the initiatives that are outlined as much as anything else in the documentation.

But in terms of asking for a mathematical or arithmetic computation, I'd be happy to receive such a question on the Order Paper if the member wishes to put it there.

MR. NOTLEY: So the answer is, no, the minister can't tell us. We know it's at least \$5.4 billion ...

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I hesitate to interrupt the hon. leader, but I'd like to draw the attention of the House to the fact that we have now gone over a third of the question period and, in addition to the hon. leader of the Independents, I have eight other members who have indicated that they wish to ask questions. I'm just trying to encourage a little brevity.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, bearing that stricture in mind — and I think making the point — I will yield to the next questioner.

### Corporate Income Tax

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question to the Provincial Treasurer is with regard to the announcement today. Could the Provincial Treasurer advise the Assembly why April 1, 1985, was set as the date on which the tax reduction would come into effect?

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, some careful planning in the drafting of the legislation and consideration of it by the Leg-

islature are to take place. As well, there are indications that the federal government may be moving in the area of tax changes, and we'd want to mesh with those.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Could the minister indicate whether the tax reductions would be factors in avoiding bankruptcy or in assisting businesses that are in difficulty at the present time to avoid bankruptcy or difficult cash-flow situations?

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, as noted by the Premier yesterday, the bankruptcies in respect of business are lower in Alberta than in Ontario or British Columbia and are less than 1 percent of all the businesses in the province. I think that would answer the question posed.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. In terms of tax reduction, could the Provincial Treasurer clarify whether one of the intents is to assist the business in a better cash-flow position?

MR. HYNDMAN: The intent is very clear, Mr. Speaker, and I'm happy to have the opportunity to restate it: to encourage upgrading, manufacturing, and processing in the province of Alberta; to broaden the economic base; to create jobs; to expand existing industries and have new jobs there; and to have new ones created and expanded, with added employment opportunities. Those are the clear and stated benefits, and they have accrued in this province as they have in others.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question in line with what the minister said. Does that mean that will enhance the business opportunity, the future of businesses in this province?

MR. HYNDMAN: It certainly will, Mr. Speaker. For the 99 percent who are in a position to take advantage of the benefit, I'm sure there will be benefits.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. My question is very clear: why isn't the legislation brought into the Assembly during this session and the tax implemented as quickly as possible, to help businesses this fall and early in 1985 rather than waiting until April 1, 1985?

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I think tax legislation must, in fairness, be considered and approved by the Assembly before it is implemented. [interjections] That's absolutely essential. What this announcement today does is provide a signal to those who are planning in the private sector, entrepreneurs who want to get out and make decisions for beginning next April — they now know that — in order to have opportunities for manufacturing and upgrading and processing, which will create jobs. [interjections]

#### **Holy Cross Hospital**

MR. NELSON: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care. It relates to the discussion that is taking place, particularly in Calgary, with regard to Holy Cross hospital. I wonder if any decisions have been made with regard to the concern raised by many citizens of the city of Calgary as to the ultimate use of Holy Cross hospital.

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, members may recall that the day after the Treasurer announced his budget for this year I also announced a proposal that affected two existing hospital boards here in the province. I should say that there has been a fair amount of work done — quite a lot — with both those boards with respect to the proposals that were put in front of them and the evaluation of counter proposals, et cetera. I know this has resulted in a great deal of speculation in the media as to what is happening or what certain dates may produce by way of a decision.

With respect to the Holy Cross board, I can only say that I believe we're very near the point of reaching what I think is an excellent compromise proposition. As soon as we've dealt with a few more details, we hope to jointly make that decision public.

MR. NELSON: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is the minister presently in a position to advise when he might be in a position to make a decision and an announcement as to the ultimate use of the Holy Cross? And — well, I'll ask a third one.

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, in a case where you're negotiating with other outside parties, near the end it's always difficult to state a date on which you hope to announce a decision. I can say that I very recently met with the board, and our objective is to get an announcement out as quickly as possible.

#### **Compensation for the Wrongly Convicted**

MR. LYSONS: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the Attorney General, on a question of policy. Could the Attorney General tell the House what our policy is with respect to compensation for people who were convicted of a crime but it was later established that they were not guilty?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I think two or three factors want to be considered with respect to that. Firstly, there is of course the desire of all people — I think it would be very widely supported — that there be a system of compensation for people finding themselves in the position, as described by the hon. member, of having been in fact wrongly convicted. The issue becomes one of the responsibility of the Crown and of the taxpayer for what amounts to a miscarriage of justice.

In at least some cases — in fact it would be difficult to conceive of a case otherwise — there would also probably be a liability on the part of a witness in the proceedings having testified in a way that brought about the conviction. That person might have given wrong or false testimony, and that would be a factor. I raise that for one reason only; that is, to identify where the responsibility might actually lie, as distinct from the Crown, in a typical case. It also is a factor that the existing criminal injuries compensation system doesn't cover this type of situation.

Mr. Speaker, I think only two other things might be said. One is that each case would have to be judged on its own. I think it's well known that there have recently been two or three cases in Canada where it is reported that some compensation has been paid in similar situations. I say that each case should be judged on its own because it is of course possible to conspire to bring about a situation where a person might, in these circumstances, gain some advantage at the expense of the taxpayer.

Having said that the decision would have to be made in each individual case, though, the policy I have under consideration at the present time for all such cases is that although there is no provision whereby the Crimes Compensation Board might

grant an award, that board might be used by way of reference in order to determine whether or not an appropriate case exists, to give an opinion to the government in specific cases and receive that by way of recommendation.

#### Food Banks

MR. SZWENDER: Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Social Services and Community Health. I am wondering if the minister could indicate to the Assembly the extent of his contact and communication with Edmonton's Food Bank and the amount of service provided by that organization.

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, this summer I met with the chairman of the board of Edmonton's Food Bank, also called the Edmonton Gleaners' Association, and discussed the questions they had and the questions I had for them. We decided that several of their people and people from the Department of Social Services and Community Health would meet to see if they could address three basic questions: one, whether or not the social allowance benefits that are being provided were meeting the needs of social allowance recipients; secondly, whether or not we need to change existing policies; also to determine other factors that may be contributing to the demand on the food bank services in the city.

MR. SZWENDER: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister indicate if the services provided by Edmonton's Food Bank have had any increase in demand over the past year?

MR. SPEAKER: I question whether the hon. minister has among his official duties to report what goes on internally in voluntary organizations.

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, in terms of the discussions I had with these people, I think it's important that we indicate that there has been an increase in demand in both Edmonton and Calgary in the last couple of years. The demand in Edmonton has increased more than in Calgary. I'd like to indicate one of the probable reasons for that; that is, there has been quite an increase in the number of agencies in Edmonton — 76 right now, I believe — that are providing services to the public.

MR. SPEAKER: With great respect to the hon. minister, I think we're getting quite far away from what was intended to be the question.

MR. SZWENDER: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Given that partial answer, could the minister indicate if his department has any plans to provide funding to Edmonton's Food Bank?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, there is no intention to provide funding, and there was no indication in our recent meeting that there should be any increase in funding. I believe the opinion of many who are involved in the food bank area is that they do not want government funding and that it would take away from it being a real community, volunteer effort. They want to be able to manage the resources they have through their central agency, which provides services through the 76 branches of the food bank.

If I could go on for a moment on that, in the meeting I had with them we discussed the significance of the increase in the number of agencies that are providing these services. One reason they perceive for the increase in demand is simply the increase in the availability of these agencies, and that has not been the case in Calgary.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I perceive that the minister is getting at it from another direction and going back to the previous point of order.

#### Mount Allan Olympic Ski Site

MR. OMAN: Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Minister of Tourism and Small Business, and it concerns Mount Allan. Could the minister bring us up to date on developments on the mountain? I understand there's been an excessive amount of snow, which has hindered the schedule. But could he tell us what's happening and how the budget looks?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, I should point out two things to the Assembly. Number one, the construction of the Mount Allan site is now in the hands of my capable colleague the Minister of Public Works, Supply and Services. But in relation to seeking a private-sector operator, that is still my responsibility. At the present time we're reviewing some 15 applications we have from the private sector, who expressed an interest in being considered as a lease operator of the site. I anticipate that in the next couple of months we'll reach a short list and get down to discussions with the individual groups.

So from my particular standpoint, yes, there is snow on Mount Allan. It's not only in between the trees; it's on the slopes that are now cut. My understanding is that progress is on target, on time, and on budget.

MR. OMAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I think Mr. Niven, the president of CODA — the Calgary Olympic Development Association, which is to be in charge of postgame activities — apparently made a request that they take over the operation of the Mount Allan facility and, if it were to be turned over to somebody else, that they would make the decision. Has the minister had the opportunity to review that request?

MR. ADAIR: Not totally, Mr. Speaker. I received the letter late yesterday afternoon, and I'm looking at it right now. I should point out, though, that the original request as to anyone who might be interested in being a lease operator on the site, which was sent out in August 1984, drew 39 interested parties. Then 15 submitted proposals relative to being interested in being the lease operators. One of the conditions of that request we have is that they must be in place prior to the Olympics, and then through the Olympics as well as after.

My first review of the letter from the CODA group indicates a preference to be the operator after the Olympics, so we'll have to look at that to see what is the actual intent of the letter and how it may fit in with our request for a lease operator that will be in place prior to, during, and after.

MR. OMAN: Mr. Speaker, one supplementary. I assume that if the CODA group were to manage it, it would remain in their hands. Is it still the minister's or the government's intent to find a private buyer for that, if possible?

MR. ADAIR: As I explained this spring, Mr. Speaker, I guess the long-term intent is that initially we'd be looking for a lease operator, and that would carry us primarily through the period of the Olympics. Our preference would be to have a lease/purchase arrangement made at some stage down the road. If that interest is there in the private sector, we'll respond to it.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. I asked this question last year. Maybe the minister has further information. Has the government done a study as to what impact

there will be on Fortress Mountain, which is just up from Kananaskis? I believe that's the name of it. What effect is there on the facilities already in place in Banff and Lake Louise? What detrimental economic effects will there be on these communities, in light of the fact that the government is putting this facility on Mount Allan?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, two things that I should bring for the information of the House are that the good people from Fortress Mountain are one of those interested in being the operator of the existing site, so that may well tie ...

DR. BUCK: That's survival.

MR. ADAIR: That's called ingenuity, enthusiasm, and innovativeness, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the private sector.

I should also point out that we've had quite a number of discussions with other private-sector operators. One of the problems the industry has faced over the last couple of years is the fact that we have not had snow and, ironically enough, it wasn't just at Mount Allan; it was along the entire eastern slopes of not just Alberta but some parts of the U.S. With the advent of the snowfall we have now and the possibilities of a good winter, that may rectify itself in part. But having said that, right now there is quite an interest in operation of the Mount Allan site by the industry itself and by people directly involved in the industry, and specifically in the ski business, in the province of Alberta.

MR. OMAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. If a ski area is improved — and by that I mean Banff generally — would that not mean that more people would likely come to the area for skiing, and thus enhance all ski areas?

MR. SPEAKER: I think we've entered the area of speculation, with or without snow.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. With due respect, the minister didn't answer the portion about what studies the government has done to find out what detrimental economic effects there will be on the communities of Banff and Lake Louise, which already have skiing facilities in place.

MR. ADAIR: To my knowledge, Mr. Speaker, there are no studies directed at any detrimental effect. Primarily, construction of that site and bringing forth the 1988 Winter Olympics will generally have positive effects. In essence, that would mean that the construction operations and after-operations of an Olympic site like Mount Allan would be to the general benefit of the ski industry in this province, in order to be able to attract more out-of-province, out-of-country skiers to this particular area. Having said that, then that would obviously help those other operators within the Eastern Slopes.

#### **Payments to Municipalities**

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, my question ... [interjection]. Tell your buddy Ralph Scurfield that.

Mr. Speaker, my question to either the Premier or the Provincial Treasurer has to do with government waste. It has to do with the transmittal of cheques, grants in lieu of taxes, and major facilities grants. Can the Provincial Treasurer or the Premier indicate what government policy is in place to make sure that these cheques get in the hands of the municipalities as quickly as possibly, just as quickly as they are written?

MR. HYNDMAN: The general policy is that they get in the hands of the municipalities as quickly as possible. Of course that depends on the government departments, as appropriate, receiving all the necessary information. When that is received and approved, the cheques are made payable and sent out.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, can the Provincial Treasurer check with his caucus buddies to find out how long some of these cheques stay in the pockets of government MLAs who are waiting for an appropriate time to get their picture taken or transmit the cheque? [interjections] Mr. Speaker, can the Provincial Treasurer indicate if these cheques are delivered through the hands of the MLAs or their constituency offices, or are they mailed directly to the municipalities affected?

MR. HYNDMAN: I don't have the details as to how that is done, Mr. Speaker. But if the hon. member has a specific matter of concern with respect to a cheque payable to some municipality within his riding, I would be happy to follow up on it if he would let me know.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, the specific question: what is the government policy with regard to getting the cheques in the hands of the municipalities as quickly as possible? [interjections]

Mr. Speaker, is the Provincial Treasurer in a position to indicate to this Legislature if he is aware of or knows of instances where large cheques have been held in an MLA's pocket for as long as three weeks, waiting for an opportunity to be presented to a group? Is he aware of this going on?

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, again, I know that the cheques are delivered to the municipalities in the appropriate way as soon as possible.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, he doesn't know, because that's not the way it happens.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood, followed by the hon. Member for Edmonton Kingsway.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, to the Premier. Can the Premier indicate to the Legislature if he is aware that government MLAs and, in many instances, opposition MLAs are asked to deliver these cheques to the municipalities?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I've never heard any complaint in the matter. If there is one, I'm sure we'll hear.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, the question from my hon. colleague to the Premier is very clear. Do government and opposition MLAs intervene or deliver cheques to various municipalities and other groups in this province? Is it a policy of government to have the MLAs do it?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I think that matter has been answered by the Provincial Treasurer.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, the question has not been answered. The question is very clear. Is it a requirement of this government to have cheques delivered by MLAs to various recipients such as municipalities and community organizations? I could name a number. Is that the policy of the Conservative government in this province?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I believe the policy is to have the Members of the Legislative Assembly fulfill their responsibilities, and that's one of them.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for ...

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, to the Premier or the Provincial Treasurer. [interjection] That may be funny, Johnston. It's not your money, though. You're starting to think it's your money.

Mr. Speaker, will the Provincial Treasurer undertake to find out from the Treasury Board if there are instances where cheques have been held for a long time and interest has been lost to the municipality because the cheque was not delivered immediately? Can the minister indicate if that study will be undertaken?

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, as indicated, I believe that the present system is operating satisfactorily and that the method is appropriate. However, if the hon. member or any hon. member wants to bring specific concerns to my attention, I'd be pleased to follow up on them.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Premier, if I may. Has there been ...

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I had already recognized the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood, and we are running close to the end of the question period.

MR. MARTIN: I'll pass.

DR. BUCK: What's the matter? Is it getting warm, Mr. Speaker? [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. That's really hardly ... [interjection] Order please. We have had an example of the same question being asked a number of times, and I haven't intervened. I realize that there has been a lack of enthusiasm about some of the answers, but that does not enter into the rules of the question period.

DR. BUCK: Just keep covering for them.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. That's quite improper. In a calmer moment, the hon. member might recognize that.

However, the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood ...

DR. BUCK: When are you going to quit?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Shame.

MR. SPEAKER: ... has said that he would like to yield his place on his question so that we might accommodate a supplementary by the hon. Leader of the Opposition. While we don't really have formal assignments of rights in that way, I'm sure we can do that.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure the Premier would like to answer this question. Given the concern expressed about the time lag, has there been any direction by the leader of government to government MLAs that once received, those cheques should be delivered promptly not for the convenience of getting their picture taken and printed in the local newspaper, but delivered promptly? Has there been any direction so that municipalities do not lose interest they would otherwise earn?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, the best information I have is that they have been delivered promptly. As the Provincial Treasurer said, if there are exceptions, we'd be glad to hear about them.

MR. STROMBERG: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I am wondering if the Provincial Treasurer has any idea how many thousands and thousands of dollars in interest I have saved the county of Camrose, the city of Camrose, and different groups, in delivering the cheque two hours after I have received it. [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I am sure the hon. member has made his representation. I did think he had a quizzical look on his face and that it was a question, but I found out otherwise.

#### Impaired Driving — Blood Tests

MR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address my question to the hon. Attorney General. It deals with the use of mandatory blood tests for people suspected of impaired driving and who cannot be tested with a breathalyzer due to injury or unconsciousness. Given a new federal government in Ottawa, my question is: has the minister or have officials of his department been in contact with the new Justice minister regarding possible new legislation permitting mandatory blood tests in this province?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, that hasn't occurred yet. The situation, as I think the hon. member knows, is that the previous Minister of Justice had some proposals in that respect. The position of our government at that time was that if the federal government was going to act legislatively under their entitlement to enact laws under the criminal law heading of the Constitution, that would be more appropriate than our trying through provincial legislation, by way of legislating under the Evidence Act or under the Motor Vehicle Administration Act or the like, to try to do the same thing. It's my intention, because I support the direction of legislation in that way, to address that issue with the new Minister of Justice. At the present time, it appears that I may be able to do that as early as next month.

MR. PAPROSKI: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. With respect to this area, has the Attorney General any specific types of legislation he will be discussing with the new Minister of Justice that he would like to share now?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I think the sort of representation we would make is simply to provide for an amendment to the Criminal Code of Canada relative to the sections that have to do with impairment and introduce the blood test in limited circumstances in the same way that tests are now taken by breathalyzer.

MR. PAPROSKI: One final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Last year British Columbia introduced and passed mandatory blood tests. Can the hon. Attorney General inform this House as to the relative success of B.C.'s initiatives in this area?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I don't have that information. I must stand on the previous answer, that I believe it's better handled in a federal way. That's no criticism of any province which has undertaken it by way of provincial statute.

#### Agricultural Credit

MR. FISCHER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question to the Minister of Agriculture. It is in regard to establishing an agricultural credit bank and an issue of agribonds. Both of these issues were debated in principle and passed in last fall's session under a private member's motion. Could the minister indicate the progress made toward implementing these private-sector based agricultural credit initiatives?



MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, they are exciting concepts. We have been working on them for some time in co-operation with the Alberta Cattle Commission, who originally brought the idea to us. It's a new and innovative approach to agricultural financing, and the department is still working on assessing it. I've also had the task force on agricultural credit, that's going to be meeting in Toronto in November when it reports to ministers, looking at the concept with respect to using it nationwide, not just in Alberta. So I think we've made significant progress with it. The next steps will depend to some degree on what new initiatives arise from the ministers' meeting in November.

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

### head: MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

#### 220. Moved by Mr. Oman:

Be it resolved that the Assembly urge the government to consider new systems for the delivery of medical services which would

- (a) allow nurses and other health care professionals to authorize the provision of health care services, and
- (b) recognize the use of private clinics and other services which might be more efficient and thus less costly than the traditional doctor/hospital orientation.

MR. OMAN: As far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, Motion 220 really has to do with medical costs. We've heard a good deal about medical costs in the last year or two. The statistics I have indicate that medical services in Alberta have increased in cost about 25 percent per year over the last little while, using up approximately 25 cents of every dollar that the provincial government spends. I know that our minister has been wrestling with this problem, and he is to be commended for the kind of effort he's putting in to try to curtail, or at least put some fence around, expenditures in the medical field. My concern today is one that hopefully will be an aid and encouragement to the minister in order to do this.

There are many areas in which we might look. One of the areas I'm really not going to deal with is prevention. But that's certainly come alive today. It's a kind of good thing to see the explosion of joggers around the country that has happened in the last five to 10 years. Some of these, I am told, are running to get rid of furniture disease. That's a kind of quasi-medical term that's used a little bit loosely to describe the situation where the chest falls into the drawer. The other thing that's happening is that people in increasing numbers are breaking the habit of smoking. Of course we have our own department of AADAC, headed by our able Member for Lethbridge West, who I think is doing a commendable job in reducing some of the abuses of alcohol and drugs.

Mr. Speaker, Alberta has been in the forefront of trying to do something about medical costs. Quite frankly, I think this is a day for bold initiatives in this area. Traditionally the whole health care system has centred around doctor/hospital orientation, and that's become very, very expensive. In effect, we are oftentimes providing thousand dollar treatments for one hundred dollar needs. I think our physicians are often over-qualified for much of the work they are doing that could be done by someone with less skills, for they are unquestionably the primary people in the area of medical treatment and, in a sense, should be overseers. Because their skills are often used

on such things as flu, headaches, sore throats, and that sort of thing, which quite frankly could easily be taken care of by those who are less well trained or skilled, we could probably do a good deal with regard to curtailing medical costs by putting them into the hands of other people.

Furthermore, with the rapid increase in medical fees — I believe that in Alberta last year medical fees increased by about 23 percent. In effect, if there was competition, the doctors might have priced themselves out of work. But there isn't competition. It's a monopoly. For this reason, it seems to me that perhaps some competitive aspects ought to be brought into the system.

The other thing is with regard to hospitals, where I think the same thing applies. Hospitals are sometimes overequipped. For instance, those of us in Calgary know that the Holy Cross and the Foothills, all of them, are out for the latest equipment, the high-budget items — CAT scanners or whatever. But again, they are overequipped for many of the procedures that are being taken care of in their beds. Perhaps there are other situations for medical care which would be less costly and therefore more suitable. Of course primary medical care is what I'm talking about. Because of both their size and organization, hospitals aren't able to move to provide the kind of care that is suitable to the particular need involved.

So my motion today is really to try to seek other alternatives which would be cost saving and more efficient. Incidentally, the members of the Official Opposition brought out a paper over the summer. I'm not sure if it was my motion that spurred them to action. Of course my motion was put on the paper early last spring. If it did inspire them to some good work, I'm very happy to have had a part in that. I think there are many things in that paper to be applauded and that we might well look at. In fact they are giving a good deal of support to some of the things I am going to say.

The first area I want to talk about, Mr. Speaker, is the utilization of the nursing profession as copractitioners or points of entry into the medical system. My motion really has to do with improved access, improved quality, more effective control of expenditures, greater cost effectiveness, and the extension of services to a relatively neglected area.

As originally proposed, the Canada Health Act limited access to the medical system and insurance only to doctors. It really was through the lobbying of the Canadian Nurses Association that that was changed to include a health practitioner rather than just a medical practitioner. I think that opens the door to a great many possibilities, not only nurses and physiotherapists but all kinds of medical practitioners. I recognize that unquestionably it's possible to put so many layers in the system that it wouldn't make sense, but in effect the Canada Health Act now leaves to the provinces the application of these, as to whom they will recognize as health practitioners.

It's been my view for a number of years that nurses have tended to be hewers of wood and drawers of water, underutilized for the training that has prepared them in the medical field. It appears now that there are many doctors, of course, that are wise enough to recognize ... Incidentally, my brief today is not antidoctor as such; rather it is a brief that would like to see a broadening of medical usage. Nurses are already being used in many areas of primary care in both the doctor's office and the hospital, partly because of the nurses' own initiative, I'm sure, and also because of a recognition of their broadening base of applicability. There have been studies done that indicate that the nurse is a very proficient user and applicator of health care services.

I could reiterate some of these to you, Mr. Speaker. For instance, a research study in '72 demonstrated that senior cit-

izens in a building with on-site public health nursing services fared far better on scales for morale and mobility and had fewer admissions to hospital than a matched group of tenants in a building that did not have direct access to such nursing care. The results support the view that the health of elderly persons can be enhanced by access to a health care system without reference to either physicians or hospitals. Another study, in Manitoba, indicated that patients attending a hypertension clinic staffed by nurse practitioners were more successful at lowering blood pressure and losing weight than patients attending a clinic staffed by physicians. Don't ask me exactly why, but that was the outcome.

There was another study in Newfoundland which compared two groups, one receiving traditional physician-based care and another with access to primary health care by nurses. In the group receiving primary health care provided by nurses, the study showed that acute care in the hospital decreased by 5 percent while increasing 39 percent in the group receiving traditional physician-based care. In addition, annual costs per thousand population were substantially lower for the primary health care group than for the physician-care group. That would be \$85,690 versus \$112,730. I don't think we are talking about setting out services that are necessarily in competition with each other; rather, I would be inclined to say that they should be seen as services in co-operation with each other.

There was a project called the Beaverton project, sponsored or worked out by the Victorian Order of Nurses in Ottawa. A nurse practitioner acted as a copractitioner with a physician, in rural practice in this case, taking responsibility for a significant portion of the patient load. The nurse practitioner's function left the physician free to devote more time to the management of more complex problems for which medical intervention was appropriate. The study concluded that home visiting by the nurse practitioner actually decreased the need for hospital or other institutional care. She was also able to identify health problems in early stages, which, if they had gone unnoticed, would have developed into problems requiring more expensive forms of care.

Mr. Speaker, a study that came out in July 1982 was done by McMaster University in Hamilton. That study tried to project what costs, on a percentage basis, could be saved if nursing practitioners were brought on stream. I won't take up the time of the Legislature with all the details, except the conclusion. There were some questions left unanswered, but they said:

Caveats and uncertainties notwithstanding, there is little question that the use of nurse practitioners could effect substantial savings. Based on our "standard" set of assumptions and parameter values, we estimate that 10.0 percent of all medical costs and 15.9 percent of ambulatory costs could have been saved in 1980 had nurse practitioner time been substituted for physician time in the provision of all services for which such substitution has been demonstrated to be safe and [reasonable].

Furthermore, they said:

allowing for the conservatism built into our estimates, the savings might be considerably higher: for all medical services a range of 10-15 percent seems quite likely to us; for ambulatory services alone the corresponding range might be 16-24 percent.

The savings across Canada would amount to over \$300 million annually, a figure I think not to be lightly sneezed at.

Aside from the area of nurse practitioners, Mr. Speaker, you have such health care practitioners as physiotherapists. Many of them are already operating private clinics within the province. I understand that the maximum billing the province will allow for those private clinics is some \$18 per hour,

whereas we are charged about \$30 per hour for similar or exact services in a hospital setting. What I'm saying is that there are alternatives to the traditional setting, and what we are called upon to do today is use our imagination and investigate those areas where we can do something about reducing our costs and not reducing our medical services at the same time.

The other area that I find most interesting is freestanding clinics. These have become very popular. I believe they were started in the United States some years ago, but they have now come into their own in Alberta. A personal friend of mine — in fact he was my personal physician — Dr. Stan Cassin, operated the medical design and management firm which operates four such clinics in Calgary. They have become extremely popular, so much so that they have taken away business from our hospitals, which I think is a good thing in the sense that he's providing competition. The criticism may be made that that's just an add-on service which we could be providing and have the facilities for, so it's a kind of double service that isn't needed at the moment. I think the point is that whenever you bring in a new service like this, there are going to be some duplications of effort. Nevertheless, the cost of that service on a comparable basis, on the figures I have seen, is substantial. To indicate the kind of demand or use for them: they're set in the community, sometimes in an office building; they're usually open 24 hours a day; and they're convenient for people. People can go and get treatment for minor or primary services and what would ordinarily be considered day care services — minor surgery, this type of thing.

Dr. Cassin indicates to me that in the year 1983 in four walk-in clinics in the city of Calgary they served 109,000 patients, which is the equivalent of two major metropolitan hospitals anywhere in Canada. Incidentally, he tells me also that with the establishment of the clinics, emergency department entries in Calgary not only stopped growing but the emergency patients seen in the Calgary hospitals has been reduced by approximately [50] percent from the 1981 levels.

Also there's no question — and the anomaly here is that we're saving money by this, because our government does not, at present at least, fund these freestanding clinics for the facility use. At the moment all they're funding them for is the doctor's fee, and the patient is paying for the facility use. If we feel they can provide a more efficient service, it may be that we ought to think about encouraging this kind of service. It's estimated that soon about 25 percent of all primary care situations in the United States will be taken care of by a freestanding or walk-in clinic.

Another thing I would like to bring to the attention of the Assembly, Mr. Speaker, is the matter of midwifery. Being a layman, I'm not going to evaluate whether or not home births should be the norm in our society. There has been some controversy about this for some time, and I know our own College of Physicians and Surgeons has recommended that they not be carried out and that no doctors participate in this. That may be legitimate; I have some doubts about that.

I wonder if we ought not to be making use of midwives, as copractitioners at least, in a hospital setting. Why not have two or three midwives on hospital staff who would perform or assist in all the births in the hospital? The doctor wouldn't have to come at all, as a matter of fact. He might even appreciate not being called and having to go in the middle of the night. After years of experience, I think these midwives probably become more skilled than the physicians themselves in delivery procedures. Of course where there were indications of complications beforehand, the doctor would be called to be present. There are emergency services and doctors always present in a hospital emergency situation in any case. So it seems to me

that there is the possibility of making good use of some other facilities or skills other than the traditional doctor orientation.

It might solve another — well, I won't mention that one.

AN HON. MEMBER: Come on.

MR. OMAN: You want it? I understand, Mr. Speaker, that a rather prominent doctor passed away recently in one of our — I'm told it was a rural community. At the funeral service, the politician, who shall go unnamed, wanted to get in on the act and said a few words: that the doctor was well known to his family and that in fact it was the doctor who had brought him into the world. Someone behind him hissed and said: didn't you know he was a veterinarian? That's some of the problems you sometimes get into. [interjections] Yes, that's a tough one.

I want to just touch a moment on the matter of problems of the aging. Statistics Canada estimates that by the year 2022 — if I can get my figures right here — every hospital bed in Canada will be filled by an elderly person unless massive additions are made to the number of beds or there is a shift to community-based care. Because the proportion of our senior population is growing as a result of both longevity and better health care and also because the number of people born in a given family is smaller today than it was a generation ago, the costs by way of pensions, health care, and housing for a society to carry, as it should carry, the elderly are increasing in rather alarming proportions and percentages.

Many of the medical problems of these elderly people are not of a serious nature, do not require specialists, and could be taken care of by home care services or community-oriented health care centres, which would be staffed by nurses who would then refer people to physicians in those cases where it is necessary. As I pointed out earlier, it has been indicated that the elderly do respond to the nursing practitioners and have confidence in them, and that it is indeed a feasible service. As we're proceeding into an area where the costs are going to escalate far beyond our ability to take care of them, it seems to me that now is the day when we should be looking at these options rather than waiting to the point they are upon us and we have to act almost in a desperation situation.

Mr. Speaker, it's a day that calls for bold initiatives. I have only scratched the surface of the possibilities. Yes, there's going to be some resistance. I can understand that the medical profession might feel threatened. Across the United States and Canada where some of these proposals have come up, I think they have reacted defensively. That doesn't mean there's no value here. I think it is for people like you, me, and those of us present to make some evaluations in these areas.

As I said, I am not here doctor-bashing. I am here to say that I think the system needs some reworking, and indeed these are the days that call for bold initiatives. Our province has been known for leadership. I would be thrilled if the province of Alberta became known as a place where things were really happening in the medical field that would be an example to others.

Thank you, sir.

[Two members rose]

MR. SPEAKER: Whether or not my eye happened to be pointed in the right direction, I did happen to see the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood first.

MR. MARTIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll try to be short so the other member can get in.

I would like to rise and congratulate the Member for Calgary North Hill on Motion No. 220. He knows that he has the support of the Official Opposition in many of the things he's saying; he has already alluded to a document. I hate to disillusion him, but we had this task force a year ago. I think the hon. Member for Grande Prairie will know. We were up there, and we were in Calgary. A lot of these ideas came from that public task force that we held, where we actually talked to people that were involved. I appreciate the help the hon. member is giving the Official Opposition in bringing forth a motion like this, because I think it is a motion we should take very seriously at this time.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care go on and on many, many times about the high cost of medicare. There's no doubt that it is an expensive service. What we in the Official Opposition have suggested from time to time is that before we look at things we consider regressive, like user fees, higher premiums, extra billing — I'm not going to go into this argument here — we begin to look at the whole medicare system itself. I believe this is what the member is talking about in Motion 220. Let's try to get the best bang for the buck and enhance, if you like, our medicare system. I believe it can be done and that many people — there are many examples, and the member alluded to them already.

I would just go through some things that I believe could save money in the medicare system. I won't spend a lot of time, because the hon. Member for Calgary North Hill has alluded to some of them. We talked about deinstitutionalization and home care. In some ways, to give the government credit, they moved in the last time. I think that would be a choice for senior citizens. We believe that would save money, because then we don't have to build a lot of buildings to house older people.

The one thing that we will come back to has to do with seat belts. I don't know if it's on the Bill again. Besides saving lives, we know — and this is a report about hospital utilization given to the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care, where they did an analysis of Ontario's experience. They said that they felt from the study that there was a 15 percent average reduction in deaths, injuries, expenditures for physicians' fees, and time of hospitalization. That's significant. The other thing that is even more significant in terms of cost — and this is very expensive in medical care — is that the average cost of treating each typical accident victim was markedly reduced when they were wearing seat belts. The patient not wearing a seat belt cost an average \$419 to treat, and those who were using belts cost \$228 per patient, a saving in the order of 40 percent. In terms of costs, I would suggest that's another reason for seat-belt legislation.

We could talk about an infection centre, for example, which is estimated to save \$3 million to \$5 million a year. We can talk, as the hon. member did and we have from time to time in this House, about doing more about preventative medicine and education. But to stay on the topic, I'd like to come to what I think is the crux of the problem and relate it to Motion 220.

First of all, I think we have a problem, and the Member for Calgary North Hill has talked about it. In fact we've had a medical-dominated system, and it's a very expensive system. In the United States, they're facing the same problems, and they're finding their system very expensive also. One of the problems alluded to in a couple of documents that have become public — the Toronto study of Alberta surgical rates deals with the fact that in their opinion there seems to be some unnecessary surgery in Alberta. We had the highest surgery rate in the country, Mr. Speaker. Of course surgery is very expensive.

One of the other things they allude to — they don't go into it in much detail — is the fact that the whole fee-for-service may be creating some of the problems. In other words, the more operations you perform, the more money you make. They're suggesting that we look at that. I think that's part of the problem we face in trying to go to another system, and I will come back to that.

Just for the sake of interest — and I know the hon. Member for Calgary North Hill would be interested — they have a different system in the States. A recent book from the Legislature Library, called *Health Plan: The Only Practical Solution to the Soaring Cost of Medical Care* — in the United States it's different; you can't take it holus-bolus. But again they talk about fee-for-service being a problem, so they're facing the same problem.

Mr. Speaker, I think the crux, though, has to do with the fee-for-service. I think the Member for Calgary North Hill is dead on when he says we have to begin to use other health professionals. I would suggest even having consumers involved much more in the decision-making that is occurring in terms of the medical care system. I refer to people like paramedics, nurses, and physiotherapists; I suppose we could go into some areas like psychologists and social workers. All these people should have a legitimate place in terms of the overall delivery of the medicare system.

I suggest, and I will quote some evidence as the Member for Calgary North Hill did, that in the long run this would save money for our medicare system. Since the Member for Calgary North Hill has talked about it and we have sent copies to the Minister of Social Services and Community Health and the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care, I'll be tabling this document so all members will have access to it. Feel free; if the government wants to take some of the ideas to help the people in Alberta, we'd be quite glad if they did. That's the purpose of it.

One of the things we clearly talked about on page 8 — and I'd like to quote a paragraph because I think it hits the crux, if you like, of the matter we've been talking about. It has to do with utilization of other health care professionals.

During the course of the Task Force hearings, the point was made repeatedly [to us] that medical doctors play the central, and to a large extent the dominant, role in providing health care services. While no one questions the qualifications and competence of the vast majority of Alberta's doctors, the question arises as to whether this reliance on doctors is the most efficient means of health care delivery. A number of other health care professionals, including registered nurses, paramedics, midwives, chiropractors, etc., are qualified to perform many of the routine procedures now performed by doctors.

And I think this is back to the crux of the matter and why it will take the bold sort of approach the member talked about.

However, they are effectively prevented from so doing by a medical fee schedule that encourages doctors to perform as many of these procedures as possible themselves. The key to greater use of other professionals and para-professionals lies not only in a restructured fee system, but also in maximizing the range of treatment options in treatment delivery. This would also reduce the strain on doctors' waiting lists. The efficiency of the health care system could be substantially improved.

