

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA**

Title: **Thursday, May 21, 1987 2:30 p.m.**

Date: 87/05/21

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

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

**PRAYERS**

MR. SPEAKER: Let us pray.

Our Father, we confidently ask for Your strength and encouragement in our service of You through our service of others.

We humbly ask for Your gift of wisdom to guide us in making good laws and good decisions for the present and the future of Alberta.

Amen.

**head: INTRODUCTION OF BILLS****Bill Pr. 9****Edmonton Convention and Tourism Authority  
Amendment Act, 1987**

MR. HERON: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill Pr. 9, the Edmonton Convention and Tourism Authority Amendment Act, 1987.

The purpose of this Bill is to make certain changes in the constitution of the authority.

[Leave granted; Bill Pr. 9 read a first time]

**head: TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS**

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to file with the Assembly appropriate copies of the new Canadian Water Quality Guidelines. These guidelines were developed in the past year while Alberta acted as the chairman of the Canadian Council of Resource and Environment Ministers.

**head: INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege today to introduce to you and to members of the Assembly, a gentleman who has served his division south of the Bow River in the municipal district of Rocky View admirably for a number of years and indeed the entire municipal district of Rocky View as the reeve of Rocky View. Mr. Bill Copithorne is sitting in the public gallery. Would he rise and receive the welcome of the Assembly.

**head: MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS****Department of Recreation and Parks**

MR. WEISS: Mr. Speaker, I'll try and put my best foot forward. In saying that, please no snickers when you see my sneakers. I'm sure the color is appropriate to some.

In co-operation with Fitness Canada and numerous private-sector sponsors, Alberta Recreation and Parks actively promotes the celebration of Canada's Fitness Week between May 22 and May 31, 1987. Canada's Fitweek is a national event which focuses on the value and benefits of physical activity and the development of healthy life-styles.

Each year thousands of Albertans participate in Fitweek related events. For example, in the 1986 Elderobio Moonwalk activity, our seniors went for especially long walks, recorded their distances, and combined them to find that as a group, they had traveled one and a half times the distance between Edmonton and the moon. This year, Mr. Speaker, they intend to go the distance to the moon and make it all the way back. We wish them well.

Our youth are involved in innovative projects offered through schools and community organizations. Adults have a wide variety of opportunities to be actively involved in Fitweek activities, and families are also encouraged to get moving and come alive during Canada's Fitweek.

Canada's Fitweek, or National Physical Activity Week as it was called before this year, has involved as many as 620,000 Albertans. In 1987 Canada's Fitweek will begin with the declaration of Friday, May 22, as Sneaker Day. More than 365,000 Albertans will lace up their favourite sneakers tomorrow and wear them around the house, around town, at school, and hopefully to work.

Mr. Speaker, it is my sincere hope that you and all my associates in this Assembly will be among those that jump into Canada's Fitweek with both feet. To facilitate this request, I received from the Hon. Otto Jelinek, Minister of State for Fitness and Amateur Sport at the federal level, two pairs of sneakers, which I'm pleased to present to you and to our Premier, the Hon. Don Getty. I've taken the liberty to provide a pair for the hon. Leader of the Opposition as well.

To the members from all constituencies on both sides of the House, I extend an invitation and a challenge to help kick off Canada's Fitweek by being a part of Sneaker Day and dressing their feet appropriately. I also challenge them to participate throughout the week by doing the following. I would first suggest that on Monday, May 25, they review their eating habits and do their bodies a favour by passing up on dessert, and I promise to do the same. On Tuesday, May 26, use the stairs instead of the elevator. On Wednesday, May 2, meet me on the front steps of the Legislature Building at 12:30 p.m. We will then join in the 15-minute public exercise session being held on the grounds. Later that day, phone their local Participaction challenge number to register their involvement as part of the challenge between Alberta's communities. On Thursday, May 28, Mr. Speaker, schedule a 15-minute stroll around the Legislature Grounds for their afternoon fresh air break. If they'd like some company during their walk, they may give me a call, and we'll try and co-ordinate our schedules. And fifth, on Friday, May 29, take part in a fun physical activity with their families, and we'd encourage them to do so.

To assist the members in supporting other initiatives within their constituencies, I'm providing a list of all registered events in Alberta. Specific events have been highlighted for their respective member's attention. As they accept this challenge, Mr. Speaker, and lend their support to Fitweek activities in their own communities, they'll be sharing in a greater effort to promote healthier, more active, and satisfying life-styles for the people of Alberta.

I urge all members and all Albertans to join in the celebra-

tion of Canada's Fitweek. Mr. Speaker, I would ask that the pages deliver these lovely, lovely sneakers and would file with the Assembly the appropriate material.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to thank the minister for the nice pantone 249 fuchsia shoes. I really appreciate that the Tories are coming to appreciate that colour so much. I also say it's quite appropriate that Fitness Week is coming up because I understand the Member for Vegreville took a fitness appraisal test a couple of days ago and unfortunately found out he was dead.

Mr. Speaker, in terms of the challenges, they look very interesting. I perhaps could challenge the hon. minister to a squash game, but I assure you I will not be challenging the Premier to a golf game. Let me just conclude by saying, of course, fitness is a very serious matter, and I'm sure that if we all took the suggestions of the hon. minister, we might even save the hon. minister of hospitals and medicare some money. I think we could all look forward to that.

Thank you.

[The Speaker revealed he was wearing a pair of blue sneakers]

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair will now rule itself out of order for the matter of exhibits under 333 of *Beauchesne*.

#### head: ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

##### Health Care Services

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, back to the minister of hospitals and medicare. The minister of health has indicated that he plans to spend \$270,000 to influence public opinion on the health care issue. My question to the minister: will he explain why the \$70,000 letter to Albertans and the \$200,000 TV coverage does not relate to health promotion but rather to promotion of the government's image as a provider of health care?

MR. M. MOORE: First of all, Mr. Speaker, the two matters are quite separate. We embarked upon a television advertising and brochure campaign some weeks ago that would provide information to Albertans about the cost of the health care system and make suggestions to them about healthy life-styles that might reduce our medical care costs. Most hon. members would be aware that in other parts of the world where health care is not paid 100 percent by government, there is a great deal of advertising being done by health care insurance companies, private companies, and others, and it's been determined that it's extremely effective to talk to our citizens by way of the medium of television and other advertisements about these matters.

So we thought that it may be useful in Alberta to try that, and \$200,000 from a \$900 million health care plan is a very, very small amount of money. We could spend \$9 million and only be at 1 percent. What we're doing with that \$200,000 program is trying to find out if indeed in this province that's an effective way to go in order to encourage a healthy life-style, to make people aware of the cost of the medical care system so that we can preserve that for the future.

Now, the other dollar amount that the hon. member mentioned is quite a different matter. It is the practice, when we make major changes to the health care insurance plan, to communicate that to Albertans. We have a responsibility to do that. Last summer, at the end of July, we reached an agreement with

the Alberta Medical Association to end extra billing. At that time, I sent a letter to all Albertans who held a health care insurance number advising them of the changes that were under way there, and we've done the same thing now. That's a matter of routine, and it will continue.

MR. MARTIN: Well, Mr. Speaker, to be a little more specific about the television advertising. One particular, and I would suggest insulting, television advertisement shows a series of pieces of medical equipment passing over an electronic scanner. Then the advertisement concludes with the message: rising health care costs is an issue. My question to this minister: does he really believe that this condescending form of advertising, trying to make sick Albertans feel guilty, is a justifiable expense at this particular time?

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I did not design the advertising. I've seen it and approved it before it went out. There was a competition amongst, I believe it was five, major advertisement companies from the private sector in this province who presented different ways they believed we could get the message across. The one that was chosen was chosen after very careful consideration by people who are extremely knowledgeable, both my director of public affairs and individuals in our Public Affairs Bureau. We believe that it's an appropriate advertising message that has been provided to us by that advertising agency.

As I said yesterday in relation to some answers in the question period, the monitoring of the results of that advertising is going to be a very important part of the costs we are paying to the advertising agency. I am hopeful that the end result, Mr. Speaker, will be that we do find that it's very effective to communicate with Albertans in that way. If that is the case, then we would be looking at spending some considerable sums of money doing just that.

MR. MARTIN: Well, a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I think if people watch that advertising, it's not appropriate at all. But I'll move over to the Deputy Premier, who I understand is now also the minister of propaganda.

The last few years have seen a truly alarming rate of the amount spent by government on paid advertising in various Alberta news media. According to the tabled answer to Question 184, direct advertising has jumped to \$16.4 million last year, up from \$14.5 million the previous year and \$10.6 million the year before. In view of the fact that government advertising has reached a level of \$45,000 per day, every day, including Sundays and statutory holidays, has the minister decided to curb the appetite of ministers to sell themselves and their policies by taxpayers' money?

MR. RUSSELL: I'm going to take some time to answer that question, Mr. Speaker, because it's important. However, I'm amazed at the source. You should see the propaganda that's dropped off at my door at regular intervals by the Member for Edmonton Centre, under the guise of and paid for by M.L.A. communications allowance. Very interesting reading. So talk about the pot calling the kettle black. [interjections] The truth hurts, doesn't it?

The advertising budgets for the various departments are considered by Treasury Board at the time that the various ministers come before the Treasury Board when the Treasurer is finalizing his budget. Very often there's a special program of one kind or another. The one that comes to my mind is the three-year pro-

gram by AADAC, which will be given substantial extra funding. A more recent one was our thrust into tourism following the formation of a new Department of Tourism. Following modern merchandising techniques, we're like any other supplier that has a good service or product to sell. You're not going to sell it, Mr. Speaker, if you keep your light hidden under a bushel. So we want to tell the world about what we've got here.

There are a variety of other information programs which I expect in this complex age that our citizens expect to receive, such as health care premium rates, subsidy programs that are available, highway closings because of construction, job opportunities that are available, contracts that are being awarded and are being tendered. There are any number of public information programs. Again the department of lands and forests budget for advertising will expand during the forest fire season or during the hunting season. So there are all kinds of reasons, Mr. Speaker, why government has to advertise.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, have you noticed that the worse they get in governing, the more they spend in advertising? Like the Premier says, spend, spend, spend. But I noticed we're even outdoing ourselves. In March 1987 we broke the record, because we had to sell the hopeless budget that the Treasurer brought down. The bill for that one month alone was more than \$2.1 million.

In view of the \$270,000 advertising campaign announced by the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care, Mr. Speaker, will this minister advise us how much the government plans to spend on paid advertising this year? Is it going to be \$20 million this year as we govern even worse?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I don't have that information at my fingertips, but I can easily get it by canvassing the departments. I will get their advertising budgets; it's included in the budget document that every member has. But I'll put it together for you if you're unable to do it yourself.

One correction, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the Treasurer's budget. The MLAs in the government used their communications allowance and pooled that and chose to do it that way. So it was not a government expenditure. The opposition members or the members of the other parties, of course, have ways of doing it in a similar fashion if they want. The majority of those funds were the pooled MLA communications allowances.

MR. MARTIN: So you spent \$2.1 million.

MR. RUSSELL: For goodness sakes, you've got to learn to read these statements if you're going to be in the Legislature.

MR. TAYLOR: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. And I'd like to get back to the original question, although I do recognize that ancient free-enterprise principle that the government is using: the poorer the product the more advertising you have to do.

