

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Title: **Thursday, April 30, 1987 2:30 p.m.**

Date: 87/04/30

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

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

PRAYERS

MR. SPEAKER: Let us pray.

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

Amen.

head: INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, it's my very great privilege today to introduce to you and to members of the Assembly, Mr. Maurice Grimand, who is the Médiateur of the republic of France and who is here in Edmonton attending the International Ombudsman Institute's directors' meeting. With him is Dr. Randall Ivany, the former Ombudsman of Alberta and the executive director of the institute. They're both in your gallery, and I would ask them to rise and receive the very warm welcome of the Assembly.

head: INTRODUCTION OF BILLS**Bill 34****Occupational Therapy Profession Act**

MR. JONSON: Mr. Speaker, today I request leave to introduce a Bill, being the Occupational Therapy Profession Act.

This Bill, which conforms to the government's policy on professions and occupations, provides professional legislation for an important group of professionals working in the area of preventative and rehabilitative education and health care in the province of Alberta.

[Leave granted; Bill 34 read a first time]

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill 34 be placed on the Order Paper under Government Bills and Orders.

[Motion carried]

head: TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure to table today the annual report of the Surface Reclamation Fund for the fiscal year to March 31, 1986, which shows a deposit reserve of \$53.6 million, and the reclamation research annual report for 1985, which identifies reclamation research projects funded by the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund.

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, I wish to file the community tourism action plan manual with the Assembly. All mem-

bers received copies of the manual on April 15, the date the manual was released to the public, and all municipalities have also received a copy.

MR. YOUNIE: I'm pleased to file with the Assembly for the information of all members the document I quoted from yesterday in question period, that being a transcript of a speech given by the Minister of the Environment on March 16. [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: The whole procedure raises in the mind of the Chair whether or not the Minister of the Environment has added a new member to his staff.

It's my pleasure to table the 20th annual report of the office of the Ombudsman of the province of Alberta.

head: INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS

MR. ALGER: Mr. Speaker, my constant bragging in this Assembly of the beauties of the Highwood constituency can now be substantiated by 80 energetic students from the Senator Riley junior high school in High River and the Cayley junior high school in Cayley. They are accompanied by their teachers Mr. Bill Young, Mr. Harold Rienders, Mr. Goble, and Mr. Holowaychuk, and their competent bus drivers and parents are Mrs. Davis, Mrs. Campbell, Mr. Day, and Mrs. Borger. Indeed, the Member for Little Bow has some students in this group too, and I'm proud to tell him so. My students and their associates are seated in the public gallery, I believe. I ask that they stand, and I request the Assembly to join me in offering these young people the warmest of welcomes ever.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, just for the record I would like to identify two of those people that have been noted by the hon. member: Andrea Wojick and her mother, Mrs. Wojick. I would like them to stand and get a special recognition as well.

MR. FOX: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure to introduce to you and to members of the Assembly today, 18 grade 11 students from the Tofield school. They're studying Law 20, and they're here today to see firsthand how laws are made in the province of Alberta. They're seated in the members' gallery, accompanied by their teacher, Mr. Bruce Buruma, and their bus driver, Mrs. Christensen. I'd ask them to stand and receive the traditional warm welcome of the members of the Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER: St. Albert, followed by Ponoka-Rimbey, followed by Westlock-Sturgeon.

MR. STRONG: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just to show that St. Albert, that beautiful community, is not left out, it gives me a great deal of pleasure today to introduce to you and through you to members of the Assembly, two of my constituents from St. Albert. They are seated in the public gallery, and they are Mrs. Susan Gunn and Mrs. Terry McKay. I would ask that they rise and receive the traditional warm welcome of the Assembly.

MR. JONSON: Mr. Speaker, it's my privilege today to introduce to you and through you to Members of the Legislative Assembly, representatives of the profession of occupational therapy. They are Rita Den Otter, president of the Alberta association of occupational therapists; Dr. Helen Madill, president of the Canadian Association of Occupational Therapists; Sharon Brintnell, chairman of the Department of Occupational Therapy

at the University of Alberta; and officers and members of the board of directors of the association: Vicky Wirth, Susan Illmayer, Marita Darbye, Nancy DeCock, Betty Lou Smathers, Gerri Watson, Holly Wong-Mah, Deanna Winter, and Allison McKinnon.

Mr. Speaker, these individuals have worked hard to see the professional Bill introduced today come to fruition, and I'm sure they will work in the future for the betterment of their profession. They are seated in the members' gallery. I would ask that they stand and receive the traditional welcome of the Assembly.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure today to introduce to you and through you to the members of the Chamber, 26 students from the grade 6 class in the Legal school in my constituency of Westlock-Sturgeon. They are accompanied by their teacher, Mr. Gene Krupa, and seven parents: Mrs. Kagi, Mrs. Wanda Nonay, Mrs. Bonnie Morin, Mrs. Carmen Morin, Georgette L'Heuneux, Mrs. Donna Lessard, and Mrs. Fauntie Dzeryk. Would they rise now and receive the welcome of the Legislature.

head: ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Hospital Funding

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the first set of questions to the minister of hospitals and medicare. On March 11 the minister told the Assembly that no hospitals had been forced to close beds because of the government's cutbacks in hospital funding. The truth wins out in the end. This week the Official Opposition surveyed hospitals in Edmonton and Calgary, our two major cities. We found that in Edmonton, of the ones we have been able to track down, at least 460 beds have been shut down, and in Calgary a further 242 beds. That's over 700 beds, Mr. Speaker. My question is: how can the minister sit in this Assembly and justify bed closures of this magnitude in our two major cities?

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, first of all, I don't believe the figures just quoted by the hon. Leader of the Opposition in his preamble to the question are at all accurate with respect to what is occurring on April 30, 1987. What the hon. Leader of the Opposition has gathered are figures that relate to the bed closures that may occur in hospitals throughout the entire fiscal year from now to the end of March 1988. A number of hospitals are planning bed closures during certain months of the year. Certainly July and August are traditional months when hospitals will close beds in larger numbers than they might at other times of the year. Hon. members should be aware that for years and years and years -- and certainly this past summer was no exception -- several hundred beds are closed in both Edmonton and Calgary during the summer months because it's more economical to close wards and beds than to leave them half empty and employ full staff to look after them. So that's what's occurring right now. Hospitals are looking at their operation and seeing if there's some way they can garner some savings in costs by closing beds during certain months of the year.

In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, some hospitals are closing some of their beds for the full year and trying to consolidate their operations into a smaller number of patient beds. In most of those cases, the hospitals are conducting their affairs such that there is better utilization of the remaining beds. As I said in this Assembly not long ago, many of the hospitals that used to

run at full speed for five days a week are now running at full speed for seven days a week and 24 hours a day.

The bottom line is that we believe that most hospitals can meet the budgetary target of operating with 97 percent of last year's funds, and do that in a way that doesn't affect patient care in an abnormal way. I'm confident the administrators, the doctors, and the nurses of this province can meet that target.

MR. MARTIN: Well, supplementary question. I might point out to this minister, if he knows what's going on, the vast majority of those beds are already closed.

It is clear, despite what the minister says -- and he talked about consolidation of services and all the rest of it -- there is no way the health care system can be maintained with the funding being provided by this government at this particular time. I want to ask the minister this question: will the minister finally confirm that he -- this minister -- must finally accept responsibility for these bed closures rather than blaming it on the hospital boards?

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, again the hon. Leader of the Opposition has little knowledge of what's actually occurring. The funds provided for the hospital system in this province on a per capita basis still exceed any province in Canada. Even with the closures which may take place over the course of this summer, the number of hospital beds -- active treatment beds -- in this province as compared to any other province in Canada is still greater. There is no question that the medical dollars provided for hospital operations by this government are adequate to meet the needs of Alberta citizens. The challenge, which is being accepted by the medical community throughout Alberta, is to try to meet the needs of our citizens in the system with fewer dollars than they had in 1986. They are meeting that challenge, and in my view, Mr. Speaker, they are doing it exceptionally well.

Now, at no time did I suggest that there would not be any bed closures. What I said was that this government was not forcing hospitals to necessarily close beds. [interjections] Well, the hon. members ought to be aware that there are 127 active treatment hospitals in this province, and if the Leader of the Opposition had done his proper survey, he would have found that the vast majority of them have not closed any beds. They've been able to reach the budgetary target that's been laid down for them in terms of this year's operating costs without closing beds, and I'm pleased that they've been able to do that.

MR. MARTIN: As usual, the minister is trying to evade the issues. I was talking about the major cities, Calgary and Edmonton. I know you've built a lot of hospitals in the rest of the province where they have a 15 percent vacancy rate. That's not the question. I'm asking: is this minister saying that there are absolutely no problems in the hospitals in the two major cities now, that everybody is getting elective surgery and that all the other needs are being served in this city right now, that there are no problems with these bed closures? Is this what this minister is trying to tell us?

MR. M. MOORE: It's interesting, Mr. Speaker, that each time the hon. Leader of the Opposition gets up, he concedes that his last preamble wasn't quite accurate; there was a little something wrong with it. I wonder if he will [inaudible].

It's also interesting to note that the hon. leader is still expounding the NDP and Liberal philosophy that rural hospitals

ought to be closed. That isn't our philosophy. They are operating at a lower cost per patient day than any other hospitals in the province, providing a very valuable service. Mr. Speaker, I just conclude by saying that if the hon. leader wants to close rural hospitals, let him give us a list of which ones.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, the minister may try to get around the issue, but the people in the cities that are talking to us know full well what's going on. He can say everything he wants here.

My question to this minister, a very important question, is: with all these bed closures, will he explain to the House what follow-up and monitoring is undertaken to assess the effects of these bed closures and layoffs on the quality of patient care? What is he doing to check into it?

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, we have a very sophisticated and complete reporting system whereby every hospital in this province provides monthly reports to the Department of Hospitals and Medical Care relative to their total bed allocation, the utilization of those beds, services performed, waiting lists: all of that kind of thing.

Mr. Speaker, there have been in this province, as in every other province of Canada for many years, waiting lists for elective surgery. That isn't going to change; it hasn't changed because of our budgetary decisions of this year. From all the reports I've been receiving, people requiring surgery and other forms of medical attention on an urgent basis are still getting that attention, and getting it quite adequately, both in Edmonton and Calgary and throughout the rest of the province.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Could the minister indicate the rationalization at this point in time, when we have hospital beds closing, we have more beds per capita in Alberta than in any other province of Canada, and at the same time we are proceeding with building and supplying new hospitals and new beds, or new facilities? Could the minister rationalize that approach at this point in time?

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, in terms of actual additional beds, the two major areas in which new active treatment beds are being built are in Edmonton and Calgary, at the Mill Woods general hospital and the Peter Lougheed hospital, both 500-bed hospitals. The decision to build those hospitals was made in different economic circumstances and when our population growth expectations were much greater than they are today.

We've been able to resolve the matter of additional beds in both those cases in an extremely good way, with full co-operation of the communities involved and those hospital boards. For example, with regard to the Edmonton General, members will know that we announced a few weeks ago that when the Mill Woods hospital opens in April 1988, the Edmonton General hospital will be converted almost entirely to extended care beds, auxiliary beds. In fact, there will be 288 auxiliary beds, plus some 60 psycho-geriatric beds. That will result in a position where some 300 people who now occupy active treatment beds in Edmonton and who have been assessed for auxiliary care will be able to move into those auxiliary beds, thus freeing up more active beds. The end result of all of that is fewer active treatment beds in Edmonton than we presently have.

A very similar situation exists in Calgary, where we asked the Calgary General hospital to take over the operation of the Peter Lougheed and to operate both those hospitals on the basis

of one hospital on two sites. The proposal, which was just announced in Calgary a short time ago, will have the Calgary General hospital redeveloped at a much lower level of bed capacity than it presently has, down from 900 and some beds to just over 600, and Peter Lougheed opening on the basis of running programs on both sites that do not duplicate one another. The obstetrics program will move from the Calgary General to the Peter Lougheed, as will pediatrics, similar to what has occurred here in Edmonton.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton Gold Bar, followed by Calgary North Hill.

MRS. HEWES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Make no mistake: elective surgery is going to become emergency surgery in this situation, and bragging about hospital beds and numbers is not valid. We're talking about access to treatment and surgery, Mr. Minister. Will the minister admit that the vast majority of the hospitals that have not had to close beds because of the cutbacks don't have the capacity to give the treatment or surgery that's necessary? They don't have it, nor will they ever have it.

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, no, I will certainly not admit that.

MR. STEWART: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Is the minister aware of any reduction in the average length of stay in hospital, particularly in the city of Calgary and in Foothills hospital in particular?

MR. M. MOORE: Yes, Mr. Speaker. As a matter of fact, the chief of surgery at the Foothills hospital some time ago directed the surgeons in that hospital to ensure that patients who are coming in for surgery would come in, for the most part, on the day of surgery, as opposed to two or three days before, and in some cases would be released earlier.

I don't yet have a report on the actual saving in terms of hospital bed days as a result of that one initiative, but I expect it will be significant and hope that I will have that report in due course. If every hospital in Alberta attempted to utilize their beds in a better way by making moves such as that, it's almost certain that it would alleviate many of the situations that now exist for people that are on waiting lists. So it's that kind of initiative that has been developed, certainly at the Foothills hospital, that will lead us, I'm certain, into a situation where the actual medical care for individual people, even though we've had a 3 percent cut in budget, will be maintained throughout the year.