As I said, until we deal with how we pay in the medical care system — when we find out that some doctors are going to be billing over \$1 million, that's a very expensive item, and it's going to be difficult to bring other health professionals in.

I would like to suggest one other method, though, and again it would take a bold move. There are examples of where other health care professionals — the Member for Calgary North Hill talked about some of them. I would like to bring some figures to members of the Assembly, Mr. Speaker. It has to do with the community clinic. This is one of the things that we've alluded to in this paper. We find a community clinic would basically have members of all health professions working together as a team to do what is best for the patient. Going into the hospital is not always best for the patient; we know that. I believe we often put too many people in the hospital when they do not need to be there. That of course is very expensive and, again, not necessarily the best treatment.

The community clinic example where they had other health professionals is in Prince Albert, Saskatchewan. At the time they brought this in in the early '70s, as the Member for Calgary North Hill said, there was a great deal of resentment from the medical profession. In fact they could not get Saskatchewan doctors to participate in this community clinic. They had to go outside the country to bring people in. But they did get very qualified doctors, people who believed in this team approach, if you like. This clinic has been going on for approximately 12 years. We have some figures in terms of cost. As I said, there are a number of health professionals working in a team approach. I believe the figures are significant. I'd just like to share them with the Assembly, Mr. Speaker.

In 1979, the last year that we have the figures compiled, the clinic saw a total of 17,295 individual patients at a total cost of some \$2 million. Taking the same number of patients, 17,295, as a comparison, the total cost provincially was \$6 million. In other words, the clinic was nearly \$4 million less expensive than hospital care. If we could do that throughout the province, that would be very significant. Other figures are interesting, Mr. Speaker. In 1979 the average hospital utilization provincially in Saskatchewan was 2,555 hospital days used per 1,000 patients seen, and this of course is one of the reasons it was so expensive. In comparison, with the use of the community health care clinic, there were only 837 hospital days used for every 1,000 patients — 2,555 for the province as a whole to 837 in that clinic. That's significant, and of course that's one of the reasons they save money.

The last point dealing with this community clinic, Mr. Speaker, is that for every 1,000 patients seen in Saskatchewan, 257 of those were admitted. So for every 1,000 people they saw across the province, 257 ended up in the hospital. With the community clinic in Prince Albert, for every 1,000 patients, only 94 needed to be admitted to hospital.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest those figures, plus the ones that were mentioned before by the Member for Calgary North Hill, are significant. If we are serious about good health care and about the costs — getting the best bang for the buck — I agree totally with the Member for Calgary North Hill: it is time for bold steps. We are going to have to take bold steps, because frankly we would be stepping on the toes of some very vested interests. Surely as the government of Alberta we are here to represent all the people of Alberta. When we have a very expensive system that the hon. minister has talked about from time to time and it looks as if there might be a way to have even better health care and to do it cheaper, then I think it's the responsibility of the members of this Assembly to take a serious look at it. Maybe you can't go into it holus-bolus, but perhaps it's time to at least set up some experiments and begin to look at how we can grapple with the costs and still have a decent medical care system.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I again compliment the member. I think it's a very appropriate motion to debate in this House, and I thank him for bringing it forward.

MRS. EMBURY: Mr. Speaker, I'm very pleased to participate in the debate on Motion 220 today. First of all, I would like to congratulate my hon. colleague the Member for Calgary North Hill for initiating this motion before the Assembly. I think it is very timely for each of us to consider the two parts to the motion and also to reflect a little bit on our health care system which, as most people know, is one of the finest health care systems in Canada.

We also need to spend a little time and reflect on what has happened over the past few years: the tremendous growth in the health care system, the new and modern technology, and many other factors which so influence what happens to the health of not only Albertans but all Canadians. As I said, over the past year the whole area of health care has been subjected to very close scrutiny, not only by the governments of each province and the federal government but also —and probably it's been a good thing — by members of the public. More and more of the public are becoming more and more aware of what makes up the health care system and understanding to some extent the terrific cost of not only the acute care facilities and other ancillary institutions or services but also our health insurance program that pays for not only physicians and surgeons but other members of the health professions.

One of the factors that heightened the awareness over this past year was the final passing of the Canada Health Act. Prior to that time, there was a long process where hearings were held throughout Canada, and subsequently there was a lot of input to the present Canada Health Act. One of the sad outcomes of the Canada Health Act is that it penalizes a province like Alberta that is trying to look at the cost of the system we have, by utilizing extra billing and allowing the concept of user fees. Of course all Albertans are very aware that not one hospital in Alberta is using that concept. But because these were the major issues, and so they should be with the cost of health care being so important, there is an exclusion of other issues raised by the new Act. One of the issues that I mention will be one of the basic issues the Member for Calgary North Hill raised in his motion.

This is not to downplay at all the fact that health care costs have increased dramatically. From 1983 to 1984, the budget for Hospitals and Medical Care was in excess of \$2 billion. Social Services and Community Health also provides a lot of health care financing in Alberta. I think it was the Member for Calgary North Hill who mentioned what all of a sudden seems to be becoming a new concept to many people, and that is the word "prevention". Of course that is part of any health professional's role in any setting where they practice. It isn't really a new concept at all; it's just a heightened awareness by people that with a little care and utilizing different methods of prevention, people would probably not end up with the sick care problems they have later on in life.

As our provincial revenue growth has slowed and the federal government has reduced the health care funding even though the costs are increasing, the key has to be to strive for a much more efficient health care delivery system. Hopefully one way to do that is by considering alternate methods, such as suggested in this motion today.

One of the topics raised by the Member for Edmonton Norwood was the concept of community clinics. Although we would probably both support the same type of service offered, a multidisciplinary approach, one of the philosophical differences he and I might have is: who runs the clinics? It seems that we're almost in a time of a chicken-and-egg situation, when people are saying that government must do this. Yet the Member for Calgary North Hill already talked about one system where our entrepreneurs, our medical practitioners with a high

degree of expertise, have gone out on their own and set up these clinics. I think that is one of the things we have to look at. We should be trying to persuade the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care to consider more incentives for these people to operate. It is a very worn-out explanation. I'm sure many members of the Assembly really agree with me and have pursued this issue on many occasions with the minister and with other people and said: why not; if it's working, what can we do to enhance this system? Unfortunately the answer that was mentioned earlier is the answer you get: we already have the facilities over here; therefore they are the facilities, if they have been provided. I think that's the sad thing about having a totally financed public system. If the institutions are not considered to be efficient or the people are not being served to the same degree they can be in private clinics, then I think we should be supporting the private clinics.

One interesting fact: I know that when it was made possible for private physiotherapy clinics — these were expanded since 1972, I believe. We had a few clinics that could claim from the health insurance plan, but this was expanded not so many years ago. If any of us checked with the minister, I believe we would find out that the services escalated. One would have to study that further and see if that was just an initial escalation and then it levelled off. It's hard to justify those rapid increases in costs unless it is in a time of high population growth or other factors that would contribute to it. But unfortunately this is the perception. It doesn't matter what we do in any field of prevention or in offering other types of services, the cost does not go down or remain at a certain level; it is continually escalating. So it's pretty hard to justify changes to this system.

The first part of the motion the Member for Calgary North Hill introduced was to allow nurses and other health care professionals to authorize the provision of health care services. In essence I suppose this motion is visualizing what has always been known in nursing as an expanded role for not only nurses but other health care professionals. But what it really means is better utilization of their services. My remarks will be directed to the role of nurses, primarily because of my background, but I also must say that I have had representations from another health professional group, the psychologists, that really questions why they are not offering a treatment, a proper service to people mentally, that should also be paid for by our health care insurance plan. This is going to be one of the problems when there's such competition for those dollars in that health care plan to pay. Maybe we're going to have to become a little bit more realistic and look at having people contribute more money themselves to the cost of the services. I know there are lots of people who won't like that, and there are lots of areas of this province that may not care for that. But I think you will find that there are a lot of people out there saying: I do want to pay something toward the services that I need, because as long as I am paying something, I have some control over the type of service I can have. I think people are very naive when they say, "Let government pay for it all", because that means you have lost almost total control of the system you want to utilize.

Getting back to the concept of nursing, the Member for Calgary North Hill mentioned that this concept was actually successfully included in the amendments to the Canada Health Act, primarily through the lobbying of members of the Canadian Nurses Association. I know that many nurses across Canada would pay tribute to Dr. Helen Glass, the past president of the Canadian Nurses Association, for the outstanding work she did in this regard, not only spending a lot of time in Ottawa in this field of lobbying but also travelling across the country to inform nurses on a lot more of the issues so they also could carry out this process.

So as the member explained earlier, what we have is a changing of terminology in the introduction to the Canada Health Act, which now says the services can be provided by health care practitioners, when and where a province permits. No doubt a lot of questions will come out of this debate, because people are going to say, what is happening now in the province? As you know, we have had a change of government, and I'm sure the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care has not yet had a meeting with the new health minister to see what the expectations will be.

Before I go on to my remarks which totally support the concept of nurses being utilized in this manner, I would like to suggest that nurses, along with others, will have to address some very important issues. Maybe we are unique in this province because we have a multiapproach to education. As most people know, we have two-, three-, and four-year programs in nursing. The two- and three-year programs that occur in the hospital schools of nursing and in colleges lead to passing your examinations and becoming a registered nurse. The four-year program in the university is a basic baccalaureate degree, a bachelor of science or bachelor of nursing degree. Also, the nurses with their RNs can receive what has been known as a — it's a very interesting term that is still used; it's a little redundant today to call it a postbasic degree, but it does explain that they can go on with their basic RN and then complete a bachelor degree in nursing. In Alberta we have graduate studies in nursing at the masters level, at both the University of Alberta and the University of Calgary. With a little bit of initiative and foresight and possibly support from this government, we could become the first province in Canada to have a doctoral degree program in nursing.

The question arises, what will the level be if nursing is considered under this insured program; what level of nurse will it be? Or can we better define it by: what specific skills will she have and in what setting will she practice? Those are some of the questions that will no doubt take time for the nursing associations to address.

Some might question the rationale behind creating new points of entry into the health care system. Critics would certainly argue that with the cost of health care increasing all the time, we cannot afford these new points of entry. I would like to suggest today that we can no longer afford not to open up the health care system to these alternative points of entry. The traditional doctor/hospital orientation has become a luxury that we as a society can no longer afford. Our health care system needs to be reassessed and new measures taken if we are to retain the excellent health care system that we have all come to know and enjoy in this province. We have to move away from an illness-oriented approach and put the health back into the health care system. It's interesting; I always thought it was a great sign of progress that while some other provinces still have a minister of health, in this province we have two ministers, one a Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care and one a Minister of Social Services and Community Health. The suggestion was made to me the other day by way of a question which said, when are you going to get back to having a minister of health instead of so much emphasis on the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care, which indicates an illness-oriented system?

There are many examples given by the Member for Calgary North Hill about the role of the nurse and how we finally have some research studies to prove that the nurse can make a difference in some situations. There certainly are target groups that I think we all understand could well benefit from the utilization of the nurses' skills. One target group of course is the elderly. Another group is people with hypertension, and nurses

have always played a major role in pre- and post-natal care. So you can see that nurses could well be the logical point of entry in terms of both cost and care. It has been proven that nurses can provide lower cost alternatives to costly physician and hospital services.

As I said, there are some research studies. One I would like to quote to you is:

A study conducted in rural Newfoundland showed that in an area where people received nursing primary care, acute care in the hospital decreased by five percent while increasing 39 percent in a control population receiving traditional physician-based [care]. In addition, annual costs per 1,000 population were substantially lower of the experimental population than for the control population in the study period.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the time, I would like to adjourn debate.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree with the motion?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: It is so ordered.

head: **PUBLIC BILLS AND ORDERS**  
**OTHER THAN**  
**GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS**  
 (Second Reading)

**Bill 233**  
**Motor Vehicle Accident Medical Costs Act**

MR. ALEXANDER: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill 233, the Motor Vehicle Accident Medical Costs Act.

It is an irony of the human condition that as we approach the advent of the Christmas season to celebrate the birth of Christ, at the same time we will face an increasing incidence of impaired driving. This particular human condition, overindulgence in alcohol or drugs, combined with the operation of a motor vehicle, cannot of course be cured by legislation. The real problem of alcohol overuse, its attendant loss of judgment and potential self-destruction, is a condition to be addressed elsewhere.

However, we must deal with the effects of impaired driving if only to limit and contain the damage. Thus Bill 233 attempts to address the issue with a limited focus on two or three principles which may help to offset the damage. Recognize that this Bill is but another arrow in the quiver, another tool among a growing array of legal sanctions against this particular anti-social act. This Bill is but another signal that we are serious about this problem, a reflection of an angry and frustrated citizenry.

Briefly stated, the principles of Bill 233 would make a driver who is convicted of impaired driving under the Criminal Code of Canada liable for expenses otherwise payable to the Alberta health care insurance plan. Medical expenses in question relate to injuries sustained by the driver or any other person as a result of the accident. The court must be satisfied before making such judgment that the driver was wholly or partly to blame for the accident. The Bill suggests a cap of \$5,000 on those expenses. It suggests that in order to pay those expenses, the vehicle may be impounded or sold or, failing either of those, other penalties such as community service may be levied.

The original wording of the Bill has caused some confusion concerning its intent. While parliamentary procedure prevents

me from introducing amendments during second reading, I would like to indicate my intention to do so during Committee of the Whole. First, this Act would state that the impounding of a vehicle pursuant to the Act does not affect the ability of a person with a prior charge to take recovery steps. The second would have to do with the insurability. I would also like to clear up any misunderstanding which has existed up to now that the penalty was unduly harsh by reason of disqualifying individuals from receiving medical care for illnesses or disabilities unrelated to the accident. That was not intended. Thus the medical expenses in question would be arising solely from the accident.

It is not now my intention to either bore members or encumber this discussion with the encyclopedia of detail which has been amassed from jurisdictions all over the world. Suffice it to say that the problem is as old as mankind, it is almost universal, and it appears to be intractable. It appears that law is generally ineffective against impaired driving but not for lack of laws or lack of trying. We anxiously scan the world for ideas, we analyze the data, and we try to formulate new laws that will find some missing link.

The previous Liberal government of Canada proposed a number of amendments to the Criminal Code in this country dealing with impaired driving under Bill C-19. It's harsh. On the first offence, a fine should be not less than \$300, which unfortunately may be harsher on some than it is on others. The second offence would see imprisonment for not less than 14 days; on subsequent offences, imprisonment for not less than 90 days. It creates additional offences. Impaired driving causing bodily harm could be punishable by imprisonment for up to 10 years. Impaired driving causing death could be punishable by imprisonment for up to 14 years. Further penalties would be immobilization of the vehicle, and on. I think we can all agree that if the new Conservative government passes these amendments, the impaired driver will face much stricter punishment.

However, the question I would like to consider is, do increased arrests and harsher penalties solve the drunk-driving problem? Regrettably, the answer is no, and it is based on the experience of countries which have much stricter penalties for impaired driving. Members will have seen statistics from many jurisdictions which show varying degrees of short-term effectiveness of some measures but generally long-term ineffectiveness. Sweden, Norway, Finland, France, England, New Zealand: all have made attempts of the type posed by Bill C-19.

The difficulty is that they don't appear to get to the heart of the problem. Mandatory jail terms for impaired driving, regardless of the nature of the driving itself, force the courts into compromises and evasions that seem to lessen the dignity of the law and undermine its effectiveness. As an example, the great Chicago crackdown of some years ago saw 6,600 motorists arrested for drunk driving but less than 10 percent actually receiving jail sentences which the judges themselves had agreed to impose. California prescribes a mandatory jail term for drunk driving that leads to an injury, for a second conviction within seven years, or for driving with a suspended licence. But in cases studied over a three-year period, 65 percent of all defendants were given other sentences, while many of the rest received probation. In hopes of stopping such practices, numerous citizens' groups, some led by family members of those who have been killed during such accidents, have been agitating for stricter laws.

Drunk driving cannot be condoned, even when it is not done in a hostile or aggressive manner. The increased risks entailed make it an offence against the social order. Mr. Speaker, the penalty for an offence against society should try to do three

things, and it is these three things at which I have aimed Bill [233]. The first is that it should increase the defendant's respect for the law. Secondly, it should improve his understanding of drunk driving. Third, it should deter this further undesirable behaviour.

How does Bill 233 propose to help accomplish a reduction in impaired driving? By achieving these changes in attitude. In my view, the principles are fundamental. The first one is that we must bring a more direct relationship between the act and its consequences, the crime and the punishment, if you like. That is presently not the case. In bringing the consequences of a vehicle accident virtually to the time of hospital checkout, the impact would be much more significant, far more significant than the present system. The present system entails roughly the accident itself and immediate hospitalization, in which all involved are treated like the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care, if you like; that is, they're given first-class treatment despite the nature of the act. So at that point in time the penalty is not apparent. Then there are charges against the driver. Then the driver is probably released from hospital. At a much later date, he appears before the court to answer the charges.

The time lapse is one of the problems. What happens is another one. The conviction, if any, and the penalty — so often a minimal penalty — are far from the act and inappropriate to the nature of the act. I suggest that this lapse of many weeks or many months, perhaps a year, breaks the offender's focus on the offence, and thus his ability to learn from it, and naturally transfers his concentration to getting off as lightly as possible. Bill 233 would require that an invoice for all hospital and medical charges be provided the impaired driver as soon as the fact of impairment is established.

There are other benefits which flow from this procedure. The cost of the accident would be accounted for in the system. Patients, doctors, nurses — all those involved in the delivery system — would follow the excellent example of the Fort McMurray hospital in costing their operations and making those costs known. Secondly, this increased awareness of costs would be beneficial to all. The payment of those costs by an impaired driver would reimburse the system and relieve some pressure on continually rising costs. As the word gets around, the educational value to society, as well as the value to the offender, which is the important factor, would be substantial in my view.