I would like to ask the minister of health and welfare whether the budget or the expenditures that he is using to advertise this program are coming out of the Premier's budget or out of the lotteries funds or out of the funds set aside for health care of Albertans. Also, who is the lucky Tory that got the contract?

MR. M. MOORE: Perhaps I would first invite the hon. member to extend an apology to the advertising firm, because it is not a lucky Tory that got a contract. The member may wish to deal

with that at a later date. I would be pleased to provide him with the name of the company that got the contract, the individuals involved, and the other advertising agencies that were involved in the competition. Mr. Speaker, I think it's a pretty sad day when the hon. leader of the Liberal Party has to make those sorts of remarks about advertising companies that are extremely good companies working in our province.

MR. R. SPEAKER: A supplementary question to the minister. Could he indicate the period of time that these advertisements will take place? Is it going to be for a year's period? What amount of advertising are we getting for this \$270,000?

MR. M. MOORE: First of all, Mr. Speaker, as I explained earlier, we're dealing with two separate issues. This message here, which is a letter to all Albertans -- on the back side of it is a fact sheet -- deals with changes made to the health care insurance plan effective August 1, which I announced on Tuesday. If we have other changes of premium rates, premium subsidies, or whatever throughout the course of the year, we will do the same thing. The advertising dollars for this are in the budget of the Department of Hospitals and Medical Care, and they're put there for the purpose of communicating. That's important, and that will continue.

The other issue is one of whether or not we can, through the medium of television and other mass media advertising, change attitudes, inform people, get our citizens more involved in the whole issue of health care. So what we did was put together an eight-week program -- it's running for eight full weeks -- after which there will be an assessment of the value of that kind of advertising. Mr. Speaker, the question is important because then we will have an opportunity throughout the course of the summer to review that whole program and the assessment we have from it and decide whether or not we can go into a major program. What we've got now is a very small, experimental program, when you talk about a billion dollars worth of health care services, and that's being done as well from the budget of the Department of Hospitals and Medical Care.

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care and particularly in view of the earlier comments by the Minister of Recreation and Parks. Does the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care have an estimate of the savings to all Albertans which will result if Albertans can indeed be encouraged to live a healthier life-style and reduce their visits to physicians and to hospitals?

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, it's very difficult to ever get an estimate on it, but I would suggest to the hon. members that the advertising work that's being done by AADAC and other similar organizations across Canada, plus the federal government's Participaction program and others of that nature over the last several years, have shown us that there is indeed great value to be obtained from that kind of medium advertising.

I expect we will see, in terms of health care in this province, a major advertising program developed within the course of the next year. It will be done on the basis of our knowing that in fact that will be cost-effective and lead to healthier life-styles and improvement in health for all Albertans.

#### Insurance Rates

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the second ques-

tion to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. On Friday last week the minister defended discriminatory practices of the automobile insurance companies by attempting to convince average Albertans over 25 that they are benefiting from this type of discrimination to young males. Now, if that was the case, then clearly Alberta's automobile insurance rates for those groups would be much lower than other western provinces, and clearly they are not. Will the minister now admit the truth of this matter, that all Albertans in fact pay too much for their insurance in this province?

MISS McCOY: No, Mr. Speaker, I certainly will not. The opposition leader continues to refer to other western provinces, all of which have government-owned insurance corporations. That form of insurance -- that is to say, government insurance -- is not comparable to the private insurance arrangements. For example, in 1982 Saskatchewan Government Insurance received a \$72 million subsidy, which no doubt had some impact on the premiums that were charged to Saskatchewan residents.

MR. MARTIN: Well, Mr. Speaker, that wasn't the question. The question was the rates. The minister said the rates were cheaper, and we've looked at it. It doesn't matter whether you're over 25 or under, business or pleasure, male or female; Alberta's auto insurance rates are much higher than the other western provinces. And since I put my information forward and the minister made that statement on Friday, will she table the information on which she bases her defence of insurance companies?

MISS McCOY: Mr. Speaker, that question is a good one for the Order Paper, and I look forward to seeing it on that Order Paper. But I must say that the leader is continuing to make allegations about Alberta's premiums and what would happen if the adjustments that he's suggesting were made in an attempt to prove his case by referring to a premium set in another province which is based on an entirely different scheme. I would challenge him to make the logic of his argument far clearer.

MR. MARTIN: I don't need to make the logic of mine. The people of Alberta know what they're paying, and they're the ones on the phone to us. They're the ones that want to know the logic. And I might point out that Manitoba's Autopac has made profits in almost every year at the same time.

Because the minister likes to stand up and make statements off the top of her head, I want to know: do they really do any monitoring to determine what are fair rates and if Albertans are being treated fairly by insurance companies? Are they checking this?

MISS McCOY: Well, again, the Leader of the Opposition seems not to be listening. We have an Automobile Insurance Board. Let me say it very slowly: an Automobile Insurance Board in Alberta. That board reviews every premium charged by the automobile insurance companies in Alberta for the mandatory portion of automobile coverage. There is no premium charged without their approval. Yes, of course, we are monitoring both the reasonableness and the fairness and the actuarial basis for those premiums.

But I'm pleased to hear the Leader of the Opposition refer to the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation insofar as he seems to think that he has all the facts on that. Earlier this year, in March, it was reported that they had had \$24 million of losses

that were not reported to the public.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, all I say is check the rates. Check the profits made year after year, and we'll debate this one right across in the next provincial election.

She says they check it. It's like the proverbial fox looking after the chickens. There's no doubt about that. But for those of us that aren't as naive and trusting as the hon. minister, will she at least agree to an independent review of the auto insurance coverage and rating practices in Alberta so that public policy may at least be based on the facts?

MISS McCOY: Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition seems to wish to criticize three or four independent members of the Automobile Insurance Board, who are put there for the very purpose that he is discussing. We do not do this just once in a while either. Every time an insurance company wishes to change its premiums, they must get approval from that board, and indeed they do.

MR. SPEAKER: Westlock-Sturgeon, supplementary.

MR. TAYLOR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A supplementary to the minister on insurance. In view of the fact that even the most impartial survey of rates across Canada indicates something is wrong in Alberta because the rates are so high and also in view of the fact that there's an investigation on in Ontario and Quebec now on the overbuildup of reserves by insurance companies -- in other words, they're charging too much, building up large reserves -- has the board or the minister satisfied themselves that the charges here in Alberta, because of a pussycat management, are not so high that what they're doing is building reserves in North America at the expense of the Alberta citizens with high rates?

MISS McCOY: Well, I again would challenge this particular member, the hon. Member for Westlock-Sturgeon, to compare the rates across Canada, and particularly I would ask that he compare our rates in automobile insurance to those in Ontario. I think that if he took the care to make that comparison, he would discover that our rates are generally only one-half of what they are in Ontario.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. In terms of the responsibility of the insurance review board, do they assure the government that none of the funds raised by an insurance company in Alberta -- such as Wawanesa, which has its headquarters in Winnipeg -- are taken from Alberta to supplement their payments in Manitoba or other places in Canada where they now exist? Is that check being done by the insurance board? Could the minister assure us of that?

MISS McCOY: Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the rates that are charged in Alberta are set on the basis of various criteria, one of which is the loss claim experience in Alberta, one of which is the region in which the car is generally being driven. They are all checked out on an actuarial basis, so they are indeed made-in-Alberta rates.

MR. GOGO: A supplementary, hon. minister. In view of the fact that there appear to be many interested groups in Alberta representing both the insurance industry and the consumers,

could the minister advise the Assembly if the hon. minister has had any serious number of requests to review the insurance system in the province of Alberta?

MISS McCOY: I can advise the hon. member that I have not. Considering that there are almost 2.5 million Albertans, I would say the number of requests is minimal.

MR. SPEAKER: Member for Westlock-Sturgeon.

### **Meech Lake Accord**

MR. TAYLOR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Premier today. We're all aware that constitutional amendments flowing from the Meech Lake agreement will be subject to the approval of the Legislature. Quebec's National Assembly has established a committee of MNAs to examine the Meech Lake agreement in detail, and in fact they're sitting right now. To the Premier: given the great importance of the Meech Lake provisions for the future of Canada and Alberta, is the Premier willing to establish an all-party committee of the Legislative Assembly to examine the Meech Lake agreement today?

MR. GETTY: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, so much for open government. But how does the Premier expect the members of this House then to blindly approve the Meech Lake accord without hearing at least some expert testimony with respect to the meaning of the concept such as "distinct society"?

MR. GETTY: Well, Mr. Speaker, the Meech Lake accord will come before our House for debate, and it'll depend there on all the members who represent all the people of Alberta to express their views and see whether the House approves of it.

MR. TAYLOR: Well, it's interesting. I think a lot more people than just the MLAs are interested. Furthermore, Mr. Premier, when will a copy of the proposed amendments be released to this Legislature? When will this happen?

MR. GETTY: As soon as they can, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TAYLOR: I'm just wondering who's taping him today.

Mr. Speaker, to the Premier: can he indicate when the first ministers will next be meeting to approve in principle the Meech Lake agreement? And can he give some indication of the proposed timetable then for the passing of these constitutional amendments?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, there is work going on right now with officials of the government of Alberta and officials of all governments in Canada to put the original Meech Lake agreement in constitutional text. It is hoped that at a meeting on June 2 the Premiers will find that that wording follows through on the principles which they agreed on, and they would then sign the agreement at that time. However, they would still have to come to Legislatures and be passed.

### **Federal Diversification Program**

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my questions are to the Premier as well. The federal government has promised a diver-

sification program to enhance not only Alberta's economy but that of other provinces. Could the Premier indicate what the status is of that diversification program at the present time? Is someone from Alberta giving specific concentration to having that program developed?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, the matter is being co-ordinated through the Department of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs, but it has the concerted assistance and attention of various departments of the government, in that material and information and consultation is going back and forth on a regular basis with the federal government.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, at the Premiers' Conference in Humboldt, Saskatchewan, May 27 to 28, will that be a matter on the agenda and one for the western Premiers' to put forward their point of view?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I'm quite sure that the matter will be discussed in some detail there. While individual provinces may have particular points of view and lead the discussion in certain areas, it's quite possible that we will have a joint position that we can make as well. Now, I can't prejudge that, because each government has different views of matters. However, if we do come to a general agreement, then it would be contained in a communiqué.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Premier. The federal government is supposedly developing a program called industrial horizons. Is the Premier aware of that, and is there some involvement of the Alberta government?

MR. GETTY: I've heard of it, Mr. Speaker. I have not got details of it at my fingertips.

MR. TAYLOR: A supplementary to the Premier. In view of the fact that the "industrial horizons" is, as it says, encouraging manufacturing and that we in Alberta are in a landlocked economy far from markets and consequently at a disadvantage at any time in the industrial area, has he got the support of the other Premiers in approaching the federal government that we would have money in lieu of an industrial program to develop programs that are more indigenous to Alberta, such as the "brain" industries, if you want to call it that?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I haven't directly, but I would say that I don't agree at all with the lead-in to his questions. Alberta has lots of strength, lots of opportunities. We are not taking the negative attitude the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon is taking, but rather we are going to build; we are not going to beg.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, in terms of the strategic plan that the federal government has talked about, I understand it was suppose to be out in March and now June, and we understand that we haven't even got the letter out off the minister's desk. Has the Premier got any up-to-date information about when this plan might be announced?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Leader of the Opposition shouldn't take his information from leaked documents. We all know that there are some of those. I was thinking that perhaps on our Order Paper we should start to put under returns and filings, "Leaked Documents by NDP." It's so nice to watch

when certain ones stand and you know they've got that document there. They try and throw the trick question at you and then say, "And now I will file this leaked document."