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

Dome Petroleum Limited

MR. MARTIN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct this question to the Minister of Energy. It seems that the Minister of Energy has finally realized that Alberta jobs and Alberta interests are at stake in the sale of Dome Petroleum to Amoco Corporation of Chicago. Yesterday the minister finally arrived at the view -- it took a little while, but he arrived at the view that Alberta's interests should be protected. My question to the minister: does the minister fail to appreciate that he may have compromised Alberta's interest by spending the first week chanting

the Tory federal line that big business should do whatever it wants and the more foreign-owned the better?

DR. WEBBER: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MARTIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, he's probably the only person in Alberta then that hasn't come to that realization. But now that the minister is aware that there may be some problems, my question to the minister: will the minister advise what recommendations he has made to the federal Tories regarding conditions the Alberta government wishes to place on the sale?

DR. WEBBER: None, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MARTIN: Supplementary question. Is the minister then standing up saying that he doesn't really care, that they can do whatever they want, and he's not going to say anything to protect Alberta's interests? Is that what he's telling this Assembly?

DR. WEBBER: That's not what I'm telling the Assembly, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MARTIN: Well, Mr. Speaker, this is rather an interesting reaction from a Minister of Energy in this province about one of the most major sales in Canadian history. My question to the minister is simply this: has he made any representation at all to the federal government about this sale of Dome to Amoco? Any representation at all?

DR. WEBBER: Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Leader of the Opposition is asking a question this time that he asked in the second supplementary.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, that as far as the sale of Dome is concerned to Amoco, we are very happy to see that there is a company out there that would want to buy Dome, and also interested that there's more than one, that there are two. [interjections] And then of course the NDP would like to have Petro-Canada as well buy . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: That's four.

DR. WEBBER: That's four, is it? Okay. Well, they're adding up all the time, Mr. Speaker. But, certainly, as the government of Alberta we would be very happy to see the sale of Dome occur as quickly as possible. We know that Amoco has or is going to put conditions to Investment Canada, which I hope that Investment Canada will consider carefully. With respect to investment into exploration and development, it's important that any company that's going to invest in this country have a commitment to exploration and development. I have seen the conditions that Amoco is prepared to put forth, and they look satisfactory to me.

MR. SPEAKER: Main question, Westlock-Sturgeon.

MR. TAYLOR: It's a supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary question, Westlock-Sturgeon.

MR. TAYLOR: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Energy. I don't know why he didn't just continue to sit down.

Now that he's starting to listen to the opposition and come

up with the same ideas five days or a week later about asking FIRA to take a look at the investment, could he also tell me at what stage this other bit of advice is that we have offered him, that he ask the government to suspend the sale of Dome for 30 days in order that groups of Canadian capital could purchase the company and thereby guarantee more jobs because it wouldn't be folded into another multinational?

DR. WEBBER: Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member thought so much of the original body, FIRA, that he's forgotten it's been dissolved and it's now Investment Canada, and where we are glad to see that there's foreign investment interested in coming into this country as opposed to the discouragement of it previously.

Mr. Speaker, in no way am I agreeing with the positions of the federal Liberal Party or the federal NDP in respect to their positions on the sale of Dome. The federal Liberals seem to be wanting to throw as many roadblocks into the process as possible over the name of Canadianization, which they hope will garner them votes in some parts of the country, to the discouragement of activity and development in this province. We want to see that entity sold. It is not appropriate to investment in this province under the current circumstances, and we want to see that sold as quickly as possible.

MR. SPEAKER: Member for Red Deer North.

MR. DAY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Supplementary to the minister. Will he be able to evaluate the impact of the sale of Dome on the smaller Alberta-based companies regardless of who buys Dome, either U.S. or Canadian, in light of the fact that when the sale goes through, the banks are likely to be able to collect on their debts, but the Alberta-based companies, being smaller and unsecured, will be left holding the bag, as it were? Would the minister be able to evaluate the impact of that?

DR. WEBBER: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I think that's an important question that a number of suppliers and service industry people in this province are asking, and I've been assured that that is one of the prime considerations of Amoco in the purchase of Dome. And in terms of the jobs in this province, as has been referred to earlier, should that sale take place quickly, it will have a significant impact on jobs in the service and supply sector in this province.

MR. SPEAKER: Main question, Westlock-Sturgeon.

Crop Insurance

MR. TAYLOR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I heard you, Mr. Speaker. I thought I was being yelled at for a second there.

Mr. Speaker, this question is to the Associate Minister of Agriculture. The Associate Minister of Agriculture recently released copies of a review of the crop insurance system in Alberta. While many of the recommendations included in the report would benefit farmers, it would still likely take months and years before we can expect to see any substantial changes in the system. With the recent announcements, particularly by the federal government, of cuts in grain prices and the end of the moratorium on farm foreclosures, it's imperative that we move as quickly as possible. When can the farmers expect to see a revenue insurance program in place, as recommended by that report, that would ensure prices of output or at least as well as

yields?

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Speaker, the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon is talking about the disastrous effects that the reduction in grain prices is going to have on our agricultural industry. And certainly governments try to be responsive to the problems that are out there, and that's a major problem. The task force, in its hearings throughout the province, heard from the farmers that part of the problem is not production related but revenue related, and therefore the committee recommended the prairie grain revenue insurance program be established.

I can only tell the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon that I propose to put that concept forward to the caucus and to cabinet and hope for their support.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker. I welcome the idea that it's revenue associated; maybe we'll work to something like negative income tax yet. But possibly, in view of the recent drop in grain prices, I wonder if the minister feels there may be a widespread abuse of crop insurance systems, where the farmers could collect more by leaving the crops in the field than trying to harvest them?

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the first part of the member's question, I tend to think that farmers are honest and that they will try to harvest their crops where possible and will not try to abuse the insurance program.

However, the member's next question is probably: why did we reduce the coverage for crop insurance for 1987? The answer to that question is: to keep it in relationship to the actual price of grain in Canada.

MR. FOX: Answer mine too; save me the time.

MR. SPEAKER: You might not get recognized. Westlock-Sturgeon, supplementary.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, a further supplemental. Can the minister tell the House what she intends doing to encourage the 50 percent of Alberta farmers that did not belong to crop insurance last year to join the scheme this year?

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Speaker, the percentage of farmers participating in the crop insurance program, in relationship to those growing grain, is certainly higher than 50 percent. The farmers who depend on grain and make their major living from the production of grain, for the most part, participate in the crop insurance program. I would encourage all farmers to participate in the safety net programs that we've been talking about and that we're trying to establish, such as the crop insurance program and the red meat stabilization program.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, some form of concrete encouragement would certainly be appreciated by the farmers, like lowering fees or the government putting a little bit more in than they have been. Could the minister tell the House whether she intends to increase farmers' premiums for the high-risk subsidy, as was recommended in the report?

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Speaker, the high-risk subsidy is a participation by the provincial government, not by the farmer.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary, Stettler.

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Should the minister decide to proceed with the recommendation contained in the report for a revenue assurance program, I wonder if she has done any study as to what it might cost and who will pay that cost?

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Speaker, the recommendation of the committee was that the crop insurance program be a tripartite program, whereby the provincial government, the federal government, and the farmers would participate on an equal basis. At the present time the federal government pays 50 percent of the crop insurance costs, and the farmer pays 50 percent. The province of Alberta pays all administration and other costs.

The recommendation of a third, a third, and a third was on the premise that there be improved coverage for the agricultural sector if the provincial government participated. I might add, Mr. Speaker, that when we're talking about the prairie grain revenue insurance, governments and the business sector, in this case agriculture, generally respond to problems. It's apparent that there's a problem in the revenue side of the grain industry, so I would expect that all governments and farmers and farm organizations will take a very close look at the prairie grain revenue insurance recommendation.

MR. SPEAKER: Vegreville.

MR. FOX: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Associate Minister of Agriculture. In terms of the pressure farmers feel to put crops in on marginal land that's subject to erosion in an effort to beef up their incomes through the crop insurance program, has the minister considered any sort of a set aside program that would help farmers with the costs involved in putting some of this marginal land back into grass?

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Speaker, the member raises a problem that we have in many areas of the province, and that's grain farming marginal land on an extended basis. The cost of putting the marginal land back into hay, over and above the cost of normal farming operations, would only be the cost of grass seed, which I understand is up substantially this year. In direct answer to your question: no, but I certainly would encourage farmers to put their land back into forage, if that would in the long term be beneficial to both the farmer and to the farmland.

Federal/Provincial Highway Funding

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the minister of transportation. The minister has been quoted to say that Alberta is not getting enough federal moneys in terms of highway budgets. Could the minister indicate how much we're getting and how much more we should expect in Alberta to expend on our highway system?

MR. ADAIR: Well, Mr. Speaker, in response to the question, it stemmed from a discussion at the RTAC conference; that's the Roads and Transportation Association of Canada. At a previous meeting that was held with the ministers of transportation across Canada, in answer to how much, presently the moneys provided to all four provinces in western Canada -- Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta, and British Columbia -- there is a \$50 million allotment coming from the federal government directed specifically to the Yellowhead Highway. That breaks out into \$10

million for Manitoba, \$11 million for Saskatchewan, \$11 million for Alberta, and \$18 million for British Columbia. Of course, that's over three years as well. The allotment for the coming year is \$5 million for Alberta, with another \$5 million slated for next year, and \$1 million for the year after.

One of the concerns we've had is that there has not been any significant amount of federal funds coming into the province's four federal highways, in essence trans-Canada highways. One of the things that did occur in recent months was the recognition by the federal government of the Yellowhead as the second or the northern trans-Canada and thus, of course, the provision of some funds for that. The only other expenditure of federal funds on roads within Alberta occurs in the national park system, but we have on the agenda for discussion a possible national highway policy, which would relate to trans-Canada routes and the likes of that.

I think it's very clear, Mr. Speaker, that we don't want any inference that we would like moneys coming that may well have to go to the maritimes or to Newfoundland for roads. We recognize that they need that as well, but we would like our share of funds that would be available.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Could the minister indicate -- and the government's been in power some 15-plus years -- why we haven't been getting our share up to this point in time? Is that the fault of the provincial government or the fault of the federal government or a fault of lack of representation by our former Premier on this matter?

MR. TAYLOR: The Liberal/NDP coalition did it again.

MR. ADAIR: Every once in a while that mouth gets going before the brain clicks in.

Well, Mr. Speaker, there's a number of things, and I'm not sure that the direct reference is to why we haven't been getting funds. Two things that apply to it: any time you're going to get additional funds that would come for a road -- that would be federal funds coming in -- possibly leaves you in the position of giving up some jurisdiction over that road. And in the position we've been in in the province of Alberta, we've been working our road system to, I think, the benefit of all Albertans. And we've been pushing mainly, for the number of years we've been in office, for the recognition, number one, of the Trans-Canada north -- that's the Yellowhead route -- and that was finally achieved just recently with the help of the Hon. Don Mazankowski and the federal government, and we appreciate that very much. And I would assume that what we're going to continue to do right now is move toward what may well be the advantages of having a national highway policy. But I want to look at the advantages and the disadvantages before I make a final decision on that one.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. In terms of a national highways policy or transportation policy relative to the paving of roads, are the ministers of Canada suggesting a formula by which we will trigger in equity in terms of federal dollars relative to highway spending across Canada?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, that's one option that is certainly being considered and will be discussed in September in Saskatoon.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, I'm interested in you worrying about giving up authority; the feds would be interfering. Were you afraid they'd ask you to drive on the left-hand side of the road? But . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, that was the question. This is the supplementary question. [interjection] Well, let's get on with it; time lingers.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, I'm interested if the minister is, besides being concerned which side of the road they'd make him drive on -- but is he robbing the budget or trying to balance his highway budget by refusing to upgrade municipal roads that now have gained the traffic and have the use that they should be classified as provincial highways, like Westlock to Villeneuve, and instead he's insistent that they stay as municipal highways to save himself money?

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member, this is not debate time, and we're not now going to deal with the road from Bow Island, Burdett, to the Cypress Hills either, please.

MR. ADAIR: Well, there is a reference to a number of the many, many miles of secondary roads that are already constructed in the province of Alberta. I can use first the fact that there are probably 9,000 kilometres of those roads not yet paved, and former ministers of transportation and this minister of transportation agree that that should be a priority to the best of our ability and as long as we have the funds to do that. And then secondarily, there are the continuing requests that come from the various municipalities for the takeover of existing secondary roads into the primary system.

As far as the first question, the problem I have, Mr. Speaker, is those who go down the middle of the road and don't know which side they're on.

MR. PIQUETTE: To the minister. In view of the fact that out of the \$300 million federal funding for highway construction \$250 million is being given to other provinces outside of the western provinces, will the minister promise that he will be much more aggressive with the federal government in terms of getting more of that funding over to Alberta so that we can get thousands of people across Alberta back to work building our roads across Alberta?

MR. ADAIR: Well, Mr. Speaker, with the best highway system in North America in the province of Alberta, I'm not sure we're behind anyone. [interjections] Now, I said North America.

AN HON. MEMBER: How about the world? [interjections]

MR. ADAIR: Gosh, I woke them up.

AN HON. MEMBER: Actually, it is the best in the world.

MR. ADAIR: That's right; there isn't any question. I used North America, but I think if you want to travel and you have maybe been around the odd time, you'll find that it's the best in the world, and that's not changed.

