

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTATitle: **Monday, March 9, 1987 2:30 p.m.**

Date: 87/03/09

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

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

PRAYERS

MR. SPEAKER: Let us pray.

O Lord, grant us a daily awareness of the precious gift of life which You have given us.

As Members of this Legislative Assembly we dedicate our lives anew to the service of our province and our country.

Amen.

Commonwealth Day

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. members, on this day we mark Commonwealth Day, and throughout the Commonwealth where we have Parliaments meeting in the British Commonwealth tradition and in the British parliamentary tradition, we have this brief message which will be read throughout the world, the message as given by Dr. the Hon. Bal Ram Jakhar, Member of Parliament, Speaker of the Lok Sabha of India, chairman of the executive committee of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association:

The Commonwealth family is a unique organization in terms of international cooperation and international living. Besides the United Nations and non-aligned movement, the Commonwealth is the largest and the most representative forum of nations. With its membership today spanning six continents and seven oceans, embracing more than a third of the world's population, it serves as a bridge between races, cultures, countries and continents. This voluntary organization of nations not only serves their interests, but also contributes towards the evolution of an international order promoting global peace, harmony and progress.

Over the years the Commonwealth has built up a network of institutions for mutual cooperation and consultation at all levels and in all spheres. At the parliamentary level the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association seeks to promote Commonwealth understanding and respect for parliamentary institutions. It provides a forum to the Legislators from the Commonwealth countries to discuss and sort out the problems afflicting contemporary society.

Today, this Commonwealth Day gives us the opportunity of pledging ourselves to rid our world of poverty, ignorance and injustice and to do our best for the promotion of world peace and prosperity. We will continue to strengthen our fraternal organization based on mutual understanding and respect in order to meet the challenges of today's society more effectively.

The Commonwealth is worthy of our deepest commitment and our strongest support.

head: **PRESENTING REPORTS BY
STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES**

MR. OLDRING: Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to table the report of the Standing Committee on the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund Act for 1986, pursuant to Standing Order 52.

Copies of the report will be distributed to members at a later date.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF BILLS****Bill 2****Daylight Saving Time Amendment Act, 1987**

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce a Bill, being the Daylight Saving Time Amendment Act, 1987.

Mr. Speaker, this Bill will change the date for the commencement of daylight saving time to the first Sunday in April of each year and thereafter provides that the Lieutenant Governor in Council may make regulations to vary in future years the period described in the Act.

[Leave granted; Bill 2 read a first time]

Bill 5**University of Alberta Foundation Repeal Act**

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill 5, being the University of Alberta Foundation Repeal Act.

The purpose of the Bill is to wind up the University of Alberta Foundation and transfer any ongoing responsibilities to the board of governors of the University of Alberta. The Bill is introduced at the request of the board of governors.

[Leave granted; Bill 5 read a first time]

Bill 7**Alberta Agriculture Research Institute Act**

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill 7, being the Alberta Agriculture Research Institute Act.

The purpose of this Bill is to provide for the establishment of a new co-ordinating body for agriculture research in Alberta. The proposed institute would set policies, determine priorities, provide overall research co-ordination, and support long-term projects in co-operation with industry, universities, and other agencies.

[Leave granted; Bill 7 read a first time]

Bill 6**Insurance Amendment Act, 1987**

MISS McCOY: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a Bill, being the Insurance Amendment Act, 1987.

If passed, this legislation will enable implementation of an insurance industry compensation plan which will support policyholders if their insurance company becomes insolvent.

[Leave granted; Bill 6 read a first time]

Bill 8**Real Estate Agents' Licensing
Amendment Act, 1987**

MISS McCOY: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill 8, which is the Real Estate Agents' Licensing Amendment Act, 1987. This being a money Bill, Her Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor, having been informed of the contents of

this Bill, recommends the same to the Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this Bill, in main, is to allow the superintendent to delegate some of his responsibilities to the Alberta Real Estate Association.

[Leave granted; Bill 8 read a first time]

Bill 215

An Act to Amend the Employment Standards Act

MR. EWASIUKE: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to move first reading of Bill 215, An Act to Amend the Employment Standards Act.

Mr. Speaker, this Bill would require an annual review of the minimum wage and its adjustment to take into account any raise in the cost of living, using 1981 as the base year. If at any time the minimum wage was raised by more than the cost of living increased, then a new, higher minimum wage would become the new base on which the future increases would be calculated.

[Leave granted; Bill 215 read a first time]

Bill 213

Public Service Pay Equity Act

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill 213, Public Service Pay Equity Act.

The Bill would provide equal pay for work of equal value for employees in the predominantly female group of jobs in the public service of Alberta. Designed to redress existing gender-based pay inequities, the Bill seeks to ensure fairness in the employment practices of the provincial government.

[Leave granted; Bill 213 read a first time]

Bill 217

An Act to Provide for Equal Pay for Work of Equal Value

MS LAING: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill 217, An Act to Provide for Equal Pay for Work of Equal Value.

To amend the current ineffective equal pay provisions of the Individual's Rights Protection Act, it provides for introduction of pay equity first in the departments of the government and the Legislative Assembly, then in other parts of the public service, and then in private-sector companies that work with the government.

[Leave granted; Bill 217 read a first time]

Bill 204

Alberta Health Council Act

MRS. HEWES: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill 204, the Alberta Health Council Act.

The Bill would establish an arm's length body which could carry out research on and evaluate programs in the health care field. In conducting this ongoing review, the council would provide objective information on health care issues in order to assist the Legislature in its consideration of health policy.

[Leave granted; Bill 204 read a first time]

Bill 209

Seat Belt Act

MR. SIGURDSON: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill 209, the Seat Belt Act.

This Bill would make the wearing of seat belts, where those belts are provided in a motor vehicle, mandatory for all persons in that motor vehicle.

[Leave granted; Bill 209 read a first time]

Bill 203

An Act to Amend the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund Act

MR. CHUMIR: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill 203, being An Act to Amend the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund Act.

This Bill would place a requirement on the government of Alberta to include in the annual report of the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund an estimate of the fair market value of the assets of the fund.

[Leave granted; Bill 203 read a first time]

Bill 4

Supplementary Allowances Repeal Act

MR. DROBOT: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce a Bill, being Bill 4, the Supplementary Allowances Repeal Act.

This Bill will repeal section 326 of the *Revised Statutes of Alberta*.

[Leave granted; Bill 4 read a first time]

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill 4 be placed on the Order Paper under government Bills for second reading.

[Motion carried]

Bill 224

Alberta Investment Act

MR. MITCHELL: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill 224, the Alberta Investment Act.

This Bill would create a new management structure for the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund involving the establishment of two new investment pools. The Alberta income fund would be designed to provide Albertans with a future source of income, and the Alberta economic diversification fund would be used to encourage the creation of new businesses, diversifying Alberta's economy.

[Leave granted; Bill 224 read a first time]

Bill 211

An Act to Amend the Statistics Bureau Act

MR. NELSON: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill 211, An Act to Amend the Statistics Bureau Act.

This Bill is to remove certain reporting requirements to the government by the business community.

[Leave granted; Bill 211 read a first time]

Bill 210

Alberta Palliative Care Foundation Act

MRS. KOPER: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a Bill, being Bill 210, the Alberta Palliative Care Foundation Act.

This Bill will allow for the establishment of a foundation to promote awareness, understanding, and provision of palliative care in this province.

[Leave granted; Bill 210 read a first time]

Bill 201

An Act to Amend the Landlord and Tenant Act

MR. JONSON: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill 201, An Act to Amend the Landlord and Tenant Act.

Mr. Speaker, this Bill provides to tenants of commercial premises the right to close their businesses for one day per week.

[Leave granted; Bill 201 read a first time]

Bill 216

Motor Dealer Act

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill 216, the Motor Dealer Act.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this Bill is to set minimum standards for motor dealers and especially used car dealers.

[Leave granted; Bill 216 read a first time]

Bill 218

An Act to Amend the Local Authorities Election Act

MR. ZARUSKY: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill 218, a Bill being An Act to Amend the Local Authorities Election Act.

This Bill would amend chapter L-27.5 of the *Statutes of Alberta, 1983*.

[Leave granted; Bill 218 read a first time]

head: **TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS**

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table orders for returns 158 and 165 as amended and accepted on September 11, 1986.

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, earlier today I had the pleasure of making a joint announcement with the chairman of the General hospital board in Edmonton on the future of the Edmonton General hospital and the Mill Woods Grey Nuns hospital. I'd like to table copies of that announcement.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table Order for a Return 140 of last year and the reply to Order for a Return 142 of last year.

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table the 11th annual

report of the Alberta Oil Sands Technology and Research Authority for the year ended March 31, 1986.

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table the 1985-86 annual report of the Department of Agriculture and the 1986 annual report of the Farmers' Advocate.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. members, it is my pleasure to table copies of *Alberta Hansard's* annual report, 1986; also the ninth annual report of the Chief Electoral Officer of the province of Alberta, the Election Finances and Contributions Disclosure Act, 1986; and also the committee orders as passed by the Special Standing Committee on Members' Services.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

MR. EWASIUK: Mr. Speaker, it is both my pleasure and privilege to introduce to you and through you, visitors from the town of Bruderheim: Mr. and Mrs. Len and Val Falardeau, their daughter Rene, and their guest Tom Foster. I would ask the guests to rise and receive the usual welcome of the Assembly.

MRS. HEWES: Mr. Speaker, I am honoured to introduce to you and through you to the members of the Assembly, 49 students from grade 6 of the Clara Tyner school in the riding of Gold Bar in Edmonton. The students are accompanied by their teachers Mr. Lloyd Ungeran and Mr. Scott Trueman and a number of parents: Mrs. Weiss, Mr. Radmonovich, Mrs. Kwong, Mrs. Grant, Mrs. Palichuk, Mrs. Lundy, Mrs. Gogal, and Mrs. Ellett. I would ask that the class, who are seated in the members' gallery, stand and be given the traditional welcome of the House.

head: **MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS**

Department of Agriculture

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to remind my colleagues that this is Agriculture Week in Alberta. For seven days each year Agriculture Week gives this province's most important renewable industry the opportunity to get its message out to all Albertans. During Agriculture Week we try to let the people of our province know that agriculture plays a vital role in the economy of Alberta and in the lives of us all.

As in past years, Agriculture Week 1987 was launched with what has become its traditional preopening event, the Alberta Agriculture Hall of Fame induction. Induction into the hall of fame is an honour bestowed upon men and women who have made outstanding contributions to the province's agricultural sector in the rural economy. I had the pleasure last Friday of inducting four more outstanding individuals into the Agriculture Hall of Fame, those being: Michael Kapicki from Andrew, Martin Kaufmann of Lacombe, the late Jacqueline Jevne of Wetaskiwin, and Beatrice Parlbay of Alix. During Agriculture Week we are reminded of the tremendous debt we owe to such individuals and to all who make up our agricultural community. It is due to their efforts that agriculture plays such a key role in this province, economically, socially, and culturally.

The theme of this year's Agriculture Week, Mr. Speaker, is Partners in Progress. That theme bears an important message for the Members of this Legislative Assembly and for all Albertans. The continuing success of agriculture in our province

involves the combined efforts of many thousands of individuals from different walks of life. Farmers and consumers, processors and producers, private businessmen and government representatives: all of us are partners in agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to encourage all to learn more about their partners in agriculture and to become involved in the effort to communicate the Agriculture Week message to people across Alberta, urban and rural alike. Each one of us should take advantage of this excellent opportunity to become more familiar with our province's most important industry and about the people who make it work. Directly or indirectly, agriculture supports each one of us; it deserves our support in return.