Mr. Speaker, I've been discussing the matter with the federal government, and they are progressing as quickly as possible. For me the important thing is that it is a good western economic diversification plan, not that it comes out by a certain date.

### **Hotel Tax**

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Provincial Treasurer. Yesterday the Provincial Treasurer announced that the 5 percent hotel room tax scheduled to commence on June 1 will not be payable on rooms booked in Alberta before March 21, 1987, and used before November 1, 1987. Last night in Banff I met with a large number of constituents and had the pleasure of advising them of this announcement. To the Treasurer: what system has he established for the accommodation industry to follow to ensure the collection and remission to the province of the 5 percent tax on hotel rooms?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, as I said in my announcement, which was put forward by my colleague the Minister of Tourism and myself, I did appreciate the advice and assistance which I received from members of the government caucus. In particular the assistance of the Member for Banff-Cochrane in representing his constituents was outstanding. [interjections] He did put on a lot of pressure.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is a reasonable response. When we bring in a new fiscal plan, such as a new set of taxation, it does have some impact on a particular sector. We have shown here that we are responsive to the requests for adjustments, and we have made those corrections. I think that because of the date of the budget and the fact that there were some considerable bookings in place before the date of the budget, we had to deal with the fact that that tax could not be collected, and it was not intended that the tax be paid by the people in the industry itself.

Specifically, we will put in place a system which will allow the department of Treasury to collect this tax. It's not a big administrative problem for the tourism sector. I think that with the sophisticated systems that are now in place, they can simply calculate the number of days that the individual stayed and apply the 5 percent tax to the room rate, a very simple calculation that will be obviously audited by our department, but I don't think will cause any undue administrative pressures to the sector itself.

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Treasurer. Will exceptions be permitted for less than the 30-day stay; for example, for colleges, universities, and such as the Banff Centre? Will there be exceptions in this situation?

MR. JOHNSTON: Again, Mr. Speaker, if we find that advanced educational institutions are competing with the private sector in providing rooms in the similar sense that anyone in the hotel business does provide rooms, then they will be subject to the taxation as well.

MR. STEVENS: To the Treasurer, a second supplementary. Will there be a fee paid by the province to the operators and penalties assessed for failure to comply with the requirement?

MR. JOHNSTON: There will be no fee for administration, Mr.

Speaker, because we don't think it's a big problem. However, if there should be a case of noncompliance, obviously we would adjudicate that on the basis of whether or not it was error or whether it was outright misrepresentation. In the latter case I would expect that there would be some sort of penalty, as there is with any failure to pay other kinds of tax.

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Speaker, my final supplementary. Has the Treasurer developed a form of application? Will it be on a four-month, third of the year approach for the industry to follow?

MR. JOHNSTON: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Documentation is now being completed. Obviously, before June 1 we'll have that documentation available and ready for all the people in the tourism industry.

### **Taxation Policy**

MR. FOX: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the Treasurer. In terms of taking a second look at the effect of some of these punitive taxes announced in the budget, will he, in the same gracious way, take a close look at the effects of the 5 cent a litre increase in gas for grain farmers?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I didn't catch the last word before they started thumping and yelling across the way. I didn't catch the last word.

MR. FOX: I'm talking about the 5 cent a litre increase in fuel used by farmers in the province after June 1.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, of course it's clear that there is no increase in farm fuel tax for farmers. It's quite clear that the fuel tax does not apply to farmers and does not apply to off-road vehicles. That's quite clearly stated, and I would not want, and I know the Member for Vegreville would not want, to leave any misleading impression in the minds of this House.

MR. CHUMIR: Along the same lines, to the minister. Would he also reconsider the 5 cent per litre tax on school boards and municipalities, which is merely passing on the problem from one level of government to another?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, they have an opportunity, if it's an off-road vehicle, to escape the 5 cent a litre tax similar to any off-road vehicle, and that's the way in which the policy has been outlined. I'm sure that when we complete the debate of the appropriation Bill and have an opportunity to debate the Bill on taxation, we'll hear more stories about the ways in which this tax will impact. I welcome that debate because we'll be considering the ways in which taxation will be applied in subsequent years, and it's interesting to hear the views from across the way.

### **Toxic Gas Leak**

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Speaker, my question concerns leaked gas rather than leaked memos and is directed to the Minister of the Environment. It concerns the gas leak that occurred in Calgary on March 29, 1987. Shortly after that, the minister said that he would not tell any judge what to do but hoped that the offender would be harshly dealt with. I paraphrase his actual words, but that was the purport of it. Is it still the minister's wish that

charges be laid?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, it remains the minister's wish that the culprit be identified and charges be filed against that particular culprit.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Attorney General. When will the Attorney General fulfill the minister's wish?

MR. HORSMAN: Well, there's an old saying about wishes, but I won't repeat it here. I don't think it's really a matter of fulfilling a wish when it comes to the question of prosecutions. It is necessary to have evidence which is sufficient to warrant the laying of an information. That is not yet available to the Department of the Attorney General. Until such time as it is, it's not possible to really proceed with the laying of charges. I should say, however, that it may in fact be now in the hands of agents of the Attorney General. I should say it is not now available; it may be, since the Department of the Environment just late last week supplied some additional information to officials of the Attorney General's department on which consideration and examination is under way.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Speaker, the record published by the Department of the Environment as to prosecutions under the Clean Air Act and the Clean Water Act shows that in the 13 years 1972 to 1984, out of 42 prosecutions under the Clean Air Act, 26 were successful. Under the Clean Water Act, of 24 prosecutions, 9 were successful. Will the Attorney General agree that this record is what has given him pause in laying charges at all in this matter, given the considerable lapse of time since March 29?

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member for Edmonton Strathcona has of course asked for me to in part account for matters that took place before I assumed the responsibility as Attorney General. That is not a consideration in this particular set of circumstances. The items under consideration are whether or not there is sufficient evidence and whether or not certain regulations and so on have been in fact complied with, and that's under review.

As I had indicated elsewhere on this subject, the matter has been made more difficult by reason of the public speculation, in terms of gathering the necessary evidence. However, as I understand it, the department is now in possession of all relevant information, and therefore we should be able to make an announcement by the beginning of next week as to whether or not there is sufficient evidence for charges to be laid in this case.

MR. WRIGHT: Final supplementary to the Attorney General, Mr. Speaker. Given that record and given the obvious difficulty in coming to grips with the problem of regulating polluters, when may we expect the Attorney General to bring forward on behalf of the government revisions to the clean air and clean water Acts and the regulations thereunder which will make them both more effective and easier of enforcement?

MR. HORSMAN: Well, I don't think that would be the case unless responsibilities are shifted. I believe the responsibility for that legislation rests with the Minister of the Environment, not the Attorney General. So it would be up to the government, through the Minister of the Environment, to recommend any

changes. As I indicated in my earlier answer, it's not really a question of the record of successful prosecutions that is at issue in this case. It's whether or not the facts are there to proceed or not.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Attorney General too. In view of the time delays in litigation and the problems of settling these cases, when will the department establish an unsatisfied judgment fund similar to those of automobile accidents, whereby those injured or harmed by environmental disasters could get their pay early, and then the litigation could go on at a time after that and could be settled eventually by the government?

MR. HORSMAN: The government hasn't had such a unique idea under consideration, but it will be noted.

MR. TAYLOR: It's free. It's the same one I gave to the [inaudible].

MR. SPEAKER: This is not back and forth. Thanks very much.

Edmonton Highlands, followed by Edmonton Gold Bar if there's time.

#### **Historical Resources Foundation Board**

MS BARRETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct my question today to the Minister of Culture. It seems that after some 14 years of working just fine the way it was, the minister has suddenly decided, prior to even second reading of his own Bill, let alone passing, that he's going to start gerrymandering around with the board that governs the Historical Resources Foundation. I'd like to ask the minister today why it is that he's made this decision to start doing it now, prior to legislative approval for the changes he's recommending in his own government Bill?

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member would have to be more clear. I don't know to what she's referring.

MS BARRETT: Let me make it clear to the author of the Bill. The Bill changes the formation of the board so that they're all appointed members instead of having some of them elected, which, as I say, worked just fine for 14 years. Will the minister explain to the Assembly why it is that he's filling vacancies on the board with political appointees instead of allowing them to continue . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member, the Bill referred to is which number? It's on the Order Paper. We're into anticipation, debate on the Bill. The question is out of order.

MS BARRETT: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I'm asking about the procedure. My question to the minister then is: will he at least admit that this pre-emptive changing of the structure of the board amounts to a political gag order on the board? Will he admit to that?

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member should probably use some of the research funds to investigate *Journal* stories. In fact, there are no changes to the current composition of the board that aren't within the parameters of the current Act,

not the changed Act. In fact, if one looks at the Act itself and at the move to have those chosen in another way appointed, those current people who are elected will stand there for two years. There's been no change to those people or those positions on the board. The only positions appointed in recent times have been those allowed to have been appointed for 14 years, as the hon. member indicates.

MS BARRETT: Well, the problem, Mr. Speaker, is that there's a public perception that serious patronage is now occurring within this very, very important board. Will the minister agree to suspend at least for now, until the passage of his Bill, the most recent appointment -- one of his political buddies from Calgary, one of his campaign workers -- until the board itself has had time to discuss the contents of the Bill? Will he do that?

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, the appointment of the chairman of the board of the Historical Resources Foundation, a competent individual with management skills and an interest in the historical resource area, has nothing whatever to do with the Bill, and in fact he was appointed to the position before the Bill was introduced in the Legislature.

MS BARRETT: But before it was written, Mr. Speaker? [interjections] Yeah, well I know the minister drafts these things a few months in advance.

Final supplementary to the minister then. Will he agree that prior to bringing this Bill forward for second or third reading, the current structure of the board will have opportunity to debate the merits and the impact it will have on their ability to function? Will he commit himself to that?

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker. I could repeat for the hon. member: if the changes in the Bill are accepted by this Assembly, the current composition of the board as it relates to those elected members will stand until the term of office of those members is over. So the Bill in fact will have absolutely no effect on the current operating of the board. However, the board is welcome to debate whatever it likes to at its next meeting.

MR. SPEAKER: Member for Edmonton Gold Bar, a supplementary?

MRS. HEWES: Mr. Speaker, yes, it's a supplementary. I'd like to ask the minister: what about those 2,000 members? What about the members who are the necessary volunteers who provide many important services and functions? How are they planned to be represented?

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, the member asks an important question with respect to members of the Historical Resources Foundation, who have indeed contributed a great deal to the history and the preservation of it in Alberta. Their relationship to the board will remain unchanged. In fact, I hope that it will be enhanced by further possibilities in terms of their involvement with the historical resources of the province and their involvement as members in support of a foundation.

MR. SPEAKER: The time for question period has expired. Might we have unanimous consent to complete this series of supplementaries, if indeed there are any more?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Additional supplementaries?

### ORDERS OF THE DAY

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed? Minister of Transportation and Utilities.