But, Mr. Speaker, important in the sense of the reference to the \$300 million -- that was the figure that was used by RTAC; I don't know that that's the total amount of money that actually is given to the other province. It was one that was used in relation

to the amount of money that was collected by the federal government in transportation-related items and taxes, and they assume that approximately \$300 million of that is spent on roads in Canada. Again, our concern is, and we're aggressive on it, that we are not prepared to give up jurisdiction just to get dollars. We're not prepared to give up jurisdiction just to get dollars, in the interests of what we're doing. And I might say that there are other dollars that have been expended in the province of Alberta in the national parks system, with some pressure from us and our federal MPs.

MR. SPEAKER: Member for Drumheller, followed by the Member for Edmonton Centre if there's time.

Farm Acreage Statistics

MR. SCHUMACHER: Mr. Speaker, my questions are for the hon. Minister of Agriculture, and they relate to Statistics Canada information regarding farm units. I wonder if the minister could enlighten the Assembly as to these numbers and how Alberta fared compared to other provinces.

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, these figures were just released, and I should point out that they're initial figures. The final figures will be forthcoming on June 3 of this year. But Alberta has fared extremely well in that we've had the smallest decrease in the amount of farm units between 1981 and 1986, in that Alberta's decrease was in the vicinity of .5 percent, which is the smallest of any province in Canada.

MR. SCHUMACHER: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister offer an explanation as to why Alberta has shown the lowest drop of any province, especially in western Canada?

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, maybe I can point out -- and I don't want to in any way leave individuals with the impression that we are not having difficulties within the agricultural sector, because we are -- but it's interesting when one examines the figures. Our decrease was .5 percent, whereby in Manitoba they were a 7.2 percent decrease, and I think that's due in good part to the participation of the various provincial governments, whereby our budgetary contribution is in excess of 5 percent this year, close to \$.5 billion, whereas in Manitoba it's 1.8 percent of their budget, accounting for some \$70 million.

MR. SCHUMACHER: Further supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Did these figures indicate whether there's been any increase in the number of acres being farmed in Alberta, and if so, how does this compare with other provinces?

MR. ELZINGA: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Our acreage usage as it relates to the farming population has increased in excess of one million acres, some 2.2 percent, the largest acreage increase of any province in Canada.

MR. SCHUMACHER: My final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Just as a point of clarification, what rule of thumb does Statistics Canada use to define a farm unit?

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, in explaining this, it's very important to point out that that is consistent across Canada, the figures that they do use. I'm of the opinion that their figures should be somewhat higher, but there is a consistency across

Canada that they do use, and I'm more than happy to share that information in a detailed way with the hon. member in the event that he wishes it.

MR. SPEAKER: Member for Edmonton Centre, followed by the Member for Edmonton Gold Bar ... Supplementary, Calgary Buffalo?

MR. CHUMIR: Yes. I have a supplementary for the Tory chap from Sherwood Park, and I was wondering whether the minister might advise, in light of all of the agricultural land in the province and with the surplus that we have of grain, why it is that the government has been suggesting and following a policy of converting grazing leases on the basis of the need for additional farmland and additional grain. What is the rationale of that policy?

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, let me at the outset indicate, too -- and I recognize why the hon. member calls me the Tory chap from Sherwood Park -- my regret to him that I couldn't quite grasp his constituency as quickly as I should have the other day when we were participating in question period.

But as he is aware, this is a policy that has developed between our entire caucus. We wish to make sure that those individuals that are participating in a grazing lease have first call on that land in the event that it is turned over to agricultural purposes, and I'm sure my dear friend and colleague the minister responsible directly for grazing leases would like to supplement it. But we believe our first priority should be given to land that could be used for agricultural purposes.

MR. SPARROW: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would appreciate having the opportunity to supplement. If you go back into the public hearings that were held by the ECA -- and we have a long report that recommended that we do exactly what we're doing; that is, before opening new lands for agriculture, to take the lands that are there, at the least cost to everyone, and convert them first. As the minister said, it was a good policy.

In southern Alberta and central Alberta there is a problem of not having enough public lands, and we recognize that. In northern Alberta we have different problems, and I'm waiting intently to hear my colleagues with their recommendations whether or not policies like that should be the same in Red Deer as they are in Grande Prairie.

MR. SPEAKER: Member for Edmonton Centre, followed by the Member for Edmonton Gold Bar.

Health Care Insurance Plan Coverage

REV. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amidst all of the confusion and frustration that the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care has created in the health care system is the threat that the minister has been making for almost two months now: that he is going to partially deinsure from the Alberta health care insurance plan the services that average Albertans and their families receive from physiotherapists, optometrists, chiropractors, podiatrists, and so on.

Will the minister now, having dragged this issue out for so long, announce in the Legislature today that he has found better ways to reallocate the health care dollar and that he will hence not cut back on these proven health services?

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, no, I'm not able to do that today. The matter is still under discussion. I hope in due course to have a decision on it and be able to provide the hon. member with that information.

While I'm on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I have received since the opening question of the Leader of the Opposition a copy of the New Democrat's news release on hospital bed closures and would note that the information in their own news release is substantially different than the hon. Leader of the Opposition's preamble. [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton Centre, supplementary.

REV. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I am glad that "weaseling" is a parliamentary term.

MR. SPEAKER: Perhaps now all of us could hear the supplementary.

REV. ROBERTS: On the matter which I was asking the minister about, does the minister in fact think it is fair to the many Albertans who have been calling our offices, who, for instance, only see a chiropractor yet who've had their taxes go up, their medicare premiums going up, and are living with a threat that their chiropractic services are going to be less well funded?

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, the Alberta health care insurance plan in this province covers more medical services than any other plan in Canada. I've indicated to hon. members that when we brought in the budget, the amount provided for medical services under the health care insurance plan is identical to that which was experienced in the previous fiscal year. We're looking at an escalation of utilization in the area of 7 to 9 percent, so it's necessary to find ways to reduce the overall costs there by somewhere between \$45 million and \$60 million.

I've indicated as well in the House on a number of occasions, Mr. Speaker, that I would be very pleased to receive from any members of the House, and that includes members of the opposition, their suggestions as to how we might meet our budgetary targets. Thus far, after having listened to this debate in the Legislature for about two months, I've received absolutely nothing from the opposition.

REV. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, our suggestions are that the minister resign or leave the system the way it is.

Will the minister at least look into entering some form of arbitration, as he has with the Alberta Medical Association and the oral surgeons, with these other associations, so that the matter of any fee dispute may be settled fairly with them?

MR. M. MOORE: The hon. member is not very well informed on the actual situation with regard to those professions he's referring to. Unlike the doctors -- the medical profession -- the other professional people who are provided with some fee schedule under the Alberta health care insurance plan are private practitioners who do not fall under the Canada Health Act and are not restricted in any way from billing patients directly. It's not our wish to say to chiropractors, physiotherapists, podiatrists, dentists that this is the amount you can bill and there will be no billing directly of patients. Our health care insurance plan pays a certain amount, after which time the practitioner, if they feel their services are more valuable, might then bill the patient.

Under that scenario it could hardly be expected, Mr. Speaker, that we would enter into arbitration. To arbitrate what? Whether or not these people will continue to be private practitioners? Or to work for the state? I'd prefer that they continue in a private way.

MR. SPEAKER: Time for question period has expired. Might we have unanimous consent to continue this line of questions?

ANHON. MEMBER: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed? Hon. member, final supplementary from this member.

REV. ROBERTS: In terms of the utilization that the minister has spent \$300,000 in brochures to try to reduce, does the minister in fact think it's fair that these other services, which in fact have had a very steady cost to the system -- that it is fair that they are the ones that are going to be paying a disproportionate share of the cuts that the minister is contemplating?

MR. SPEAKER: Well, hon. minister, this is the second question in this line of supplementaries that's asking for an opinion, and under 359 of *Beauchesne*, subsection 11, asking opinions is really not a valid form of question.

ANHON. MEMBER: That's not fair.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, this is not a little discussion dialogue going on here, hon. member. The Chair is pointing out that two of the questions -- examine the Blues -- are seeking opinion.

Hon. minister, respond to whatever the gem of the question was.

MR. M. MOORE: Well, without giving an opinion, Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could just give one fact that should have been required reading for the hon. member. The increase in utilization of physiotherapy services, for example, over the last four years has increased to 39 percent a year. That's hardly stable, and I hope the hon. member would take the opportunity to review those facts.

MR. TAYLOR: Supplementary to the minister. I'm sure he, as I do, gets a great deal of mail on this subject, and it's a great deal of concern to many Albertans. Could he share with the Assembly whether he has a target date by which time he will have made up his mind and we will know exactly where we stand as far as the extra services are concerned?

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, yes, I'm hopeful that we can complete our discussions before the Legislature adjourns, certainly, but that depends on how long the Legislature does sit, bearing in mind that there are a number of professional groups that I've been involved in discussing these matters with. I've been listening quite closely to the public and to my colleagues in the government caucus and to members of the opposition as well who have forwarded to me their concerns with respect of the entire matter. So it is something that can't be dealt with lightly, and it does take time, and I hope to be able to complete those discussions soon and we'll have an answer.

MR. SPEAKER: Further supplementaries on this topic?

MR. MARTIN: Point of order. Mr. Speaker. I would suggest that if the minister wants to come back to the first set of questions, if he wants to do that, then I should have the right to come back with a supplementary question.

MR. SPEAKER: All right. Well, representation has indeed been made, and both hon. members could perhaps deal with it in light of what happens tomorrow.

The Chair at this stage would really like to make the representation on behalf of other members of the Chamber that all throughout this week a number of other members have been left -- well, it's baseball season -- in the on-deck circle. The same is true with respect to today; we have five members waiting in the wings. And the Chair would respectfully request all those who are into the lists of questioners automatically as well as those responding to give some care and thought to making the questions and the answers somewhat shorter.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: Might we revert to the introduction of special guests?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Member for Lethbridge West.

head: INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS (reversion)

MR. GOGO: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's indeed a pleasure to have the opportunity today to introduce a member that served many years in this Assembly. His most recent place on the floor of the Assembly was as my predecessor, as the Deputy Speaker. The Hon. Frank Appleby served all citizens of Alberta for many years in a very positive and strong way. He is seated in the members' gallery today with his wife, Dorothy. I would like to ask the hon. former Member for Athabasca to rise along with Mrs. Appleby and receive the very warm welcome of former colleagues in this House.

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, my intention was to do exactly the same thing, to introduce two very dear friends. Thank you, sir.

MR. CRAWFORD: I'll move that motions for returns 176, 199, 200, and 202 stand.

[Motion carried]

head: WRITTEN QUESTIONS

183. Ms Mjolsness asked the government the following question:

What was the average caseload served by on-line social allowance workers and by on-line child welfare workers, in each case, employed by the Department of Social Services in each of its district offices, and on the basis of the total of all such district offices:

- (1) averaged over the 1986-87 fiscal year; and
- (2) on March 31, 1987?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, the government will not be accepting Question 183. Hon. members will recognize that yesterday I filed the answer to Question 132, 1986, which contains the up-to-date practices in terms of standards, and with respect, Mr. Speaker, in our view the answer would be precisely the same for this question.

201. Ms Laing asked the government the following question:

For the 1986 annual report of the Alberta Social Care Facilities Review Committee, what were the costs of

- (1) the research and other preparatory activities not having directly to do with printing,
- (2) printing, and
- (3) distribution?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, we accept Question 201, and the answer is as follows for the costs: the art work was \$227; typesetting, \$445; printing, \$2,199; for a total of [\$2,871]. There were no other costs paid out. The research and preparation was done in house.

head: MOTIONS FOR RETURNS

175. Mr. Sigurdson moved that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing copies of those studies, reports, and other documents on the basis of which the hon. Minister of Career Development and Employment stated on March 6, 1987, *Alberta Hansard*, page 16, "the job creation program that the Premier talked about just a minute ago created 60,000 full-time jobs in this province in 1986."

[Adjourned debate April 14: Mr. Shrake]

MR. SHRAKE: Mr. Speaker, welcome to the second chapter of the ongoing saga of Motion for a Return 175, by the author, the Member for Edmonton Belmont.

It's a very unusual type of a motion. I think I should get Dusty Vida up in 503 to give some assistance in writing this type of motion, because this one asks for "copies of those studies, reports, and other documents on the basis of which the hon. Minister of Career Development and Employment ...", et cetera. In a page of *Hansard* from March 6, it was stated that regarding job creation, it "created 60,000 full-time jobs."

So of course we have to look back in *Hansard* to get, first off, where we're going. But looking into *Hansard*, we have here, I guess, the Premier speaking on job creation. In answer to a question, he spoke of "highways, parks, dams, irrigation systems" -- assistance to municipalities. And then in another place in the question he talked about tourism, the petrochemical industry, the technology and research industry, private-sector assistance, and efforts by the government that are working to maintain jobs. And this all goes back to job creation, which is in this motion for a return. And then the hon. Minister of Career Development and Employment got up and made an additional comment, speaking about 60,000 full-time jobs in the province. So I guess these are the documents and reports that we need.

Well, first off, I'd like to say that the answers to these questions and also the questions that were raised during the debate asking what our strategy are all available in the library. Read the throne speech, the estimates for the department, or if you like, you can contact the department; phone them or send them a memo. Or if all that fails, get hold of Dusty Vida up in 503.

I'm sure she'd get it for you, if you like.