It is also fitting, Mr. Speaker, that I was able to introduce today in this Assembly Bill 7, the Alberta Agriculture Research Institute Act, which underscores our government's commitment to the future of our agricultural industry in Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the associate minister and on behalf of the Alberta Department of Agriculture, I would like to dedicate Agriculture Week to Alberta's farmers, ranchers, processors, scientists, and agribusinessmen: our Partners in Progress.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, it's a very nice statement, and I don't think anybody in the Assembly would disagree with the sentiment. But I must remind the minister and the government that times are extremely difficult right now in rural Alberta for many, many farmers, and many of them do not feel, if I may so, like partners in progress. Many of them at this point, that I've talked to at least, feel like partners in despair. I would remind the minister that we are meeting, and I would hope that there would be some initiatives because I know, for example, that many farmers are strangled with debt. Many farmers in south-eastern Alberta are worried about drought. In fact, it's estimated by the Wheat Pool that some 25 percent of the farmers in Alberta are insolvent right at this particular time.

So, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure they would appreciate that we acknowledge Agriculture Week and the importance that agriculture plays in the province, but I would hope that they would be looking for some initiatives also from this government. We will start and have a few questions to the Premier in a couple of minutes; I'll be interested in the answers. I certainly look forward to more initiatives to deal with what I believe is a very serious situation in rural Alberta.

head: ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Agricultural Assistance

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, maybe we can start off with Agriculture Week and ask some questions of the Premier. Agriculture Canada has reported that they expected a 29 percent decline in farm income for 1987. Is the Premier not concerned that some of these farmers may not be able to afford to plant a crop this year?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure all hon. members know that the agriculture industry is the first priority of this government and that the government has moved in a variety of ways to assist our farmers and ranchers. I need only remind the hon. members of the dramatic reduction in the cost of borrowing to our farmers and ranchers, the dramatic reduction in the cost of fertilizer, the 64 cents a gallon reduction in the cost of energy to farmers. These are commitments to our farmers and ranchers.

I might also point out that in Alberta's rural economy our raisers of cattle and of hogs have been participating in an exceptional year and are able to not only make good profits but actually expand their operations significantly.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, that's all very well and dandy, but I talked about the 29 percent decline, and I might point out to the Premier that the Wheat Board has advised the federal government to slash prices even further for wheat, oats, and barley. My question to the Premier is this: what consideration has the Premier given to a program of assistance aimed specifically at planting for the 1987 crop year?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I just want to remind the hon. member that the government has a variety of programs which assist our farmers in financing for crops in the future, and I feel that the farmers of Alberta are resilient, tough, the most competitive in the world. They will be able to hold their own under any conditions and are not thinking as negatively as the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MARTIN: It's all very well and dandy to give speeches. Nobody would disagree that they're resilient and tough. They have to be resilient to deal with this government.

Predictions have been made that anywhere from 800 to 1,600 farm failures will occur this year. My question to the Premier is: if farmers are forced off the land -- that could be up to four a day -- what answer does the Premier give, how they should make a living, when we know that in Calgary we have a 12 percent unemployment rate and we have a 12.5 percent unemployment rate in Edmonton? What are you telling those farmers, Mr. Premier?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, the government has programs to assist our farmers and ranchers in every way possible. They're helped with their restructuring of debts. They're given advice by their mentors. They are assisted by district agriculturists. We have programs which assist them.

Now, it is true, Mr. Speaker, in any industry, and agriculture is no different, that you can't keep every single producer always continuing on and that those that may for one reason or another not be efficient enough or capable enough may, in fact, fall out of the system. Nevertheless, the government is committed to the family farm. The government is committed to agriculture as its number one priority in this province and will do everything possible to help our agriculture industry. I should point out that in the last year agricultural net income increased as a result of the government's programs. [some applause]

MR. MARTIN: Pretty weak pounding about that one.

My question to the Premier is that part of the problem is the advice they got before from the Alberta Agricultural Development Corporation, and there's one specific thing I would ask the Premier that he would do. Would he ask this government agency to have a moratorium for at least a year or two on farm foreclosures? That's the least this government can do.

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, our Minister of Agriculture or the Associate Minister of Agriculture may want to augment my reply. I would just say this. We have had a group of citizens and members of the Legislature going throughout the province reviewing the Agricultural Development Corporation, and they've gone to the people who are the experts, the farmers and

ranchers of Alberta, and asked them for their advice. They will be making a report to the House, and we will be having recommendations on changes in that organization. I would say, Mr. Speaker, that the government will do everything possible to help any farmer and rancher in this province.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, my supplemental is to the Premier, with respect to the federal budget that had no news for the farmers. Can the Premier tell the Assembly what contingency plans the province has in place if the federal government, as it now appears to do, refuses to provide another deficiency payment for this crop year?

MR. SPEAKER: The question is hypothetical. Member for Little Bow. Sorry, hon. member, you've had . . .

MR. TAYLOR: Can I reword, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: Sorry, one crack.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Premier as well, and it's with regard to the Canadian Wheat Board recommending that wheat prices and barley and oats be down 20 percent in the upcoming year. Could the Premier indicate whether representations have been made to the minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board by himself or his minister to date, and if not, are there meetings being established to discuss that question?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I would like the Minister of Agriculture to respond to that question.

MR. ELZINGA: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I can share with the hon. member that representations have been made to Mr. Mayer as it relates to the recommendation coming forward from the Canadian Wheat Board. In addition to that, there is a meeting slated for March 30 in which all agriculture ministers from across Canada will be gathering together in Ottawa.

MR. OLDRING: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the Associate Minister of Agriculture please advise the Assembly what steps the Alberta development corporation is taking to date to preclude foreclosures?

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Speaker, I'd be happy to respond to that question. The Alberta development corporation reviews all avenues of opportunities for a farmer to overcome his indebtedness and to work through the program so that he can repay his bills before any action is taken. They've enlisted enterprise counselors who are peers in their farming community to assist the ADC borrowers. And I might add to the Leader of the Official Opposition that ADC did not give the advice; the farmers went to ADC just as they went to any other lending institution to borrow the money, and they presented their proposals to ADC. All of the Assembly and Albertans must also realize that the members of the committee who have been traveling throughout the province have been talking to ADC borrowers and other farmers as well about the total financial situation and the total financial needs of the agricultural industry in this province.

MR. TAYLOR: That's what they need: lots of sympathy.

MR. MARTIN: That's right.

Unemployment

MR. MARTIN: I'd like to direct a second set of questions to the Premier and continue as we did, talking about unemployment. Mr. Speaker, there are a record number of employable people now on welfare in our province; I believe over 69,000. The welfare budget has already been overrun twice in this budget year, amounting to more than \$105 million over budget. My question to the Premier: can the Premier advise why he's not taking the opportunity in the early days of this session to lay out a job-creation target for the coming year? Wouldn't that \$105 million be better spent on job creation rather than welfare?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, the funds which we have allocated towards those who are unable to care for themselves and obtain employment is an indication of the government's commitment to caring for people in this province and protecting them when events impact on Alberta that they are caught up in and unable to find work or care for themselves. It may well be, Mr. Speaker, that our Minister of Career Development and Employment would want to comment upon the hon. Leader of the Opposition's question, or perhaps our Minister of Social Services.

MR. MARTIN: Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ORMAN: He's not interested in the answer, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: Minister of Career Development and Employment.

MR. ORMAN: Thank you. I'm glad somebody's interested in the answer, Mr. Speaker. We have identified that of the seven categories of social assistance recipients there is one category that we are very concerned about, and that is the "employables" category. We are concerned about the two major barriers to employment, being a lack of recent work skills and a lack of recent work experience. We will be presenting, hopefully later in the session, our objectives in terms of dealing with that category of employables on social assistance.

MR. MARTIN: Well, yes. Supplementary to the Premier. I don't want to talk to his flunkies. I want to talk to the Premier, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Premier. We've mentioned there are 30,000 more Albertans now unemployed since he became the Premier of this province, I am asking specifically: is there a target date that we can at least put those 30,000 people back to work?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, as we mentioned on Friday in the House, the government has had major programs under way to assist in reducing the number of people on unemployment. In some cases those programs have gone to maintain jobs and allow people to continue to be employed, because we've had the major impacts on this province of low prices for agricultural products and the problems of the international price for oil. We will be, during the course of this session, dealing with other matters having to do with unemployment.

But could I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that I find it completely offensive for the Leader of the Opposition to refer to a minister of the Crown who is providing him information, and to all of the House, as a "flunky".

MR. SPEAKER: Whether or not the phrase is appropriate is up

to an individual member's discretion. Unfortunately, it is not referred to as being one that is not allowed within *Beauchesne*.

MR. MARTIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I frankly don't care whether the Premier finds it offensive or not, because we're here to ask these questions. People want the answers.

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Premier. There have been some studies indicating that more and more Albertans are increasingly concerned about their personal financial security. My question to the Premier flowing from that: is the Premier not concerned about the harmful economic effect of this insecurity, and why doesn't the throne speech show it?

MR. GETTY: Actually, Mr. Speaker, quite different from the comments made by the Leader of the Opposition, most Albertans feel very strongly that they are going to come through this short-term period of adversity. Most Albertans are preparing themselves to build and grow in the future. They do not share the negative views of the Leader of the Opposition. [interjection]

MR. SPEAKER: Order, hon. member.

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, the people of Alberta share with this government a commitment and a belief in the strong future of this province, and we're going to work together to make it come true.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. It's nice for the rhetoric, but we're looking for action. They had so much confidence in this province that there was a net migration of 20,000 in the fourth quarter of 1986. That really showed a lot of confidence. I suppose that's one way to solve the unemployment problem. But does the Premier agree that out-migration is not a viable solution to the unemployment problem in Alberta?

MR. GETTY: Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, it was the supporters of the ND Party leaving when they realized that they had such little hope in this province.

Mr. Speaker, I only will repeat that the people of Alberta, who, by the way, support this government with the largest majority in all of Canada, agree with the government that the future of this province is superb and that we will work together to get through this period of adversity, and we'll be building this province through this year and the years to come.

MR. TAYLOR: Supplemental, Mr. Speaker, to the Premier. Don't feel bad about the flunky business; at least he's got a job. I was just trying to put . . .

Could the Premier give the House any information -- will those that have lost their jobs through the government cutbacks to people services be eligible for the work for welfare program the government wants to have in place this summer?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, anybody who deals with the government in any one of our programs will be assessed as to how they might participate in the government programs. Might I say most people in Alberta agree with the government that the government has got too big and that it is time to start to reduce the size of the government and the public service and are supporting us in that regard very much. Also, Mr. Speaker, I should point out that working with the members of the Alberta union of public employees, we have been able to provide with their assis-

tance certain programs that have alleviated some of the impact of the reductions in the public service. I congratulate Mr. Booth and those of his union for working in the co-operative way that they have.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Premier. Small business creates a lot of jobs in the province and certainly maintains them and does provide opportunity. Could the Premier indicate whether the lending institutions in the province of Alberta have tightened up their policies with regard to finances to small businesses in this province at the present time?

MR. GETTY: It's pretty difficult to know on a day-to-day basis, Mr. Speaker, but I would say that having discussed this matter with the chief executive officers of the major banks, they have assured me that is not their policy and that they have a great deal of faith in the future of Alberta and Alberta small business and will continue to support them. I should also point out that through the government's programs, the small business term assistance program, which we originally provided to an extent of \$750 million, three-quarters of a billion dollars to small businesses in Alberta -- the small business sector participated so actively in that that it was increased, as members know, to over \$1 billion and provided additional assistance to small businesses, and I know they have also been expanding and helping to fight unemployment in that way as well.

Assistance for Handicapped

MR. TAYLOR: A question, Mr. Speaker, directed to the Premier. All members of the House know Canada's own Man in Motion, Rick Hansen, is in the province's capital as part of the world tour to raise money for spinal cord research. That is quite an inspiration for disabled people while, in contrast, Alberta's disabled have lost confidence, threatened by cuts that will jeopardize their quality of life. At a time when other provinces are increasing their services to the handicapped, will the Premier tell whether this government will reconsider its proposal to make Aids to Daily Living users pay up to 50 percent of the materials they receive through the program, which they cannot afford?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I have had an opportunity today, as have certain members of the opposition, to meet with Mr. Hansen and then spend some considerable amount of time with him and with a representative group of the disabled community in the province. I must say it was a very positive meeting. They feel that Alberta leads in the area of assistance to the disabled. They make the comment to us that our funding is far greater on a per capita basis to assist the handicapped and disabled of any province in Canada. While we agreed in our meeting today that there are always improvements and we will work on them, we were able to have a very co-operative, very optimistic, and positive point of view coming out of that meeting.