#### head: INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS (reversion)

MR. ADAIR: Thanks very much, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to introduce to you and through you to the members of this Legislature, 65 energetic, enthusiastic young members of the grade 6 class of McGrath elementary school in the town of Peace River, in the constituency of Peace River. They are accompanied by five teachers, Mr. Don Weaver, Mrs. Imray, Mr. Churchman, Miss Willms, and Mr. Tardiff; 12 parents, Mrs. Woroniuk, Mrs. Osinchuk, Mrs. Higginson, Mrs. Millar, Mrs. Harrop, Mrs. Freelend, Mr. Rohatyn, Mrs. Hyde, Mrs. Reimer, Mrs. Semeniuk, Mrs. Moreside, and Mrs. Darr. I would ask them to rise and receive the warm welcome of this Assembly. They're in both galleries.

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, introduction of visitors, please?

MR. SPEAKER: Yes.

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, it's my distinct pleasure to introduce to you and through you to members of the Assembly, 41 students from grades 6 to 9 from St. Michael's school in Pincher Creek who are members of the St. Michael's junior high school band. They are accompanied by two teachers, Miss Susan Foster, who is their band director, and their principal, Mr. Ed Knox; and seven parents: Mrs. Margo Schmidt, Mrs. Judy Knox, Ken and Mary Clinton, Mrs. Maryann Wentz, Mrs. Patrick Hochstein, and Mrs. Maureen Mitchell. Yesterday they participated. I understand, in the provincial band festival in Red Deer. They are seated in the public gallery. I'd ask them to rise and receive the warm welcome of the Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER: Other introductions? Member for Westlock-Sturgeon under Standing Order 40.

---

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, I rise to seek the unanimous consent of the Assembly to move the following motion under Standing Order 40. I've given advance notice to the House leaders and to you, Mr. Speaker. The motion is:

Be it resolved that an all-party committee of the Legislature be established immediately to examine the April 30, 1987, agreement on the Constitution, the Meech Lake communiqué. The committee would be empowered to call witnesses and receive public submissions. The committee would be responsible for report-



ing to the Legislature prior to the required government motion in respect of constitutional amendments flowing from the Meech Lake communiqué.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I realize that under Standing Order 40 all it requires, as I read it, is a matter of one member of the Assembly denying unanimous consent to proceeding under that particular motion. I want to raise a point of order relative to this matter because the hon. Leader of the Liberal Party . . . I assume that I have a document here which was put out -- it is entitled Liberal opposition news -- in advance of the Assembly sitting this afternoon on this issue in which he makes several comments relating to the desirability of dealing with constitutional amendments. To do so in the way such as this, however, is obviously not one of urgent and pressing necessity because in fact there is no constitutional amendment yet developed as a result of the Meech Lake agreement. So how can it possibly be a matter of urgent, pressing necessity to discuss a constitutional amendment which has not yet been formed or agreed to in any way by this government or any government in Canada for that matter?

Mr. Speaker, it is an important issue obviously and will have to be considered by the Assembly, and there is a process. Perhaps it's because of the hon. member's relative inexperience in the Assembly relative to dealing with matters of constitutional change that -- it is important to note that there will have to be an accord signed by all governments before a constitutional amendment can be considered by the Assembly. When that is done, however, then of course the matter must come before the Assembly, which of course is an all-party committee represented by all parties in the Assembly, and all opportunity will be given to all members of the Assembly to participate in debate on any such constitutional amendment. Therefore this is not a case of urgent pressing necessity, and in this particular case all that has to be done is for one member to say no to the request, and I do so now.

MR. SPEAKER: On the point of order with respect to the applicability of Standing Order 40, so the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon is now on the point of order.

MR. TAYLOR: Yes, on the point of order, Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that when you move a motion for unanimous consent, the first discussion that takes place is on the matter of urgency. I would suggest in all due deference to the hon. minister that he'd made about two jumps ahead of me. He has decided that it wasn't urgent and also had voted before you had even called the question. What I believe has to be debated now, Mr. Speaker, is a point of order to hear our argument of why we think it is urgent. Of course then if the House doesn't think it's urgent, we'll vote against it. But it follows.

MR. SPEAKER: With respect to the point of order, the points have indeed been made by both members, and I'm sure all members of the House have listened attentively. Therefore, the Chair rules that we are now back with respect to -- and recognizes the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon to succinctly put forward his argument with respect to urgency.

MR. TAYLOR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think all members of the House would agree that the Meech Lake agreement -- that's what we're talking about, not the Constitution -- to amend the Constitution, the Meech Lake agreement to amend, was a

significant achievement. However, what members will not or may not agree on is what each individual aspect of the Meech Lake agreement means. What, for example, is a distinct society? What, for example, are provincial programs that comply with national objectives? I don't think we have the answers to these questions, nor do the people of Alberta.

As I understand it, federal and provincial officials are at present working on a draft constitutional amendment based on the Meech Lake accord or agreement. We will see the fruits of their labour, I hope -- as has already been mentioned by the minister -- shortly, particularly since this Legislature will be asked to support the constitutional amendments of the government. I'm hopeful that when we have the detailed discussion in the House of what all these particular amendments mean, their implication for the future of this province . . . But I am concerned that with insufficient time to examine the proposals, we may agree to some significant constitutional changes which are not quite clear. Right now an all-party committee of the Quebec National Assembly has already been put together and is holding televised public hearings on the constitutional agreement. Now, while it's clear that the constitutional agreement has a great deal of impact on Quebec, it is also clear, Mr. Speaker, that it has a great deal of impact on Alberta, maybe even more so. I think it's important that in order to represent the people of Alberta, we must be able to canvass their views on the constitutional amendment.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Would Westlock-Sturgeon give way to a point of order?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member for Westlock-Sturgeon should be addressing the urgency and not the issue. We've been listening primarily to argument about why it should be done rather than when it should be done, and particularly why it should be done immediately, today. That's what the debate should be on.

MR. TAYLOR: I'll try to summarize, Mr. Speaker. I was using the example of Quebec to show that they felt it was urgent enough to put an all-party committee together. In other words, I'm not a voice in the wilderness. This is indeed considered urgent by many people in Canada and by many people in Alberta. Also, in order to represent the people of Alberta, I think we'd be wise to get a public hearing as Quebec has called for and accept public submissions. We need a committee to do that. To get the committee off the ground -- they got it off two weeks ago, and they're wrapping it up in the next three weeks. That's their deadline. They seem to feel there is a deadline, there is a rush. And Ontario feels there is a rush. I don't understand this laissez-faire, easygoing attitude here when it's so important to get input from the people of Alberta on this issue.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. With respect to Standing Order 40, it is indeed up to the mover of the motion, the one seeking unanimous consent of the House, to make the case with respect to urgency, and [he] is indeed the only person who is able to speak to try to make the case for urgency. That is backed up by *Beauchesne* 405 and sundry other citations. So with respect to Standing Order 40, the Chair puts to the House: is there unanimous consent of the Assembly with regard to dealing with the

matter as distributed to the House? All those in favour, please say aye.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed, please say no.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion fails. Government House leader.

MS LAING: Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Is this a point of order?

MS LAING: Yes, it is.

MR. SPEAKER: Point of order, Member for Edmonton Avonmore.

MS LAING: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order in regard to the Minister of Education. The last day we debated my Motion 176 on the Order Paper, she stated that she would not release that report under citation 390(2)(n) of *Beauchesne*. I would argue that citation 327, sections (1), (2), (4), (5), and (6) of *Beauchesne* would defeat the minister's arguments and citation. I would refer to *Beauchesne* 327(1), which states:

A minister . . . is not at liberty to read or quote from a despatch or . . . state paper not before the House . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, hon. member, please. Indeed, the Chair has failed as well. The point of order really should be raised when the House proceeds to that appropriate spot in the afternoon, after the Government House Leader has directed whether or not this particular issue is going to be raised on this day. Perhaps we could carry along in that vein and see what transpires. Government House Leader.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I move that the question and the motions for returns, except motion 178, stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Just not quite yet, hon. member. All those in favour of the motion as moved by the Government House Leader, please say aye.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed, please say no.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion carries.

MS LAING: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order in regard to Motion 176 standing on the Order Paper in my name, which the Minister of Education has refused under *Beauchesne* citation 390(2)(n). I would argue that under . . .

MR. YOUNG: Very succinctly, Mr. Speaker, the only item before us, having passed the last motion, would be Motion 178. I believe the hon. member is speaking to Motion 176.

MS BARRETT: On the point of order, Mr. Speaker. The member has a right to raise a point of order at any time. We are not governed by the rules which apply to privilege. The Member for Edmonton Avonmore attempted to raise a point of order at what she believed to be an appropriate time and was told by the Speaker to wait for a moment so that it would now be discussed. It is a legitimate point of order, and I think the Deputy Government House Leader ought to let it be heard so that it can be ruled upon.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, the Chair has a certain amount of confusion here, because of the . . . First, the Chair would like to know if in the course of the afternoon there are any questions to be dealt with. That should be dealt with first; then we go on to Motions for Returns. Rest assured that before the afternoon is out, the Chair will indeed listen to the point of order as raised by the Member for Edmonton Avonmore, whether or not the motion for a return is going to be dealt with this afternoon. The Chair wishes to deal with the matter on this day, because there's a whole matter of whether or not the matter is even being raised at the earliest time.

Are there any questions that must be dealt with, Clerk, or not? No. Thank you. Now, the first of the motions for a return, and the only one is 178. That's correct.

#### head: MOTIONS FOR RETURNS

178. Mr. Sigurdson moved that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing those eight studies referred to by the hon. Minister of Career Development and Employment during the course of the Oral Question Period of March 23, 1987. *Hansard* page 262, which he said "indicated that there is a net negative effect on the level of employment by increasing the level of minimum wage."

[Adjourned debate April 14: Mr. Brassard]

MR. BRASSARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I didn't think I was going to make it again today. I adjourned debate on this motion which was raised by the Member for Edmonton Belmont, who requested the issue for a return of the documentation showing the negative impact of a rise in the minimum wage rate on employment.

It's obvious that the minister did his research, because he referred to eight specific documents. Now that the same minister is being asked to redo the research for the Member for Edmonton Belmont, I take exception. One would almost conclude from the motion that the eight studies referred to were the only documents available on this subject, when in fact there are any number of them available to all of us.

So I paid a visit to the Legislature Library and found four of the specific manuals right here in this building. I had brought one of them with me, but I finally had to return it as it was overdue. I brought it specifically to point out that this one article alone contained no less than 42 references from which the study was drawn, so there is certainly no lack of supportive information available, as indicated even from this one manual itself. This information, therefore, is as available to the Member for Edmonton Belmont as it is to our minister or to any other member of this Assembly as well -- anyone, that is. who wants to take the time to look it up.

Mr. Speaker, I'd be very happy to read a quote or synopsis from the eight documents which clearly verify that well-

documented fact that an increase in the minimum wage will have a very definite negative reaction on employment. I'll quote. The article was written by Mr. D. Maki, listed in *The Effects of Changes in Minimum Wage Rates on Provincial Unemployment Rates*. This study estimated the effect of different minimum wages to average wage ratios on provincial unemployment rates from 1970 to '77. The results showed the changes in the minimum wage had an adverse effect on provincial unemployment rates.