But anyway, in trying to get these documents, it becomes very confusing. What documents do we want? And I've kind of looked into it, and the further I got into it -- that would be a lot of documents. I think the one day here when the Minister of Recreation and Parks brought down the material for one of these returns, it took three pages to haul the material away. When you get into this one here, I think we would take every page we have in this Legislature to haul the material away.

But I wonder if they're looking for the documents that are pertaining to the job creation in the small business sector, because if so, you can get some information on it. The Alberta Opportunity Company: if they made 305 loans to small businesses last year, well, that was a lot of jobs. Or perhaps they're looking for job creation in the agricultural sector. In '85-'86 our government committed \$109 million to the agriculture sector, which provided loans and guarantees to farmers, agricultural businesses, and food processing. And that was a lot of jobs. Or are they looking into the oil industry? Do they want the documents, studies, and reports on that?

MR. STRONG: You know we lost 50,000 there, Gordon.

MR. SHRAKE: No, there are 15,000 jobs created in there and an additional 10,000 indirect . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Chair would direct a few members to look at Standing Order 13(4)(b).

Please continue, Calgary Millican.

MR. SHRAKE: Thank you, sir. [interjection]

Oh, I see you're here today. Where is the front half of the horse? Sorry about that.

Anyway, this is some funding that's been working to provide jobs for Albertans. Or perhaps we go back and try to locate the 60,000 jobs that were specifically spoken of here. Well, there is another set of programs which you'd find in your budget, and this is the budget for capital works. First off, we have here the budget for the capital spending by the various government departments; I'm not going through them all. That's \$1.553 billion. Or perhaps you want to go into the budget for the heritage fund capital projects. Now, that was \$740 million. Or else there is the Department of Career Development and Employment. But figuring these out, this is 60,829 person-years of work in jobs. But that's not all, so perhaps the minister's figures are incorrect; 60,000 is covering this.

But are they looking for the job creation in the other areas? Because there are the job-creation programs, which are your PEP program, your STEP program, your NEED program, your wage subsidy program, the Alberta environment employment program, the employment skills program, the special placement program, the rural housing assistance program, the Alberta international marketing employment program; we've even got the Quebec/Alberta exchange program. And rather than go into the details of all of those, I'll give you the bottom-line figures on those, and there we have \$277,733,282, which created 29,481 jobs.

But I guess we're not through yet. I won't go into all the other programs. We could go into the economic development department and all the other programs, but I don't believe it would be worth while bringing all that material to the House, because I'm still waiting to see what the opposition did with that pile of material that the pages all hauled out. I'm waiting to see

a motion or maybe a Bill or something. So I would suggest that perhaps the opposition use their research budget or else phone Dusty Vida and dig up this material themselves, or else do the other thing, and write up a motion for a return and specify what is it they want.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton Kingsway.

MR. McEACHERN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to speak in favour of Motion 175, and I had a little trouble trying to figure out why the minister didn't want to make this information available. So I took a really close look at the wording of the question again, and in spite of my friend from over here, the previous speaker, saying that it isn't clear enough and somehow that he would have to look through several documents to find it, I think the onus is really on the minister to come up with this information in some kind of reasonably concise form and cover up or back up his brag.

It says here that we want

the copies of those studies, reports, and other documents on the basis of which the hon. Minister of Career Development and Employment stated on March 6, 1987, *Alberta Hansard*, page 16, "the job creation program that the Premier talked about just a minute ago created 60,000 full-time jobs in this Province in 1986."

Now, yes, he stressed the words "full-time jobs" as well in some of his other comments, in fact in that one itself. So I don't understand why the minister shouldn't seize this opportunity and lay us out a document and show not only us but the people of all of Alberta exactly how many jobs were created and in what industries, and where and why and how. In fact, if he doesn't do it, it seems to me that he embarrasses his Premier, because he's quoting his Premier as having said that, for having described these jobs. So to not come forward with the figures, with the documentation, seems to me to be leaving his Premier out to dry.

I got thinking about it, and I thought there must be something more than just worrying about his Premier's skin, though. I got thinking: he must have something personal that's bothering him about why he didn't want to make this available. And then I remembered that about a month ago in this Assembly, when he was being asked some questions, he stated that governments do not create jobs. And I thought: now, just a minute; that's in direct conflict to what he said now about these 60,000 jobs that are created by the government. So I guess these two mutually exclusive statements: one, that governments don't create jobs, and then another statement that this government created 60,000 jobs -- he must have had some sleepless nights wondering which one of these statements he should decide to try to justify or back up with some kind of detail. He probably lost a few nights sleep on it over a couple of weeks. He should have, if he didn't.

In any case, I think he thought a lot about it. I think he came down on the side of what I would call ideological idiocy; that is, the idea that governments don't create jobs. Therefore, he's embarrassed to bring in a document that says that they created 60,000 jobs. So he's avoiding that and saying, "No, we're not going to prove that, because governments don't create jobs." That's the side he came down on. Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't happen to agree with that particular philosophy, but I can see how it would be rather embarrassing when you make two conflicting statements. You have to decide to back one of them up. So I hope you go on telling us that governments don't create

jobs.

But I still can't help thinking . . . [interjections] Well, there's a few of those; that's what I was going to say. There are in fact a number of jobs that governments do create. This government, for instance, has created the biggest bureaucracy for the size of its population of any province in Canada. So I think he chose the wrong side, Mr. Minister. It is fairly obvious that this government does create some jobs. Like I said, they created a big bureaucracy. They've also created some individual jobs: one for Mary LeMessurier. In fact, she's gone to London. I mean, the job isn't in Alberta -- it's in London -- but still she created a job. That only leaves him 59,999 other jobs to find and show us that he's created or that his government has created. Then of course there's Ron Liepert, who's gone to Los Angeles, so that only leaves us 59,998 jobs to justify or to make his claim good. Then of course there is Horst Schmid, who's gone to wherever he chooses. No, I believe he chose New York. So that's 59,997. Then there's Don Getty, who's gone to Palm Springs -- no, he's not, either. I'm sorry; I was anticipating what's going to happen in the next election, actually.

MR. SPEAKER: Let's perhaps, hon. member, come back to the point of what this motion really is.

MR. McEACHERN: Well, Mr. Speaker, the point of the exercise is to embarrass the minister, quite frankly, into putting up or shutting up. He should not claim that he's created 60,000 jobs if he can't deliver, and he's just not doing it. I could name a few others, like Hugh Planche, but I'm not sure where he's gone. Then there's Dave King, but I guess he's in limbo; he has not really created a job for him. So there's some problems there, and that's only a few of the 60,000.

But in any case, Mr. Speaker, I think it's clear that governments do create jobs. Some of them are not all that good a job. I'm thinking of some of the STEP jobs. The program has some merit, but \$5.50 an hour is certainly poverty wages in this society. Although given this government's tight-fisted budget, I would suggest that an increase in the number of STEP jobs would probably be better than what we got. Nonetheless, that's not saying much, because certainly they should pay more than the \$5.50 an hour if they expect people to be able to perform the jobs that they're asking them to do.

ANHON. MEMBER: [Inaudible] full-time jobs.

MR. McEACHERN: There were some other full-time jobs, though, that this government talked about awhile back.

[Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair]

I remember very clearly that the Minister of Public Works, Supply and Services was bragging about the jobs that the Olympia & York deal was going to supply. He swore on his honour that it was not just a sweetheart deal for some friends of the Tories but that it actually was a job-creation project. So maybe you should include those in your calculations and in your list of the 60,000 jobs that you have an obligation to present to this Assembly.

ANHON. MEMBER: We can't. Those came after.

MR. McEACHERN: Oh, those came after the 60,000 were created. I'm sorry. I'm getting ahead of myself again. But in

any case, we should go back then to last year's figure and find the 60,000 jobs in last year's projects.

Mr. Speaker, I've come to think that maybe the documents that back up this claim are secret documents. I think there's something that's locked away in a safe so deep that this minister can't get his hands on it. I don't know who's the guardian of it, but in any case, either they're locked away and you can't get access to them or else he's ashamed of the documents, or maybe it's just possible that they exist only in his imagination.

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of people in my riding that would like to know about those jobs and maybe have access to see who could create 60,000 jobs last year; maybe they can create 60,000 again this year. And I know some people that are unemployed that would be delighted to have access to those jobs. I think, for example, of a young man that was waiting for some surgery. It was supposedly elective surgery, but when he can't do his job because he needs the surgery first, when is an emergency not an emergency? In fact, one of the terms that has developed, and it's happened a couple of times now in terms of people wanting to get into hospital -- did you ever hear of emergency waiting lists? I mean, that's the state we've come to in this province.

Now, that young man, when he gets over his operation, now that he has finally got in, is going to be looking for a job, and he will be very lucky to get his old one back with the kind of pressures that are in our society right now for jobs. He was one of 1,100 people waiting for elective surgery on an emergency waiting list, and that's the state we've come to in this province. Well, I know he would like to know about some of those 60,000 jobs, and he's probably worried that somebody else took one of his jobs. Are you going to count that into your 60,000? It's a matter of who gets it and who doesn't get it, but it doesn't create another job just because one person got laid off and another person took his place.

I think of a 27-year-old lawyer that is working on a STEP program. That's how tough things have got in this province at this stage. I think of a father with a wife and four kids between the ages of three and 11 that would love to know where there is a job for him, and perhaps if you told him where these 60,000 jobs were created, maybe he would have a place to look, some suggestions of where he might go.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister was talking about, if some of these jobs that he said he created were created through Vencap or the SBECs or the Alberta stock savings plan. Where were they created? Lay them out on the table and tell us exactly what dollars were put in, and not just the dollars but the number of jobs as well. And we want, of course, not just jobs but full-time jobs.

One of the things that this minister and this government have not done is address, in terms of economic development of this province, the demand side of the equation. I rattled off some of the programs that they've run -- these SBECs, the Vencaps, the small business term assistance program, and so on -- and they keep bragging about the money they're giving to support industries. But where is the money for the workers so they can go out and afford to buy the products of those industries? How can the retailers, how can the service industries sell their wares if people don't have the money to buy? So you'd better start looking at the job side of it.

I'd like to point out to this government that the federal government regularly, when they bring in a budget, indicates the dollars they're putting into specific programs and how many jobs they expect to create or how many they expect to cut back. And I think it's time this government started to become more accountable too. Nobody expects you to be 100 percent perfect every time, that that's exactly how many will be created or how many will be cut off when you cut health care and education.

But at least they could make some projections and lay some plans and see where they're going, and down the road we could then check whether or not that's what was actually happening, whether the programs were actually working or not. We don't see any of that from this government.

Mr. Speaker, I and the members of Edmonton Kingsway and in fact probably all Albertans would like to see the documentation, because I'm sure that the people of Alberta in this tough economic time would like to be comforted by the knowledge that this government really is doing the job. I mean, if you can lay that out and show everybody and we can all say, "Gee, yeah, it's really great; good stuff," that's what we would like. We would like that kind of comfort. So I can't see why you don't bring us the documentation.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Motion for a Return 175 requests copies of "studies, reports and other documents on the basis of which the hon. minister" was able to make a statement in this Legislature on March 6, in which he alleged that 60,000 full-time jobs were created in the province in 1986 directly as a result of a program of some sort which his government introduced during that fiscal year.

How did this request happen to come onto the Order Paper, Mr. Speaker? Well, I'd ask hon. members in the House today if they will turn back in their mind and come back with me to the first day after the Speech from the Throne, the second day on which this Assembly was sitting, March 6, 1987. This is as a result of a series of questions put to the hon. minister by the Member for Edmonton Belmont, and at the conclusion of that series the hon. Member for Red Deer North rose to his feet, Mr. Speaker, and asked:

At the risk of confusing members opposite with more facts, to the minister of career development, what have his job creation programs actually meant in terms of reducing unemployment in this province?

In answer to that particular question, the minister then went on to say:

I should also let members opposite know that the job creation program that the Premier talked about just a minute ago created 60,000 full-time jobs in this province in 1986. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, there are 22,000 more people working in '86 than in 1985.

Well, now that we've set the context of this statement made by the minister on March 6, I would just like to emphasize something said in that question from the Member for Red Deer North. He used the term "more facts." The member asked for more facts. Good for him, wanting facts. We want facts. We want to know about facts too. And he asked the minister what had been done to reduce unemployment. Well, we look at these statements, and the Member for Red Deer North seemed to think that there were facts on which the minister could give us some information so as not to confuse us. Well, we want those facts. And so the Member for Edmonton Belmont put a motion for a return on the Order Paper asking the minister to produce facts. Tell us what he knows that is factual. Don't give us his opinion; don't give us his speculation; don't give us his supposition. Give us the facts that are at his disposal.

In a little while, Mr. Speaker, we're going to get to vote. We're going to get to vote to determine whether the minister will have to produce facts -- facts that would support, facts that

would back up, facts that would reinforce the statements that he makes to the members in this Assembly. And then, Mr. Speaker, we'll get to see where the hon. Member for Red Deer North stands. Will he vote to provide members of this Assembly with facts? Or will he vote to deny facts to the members of this Assembly? He will have to make that decision, and in view of his question of March 6, 1987, we'll see what decision he makes when he's in the House to vote on this motion for an order for a return, as well as all the members over there on the government side of the Assembly, Mr. Speaker. They'll all have to decide whether they're going to vote to provide the Assembly with facts.

Well, I think at least as important as this, this whole little process raises a question, Mr. Speaker, as to whether we're going to continue to hear Pollyanna-type statements full of happy rhetoric, unsubstantiated rhetoric, or are we going to start hearing about realistic acknowledgments of reality from the hon. minister? Are we going to have some assurance that the government is aware of what Alberta is facing, and that they're coming to grips with those circumstances?