I confirm for the hon. members that we have agreed to create a Premiers' council on the status of the disabled. That organization will, I'm sure, as it develops, help the government in providing additional support for the disabled and handicapped. And I'm looking forward to making sure that although Mr. Hansen, who is a tremendous inspiration to all of us in Alberta, may leave our province and continue on with his project, the things that he believes in will continue to be followed and pursued by

the government and the people of Alberta long after his trip is over.

MR. TAYLOR: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Fine words, but they don't fit the actions. What individuals or groups were consulted prior to the announcement that users would suddenly have to pay 50 percent of the essential materials they obtain through the program?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, there has not been any such announcement; that's why it's very difficult to respond to it.

MR. TAYLOR: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. It seems to be a dialogue of the deaf, so I'll try something else. Today a ramp on the front steps of the Legislature allowed Rick Hansen to enter the building through the front door. Tomorrow will the handicapped once again have to resort to the back door to get their needs addressed? What visible action has the government taken to enhance the ability of the disabled to become fully integrated members of their society? Will they continue to have to come in through the back door of this Legislature?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, there are several entrances to the Legislature that handicapped people may use. One is out in the front, if the hon. leader of the Liberal Party wants to take a look, and also there is one on the side, both of which friends of mine who are handicapped find they can avail themselves of quite well. The council that I referred to, Mr. Speaker, will assist in the future. We do have some problems with the structure of the Legislature and the steps; it is almost impossible to build into the steps, as they are now in this traditional building, a means of a ramp. But as I said, there is a way in the front and there is a way on the side, and I think most disabled and handicapped find they can avail themselves of that very well.

MR. TAYLOR: A supplementary. To \$3.5 million a side door. Now, rather than enhance . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member, \$3.5 million refers to what in the context?

MR. TAYLOR: Three and a half million dollars to the renovation of the Legislature, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Inaccurate, hon. member. Sorry; please continue.

MR. TAYLOR: Okay. Rather than enhance this reputation for hypocrisy that was gained by giving well-deserved money to Rick Hansen's Man in Motion, then cutting back services to the disabled, will this government put its mouth where its money is and show a commitment to the province's handicapped, rather than cutting back services, and allow them full participation?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member just can't be listening. I don't know if he's got some research assistant that's providing him with that garbage he's using there.

First of all, with regard to the Legislature, that was not the government's decision. It was the Speaker who recommended the things that had to be done because this Legislature just can't start to disintegrate, and therefore we followed up. It was the Speaker dealing through the legislative services committee of the members. We don't make those decisions. We certainly

take advice and then follow it up when it's necessary.

As far as providing assistance to the disabled and the handicapped in this province, the people of Alberta should know, despite the comments from the leader of the Liberal Party, that they contribute more than any other province in Canada on a per capita basis to helping the disabled and the handicapped.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of clarification for the record. The figure with respect to the renovations was substantially below \$1 million.

Oerlikon Aerospace

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is a follow-up to that of Friday. It's to the Minister of Technology, Research and Telecommunications. The possibility of Oerlikon coming to Calgary was there in 1986, but because of the some \$45 million of DRIE grants provided in the province of Quebec, Oerlikon did not come to Calgary. Could the minister confirm that, and was the minister involved in any way in terms of that decision?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, first of all, I confirm that the decision as to the contract with Oerlikon was, of course, a federal contract. With respect to Oerlikon's involvement or any portion of the contract coming to Alberta, a small contract has already come to Alberta and is currently, I believe right now, in the process of being completed. We expect that there will be a larger portion of the total overall contract with Oerlikon coming to Alberta.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Could the minister indicate what will be the terms of the contract, and will some type of industry be located in Calgary with regard to the further investment? As well, will the DRIE department invest some of the federal funds in that establishment of Oerlikon here in this province?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I don't believe there will be any DRIE funds involved in any of the Oerlikon contract that is executed in Alberta. There may be some federal funding -- I'm not sure of that yet -- to the company which will be executing a part of that Oerlikon contract on a subcontract basis. If so, that would be a funding flow which would be part of the original contractual arrangement with Oerlikon.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Could the minister indicate what involvement the minister partook in in terms of the negotiations in the period of time in 1985 and then seven months later when the decision was made by Oerlikon to locate in Quebec? What input did the minister have in any discussions that went on, if any?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, obviously, as minister responsible for this department I had no input in 1985. There was some discussion with regard to the location and the potential for Alberta in 1986; that was primarily through my colleague the Minister for Economic Development and Trade.

MR. TAYLOR: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Could the minister inform the House whether or not he has ever met with representation from Oerlikon people since he has been minister?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I haven't met with anyone that I think is a representative in a direct sense of Oerlikon. I have certainly met with a subcontractor. I have met with the chief of purchasing for the military establishment in Ottawa, as well as several officers of our military establishment in Ottawa who came out to Alberta and examined a number of the potential manufacturing capabilities and also our supportive systems, including the electronic products test centre here in Edmonton.

MR. R. SPEAKER: A final supplementary to the minister. Could the minister indicate the number of jobs that will be created by further investment in the industry in Calgary? Is that number available at this time?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make sure that in the exchange of questions and answers, I'm referring to Alberta. The hon. member keeps referring to Calgary. With respect to the number of jobs, I am advised that there could be as much as \$25 million worth of the contract come to Alberta; there may in fact be more. That's one of the things that's currently under discussion. So based upon that, I'm unwilling to give a firm number other than that it is certainly going to provide some jobs additional to that which already exist in the province.

MS BARRETT: Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the minister is prepared to table any documents which led to the decision of the Alberta government to invest more than \$15 million in share purchases of General Research Systems, the junior associate business partner of Oerlikon, which resulted in I believe 110 jobs at a cost of about \$180,000 or more per job.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, perhaps the hon. member could assist by indicating what questions might be in mind in order that I could respond, either in question period or in estimates. I would be happy to provide the rationale and the reasoning and the reasons for the investment by the government. I would not want, however, to acknowledge as fact the numbers just provided to me by the hon. member.

MR. SPEAKER: Perhaps the consultation could take place outside the time lines of question period for this day.

Hospital Funding

DR. WEST: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care addressing better utilization of hospital beds throughout Alberta. In regards to allowing of designation of active treatment beds to long-term beds in our hospitals, could the minister indicate if there will be flexibility given to hospital boards and administration to rotate these beds back and forth in these categories as need dictates?

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I wrote to all board chairmen of hospitals in rural Alberta about two weeks ago inviting them to make application to convert some of their active treatment beds where they felt that was appropriate to long-term care beds.

I must say that what we're anxious to do here is to provide an opportunity for hospital boards to care for elderly citizens, either in the context of nursing home beds or auxiliary beds, in a manner that's appropriate; and that means additional or different kinds of nursing home care, some physiotherapy services, that kind of thing, perhaps some changes to the actual physical structure itself. In that regard, Mr. Speaker, I'd have to say that such

policy would not lend itself to moving back and forth between active treatment beds and extended care beds. We would want whatever arrangements are made to be rather permanent for the good of the patient.

DR. WEST: A supplementary. In view of that then, will the funding be somewhere between active treatment and long-term care bed levels to better address the budgets of hospitals taking this initiative in this conversion process, Mr. Minister?

MR. M. MOORE: We'll be asking any hospitals who would like to go this route to provide us with information with regard to the overall costs, both capital costs that might be involved and also the ongoing operating costs, with a view to providing the appropriate kind of extended care. That will vary from one hospital to another, depending on their size, their current operating budget, their occupancy rate, and a host of other factors. So it's difficult for me, Mr. Speaker, to give a figure. Certainly, we will be providing them with enough funds to do the job, and that will be a matter of negotiation in each individual institution.

DR. WEST: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister indicate how many long-term care beds could be developed under such a plan in Alberta?

MR. M. MOORE: Well, I'm not sure, Mr. Speaker. We just announced today the conversion of over 300 beds -- 348 beds to be exact -- at the Edmonton General hospital to long-term care and the opening of the new Mill Woods hospital, and that's in a major urban centre. There are other opportunities I think within urban centres too, but even more exist in smaller rural communities. What the figure is, I don't know. We will learn that when we receive from all of these hospital boards across the province some answer to my letter requesting them to consider the possibility of converting some of their beds to extended care beds. I hope there is a good response and that that will allow us to accommodate most of the requests for extended care services in rural Alberta that we haven't already met with the very extensive building program that's been going on over the last few years.

REV. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, it is not an easy or inexpensive thing to simply convert a bed. For instance, in the announcement today, how many capital dollars has the minister put aside to make the necessary conversion at the Edmonton General hospital to long-term care beds?

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, we believe that in order to convert 288 beds at the Edmonton General hospital to auxiliary care and to provide an additional 60 beds for geriatric care at a higher level, for a total of 348 beds, coupled with some improvements to the Youville centre to make that a world-class geriatric care facility, the total capital cost involved there will be in the order of about \$20 million beginning, hopefully, later this year and concluding about two years from now when the entire facility would then be open for extended care patients.

MR. CHUMIR: Supplementary to the minister, Mr. Speaker. Why did the government not take the sensible step of allowing and promoting the conversion of these beds a long time ago, in light of the fact that so many rural beds have been underutilized for years because of the shortage of doctors in those areas?

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure how to answer that question except to say this: things change in medicine from time to time. Most hon. members would know that specialties in medicine are developing more and more in the larger centres, and because of the government's very extensive rebuilding and building program of the hospital system in this province, we now have some very good regional hospital systems that are taking more and more active treatment patients from the rural areas. The result has been a gradual shift of active treatment patients moving to more highly specialized facilities. And the population in our province on a percentage basis is increasing amongst those over 65, resulting in an additional need for extended care beds. It's because of all those factors that we find ourselves in a position where we can now move in this direction. I make no apologies for not having done it earlier; it probably wasn't appropriate earlier.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Calgary Mountain View, followed by the Member for Edmonton Gold Bar, if there's time.

Handicapped Children's Services

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My questions are to the Minister of Social Services. As the minister is aware, the department entered into contracts with parents of handicapped children in the Calgary region in order to provide those families with services to those children. In December of 1986 those contracts were arbitrarily cut without consultation with the affected parents and constituted a 57 percent reduction in services to those handicapped children. Will the minister assure the Legislature that she'll restore handicapped children's services to the level her department agreed upon when it signed those contracts with those individual families prior to December 1986?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I can assure the hon. member that notwithstanding what I consider to be an unfortunate occurrence in Calgary with respect to the planning of the handicapped children's services budget, the budget indeed will be in place in its total for the coming year; it will match this present year's budget. But I should say for the information of the hon. member that we have now underway with the parents across the province a look at handicapped children's services in total, because it is our view that there may be other factors that have put Calgary in a position where they seem to be spending more than other parts of the province on a per capita basis.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Thank you. Mr. Speaker, I'm asking about the levels of service that existed in Calgary prior to December 1986. Is the minister then saying that she will not be restoring levels of service to Calgary as they existed prior to December 1986?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has already mentioned that these services are delivered on a contractual basis. I certainly agree that it was a most unfortunate occurrence that because of poor planning, whatever, the Calgary region found themselves delivering services that in some cases were not appropriate for handicapped children. Those programs were not being delivered in the same way in other parts of the province. So on the basis of it being an individual contract, those contracts will be renegotiated. They're appealable, and if

any family finds itself in a circumstance where the contract that is offered is not appropriate to the type of care needed for their child, they're certainly in a position to appeal.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Well, Mr. Speaker, these families are going to continue to be hurt until this bureaucratic tangle is sorted out. Is the minister prepared to restore the program back to its levels of service as they existed prior to December 1986 until this mess gets sorted out?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I think all hon. members would agree that it is important to make sure that funding for programs is shared on an equitable basis across the province, and I can assure the hon. member that a correction indeed is taking place in the Calgary region. The region has written to every single family who has been involved in the delivery of the program, and it is only a very small percentage who are still in difficulty. I have made note with the region that those services are appealable on the basis that if the family disagrees with what is being offered by the region, they can appeal. I can give every assurance that on the basis of the work with families across this province, we will have a more equitable distribution of funding under the program.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Mr. Speaker, then I would like to ask the minister: why are families forced to appeal decisions of the Social Services department each year, even after their appeal was upheld in the previous year? Will the minister instruct her department to change that policy of bureaucratic harassment and allow that people, once they've won an appeal one year, don't have to keep fighting it year after year with the bureaucracy?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member has probably got a very good point with respect to how appeals and the consequence of appeals flow through the process. I would say this: in a number of cases that have been brought to my attention, in fact the needs of the handicapped child changed and therefore the appeal that was heard and the decision that was made the previous year is not always applicable to the following year. But I believe we can do a much better job in seeing that where it is appropriate, the appeal mechanism as it has been instituted and the decision that is rendered stay in place.