In repeated offences the penalty is clear; it is even calculable. The impaired driver will know that he cannot hope the courts will be lenient again. He will know the consequences and the costs. It is an appalling statistic, but 75 percent of impaired drivers are repeat offenders, some as many as 21 times according to the record; the average in some places, 3.1 times. Obviously we're not getting to the bottom of the problem.

Mr. Speaker, since the introduction of Bill 233, I've seen some misunderstandings of the intent, and I hope that intent will be made clearer. Interest groups with whom the Bill has been vetted have had some of their reservations alleviated, and their concerns now seem to be in helping to solve the problem. I'm pleased to see an increase in support for a needed initiative. I recognize all the complexities. I know the difficulties. I've been through many scenarios. Many of them have been counted to me. In my view, they can be handled.

It has been said that this Bill is just a sort of sly, sidewinder attack on medicare. It's not an attack on medicare, but it's an attack on those who inflict senseless costs on medicare and on all the rest of us. At the moment they do so with relative impunity. If we are to achieve the principles I previously delineated, which are widely recognized as being necessary if we're

going to get at the root of the problem, we must attack the problem where it is.

Let me conclude by reiterating the principles I think are at stake here. One, whatever law we pass must increase the defendant's respect for the law, not his deviousness, shall I say, in finding ways to circumvent it. Secondly, it must improve his understanding of drunk driving. As I think of the possibility of landing in the hospital along with three or four others who have been severely injured by an impaired accident, I can see the Bill being presented, with the delineated, outlined costs on it, having the kind of impact and delivering the kind of understanding to the defendant that he would not otherwise receive. The third principle again is to deter further undesirable behaviour. It strikes me that if I knew the possibility of a \$5,000 cost existed when I stepped into my car to drive home in an impaired condition, I could safely say that I would think twice.

I think the principles are worth supporting and, as a consequence, I recommend Bill 233 to hon. members.

MR. McPHERSON: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address some remarks to Bill 233, the Motor Vehicle [Accident] Medical Costs Act. I noted that the mover of the Bill, the Member for Edmonton Whitemud, indicated in his remarks that it has some complexities. They are acknowledged; they're recognized. I'm encouraged to see that over the course of time since the member introduced the Bill, he has given further consideration to the Bill and is proposing some amendments to it. The member spoke about some attacks on the Bill he has heard in the past and perhaps has been accused, as he said, of some "sly attack on medicare". I don't believe that is in this Bill.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to address the principles of the Bill. In considering the principles that are debated in this House and outside this House, as so many principles on social policy are, it strikes me that many of the arguments can be rendered down and perhaps crudely characterized as a debate between the hardheaded conservatives and the softhearted liberals. Sometimes this debate focusses on one side tending to blame the individual and exonerating the system, the other blaming the system and exonerating the individual. It seems to me that the debate pervades public policy. I believe the debate can be useless and perhaps harmful. I believe the answer is yes; any public policy that ignores either individual accountability or system accountability, emphasizing one to the exclusion of the other, will fail to that extent. I subscribe to a proper balance between individual accountability and system accountability. Holding individuals accountable for their behaviour does not excuse or justify a bad system that encourages poor individual behaviour. A bad system demands reform. But equally, bad systems do not justify bad behaviour. Individuals must be held accountable for their actions. I agree that it's a tough balancing act. But public policy must be both softhearted and hardheaded.

Where does that lead us with respect to Bill 233? It seems to me we're dealing with a Bill that proposes harsher penalties for drunk driving, especially when injury results. If it's implemented, this Bill would focus sharply on the seriousness of that activity. Moreover, it would shift the burden of medical costs of up to \$5,000 — and I want to come back to that later — to the individual who committed the offence, as opposed to society. It seems to me the Bill presupposes that the current system does not hold individuals accountable enough for their actions and calls for some system reform to ameliorate this situation.

Mr. Speaker, the Bill makes a strong statement that society shouldn't have to pay for self-inflicted injury incurred during the commission of a crime. Bill 233 provides for individual freedom of choice. A person has a choice to step into a car

and drive away when he's drunk, but by exercising that choice he's not only breaking the law but putting the innocent lives of others as well as his own at risk. Moreover, our present system seems to operate in such a way that the very people on whom he may have wrought so much personal injury support the very costs that are involved.

The question Bill 233 asks is this: who should pay for the medical costs involved? It answers it by saying: if an individual wants to exercise his choice of breaking the law by drinking while driving, he should be willing to step up to the Bar and accept the consequences of his actions.

Mr. Speaker, I support the principle of the Bill because we've seen a steady erosion of personal freedoms in this country by transferring individual responsibility to the government. I support the principle because we continually debate ways of curbing the carnage on our highways and roads from drunken driving. If we're going to get serious about this carnage — the heartache, the upset families — let's allow the powerful natural forces of individual responsibility, individual constraint, to at least enter into the decision-making, rather than allowing people to make their own decisions and then shifting the costs of those consequences where they simply get lost in the system.

Mr. Speaker, there's an old truism: if you reward an activity, you get more of it; if you penalize an activity, you get less of it. Certainly we have penalties for drinking while driving, if you get caught and if you get convicted. It seems, however, that the penalties aren't offering all that much of a deterrent. According to the 1983 Alberta traffic collision statistics, the proportion of drinking drivers involved in fatal collisions has increased over the past five years from 24.9 percent in 1978 to 28.2 percent in 1983. Admittedly, that same report goes on to indicate that the number of drinking drivers involved in injury collisions has remained fairly stable over the past five years at approximately 14.5 percent.

While any evidence that suggests penalties are an effective deterrent against drinking and driving are anecdotal, we have witnessed a slowing in the consumption of alcohol by Albertans since 1971. This is a positive trend, and I think that trend results from many of the fine efforts by organizations like AADAC through their prevention campaigns directed toward positive life-style and fitness. I notice the hon. Member for Lethbridge West attended this debate, and I compliment and commend the activities and efforts of that organization.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that public attitude toward drinking and driving has to change. Education is the key. We must get to a point where drinking and driving simply becomes socially unacceptable. This shift in attitude must start at the bottom of the caldron and boil up to the top of society's consciousness.

I'd like to take a few moments in this debate to share with members what I consider to be a very important development in reducing the problem I'm alluding to. It's a development that's been put forth by the Optimists Club in Red Deer. Hon. members may be interested in knowing that the Optimists Club in Red Deer has embarked on a community service project known as DUTI, which is aimed at reducing the incidence of driving while under the influence of alcohol. The purpose of the program is to reduce drinking and driving by (a) increasing individual awareness that presently held attitudes are a significant part of the problem, (b) encouraging the development of alternatives to presently held attitudes, and (c) stimulating communication on the problem.

Mr. Speaker, the DUTI projects undertaken so far by the Optimists Club in Red Deer are rather significant. Their first project was a commitment by all members of the Optimists Club that they would not drive while under the influence of



alcohol and the encouragement of the use of alternate means of transportation to their residences in such an event.

The other program they have embarked on is this. As hon. members may know, at the time of high school graduation every year, there is a tradition of very large parties held in various high schools around the province that have generally been fairly disorganized and resulted in young students drinking and driving their vehicles home. Notwithstanding the noncommitment of schools to become involved in such activities, the Optimists Club managed to contact the organizers of these parties, the graduating classes, and offered their services to provide transportation on a strictly voluntary basis.

It's had a fantastic result in the Red Deer and central Alberta area. I will enumerate just a couple. The Camille J. Lerouge Collegiate graduation bush party: last year the club provided a school bus, Optimists' cars, and drivers all night for some 450 students from the party to their residences. The Delburne high school graduation party, 85 guests: Optimists arranged for a group of parents to drive students home all night. The River Glen high school graduation bush party included 100 guests, and again the Optimists provided students with transportation both to the party and home. And the Lindsay Thurber Comprehensive high school graduation party, some 400 guests: again, the voluntary activities of the Optimists Club in Red Deer provided transportation to and from the party.

They have also been involved in establishing a program of taxi vouchers in Red Deer, whereby you can get a taxi voucher from the organizer of a party, even a residential party, and that taxi voucher will provide you with a ride home through the Optimists Club. Although the club doesn't pay for the actual cost of the taxi ride, the host of the party will do that. That has been very successful.

They've been involved in many, many programs, Mr. Speaker. They hope to encourage the Alberta Liquor Control Board to approve a program where these taxi vouchers would be made available in Alberta liquor stores and, moreover, where liquor stores would approve the placement of their DUTI cards outlining the program in all stores across the province.

They have been successful in developing a documentary film which is going to be aired on CTV on December 3, 1984. It is truly a remarkable program, Mr. Speaker, and the initiatives of that club in Red Deer are really grass-roots initiatives. The DUTI project is a terrific idea, and ideas have consequences. I commend the Optimists Club and offer them my support and best wishes.

Mr. Speaker, the point I'm trying to raise in the activities of the Optimists Club in Red Deer is that it seems to me that they have recognized that effective, compassionate social policy must combine both individual accountability and system accountability. Our health care system in Alberta is essentially a public utility. Certainly there are those who are drawn to the public utility approach. I don't happen to see them in the House at the moment, but there are those who are drawn to the aspect of a public utility approach. There are those who believe that a government franchise, a government set of regulations, and government-set prices will lead to an efficient, effective system responsive to consumer needs, even if the consumers have absolutely no incentives or accountability for the cost consequences of their own decisions. I don't subscribe to that. In my view, you don't curb cost increases or constrain deleterious social activity by removing all aspects of individual accountability.

Conversely, I don't think one should face a financial catastrophe for being sick or injured. Therefore I would be more favourably inclined to see the \$5,000 limit enumerated in the Bill under section 7 exchanged for, let's say, 10 percent of

family income, to recognize different financial circumstances. I think the net result would be about the same. The result though, Mr. Speaker, would be to attach some measure of personal responsibility to the individual for his own actions. If those actions result in injuring oneself or others by drinking and driving, that individual should be prepared to accept the consequences of those actions, and I think that would be a progressive move.

Thank you.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity of participating in second reading of Bill 233, the Motor Vehicle Accident Medical Costs Act. First of all, I want to commend the Member for Edmonton Whitemud for bringing this forward. The amount of work and study he's put into it is obvious by the comments he's made. The Member for Red Deer continues to impress me with a great deal of ability to ferret out issues, obviously do his homework in great detail, and present very logical arguments to this Assembly.

If I could, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to begin my discussion with some indication of the severity, as I would call it, or magnitude of the problem here in the province of Alberta, and of those who are actively working to change what I think is a truly preventable number of actions by citizens who, for a variety of reasons, simply have no consideration for their fellow man.

Two years ago, there were over a hundred people convicted every day in this province for impaired driving. That's about 28,000 a year. Last year it was down to 26,000. That attests — and I hope the hon. Solicitor General would enter the debate at some point because he has better knowledge than I — to the very great type of enforcement or quality of police we have in this province. In the province of British Columbia, with some 3 million people — half a million more — their convictions are at 17,000, which indicates, to me anyway, not the high degree of enforcement that we have in this province, which I think is an indicator of the dedication of the police forces serving in Alberta.

Of those 28,000, Mr. Speaker, the law now says they must attend an impaired drivers' course in this province before they can be reinstated. From the latest figures we have, there are some 17,000 attending, which means there are from 9,000 to 11,000 or 12,000 who don't attend. It's my view that many of those are driving today. And if they're driving today, while they're suspended, they're certainly not insured and not licensed. I'm of the view that with the type of society we have today — we can put men and women on the moon, talk to them, and bring them home — surely to God we can determine whether those very people have medicare coverage in this province and whether they have a licence. It wouldn't be difficult to determine whether or not they're driving.

We must recognize that the one great common Americanization in this province, represented by 1.7 million sets of licence plates, is that a lot of people are driving. And for all we say about public transit, if you have to make a choice between working on Refinery Row without access to a bus and supporting your family, then I submit that, recognizing the chance of getting caught is about one in 2,000, you'll invariably take a chance and drive without a licence — drive many times without a licence.

Mr. Speaker, as the Member for Edmonton Whitemud indicated, the problem is not new; it's been going on for a long, long time. There are groups out there virtually screaming to government to take some action. The People Against Impaired Drivers, a group of volunteers in this province that now has something like 12 chapters — they're people who have been

hurt, hurt severely, as a result of personal experiences and losses — are saying to government: it's time you acted. The Alberta Motor Association, the Alberta Medical Association, the Alberta safety league, church groups — a variety of groups — are demanding some type of action from government to lower the problem.

What are we doing? Mr. Speaker, I submit that we have now — reference is made by the sponsor of the Bill in section 1 to the sections under the Criminal Code indicated there. The law in Canada says very clearly that if you are convicted of a second offence — we've taken this out of the hands of judges in case people think judges don't have the temerity to exercise the law; we've made it by statute 14 days in jail.

Why is it then that records indicate that last year some 5,200 or 33 percent of those who took the impaired drivers' course were second or subsequent offenders and less than 200 went to jail? Is someone not doing their job? I'm not a lawyer — undoubtedly I have other vices — but I'm told that if a charge before a judge could result in incarceration, you must have been served with prior notice at least two weeks before that the results of that charge could put you in jail. I am told that in most instances that document, for some mysterious reason, does not surface. As a result you cannot be charged with a second offence under the Criminal Code but must rely on the great computers of the motor vehicle branch to pick up second and subsequent offences. As a result you'll find your suspension increased from six months to one year to three years and so on. But that does not seem to look after the problem the hon. Member for Edmonton Whitemud is addressing.

I am very strongly of the view that the Member for Red Deer is right. I don't think we need more laws. We look to the greatest country in the world — at least around here we think it's the greatest country — called the United States. President Reagan appointed a Mr. Volpe. He did a year's study and came up with 23 conclusions. Besides raising the drinking age, there were 22 of them; I won't mention the drinking age because that's a sensitive issue around here. They said certain things should happen. Two years ago I advocated that on conviction, you should do 48 hours in jail. Not that it's going to affect you so much, but I can assure you, if the Member for Red Deer goes to jail for 48 hours, his 35 colleagues in this House are going to be very careful of how they drink.

If we can only influence the great third and fourth estates to put names in the newspapers — I've had discussions with the daily press in this province. God help you if you're an instructor at SAIT or NAIT. It's in the paper. But can you honestly believe that of the 28,000 convictions that were recorded in this province, fewer than 200 made the press? Are they carrying out their responsibility? I talk to them, and they say that's not news. They stand for truth, honesty, and public disclosure. How do they answer that?

I know we have members of the PAID organization who take time off work to go and sit in court and listen to these cases. It's only through complaining and letters to judges that they've somehow tended to increase the sentences in accordance with what the politician or legislator has decreed. Volunteers have done that — people who, God knows, have better things to do, because they're expected to raise their families. I see them in the courts across Alberta. We now have Mothers Against Drunk Drivers. We have SADD, Students Against Drunk Drivers. It seems to me that in this great volunteer province, we have a very high number of volunteers who have said: let's get involved and do something.

The Member for Red Deer talked about the Optimists Club. I believe there will be an hour on prime-time television this fall. Red Deer, Alberta, at 40,000 or 50,000 strong, like a

suburb of Toronto, will be the focal point on the CTV network this fall — before Christmas, perfect timing — for the problems of impaired driving and what a community is prepared to do. I think we should be very proud of those people, Mr. Speaker, very proud of any service club that is prepared to get involved. However, does that solve the problem? To date, it has not. Convictions continue to go on and on. What is the answer? I don't know what the answer is.

I don't believe that the answer lies in Bill 233. The fear I have in supporting the Bill, and my reluctance to support it, is that many people will think that as a result of that Bill, we've solved the problem.

Honourable members know as well as I do that very few people drink alone and very few people drive alone. It's hard to believe there could be 28,000 convictions in this province, and many of us are not aware that some of them are our friends. What steps have we taken? Have we taken the time to take the keys away, to encourage to take the keys away?

I spoke to a group of 300 high school students from across Alberta at the Chateau here last fall. We posed the question to them: what should be done? You should have heard the ideas that came out. They told me of house parties they have where you don't get in the door unless you surrender your keys and put them in a basket, and you don't get out unless someone, called your peers, makes the judgment that you're able. I know we're adults here, and we don't do that. They have some excellent ideas of what to do.

I know there are other people anxious to enter the debate, and I'll wrap up very quickly, Mr. Speaker. It seems to me that we should take heed of the comments made by the Member for Red Deer. Public attitude is the key. Until we as citizens are prepared to take a stand that people who drink and drive are a danger to society, and we're prepared to at least have the courtesy to go and talk to them — if we don't want to be courteous, let's take their licence number. Governor Rae of the state of Washington had a program three years ago. If you were driving erratically, someone took your number, phoned a central agency, you got a phone call, and they said: "Mr. Smith, the way you've been driving has been reported. We're not going to give you a ticket, but we thought we should bring it to your attention and make you aware." They had a drop in incidents of 25 percent in one year. That's public awareness.

Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, to continue the way we're going, and end up with the highest per capita incarcerated in our jails of any province in Canada — I don't think that's something to be proud of. I think they go back 6.6 times. The law as we presently see it does not work, as the Member for Edmonton Whitemud said. If we as responsible legislators are prepared to get involved in the issue, we will attempt two things: one, we will see that new and innovative programs are carried out to make people aware of the problems of impaired driving; secondly, we will enforce the law as it presently exists on the books in Canada.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, first of all, I should indicate that I'm not getting in just because I was invited by the Member for Lethbridge West. I had intended to take part in this debate in any event.

I'd like to congratulate the Member for Edmonton Whitemud for giving us the opportunity to have a good debate in this Assembly about one of the greatest social problems we have in North America. It's not unique to Alberta, and it's not unique to Canada. Indeed the problem is worldwide, wherever Karl Benz's invention has come into contact with an even older invention by society. In fact the only countries that do not have

a problem with drunken drivers are either Mohammedan countries where there is no drinking or those countries where there are no automobiles.

When one wants to address the issue of drunken driving, you really have to start from the social and medical effects and perhaps nowadays the health costs associated with it. The social effects of drunken driving have to be looked at in addition to the social effects of excessive alcohol consumption. We've heard some comments from the chairman of the Alberta Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission, who has addressed this Assembly on previous occasions on the social costs of excessive alcohol consumption. We won't go through all of those again.