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, we're giving the minister all the time he needs to go out and get those studies and reports typed up, if he needs to type them up, so that they're in a form that can be presented to the Assembly. We're giving him lots of time to ponder the bleak future of many thousands of Albertans. And, Mr. Speaker, we're giving him lots of time to reconsider his public relations strategy, to rewrite his stance, so that he can in fact present a factual picture to the thousands of Albertans looking to him for hope and for meaningful action. That's what we're giving him lots of time to do. So there's no excuse that he didn't have enough time to produce facts.

Now, the minister rose in the Legislature on April 2 and said that these are something that are internal documents provided to him as a minister of the Crown, and therefore, Mr. Speaker, for some reason he's not under any compulsion to table them in the Legislature. These are documents that are alleged to support the notion that his government has reduced unemployment. Well, even though the minister has said that his government created 60,000 full-time jobs, he can't, or won't, release the information on which that allegation was made. I wonder.

Mr. Speaker, I try to imagine if I had those documents in my filing cabinet in my office and I was the Minister for Career Development and Employment. I would table them. Sure, I would. If I had the documentation that proved that 60,000 jobs had been created by my government in this province, I would be only too keen to provide it. I wouldn't be waiting for any member of the opposition to put a motion for a return on the Order Paper. I mean, look, what a success story. Here's the government in response to difficult circumstances, in one year single-handedly creating 60,000 jobs. What a wonderful story to tell the people of the province and to demonstrate and prove to them what a good job that I and my government are doing. I mean, I'd call a press conference. I'd make a ministerial statement. I would release all the reports in triplicate and quadruplicate, many, many times over for every member of the press gallery. I would make self-congratulatory speeches. I would quote it in the throne speeches. I'd get my backbenchers to pound on their desks. Ah, what a wonderful thing it would be to show the province.

MR. PIQUETTE: Jubilation [inaudible].

MR. HAWKESWORTH: That's right. The bells would ring all

over the province if I could produce that kind of documentation. In fact, you'd expect a government to be enthusiastic about releasing that kind of evidence and only too glad to show it around and tell everybody. So why, Mr. Speaker . . .

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Associate Minister of Agriculture, would you quote your point of order, please?

MRS. CRIPPS: The minister has given news releases, and the minister has talked about the number of jobs he . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. Perhaps if an hon. member wishes to raise a point of order, then perhaps they could begin by quoting the section of *Standing Orders*.

MRS. CRIPPS: Standing Order 306. [interjections]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Calgary Mountain View.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I hesitate to say that it's not just the opinion of the minister which has been widely broadcast. That's not what's crucial at this juncture. It's the documentation and the objective evidence to substantiate his happy, Pollyanna-type rhetoric.

So why don't they produce this documentation? Mr. Speaker, they brag about everything else whenever they've got these reports about things that are going well for the government. We haven't seen too many of them lately, but we know that when times were good for the government, all these sorts of reports and documents were very public and they were quite happy to release them.

But it also raises the question, and I only ask this as a question: is it possible that the minister doesn't have the documentation? Is that it? Maybe the minister became confused and inadvertently said something that he got mixed up, or something in his own mind that somehow didn't fit. But maybe he was just too enthusiastic. I don't know. We could speculate, but that wouldn't get us anywhere. All we want are facts. That's why we're here and that's why this motion for a return.

So in the absence of the minister actually tabling something for us, perhaps we could reconstruct facts that we do know are public and then test the minister's allegation of 60,000 full-time jobs just to see if it's possible that there might be some documentation or a report somewhere that might exist on this matter. So I wonder if we could maybe take a look at some statistics that do get released from time to time in the minister's office. Those are the Statistics Canada figures that are compiled and released monthly by the minister's office, as I understand it.

I wonder if we could just go over the columns a bit that Statistics Canada produces, and let's take a look at June 1986. As I remember, that was my first time in this Assembly and the first budget speech that I had ever heard presented by the hon. Provincial Treasurer, at which point this particular program of spending and fiscal regime was introduced. Let's look at June 1986. Now, the unemployed in Alberta in June of 1986 on an adjusted basis were 135,000, and on an unadjusted basis -- I suppose maybe you feel better if you're unadjusted being unemployed or maybe you feel better when you're adjusted and unemployed; I don't know, but at least these are provided in two columns -- the figure for June of 1986 was 131,000. But what's more important are those that were employed. On an adjusted

basis, there were 1.145 million Albertans working. And if you want to look at the unadjusted figure, 1.163 million people were working.

What happens when we go to February of 1987? About the time when the minister made his statement in this Legislature, the only figures that were available at that time were those of February 1987. What do we find there? Well, we find the number of Albertans employed in that month on an adjusted basis were 1.133 million. What does that tell us? On an adjusted basis, there were 12,000 fewer Albertans working in February of 1987 than there were in June of 1986. Well, seeing that Statistics Canada provides us two sets of figures, let's look at the unadjusted rate. In February of 1987 there were 1.108 million Albertans working. And the difference in February of 1987 with that of June 1986 was that there were 55,000 fewer people working in Alberta between those two months. That's what led me to wonder if perhaps the minister had gotten a bit confused because 55,000 is close to 60,000; the only problem is that it was going in the wrong direction.

Now, the question is: do these statistics support the minister's contention that 60,000 jobs were created in 1986? Well, let's take the difference between the lowest employed total in 1986 -- in that year we would have to go to January, in which 1.127 million people were working -- and the highest, in July of 1986: 1.183 million. But, Mr. Speaker, none of this could really, I imagine, be attributed to the spending program in that year's fiscal plan. But the difference is 56,000. That's close to 60,000. Maybe that's what the minister was talking about. But then it would probably be stretching the point to claim that they were full-time jobs, because apparently 11,000 of them were lost in one month, and 40,000 were lost in two months. The employed figure from January '86 to January '87 actually declined by 20,000. And if we go from February 1986 to February 1987, the figures are even worse.

Well, it seems safe to conclude, Mr. Speaker, that even if we accepted the minister's contention that 60,000 full-time jobs were created in Alberta in 1986, and I would just say it would be stretching the bounds of our imagination to even consider that, but if we do consider that, at least that many and probably many more were lost very shortly afterwards.

Now, I would submit that those figures from Statistics Canada do not support the minister's contention. But they do highlight something else, however. In his estimates, which we've reviewed in this Legislature recently, the minister said that there were 1.271 million people in the work force in 1986,

which is a 1.8 percent increase in the size of the labour force in the province of Alberta. That's an increase of 22,000 people moving into the labour force . . .

Later in that same evening the minister went on to state:

There are some areas that are indicative of where this economy is going. As I indicated earlier, there were 22,000 jobs created between 1985 and 1986.

Well, Mr. Speaker, again this is maybe getting into the realm of confusion in the minister's mind, but the fact that there were additional people in the work force does not support the contention that extra jobs were created. Now, perhaps then the minister was confused when he said 60,000 jobs were created. Perhaps he thought that there were 60,000 more people in the work force, although that contradicts the statements in his estimates.

Again, we're trying to construct what might be reasonably accurate facts based on what is publicly available to us to test out the minister's contention. All that those statements would indicate is that there was a growth in the labour force. The min-

ister later went on to say that that equated to additional jobs in the Alberta economy. And those are two completely different things. So there's some confusion there, and maybe it's the same kind of confusion that he was a victim of when he made his statement in this Assembly on March 6.

But, Mr. Speaker, what we're wanting to find out are facts. I mean, if the minister was confused, as he maybe is from time to time . . . We're all human. I sometimes get confused; no doubt the minister does. If he'd simply said, "I was confused; we all make mistakes," I'm sure we would be quite happy to say, "Okay, now we understand where these figures come from. That's okay; we all make mistakes." And no one would begrudge him that sort of lapse. Well, Mr. Speaker, I think it's fair to say that 60,000 jobs, at least on the surface, were not created in Alberta in the last fiscal year. Perhaps later he made some reference in this Legislature that the 60,000 jobs were created as a result of capital spending, the provincial government's capital spending last year. So it raises the whole question: does capital spending create jobs? Well, I suppose to a certain extent it no doubt does, and I will get to that in a few moments. But if you look at jobs that are created by way of capital investment, we should be able to pull that together and see whether there is some correlation between public capital investment and job creation, particularly because this minister is very keen on the relationship between the private sector and what happens in the public sector. I think that's probably a view shared by pretty well all the members of this Assembly. However, I'm sure he would accept that there is probably some relationship, that if the public is investing capital dollars into the economy, maybe the private sector is doing the same thing and, as a result of that, jobs are being created.

So let's test that suggestion, Mr. Speaker. We could take a look at what's been happening in public capital investment and private capital investment and see what comes from that. Again, these are figures that come from Statistics Canada. If we take a look at one of our favourite governments in this country, that being of Manitoba, it might be an interesting point of comparison. Private capital investment in Manitoba between 1982 and 1986 inclusive increased by 10.3 percent; in Canada it increased by 5.4 percent. Alberta -- now this is interesting -- fell by 7.9 percent between 1982 and 1986. That's in the private sector. Now, as I said, is there any relation between public capital spending and private capital investment? For public capital investment between the years 1982 to 1986 in Manitoba, it grew by 10.9 percent, in Canada as a whole by 1 percent, and in Alberta it dropped by 1.4 percent. If we figure in the amounts for our current fiscal year, that will change these figures dramatically as well. So there does seem to be some possible correlation; public capital investment seems to generate some private-sector spin-off investment. Nevertheless, all it tells us is that things have not been going well in Alberta since 1982 to 1986.

Then maybe we could look at: are there any sorts of formulas around by which we could take capital budget which is being spent by the provincial government and see whether that results in how we could figure out whether jobs are created by that? So I undertook to phone some friends of mine at the city of Calgary who are always very good at supplying me with information when I need it. This being something I try to verify for myself -- whether the minister's allegations might be correct -- I took it upon myself to phone some of those people and ask them this. I said, "Are there any ways that you could take capital budget that's being spent by a public authority and figure out the number of jobs that would create?" Well, this is what they told me.

First of all, you have to take out the land values. Then on the basis of what's remaining, you could guess that the number of man-hours created by \$10,000 worth of expenditures will vary anywhere between 190 to 210 man-hours. Now, this varies. If you say, for example, we're going to be setting up chain-link fences or concrete barriers in the middle of bridges, that would create 467 man-hours. If you were going to, say, pave a rural road, the guess would be that the figure would be somewhere between 67 to 70 man-hours. If you're going to be doing paving or noise barriers in other parts of the city, they told me it could be closer to 186 to 190. You know, these are all rough guesses.

I have no idea what the land values were in the capital budget which was submitted to us in the last fiscal year. I'm sure those could be found if the minister's department really wanted to back up the minister's allegations. They could quite easily take out the land values that were part of the provincial government's capital budget last year.

Let's just try and do some conversion. If we say that one person-year, man-year, is 1,885 hours -- or one person working, let's say, approximately 2,000 hours, for the sake of those of us like me who even with a calculator find it hard to do all these conversions and formulas and so on -- that would equate to approximately one man-year. I would hope the minister would accept that that could be considered one full-time job, which was what he referred to in his statement in the Legislature on March 6. Well, we looked at the budget from a year ago to find that the capital budget in that fiscal year was \$1,531,817,927. I added to that the capital fund figure, which was \$332,796,000, leaving a grand total of \$1,864,613,927, which I then converted to . . . If we take the figure, Mr. Speaker, that \$10,000 of public investment equates to 200 man-hours, then \$100,000 of expenditure ought to lead to 2,000 man-hours. On that basis I divided the total capital spending by \$100,000 and arrived at a figure of 18,646 man-years. If the minister is working there adding up the figures, he can follow the formula that I've used, reaching that conclusion.

Now, this does not take out any of the land values that were contained in that last year's fiscal budget. So obviously what I presented to you this afternoon clearly indicates that it's on the high side, using the rule-of-thumb suggestions that were provided to me when I did some of my research to try and determine this figure. But the point being, Mr. Speaker, that 18,646 jobs is a heck of a long way from the 60,000 figure provided by the minister in his statement on March 6.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

MS BARRETT: Thanks, Mr. Speaker. I too would like to add my voice of support. [some applause] Mr. Speaker, those government members make me nervous when they applaud my standing to speak. This worries me.

The motion for a return that I think is worthy of support, Mr. Speaker, is 175 on the Order Paper today. But before I address the actual issue of the content of the motion, with your permission I'd like to observe that the minister responsible -- that is, the Minister of Career Development and Employment -- at least has had the guts to be in the Assembly during the time this debate has gone on. I think that's a nice thing to note to the Member for Banff-Cochrane.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order. Order please. With respect,

Beauchesne 299 speaks very clearly about the matter of relevance, and the Chair doesn't believe that's relevant to Motion 175. Edmonton Highlands.

MS BARRETT: Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. MARTIN: It makes the guy over there from Banff nervous.

MS BARRETT: Yes, on the point of order . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order. There is no point of order. Edmonton Highlands.

MS BARRETT: Oh, good. That's what I thought. Great. As a matter of fact, I was going to say it's a pity, though, that his nose is buried in other documents. Perhaps . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. If the hon. member wishes to speak to Motion for a Return 175, then speak to Motion for a Return 175. Edmonton Highlands.

MS BARRETT: I promise, Mr. Speaker, that really is what I want to talk about. I certainly didn't want to upset any member of this Assembly, Mr. Speaker included.