I would also comment, Mr. Speaker, that as a result of meeting with a number of the groups who have been involved in handicapped children's services -- and I think all members would agree that probably this is one of the groups in our province that share a very large burden with respect to raising their children in their home, and they do it with a lot of pride and wanting very little participation by government. I think it is important for us to note that their message to me was that in all respects we are not second-class citizens; we believe that like all first-class citizens in this province we will help share the burden of whatever must occur in terms of the taxpayers needing to have a rationalization of government services. However, notwithstanding their brave stand in wanting to share in that burden, I can assure you that we will be doing everything possible to make sure that the services that were in place last year continue this year but on a more equitable basis.

MRS. HEWES: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Services to handicapped and disabled children in Calgary have been shared and greatly enhanced by an outstanding outpatient program run through the Alberta children's hospital. Now the cuts that have

been made to hospitals — this one has not been immune either. Of course there are hospital cuts, but they will put social service and treatment programs in Calgary and region at risk. Will those cuts, Madam Minister, be reconsidered in the light of this fact?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, if I understand the hon. member's question correctly, she's referring to possible cuts in delivery of services by an institution which has a board and will obviously be making their own decisions. Whatever those decisions are — and I have not had final word as to the final decisions — then certainly we will make every effort to monitor our programs to see that they're in keeping with the needs of the children in that community.

MR. TAYLOR: They've announced 3 percent.

MR. SPEAKER: Member for Edmonton Gold Bar.

Education Funding

MRS. HEWES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The learning disabled make up 10 to 15 percent of the population, or up to 354,000 Albertans. These people are said to have an invisible handicap. They nonetheless have an intrinsic right to self-determination, personal development, and the opportunity to contribute to their community. This opportunity will, however, be eroded by cutbacks in education. My question is to the Minister of Education. Will the minister take action to ensure that all teachers are trained to recognize the symptoms of learning disabilities at an early stage, since many learning disabilities are not recognized until a child has been in school for a number of years?

MRS. BETKOWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak to two points that the member has raised. First of all, in terms of support for the learning disabled and all those with special education needs in education, as I said on Friday, the special education portion of my budget will remain level this year versus next year, and I think it speaks to the quality that will be maintained within that system.

Secondarily, the question with respect to detecting learning disabilities at an early age is obviously a key element in ensuring that you pick up the deficit at an early time. I will be announcing shortly in that regard a new diagnostic program which will be in place in our elementary school system to ensure that we in fact catch the difficulty early on so that we can deal with it at that time.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member, the time for question period has expired. Does the House agree that we allow the Member for Edmonton Gold Bar to finish her series of questions only?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MRS. HEWES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again to the minister. Can the minister guarantee with the new program that parents will be made aware of diagnostic testing that takes place in Alberta schools before it happens and that such information will not be given to parents only at the discretion of a local board?

MRS. BETKOWSKI: Mr. Speaker, obviously parents are interested in their children and in ensuring that those children learn

as best they can. The communication between home and community and school is a key element in that whole process, and I will look towards the School Act, for example, to ensure that some of those processes, which are informal at this point, are in place.

MRS. HEWES: Mr. Speaker, will the minister guarantee that the availability of special services such as psychologists will not be jeopardized by the budget cuts?

MRS. BETKOWSKI: Mr. Speaker, as I tried to point out in this Assembly last week, the setting of a budget within a school board is the responsibility of that school board. I will not guarantee the hon. member that a school board will not look at the best way to deal with the funds available to them and may make decisions which affect some of the programs run by that school. But I would say again that I am proud of the work that school boards are doing in this province, pulling up their sleeves and dealing with what is the most important role, the most important priority for education in Alberta; that is, delivering a basic, good program to all students in this province.

MR. TAYLOR: You're copping out.

MRS. HEWES: Well, exactly, Mr. Speaker. So then what guarantees does the minister have that school boards will not reduce programs for children with special needs before looking at other means of absorbing the cuts? The 3 percent really translates into 10 percent, and we've already seen slashes to community schools and the end of the teacher intern program.

MRS. BETKOWSKI: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is constantly looking for guarantees. The way in which the dollars from education pass through to school boards, particularly with respect to special education, is that a block of funds is given to a school board to spend on special education needs. Yes, I can guarantee her that those dollars will be spent on special education needs. How they will be allocated within special education for the various needs is a matter which school boards will decide. If the hon. member would like to suggest that we ban the use of school boards, elected trustees, in this province, perhaps she would like to put the motion on the Order Paper and we could all debate it. [interjection]

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The extension to question period was simply on the basis for the member who was asking the main questions, hon. Member for Edmonton Avonmore.

Before Orders of the Day are called, I'm sure that all members of the Assembly would join with me in extending our sympathy to the Member for Vegreville and to his family on the death of Derek Fox's mother on Friday. And I'm sure again that members of the Assembly will join with me in extending our best wishes to the Member for Chinook, who I understand is in hospital. On behalf of the Assembly I will be extending appropriate messages to both the Member for Vegreville and the Member for Chinook.

MR. STRONG: Just a point of order, Mr. Speaker, that I would like to see in future in question period, if any member rises to ask a question, that the supplementary questions be included to the opposition parties in that question. Could you consider that?

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, the Chair will consider it.

ORDERS OF THE DAY**head: CONSIDERATION OF HER HONOUR
THE LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR'S SPEECH**

Moved by Mr. Alger:

That an humble address be presented to Her Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor as follows:

To Her Honour the Honourable W. Helen Hunley,
Lieutenant Governor of the province of Alberta:

We, Her Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Legislative Assembly, now assembled, beg leave to thank Your Honour for the gracious speech Your Honour has been pleased to address to us at the opening of the present session.

[Adjourned debate March 6: Mr. Martin]

MR. MARTIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to rise to participate for a couple of minutes in the debate. I'm sure that the hon. members opposite want to hear this particular speech.

I would first of all, Mr. Speaker, say that now we're all veterans in our respective positions, it's again good to deal with you as the Speaker of the House. We appreciate on this side of the House the fairness that you show.

Mr. Speaker, I would go on there to talk about what I perceive happening in the province. It may again come as no shock to know that I have a different point of view than the government about what is happening in the province. I would suggest then that only one of us can be right, and because they're wrong, we must be right.

The other thing I want to say, though, is that we must look back in history to understand why these mistakes are made so that we do not make the same mistakes again. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that during the life of the Conservative government that came to power in 1971, there were three major mistakes that occurred that left us vulnerable economically and socially as we are now, to have the debates that we're now having in this House. I don't need to go on in great detail, but I think it's worth repeating here again.

First of all, the government says, "Well, yes, we've been concerned about diversification, and we've done a good job there, and we've raised questions." But the fact remains, Mr. Speaker, that this is one of the major reasons. The government recognized before the trust fund was brought in, in speeches that the Premier of the day was making -- and I've read this in the House and won't bother with it again -- but the Premier of the province at that time was predicting that we had a decade to turn around, that we were basing too much of our provincial revenues on one source.

I think life during the late '70s was too easy. People were predicting that the price of oil was going to be up at this point -- \$60, \$65, \$70 at this particular time. I don't need to remind people that that just hasn't happened. I look at the figures, and I think it shows it rather dramatically. And I think perhaps the Provincial Treasurer would agree with me that this is a major problem. When I look -- and a source for this is the Canadian Tax Foundation -- at provincial and municipal finances, when I go back and I look in 1980-81 . . . Mr. Speaker, this does include the revenue from the operation of the trust fund, so it is consolidated. When I look at that, I find that out of a total gross revenue of almost \$9.9 billion, from natural resource revenues we had \$5.1 billion, 51.5 percent. That shows how vulnerable

we were at that particular time; over 50 percent of our revenues were coming from that one source.

In '82-83 we started to spend more. Our total gross revenue went up to \$13.2 billion. Of that, from natural resource revenues was \$6.8 billion; we're up to 51.6 percent. In '83-84 it could go down 43 percent. Then when we look at the last two years -- and the source for this is the Public Accounts -- obviously it's going down. Our spending is still up, but our natural resource revenue is going down. So '84-85 was 40.6 percent; '85-86, 38.7 percent. While the reality is, as the prices go down, the percentage of our natural resource revenue that represents also goes down; that's the major reason that we have the deficit that we now have. So as a result, Mr. Speaker, we're very vulnerable. We're like any banana republic anywhere in the world that's based on one source, of a lack of a diversified economy.

The other point, though, that we made, Mr. Speaker, was that we were told -- and many people in this province besides the government, specifically the oil industry, believe that deregulation would solve all our problems. Now I can remember in the Western Accord when we brought it in, and most people were predicting the prices going down -- and I have made this point, but I think it is one that should be made again: even if one believes in deregulation, one should not choose to go into a deregulated market when the prices are going down. It made no sense at all. And if we could find that out with our research capabilities and most people were predicting that the price was going down, I for the life of me couldn't understand -- even if you believed in that, if that was your ideology -- why you would do it at that particular time. I remind hon. members that if we'd had a made-in-Canada price right at that particular time, we would not have the deficit that we have at this particular time. Now I think I might say that in many ways it was a triumph of ideology over common sense, and that is precisely what happened that particular time.

The other particular thing that happened, the third major problem, is that -- you know, we are now talking about restraint, and we're talking about government spending too much. I wish the government would have recognized that factor in the '70s, because as I just pointed out, government spending between '80-81, including the trust fund, went up \$4 billion. There were times in the late '70s that we were spending all sorts of money on all sorts of things that we didn't need. I would like to have some of that money back, Mr. Speaker: \$1.2 billion overruns, and the trust fund, and a \$75 million birthday party where we had a great time. I would point out that our sister province spent \$3 million, and I was told they had a great time, but we spent \$75 million; we were the big spenders at that time. I notice that even the Treasurer is now talking about bringing it under some control. Hospitality costs have gone up every year. We were told at that time that we needed it to do business; we had to be the big shots in the international scene. I recognize and I commend the Treasurer for recognizing that those expenses were uncalled for. And I'd just say to the hon. members that their ideas of economic resurgence haven't worked. I would agree with the Premier that we have spent a lot of money, supposedly on economic resurgence. The point I was trying to make today and Friday is that it hasn't worked, though. That's the reality. And I would point out that we spent \$.5 billion, supposedly to kick-start the oil industry, back in 1982, then another \$550 million in June '85 and recently, since the time we sat last, another \$1 billion, in November 1986. But the problem with these programs in the past was that there were no performance

guarantees. If I look at that amount of money that we have spent, I would suggest that we could have had a jobs fund that would have put people back to work. We would never have had to face the unemployment that we have. The government has to accept that that money is wasted and gone forever. It would be nice to be able to draw back the clock and bring it back, but obviously that's not going to happen.