A quote from Mr. P. Fortin in his article on the effects of minimum wages on unemployment. This is the case made in Quebec. This study estimated that a 10 percent rise in the Quebec minimum wage would result in a .6 to .8 rise in the average industrial wage and a 2 to 5 percent rise in labour-intensive industries such as clothing. It also showed that a 10 percent rise in the minimum wage would increase overall unemployment by 1 to 1.5 percent.

In the article written by R. Swidinsky entitled *Minimum Wages and Teenage Unemployment*, this study examined the impact of changes in minimum wages . . .

MR. McEACHERN: Point of order, Mr. Speaker. The member is discussing the substance of the issue rather than whether or not the document should be released. I mean, it doesn't matter . . . I'm quite prepared to debate that with him and in fact could very well have some rebuttal points on what he is saying. But the issue is whether or not the document shall be released and whether or not the member has an obligation to do that in light of what he said in the House.

MR. SPEAKER: And this is using what reference? This has something to do with relevancy of debate? The Chair assumes so.

AN HON. MEMBER: He's never read the book.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair assumes that's what the Member for Edmonton Kingsway is referring to, and I'm sure the Member for Olds-Didsbury will take due note of it just as the Member for Edmonton Kingsway has had to respond to other people in making points of order with respect to his own relevancy in other debates. So Olds-Didsbury, taking due note for relevance, please.

MR. BRASSARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm not going to read the synopsis from each of these eight studies, because I do agree that that is not the issue here. The issue is whether having done the research, should he have to redo that research for this House? I say no, Mr. Speaker. I think it is appropriate for each one of us to do our research. If there were only a limited number of manuals available, that would be one thing, but there is absolutely no limit to the number of reports documenting that the rise in the minimum wage will have an adverse effect on employment.

I'm going to close, Mr. Speaker, by saying that I think this is an attempt at grandstanding; it's very petty and trivial. I suggest that we get on with the true concern of this Assembly and, therefore, call for the question on this motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I had no intention until I listened to that drivel before me. The point that is made very clearly in

this House: when a minister stands up and says, "I have eight studies and I clearly show that there's a net negative impact on the level of employment by increasing the level of minimum wage," it is surely his responsibility to come forward with those studies so we can take a look at them. Obviously, government policy is being based on that. If that's not relevant to discuss in this Legislature, I don't know what is, hon. members. For backbenchers to sit back and say, "Well, this is just wasting government time" and all the rest of it, what are we going to do? What Bill do you have of such urgency that you want to debate? I haven't seen anything you've brought up that's very relevant in this House at this particular time. I for one resent that sort of innuendo.

[Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair]

Mr. Speaker, clearly this is a very important issue, and there is a legitimate debate about this. We have the lowest minimum wage in the country. Is our unemployment the best in the country? Obviously not. But the minister says he has studies that prove this. All we're asking to do is to follow our duties in the opposition and check those studies. Maybe he's got a problem like Mr. Pocklington: he would like to pay everybody zero wages. Is that good for unemployment? Maybe that's where his research comes from. Surely it wasn't us that stood up and said he had eight studies. If the minister is so sure of these studies, I for the life of me don't know why he wouldn't want to bring them forward to protect his position that we should continue to have the lowest minimum wage in the country. It just doesn't make any sense.

No, Mr. Speaker, we know what happened before with this minister. He stood up, talked off the top of his head, and now he's asked to justify it and he can't do it. Surely it's a legitimate role of the opposition to try to make ministers accountable. If the hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury doesn't understand that simple thing about parliamentary democracy, then I don't know what he's doing here. The point we want to make is that if they cannot justify paying below-poverty wages, then this government should be held accountable. And I want to ask this simple question. We have the lowest minimum wage in the country, the lowest of all 10 provinces. Why then, following the logic of this government, don't we have the best employment record in the country? I suggest that these studies are absolute sham, and I can pick all sorts of studies out. But that minister should have put them forward so we can look at the viability and the relevance of them. And I can go to the library and show you all sorts of other studies too.

So instead of us wasting the time of the Legislature, surely it's the backbenchers that sit back there and pound their desks and do nothing else, Mr. Speaker.

MS LAING: Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in support of this motion. The minister said he has eight studies. If he has eight studies, then we should be able to see those studies so that we can evaluate studies. We need to be able to look at things like sample size, the parameters of the study; that is, what dimensions were being measured and how were they being measured? What were the underlying assumptions that went into the research? What was the underlying philosophy? We need to be able to evaluate research design and the data and the interpretation of the data. Too often scientific research studies simply serve to prove the favourite assumptions of the authors of those studies. We therefore have a right to look at those studies, to

evaluate them and determine on what basis the conclusions were drawn.

The minister, as a minister in a democratic government, has a responsibility to bring those studies into this House and give them to the members of the opposition to evaluate, so that we can speak to the people of Alberta on their behalf and say that we know what is going on. Because most of what is going on -- and it seems to be -- is hiding away information from people of Alberta. We have government by secrecy and we have to stop that. That is why the people of Alberta elected an opposition to this House. I therefore ask for these studies to be tabled.

MR. McEACHERN: A couple of points, Mr. Speaker. It seems to me a shame that we should have to even argue this point. *Beauchesne* 327 says that a minister that refers to a document in this House to influence debate should table that document in the House upon request, and we have requested it. Three or four times it's been turned down, and we find ourselves in an argument as to whether or not they should bring in those documents. And the Speaker of this House or the Deputy Speaker, whichever is in the Chair, should order rather than us having to argue the case that they have to table those documents.

Now, while you're having a look in there. I just want to make one comment. I chastised the member on my left for getting into the truth or falsity of the assumption. I would just say one more thing to him in that regard, on danger of being out of order, as I pointed out he was. What he seems to fail to recognize and those studies seem to fail to recognize is that there's such a thing as demand-side economic policies that could be implemented in this country, and we've been forgetting about them for years and years. We look only at the supply side of it. So if a businessman can get cheap labour, he's going to prosper. What if the people had some money in their pockets? People cannot live on \$3.80 an hour. If they had some money in their pockets and could go out and buy things, that would stimulate the economy. That side of the economic policy of this government has been totally disregarded for years and years. That's why he has the one-sided look at that particular issue.

Mr. Speaker. I guess I would like a ruling that the minister has an obligation under *Beauchesne* to table those things. I think they should be here and we shouldn't even be debating it.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hon. Member for Red Deer North.

MR. DAY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just briefly, because I do feel that the people of Alberta would have us discussing issues of greater importance than the items being brought out . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: Than the minimum wage?

MR. DAY: No, the members opposite are not talking about minimum wage. They are straining at a gnat and swallowing a camel here by picking away and expecting that every time a minister stands up and says something, he's to come out with the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* and the entire contents of the library, which they don't even know where it's situated . . .

MR. McEACHERN: Bullshit.

MR. DAY: . . . to back up the statements. Now, I back up my statements by citing 327(1) of *Beauchesne*, which obviously the members opposite . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hon. member, I hesitate to interrupt, but the Chair almost doesn't believe what the Chair heard in return. The Chair would sincerely hope the Chair didn't hear what the Chair thought the Chair heard. Edmonton Kingsway.

MR. McEACHERN: Mr. Speaker, you did hear what I said, and the member had it coming. He said that the members on this side of the House don't know where the library is, and I said that's bullshit.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Well, hon. member, that's something that undoubtedly is going to be discussed at some greater length later. Hon. Member for Red Deer North.

MR. DAY: I'll leave that matter to the Chair. I do not . . . [interjections] No, I wouldn't want to be drawn to that level, to be discussing things of such a nature.

However, 327(1), Mr. Speaker, says: "A Minister of the Crown is not at liberty to read or quote from . . ." Now, I do not recall a direct quotation being taken from the eight studies referred to. There was no direct quotation. That is something so basic and so simple, I was going to say I'm surprised they missed it. No, Mr. Speaker, I am not surprised at all that they missed it. I've had the discomfort of having to listen to many ridiculous suggestions from the members opposite in the last year. This is one of the more ridiculous in terms of suggesting that every time somebody walks into this House and stands up and says something, they've got to be packing the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* with them, when we have referred and told the members opposite that there's plenty of reference to this particular direction. However, their leader stood up, referred to a number of these books themselves, and totally dismissed them as being a sham.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that it's total hypocrisy on one hand to be saying, "We want to see the documents to study them." We've told them where the documents are readily available. On the other hand, without even seeing any documents, they dismiss them as being a total sham. I suggest that is gross negligence in terms of any academic intent, and I would suggest that the members here in this House dismiss this motion and let's get on with the business.

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

MR. NELSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The motion before us today -- we seem to have lost the intent of what it's all about, and we're discussing a lot of things other than what it is. Considering the fact that there may be reasonably good research available. I would like to suggest and move that we adjourn debate on this motion to allow the opposition the opportunity to go and research theirs and then deal with it again.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Does the Chair understand the hon. Member for Calgary McCall has moved adjournment on Motion for a Return 178? All those in favour, please say aye.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

[Several members rose calling for a division. The division bell

was rung]

[Eight minutes having elapsed, the House divided]

For the motion:

Adair	Elliott	Nelson
Ady	Elzinga	Oldring
Anderson	Fischer	Orman
Betkowski	Fjordbotten	Osterman
Bogle	Getty	Pengelly
Bradley	Heron	Rostad
Brassard	Horsman	Schumacher
Campbell	Hyland	Shrake
Cassin	Johnston	Sparrow
Cherry	Jonson	Stevens
Clegg	Koper	Stewart
Crawford	Kowalski	Trynchy
Cripps	McCoy	Webber
Day	Mirosh	Weiss
Dinning	Moore, R.	West
Downey	Musgreave	Young
Drobot	Musgrove	Zarusky

Against the motion:

Barrett	Hewes	Sigurdson
Chumir	Laing	Speaker, R.
Ewasiuk	Martin	Strong
Fox	McEachern	Taylor
Gibeault	Mjolsness	Wright
Hawkesworth	Roberts	Younie

Totals	Ayes - 51	Noes - 18
--------	-----------	-----------

[Motion carried]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before we proceed to the next item of business, the Chair believes the Chair heard accurately with regard to a comment made by the hon. Member for Edmonton Kingsway regarding unparliamentary language on page 105 of *Beauchesne*. Now, the Chair is not in a position to perhaps rule at this time without the production of the Blues, so perhaps we could let the matter rest with the Member for Edmonton Kingsway, and if he chooses at this time, perhaps he could take the appropriate step.

MR. McEACHERN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I am sorry that I used the word "bullshit," but if the Member for Red Deer North would like to come with me, I will show him that I know the way to the library, and we will not step in any bovine excrement on the way.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before we proceed with the next order of business, Speaker Carter will deal with the point of order raised by the Member for Edmonton Avonmore. Would the Chair ring the Speaker, please.

MS LAING: Is it my turn now?

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Edmonton Avonmore speaking to a point of order which has some relevance with regard to Motion for a Return 176.

MS LAING: Thank you. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday last when Motion for a Return 176 was up for debate, the Minister of Education had argued under *Beauchesne*, citation 390(2)(n), that she was not bound to table the document. I raised at that point *Beauchesne*, citation 327(1) and (5), as a way of defeating the minister's arguments in that citation. I would like to now speak to that, and I would request a ruling on that particular citation in *Beauchesne*.