Now, on the motion. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that there are a lot of unemployed Albertans that don't take this matter as lightly as evidently the Minister for Career Development and Employment does. As a matter of fact, at last count there were about 145,000 of them, and that's just the official count. Now, when they hear the minister saying that the government created "60,000 full-time jobs in the province [of Alberta]," I can assure you a lot of them scratch their heads and wonder who got them. As a matter of fact, if you look at the statistics about unemployment in Alberta, you'll see that 100,000 Albertans have been unemployed for three months or more.

Now, Alberta seems not to be interested in collecting the statistics about new entrance to the labour force in the way that many other provinces do, so we don't know the real facts about how many new entrants there are. However, we do know that in February of 1987, the last month for which statistics are available -- that is, until next week, next Friday -- 87,000 people were job losers; 87,000 of those who are unemployed were job losers. Now, I think that if the minister has the statistics he says he has or that he has quoted in any event, he would take the opportunity to alleviate the stress under which these people live by providing those facts to make it very clear to these people that they're not being left out in the cold, that as a matter of fact for any given time out of the 87,000 people who are job losers, 60,000 of them can probably expect to get work right away because that's what the government is targeting and that's the government's track record.

Or is it the government's track record, Mr. Speaker? I think the government's track record is more with respect to income and unemployment, that of more than doubling the level of poverty in this province between 1981 and 1984, and I may suggest to the members that probably by now the figure has close to tripled between 1981 and 1987. The reason of course will be that the unemployment rate has grown, and also the rate of part-time work as traded against full-time work has grown.

I think the minister owes it to the 50,000 people in Alberta who are unemployed but who are heads of families to come up with the promising information that he referred to in the Assem-

bly some several weeks ago about the 60,000 jobs that the government created -- that's just that the government created, and they were full-time jobs. Well, 50,000 unemployed people who are heads of families -- that is, financially responsible for other family members -- I think have a right to that information, and they have a right to the detailed information.

I note in the quote from the Career Development and Employment minister, Mr. Speaker, that he talked about the full-time jobs in 1986. Now, the minister may not want to table those "studies, reports, and other documents," the basis of which became the launching point for his comments. But perhaps the minister would like to clarify whether or not the bulk of those so-called 60,000 full-time jobs were (a) seasonally employed, temporarily; (b) STEP, PEP, leap, or flip kinds of jobs, those six-month stints at \$3.80 to \$5.50 an hour, after which those people are assigned to the "federal responsibility" -- that is, the unemployment insurances queues, for which they would qualify, of course, at a reduced income. You know how the cycle goes, Mr. Speaker.

I wonder how many of those so-called 60,000 jobs -- and I'm not convinced at all that they were created; the stats don't bear it out, that's for sure -- were temporary jobs or seasonal jobs. How many were directly created by the government? How many were spin-offs created in the private sector? How many were sustained? That's a really important one. How many contributed to the overall stability of the economy in the feeble attempts to get the economy back on the road to prosperity that the government has made, minor and feeble though they've been. I think, Mr. Speaker, that the unemployed youth of this province would like to know that they stand a chance at one of those 60,000 jobs, provided that the government's going to use those 60,000 job figures as the basis for which to claim some sort of track record on our economy. Particularly those between the ages of 15 and 24 years old: 17.2 percent of them are unemployed, the vast majority of whom have never had a job to begin with.

I think this government is governed by a siege mentality, and I think it's made profoundly clear in the instance whereby week after week we have to debate for factual information the government itself, a minister of the Crown, says that he has. I think it shows that we're looking at a government in trouble and a government that is prepared to throw around figures in an ad hoc and careless way regardless of the real facts, regardless of the circumstances in which real people find themselves, regardless of the fact that more and more people are unemployed in this province with no hope whatsoever.

I believe I have 30 seconds left. Is that correct, Mr. Speaker?

I think that the unemployed in this province, not to mention the people who are footing the bill for the government in its operations and getting the cutbacks and getting at least another 3,000 total job cuts within the public service, have a right to the information that the government says it has. On that point, Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could move to adjourn debate.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Yes, under Standing Order 8 the time limit for this order of business has expired. The Votes will automatically show that the Member for Edmonton Highlands has adjourned the debate.

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

Bill 213
Public Service Pay Equity Act

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure today to advance Bill 213 for the consideration of the Legislature. I know it's one that cuts across party lines, because I don't think there's really a Liberal or NDP or Conservative position on pay equity. There are different judgments and different ideas.

A couple of things I'd like to hit very quickly. This Bill is intended for the public sector alone. We're talking about equal pay for work of equal value, and it's to remove the gender gap, if you want to call it that, with women in the work force and to try to equalize or try to bring their level of employment from the traditional ghettos where women have been employed, particularly in the office sector, up to the same level of compensation that men have achieved.

The point, the one I want to emphasize as being to the public sector, is that so many people take off when they hear "equal pay for work of equal value." They start thinking of the tire shops and the small hamburger stands and so on. The Liberal Party's argument is that if it is introduced into the civil service, which is our largest employer in this province, it almost certainly will follow into the large corporations, just because no large corporation likes to be behind government; it's an insult to their board of directors. So whatever government does usually gets adapted by the large corporations. I can say that, being vice-president of a couple of the larger world corporations at one time in my life, you have people always looking to see what are the general trends, the general area. You don't want to be far ahead; you don't want to be far behind. But if the civil service adopts it and then the national corporations adopt it, it will slowly permeate out to the work force.

And I see no necessity at any time to create a bureaucracy that will be out interfering with small business or giving small businessmen more forms to fill out. So that's the first thing I would like to disabuse or get across clearly to everyone in this House. This is intended only for the civil service, and from there hopefully it will spread to the large -- well, I know it will spread to the large corporations, being so familiar with them, and then I think everything else will follow. As time goes by it will gradually go through.

[Mr. Musgrave in the Chair]

While I'm talking about what time will do, I would like you to go back just a bit and think about the natural progression of discrimination in the work force. It was probably only a hundred years ago when discrimination by birth in the work force was the first discrimination to go. Now we think of it as being quite quaint. We can't really think that somebody would have hired, 75 to 100 years ago, an individual because of who their parents were or what their pedigree was and whether or not they had a title. Certain people qualified to go into certain occupations because of what their families were. Now we'd laugh at that. We've put that behind us.

But then the next big leap we had to go by was discrimination on the basis of religion. Many of you people, if you will talk to your parents, can remember so and so: oh, you couldn't get here unless you had such and such a religion, or you wouldn't get hired on that railroad unless you had this and that religion. That to the modern generation, discrimination on the basis of religion, on the pay that they would get or whether they'd get jobs, seems like it's ancient history today. Yet it was

less than a generation ago that we did, and we thought, quite validly, discriminate on the basis of religion. Didn't think it was anything wrong. After all, we wanted to work with our friends, and if our friends went to the same church, they're more likely to be easier and have a more amenable work force than people that went to another church, even if they were Christians. After all, God knows that they weren't all the same. So we got rid of that.

The next frontier we tackled was one of race. Nearly all of us here can remember that. We can remember since the last war Martin Luther King and all the others, particularly in the U.S. ...

MRS. MIROSH: We're not that old.

MR. TAYLOR: ... what went on, the discrimination of race. Well, there's always somebody that's very young in the crowd, but maybe I will send her a videotape of one of Margaret Mitchell's books or something like that to bring her up to date.

However, Mr. Speaker, there is the case of race, and it's not finished yet. There is still discrimination on hiring on the basis of race, but legally it doesn't take place. It's not countenanced; it's not permitted in North America and in particular in Alberta.

Now I would submit, members of the Legislature, that we've come to our last frontier: discrimination on the basis of gender or discrimination on the basis of sex. And I would submit that 20 years from now our children will be reading reports about the Bills being introduced and the arguments back and forth -- and I'm sure we're going to hear quite a flow of it over the next while, under gender basing. They'll be thinking how quaint it is. "Do you realize that dad and mum and their relatives argued whether or not there should be pay equity on the basis of gender, whether it's discrimination, being on the basis of gender?"

So I submit that here's a chance. We're not in the cutting edge. I would not even think we're offering to this Legislature something new that has not been adopted and vetted and tried and used in some other parts of the democratic world. But on the other hand, we're not last either. We're not last. But later on, as I develop the argument, I will try to point out what areas have had experience in this and what moves they're moving forward.

So I just ask you to bear with me as I go through some more of the details but to remember at the back of your mind that we have conquered discrimination in the work force on the basis of rank and religion and race. Now gender is up on the chopping block, and it's for us to feel some way. The arguments we had back in the days of rank, religion, and race still hold for those that wanted change. "We can't interfere with free enterprise. We can't interfere with the employer's right or the management's right to say what they want. Who knows if somebody from another religion or race or rank will be able to do the job?" We all have some sort of prejudices built in, whether we like it or not, so you hear those same arguments. But I submit that of all places, this Legislature is the place to give leadership to the rest of the province and to the other hirers or managers in the province as to how we would handle the whole question of gender inequities.

It's interesting that work -- I want to touch on another philosophical base for gender equity. If those that believe -- and especially those in the right wing of political thought often think that a strong segment of reward for a job is based on the responsibilities of the employee. In other words, the whole question of raising a family, the whole question of supplying a proper home

and education for the family, is one of the reasons of flowing income from a job back to the employee. We even go so far in our society many times to make sure that people from all walks of life and all incomes have access to education and health, amongst the major areas, and other areas. We put forward subsidies. We put forward state medical plans, state insurance plans. We put forward the public school education system.

In other words, we have a very, very big interest as legislators in trying to assure that people that are born and raised and trained and come into our work force have equal opportunity to enter the work force with equal amount of training, provided that they themselves wish to take it. In other words, there's no discrimination. We try to do our best not to discriminate against people or children as they mature to go into the work force, that they all had equal opportunity to acquire the education and the training and the health and the life that they need, necessary to be well-adjusted and well-rounded adults and contributors to society as a whole.

But when you look at it that way, then you also realize. When you look at the number of people hired, when you realize that today -- for instance, in the last 20 years the number of women in the work place has increased, and in the last 10 years female participation rate in the Alberta labour force, which was just under 50 percent in '86, is now up to 62 percent; 62 percent of the women are participating in the Alberta labour force. If you also put that together with the statistic that now 40 percent or more of families are single parent or multiple parent, whatever way you want to call it, you see how our society has evolved, so that a great deal of the responsibility of bringing up the next generation rests on women. And if one of the ways of women being able to discharge that responsibility -- maybe that's a subject for another debate at another time, as to why there are so many single parents, why 80 percent of single parents are women. Nevertheless, the major load in today's society of bringing up children and putting them into the work force as contributing adults falls on women. And consequently, it is only fair that they at least have the right to equity and justice in the pay system that men have.

Now, the Alberta Liberal Party, Mr. Speaker, is firmly convinced that it is only when all members of society have an equal opportunity to participate in that that they become truly productive. This is why we are so committed to the pay equity initiative. That argument holds true. Again, I recall that back in history when rank, race, or religion -- those barriers -- were put away, people felt that they were valued, their self-respect increased, and indeed they rose to the occasion. Even the critics and the naysayers of those times surely -- how could you expect a Presbyterian to be a good worker, or how can you expect a brown or a black to be a good worker, or how can you expect somebody that wasn't born an esquire or in an industrial class to be a good worker? -- found that it didn't hold, that when the advantages and the equity were extended to these people and to that sector of society, they indeed became truly productive and valuable contributors to society.

Let's look at a few statistics in Alberta. I've already mentioned that the participation rate was 60 percent. But let's just look at the civil service itself. And this is all I'm talking about right now, because if we remodeled the civil service and the government service, we'd have remodeled Alberta. The participation rate for women in the civil service now is 49.2 percent. That's almost fifty-fifty. The average annual salary for males in the civil service is \$34,949; the average annual salary for females, \$24,977. In other words, females earn on the aver-

age 71.5 percent of what men do in our civil service. That's a gap of 28.5 percent. Any logic would dictate to you that surely the women of our civil service aren't worth 28.5 percent less than the men. Maybe because I'm a man, I suppose I could have stated it the other way. It's highly questionable whether men are worth 35 percent more than the women.

AN HON. MEMBER: That's right.

MR. TAYLOR: Is that right?

AN HON. MEMBER: You know they're not.

MR. TAYLOR: Bang the desk.

Now, there is legislation in Alberta protecting women. [interjection] You'll have to yell louder if you want to get in on this. The Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms does protect the hiring of women up to a certain extent. It makes it clear that equality of employment is a right guaranteed to all. That's in section 15. It clearly permits this government or any government to establish special programs to help disadvantaged people. The rights are guaranteed equally to both sexes in section 28. So we have all the authority we need under the Charter of Rights and Freedoms to go ahead and put such a Bill in.

Human rights codes are enforced on the basis of complaints, however, rather than a proactive measure. In other words, human rights in this province -- there has to be a complaint, something filed. The province itself does not go out and enforce, let's say. And this is one of the things we're suggesting here, that the Alberta government get involved in rectifying inequality in the workplace and putting a system of equal pay for work of equal value into the public service.

Let's look a little at the concept of equal pay. As I mentioned earlier, we're not in the forefront, but on the other hand we're not in the back. We're just comfortably in the middle of the road, if you want to call it that, and this is a chance. This is why I think this type of legislation -- although people on the opposite side may consider it just a little *avante-garde* and my friends on the left may feel it doesn't go far enough. But I would want to say to my friends on the left: rather than junk this, let's take what we have here now; let's take what we have here and let's pass it, and if they want to extend it farther, we'll debate that Bill then. But let's not throw out the baby with the bath water and on a moral principle. [interjection] So I just wanted to . . . Why don't you look as if you disagree a wee bit? It'd make them feel happier.