Now to be fair and honest in terms of this Premier, he wasn't there through part of that, and it is a new government. He was there through part of the previous government, but I think we have to be honest. The present Premier assumed office and formed a government, I believe, some 16 months ago. Mr. Speaker, since then we've had an election. A new Legislature was elected. And I would just suggest to the government, as I did last session -- we talked about this last summer -- that I believe there was a growing number of Albertans that were looking for change. There were people that were dissatisfied out there, the Premier would admit. Some people didn't vote, but there was, at least by Alberta's terms, a significant number on the opposite side. And I would suggest that that was a yearning for some sort of new beginning, that there was some disillusionment. Obviously, most people -- and I accept that -- at that particular time still wanted to believe in the Conservative Party. Old habits die slowly.

But what do Albertans want? What do I believe they want? Well, Mr. Speaker, I think there are two or three things that Albertans want -- perhaps three things -- from their governments, whether they be federal or provincial. I think we would all agree that they want a lean, clean administration. I think they want to believe again in their politicians. I believe, secondly, that they want some positive action on opportunities for people, be it that they live in rural Alberta or urban Alberta, but especially for our young people. If you look at the studies, there is growing despair about the future for our young people. And I believe that, above all, they want a sense of fairness. People are prepared to, as the government might say, bite the bullet, but they want to see all of us biting the bullet. They want that sense of fairness, and if we're going to cut government programs, they want those cuts where they're going to least affect the most defenseless in society. That's what Albertans want from us, I believe.

So let's look, Mr. Speaker, if we may, at the government's record in those three areas. First of all: lean, clean administration. Well, I will say this for the government: they're slightly better than the federal government. I'll give them that. But then you would have to go a long ways to find a government quite as corrupt or out of control as the federal government at this particular time. But I would remind people, and I would remind the government that people perhaps weren't as concerned about patronage and what looks like patronage appointments during the '70s. I don't think they thought about it much because times were good. But one of the things they look at from politicians is that especially when they're being told that they have to restrain themselves, they want to know how it is affecting the government and the government's friends.

I don't need to go through. I have 14; maybe some of them, Mr. Speaker, are able people. I can tell the government that when I go around -- we hear about Mr. Planche, and we hear of Mr. de Rappard being put into another area. Mr. Liepert, Mr. Coombs, Mr. Nimmo, Mr. Millican, Joe Dutton, Milt Pahl, Myrna Fyfe, Ron Ghitter, Bob Dowling, Tom Donnelly, Mary LeMessurier, Horst Schmidt all being involved with the government in some way or another. I can tell them that there is a

cynicism out there.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't raise this -- and as I say, maybe there are some good reasons for some of them; some of them I certainly would check. But I want to say that there is ... What's frightening to all of us in political life, regardless of what political stripe we are, what is dangerous in a democracy, is when most of the people do not believe in politicians any more. And I don't care who you are or which side of the House you sit on, all of us must be concerned about the image people have of us. It leads, first of all, to cynicism that all politicians are crooks, that they're all in it for themselves; then it leads to people not bothering to vote. I think all of us would agree that this is extremely dangerous when this starts to happen, and it is happening in our country. It's not that -- as I've often said to people when we are raised with this issue: "Look, most people, regardless of their political stripe, are as good and as bad as the people that elected them. And most people, I believe, that come to public life do so because they actually want to serve people, and I believe that's true on both sides of the House."

That is why, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the government would consider a code of ethics Bill. We will be raising this as a private member's Bill, but I say to the government that I think it would at least go some way in dispelling some of the cynicism that is hurting all of us in political life. I will be bringing this private member's Bill in, and I would hope that at some point -- I've never seen one of my private member's Bills passed yet, but perhaps another Bill from the government similar to it, will come through. Even if the government doesn't think we need it surely they must recognize that there are people out there that are not satisfied with politicians and political life at this particular time and that we are all affected by this.

Well, what other things can we look at Mr. Speaker? The economy. We are told that Conservatives know how to run governments. After all, they're the business government and they know how to run governments. Well, what is the result of this government for the last 16 months? We've already talked about some of the indicators in question period in the last couple of days. But I would again remind the government that these figures are the realities and the facts. There are 30,000 more Albertans unemployed, and that's after spending a lot of money on things that didn't work. The reality is not just spending money. That doesn't necessarily mean that your programs are effective, because many of them are short term; when they stop, people go back on welfare. So we have 30,000 more Albertans unemployed, and a significant number of those, as the government acknowledged, are employables.

The other results we have: 111,800 Albertans have left our province for other parts of Canada. That's showing some confidence in the province, which the Premier talked about earlier. There's been a 63 percent increase in business failures in 1986 and, as I mentioned earlier, a 29 percent drop in farm income expected this year. Along with that Mr. Speaker, the government acknowledges -- I take it the figures haven't changed -- at least a \$3 billion deficit this year.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it seems to us that knowing those figures, knowing the economic reality, then I would think a government that cared -- we're told they're a caring government -- would have come in with a very different throne speech than they came in with just a few days ago. Now, I tried to look through the throne speech and find out what the buzzwords were because usually you can predict the message a government is trying to get across by their buzzwords. And the key buzzwords seem to be "continue" and "review." Using those terms, it seems to me,

then, that all we're getting is the same old stuff, but we're going to have a few studies and reports.

Well, Mr. Speaker, people are unemployed, hurting, right now. People in the rural areas -- no matter what the Premier says, there's a significant number out there that are on the verge of losing their farms. Many people are concerned about the social programs that are occurring right now. And it's not that you necessarily always save money, because we just acknowledged that \$105 million more had to go into the welfare program. As I mentioned earlier, I would have loved to have seen that in job creation, to make people productive and proud, as we talk about Albertans being. It's hard to be proud for very long if you're on the welfare rolls for very long.

So it seems to me we have to change the priorities, Mr. Speaker, and I didn't see that. As I say, they say "continue and review." Well, continue is not working, and the reviewing should have been done a long time ago, because this was, supposedly, a new government 16 months ago. I don't need to tell you that it doesn't even make economic sense to have the high unemployment we have, because eventually you pick it up in other areas. We can cut back in education, we can cut back in social services, we can cut back in health care, we can have a higher unemployment, but you end up paying more for that. You pay for it in terms of misery. I have quoted figures here, and I won't bore you about higher suicides, more people going to jail, more young people involved in crime. These things are happening right now. They're happening in my riding; they're happening in other ridings.

We can have more and more farmers. The federal government is going to pay them not to farm. What are we going to do with them: train them to become building trades people and join the unemployment rolls in the cities? If there is a mass exodus from rural Alberta, it's not just the farmers. Everybody in rural areas depends on the farm income. The teachers: there won't be schools. The hospitals will shut down. The businesses will shut down. You'll have more of an exodus into our major cities. As I asked earlier on, Mr. Speaker -- I for the life of me do not know what we could do right now, with 12.5 percent unemployment in Edmonton and the latest figures of 12.8 percent in Calgary. So it seems to me we have a choice. We can either say that we've done everything we can -- we've thrown out a lot of money -- or we can change our priorities in our programs to see what we can do differently. But again I get "continue" and "review."

Mr. Speaker, a little bit about the restraint program. I know; I've seen the Premier say that they're a caring government. That seems to be another buzzword, which is rather amusing to most people that are getting their budgets cut right now, how caring they are. And we're making cuts. The government is downplaying the restraints in the throne speech, but it's quietly making cuts. I understand, for instance, that Genesis -- kids with alcoholic problems, crime problems -- we'll only be doing that, working with them, during the day. I don't know what we're going to do in the evenings. We hear of this cut, that cut, and then the government says, "Well, we really didn't mean that; we'll come back on it." But the reality is -- I think the Treasurer would agree with me -- that there are people being cut. And I just say that we should be looking at this much more carefully, and I've made this argument over and over again.

The poll the Premier alluded to agrees with the opposition on this, that it shouldn't be across the boards; it should be selective cuts. That's what I've said right from the start, Mr. Speaker, and that's why we believe there's a double standard in the way

the government hands over money. At the same time that we're slashing services to people, we still have the patronage appointments; we still have ministers' offices that I believe are vastly overstaffed. We have some of the highest paid civil servants, at the top level, in the country. We've checked that. We have 25 ministers; we don't need that many. Other provinces are getting by with less.

That's the type of thing that if we did that and sent a message and selectively tried to cut at the top while protecting as much as we can those services, I think Albertans would accept much more than when we go after education or community schools or the rest of it. I'm not saying that we have all the answers, but we tried to, as Official Opposition, show where we could cut \$750 million, and we know it could be done. Perhaps there is more there, but we don't have the same access as the Treasurer does to some of those programs. But I would say that I would hope -- and we'll look at the budget -- that the Treasurer is coming at it as much as they can at the top level, because up to this point I have not seen that particular approach. So I will look at the 20th with great interest.

Mr. Speaker, the budget I know will tell us more than the Speech from the Throne. Speeches from the Throne are deliberately vague; I'm well aware of that. But I will say this about the government: you outdid yourselves on this one. The only specific thing I could find -- and I congratulate the government -- is that we, I hope, will have seat belts, although I understand the Conservative convention comes up first and some of the more right-wing of the Conservative Party may make the government a little nervous about that. That's why we brought in our own private member's Bill, just to make sure it's debated this time. Other than that, it was deliberately vague, and I got the feeling listening to it that this was unreal. Is this the Alberta that I've been traveling around in? Is this what's happening in my constituency? It's like there were no problems; everything is going along well. We're spending the most, and this and that; we have the best, and this and that. It was, as I said, "continue" and "review."

Well, Mr. Speaker, as I travel the province, that's not the message I'm getting, and I can tell the government that I'm talking to a lot of Conservatives out there, because obviously the majority of the people voted for the Conservatives in the past.

MR. TAYLOR: Are they still in business?

MR. MARTIN: Well, time will tell. But the point I make is that many people are concerned. If you want to be selective on polls, you should take a look at the issues, and on the issues most people do not agree with the government on the approach that they're taking.

The message I seemed to get was sort of -- if I may say so, I thought maybe R.B. Bennett had been reincarnated or maybe even Herbert Hoover, because the message seemed to be a message of declining opportunities and lowering expectations. Well, I thought all this government were great entrepreneurs, that they would come back and tell us about new ways to create jobs, that they would have a whole new approach other than telling the poor that we have to restrain ourselves. That's all I saw in that particular Speech from the Throne. And if I were an unemployed person looking just for a glimmer of hope from this government, whether I be in the building trades or a young person that hasn't had a chance yet, I would have been very disappointed in that Speech from the Throne.

[Mr. Musgreave in the Chair]

Mr. Speaker, if I was a single parent with three or four children -- and some in my riding are -- going to the Food Bank because I do not get enough from welfare at this particular time, and I was looking for a glimmer of hope there, I would not have gotten it from that Speech from the Throne. As we talked about it earlier, especially if I was a young farmer, part of the 25 percent that the Wheat Pool is talking about, and looking for some acknowledgment that I might be able to hold on to my land at least for another year, that they understood my plight and that they might look at a moratorium or some other measure, I'd be greatly disappointed in that throne speech.

If I was a parent, worried about my children's future, and many parents are -- it starts with the educational system. If you look at any polls, they are really questioning what the future holds for our young people 10 or 15 years down the way, and that's a difficult question. We're having problems all over. I recognize that. But people are looking for some answers from their elected people. Again, if I was looking for that, at least acknowledgment of it, Mr. Speaker, I would have been very disappointed. I hate to say this because there are good people opposite, but I have to say that this new government is already old. It's tired, complacent, because they're not giving us anything new.

The Speech from the Throne should have told us about a new Alberta. It should have given us targets for the unemployed, how we're going to deal with them. It should have talked about other cuts rather than the cuts in education and those sorts of levels, an acknowledgment of what is happening in Alberta instead of telling us to continue and review.

I did notice some things, though, and I believe that the government -- I don't know if they've polled or whatever, but it's clear that they have certain lines that I expect we'll hear in this session from time to time. One of them is that Albertans must be more like other Canadians. That's one I've heard a number of times. I don't necessarily disagree. I think Albertans want responsive government and less of the self-satisfied, directionless course charted in the throne speech. Mr. Speaker, Albertans also need a government which can do more than distribute windfall petroleum revenues for its own advantage. I just talked about the waste. It won't be in four years that we'll be more like other Canadians because we'll be in the bottom half in Canada and more like less developed nations if we don't turn this around in the future. As I've said, we're too reliant on the resource commodities. We have basically a government, unfortunately, at this time with no economic plan.