I would like to comment on some of the medical aspects from my previous experience. That experience, Mr. Speaker, is of 25 years' practice on a busy Alberta highway, Highway 16 west. It's also an experience of 25 years as a coroner in this province. I can assure you that there is nothing worse in this life than having spent all night repairing the damaged individuals who have survived an accident and then having to go around and talk to the families of those people who did not survive. It's a very sobering experience in more ways than one. Those are the people who have probably done so much to change the attitudes of society, and those attitudes have indeed changed.

When I first went to Hinton, drunk driving in this province was literally regarded as a lark. The policeman and the doctor would go to court. They would give the usual evidence — and it was usually minimized — that the offender had been staggering, slurred speech, had bleary eyes, and smelled strongly of alcohol. Then the judge, if he was up on the subject, would say: "In your opinion, doctor, was the accused impaired or was he drunk?" Sometimes I used to express the opinion that the accused was further than that; he was blind drunk. The fine would be \$25. That was 25 years ago in this province.

It's the efforts of people like People Against Impaired Drivers, Mothers Against Drunk Drivers, and others that have resulted in a gradual escalation of the penalties over the years. But as of now, do the penalties have any relationship to the offence? There is of course the offence of drunk driving. People may get away with getting home without having an accident, or they may be charged with drunk driving without causing an accident, bodily injury, or death. But when they do cause injury, the injuries can be catastrophic. The number of otherwise healthy people in this province who are brain damaged, quadriplegic, paraplegic, or who have lost limbs and employability as a result of drunken offences by others, is so large that it has become an offence against humanity, not just against the law. When one has taken part in putting these people back together as best medical science can, and one realizes during the procedure what the subsequent life of that injured person is going to be as a result of the immoral behaviour of the drunk driver, one begins to get fairly hot about it.

Society's attitude has changed, and so have the penalties. If you analyze Bill 233, what it really is, is an additional penalty of up to \$5,000, depending on medical costs, and in the event of inability to pay, a further suspension beyond that already in the Criminal Code of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I've been speaking so far about the current penalties. But it's of interest to look at the penalties proposed by the recently deposed federal Minister of Justice, the Hon. Mark MacGuigan. I'd like to read through them as they apply to drunk driving. For the existing offence of impaired driving, he suggests that the minimum sentence on a first offence be a fine of \$300, the minimum penalty on a second offence be 14 days' imprisonment, and the minimum penalty on a third or subsequent offence be 90 days' imprisonment. On the other

hand, the maximums on indictment for any offence — first, second, or subsequent — are five years' imprisonment and an unlimited fine. That's probably the only offence in this country that has ever been suggested for an unlimited fine. In other words, the president of a corporation with personal assets of \$5 million could quite properly be fined \$1 million and given five years in jail. I presume that would be limited to when he plowed into a queue of children waiting for a school bus. But that's the proposal. Failure or refusal without reasonable excuse to provide a breath sample: the same penalty. Refusal to give a sample of blood when unable to give a sample of breath: the same.

There are some interesting additional proposals. Dangerous or impaired driving causing death — no implication of criminal negligence required, just the two facts of a death and a blood alcohol over .08 percent — maximum 14 years' imprisonment. For dangerous or impaired driving causing bodily harm without a death: a maximum of 10 years in prison.

These suggestions were put forward in the Parliament of Canada by Mr. MacGuigan as part of an omnibus Bill to do with the Criminal Code. Our own Attorney General has said that if these are implemented by the federal Parliament, there is little need for this parliament to get involved with additional penalties. Having just read them out, I think any branch of society would say those are significant enough penalties. If a philosophy of punitive deterrence will indeed work, surely those penalties will.

I said society's attitude has changed, and these suggestions in the Criminal Code of Canada proposal indicate how much they have changed. I welcome it. Indeed the problem may be that some members of the judiciary — after all, there are not many people in this province of ours who drive and drink who have never been impaired, and that applies to the judiciary as well — will not exercise the discretion available to them and, if so, it may be that the minimums will have to be increased. That will not be a proposal of the judiciary; it will have to be a proposal of those elected to represent society, which is currently outraged by these offences.

If one looks at the scale of the penalties proposed by Mr. MacGuigan, I'm not really sure that a further suspension until one pays off a maximum of \$5,000, and the fine of a maximum of \$5,000, are applicable. If we accept the philosophy that's expressed in the Bill, I think the limit of \$5,000 is almost a token in relation to modern medical and health care costs in relation to the injuries I've described. Five thousand dollars doesn't begin to pay the medical and hospital costs of these injuries. Indeed in our own legislation in this province in relation to the Motor Vehicle Accident Claims Fund, we allow a maximum payout of \$100,000, and the offending driver who did not carry insurance is responsible for paying off that \$100,000. He may not have been drunk at all; he may not have been drinking. But if he doesn't carry insurance and there is a public liability claim against him, it can be a payout of \$100,000, and he is then responsible for reimbursing the Provincial Treasury for up to that amount. So \$5,000 is pretty much a token.

I have some additional concerns about the Bill, Mr. Speaker. We all know that our law enforcement system and court system have quite a load upon them. Unfortunately I think the provisions of this Bill might add to the court and law enforcement load an unnecessary load that may indeed not have much effect upon impaired driving.

The societal changes that I have mentioned have occurred partly because of the actions of individuals who had friends, family, acquaintances, or neighbours maimed or killed. They have also been the result of an education process that has been

developed by various levels of government and other programs — Check Stop in this province and equivalents in other provinces. The educational programs of the Alberta Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission, the Alberta Medical Association, the Alberta Motor Association, and many other organizations have indeed assisted in the development of changes in the penalties for drunk driving. In addition to the court load that is already required for conviction under those offences, and to enforce either the current or the potential future penalties, I'm not sure that we need to add the provisions that are required for collecting these amounts of money.

There is another unfortunate one in here. We have spoken at some length about the victims of drunk driving who are the direct victims. But in all humanity, I think we have to have a look at the families of the drunk driver. The original proposal to remove Alberta health care insurance plan benefits until the \$5,000 is paid off may be an additional and unfair penalty for those families. It is specific in the Bill that there would be no deprivation of health care. But the very fact of not having the coverage for a family that may be of limited resources — we're back to an old philosophical point about publicly provided health care versus privately provided health care, and I'm not really convinced that this is an area where it should be involved.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to repeat my thanks to the Member for Edmonton Whitemud for giving the opportunity to express these opinions and comments. I think the changes proposed in the federal Criminal Code amendments, if they are implemented and if they are enforced and used by the judiciary, will in many ways remove the feeling by many groups in society that the current penalties are unrealistic in relation to the nature of the offence. If those changes are implemented and used, I think there will be little need for additional legislation such as is represented by Bill [233]. Of course a problem exists if they are not introduced and passed and used. At that time I think this parliament will have the obligation to look after the genuine concerns of Albertans by introducing some form of penalties that approach those suggested in the Criminal Code amendment proposals.

Thank you.

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, I have a number of comments to make with respect to this particular Bill, by way of both supporting the intent and concept and questioning certain aspects of the Bill. However, in view of the time allotted today, I move that we adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: It is so ordered.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, by way of government business this evening, the debate on Motion No. 12 will resume. I move we call it 5:30.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

[The House recessed at 5:26 p.m. and resumed at 8 p.m.]

## head: GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

12. Moved by Mr. Lougheed:

Be it resolved that the Assembly approve in general the operations of the government since the adjournment of the spring sittings.

[Adjourned debate October 17: Mr. Notley]

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of the fall session I always welcome the opportunity to respond to the cheerleading by the hon. Premier, across the way, when he tells Albertans that there are no clouds in the sky and that the sun is shining. I have a number of rather serious comments to make. But I wouldn't want to offer a few initial observations without drawing to hon. members' attention some of the matters that have developed over the summer, such things as concern about this government's continued waste and extravagance, spousal travel hither and thither around the world and across Canada, the Lee Richardson bank loans. In his initial comments the other day the hon. Premier talked about the impact PetroCan has on the rental market in Calgary. Quite true, but then one might also ask what the impact on the rental market is of spending all the money we are on Government House in Calgary. There are some of those observations which, quite appropriately, should be raised at the beginning of the fall session.

But tonight, if I may, I want to start with the first comment the Premier made, and that is that he drew our attention to the Pope's visit. We're all very proud of the work that was done in planning for the Pope's visit to this province. But it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that while members on both sides of the House were indeed honoured to have the Pope visit Alberta, rather than simply drawing attention to his physical presence for a few hours in Alberta, it might be more important if we reflected on some of his observations when he was in Canada. The homily he gave in Edmonton was a very powerful one, dealing with our obligations to people in the southern half of the world. But I think his homily in Flat Rock, Newfoundland, is one that we might well ponder upon for a moment. I'd like to quote:

I join with them [in other words, the bishops] in appealing to those in positions of responsibility and to all involved to work together to find appropriate solutions to the problems at hand, including restructuring the economy so that human needs be put before mere financial gain. The social doctrine of the church requires us to emphasize the human primacy of the human person in the productive process, the primacy of people over things.

As we reflect upon those observations, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that one has to ask: has the time come on this continent to look at whether we shouldn't restructure the economy so that there is a primacy of people over things? I think the moral message that His Holiness brought to North America has a good deal of sound economic advice as well, although I realize that when we debated the bishops' report a year and a half ago, hon. members of this House made a number of observations in which they made it quite clear that this government caucus didn't agree with the bishops' report. But I think growing numbers of Canadians and Albertans are beginning to ask whether or not, in making decisions, it isn't time to restore people to the primacy and certainly that human resources should come first, especially when we see the deficiencies of our present economic system.

I raise that observation deliberately, Mr. Speaker, because yesterday we paid tribute to a former premier of the province.

One of the things that Mr. Strom did during his three-year tenure as premier of Alberta was be responsible for the development of the human resources concept. His predecessor, Mr. Manning, issued a white paper. I'm going to be talking a little later about this government's white paper, but he issued a white paper on human resource development. The underpinning of that white paper was that human resources are more important than physical resources and that there had to be a reorientation of government policies to underscore the importance of human resources. In 1971, when the now crowd took over, one of the first things they did was to dismantle many of the initiatives of those three years and do away with the Human Resources Research Council.

Because I think human resources are the most important, I want to start my comments tonight on human resource issues and then, a little later, close them on the same theme, human resource matters. Mr. Speaker, when one looks at the people problems that face Albertans in 1984, it is a pity that in 1972 this government dismantled some of the framework which allowed government to look at human resource problems within a total context. What we have seen in place is ad hockery that moves, especially just before an election, to bring in programs that are attractive and popular, but ad hockery that doesn't really deal with some of the short-term and long-term human problems that face the people of this province.

Mr. Speaker, when one travels around Alberta, I don't know how you can ignore the desperation that is a fact of life for a lot of people — perhaps not for members of the Legislature whose incomes may be very high but for the average Albertan who is faced with unemployment, who sees that there's a good chance of losing the home that he or his wife have put all their life savings down to purchase. Now, because one or the other has lost their job, that home is being foreclosed upon. When one sees the evidence that we discussed — my colleague raised it yesterday in the House — of the growing incidence of suicide, the growing incidence of wife battering, and the clear relationship between some of these unfortunate social effects and the desperation that faces people ... The minister across the way is smirking. I find it rather unfortunate that the minister is smirking at something like this, because he should be paying attention to some of these concerns. If these government members are reporting to the ministers as they should, then I don't know how he can be unaware of the concerns that exist among people in this province.

Mr. Speaker, when one looks at the statistics, when one looks at the evidence, there is no question that there are a large number of Albertans who are facing the challenges of the recession and are having a great deal of difficulty facing those challenges. I'm not suggesting, and neither is my colleague, that we can come in and develop a series of government programs that will make everybody happy. But I am saying that if we are genuinely concerned about human resources being more important than physical resources, then we have to take a look at the shamble of government social policies that exists in Alberta in 1984.

I suppose that there is no more moving example of how deficient our approach to social services has been than the moving comments of Richard Cardinal in his diary. Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that we've made some small steps; we even discussed legislation in the spring session. But the fact of the matter is that the problems that led to that tragic suicide have been there blinking, almost like a warning sign in the evening, for a long time. In 1980 we spent a lot of time during the spring session of the Legislature discussing certain elements of social service policy in this province. In 1982 we had the Ombudsman bringing in his report on foster care. We

had the Cavanagh Board of Review. And while the government moved a little bit here and a little bit there but mainly promising to study and study and study, the fact of the matter is that not a great deal was done.

Mr. Speaker, we all realize the deficiencies because one young man was articulate, had the ability to write in a dramatic way and in a testimony not only to his own life but to all kinds of other Albertans, and perhaps more graphically than any of us could, brought the attention of the people of this province to the inadequacies, not of a group of social workers who are overworked but of a process for which we are responsible and this government is accountable.

I'm not going to stand in my place and leave any inference of criticism about individual social workers, because in 1980 I raised warnings with the minister's predecessor about social workers, child care workers, who had come to me and were telling us that there were going to be tragedies because they had caseloads they couldn't handle. When they came to me, I know perfectly well that they went to government members as well. We discussed those issues in the spring of 1980. Mr. Speaker, the tragedy of Richard Cardinal is an indictment of a process for which this government is responsible.

AN HON. MEMBER: Where were his parents?

MR. NOTLEY: Somebody says, where were his parents? I really wonder at that kind of comment.

I say to members of the House that one of the reasons we are discussing this matter tonight is because there hasn't been a systematic framework for developing human resource policy in Alberta. If this government is going to be serious about putting people first, then perhaps the best way to remember Harry Strom would not be to name a public building after him but to resurrect the process by which we can come to grips with some of the human resource problems that face Albertans. That, I suspect, would be a standing way, a monument, to that very great Alberta gentleman that perhaps would be more fitting than naming a building after him.

Mr. Speaker, I raise the issue of social services because there is clear inadequacy on the part of the government. And I'm not going to say outside the House what I'm not saying inside the House. The responsibility of the opposition is to bluntly lay out what people are telling us and what we feel deeply as members of this Legislative Assembly. I'm saying to the members of the government that while you can talk all you like about this white paper, and we'll get to it in a moment, the failure to deal with the desperation of so many thousands of Albertans is something that, if I were you, hon. members, I wouldn't smile about. I would ponder and evaluate in your next caucus meeting whether or not there aren't some changes in government emphasis which shouldn't be made before the next election.

Mr. Speaker, not only do we have a province in which we seem to have lost sight of the primacy of human resources, as His Holiness Pope John Paul has suggested, but we have an economy which, despite the best efforts of the Premier to tell us otherwise, is in serious trouble. Every time we meet, we have members of the government telling us that prosperity is just around the corner, that the worst is over, that things are improving, and that we don't need to worry about the naysayers and the knockers, et cetera.

As I look back on this 10-point platform that provided the coattails for most of the hon. members who are in this House, one of the points that I thought was quite interesting was the overview of their 10-point platform, October 31, 1982, in which they say: because of these policies, national forecasts show that

Alberta will lead Canada's economy in 1983. That's what they said just before the last provincial election. There isn't a single Tory member in the province, let alone the Tories who were in business and who are now out of business, the Tory farmers who have been forced off the land, the Tory people who are unemployed, and the hundreds of former Tories that gathered in front of the Legislature yesterday to tell this government what they thought of them — very few would argue that Alberta led Canada's economy in 1983, unless you want to be the leader in such things as slowdown, retrenchment, growing unemployment, growing bankruptcies, growing number of foreclosures. If that was what the government meant by leadership, I suppose that was certainly part of the platform in 1982.

Mr. Speaker, when we hear the Premier tell us, as he did yesterday, that things are looking up, one has to look at that in the context of what they've said for the last two years. In October and November of 1982, it was: things are looking up. When we met in the spring of 1983, it was: things are looking up. It didn't look up; things got worse. In fall of 1983, we were told that things were going to look up, and things didn't look up; they're getting worse. In the spring of 1984: things are looking up. Yet over the summer we had growing evidence of stagnation, at best, in the economy, migration of people away from Alberta, and all the other factors that I have identified to this point in time: unemployment, foreclosures, et cetera. Now they tell us: don't worry, Albertans; everything is fine. Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't think Albertans believe them. As I travel around the province, I have all kinds of people who come and tell me — and they're certainly not members of the New Democratic Party or supporters of the Independents or Liberals, but people who have traditionally supported this government — that they are not satisfied with the economic performance of the Lougheed government.

I know that this government uses the Conference Board when they can find good evidence and ignores it when the outlook isn't so bright. In fairness, I would have to say that the recent Conference Board report, although there are all kinds of ifs, ands, or buts, does suggest that there might be some modicum of recovery. But if you look at the forecasts in the Conference Board report, we find that unemployment in Alberta in 1985 is expected to rise to 12.7 percent, which is higher by 1.3 percent than it is today and which is much higher than Saskatchewan, Manitoba, or Ontario — which, as a matter of fact is even forecast to be higher than the province of Nova Scotia. Before the backbenchers get too enthusiastic about this rosy picture that the Conference Board is reporting, I'm not sure that many of their constituents would want Nova Scotia unemployment to be a fact of life in Alberta. We're certainly not used to it. We've never been used to it in the 40-some years that I've been around. Now apparently the best we can hope for in 1985 is to have an unemployment rate that is actually higher than in the province of Nova Scotia. It may be small consolation to us that we're going to have a slightly lower rate of unemployment than New Brunswick. But that's with the Hatfield government, and it's certainly not surprising that we may come in slightly ahead of them. But I ask hon. members whether we really think that is something we want to go back with to our constituencies and say, "Happy days are here again; give us a slap on the back because we're doing such a great job".

Mr. Speaker, let's take a look at some of these other indicators. As I said, unemployment is expected to be at a record high. Never before, outside of the great Depression, have we had figures anywhere like — I'm not talking about the overall numbers, the human tragedies that my colleague will talk about when he speaks. But the percentage is much greater than any

time since the great Depression. We see the increase in foreclosures. If you just take the home foreclosure figures for the first eight months of 1984: 5,190 in eight months of 1984 compared to 3,869 for 12 months in 1983. A 34 percent increase so far, and we aren't even at the end of the year. We could well find that foreclosures this year will be double the rate of home foreclosures in 1983.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of people like the fellow Albertans who gathered yesterday who see that their homes may be taken away from them, who go to the local store and the local store has closed up and gone broke, and who may be dealing with service companies in one way or another that have gone out of business. When they hear the Premier tell them on television that it's fine, they frankly don't believe him. And they shouldn't believe him, because the fact of the matter is that things aren't good in this province.