There is no question that there are other -- for instance, in Quebec in 1976, the Quebec charter of rights and freedoms put through equal pay for work of equal value, although there in Quebec it is reactive -- a complaint has to be laid -- rather than proactive. Our system talks about putting a system in. Manitoba in 1984 put in a system. I know it's a dirty word sometimes to a few, but Manitoba's had it. In 1986 -- just check your history books gentlemen, 1986 -- there was actually a Tory government in Ottawa, and they put in equal pay for work of equal value in the public service. Currently Ontario is putting one in, broadly, right across. I'm not suggesting that we go as far as Ontario; we're restricting ours to the public service. And interestingly enough, outside Canada there are states like Minnesota and Iowa that both have equal pay for equal work legislation. Great Britain has had it for some time; Australia and New Zealand have had it for some time.

Mr. Speaker, there are six fundamental premises in our Bill

introduced here, Bill 213. One of the purposes is to address gender based pay, which I've talked about already. The second is that because pay equity is intended to redress the historical economical disadvantages endured by women, only employees in the female occupations will be eligible for pay adjustment. We don't intend in this one to try to take salaries back from men or, where those areas are that men feel they've been discriminated in favour of women, it will still be a complaint basis; it won't be proactive.

Thirdly, instead of simply comparing and compensating equal work of similar nature, pay equity necessitates comparisons of dissimilar jobs to determine whether the jobs are of equal value to their employer. Fourthly, equal value comparisons are limited to a given establishment. In other words, we are not moving out and comparing -- we're trying not to compare, as they say, goats with chickens or eggs with something else. In other words, we're keeping it in the same given establishment.

Next, the legislation is not retroactive. We're not going to try to go back, in this legislation, to change the inequities of the past. And finally, wage reductions to satisfy pay equity will be prohibited. In other words, in those areas where men are way out of line with the women and it was decided that they should not be paid that highly, they will still not get reduced.

Now, some might say, "Why did we pick on the public service?" Well, I think that first of all we have an obligation to ensure equality in society and illustrate that in our public service. Also, the wage gaps between the males and females, although it is, as I mentioned, 21.8 percent or more, it is still less than is in the entire economy, so it is easier to move it together. Also, the public service has a diverse and large work force, so that the leadership it gives will cut across many, many sectors.

The implementation of pay equity relies on the existing strengths of the collective bargaining systems, so this Bill puts it into the collective bargaining system. And pay equity programs in other jurisdictions in Canada already pertain mostly to the public service, so we have a lot of examples and everything to work on in case we have troubles in adjusting and doing the assessing here. The Act covers over 30,000 employees that are covered under our civil service Act here, so we have a great deal of coverage indeed.

Now, we intend and the Bill intends that the pay equity plans would be done in stages, actually up to five years, although maybe in three to four years it would be done. The amount of money that would be put into the plan -- and obviously, if the gender gap is there, we're going to have to be raising some women in different sectors. The total overall increase in salary in this Bill will be limited to 1 percent, one measly little 1 percent in any one year. Our calculations show that within four years and five at the most -- of course, it's hard to say how much will have to be picked up, but at the very least we would say that a high percentage of those that are now making less should be brought up to men's salary. It would still only be five years, and chances are that it could be done in four years. In other words, 1 percent a year, which is \$9 million a year. That is a blip. I'm not sure whether that even covers the traveling expenses of the MLAs. That \$9 million a year can accomplish what we're talking about: establishing pay equity in the force coming along at 1 percent a year.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I know many others will want to put forward opinions on this area and talk about the area, so I've skipped here and there. I know there's a lot of details, and I understand also that I will get a second kick at the can down the

road, because it's liable to go on for sometime, to close out the motion.

I'll conclude by saying that actually Alberta is in a very fortunate position to learn from the experience of other jurisdictions. There's a great deal of other areas to show. We can build upon that. Also, Mr. Speaker, pay equity is a fair, balanced, and workable piece of legislation. It's basic social justice and fiscal responsibility. So, indeed, I'm very pleased to have had the opportunity to present a Bill that will be a hallmark or a mark of the leap forward that all Legislatures make from time to time. In the years ahead when people look back on this Legislature, they will be able to say that in 1987 we introduced a pay equity Bill in the civil service.

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Speaker, I listened very carefully -- I'm sure we all did -- to the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon. I understand that he has recently agreed to donate seven of his organs for transplant. Now, hopefully the eventuality of that donation will be many years hence, but sadly I see, though, from the intent of Bill 213, that he's made a premature donation of one organ: the Liberal leader has given up his brain.

Mr. Speaker, women in the public service, indeed women in all employment areas, have not demanded knee-jerk reactions such as Bill 213. They have not asked for tokenism. In fact, I have never heard him give a speech before that he didn't believe in as much as what I've seen today. He was completely at a loss to end his remarks. Tokenism, favouritism, or suggesting that there somehow be a golden halo from the employer placed on women to give unfair advantage: no women in my constituency, no women in the public service has ever expressed that kind of demand, and that's what 213 is all about. In fact, what 213 is doing is replacing the market. It's replacing the collective bargaining system with administrative judgment in establishing pay rates. In other words, members of the Assembly, Bill 213 is the new NEP. It's the new national equity program for the public service of Alberta, less than 3 percent of the labour force of this province.

What I hear women expressing to me in their discussions or in letters or in conversations is that they want fairness. They want equity; they want recognition. They want honesty and opportunity, just as men do. The women I met in the public service of Alberta for the past seven years that I was minister of personnel administration -- whether they were in divisions 1 through to 12, whether they were in the opted out or excluded areas, whether they're in management or on senior officials list, or whether they were on contract -- never asked for their opportunities and neither did the men. They earned them. They never asked for their pay increments or their merit pay because of their sex. They never asked for their promotions. They earned them. They have never asked for equal pay for work of equal value. This government has always paid men and women the same for work that is the same and for a person's characteristics and abilities that are the same.

Whatever the liberals and socialists mean by equal pay for work of equal value, that has not been asked for by the women that I know in Alberta. They've asked for equal treatment, for doors not to be locked to them, for opportunities for career advancement, for equal opportunity. Legislatures cannot change attitudes by changing laws. We can set examples, we can provide opportunities, we can provide information, and we can, through legislation, ensure that unacceptable practices are not permitted, and that we have done through the Human Rights Commission and the Individual's Rights Protection Act. And

yes, they are modified and amended from time to time as society changes.

There is a substantial difference, Mr. Speaker, between the average wage of men and the average wage of women. Women in general earn on average less than men. This proposed legislation assumes that this wage gap is due to the existence of practices or legislation that discriminate against women on the basis of their gender. So to combat this, this systemic gender discrimination, the new NEP, Bill 213, which is a complete copy, with one exception, of the Ontario legislation, advocates the implementation of a system of pay equity or equal pay for work of equal value.

[Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair]

Now, I mentioned the Ontario legislation and why I thought the member could barely contain himself as he read it and studied his Ontario counterparts' legislation. There's one difference, and that is the amount of statistical size of the numbers of women or proportion of women in any class; instead of 70 percent it's 60 percent. But basically the legislation is word for word stolen from Ontario. Now, I'm not sure that Albertans want in this province a Bill prompted by the unholy Liberal/NDP alliance in Ontario.

Equal pay for equal work is widely accepted throughout Canada, certainly accepted in Alberta. It's commonly agreed that when men and women perform the same job, they are to be paid the same wage. This concept is often applied even if jobs bear different titles, and there are cases right here in Alberta. One case, for example, is a group of female nursing aides from the Royal Alexandra hospital who did argue successfully that their duties were equal to those performed by male orderlies. The system provided for an answer, and it was ruled that they were entitled to equal wages.

There's another argument: equal pay for similar work. And that's just an extension of the equal pay for equal work, where jobs that involve duties that are very similar in skill or responsibility or effort are considered worthy of equal recognition and remuneration. The Member for Westlock-Sturgeon mentioned the Canadian Human Rights Commission. Well, there's a case there where a group of female librarians argued successfully that their duties were very similar to those undertaken by male researchers, and their salaries were made equal. But the concept in Bill 213 is a notion that it is possible to compare apples and oranges, and proponents, such as the member today, argue the jobs that are as dissimilar as a truck driver or a nurse or a secretary or a building inspector can be compared if we can find some way of rating their jobs.

Now, let me show you the kind of rating system we'd suddenly find ourselves in with this new bureau and this new bureaucracy.

MR. DAY: That's what it's all about

MR. STEVENS: And that's what it is all about. Thank you, member. That's exactly what this is about: another level of bureaucracy. Remember that I said the "national equity program."

We'd find four new kinds of job evaluation plans according to the Bill. And it's interesting when you look at these four new ways of ranking people and providing them with remuneration that will somehow over -- what was it he said? -- a four- or five-year period reach nirvana, reach equality, with a 1 percent

cap each year. First would be ranking. Someone, the bureaucracy, would decide on the importance of the jobs to the organization; not the employer, not the union, not the employee, not any combination of them working together, not the marketplace, but someone.

The second thing that that ranking would do would be to look at the jobs and compare whole jobs against degrees of difficulty. Let's see; is it difficult to lift this, or is it more difficult to work that computer? Someone would decide that, and they would rank that. Then they would break the jobs down into component factors such as skill, and give it a grade, and initiative and judgment and working conditions. These factors would then be weighted by percentages of dollar amounts, and again we'd have a third ranking. Then we'd come up with another one; we'd have a point factor system. We'd decide on what compensation would be determined and then divide that into degrees, and jobs would be based on the factors and the degrees, and every degree of each factor would have a point scored to it, and there'd be a little classification system. Now, I can assure you that in some sectors of our society women would be no better off. Indeed, I can show that they would possibly be worse off in that system, because again it's how the system is applied.

Mr. Speaker, the member proposes in Bill 213 that the system is required because employers undervalue the work performed in predominantly female occupations. I heard him use the words "female ghettos, job ghettos." Therefore, equal pay for equal work, as is practised in this province, is ineffective because women and men perform very different kinds of work. But different surely does not imply that women's work is less valuable to employers or society than men's work.

He mentioned other countries, the United States. Well, Mr. Speaker, the origins of pay equity came from Europe, and it can go back to 1918 and the establishment of the International Labour Organisation. It was entrenched in the ILO's founding document, the Treaty of Versailles, and the concept was then reaffirmed in 1951, when all ILO members were required to apply the principle and listen to the principle of equal remuneration for men and women workers for work of equal value -- 1951. And again, when the European Economic Community was established in 1957, its members were bound to ensure equal pay for equal work. So we have the history then since 1951 in Europe, where France or Germany or Italy or the United Kingdom have now entrenched equal value in their constitutions or their labour codes. But I can assure you that the experience of these countries cannot provide much insight, in this country at least, of their effectiveness of pay equity plans.

MR. TAYLOR: So why did you send . . .

MR. STEVENS: I'll explain. I listened to you very patiently, never even interrupted you.

The main difficulty is the narrow interpretation of the term "equal value." The few challenges under European legislation are disputes between equivalent or similar value. European governments are very hesitant to interfere in the free collective bargaining process, and they've only implemented equal pay legislation in piecemeal fashion. They prefer the collective bargaining process to be the solution. So while they may have embraced the theory, they have paid no attention whatsoever to implementing it in the way in which Bill 213 is proposing it. And on the basis of that I think that's a very, very spurious argument.

In the case of Manitoba -- and I'm sure there are many New

Democratic Party speakers ready to leap to the support of this Bill or to modify it in some way. But let's look at Manitoba. [interjection] Hang in there. You'll hear it.

MR. DAY: Do we have to look at Manitoba?

MR. STEVENS: Well, I think we should. I understand how sad it is.

The Manitoba government implemented its pay equity Act in 1985, for full implementation by 1992. A bureau was established. Of course, there would be a bureau. And all public employers and Crown entities and universities and even the larger health care facilities are bound by the Act. Pay increases are limited to -- did we hear that? -- 1 percent per year. I wonder where that came from. Well, that's from Manitoba. Phased in over four years: there's the little alliance again. Disputes in the civil service are settled surprisingly, New Democratic Party, by arbitration boards. Oh, oh, the New Democratic Party supporting arbitration board decisions; the New Democratic Party not agreeing to collective bargaining. Oh, my goodness. Disputes solved by arbitration boards; union involvement and the collective bargaining process are not required. Now, that's interesting. Job evaluations, pay equity plans are mandatory in Manitoba. Now, that's quite a surprise to me to learn that. I thought I should share that, Mr. Chairman.

Can you imagine here in this province, the largest employer, we've been told . . . And it's not factually true, Member for Edmonton Kingsway, the comments you made on another matter today.

MR. McEACHERN: Oh yes, it is. Check Stats Canada.

MR. STEVENS: It's not true. But still, with less than 3 percent of the labour force in this province employed by the province of Alberta, can you imagine the NDP or the AUPE, the Alberta Union of Provincial Employees, accepting an arbitration board or a labour board decision about pay rates? I can't believe that.