The other argument I heard from the Premier -- it's a good one -- government spending always goes up and it has to end. Well, again, I would partially agree with the Premier that not all spending should increase every year. But as I said before, the issue is fairness. I notice in one that we give Mr. Dutton \$71,550 to live in Hong Kong, while people on welfare are going to the food banks. Albertans will not accept those double standards anymore. The point I make is simply that if we can come at it with fairness and if we cut where we can afford to cut ... There's no doubt that this has been a top-heavy, expensive government, and there's all sorts of waste that we can cut -- the unnecessary, the frivolous -- at this particular time. That's what they want, Mr. Speaker, not at the bottom level, if I may say so.

The other point I would make to Conservatives -- and I think federal Conservatives forget this too -- somehow Conservatives in their ideology believe that you can basically run government

the same as you can a small business. Mr. Speaker, it doesn't work that way. That's why the old saying about Conservative times are tough times is true. There has to be a recognition that you have to come at it from the people-needs first and, yes, keep your administration as lean and clean as possible, be concerned somewhat about the deficits. But the point I've tried to make -- the deficits are increased by the unemployment. And that's happening federally. We pay out millions of dollars in unemployment insurance. So if you come at it from a different way, you'll deal with your deficits and you can still deal with human needs. Government is not a for-profit business, and Conservatives better recognize that you can't run governments in that particular way.

The other line is -- and, again, there's some truth to it -- that we are the prisoners of the international market forces. Well, yes, to some degree that's true. But, Mr. Speaker, there are other countries in the world. There are other provinces that are doing better than us. It's cant to say, "Well, there's nothing I can do about it; it's an international problem, whether we're dealing with wheat or oil; therefore, there's nothing we can do." I thought Conservatives were the doers. I used to hear about the doers all the time, but now we just accept; there's nothing we can do. We just sit down and hope there's an oil boom again sometime. That's nonsense. There are all sorts of things that -- if I may use their term -- a caring government could do. And the reality is that governments that say that there's nothing we can do should be turfed out in the next election because there are all sorts of things that can be done.

Mr. Speaker, we tried to offer one thing that oppositions are accused of, and it has to do, I expect, that we do better on television when we're negative and when we are attacking. That's part of the system, I think we all agree. Even the Premier was in opposition at one time and I think would recognize that there's a different role over there. But it's fair that people demand from all of us, from all political parties, what we stand for and what our alternatives are. Then they will judge. That's the way democracy works. So we went to some trouble preparing paper -- one to deal with, as I mentioned, where we would cut and another one to deal with revenues, recognizing that we have the problem. I hope I'll see some of our answers in the Treasurer's budget speech coming up. I think we'll agree on a couple of things perhaps.

But we also took some time, as you're aware, to lay out an alternative throne speech, one that we believed better answered the needs of the people at this particular time. I'd like to just go through a few of the matters. I won't read it all because I know the government would get too excited and want to run out and redo their throne speech. But I will throw out a few ideas, Mr. Speaker. One of the things we did do is a fair amount of consultation through task forces, talking to Albertans about some of the things they believe in and some of their answers. We'll be coming back with some of those things in the future.

But I wanted to say, just picking certain areas -- the recommendations from the Labour minister. There are obviously in those recommendations a couple that aren't bad. But if we think that's going to solve the labour problems, it is not going to. And I hope the government, when they come back with their anticipated labour review, will recognize that. Again, the things that caused the problems were the 25-hour lockouts, pension funds, and the spin-off companies. The only thing we've added is a longer period of conciliation. That still didn't solve those particular problems. That was one of the major reasons.

The replacement workers. I'm glad the government recog-

nizes that they should get their jobs back. But I want to say to the government: what do you do -- and there are couple of examples right now that I know the Premier is aware of, Zeidler and Lakeside Packers. If somebody refuses to negotiate, it becomes very difficult to prove that they're bargaining in good faith when they've already brought in a brand new labour force. They can do this in tough times; it's a little harder when the economy is buoyant. But we should have dealt with the replacement workers, recognizing that those things are still happening. And we should have dealt with the fact -- I don't believe there should be replacement workers.

Mr. Speaker, the other day the Minister of Culture talked about International Women's Day and that we're going to hand out another magazine or something; I'm not sure. I would hope that this wouldn't be all we're going to do, because I believe that the vast majority of women are looking for more than that. I believe we're going to have to get in the 20th century and bring in pay equity. I believe we're going to have to look at affirmative action, especially within the public service. I believe that child care standards -- we know that the funding is inadequate, and that's a thing that we need. I believe that most women and most men in the province know that we need protection against family violence and better assistance to victims that are battered. All these things I believe the government could have looked at. And it's not spending money because the point I make is that that's preventive social services. You know, you end up paying for the problems after anyhow, and I expect that's what they wanted from us.

When I looked at what we're going to do, I didn't see much about natives, even though we're having a First Ministers' Conference.

I don't know where the government stands on some of those issues. I was hoping I would see something about the Lubicon and how they were going to deal with that situation, because that's a shame that could affect us even in the Olympics, that we'd get that settled. I was looking for that, Mr. Speaker. I was looking -- all I've read in the papers is that the Attorney General doesn't believe in self-government. Well, I want to know the approach, then, that the government is going to take to the First Ministers' Conference, because I believe that self-government for natives is a reality, and its time is coming. Again, the government had better get in on the 20th century, Mr. Speaker. Maybe the hon. Attorney General doesn't know what self-government means, but he'd better look at it, because most people are going to be advocating that. But the government hasn't told us what their stand is going to be at that First Ministers' Conference.

Mr. Speaker, in terms of jobs, I just mentioned the money that we wasted. I would like to have had that money back so we could put it into a jobs fund. But there are all sorts of things that we could look at. I've talked about a jobs fund, but an idea that we could even borrow from the Socreds in British Columbia, that I'm told has had some economic impact although their economy isn't much better than ours, but they've had some success with it is their critical industries commission. As I understand, it's a negotiation process through a co-operative involvement of labour, management government and financial institutions. So we could take a look, because I'm told that they've had some success keeping industries viable that would have otherwise gone out of business. I would have liked to have seen something like that. I would have liked to have seen an economic council of Alberta. I would have liked to have seen an Alberta works program. I would have liked to have seen a

youth business start especially from a government that talks about entrepreneurs. That's an area that I don't think we've tapped very much, where young people could start some of their own businesses with some help. We talked about that in the election. Mr. Speaker, I didn't see anything.

The problem with cutting back in education, the 3 percent -- with institutional inflation, especially in the rural areas, it's much higher. I think the Minister of Education understands that. We need a fairer funding formula, because what happens with these cuts -- and the percentage that the province used to pay has gone down, down, down all the time to where I believe it's now 63 percent -- you're putting tremendous pressure on local boards. The minister may talk about all the decisions that she wants the local board to make. But the decisions can come to this: they either, through the property taxes, raise taxes, and especially with a recession in rural Alberta that makes no sense at all because people don't have any more money -- the last thing that farmers need, for example, is more input costs -- or they can look at user fees. The previous Minister of Education didn't like that term, but we know there's more and more being put on for certain courses, if you take them, that we charge extra. Or they can look at a cut because education, as the Liberal leader has pointed out is a labour-intensive field. I believe that over 90 percent of most budgets are labour intensive.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the only way you can save a fair amount of money, then, is to put more and more kids into the class. And I suggest to you if we still don't believe that that has an impact on education and educational opportunity, then we haven't been in the classroom. But those are the realities, those are the decisions that the boards will be making. And that's the least alternative. Which one's the worst? So you go through it that way. Is that the type of decision-making that she wants the board to have? Or should we go back to a report that was prepared that we gradually work back to 85 percent funding and work with the boards that way? Because property taxes are not the appropriate place for education. Property taxes were meant to be services for our property, and education certainly wasn't that. The funding should basically come out of this Legislature for education, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on into agriculture. We point out and I think the government would agree with me, that one out of three Albertans depends on agriculture, either directly or indirectly. And we have attempted through a task force -- and we'll be coming back with that in the next month or so -- to assess what we can do, recognizing that there are international problems, especially with the grains, because the subsidies of the Americans and the subsidies of the European Common Market, that some of our traditional markets are not there. But are there things that we can do -- that's the reality -- or do we just drop our hands and say nothing can be done? We on this side of the House believe that there are things we can do to keep people farming, and we'll be presenting them during this session.

We've talked before, Mr. Speaker, about debt adjustment but also we want this government to be firm with the federal government. I haven't heard -- I'm looking for what our stand or this government's stand is on closure of rural post offices by the federal Conservatives, because that has an impact a very big economic impact in rural Alberta. Are we concerned, do we believe in what they're doing there, or are we going to stand up for rural Albertans? We will want to know that from this government during this session. I think all of us on this side want to know that.

Mr. Speaker, have we examined the comprehensive farm income assurance program such as the province of B.C. has brought in? Have we looked at debt adjustment? Have we looked at a moratorium? I know there will be something on hail and crop insurance, and I look forward to that committee coming back. We will take a look at it and see if we think it adequately meets the needs. Many of these things could be done without increasing the deficit. Above all, it depends on a couple of things: cutting wasteful spending and tax fairness.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to come to a conclusion here today by saying that we in the Official Opposition see our role to keep the government on the spot but to represent a lot of people in this province. We believe that we're elected to represent working families in this Legislative Assembly, and they, whether the government will acknowledge it or not, are facing a severe crunch. When I'm talking about working families, I'm in the broadest sense: in rural Alberta dealing with farmers or urban workers in my particular riding. The point is that unemployment, educational cuts, lack of quality day care -- all these things are having a severe impact on people. If I could get one message through to the government it would be that everything is not "continue" and "review," that these things are happening to people right now. And again I say: you pay a price for it.

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

Mr. Speaker, the government in the past could perhaps have enough money to buy enough people out during elections, but I now believe that ... As I said, R.B. Bennett is back, and the Conservatives in this Speech from the Throne -- I hope I am disappointed in the budget -- are acting like Conservatives. Unfortunately, when they start to act like this, it is ordinary people who are hurt the worst. I would say to the government, do not, as you did in deregulation, let your ideology overcome your common sense, because, Mr. Speaker, I am prepared, if the government wants to borrow some of our policies, and I'm sure there will be some other good ones from other parts of the opposition, to take them, take them all, bring them in. We think they would be good for ordinary Albertans. Even if they win the next election using our policies, we would have done our job for ordinary Albertans.

Mr. Speaker, we'll continue the educational process during this session, and we will hope that some of the members opposite will see the wisdom in some of the things that we are going to advance. As I said, and I think all of us agree: regardless of which political party we're in and regardless of which side of the House we sit in, we're all elected to do our best for the people that elected us here. We may have an honest difference, but I just say to the government: look at your conscience. If you can honestly tell me that you're doing the best possible job with your policies, then by all means continue ahead and we'll have that good debate here in the Legislature. But I also say to the government, Mr. Speaker, that if you look at your conscience and you do not believe that you are doing the best possible job, that there are other ways that we come at the severe economic problems, then I think this government owes it to the people of Alberta to change and to change quickly, because more and more people are being hurt. I throw that out as a challenge to the government.

The other thing I would like to do, Mr. Speaker, being the helpful person that I am, I'd like to file our alternative throne speech with our budget cuts. We can't hand it out to everybody, but I would like to file it, and I know the Treasurer will run right

out and read it. It's called Promoting Fairness and Renewing Opportunities, and because ...

MR. TAYLOR: Is that the one that recommends blue and orange food hampers?

MR. MARTIN: No; well, I guarantee it's not going to be red like your tie.

Mr. Speaker, because I have said clearly that I do not agree with the thrust of the throne speech and I've asked the government to look at their own conscience, at this point I would like to bring in, if I may -- I could go on for a little while longer, but the Treasurer is shaking his head. All right, I would like to bring in an amendment, I would just say that the motion for the presentation to Her Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor of an humble address on today's Order Paper be amended as follows:

By adding at the end of it:

but regrets the absence of any programs aimed at achieving a significant reduction in the unacceptably high number of Albertans currently unemployed.