*Beauchesne* 327(1) says:

A Minister of the Crown is not at liberty to read or quote from a despatch or other state paper not before the House . . .

and that

This restraint is similar to the rule of evidence in courts of law, which prevent counsel from citing documents which have not been produced in evidence. The principle is so reasonable that it has not been contested; and when the objection has been made . . . it has been generally acquiesced in.

The minister, in estimates debate, stated:

One of the recommendations of the report is to fund a community school for a couple of years on a start-up basis and then let that school out on its own.

I would suggest that that is a quotation from a document or in essence a quotation under *Beauchesne*, section 327(2): it will "be done without injury to the public interest." These were community schools funded through the public purse both at the provincial level and at the municipal level, and the local boards put money into the support of these schools. They were a public service delivered to the public. There are no allegations of wrongdoing. I don't see in any way how this could go against the public interest to release this document.

Under *Beauchesne* 327(5): "To be cited, a document must be quoted or specifically used to influence debate."

MR. SPEAKER: Order in the House, please.

MS LAING: And that certainly was the tenor of the introduction of the information in the estimates debate on May 27, as recorded in *Hansard* on page 1101.

In addition, *Beauchesne* 327(6) says: "If a Minister cites or quotes an official document in debate, he" -- or she -- "should be prepared to table it."

I would therefore ask for a ruling on my request for this document under *Beauchesne* 327.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the point of order that has been raised, I want to address three different elements. Dealing first with the points just raised by the hon. Member for Edmonton Avonmore, specifically citation 327(1), I call to attention that that refers only if there is -- I'll quote -- "liberty to read or quote from . . ." Neither of those verbs or actions were taken in the specific case.

With respect to sub (2), it suggests that where a document has been cited it ought to be laid, unless there could be injury to another party. The difficulty I have again is that since there was not a quotation, or not a reading, therefore there was not a citing.

With respect to sub (4) of that same section, I have some difficulty with that because I have not seen the document, and I don't know that the hon. member has seen the document. We don't know whether there's one document, more than one document, whether the documents are in chapters or in sections, or

how it's put together. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I cannot see how that would apply.

Citation 327(5) suggests that "To be cited, a document must be quoted or specifically used to influence debate." Again, the action to be quoted did not occur. The only reference in debate occurred in estimates, which was in committee. First of all, had it been deemed while in committee by the committee that it should have been tabled because it was used to influence debate, it should have had that decision made in committee, not in this House. But in any event, the hon. minister in speaking in committee did not -- if one examines the context of the debate, made reference only in an indirect, passing way. If one reads the three or four paragraphs relating to the matter in hand, only one has any reference to the report, and it is as an add-on, if you will, or a by-the-way comment, Mr. Speaker, and I would question whether it should be construed to be influencing debate.

So with respect to quoting, there certainly wasn't any. I doubt that one could argue that there has been any citing for that reason. There is a very indirect reference at best.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, as I understand the rules taken together of *Beauchesne*, the intent is that if an hon. member or minister uses quotations, citations, from a document, then in fairness to other hon. members, those should be tabled. But there is also a reference to the need, and that reference occurs in [390]. It deals with, I think, direct application to motions for returns, where it is suggested that "Papers requested, submitted or received in confidence by the Government from sources outside the Government" do not need to be tabled. There's a very obvious reason for that. The reason is that some of those documents are considered to be internal advice, similar to the departmental memoranda, and without that safeguard it may not be possible to obtain, on behalf of the government and in the public interest, the most candid and objective evaluations. So we're really weighing, if we look at the rules overall, those two situations: one, the need of government, and in the public interest, to obtain candid reflections upon issues, which can be used for guidance and decision-making of ministers in government; on the other hand, there is the need, as much as can be, to provide that same information to the House. Now, that is the issue before us in broad terms.

But I submit, with respect to this particular situation, that if we were going to have a point of order, the point of order should have occurred at the time the actual reference was made. It did not occur at that time. Furthermore, since that reference, however indirect, was in committee, it should have been made in the committee, and it's inappropriate for the House as such to deal with the matter.

MS BARRETT: Mr. Speaker, to the Deputy Government House Leader. That was a pretty flimsy fake job, if I must say.

He cited the *Beauchesne* reference 327, correctly identifying that subsection (1) does not apply. However, in typical fashion, he skips over the important stuff. Subsection (2) says:

It has been admitted that a document which has been cited ought to be laid upon the Table of the House, if it can be done without injury to the public interest. The same rule, however, cannot be held to apply to private letters or memoranda.

That is specific, Mr. Speaker. It doesn't say, "or comparable items," or what the minister interprets to be comparable items or what anybody interprets to be comparable items.

The next reference that is important here -- and I believe that our argument outweighs the minister's by a ratio of about 4 to 1

-- is subsection (4), which states:

Only the document cited need be tabled by a Minister. A complete file need not be tabled because one document in it has been cited.

That's pretty clear that we're not asking for the whole secret process. We just want the one, and we want the ruling that demands the one.

Next, and I would argue that this is the most important in this context, is subsection (6):

If a Minister cites or quotes an official document in debate, he should be prepared to table it. A private Member has neither the right nor the obligation to table an official, or any other, document.

Now, the Deputy Government House Leader has tried to make the flimsy argument that the citation by the Minister of Education was done in passing. Now, come on. I'm going to read from *Hansard*. It'll take about 60 seconds or less to make the case. On page 1101, *Hansard*, May 7, 1987, quote:

The report and evaluation of community schools by Dr. Ann Harvey has made some very important recommendations, one of which is that the funding mechanism is not working because we are not sharing those funds equitably around the province, particularly for those schools of which the Member for Calgary Foothills spoke, which are running full community school programs without a cent of funding. One of the recommendations in that report is to fund a community school for a couple of years on a start-up basis and then let that school out on its own.

I will close the quote at that point.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the minister was responding to the Member for Edmonton Avonmore's criticism of the very budget estimates which call for a 50 percent cut to the funding of the designated community schools. In defence of her estimates, she cited the document which she now resists tabling, despite the fact that *Beauchesne* citations under 327, which guard against this very kind of abuse, are profoundly clear on the matter. Now, the citation from the minister might even be flimsier, citation 390, in which a multitude of excuses are laid out by way of provision to prevent the minister from having to provide documents cited. Of all the ones chosen, the one that was chosen in defence of this indefensible position was sub (2)(n), which states: "Papers that are private or confidential and not of a public or official character."

Well, Mr. Speaker, the point here is that it is not a private or confidential item under issue. It is a matter of public record. It has been used to influence debate very clearly. It was commissioned by the department. It is being used by the department in its decision-making process. And, finally, it was used in debate on record. I think the issue is very clear that the ruling must be that the minister is now obliged to table that famous document.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Speaker, on this point I respectfully agree with everything that has fallen from my hon. friend from Edmonton Highlands on this point of order, in the citation of the various subsections and sections from *Beauchesne*, particularly 327(6).

But it's the principle of the thing that really governs, as the citations are merely illustrations of it. And the principle of the thing is this, Mr. Speaker, with respect. It is that if a minister or other member -- but we're dealing with a minister here -- adds to the weight of his or her proposition in debate a citation from an official document so that it's calculated to influence debate,

then we on the face of it accept that the minister has correctly interpreted and is correctly reproducing the contents of that document, and it does, in fact, add weight. To make sure of that, every member is entitled to the production of the document, so that it can be checked. It's rather like hearsay evidence in a court of law; that to the extent that it is permitted, one is entitled to examine the source, if possible, and that is simply the case here, Mr. Speaker.

MRS. HEWES: Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak in support of the point of order. The arguments have been put forward by members of the Official Opposition with due attention to the rules of *Beauchesne*. I found the argument of the deputy House leader indeed weak and unconvincing in total. There is no question in my mind when you read the *Hansard* and understand the context in which this document was referred to, that it was cited. *Beauchesne* [327](2) says very clearly, Mr. Speaker, that it "ought to be laid upon the Table of the House, if it can be done without injury to the public interest."

Well now, clearly there is nothing in this document that would not be in the public interest. This is a document commissioned by the department, paid for by the public, and submitted to by members of the public, about public institutions. What could possibly be in there that would do injury to the public interest or would not be in the public interest? That defies any kind of logical description.

Mr. Speaker, further, in *Beauchesne*, 327(5): "To be cited, a document must be quoted or specifically used to influence debate." Now, if it wasn't being used to influence debate, why on earth did the minister raise it in the first place? What on earth was the minister using it for -- or talking about it or referring to it -- if it wasn't to influence the debate? Otherwise, it was a useless exercise. So that one simply doesn't hold water.

Mr. Speaker, further, *Beauchesne* 327(6): "If a minister cites or quotes . . . he should be prepared to table it." Now that's unequivocal. I submit, Mr. Speaker, the minister did cite. The minister did specifically use the document to influence debate. It will not do injury to the public interest.

It seems to me that what we have, Mr. Speaker, is an example of attempting to use the procedures to withhold information and to baffle not only members of the government but the general public, and that I find quite unacceptable.

MR. STEWART: Mr. Speaker, very briefly. It seems to me that the various subsections of 327 contemplate a document being cited, before you even get to the various subprovisions and the various points raised by members of the opposition. Therefore, the question is whether or not the document was cited, and 327(1) clearly indicates that a document to be cited must be either read from or quoted from. In fact, the word "citation" itself -- and looking at Oxford dictionary indicates: a quotation in support of a position. So if there's no quotation or it's not read, then indeed there's no document cited and, therefore, the other provisions which contemplate a document's being cited do not prevail.

[The Member for Calgary Buffalo rose]

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Chair apologizes to the Member for Calgary Buffalo.

However, having perused the memos and looked at the various references, and also being very much aware that there has been indeed some selective quoting of documentation

from all quarters of the House and that with respect to *Beauchesne* 327, all of the various parts should be taken into account.

However, the main issue is this: that the matter arose while the House was in Committee of Supply, and with respect to our own Standing Order 62(3), the Chair cannot rule on this matter, but it must be a matter which will be raised, one assumes in due course, when the House returns to Committee of Supply. Because for a matter raised in Supply, that is the appropriate place in which it must be dealt with.

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

**Bill 217  
An Act to Provide for  
Equal Pay for Work of Equal Value**

MS LAING: Mr. Speaker, I rise today to present to this Legislative Assembly for its approval Bill 217, An Act to Provide for Equal Pay for Work of Equal Value. This Bill would require that the principle of equal pay for work of equal value would apply to employees in the public service sector of Alberta, and then to employees of employers with contracts with the Crown in right of Alberta, and to boards and commissions of the Crown.

Mr. Speaker, this Bill is about justice, equity, about fairness for the women of Alberta. I would begin my remarks with a couple of quotations from a report to the United Nations.

While women represent half the global population and one-third of the labor force, they receive only one-tenth of the world income and own less than one percent of the world property. They are also responsible for two-thirds of all working hours.

In other words, women -- one-half of the world's population -- do two-thirds of the world's work for one-tenth of the world's income, and own less than one-hundredth of the world's property. Mr. Speaker, that is not fair.

Another quote, from the Bible:

The Lord spoke to Moses and said: "When a man makes a special vow to the Lord which requires your valuation of living persons, a male between twenty and sixty years old shall be valued at fifty silver shekels. If it is a female, she will be valued at thirty shekels."