I'll tell you why it's presented, Mr. Speaker. It's called political expediency, and the words he said today are in *Hansard*. The idea of pay equity is very popular with some women's groups and with some employees in general. Women are promised increased wages without having to make any further investments of their time, their lives, their families in education training or job training. Men are assured -- and we heard the words today -- that their wages will not be lowered to meet the objectives of the program. This is the new cure for the wage gap. Who pays? The employer. Now, we don't want, of course, the Liberal Party says, to propose this for any other group than the public sector, because the public sector has so many people and it's got a variety of employees and it's got a complex system. You see, pay equity can be implemented in the public sector much more easily than in the private sector, where the wage gap is much greater.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that in this province in four years the wage gap -- and again, we have to remember that the wage gap is based on an assumption that all men and all women in whatever levels of jobs are therefore equal. They're not. Skills are rated; the market is there. But still, in 1982, 63.3 percent was the female/male average salary; in 1986, 71.5 percent. That's a gap that's changing each year; it's decreasing each year. In the last 10 years it's changed tremendously. It's still moving, and in the last year it changed by nearly 3 percent. So there is a movement towards an increasing recognition.

There is also a great influx of women in our senior management levels in the public service, particularly in the higher levels, and it's within those levels that those future employees in the senior level will be found. That's a change, in fact, in five years of a threefold increase in the number of females in our management of our province of Alberta.

It's certainly easy to propose it for the public sector, because government budgets have much more flexibility than the private-sector business budgets. Government budgets can be adjusted. We can have a larger deficit, and only our children will have to pay for that. The common employer, the small business operator, and the small scale of the other public services that are out there in Alberta cannot handle that kind of adjustment, so we won't do it, promises the Alberta Liberal Party. That's not the promise of the Ontario Liberal Party or the Ontario NDP and certainly not the province of Manitoba, which has now designed their pay equity plan to be applied to the private sector.

I'm going to conclude shortly, Mr. Speaker. I know there'll be other members of the NDP . . . [applause] Oh, that's nice; that's great. It's nice to have that unanimous support.

I'm going to say that Bill 213, the new national equity plan, has three problems. First, it will destroy women's initiative if this plan is adopted. If given pay raises to bring wages to par with higher status, traditionally male jobs, women may be encouraged to remain clustered in traditionally female jobs, leading to the creation of the pink-collar occupational ghetto. There's no doubt in my mind. Second, damage to the market system: if wages are set artificially in the public sector, there is no question that private-sector wages will be affected. In fact, what will likely happen is that there will be a change from one sector to the other of candidates. Third, there will be a tremendous . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I hesitate to interrupt the hon. member, but you know, in the past there's been a tradition of paying respect to the members who are speaking, and only one is allowed to speak at a time. Would hon. members continue to preserve that tradition.

Banff-Cochrane.

MR. STEVENS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In conclusion, I just wanted to say that for the taxpayers, for the people of Alberta -- all of the men and all of the women of Alberta -- if we take this kind of action and if we arbitrarily increase wages through some kind of a bureaucracy and pay equity program, that cost has to be borne by the taxpayers of this province. It may also have to be recovered by laying off other workers or by raising fees for services or by doing a combination of those things. Mr. Speaker, this Bill is a sham.

[Two members rose]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I believe the hon. Member for Edmonton Highlands has caught the Chair's eye.

MS BARRETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. With some reluctance I'm required by conscience to lend my support to Bill 213. The reluctance is that it's true; it's an insufficient Bill.

It doesn't surprise me that the Member for Banff-Cochrane recognized that it was copied from the Ontario legislation. I've noticed the same is true for the Quality Child Day Care Standards Act. The same one we introduced word for word over a

couple of consecutive years has also appeared on the Order Paper under the Liberal caucus sponsorship, so that doesn't surprise me.

I must say that when we developed our pay equity Act, Mr. Speaker, we consulted organizations from across North America and looked at legislation from around North America, but we didn't do it the cheap way. As a matter of fact, what we did is we contacted the people who had pay equity legislation and said: "Where did you go wrong? Are there ways that you can improve it?" And we actually amended our legislation so it wasn't a direct copycat of anybody else's. And we think that that's won accolades, because, after all, the first people into any progressive movement are bound to learn where they were right and where they weren't so right. And it's nice to keep that progressive momentum going by improving as you go along.

It's a real problem in this instance, because the Member for Banff-Cochrane -- and I know he was public service minister, which no doubt has fueled his passion against this kind of policy -- has given me lots of debate material to go on. So I think I will start first to address the comments by the government member, whose authority in the matter is certainly not contested; integrity perhaps, but certainly not authority. I do recognize that he was minister of the public service for several years.

Unfortunately, he got his facts a little bit wrong, methinks. The last letter I received from the Labour minister, who is also in charge of personnel administration, dated November 18, 1986, indicated that comparing all position types in the Alberta public service -- that is, full- and part-time combined, and perhaps contract as well; the current minister has changed the way the calculations are done compared to the previous minister, whose calculations I actually preferred dealing with; I thought were more accurate -- women's earned income in the Alberta public service as at September 1986 in fact stood at 69.2 percent of earnings compared to their male counterparts, not as indicated by the Member for Banff-Cochrane who said that in '85-86 it rose to 71.5 percent. I believe that if you look at March 31, 1985, the figure was 68.3 percent. So the minister and I certainly differ on how the figures are being calculated and the net result.

But even if we differ on a couple of percentage points, the fact of the matter is that even if the rate of increase which I have acknowledged has occurred in the Alberta public service in terms of closing the wage gap, the actual fact would not be accomplished until at least the year 2030. I don't think that's exactly working at breakneck speed, Mr. Speaker. I think that a little legislation might just hurry up that process a little bit.

Now, the Member for Banff-Cochrane also said in his concluding remarks that at the bottom line the problem with this sort of Bill is that it causes market distortions, it adds to the pink-collar ghettos, and it actually increases taxes. Well, what he's saying, I think -- and I don't think I would be wrong in interpreting it this way. The member was saying that the Bill would result in unfair practices. If I'm not mistaken, that's really what he was getting at. He may think that's true, Mr. Speaker, but I want to ask members of the Assembly how long they think it is that women have to carry that unfair burden.

Since women have officially participated in the paid work force, primarily noted since the Industrial Revolution, it's been absolutely clear that women are not paid as if they hold up half the sky, even though women do. You see, the member points out that all kinds of inequities could happen. Well, someone always pays the price for inequality, Mr. Speaker. Why is it always women? Isn't it time that we started to recognize that

women in the work force work just as hard, have acquired just as many skills, have just as much experience, and can do lots of the same jobs as men? I think it is. I think the problem that the Member for Banff-Cochrane was overlooking is that on one hand he says: well, we're doing our bit, you know; it's slowly increasing -- and I acknowledge that, generally speaking, broadly speaking, to be true -- but at the same time we'd better not legislate it. Well, you know, Australia has had pay equity legislation since 1975, and it's working very well there.

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

The member talked about the grid system and how arbitration boards would be necessary, and wanted to know why it is that we wouldn't stand up and fight that. Well, I might point out, Mr. Speaker, that arbitration is acknowledged by social democrats from around the world as an essential tool when an impasse occurs in the collective bargaining process. And it's also acknowledged by this social democrat. However, I remind the member, who was a minister at the time, that this government decided that even arbitration wasn't good enough to fit into their political agenda, and they politically gerrymandered the whole process, not only by taking away people's right to collective bargaining but also stacking the deck so overwhelmingly in favour of the government or the employer that the arbitration process was almost nullified. I am referring to Bill 44, and I'm sure that the then minister of the public service -- I certainly saw him on the floor defending that Act -- had no qualms about that. So maybe the member is talking out of both sides of his mouth.

Now, the member also talked about the market distortions that would occur if we enact a Bill like this. And that certainly is true. Actually, one of the fundamental flaws of this Bill is that it addresses only the public service and doesn't take a very long view of how we handle the issue. You see, pay equity itself is not going to solve all of the problems that women experience in terms of pay discrimination in the work force. It needs to be complemented by an affirmative action program as well. Now, it has the benefit of raising the earned incomes of women in the work force, but it also has the benefit of reducing the number of people who need to rely on social allowance for supplementary income because their earned incomes are too low to permit them to make ends meet, to keep body and soul together.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that more and more of the poor in Alberta, which, remember, have more than doubled since 1981 -- possibly as much as tripled since 1981 -- are working poor people. One of the reasons is because it's since that year that we've had no increase in the minimum wage, which has affected more women than it has men because women enter into the low-paying job categories much more predominantly than men do, and they don't get accelerated up through the promotion ladder as quickly as men do. And that's been true for the Alberta public service as well as the private sector.

So it's true that this Bill, in isolation, would cause some market distortion. There's no doubt about it. That's why the Official Opposition New Democrats have always advocated -- and this is long before it became fashionable to do so, I might add -- a hand-in-hand approach; that is, the approach that advocates pay equity on an incremental basis accompanied by incremental affirmative action programs, and the two, in fact, to work from, shall we say, a centre of leadership through concentric circles into the rest of society.

For example, in Manitoba the pay equity legislation that my counterparts in Manitoba drafted and enacted calls first for the implementation of the policy to be agreed upon within the public service, and the process to be agreed upon -- including that famous arbitration process that practically caused a heart attack in the Member for Banff-Cochrane -- to get that agreed to by all the members of the public service through their union, and then to start the setting aside of a special fund; that is, the 1 percent per year of the annual payroll in order to start the process rolling. Thereafter, a few years later, it would become the issue for contract compliance; that is, as one of the criteria in order to be eligible to do business with the government, a private-sector employer would have to have embarked upon a similar pay equity program. In the interim, the agencies of the government -- that is, Crown corporations and trading agencies and so forth -- would have embarked on the program.

So in fact the whole thing would not come to a conclusion for approximately 10 years, but in that time people would have had a chance to absorb the socioeconomic thrust that accompanies such a drive and at the same time have a chance to plan for the financial implications of it. As I said before, Mr. Speaker, someone always pays the price for inequality, and I think for the history of civilization as recorded it is almost exclusively women who have been singled out as the largest single group of people to be discriminated against in virtually every part of the socioeconomic makeup, but most profoundly in the paid work force, since the Industrial Revolution.

The Member for Banff-Cochrane also expressed a serious concern about how it is that we established this grid system, and isn't this, after all, going to call for human judgments? I mean: "How," he says, "are we going to be able to compare one skill against another or one level of responsibility against another?" and all the rest of it. Well, you know, that famous economic so-called philosopher/architect, Adam Smith, talked about that famous invisible hand of the marketplace so long ago, Mr. Speaker. Well, what he was acknowledging is that there are natural mechanisms that people find, or that economies find, which help them participate in the value judgment element of society. It is true that the economy, the marketplace, does actually implicitly value work and products. Sometimes it doesn't want to. For example, I remind you of the oil prices internationally from 1973, which catapulted this government, not to mention the economy, into a very high swing because the value of our limited resource had suddenly escalated overnight. Well, that was because of a physical need; that is, the industrialized world required certain energy sources and if it had to respond to what was then supposed to be a shortage of that energy source, it was going to do so by paying more for it. That's certainly true. And that's one of the wonderful parts about the marketplace.

I actually believe in a mixed economy. I think the marketplace is very useful in helping us make our decisions and very useful in distributing economic justice. But I must say, Mr. Speaker, that it hasn't been very useful in delivering economic justice, say, to the southern hemisphere of our planet, and it hasn't been very fair in delivering economic justice to women, par-

ticularly in the industrialized world, who participate in the paid work force.

Therefore we have to call upon human judgment, and I know that this scares the bejabbers out of the former minister responsible for personnel administration. But I'm sure he's a tough guy, and I'm sure he will find a way to admit that we make value judgments every day. The minute we wake up in the morning we make value judgments, and we keep doing it all day long. We make judgments about whether or not we're going to be nice to somebody that day; we make judgments about whether or not an employee of ours might be due for a raise. We make judgments about just about everything that we encounter in our environment. Now surely, if we can agree, and the Member for Banff-Cochrane did agree that women have gotten the short end of the stick, if we can agree to that -- and that's a value judgment -- surely we can agree to a collective process whereby we determine the remedy for the problem. And that's exactly what's called for in pay equity legislation.

The collective design-making process has two advantages. Several heads put together work better than one working alone. But the other advantage is actually quite political, and that is that if you've agreed to the process and you agree to the, let's say, grid factors that you come up with, or the weigh scales that you come up with, it's pretty hard to walk away and then gripe about it after the fact. So it's politically advantageous to use that process to achieve a social goal that we all agree upon.

I found it really interesting that the Member for Banff-Cochrane said that he didn't have any women in his riding talking about how it is that pay inequity is a sore spot for them. I really do not believe that. Even in his riding, Mr. Speaker, that just can't be true. I've visited Arizona -- and I think that's got to be one of the most right-wing states there is in that whole union -- and they sure talk a lot about it there.

When it comes to objective need, I think it's really important to point out that the first slide in earned incomes occurred this year since 1967 for women compared to men. It wasn't this year actually; the statistics were just collected a few weeks ago. But in 1984-85 women in Canada had average earnings -- that is, from full-time employment -- of 64.9 percent of their male counterparts. And it's a sorry fact, but here it is. That's down from 65.5 percent in the preceding year. Alberta did not escape this phenomenon. In 1984-85 Alberta women in the full-time work force were earning 65.1 percent of their male counterparts, down from 65.6 percent of their male counterparts in 1983-84.

I take it, Mr. Speaker, that I'm supposed to move to adjourn debate now? I will do that.

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

HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed, please say no. The motion carries.

[The House recessed at 5:28 p.m.]