Mr. Speaker, I have copies here.

I'll just leave you the reason I brought this through: that many of our social problems, not all of them, will be solved if we move -- and I know it can't be done overnight -- towards a policy of full employment. I think it's the most important issue that we face today in both rural and urban Alberta. So I would move and I would hope that the Assembly would accept my amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair interprets that the amendment will then read, "... Your Honour has been pleased to address to us at the opening of the present session" -- in place of the period add a comma and then the words as presented by the Leader of the Official Opposition.

Copies of the amendment will now be distributed to the House before any further conversation takes place, or discussion.

MS LAING: Mr. Speaker ...

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member, just half a moment. I prefer that all members of the Assembly have a chance to review. Thank you.

Speaking to the amendment, members, the Minister of Career Development and Employment.

MR. ORMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to speak to the amendment made by the hon. Leader of the Official Opposition and say, I guess for the third time this week, that we do in fact address the matters of unemployment, and particularly the matters of high unemployment that we're faced with today. Certainly we have said in the past, and I reiterate in this House, that unlike the Member for Edmonton Belmont, who indicated that 10.5 percent or 11 percent was too high, any level of unemployment is too high. There is no level that is acceptable of unemployment unless it's zero.

Mr. Speaker, our Premier spoke not only during the last throne speech but he also spoke at this throne speech about our commitment as a government to job creation through our capital works programs. I'd like again to say that as we did on Friday, that our capital works program from the last budget, for the budget year 1986-87, was the largest job-creation program in the

history of this province, and in fact there were in excess of 60,000 full-time jobs that were created in this province as a result of that job-creation program.

I should also point out that, in fact, we are working in areas with the private sector, for truly the private sector is the area that job creation comes from. Government is not a job-creation source, Mr. Speaker; it is the private sector. And we as a government rededicate ourselves, and I think it's clear in our throne speech, that we do in fact rely heavily on the private sector to create jobs, and in fact they have done a job.

There are 22,000 more people working in 1986 than there were in 1985; 22,000 people. Now that in my mind indicates that in fact there is job creation happening in this province. I should also point out that even though there is a significant increase in the number of jobs, there is a commensurate increase in the number of people entering the labour force and in 1985 there were 1.249 million people in the labour force. In 1986 there were 1.271 million people in the labour force. So if these people are leaving the province, Mr. Speaker, as the Leader of the Opposition would have us believe, in fact it's not showing up in the labour force statistics. That's an increase of 1.8 percent in the number of people in the labour force -- one year, 1985 compared to 1986.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, hon. ministers.

MR. ORMAN: I would say that that is an indication that in fact there is strength in this Alberta economy, and when the Premier speaks about the faith that the people in this province have in their future, in fact it is manifesting itself in the statistics that present themselves.

Now, that doesn't mean to say, Mr. Speaker, that we can abandon job-creation programs and we can abandon our commitment to stimulating the economy at this present time to assist the business sector to expand and to create the meaningful jobs. And we talk about work while on welfare. Well, that program will not be a success unless the private sector is a full participant in that program and unless they are involved in delivering the meaningful work experience that is necessary to make people marketable in the labour force.

I would say that in fact there are jobs available, Mr. Speaker, but the restructuring of the labour market in Canada and, for that matter, in North America is a well-known fact, and people that have skills that are not commensurate with the demand of the labour force must look at the alternatives of either upgrading those skills or looking at other areas. And when I talk about our role in assisting individuals to look at alternatives to the traditional jobs, I think our record speaks for itself.

I want to give the hon. members an example of something that I think is typical of what is happening in the province in terms of the restructuring of the job market. I had the pleasure, along with my colleague the hon. Minister for Economic Development and Trade, to open the entrepreneurship centre at NAIT, Mr. Speaker, and that for me was a truly gratifying experience, because I met two individuals at NAIT who had come from the traditional trades. They came from the trades that the hon. Leader of the Opposition speaks about, and those are the building trades. There was a tile setter and there was an electrician, and these individuals were out of work and looking at alternatives because there was no longer a demand in the marketplace for their skills. Well, Mr. Speaker, they were looking at the alternative of small businessmen, and they were looking at the opportunities that are there in the marketplace for entrepreneurs.

Well, the tile setter is now manufacturing clocks as a small businessman. He learned the skills of being a small businessman and he is now marketing tile clocks, Mr. Speaker, as a small businessman, and he has created employment doing it. The electrician has opened a business that is in the business of audio and visual marketing and he, too, has created employment. So for individuals that have the initiative to examine their skills and look at the options and the alternatives such as the entrepreneurship centre supported by this government, there are opportunities out there, Mr. Speaker. In fact, I believe that is why we're seeing 22,000 more people working in 1986 over 1985, because they are looking at alternatives; they are looking at the jobs that are available, examining their skills with the assistance of the programs and the career centres that this government feels so strongly about, their role in assisting individuals who are looking at options to unemployment.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that it is the government's role to create jobs, because obviously we are not reducing the quality of the programs we deliver; we are reducing the magnitude of the programs that we're delivering. Therefore, there is a need for fewer people to deliver those programs, and that's quite an evident fact, Mr. Speaker. Therefore, I would encourage -- and the Leader of the Opposition asked in question period just today what we would suggest for the individuals that have been working for government or for agencies that are funded by governments. I am pleased to take this opportunity to answer that question that he didn't have the courtesy to listen to the answer at that particular time, and that is: examine the options, look at the skills you have, talk to the professionals, and examine your options.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, I think the Department of Career Development and Employment plays a significant role. In fact, last year our department alone either counseled or assisted people to look at alternatives or find jobs. The number was in excess of 500,000 people, and I think that that's a significant number. I think, in fact, that this department works, and I think that our thrust in the area of job creation, in the area of training, works absolutely. Certainly, when there's a downturn in the economy, such as agriculture and energy, when the demand for our commodities on a world market is not as high as it has been in the past nor as high as we anticipated it to be, yes, in fact, there is going to be higher unemployment. But we must look at the alternatives.

Two-thirds of all new jobs created in this country, Mr. Speaker, are created by small business. I could go on and on about our commitment to small business and how we see small business as the role for creating jobs. So when you talk about job creation, you don't look at the Department of Career Development and Employment. You don't look at our capital works projects. You look at all of the departments that we have as a government and what they deliver in terms of a commitment to small business, allowing them to expand, allowing them to create the jobs. We're finding in this restructuring of the economy in Alberta and Canada, Mr. Speaker, that the service-producing sector of this economy is the area that jobs are being found; it's not the goods-producing.

So if the members opposite are looking for smokestacks in terms of diversification, Mr. Speaker, they're not going to see them, because the goods-producing side of the economy is not creating the jobs. It's the service-producing side; it's the small businessman; it's the people that are looking for their niches in the Alberta market, in the Canadian market, and in the international marketplace, Mr. Speaker. We have seen a dramatic in-

crease in our export sales around the world as a result of small business examining the options beyond Canada's borders, beyond Alberta's borders, beyond the borders of the United States, to find areas where they can find a niche and they can produce to a demand in a world economy. I think we're on the leading edge of that today, Mr. Speaker. I think it's happening. It's very evident when you look at the statistics of the relationship of our exports to our gross domestic product, and I'm quite excited about the prospects, as are my colleagues that work in that particular area dealing with the private sector.

Job creation in this province is going to come from the tourism industry, and I'm pleased that my colleague the Minister of Tourism is here, because we meet on a regular basis and we talk about the opportunities for job creation as a result of expanding our commitment to tourism. There is no question in my mind that the third pillar of this economy in Alberta is going to be in the tourism area, and certainly the Olympics are going to be a good example of how there is going to be attention drawn to the province of Alberta worldwide, and it will pay dividends in the future. It's evident, our commitment to the Olympics, but moreover, our major commitment is to the legacy that the Olympics are leaving here, because that's where the dividends are going to come in terms of job creation -- not by governments hiring people holus-bolus just to try and reduce the unemployment rate; that's not the case.

Mr. Speaker, I should also point out that in fact Alberta has over the last 10 years been a net recipient of interprovincial migration to this province. There are 163,000 people in terms of net migration to Alberta from 1976 to 1986; 163,000 people have come to this province from other provinces over the last 10 years. My hon. colleagues would like to compare us to Manitoba. Well, I can tell them that in the last 10 years there has been a net outflow of 43,000 people. So, in fact, people are coming to this province. They still see Alberta as the land of opportunity. They see the opportunities are here in Alberta, and the smart businessmen will be in Alberta over the next two years because herein lie the opportunities in Canada if not North America. [interjections]

I quite frankly get sick and tired of hearing the gloom and doom. I realize they are the opposition, Mr. Speaker, and that's their job. They speak about co-operation. The hon. Leader of the Opposition spoke about co-operation as MLAs, as people in this room to move to higher ideals of higher employment and of diversification. Well, that doesn't come by being naysayers and knockers, Mr. Speaker. They have a role in terms of supporting the initiatives that are in fact creating jobs, the opportunities in Alberta. I'm new to this Legislature, Mr. Speaker, and if there's anything I've been disappointed about, it's about the negative attitude that the opposition has in this Legislature. And I'm not surprised, Mr. Speaker.

So I questioned whether I should even rise to dignify this amendment. But in any case, I did, and I thought it was important that we go on record about where this government goes in job creation. I think if Albertans see that stacked up as opposed to where they're going on job creation, there's going to be a turnaround in the next election. [interjections] They're right, but it's not in their favour, Mr. Speaker.

MS LAING: Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in support of the amendment, and I would respond first to the Minister of Career Development and Employment.

I would suggest the government is responsible for providing an opportunity for all Albertans to live and work with dignity. I

would suggest to you that your job-creation initiatives are not working, as we do in fact have a high, high unemployment rate. I would ask you: how many graduates from NAIT in fact found jobs? I would suggest we don't need them to all be entrepreneurs. I would suggest that your career centres, in counseling people, from what I hear from my constituents, counsel people who have many skills to go back and take training in the work that they have already done. So I think you need to evaluate your programs.

I'm deeply concerned about this cavalier attitude towards unemployment. Unemployment has a terrible cost for society as well as individuals. Society as a whole loses the productivity of unemployed people that could be providing much needed services to those people that could pay for them. There is the loss of expertise of those trained, and I would suggest that teachers do not need training, but probably a thousand of them will be graduating this spring that will not have jobs. We will be losing the expertise of nurses, engineers, doctors, architects. On top of that, those that will remain in high-stress positions will burn out because of the lack of support services.

There will be loss of enthusiasm of the newly trained people that come out of the university, and again, I have spoken to people who have worked with first-year teachers who bring all sorts of ideas and enthusiasm into the schools, and those people will be losing their jobs as a result of layoffs. It is this energy, this creativity, this enthusiasm that will be required to recreate our society, to bring forth the recovery that you talk about, and I'm suggesting that those people may well be moving out of the province. We will see that people, individuals, young people particularly, will lose their opportunity to develop careers, to create families and homes, and that those years, the years of their youth, are their most productive years, the most important years, and they cannot be recaptured. I would suggest to you that the youth unemployment in this province is a crime against the young people that live here.

We pay another cost in this society in terms of the violence on the streets. We know that there's an increase of robberies and break-ins when there's a high increase in the rate of unemployment. There is an increase of violence against people, including rape. There is an increase of violence in the homes in terms of battering, child abuse, sexual abuse, as people take out their rage and sense of powerlessness and lack of control on the people closest to them because their voices are not heard by the Legislatures and the policymakers.

Indeed, there is also an increase in mental illness in terms of despair and hopelessness. People retreat into their homes, into alcoholism, into drug abuse, and they give up trying and end up suiciding. For every 1 percent increase in the unemployment rate, there is a 4 percent increase in suicide in the next two years. This lag time represents a time of growing desperation as unemployed people use up all of their resources, and often have to live off the goodwill of families, relatives and friends. After approximately two years those resources have been depleted, as has been their sense of self and their self-esteem as a person capable of contributing to society. I believe people want to be able to contribute to society, and high unemployment rates deny them that opportunity. In addition, these people suffer from a tremendous sense of failure and of guilt. They believe that they and their world would be better off if they were dead, that they are just a burden to society.