In this year of 1985 women in Canada as a whole earned 64.9 percent of what men earned and in Alberta, 65.1 percent. So the biblical practice of setting the value of women's work at two-thirds of the value of men's work continues, and that, Mr. Speaker, is discrimination.

We have heard in this House many reasons why this discrimination, this unfairness, does and must continue to exist. I am reminded of the comments made by the hon. Member for Banff-Cochrane on April 30 last when he stated that no woman had ever come to him to demand equal pay for work of equal value either in his constituency or in his department while he was minister.

MR. STEVENS: Quote the comment fully.

MS LAING: Well, there may be many reasons for this, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps the hon. member does not appear approach-

able. Perhaps the hon. member talks but doesn't listen. Perhaps the hon. member listens but doesn't hear, or perhaps the hon. member hears but discounts women's experience.

Certainly, while the hon. member spoke, I was reminded of rationalizations about the abuse of women and children. It was held that the abuse of women and children doesn't happen. Secondly, if it does, they -- women and children -- cause or provoke it. And thirdly, it's good for them, and they like it. Let us examine reality. Statistics Canada for 1984-85 ...

[Mr. Musgreave in the Chair]

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I'm not sure whether the member was imputing motives, but I will refer to the quotation which she has just referred to: *Hansard*, page 936. I clearly did not say what the member said that I would say. The member has quoted from *Hansard* and has misquoted and has imputed motives. Clearly, on page 936, my quotation, my remarks were said in this Assembly, and she has misquoted and has imputed motives. [interjections]

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. We will deal with that point after the hon. member has finished speaking. But before the hon. member rises, could we revert to Introduction of Visitors?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hon. Member for Athabasca-Lac La Biche.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**  
(*reversion*)

MR. PIQUETTE: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Je suis fier -- I'm very proud today to welcome through you and to you and to members of this Assembly, 60 grades 5 and 6 students from l'école Plamondon school. I was their teacher and their school counselor just prior to the election one year ago, and it really makes me very proud to welcome them here today, because a lot of my efforts as a school teacher and my fond memories have been lived as a teacher in Plamondon school. They are accompanied by their teachers, Mrs. Plamondon and Mr. Stefanyk, and also a teacher aide, Mrs. Bernice Plamondon, and by the following: bus driver Mr. John Menard and parents Mrs. Zatorksi, Mrs. Gingras, and also -- I think I'm missing perhaps one parent there as well. I would like the Assembly here to give these students and parents and teachers very warm applause.

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

**Bill 217**  
**An Act to Provide for**  
**Equal Pay for Work of Equal Value**  
(*continued*)

MS LAING: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to return to an examination of reality.

Statistics Canada for 1984-85 indicates that on a nationwide basis women earn 64.9 percent of what [men] earn, down .6 per-

centage points from the 1983-84 level of 65.5 percent. In Alberta a similar downward trend is in evidence. In 1984-85 the figure was 65.1 percent, down .5 percentage points from the 1983-84 figure of 65.6. Contrary to popular belief, the gap between men's and women's wages increased in 1984-85 and reversed the trend to reduction. In addition, although significantly more women in the civil service are in managerial positions, the percentage of women as managers remains more or less constant.

In view of this consistent and ongoing differential and discrimination, women made up 42 percent of the labour force, and 46.6 percent of women in the labour force solely support themselves and their families. Studies show that 42 percent, or four in 10, of families headed by women live in poverty as compared to one in 10, or 10 percent, of families headed by men. Seventy percent of elderly women as compared to 30 percent of elderly men live in poverty. Approximately 50 percent of married women work, and of those, 49 percent of those two-income families would fall below the poverty line if women were not working. The single largest predictor for women and children to live in poverty is divorce. After divorce a woman's financial position drops drastically, and the man's position is bettered by 30 to 60 percent. Surely this is unfair. Surely this is unjust.

We hear that there are many reasons that women earn less than men and thus are more often fated to live with their children in poverty. Reasons given include: women are less well educated, less committed to working and have other priorities, that they have discontinuous participation in the paid labour force, and that they miss time and do not want responsible positions.

Reality paints another picture. An American research project called the Panel Study of Income Dynamics determined that these factors accounted for only one-third of all the wage differential between men and women. A Canadian study, The Parliamentary Task Force on Employment Opportunities for the '80s, determined that "women are on average better educated than their male counterparts." For instance, in 1983, 1,150(X)0 females as compared to 915,000 males had postsecondary diplomas or certificates. Women who have university degrees on an average earn the same as men who have not completed high school. In 1970s' research done at the University of Alberta, it was shown that women academics were consistently hired at lower salaries and were more often denied promotions than men academics with similar qualifications and experience. A survey at the University of Alberta showed women on an average had higher grade point averages than men in all faculties, including science.

Research in the United States shows that men and women who had restricted hours of work and were frequently absent did not earn consistently less than similarly qualified colleagues who had no such limitations. In the U.S. Army concerns about preparedness, evaluated in terms of days lost from work, were raised because of high rates of pregnancy among women. It was determined that men and women had a similar rate of absenteeism. Women were absent due to pregnancy; men were absent due to alcoholism, drug abuse, and absence without leave.

Thus the mythology and the misinformation about women's education and work patterns are used to perpetuate the unfairness and injustice that we see perpetrated against women these days. What is happening is that the majority of women work in the undervalued service sector. The increasing povertization of women is due to the rapid growth of the sector, traditionally



women's work, and thus undervalued and underpaid. In addition, women are forced into part-time work at low wages and without job security and job benefits. Therefore, women's intermittent employment is more a systemic problem than a problem of women's choosing such employment patterns. Often they are forced to work at far below their skill level.

For too long, Mr. Speaker, the plight of women in the work force has not been a societal concern, and indeed, women, who make up nearly 50 percent of the labour force, are lumped together with disabled persons and aboriginal peoples. In addition, we still have to contend with the belief that women's place is really in the home, in spite of spiraling numbers of women who have sole responsibility for the support of themselves and their families as single parents or as the wives of unemployed husbands.

We cannot suggest, as many do, that women move into the nontraditional work, because that denies the necessity and the value of the work that women have traditionally done. What we must do is put a fair value on the work, for someone has to do it. Surely the solution cannot be that women move into nontraditional work and out of the pink ghettos and that men move into nontraditional, otherwise known as women's work, at the same rate of pay that women receive, and thereby create blue ghettos, or perhaps purple ghettos, as we mix men and women together. A ghetto, Mr. Speaker, is a ghetto, and as such is unacceptable. What we want is a fair wage based on the value, the skill, the responsibility, and the conditions under which the work is performed.

The third point or rationalization we have heard is that it is really good for them and they like it. That is unfair treatment, shades of Freud's theory of female masochism; it has been disproved and discounted for some time. But what of the statement of the hon. Member for Banff-Cochrane about the national equity plan? And I quote: "It will destroy women's initiative if this plan is adopted"; end of quote. Has special status destroyed men's initiative, I ask? Is the hon. member suggesting women are different and that fairness and equality will destroy them or pervert them? My experience in the real world of people, of men and women, is that systemic and systematic unfairness is what destroys initiative and creates hopelessness and apathy.

Roberta Ellis-Grundfeld, the Manitoba Pay Equity Commissioner, states that as a result of the institution of pay equity legislation women have come to believe that they are worth more than they thought they were, and I quote:

The effect is to boost self-esteem, and the spin-off is that better paying jobs seem more accessible, both to women and those doing the hiring.

Mr. Speaker, all of society pays for this injustice perpetrated against women. Working women and their children live on incomes below the poverty line, and thus the state, the taxpayers, must subsidize their living allowance, must subsidize child care costs and education costs. The costs of children living in poverty have been documented by the Standing Senate Committee on Health, Welfare and Science, Canada. Insufficient nutrition during pregnancy, one of the results of female poverty, may lead to low birth weights and possible irreversible brain damage during the second trimester of pregnancy. Children living in poverty tend to have lower levels of school achievement. One of the reasons is that they are hungry. These children may miss more school because they do not have adequate clothing or because they suffer more from illness. They suffer from lowered self-esteem and apathy because of circumstances beyond their control that deny them the basic necessities of life. So children,

too, pay for the unequal and unjust treatment of women.

Many reasons are advanced as to why we cannot institute pay equity. I would like to address some of them. One, it is interference in the free marketplace. Mr. Speaker, we do not have a free marketplace. In the past and in the future the state has intervened to correct injustice and exploitation. We have child labour laws. We have minimum wage laws. And I remember when the women's minimum wage was lower than men's minimum wage, and the belief abounded that to make it equal would ruin the economy. But it didn't. We have equal pay for equal work -- another principle railed against. I remember when female teachers received less than male teachers did, and it was suggested that to raise their salaries would ruin the economy. But it didn't. And in addition, we have standards for the workplace, and Mr. Speaker, the free market economy doesn't mind asking for wage controls when it pleases them. In order to live in society, we must have rules so that all people are treated fairly and justly. Equal pay for work of [equal] value is one such rule that must come into practice if we are to have a fair society.

A second reason given: pay equity will interfere with the process of free collective bargaining. Unions don't make these allegations; unions are in favour of equal pay for work of equal value and are lobbying for it. Like minimum wage legislation, this places a standard upon which negotiation is founded.

A third reason: pay equity will ruin business and the economy. It seems most unfair that women should be charged with subsidizing business and holding the economy together. Surely this is a collective responsibility shared by all segments of society, and women and children alone should not have to bear the burden. In some areas where pay equity has been established in fact the economy has not been ruined, and it survives.

The fourth reason: pay equity will not help women. This is a very common one. It will create negative consequences such as increased unemployment for women. This was raised when it was suggested that the minimum wage for women be at a par with the minimum wage for men. Again, let us look at reality. Australia phased in pay equity in the years from 1972 through 1975. The employment of women continued to rise in the years 1973-77 on an average of 3.6 percent a year, while men's employment rate rose 1.1 percent during that time, and women now earn 85 percent of what men earn. In Britain since pay equity was instituted in 1974 women's average income has increased by 18 percent. The wage gap has been narrowed in other countries, including Finland, New Zealand, Norway, and Sweden. Reality, Mr. Speaker, not mythological theory must be brought to bear on this issue.

Of course, a final argument is that it is impossible to measure the relative worth of different kinds of jobs. Although job evaluation is not precise, it is certainly not an impossible task. It means a comparison of jobs on a series of factors unrelated to gender. It does not mean equal pay for equal work or same work. It is not a complaint-based system, nor is it affirmative action. Pay equity evaluates jobs in a systematic and fair manner so that the wages in low-paying traditional jobs are raised, so that a day care worker is not paid less than a zookeeper. It requires that jobs be evaluated according to four criteria: skill, effort, responsibility, and working conditions.

This process has and is working in a number of countries, including New Zealand, Australia, Britain, in sixteen states in the United States, and in Manitoba. Manitoba estimates pay equity can be phased in over a four-year period if employers set

aside the equivalent of about 1 percent of the payroll each year. No wages would be reduced. I think it is to be remembered that employees have been doing a job classification for years. This is not a new process.

It is to be remembered that governments have intervened in the free market system for years: minimum wage laws, rent controls, grants, subsidies, royalty holidays. It is time government intervened on behalf of women. Education is not enough. Laws, governments can and should lead the way. Years ago equal pay for equal work was considered an unrealizable goal. Now it is taken for granted. That is how change, how improvement, occurs. To argue, as some do, that we cannot afford the cost of equal pay is to imply that women have a duty to be less well paid until other financial priorities are accommodated. This is absolutely unacceptable in a society committed to equity, fairness, and justice. The gender-based wage gap is nothing more than discrimination on the basis of sex and is fundamentally wrong.