I'm going to deal a little later with some of the long-term implications, but knowing what anyone in this House knows about the uncertainty of oil pricing and what faces us on the farm, any Albertan who suggests that the economic picture of this province is rosy is frankly so childlike in their naivety that it is nice that such people live in an Alice-in-Wonderland world. But it's not the real world that should be in front of members of the Legislature.

What are some of the things that can be done? I suggest that one of the places we might start, one of the things we might do, because we're going to have all kinds of people out of work, is show a little respect for local governments in this province. A few days ago, I had the privilege of addressing the Alberta urban municipalities convention in Calgary. Frankly, they were amazed that this great white paper had been produced and it virtually ignores municipalities. They find it very difficult to understand how any government can develop programs that are designed to put people back to work unless municipalities are seen as partners in the process.

Apparently the Premier is going to be visiting Mr. Mulroney along with some other premiers in November, I gather, at which time they're going to be talking about a federal/provincial conference on the economy. I think we should be moving much more quickly than some of the dates that have been suggested. But at the very least, one practical step that this government might want to examine, if it wants to prepare sensibly for its capital budget in 1985, is to have a summit meeting with the municipalities in this province, because in my judgment, municipalities have a closer sense of what is needed in the different areas of Alberta, in their respective jurisdictions.

There are all kinds of projects, good projects, practical projects, that are a lot more defensible than Mount Allan — getting into socializing the ski business on this mountain — a lot more practical than some of the things that this government digs up and throws out just before the Provincial Treasurer brings in his capital budget and says, we're going to spend \$3 billion and make all the decisions. Let's sit down with the local officials, who give a lot of practical advice on providing options which make sense. Then we can begin to deal with the unemployment problem.

I'm not suggesting that you can solve unemployment overnight by capital works projects exclusively, but I am saying that there are a lot of worthwhile public projects in this province that should probably go ahead now because we get better value for our dollar — that's not just better value for our provincial dollar but better value for the local dollar as well — and that is going to require some kind of close co-operation between the two levels of government.

I know some of the members, especially in Edmonton, are a little edgy about the prominence of the mayor here, but the

fact of the matter is that they should be accepting the voters' judgment in the civic election just as we have to accept the voters' judgment in the last provincial election. Hopefully that will be changed in a few months' time or a year or so, when the people of Alberta next go to the polls. But in the short run, if this government is serious about dealing with unemployment, I suggest that a summit meeting with municipalities is one important step.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to move from there to deal with the agricultural situation. In the white paper we're told that the engine of economic growth is the oil and gas industry and that agriculture is going to be a source of stability. We have the Premier making it fairly clear in his comments yesterday that oil and gas, in this government's terms of reference, is the most important industry — but only if you look in dollar volumes. If you look at the future of this province, the most important industry is our most valid, vital, long-term renewable resource industry, and that is agriculture.

With that in mind, we have to ask ourselves: what are some of the problems facing agriculture? Yesterday in the question period the Premier said: in 1983 there were 33 bankruptcies; now there are only 52; 52 is a relatively small number out of 56,000 farms. Mr. Speaker, if the bankruptcy figures were the total story, then I would agree with him. But as Stan Bell, president of Unifarm, properly said this morning: the bankruptcy figures are just the tip of the iceberg. The fact of the matter is that you've got all kinds of farmers that are in very serious trouble. You've got farmers — I see that our young friend from Edmonton Belmont, who now claims to be the agricultural expert, is adding his total knowledge in two or three seconds. Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that there are thousands of Alberta farmers who are in trouble.

Who are some of these people that are in trouble? It would be bad if it were well established, older farmers. But for the rural members who have travelled in their constituencies, who are the people who are really facing trouble? It's the younger farmers, the people we need in agriculture. They are the ones who are facing foreclosure. They're the ones who are putting their land up for sale, who are in danger of losing their equity. They're the ones who are in the most trouble.

Mr. Speaker, it's fine to say that there are a lot of farmers who are in good shape. I know farmers in the Peace who are in very good shape. Some of them even go down to California and Arizona in the wintertime, and that's fine. They've earned it. But it is the younger people who are taking over, and frequently taking over in a situation where they've had to pay far too much for the land, where they are now caught in this cost/price squeeze and are in danger of being forced off the land. I don't know how you can have an agricultural policy if we take this kind of complacent attitude to the real engine of agricultural recovery, which is the young farmer.

Mr. Speaker, travelling around my constituency the other day I was in the Cleardale area and met with a couple of farmers who said: we have some concerns about the inclement weather conditions in the spring; we'd like to call a meeting. Knowing some of the meetings government members have had on the white paper, where six and seven or 10 people come out after these great big advertising blitzes go on, I must confess that I wasn't sure whether there would be much interest. But I want to tell you that two days later we had about 100 people there, and they weren't there because they were ardent New Democrats. They were there because the area is facing serious trouble. If it was just one area facing serious trouble, I would say, okay; maybe that's an exception. But, Mr. Speaker, all through the province I get the same message, whether it is farmers in the south who've been facing the problems of drought, whether

it's the pockets in the north where we had inclement weather during spring seeding. Now, with the situation as a result of the snowfall and what's left of the crop being under the snow, you have a sense of desperation.

Mr. Speaker, in deference to some of those people who came out, I'd like to outline six of the points they brought to my attention as the MLA, and the regional director of the Department of Agriculture was also present at the meeting. First of all they said, it's fine to talk about an all-risk crop insurance program — the Premier made reference to that — but if you really look at the way in which that crop insurance program is working, it doesn't even begin to fit the bill. It's time to overhaul crop insurance. Among 100 people who were present, not a single person argued that it was satisfactory. When we put that issue to them, it was unanimous that there should be an improvement and an upgrading of the crop insurance scheme. It isn't good enough to simply say: we've got all-risk crop insurance; we don't need anything else. The fact of the matter is that if you talk to farmers in areas where they've been hard hit by inclement weather conditions, they will tell you in blunt terms: what are these politicians doing with crop insurance that there isn't a better deal than there is at the moment?

The second thing they said, Mr. Speaker, is that just before the last election we had an interest shielding program for farmers. Admittedly, the interest rates have gone down but, if anything, the effective interest rate, which is the difference between inflation and what the banks are charging, has gone up. Every one of those people said: if we could have an interest shielding program, financed by the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, a month before the election in '82, where is the interest shielding program in 1984 when we have to try to borrow money to maintain our operations, either to take our crop off if the snow ever melts or, more seriously, to put it in next spring? One would think that at the very least that's something this government could do, because they did it before the last election. We still have no commitment from the Tory caucus. Are we going to wait until a few weeks before the next election? If that's the case, Mr. Speaker, in the interests of young farmers in this province — someone pounds their desk over there — I say, let's bring the election on. That may be the kind of thing they need to stay in business. It's a practical thing. If it was good enough in 1982, why can't it be done in 1984? [interjection] The member across the way says, what about the interest rate? He's always the one who talks about the effective interest rates between inflation. He's given us a few lectures. If he takes a look at that he will know, just as those farmers did, that interest shielding in 1984 is even more necessary than it was in 1982.

The next thing they came out with, Mr. Speaker, was support for some form of debt adjustment — not an overall debt moratorium but a debt adjustment, the kind of situation that the banks were able to work out with Joe Dutton and with at least one other person close to this government. That was a form, you might say, of debt adjustment. If you can have debt adjustment for Lee Richardson and Joe Dutton, farmers are saying: why can't we have debt adjustment for us? Of course, they're absolutely right. They find it very difficult. When fertilizer is a major part of farm input costs, they say: let's have some kind of rebate system on fertilizer so that we can at least take the provision of fertilizer, which is produced from natural gas, the total equivalent of the royalty. That was accepted unanimously.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, the people in Cleardale said that they felt that we in Alberta should have at least the kind of scheme that the Tory government in Saskatchewan brought in for farmers in that province when they had inclement weather conditions during spring seeding. They brought in a program

of acreage payments. Today we heard that the Minister of Agriculture was thinking about it. The rain came in May, and it was a record rain. There are parts of northern Alberta where we had a very desperate situation. I know that the minister is aware of this because the DAs sent all this information to the government, unless it got lost in that bureaucracy in the new Agriculture Building and didn't get to the minister. But I'm sure it did. The fact of the matter is that they were prepared to go ahead with the scheme in Saskatchewan for northern Saskatchewan farmers, but in Alberta we're still thinking about it. One of the points the farmers in Cleardale said was that if the Devine Conservative government can do something, why can't the Lougheed government do something in Alberta if they really care about farmers?

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to add one other comment on what I call the debt crisis that is facing Alberta farmers. If we're really serious about protecting the young farmers, we've got to do something. We can look at those options. I happen to think that a debt adjustment Act has a good deal of merit. But it's worth reminding the members of this House that the Reagan administration brought in a program where 25 percent of farm debt in that country will be deferred and will be deferred without interest. That is going to make it possible for a lot of American farmers to finance their operations in 1985. I'm well aware that this is just before a presidential election. It may well be that the motives of Mr. Reagan are essentially the motives of the Tory government in 1982, but that's beside the point. We have a program in the United States that is going to keep a lot of American farmers in business, especially young American farmers who have had to borrow to purchase their land and who now face serious financial difficulties because of the agricultural recession in that country — not recession totally, but the agricultural recession and the cost/price squeeze.

Mr. Speaker, if a right-wing government like the Reagan administration can bring in that kind of scheme, faced as they are by a \$200 billion American deficit, why is it not possible for us to do that when we as a province have a \$13 billion Heritage Savings Trust Fund? Why are we not able to allow some kind of leeway for these farmers who are facing foreclosure or forced sale? We can talk all we like about just a few bankruptcies, but those statistics don't tell the story. They don't tell the story of the young fellow in Cleardale who is going to go to the FCC office and give them the keys to the property and say, take it, and walk away because there is just no hope in carrying on. It doesn't tell the story about the forced sales of land, where the land values are plummeting and all the equity that people have built up is wiped out. It doesn't tell the story about what the impact will be on the future — and we're supposed to be concerned about the future, at least between 1985 and 1990 — if many of our brightest and youngest farmers, people who got into farming at a time when land prices were very high, become the victims of the current recession.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would heartily recommend to members of the agricultural caucus that while no one expects them to make any statement in a formal debate, I think farm people in this province will be watching their response very carefully. They will want more than the kind of rhetoric we got yesterday from the Premier, in dealing with what is a serious situation.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to move on from there to talk a little bit about the rather interesting error in estimates in the national energy agreement — not the NEP but the agreement signed in 1981 by the Premier. You may recall that afternoon, Mr. Speaker. It seems to me there was a picture taken of wine glasses tinkling. I have a recollection that that was a very joyous occasion, because two governments had gotten together on September 1, 1981, and had made an agreement. We were told

what a great agreement it was. Under the terms of that agreement \$64.3 billion was to come to the province of Alberta. Today the Premier tells us: shucks, I didn't really think we'd get that. But a funny thing — I clearly remember 1981, and I don't recall any of these members in the House saying we wouldn't get that. I don't recall the Premier saying we wouldn't get that. I don't recall any of the Tory organizers saying we wouldn't get that. All I recall them saying is what a great deal it was because we were going to have \$64 billion. I recall as well, and the Member for Little Bow will recall, members on the heritage trust fund committee seriously talking of increasing the amount going into the heritage trust fund because we're going to have this huge revenue.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps the Premier knew it was only going to be \$27 billion, but he certainly didn't let on to his members in the caucus. Either that or they are all skilled actors and should have Oscars for performances. This government of course should be given the best acting Oscar of the year; there's no question about that — not when it comes to performance but best actor, yes.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, we now find — isn't it interesting — that it's not going to be \$64.3 billion; it's going to be \$27 billion. But there's one additional little wrinkle. With the soft energy prices today, who sitting in their seats across the way will now stand and tell us that this is money that we know is going to come in, in 1985 and 1986? Who can tell us that? I suspect nobody can. I suspect that if we find that energy prices begin to collapse, there will be pressure from two sources. We're going to have Mr. Mulroney — a very effective politician, great speaker, tremendous personality — patting government frontbenchers on the head, simply saying: we need money because we've got this big deficit. So he will be trying to hang on to his share. We're going to have the oil companies saying: with softer prices, we have to have more money for exploration. And guess where a large part of that is going to come from? It will come from our share of the take, from our share as the owners of the resource.

So, Mr. Speaker, I don't think the government members should make light of it. I must confess that I was rather astonished today that the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, who has always got reams of statistics whenever they are favourable, was not able to tell us, after preparing a motion for a return, total cost in forgone revenue or direct estimates of these eight points contained in the sessional report. We know the first one is going to cost us \$5.4 billion in total, because the Premier told us that. But there are seven additional changes. For us, as members of the Assembly who are supposed to be concerned about properly managing the affairs of this province, having input and making decisions on priorities, one of the things we should know is what our revenues and expenditures are likely to be.

The Member for Little Bow can correct me if I'm wrong, but I believe that one of the things the now team did when they were in opposition was demand to have a committee look into revenues and expenditures. There you had both sides; you had long-term planning. Fair enough; that makes sense. We're going to have a white paper on science and industrial development — nothing wrong with that; we should have long-term planning. But one of the things we have to have in long-term planning is some indication of what these programs that we bring into effect are going to cost us. No one is saying that we're going to hold the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources totally accountable for the ups and downs of international energy pricing, but certainly programs that are direct incentives should have some estimates. There have to be some estimates. You bring in programs and say, well, whatever it



costs we'll pay it. There have to be some estimates, and I know the government has some estimates. But the Legislature doesn't. The Legislature should have some estimates so that Albertans can make a judgment on whether this government is handling these affairs in an effective way.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think it would only be appropriate to offer a few observations about this document, *Proposals for an Industrial and Science Strategy for Albertans, 1985 to 1990*. I'd like to say that I think it's useful to have a white paper for that. I see the hon. Minister for Advanced Education is in his place. I welcome the public discussion that the white paper will generate. The New Democratic Party will be responding in a relatively short time, towards the end of the month, and our convention will be dealing with a document about as long — and, I hope, a little more useful and constructive — in our formal response to the white paper. But I think it is at least a step in the right direction that the government is laying before Albertans some of their proposals.

Mr. Speaker, there are aspects of this white paper that really amaze me. We almost ignore — at least so downgrade — the renewable resource sector of the economy. We pay a little bit of lip service to agriculture as a source of stability, but it's far more than that. There are a few references in the white paper to forestry, but I noticed yesterday in the Premier's statement that there was almost no mention of what has happened in our forestry industry. The big deal we were going to have in Whitemcourt and Fox Creek, and they had a special caucus committee in 1979 or 1980, I believe, that made recommendations — that's all gone with the wind, as it were. We have the proposal of people in Hinton, interest in the thermomechanical expansion of the company there, although at this stage I gather there is a strong probability that won't go ahead. That's unfortunate, because it would create a lot of jobs in the Hinton area. I believe 400 jobs would be directly produced if St. Regis were to undertake that expansion, although I gather the ownership has changed in the last few months. In any event, Mr. Speaker, there seems to be very little emphasis on the renewable resource industries.

I was pleased to be a guest at the Hinton Chamber of Commerce not so long ago. Almost without exception people at the chamber of commerce meeting said to me: what has happened to this government's dream of diversification; where is the commitment to develop an economy which is not so dependent upon one industry? The problem with the white paper is that no matter how we dress it up, it is still an agenda that is going to lock us into dependency on other people's decisions, whether it's OPEC or the temporary surplus of gas on the American market and the pressure to bring down natural gas prices.

Mr. Speaker, no one is saying that the oil and gas industry isn't a major industry and won't continue to be a major industry. Of course it is; nobody in this House would argue otherwise. But if we have a future at all, we've got to get away from the notion that the engine of economic growth is this oil and gas industry. It's going to be a factor, but surely the emphasis has to be placed on diversification and especially on the renewable resource industries. That's one of the reasons why I think it's unfortunate that agriculture got such short shrift in this particular document.

To bring in a paper of this kind and ignore municipalities is really astonishing, and I'll have more to say about this next week in a private member's resolution. If the government is serious about working together and developing an industrial and science strategy, municipalities have to be treated as partners in that process.

Mr. Speaker, I said I would begin my comments by talking about human resource problems. I want to end by talking about

human resource problems but perhaps in the context of the white paper. One of the things that really impressed me during the recent federal election — there wasn't a lot that impressed me — was that we had a national debate among the leaders over women's issues. That was important — not just a sort of glib comment at the end of a politician's speech but a substantive debate on the rights of women, on the concerns of women, on how we can achieve genuine gender equality in this society. I don't think Mr. Mulroney had all the answers, and he was, as always, quite capable of sidestepping commitments. But at least he was there. At least he gave some genuine commitment to follow through on major items. Mr. Speaker, isn't it interesting that when one thinks of proposals for a science and industrial strategy — all the implications that has for the 50 percent of the population of this province who are women, with the tremendous interest in this subject that even Conservatives brought forward in the last federal election — there is no mention at all in this white paper. What an incredible omission. Oh, we're going to stick our nose into the education system, and we're going to provide more money to oil companies. But we totally ignore the special problems faced by women. Mr. Speaker, I really wonder whether Mr. Mulroney wouldn't want to give a little bit of Irish advice to some of his friends here in Alberta about the political stupidity of that move, because the issue really demands some genuine attention.

In Alberta today, there are many problems that face women. First of all, when you take a look at the raw statistics and find that the average female earns 52 percent of the average male's wage — and from 1979 that has dropped from about 60 percent to 52 percent — it's pretty obvious that there is a gap in the income between men and women. If we're concerned about a blueprint for the future, we don't ignore that.

Another thing that concerns both my colleague and me is the extent of poverty and how poverty tends to be concentrated among women — the sad situation faced by older women. But it's not just the older women, if we look at the problems that heads of single families have to face. In 1981, 28.5 percent of female-headed families of two or more people lived below the poverty line in Alberta. In 1982 that rose to 35.2 percent. That's a rather devastating statistic. This is the government that the minister across the way was so proud of when we cut back on the shelter allowance. It was going to save money. These are the people who are going to be affected, Mr. Speaker.