Another cost of high unemployment is the loss of purchasing power in terms of goods and services increasing the spiraling unemployment rate and the economic decline. The reasons for

employable people being on welfare, I would suggest, is not a lack of job skills or experience, but a lack of jobs. They are unemployed not due to personal deficits but due to the failure of the system to provide them with an opportunity to work.

Indeed, recent cutbacks in government spending are resulting in increasing numbers of unemployed due to layoffs as well as cutbacks to grants to municipalities, health care, and education. I would suggest that the municipalities, the health care, and the education systems have no part in the decision-making process that looks at how much money they will have to spend. They only have any power in deciding how they will manage without money, and that is unfair to them. I would suggest that the people that are being laid off will in a year be numbered among the unemployed employables on social assistance. The government through indiscriminate cutbacks policy are adding to the problem of unemployment and all of its attendant problems. Therefore, I would move a subamendment to the amendment. The wording is:

and further regrets the continuation of those cutback policies which further worsen the already high rate of unemployed Albertans.

I would hope that the government members would listen and take these remarks seriously.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Member for Edmonton Highlands, the Chair will recognize the member after this subamendment has been distributed to the whole House. Thank you.

The subamendment is in order. The Chair recognizes Edmonton Highlands on the subamendment.

MS BARRETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In supporting the subamendment as moved by the Member for Edmonton Avonmore, I'd like to contrast it with comments made by the leader of the government just a few days ago, Friday, March 6, in this very House when it was put to him that it would be a good idea if the Legislative Assembly struck a select standing committee to deal specifically with unemployment and job creation, those two issues being the primary issues in the minds of the Alberta public. The Premier had the gall to say, "I can't imagine a more foolish effort." In contrast to that, I must say that I can't imagine a less sensitive response from the very person that 144,000 Albertans are looking to for leadership on the crisis which is wracking the very essence and foundation of this province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the subamendment

regrets the continuation of those cutback policies which further worsen the already high rate of unemployed Albertans.

The point that's being made here is that when there is the inability in other sectors of an economy to provide the basis of production and sustenance for the human beings participating, such as they may, in that economy, people look to the government to provide those alternatives. I've listened to the Premier, the current Finance minister, the previous Finance minister, the previous Premier talking about the bogeyman of deficits and how it is that it's smarter for us to allow for unemployment to continue to grow unabated than it is for us to invest in the future of Alberta by allowing a deficit of some sort provided that it's directed. That of course, is not the philosophy of the government because the government has a perspective which says that debt is bad, period, no matter what it is used for.

Well, I would like to present an alternative to that. It is my estimation that the government is not going to reduce significantly or eliminate its current projected deficit by eliminating the jobs that will go with the across-the-board 3 percent decrease to the four major funding agencies of the province; that

is, municipalities, higher education institutions, education, and hospitals and medical care systems. In fact, it would seem to me that what we will accomplish is nothing more than adding to the debt that Ottawa -- that is, the federal government -- may incur in trying to keep some of those people on unemployment insurance for the duration that those individuals are allowed. And then what will happen is that those people who remain unemployed will come back to need the help of the Social Services department in Alberta, such as they are able to get that which is not entirely sufficient as you know, and which involves an awful lot of loopholes, as I'm sure all members know.

Now, this is a system which in fact perpetuates the economic destruction that characterizes the current syndrome in which Alberta's economy sits. In other words, the greater the unemployment the greater the industrialization syndrome, the lower the hope for investors to continue or even look to Alberta as a new place for investment opportunities. In other words, we do nothing more than drive our economy further down a spiral into acute and sustained depression as opposed to prolonged and barely contained recession.

Now, on the matter of deficit financing, Mr. Speaker, for those who have ever studied the issue, you will know that there are considerations for deficit financing when it comes to providing the infrastructure which is helpful if not necessary for attracting foreign investment and for attracting investment from Albertans and Canadians. This is commonly known as a public investment in public capital stock, Mr. Speaker. In other words, what you do by keeping people employed is use your social and planning priorities to determine how best you can keep people employed and engage in the projects which will see to the continuance of a stable economy or at minimum assist in the regaining of an economy onto a stable trajectory. It comes as no surprise to me that the current government is too shortsighted to take these perspectives into account.

Now, it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that if we engage in the sort of layoffs that this government has already precipitated -- and we don't even know the real extent of those layoffs yet; we won't know that until the budget and maybe even the budget that will be tabled in the spring of 1988 -- we're going to help 'deskill' our population, chase qualified, skilled Albertans to the nearest bonier, looking for jobs, looking for the ability to keep themselves alive, and we're going to continually erode the industrial base, such as it is, of this province, which in turn is going to put this province into an economic status of have-not on a continual basis year after year. This is the very policy that a government should not employ in trying to somehow reintroduce a notion of possible prosperity down the road.

It occurs to me further that by adding to our unemployment and taking away individual Albertans' ability to participate in the demand side of an economy, we're not just going to hurt the individuals, in particular those who are unemployed; we're also going to be indirectly attacking the other pillar industry of our economy. In concert with absence of programs designed to ensure that farmers are able to maintain their land and their equipment we will in fact be promoting to the depopulation of rural Alberta. Then if we don't have any answers for a new industrial base in this province, we're guaranteed a permanent have-not status. No projections needed. You can drop your research departments. It's absolutely certain that that's what's going to happen, Mr. Speaker.

When I hear the manpower minister talk about how it is that this government is engaging in the retraining of Albertans, I have to point out that I think the underlying assumption is that

Albertans are not highly trained. That's not so, Mr. Speaker. The problem in Alberta is that those highly trained people haven't got any jobs to go to. And despite the rhetoric of this government about the importance of the private sector -- which, by the way, I do believe is important -- and despite their rhetoric about how it is that government had better not compete with the private sector by intervening in public matters such as economic crises characterized by severe and chronic unemployment, I have to say that that's deflection. That's running away from the issue. That, I think, is personified by the Premier's statement of last Friday in which he said he couldn't "imagine a more foolish effort" than striking a special select committee to deal with, in a comprehensive way, unemployment and job creation in Alberta. It's a real slap in the face to Albertans, Mr. Speaker.

It occurs to me in closing that there are a number of studies that exist, both in Canada and the United States, which indicate that regardless of the type of social service program we're talking about with respect to supporting unemployed people, there is genuine merit in considering adding a few percentage points to the money that it costs to keep people on, say, unemployment insurance or on social allowance and actually creating real jobs in a comprehensive way.

Now, I'm not talking about work for welfare, Mr. Speaker, because I don't think that is any answer. I'm talking about if you have an individual who is drawing \$10,000, \$11,000 a year from the unemployment system or from the social allowance system, maybe it would be smarter, and in fact there are a number of studies which would prove this, to spend 10 or 15 percent more than that \$10,000 or \$11,000, direct it into a program -- perhaps an industrial base, perhaps a public capital stock base, perhaps an infrastructural base, whatever the public will determine -- and keep those people employed. The benefits are that you increase genuine demand, because people have money in their pockets again and they also have the belief that they have a stability of income so that they are prepared to spend, and they do spend. That in turn helps promote the re-escalation of the industrial base in which we invested collectively.

I notice that the cabinet has no problem in investing millions of dollars at a time in companies of questionable industrial worth behind closed doors . . .

MR. SIGURDSON: You put that nicely.

MS BARRETT: Thank you. It's true. My friend said I put that nicely.

The government has no problem in spending all kinds of money like that, but the minute it comes to talking about social planning on the basis of publicly determined priorities, suddenly that's an intrusion into the private sector and into the workings of the economy. Well, let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, that invisible hand that Adam Smith talked about hasn't existed since Adam Smith has existed. And until we wake up and recognize that we're in a mixed economy that permits us with our intellectual capacity to help offset the downturns in an economy by increased public spending, or at least stabilized public spending, and hopefully with similar intelligence tells us to reduce our public spending when there is no slack within the private-sector investment, then maybe that's what we ought to do. That, I think, is the whole point behind the amendment, which I support and which I am speaking to. The idea here is that it makes no sense to cure what is essentially a crisis of unemployment by adding to it.

I hope that those words will help convince the government to

support and vote in favour of this subamendment,

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Speaker, speaking on this subamendment. A particularly insidious feature of some of the government cutbacks is that while they purport to be cutbacks of money, they do in fact cost jobs but don't achieve the object of really cutting back money. They are false economies and in some cases actual illusions -- not simply delusions but illusions.

Take the area that I am responsible for, Attorney General and Solicitor General, in my critic role. Here we have cases where prosecutors are dispensed with, Mr. Speaker, but the caseload is such that private firms are employed to do the same work. So there isn't a freeze on consulting work and the like, but there is a freeze on prosecutors and other people in the Attorney General's department and dismissals of some of them from the government service. But the cost of employing private counsels is greater than that of employing the skilled prosecutors who have been doing the job in the past, so we lose jobs but pay more anyway.

The same thing has happened in the family and youth courts, Mr. Speaker, where private counsel have been hired to replace those who have been phased out in the government service at a higher cost. Not only is the per hour rate higher, but because the counsel aren't as skilled as those that have been let go, the total is considerably higher. But somehow it looks better in the books, and in fact there has been a net loss of jobs. Transcription services to the court, to the Queen's Bench: the proposal there is to cut them, but what happens is that the public who are involved in litigation -- and not all of us can avoid being involved at some time -- pay more.

So the cutbacks are an illusion in many cases -- cutbacks with social workers, for example, so that each of them has a load that exceeds 250 cases per worker. It's impossible to administer them with any accuracy, so there are cases where those who are not entitled to certain allowances take advantage of the impossibility of scrutiny of the cases to obtain allowances they're not entitled to at the expense of those many who are entitled to allowances but, again, whose workers cannot adequately investigate their cases and give them what they're entitled to.

So I just wanted, Mr. Speaker, to bring to the attention of the House not only the adverse effect of cutbacks on the employment problem, which the subamendment speaks to, but, beyond that, the illusion that jobs really are being dispensed with at a saving to the Treasury. I speak in favour of the subamendment and hope it will reach a vote, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. SPEAKER: The question is called on the subamendment. All those in favour of the subamendment, please say aye.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed, please say no.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

[Several members rose calling for a division. The division bell was rung]

[Eight minutes having elapsed, the House divided]

For the motion:

Barrett	Mitchell	Sigurdson
Ewasiuk	Mjolsness	Strong
Hawkesworth	Pashak	Taylor
Laing	Piquette	Wright
Martin	Roberts	Younie
McEachern		

Against the motion:

Adair	Elliott	Musgrove
Ady	Fischer	Nelson
Alger	Fjordbotten	Oldring
Anderson	Getty	Orman
Betkowski	Heron	Pengelly
Bogle	Horsman	Reid
Bradley	Hyland	Russell
Brassard	Isley	Schumacher
Campbell	Johnston	Shrake
Cassin	Jonson	Stewart
Cherry	Koper	Trynchy
Clegg	Kowalski	Weiss
Cripps	McCoy	West
Day	Mirosh	Young
Downey	Moore, R.	Zarusky
Drobot	Musgreave	

Totals	Ayes - 16	Noes - 47
--------	-----------	-----------

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

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

MR. YOUNIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to support the amendment as put forward by the Leader of the Official Opposition. In beginning, I would like to hearken back to something said earlier today by the Premier in talking about faith in the strength of Albertans. I certainly share his faith in the strength of Albertans. Unfortunately, I also have to share in the lack of faith that Albertans seem to have in the strength of the government to do something concrete.

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

MR. SPEAKER: All those in favour of the motion, please say aye.

HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

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

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, before moving adjournment of the House, I should tell hon. members that it is not the intention that the Legislature sit tonight or tomorrow night.

[At 5:29 p.m. the House adjourned to Tuesday at 2:30 p.m.]

[Motion on subamendment lost]