Poverty is a disgrace in a province as wealthy as we are in a country as wealthy as Canada, regardless of who it affects. The truth of the matter is that poverty affects women more than men. Well-heeled men with their professional incomes or the money they can earn from coupon clipping or their well-paid jobs, should not smugly sit back and ignore one of the real elements of inequality that exists in Alberta in 1984.

When one looks at the role of women in nontraditional jobs — the Minister responsible for Personnel Administration made a few comments, telling us that we're going to have more women in management positions. But when you look at the figures, you find that while the percentage of male employees in management in the public service in this province increased from 24.1 percent to 23.8 percent, the role of women in senior management increased from 2.2 percent to only 2.6 percent. Also, Mr. Speaker, we have the problem of benefits for women who, for one reason or another, have been separated or divorced from their husbands. In this province 75 percent do not receive support payments from their former husbands, but in Manitoba, with their new computerized maintenance payment system, there's an 85 percent compliance rate.

Mr. Speaker, if we're really concerned about the rights of women, one of the things we should be concerned about —

and this minister across the way who wants to save taxpayers' money should surely be interested in ensuring that men, or women for that matter but in most cases men, who have an obligation for support payments are making their payments. But in 75 percent of the cases in Alberta, they aren't. A government that can bring in a cutback in shelter allowances, which is mainly going to affect women, seems to be rather slow, to put it mildly, in getting in step with advances elsewhere in the country to ensure that men follow through on their family maintenance payments.

Mr. Speaker, you and others may say that these are social issues. Of course, but there are a lot of social issues that are touched in a white paper on science and industrial strategy. One area this government likes to talk about in their white paper is high tech. Well, what's the impact of high tech on women? The impact of high tech on women is to have a really massive impact on their potential in what you might call traditional jobs. We've got to move women away from traditional jobs so they play an equal role in nontraditional jobs. In clerical and secretarial jobs, the impact of high tech is going to be devastating. But they aren't doing anything in this long-term strategy to deal effectively with that.

Mr. Speaker, I know members of the government will say, but we've got the hon. minister across way who has actually launched the Women's Secretariat. But the secretariat was given a total of \$29,000 over and above the budget allotted for the previous Women's Bureau. That isn't enough. That's tokenism. Surely we ought to do better than that. We aren't doing enough.

One area I want to make a comment on is privatization and the impact on women. When we're appealing to the extreme right wing in our party, I know it's great to talk about privatization and what a great thing that is. Well, what does it do? You're dealing with various firms that don't have collective agreements. In fact, what you're doing is depressing the real wage rate and the real income. And who is going to be most hurt by that? It is going to be women.

Mr. Speaker, it is rather sad that at a time when we have the Premier telling us that our best days are ahead of us, that elsewhere in the country there is a recognition of gender equality, of a whole range of things that we should be undertaking in the interest of simple fairness, in Alberta we continue to snooze as if we were in the 1850s. Of all provinces, where some of the people like Irene Parlby, Nellie McClung, and the women who led the fight for women's rights — what a way to forget the memory of some of these outstanding people in our own political history.

Mr. Speaker, I would like the members of this committee tonight to take the time to reflect upon this glaring omission and to instruct those authors of the white paper and Executive Council to recognize the worth, the role, of women and the need to take appropriate action. Therefore, I would like to move that Motion No. 12 on today's Order Paper be amended by adding at the end of it:

but regrets that nowhere in the entire text of the Government's White Paper "Proposals for an Industrial and Science Strategy for Albertans 1985-1990" released after the adjournment of the Spring Sitting is there the merest mention, let alone substantial cognizance taken, of either the major role of women in the Alberta economy or the unique problems currently faced by women in their attempts to secure greater participation in our provincial economy.

Mr. Speaker, I have copies for hon. members.

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, could I ask whether or not copies of the amendment will be available to the government benches?

MR. SPEAKER: There is a limited number of copies. I suppose that if all members wish to have copies, we have the choice of either adjourning for a moment until the copies are made or, if it would suffice, I'd be glad to read the amendment again to the House.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, there are 79 copies made, so the pages will have an opportunity to distribute one to every member.

MR. SPEAKER: As each member's face lights up, I'll know he received a copy of the amendment.

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, there are colleagues of mine, particularly the Minister of Advanced Education and perhaps the Minister of Labour, who are more prepared than I am to speak to the detail that is suggested by the hon. member's amendment. Nevertheless, I would like to comment briefly on the general terms or the thrust that is suggested by the amendment which, while it is characteristic of the hon. Leader of the Opposition, is characteristic in the extent to which it is out of touch with reality in the province today and particularly out of touch with the attitude of this government toward the citizens and the needs of the citizens of the province.

I am not aware of any legislature in Canada which is better served by the number of women who are members of the government caucus than in this caucus in this Legislature. As a result of that, as well as resulting from the participation of women in leadership roles in the Progressive Conservative Party, which supports this government from one end of the province to the other ... [interjection] We could start with the president of the provincial association, yes. I think it is fair to say that there is no provincial government in Canada which has a wider range of programs operating to the benefit of women who want to participate in the life of the community by either participating in the work force or otherwise participating in our social, economic, and cultural life.

The amendment, Mr. Speaker, is typical of the extent to which the opposition is out of mind of the concerns of the people of the province. I certainly urge the defeat of the amendment.

MR. MARTIN: It may come as a shock to people, but I'm going to rise and support the amendment. That brilliant address by the Minister of Education really turned it around for me — almost. But I will attempt to get in the debate anyhow.

I'm sure the Minister of Advanced Education and the minister in charge of women ...

[Mr. Johnston left his seat]

You're not leaving, are you? I have a few things to say to you. We know you have a tough job with this government, Mr. Minister, and we're here to help you out.

The point that has been totally missed by the Minister of Education is what the motion said. We're talking about a major proposal for the future. We're not talking about how many Tory women got elected, that you have a provincial president that is a woman. That's not the point. If you read the motion, it has to do with Proposals for an Industrial and Science Strategy for Albertans, 1985 to 1990, and there is not one word in there about over 50 percent of the population. The point my colleague and I are trying to make is simply this: there are serious problems faced by many women, maybe not by these particular members here that are elected, maybe not by the Conservative

provincial president, but that's hardly the point. There are more women than those few the minister is talking about.

Mr. Speaker, it would be nice to think, and perhaps from the Minister of Education's comments we could believe, that maybe they suffered from a case of collective amnesia when they concocted the white paper and forgot all about women. But the total exclusion, especially since we faced a federal election — at the same time, we have a woman in the United States, potentially at least, to be vice-president — strikes us as a rather serious omission. That's the whole point of the industrial strategy and what it is going to do for over 50 percent of the population. Maybe when they alluded to the disadvantaged on page 69, they were including women in that statement, because surely the average woman working in Alberta could be classified as disadvantaged.

I will repeat some of the statistics, and I hope the Minister of Education will listen. The average woman working in Alberta earns 52 cents to every dollar earned by a man — hardly a fair situation. Housing costs are more likely to cause her hardship than anywhere else in the country. It's well documented, and I'll come to that. She has a better chance of becoming a single-parent head and sole support of her family here. If she happens to be unattached or the head of her family, she stands a one in three chance of living below the poverty level. If she's married or living common-law, she faces almost a one in five chance of being battered, almost double the national average. That's the point we're trying to make, Mr. Speaker, and that's why we think it's such a serious omission.

I would like to try to bring it to why we're talking about social concerns, because it is alluded to in two short paragraphs on page 69 of the white paper. The sheer rhetoric I'm quoting here says:

Some may question the heavy emphasis on economic matters and suggest it reflects a lack of priority to social concerns. These terms are deceptive because an Industrial Strategy has as its basic objective the securing of existing jobs and the training for and encouragement of new jobs. Today this is probably the overriding "people issue" in the province.

It goes on in the second paragraph to say:

The strategies are directed towards an Alberta where the quality of life is high and improving. The capacity of a society to care for the disadvantaged in the longer term is dependent upon the productivity and competitiveness of the economy.

Where they say the terms are deceptive because it has as its basic objective the securing of basic jobs — it goes on to say that things are getting better.

Mr. Speaker, what we are suggesting here is a complete lack of recognition of the economic implications underlying social concerns. The fundamental weakness of the white paper is its complete failure to address a crucial economic question — the distribution of wealth in this country. I come back to those figures: 52 cents to one dollar. The Tory strategies are indeed, and I will agree with the white paper here, "directed towards an Alberta where the quality of life is high and improving" and not towards an Alberta where it is not. In other words, the have will improve and the have-not will continue to go down. I've called it — and I won't bore you again, Mr. Speaker — the old trickle-down theory. It certainly is relevant here, because we're having more of the trickle-down theory. Those that have will do very well according to this white paper, but there is no mention of how we will distribute some of that wealth so that people — especially women, as we point out here — will achieve that equality, that gender parity. There is nothing in the white paper about it.

Mr. Speaker, we could go on in some other economic forecasts, and my colleague talked about it. During the boom years the gap between men's and women's wages actually widened. As we mentioned, in 1979 women earned almost 60 percent of the average male wage. By 1982 that dropped to 52 percent. We find out that higher levels of education have not equalized the earning power between men and women. We find out that a university educated women still earns much less than a man with a high school diploma, just as she did 10 years ago. And the wage gap increases with education.

We can look at poverty. [interjections] Some people in the province don't find this quite that amusing, I can assure you, Mr. Paproski. Mr. Speaker, the member from . . .

MR. PAPROSKI: That was my speech five months ago.

MR. MARTIN: Well, I'm sure you'll support this amendment then. I'm glad you will. The Member for Edmonton Kingsway has announced that this is his speech and he will be glad to support the amendment. We'll look forward to it.

MR. NOTLEY: He will have a chance to vote on it shortly.

MR. MARTIN: Yes, he will have a very good chance to vote on it.

Mr. Speaker, we go into poverty. My colleague has talked about the fact that women, especially elderly women . . . [interjections] See? They find this whole issue amusing. We appreciate that, and we will remind the voters of Alberta about this later on.

But the fact remains that women form the biggest group in poverty, Mr. Speaker. Certainly it's been well documented about elderly women, but the fact is — and I see it in my riding in Norwood every day where there are single parents — that these people are below the poverty level. We know that women are going to fall into poverty much more than men do. This is a fact of life in Alberta, even more so than other provinces in the country.

The government cutbacks we're so proud about, the shelter allowances we take away, who do they affect? Predominantly women and children. They don't affect high-income Tories; no doubt about it. But the fact is that that's having an impact on women. The minister may not like it, but the fact is that it's been documented. He calls every study that doesn't agree with him unscientific. But the report "The Unkindest Cuts: The Impact of the Recent Social Allowance Cutbacks" puts the impact it was having on people into perspective very well. He may grin about it, but I can assure you that there are people in my riding who aren't grinning about what's happening out there.

We can go into the employment practices of this government, and we find out that the Alberta government does not practise affirmative action. We find that the average female provincial employee earns \$10,000 less than their male counterparts. We find that most of the men are in upper-management positions, and it is getting worse. We can argue, as we did in the Legislature last spring, but there are figures to indicate this, and we will back them up. We can assure you of that.

We can go into other areas. My colleague alluded to privatization. When we bring in privatization, what that is is another form of Tories at the trough. Somebody has to make a profit; therefore the wages go down lower. At this point the people that have been privatized and are taking lower wages inevitably are women. The minister and this government are well aware of that. We can go into the whole fact of what's happening with private day care centres. This affects women;

it affects their ability to make wages. The fact is that there are no standards in this province — the worst in the country.

We can go into the fact that women across the province have asked for an advisory council. I know that the hon. Minister of Advanced Education, in charge of women — and I understand he's probably a feminist. In fact, I saw that on television. He said "probably" a feminist. He's going to have to be quite a feminist, because he's got this huge budget, as my colleague alluded to, of \$29,200. I appreciate the minister's ability, but he will have to be really good. Maybe they can cut down on some of the spousal travel and give it to the minister to help out women.

MR. JOHNSTON: Me?

MR. MARTIN: No, I know you didn't; I appreciate that. We had that conversation.

The other point that is important for the future, and my colleague talked about this, is that we deal with an industrial and science strategy. We talk about high tech. The fact is that there are some studies. Women and the Chip — I know the Minister of Advanced Education in charge of women would have this study right on the tip of his tongue. It was conducted in 1981 by the Institute for Research on Public Policy. According to the study, Mr. Speaker, the new employment created by computerization will be largely in the professional and technical fields, where men predominate and women are in the minority. That could have serious consequences for employment for women. The U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics has also indicated that computerized office technology will increase job opportunities, but American experts caution that the new jobs may be menial and low paying. Again, if we continue the same way, that's where women will be — in the low-wage ghettos that they're in in this province right now, the 52 cents compared to the dollar.

Mr. Speaker, I say in conclusion that this is a serious issue. It is being debated seriously. In Canada we had a debate about it. It is being debated in the United States. But here in this province it's not even mentioned. Then some people sort of grin and tell us — we have the Minister of Education say that we elected a few women politicians and we have a provincial president; therefore we're doing all these things for women. It's a type of arrogance that is becoming known with this government. They're going to pay the political price for this type of nonsense we get from them. Every time they feel a little threatened, all they do is get arrogant and try to be smug about it.

What we are saying, and we will be making this clear, is that the white paper they're so proud of doesn't even mention over 50 percent of the population. Then they smugly tell us that everything's all right. It doesn't even mention it. Maybe you haven't read it yet, Minister of Manpower. I wouldn't be surprised if you hadn't. It doesn't even mention it. The point we make is that there are serious problems for over 50 percent of the population. If they don't like the figures in this province, remember that they have been the government. They are the ones that have been in power; nobody else. The figures are loud and clear.

Rest assured that we will be talking to Albertans about it. We welcome this government's attitude. We'll be going right across Alberta, riding by riding, and we'll talk about the white paper and what it's doing. The government can sit smugly back and say everything's okay, as the Premier did: boy, we got the white paper, and there's no suffering in the province and aren't we lucky to live in jolly old Alberta; everybody's happy. But the fact is, there isn't. We're trying to point that out by this

serious amendment. I think we should get some votes. I know that some people are concerned, as is the Member for Edmonton Kingsway. Another person I know is concerned about this issue is the Member for Calgary McKnight. I hope some people who care about this issue will support us on this amendment. It doesn't mean that the government will go away. If some of you every once in a while stand up and vote with your conscience, it doesn't mean the government is going to come to an end. We believe this is a serious omission, and I believe there are some members here who believe it is a serious omission too. Mr. Speaker, I ask them to vote with their conscience, not like sheep for once.

MR. SZWENDER: Is that a leadership speech?

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, I have never seen such a shameful exercise in my life. Has anybody ...

MR. SPEAKER: May I suggest that the hon. minister is getting very close to the line. Perhaps the merits or otherwise of anything that's said in debate can be dealt with without being characterized in a way which might reflect on the person who made the remarks.

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, I wasn't directing my remarks to the speaker at all. I was directing my remarks to the piece of paper that was in front of me, the amendment that was so kindly distributed to all 79 members.

I haven't, at least today, seen anything that's more sexist than the amendment we see before us. If I were a member of the other sex, I would have difficulty maintaining my supper. What I see before me is a paternalistic statement that suggests that for some reason the female part of our population is not part of this great province when it comes to an industrial and science strategy for this province. That's what this suggests. What utter nonsense, Mr. Speaker. We all know from recent studies that some of the most successful small businesses — as a matter of fact, out of proportion to their numbers — are conducted by females. I'll provide that to the hon. member, and the hon. member I'm sure will want to put that on the Order Paper so he can get a copy.

What we're talking about is a white paper in which all the people of the province of Alberta can participate in terms of the industrial and science strategy for the period 1985 to 1990. What the NDP is saying is that the female part of society can't participate unless you specifically identify them. What utter nonsense. What sexist nonsense. Mr. Speaker, I have considerably more confidence in the ability of our female industrialists and scientists and businesspeople to contribute to this province than the hon. members who represent the NE — the NDP. I have the same trouble as the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources has in terms of those acronyms. We have considerably more confidence in the female population of this province than that party has. Were the hon. members listening yesterday about the contribution of a person the Premier was speaking to in the plant in Joffre? That was an identified person.

What I'm saying is that this white paper is for all Albertans. It is not, as suggested by the NDP, for just one segment of Albertans. It represents opportunities; it represents a plan of action. I appreciate that the socialist party over there is mired in their old distribution problem, and that's all they can think about. When somebody comes forward with some brilliant new ideas, what can they do but regurgitate the old nonsense that may have been fine and dandy in the '30s and '40s but has no place in the '80s and the '90s. So we hear that nonsense here, and we've seen what's happened because of that nonsense being

implemented. We've seen the interest rates because of the socialist policies of the NDP-inspired Liberal policies in Ottawa. We're all paying for it today, and you want some more of it instead of a policy that will lead us into the 1990s. Mr. Speaker, the absolute nonsense of this — what is it? — amendment that's put forward and the suggestion that somebody should even support it. Nonsense, Mr. Speaker. There's no way that this Assembly should in any way consider voting positively for the amendment put forward here.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I want to participate only briefly in dealing with the amendment and, to some extent, some of the criticisms which have been levied against the white paper, and to perhaps echo some of the initial comments which my colleague the Minister of Municipal Affairs has brought forward.

Mr. Speaker, if ever I have seen the classic red herring, it has been put before us today. Here we see a party who has come back, presumably invigorated from a summer's rest. They have argued that they have travelled across this province talking to people everywhere — I don't know everywhere else they talk about. They say to us that they have had a chance to examine the white paper, to discuss it with a variety of constituent groups across this province, and yet they can't give us any clear alternatives for this paper. In fact, because they haven't really understood the importance of this document, they trot out a very demeaning, patronizing position, as the minister has pointed out. I hope they continue on this course, Mr. Speaker, because clearly that 52 percent they refer to, which they have all of a sudden discovered overnight, will not support that party for the position they have taken here today. [interjections] A classic red herring case.

I spent part of the summer travelling with my 14- or 15-year-old kids, and they like this music. There's a particular song that has struck me as one of my favourites in the last little while. It's by the Sex Pistols; they're a hard rock group. Anyway, the song comes on: this is not a love song, it says. The follow up line: I'm moving over to free enterprise. The point is, this is not a social policy statement; this is an economic policy statement. It's unfortunate these two members across the way haven't been able to decide the difference between economics and social policy.

We have noted very clearly — and I'm very glad that the Member for Edmonton Norwood drew it to the attention of the House — that in fact we didn't intend it to be a comment on the various alternatives or a listing of the very comprehensive social programs which this government has put forward to deal with those very issues dealing primarily with unemployment, women's issues, and with the other social issues which of course are a clear objective of this government as well. However, before we can solve the social problems, as the paper points out, we have to get the economy going. We have to deal with unemployment. We have to deal with investment levels. We have to deal with the kinds of problems that are before us. To suggest that what we're trying to portray here in trying to describe the view of Alberta in 1990, trying to bring together the collective opinions of many people, many sexes, and many races, and trying to define that future for us — that women are not included in that part of that debate surely must be an insult to the women of this province.

Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that when you deal with those areas of the future in this province — and we have clearly underscored the objectives which we want to achieve in the area of education, in the area of advanced education and training, and in the area of retraining programs which we will have to move through in the next decade — of course we're dealing

with all sexes. There isn't any question at all that both women and men will be displaced, that both women and men will have to continue to go through a life-long learning process. That is in fact what this paper talks about, and those are some of the choices which are presented to allow this debate to be continued.

We could go on. The minister beside me has indicated that if you want to debate social issues, then why don't you get it on the paper? You know damned well that the priority we have assigned not just to women's issues but to the social programs and policies themselves clearly outstrips the rest of Canada in terms of the priorities we have given. Of course you would be embarrassed to debate that, because you know it's a lose for you. You don't want to bring it forward for this Assembly to consider; therefore you find an opportunity to drag the red herring across the trail. You have suddenly found out the importance of women in this issue, and you're now trying to talk about the gender gap. Well, it's too late. You haven't discovered it. It's not new to you.

Mr. Speaker, let me go on to say that even though the paper doesn't talk about municipalities — which we have already agreed to — there is a long list of other things it doesn't talk about. But by not mentioning it, certainly you're not precluded from the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: Could I just intervene briefly and suggest to the hon. minister that it isn't that I feel slighted, but I think it might be well if he addressed his remarks to the Chair.

MR. MARTIN: Learn parliamentary procedure.

MR. JOHNSTON: Thanks, Mr. Speaker. I think I was misled by the Leader of the Opposition when he referred to the Assembly as a committee. I made a slight mental error there.

Mr. Speaker, let me go on to say that some of the initiatives which will flow from this aren't all tied into the white paper either. I know for sure that the Minister of Education is currently in the process of bringing forward some new discussion ideas with respect to education itself. Surely through the process of education, in both the K to 12 and the advanced education areas, all people in this province, whether they're men or women, will have an opportunity to increase their contributions. It is unfair to the nth degree to suggest that because women are not mentioned in this paper, they are for some reason suddenly precluded or, for that reason, are second-class citizens in this province. Just the opposite.

Mr. Speaker, let me go on to say that in terms of the Women's Secretariat, new initiatives, which of course weren't recommended to us by the socialist party across the way, which came about as a discussion within our caucus, the high importance which we place on the secretariat and the debate of women's issues, have of course been reinforced by some of the discussions brought forward by resolution by members here — a continuing importance, a continuing debate, and it cannot be suggested that we have ignored or overlooked it. It's just unfair to the degree that I know the members in this House will clearly express their displeasure by voting against this amendment.

Mr. Speaker, let me simply conclude by saying that it's easy to see through this kind of ruse. Early in the House, it's very easy to see through this kind of process. I certainly hope the respect that some of us have for the opposition party can continue through the duration of this, because it was not a very responsible position to take, even in terms of this parliamentary debate. I know the electorate of Alberta will remember that.

One final paraphrase, Mr. Speaker. If Benjamin Disraeli will forgive me, I'll simply rephrase one of his famous quotes.

Clearly tonight the opposition's exaggeration is not invective and their petulance is not debate.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a comment or two with regard to this amendment. I certainly take the word of the author of the white paper that the intent of the government was to treat both male and female equally. But at times my colleague Dr. Buck and I look at various documents of government, and we look at them in terms of that well-worn phrase we see on television quite often in one of the communication ads that concludes by: we're just not too sure. I think that's what I'd have to say tonight. I'm not too sure that that was the intent of the government. If it was, then I accept it. If it was that they should be treated equally, that there should be economic equality, that's acceptable.

But when we examine the recent federal election, and I just happened to bring in for my entertaining reading this evening — I didn't realize that I was going to be involved in this debate — a document from the Legislature Library called "On the Issues: Brian Mulroney and the Progressive Conservative Agenda, Statements of Policy and Principle, May 1984". I hope all members in this Legislature will take some time to review this document and look at the commitments that our Prime Minister made to us as Albertans.

In keeping with the matter at hand, keeping my focus on whether or not recognition of the role of women in our society should have been in the white paper, I only raise that in this document there are a number of pages and a number of issues that are documented with regard to a concern to women. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to read into the record a statement our Prime Minister made in Ottawa on March 3, 1984, which he felt should be made to Canadians and took the time in the House of Commons to do it. There are following documentations that emphasize his concern with regard to economic equality for women not only in the rest of Canada but in Alberta as well. This is what he said:

Restoring and revitalizing our economy is the cornerstone of our policy orientation. Yet throughout our policy process we must not lose sight of Simone deBeauvoir's very accurate statement that equality for women will only stem from economic equality.

Mr. Speaker, if the authors of the white paper had placed even a statement to that effect in the paper as a preamble, as a leading statement, it would have been clear that this government takes that position and supports the position of their federal leader. I'm sure that all of us in this Legislature support the statement of the Prime Minister. It is a good statement. But I think it would have enhanced the white paper to have documented that and that the women in various walks of life who are going to be faced with losing jobs in the service sector, as is mentioned by the Prime Minister, who are going to face the microchip industry, which is going to change all of the employment opportunity for women not only in Alberta but across Canada — and Alberta is going to be a leader in that area. Certainly it's going to affect the retraining, the opportunity that women need in our society, not only in 1984 but from 1985 to 1990 and into the 21st century.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think there would have been anything wrong with a mention such as that. I don't think there would have been anything wrong in this Legislature. It's unfortunate that we forget ourselves at times and become partisan in nature. I can understand the reaction of government tonight, because I sat on that side of the House as a government, reacted in the very same way. When Mr. Lougheed as the Leader of the Opposition suggested something on that side of the House, we scurried and thought of a dozen different reasons why we would

say, it's wrong and we're going to vote against it. Then we'd look around at each other on that side of the House and would get that informal signal and we would vote against it. I remember the hon. Bob Clark, when he was minister at that time, and I talking about it a number of times after and saying: how foolish; why didn't we agree. Albertans may have complimented us as a government. We forgot to inspect the idea on its merit, and at times we let our political biases override our objectivity in the Legislative Assembly. Tonight, when we look at this issue, I think it would be fair of us as legislators to say, yes, we did overlook it. Let's emphasize it by the amendment, agree to it, and say that we'll add our concerns, our information in debate tonight and in other debates, and show that we want economic equality for women in Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, on that basis I am going to lend my support to the amendment, and I hope other members of the Legislature will reconsider.

MR. ALEXANDER: Mr. Speaker, as one of those who participated in the white paper process and heard from a couple of women's groups, I'd like to contribute very briefly two elements that have not already been covered so excellently by my colleagues on the matter of women's concerns. I want to distinguish on behalf of those women of the province who are not feminists and are not looking for jobs and, in the context of the amendment and the conversation so far, are not looking for "greater participation" in the provincial economy if, as I understand it, that thrust is toward employment and those kinds of things.

In the course of the hearings, we heard from two women's groups in Calgary. Their concerns revolved around unemployment generally and the work environment of the employed, and many people mentioned that. They acknowledged, after comment, that it was in fact the future work environment that the whole thrust of the white paper was attempting to address. They also commented about such things as better maternity leave arrangements, child care, educational quality, and homemakers' pensions, all of which are current discussions and need not necessarily be included in the specific strategy addressing itself to an industrial and science strategy.

Another group of women spoke of the traditional view of the family, with father as breadwinner, changing because more women are working. We entered into some discussion on that matter. I asked them what their view about that change was and what they felt the impact of this change on the future shape of our society was going to be, conceded that child care was important, and they agreed with me that the investment that they and us, between the two of us, we're going to have to make in their children's future was one of the crucial issues.

They made side issues such as the success rate at the present moment of female entrepreneurs, who are forming businesses at a high rate; that is, those who do want to get into business and participate in the economy are doing so and doing so quite successfully in the entrepreneurial area. They spoke of retraining. That's for both men and women and is a high concern at the present moment. But generally the discussion which I wanted to try to draw out of them was one which separates the issues that are identified as feminist — that is, highly participative in my view, quite interventionist — as opposed to those of women's issues, which includes a very large segment of women who still value the homemaker's role. The women who still value the homemaker's role are those to whom the strategy is addressed equally. That is, they're concerned with the future. They're concerned with the environment in which their children will grow and be educated and try to find jobs and do well. They were, I found, interested in the fate of the family.

I just want to focus on this issue and the overemphasis — I would hesitate to quantify it, but it's perhaps 50 percent skewed in favour of the one segment of today's women's population which is concerned with these kinds of issues but totally leaves out the other segment. I suggest that women, in their attempts to secure greater participation in our provincial economy, as has been discussed and is suggested in this amendment, fail to address altogether the concerns of women who are not in fact seeking that kind of participation, women who in fact have the most important job in the world; that is, the care and nurture of the next generation. This is not their concern, and this amendment fails to address their concern by focussing specifically on the other element. In that sense, arising both from what I heard on the white paper forums and from concerns I've had expressed to me by women of the other persuasion, it simply must be defeated.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, democracy in the House this evening permits me to engage it for another five minutes or so. I do so motivated by the hon. Member for Little Bow, who made the suggestion that the amendment had merit, that he doubted. I want to address that, because in that observation I think I detected a fundamental misunderstanding of what the white paper on industrial strategy and science policy is all about.

I was rather pleased to see both members of the New Democratic Party up this evening, in close proximity, one to the other, in tandem, but going in somewhat different directions. The amendment that has been proposed and which they are supporting together, but obviously without a caucus beforehand so that the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood would be well prepared for the debate, is an indication that we will have more excitement in the House on future occasions and also that the rivalry for the leadership continues from the spring session.

Mr. Speaker, to come to the point of deep concern I have, it is this: the policy paper is a policy paper on industrial and science strategy looking to the future. It is for all Albertans. It doesn't distinguish between men or women, and the reason it doesn't is because it is concerned to ensure that we have the thinking and the ideas of all Albertans, as much as it is possible to achieve, in order to create the optimum of opportunity for everyone. The hon. Member for Edmonton Whitemud put it very nicely, I believe, when he said that this is directed to the future and to families, and everybody is a part of a family. That's what this is all about.

If the hon. members would look, I don't think they would find any of the observations, any of the suggestions, classified as to whether they're for men or for women. They're for opportunity for all Albertans, and it must be regarded that way. If we begin to divide our society up into pockets and parcels, surely that isn't going to be opportunity. I am really quite surprised that the hon. Member for Little Bow missed that very important point.

The hon. member also raised a question on which I want to refresh his memory by pointing out that this government has in fact brought in the Matrimonial Property Act. We're dealing with, and have had a paper out on, pensions and pension policy, which is directed very much at the opportunities and ensuring that we balance off those opportunities between men and women. I assume that that policy meets with the support of the hon. members of the opposition, because they certainly haven't brought it to the floor of the Assembly to criticize it in any respect. It's been out for five months now, so I'm sure they must be supportive of it. This is also the government that brought in the Individual's Rights Protection Act. The hon. Member for Little Bow was in this Assembly at the time it happened, and he is now nodding agreement that that was a

firm commitment to equality of opportunity, men and women. So obviously his doubt has now been removed.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to make these brief comments because I think it is very important that the objective of the paper not be misunderstood, as this particular amendment — my hon. colleague the Minister of Advanced Education called it a red herring. What other kinds of herrings do we expect from those with philosophy who can support the national energy program and who can call themselves the New Democratic Party?

Mr. Speaker, this is an amendment which is misplaced at the very best, and I urge all hon. members to defeat the amendment.

[Mr. Speaker declared the amendment lost. Several members rose calling for a division. The division bell was rung]

MR. SPEAKER: While we're waiting for the time for the recorded vote to elapse, I want to mention that a remark which I made while the amendment was being distributed was no reflection on the merit of the amendment. If it was, it wasn't intended to be.

[Eight minutes having elapsed, the House divided]

Against the motion:

Alexander	Hyland	Oman
Alger	Isley	Paproski
Anderson	Johnston	Pengelly
Appleby	Jonson	Reid
Batiuk	King	Schmid
Carter	Koper	Shaben
Cook	Kowalski	Shrake
Cripps	Koziak	Stiles
Diachuk	Kroeger	Szwender
Drobot	Lee	Thompson
Elliott	LeMessurier	Topolnisky
Embury	Lysons	Webber
Gogo	McPherson	Weiss
Harle	Moore, R.	Young
Hiebert	Nelson	Zip

For the motion:

Martin	Notley
--------	--------

Totals:	Ayes -- 2	Noes -- 45
---------	-----------	------------

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words this evening on Motion 12. I can't help but be amazed at the lack of knowledge in this province that was demonstrated in the remarks of the Leader of the Official Opposition. I suggest that he take some time and travel this province and stop and investigate what is going on; rather than jump from his small meeting to small meeting, maybe talk to the people in between instead of just the disgruntled.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition started his remarks by talking about primacy of people over things. I'm proud to stand in my place tonight, Mr. Speaker, and say that one of the reasons I became a member of the Progressive Conservative Party of Alberta and one of the reasons I'm proud to represent them in the House is because of the importance it has put on people. Again I suspect that the hon. Leader of the Opposition's concept of the importance of people is very different from mine. I prefer the emphasis on people as individuals, the encouragement of people to be self-reliant, to retain their self-respect, to be independent, to stand on their own feet.

Unfortunately, I think the concept being expressed from across the floor is that Albertans want a Big Brother attitude. They want someone to look after them, make all their decisions, look after them from the cradle to the grave. That, Mr. Speaker, is not what Albertans are looking for. I think we have to think back to the pioneers who settled this great province of ours and analyze the characteristics they brought, and give them credit for how well they did in building the nation, in opening it up and developing our institutions without many of the social backup programs we have today.

I'm also proud to be a member of a government that provides assistance to groups that need it and to groups that we highly respect in our society. I look at the programs this government provides for senior citizens. The feedback I get from senior citizens is very, very positive. Those programs range all the way from health care to housing, transportation, and recreation. I submit that those programs are being carried out by this government out of respect for senior citizens.

I look at the programs we have for the students of this province. I look at the ideal K to 12 educational system. I look at the variety of universities and colleges, and the assistance that is provided to our young people in those institutions through the Students Finance Board. I submit that those are people programs and priority to people. I look at the assistance we give to the unskilled adult through our upgrading programs, our training programs, our colleges, our Alberta vocational centres, our community vocational centres, our Alberta opportunity corps programs. I look at a health care system second to none to assist the sick and the needy. I look at a very varied and broad-ranging and well-funded social services program which assists single-parent families, low-income families, and people who are having difficulty finding their place in our work force and in our society. I stress the word "assist". It is not our desire to take care of them, as I believe the hon. member opposite would advocate.

I look at our unemployed and I recognize, as does this government, that the unemployment problem we have, which was created as a result of overbuilding, a surplus, and rapid growth that slowed down, is going to be with us for some time. I think the programs that we have aimed to assist the unemployed show a very keen concern for people.

I'm not interested in standing here and talking percentages, as the hon. member opposite is. I think it's very unfair and an effort in futility to start comparing percentages between provinces and saying that this one is doing better than that one, if you don't look behind those percentages at the various factors that actually determine the number of people that are unemployed. We tend to aim our programs at the people that are unemployed, not at the percentage.

I would like to review a few of those programs very briefly, Mr. Speaker. During the current summer, the summer tem-

porary employment program created in excess of 10,000 positions, mainly for young people in this province. Currently the Alberta wage subsidy program, which we started last May and just recently increased the funding to \$30 million this budget year and extended it for two more years at a budget figure of \$30 million a year, is assisting, in co-operation with the private sector, 11,000 Albertans in having jobs in this province.

I look back at the recent announcements I had the privilege of making on behalf of this government aimed primarily at young people. The Alberta youth employment and training program was funded to the tune of \$123 million over the next 30 months. All I've heard from the opposition about that program is criticism, and I have to conclude from that criticism that they were not concerned about our young, well-trained Albertans who were having difficulty getting that first bit of experience in the work force. I must say I'm very disappointed with that type of attitude. I would have thought all Albertans would be concerned about the state of our youth.

In the same announcement there were a variety of other programs aimed at other groups totalling additional expenditures of \$250 million over the next 30 months, bringing the total commitment to assist those people having difficulty with employment to approximately one-half billion dollars.

A variety of groups received assistance, from those in remote communities of the province, those who were disadvantaged, the expansion of the opportunity corps program, the employment counselling relocation program. Additional assistance went to our settlement services agencies in dealing with our recent Canadians. And on and on it goes.

Mr. Speaker, there are two or three other major areas I wish to address in connection with Motion 12, dealing with the economic recovery which my hon. friend opposite doesn't seem to realize is occurring, dealing with diversification, which again apparently there is little understanding of in the opposition benches. But in view of the hour, and I don't think they can absorb any more tonight, I beg leave to adjourn the debate and the lesson until my next opportunity.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree with the motion to adjourn the debate?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: It is so ordered.

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, the House will be in Committee of Supply tomorrow morning to consider estimates related to the heritage fund, those of Energy and Natural Resources and/or Recreation and Parks and/or Hospitals and Medical Care.

[At 10:12 p.m., on motion, the House adjourned to Friday at 10 a.m.]