Mr. Speaker, we believe this is an issue that touches all women, and therefore pay equity must be instituted not only in the civil service but in the boards and commissions of the Crown and in the private sector which has contracts with the government of Alberta. Mr. Speaker, this is a time for action. I urge support for this Bill, and I close with a quotation from Dr. Martin Luther King: "Freedom is never voluntarily given by the oppressor; it must be demanded by the oppressed." I would paraphrase: justice is never voluntarily given by the powerful; it must be demanded by those who suffer injustice. I speak for those who suffer injustice, and I demand justice.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order in the gallery. Before the hon. Member for St. Paul rises to speak, the Member for Banff-Cochrane would like to respond on the point of order.

MR. STEVENS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I hesitated to interrupt the member further, having drawn it to the attention of yourself and the Assembly, but I rise and refer specifically to *Beauchesne* 316, which indicates that a member, while speaking, must not, under subsection (c):

impute bad motives or motives different from those acknowledged to a Member.

And further *Beauchesne* 319(3), in which no member may cast "reflections on the House itself" or "to impute to any Member or Members unworthy motives for their actions in a particular case." Further, Mr. Speaker, I refer to our own Standing Orders of this Assembly, section 15(5).

I am very concerned, Mr. Speaker, in having asked for assistance in reading the Blues today, to know of course that that is not possible for some 30 minutes. I will read the Blues overnight or tomorrow morning at the earliest opportunity. I trust the member will as well, because I distinctly heard her refer to comments that I made in debates in this Assembly, reflecting upon motives or assigning motives to myself, which I consider to be most improper and unparliamentary and unbecoming to her in presenting her case for her constituents, and possibly a question of privilege and a question of untruthfulness in reflecting upon the motives of this member for his constituency, in representing the people that I have represented since 1979.

MR. DROBOT: Mr. Speaker, I am glad to speak to this Bill. I think the New Democrats are really showing their socialist tendencies on this one: let's pay everyone the same wage or salary no matter how much education or training or lack of it they may

have. I do not want to be misunderstood. I would be the first to stand and defend equal pay for equal work, but I cannot defend a motion of pay equity, which this Bill advocates. Equal pay for equal value has gained wide acceptance in Alberta and the rest of Canada. It is commonly agreed to, as it should be, that when men and women perform the same job, they must be paid the same wage. However, the concept of pay equity, equal pay for work of equal value, is not so universally accepted.

The member sponsoring this Bill has said that we need to amend current ineffective equal-pay provisions of the Individual's Rights Protection Act. Mr. Speaker, this legislation is not ineffective at all. The Individual's Rights Protection Act guarantees that all male and female employees in this province who perform similar or substantially similar work must receive equal pay. I think the kind of protection this Act gives is necessary and effective. Men and women doing the same work of equal value are being paid the same, or where there are inequities, the Individual's Rights Protection Act offers a formal board of inquiry which is empowered to hear cases and amend pay increases. This has been enforced and proven effective many times.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to relate two cases where this Act has been proven effective. In Alberta female nursing aides took a case to the board saying that they perform duties very similar to those performed by male orderlies in hospitals and should thus be paid the same. The nurses were successful. Another example is the case heard by the Canadian Human Rights Commission involving female librarians, who argued successfully that their duties were very similar to those undertaken by male researchers and therefore their salaries should be equal.

Mr. Speaker, no one can argue that equal work does not deserve equal pay. However, pay equity, which this Bill advocates, has nothing to do with people getting paid the same salary for doing the same job. Rather, this Bill rests on the idea that it is possible to compare apples and oranges. What they would have us do is pay a truck driver and a brain surgeon the same salary if their jobs were rated to be of equal value to their respective employers. This whole notion of rating the value of occupations and employees to their bosses is very subjective, and no objective classification system has evolved which can be used as a model for evaluating the relative work of employees to their employers.

Quebec and Manitoba both have pay equity provision in their charters of rights and freedoms, and studies show that they do not receive very many complaints requiring the comparison of two totally different jobs. When in fact this does happen, experience has shown that courts are very reluctant to rule on the similarities of various jobs. I wonder how the government is expected to do this when judges who are highly trained and experienced to make these kinds of decisions cannot even do it.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I must confess that I have trouble with the idea of increasing someone's wages when they in turn are not expected to make any further investment in education or training in order to warrant an increase in wages. I think the reality is that people should be paid more if they have invested more time in education and training, because these employees will undoubtedly be of higher value to their employers than someone who has not. Surely it is unreasonable to demand a raise if you have not increased or upgraded your value to your employer.

Mr. Speaker, I have a feeling that pay equity could do more harm than good. The institution of pay equity might very well destroy women's initiative. If given pay raises to equalize their

wages with higher status, traditionally male jobs, women may be encouraged to remain in traditionally female jobs and not try to compete for equal status in the work force.

[Mrs. Koper in the Chair]

Pay equity may also result in unemployment and increased costs for taxpayers. If wages are raised without increases in productivity in the public service, the cost of increased wages will have to be absorbed in departmental budgets by layoffs and increased fees for services and a further increase in the tax base.

However, the most important problem with pay equity. Mr. Speaker, is that it would treat the symptoms and not cure the disease. The fact that male and female wages are not always on par is indisputable. However, this Bill assumes that these differences are caused by practices in laws that discriminate against female employees. There are laws in place to protect women and to ensure that this kind of discrimination does not happen, and it does have legal recourse. Canada's human rights code, section 2, passed in 1978, explicitly makes it a discriminatory practice to maintain differences in wages between male and female employees who perform work of equal value.

Therefore, it is not a lack of laws that perpetuate the problem. Many other factors contribute to the wage gap between men and women. Women tend to be concentrated in lower paying jobs. Often this is because of training or experience, or it may be due to social values and attitudes. Little girls are encouraged to be homemakers and not go to university or into the trades. I do not want to be attacked as thinking that there is anything wrong with being a homemaker, but unfortunately the training for this does not help women to obtain higher paying jobs in today's market. Where women do have as many years of education as men, men are more likely than women to have taken courses that will prepare them for entry into higher paying occupations.

More importantly, women are less likely to seize opportunities for advancement. The personnel administration office reports that while women account for 52 percent of the public service, they comprise only about 35 percent of those who enroll in training programs. The same study shows that women do not try to increase their numbers in management positions by applying for upper-level jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I think it can be seen that there are many factors involved in the problem of women in general having lower incomes than men, and obviously discrimination is not the only problem. Even if this Bill 217 were passed, it is not the cure that is needed. Women should not be paid more to stay where they are, but rather should be encouraged to seek the education and the training that is necessary to make it in this era of advanced education, technology, and training. Bill 217 is not the answer. Pay equity would only hinder the further development of women in the work force, not help them,

MADAM ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Calgary McKnight, followed by the Member for . . .

MR. MUSGREAVE: Thank you, Madam Speaker. It's already been pointed out by two of the hon. members that this is a difficult issue, and it's one that is fundamental to our society.

First of all, I'd like to give a little history to the members of the opposition and quote from their past leader and mention something about what's happening in Manitoba. In speaking of a women's council, the late Grant Notley said that first we have

to "get more women elected to the Legislature of Alberta." [some applause] I hope the applause will be equal for the next remark. "The second thing is to deal with the issue of equal pay for equal work." I'd like the opposition to realize that he did not say work of equal value.

He also said that

One of the things we have to commit ourselves to, regardless of where we sit -- let me speak directly in a nonpartisan way on this item -- is removing the differentials between working men and women.

Probably his remarks were made in view of the dismal record of the Pawley government at that time in the first part of this decade.

According to a *Globe and Mail* article of three years ago, here's what the president of the Manitoba Government Employees' Association had to say about the first three years of the Pawley government's record at that time: the number of women employed by the government had dropped; the wage gap between male and female workers still remains at 30 percent; no action had been taken on the NDP promise of equal pay for equal work; and staff cuts resulted in more women than men being laid off. And just recently there was an item in the *Alberta Report* that pointed out that Manitoba has three female deputy ministers, the same as Tory Saskatchewan -- three deputy ministers.

Now I'd like to deal with the concept of equal pay for work of equal value from the point of view of the business community. In my view, the business community must become aware of the origins of wage disparities between men and women, as there is a form of discrimination against women that must be eliminated. Until very recently men and women have commonly been segregated relative to the types of work society has encouraged or allowed them to perform. Even today women working outside the home are employed mainly in the clerical, sales, and service sectors -- as the Member for Edmonton Avonmore called them, "job ghettos." Now, if those women were in job ghettos of executives making \$100,000 a year, I don't think they would complain. But historically men have been thought of as the breadwinner for their families, while women were viewed as working only until they got married or in order to subsidize their husband's wages. As a result, a tradition of paying men higher wages than women has developed in our society.

Recent attempts to eliminate wage discrimination through the enactment of equal pay for the same or similar work legislation has often failed because in many instances men and women are not performing the same work. Equal pay for work of equal value legislation such as contained in the Canadian Human Rights Act attempts to address the problem of wage discrimination through the application of the concept of comparable worth or value of jobs. But this is not a subjective process nor is it based solely on market forces. Values are routinely assigned to work based on requirements such as skill: level of education or experience; effort: physical labour or mental concentration; responsibility: the supervising of others or financial decision-making; and working conditions: whether it's outside work or whether there are problems of safety or noise.

The critical aspect of the equal pay for work of equal value concept is that two jobs -- for example, one where women generally are represented and the other with mostly men -- can be compared as to their value, based on the four criteria I mentioned earlier. There is no question, in my view, that the vast majority of jobs, professions, business ventures, even service in the armed services can be performed by men or women. Rather

than waste time, energy, and money in hiring vast hordes of civil servants to enforce equal pay for work of equal value rules, I suggest we recognize the ability of the workplace to determine the value of a job. Then let's ensure that if the women in our society are performing these jobs, they get the same pay as men. But at the same time, let's be encouraging more of our young women to receive the maximum education and encouragement so that they can qualify on the basis of merit.

But we could do something here in government. I realize that salaries are posted, and once a year you can find out how much you're making and compare it with what other people are making. But executive assistants in this building do not know what each one is receiving, and there have been cases where some executive assistants have been paid less than others because of the simple fact they are women. I think these are the kinds of rules that if they're going to be in place should be justified by those who put them in place. We are now in the process of reducing staff, but we could take an attitude and say that when we are rehiring, we are only going to hire qualified women.

We could also make some significant changes in hospital boards, boards of education, and universities by being a little more dramatic and a little more positive, by saying to these boards, agencies, and what have you: "We are not going to fund as much as we have in the past unless you change dramatically the way you put women in positions of authority within your organization." All you need to do is look at the number of females that are in the classrooms of our school systems and look at the number of females that are principals of our high schools. Worse still, look at the number of women that are superintendents of our school systems. I suggest to you there's not very many. There are not very many women deans in our universities, and on and on it goes.

What we have to do is change and turn the attitude of society around so that there is no question that the barriers that are subtle and not so subtle are removed. These barriers have to be removed so women can attain a position of their choice for which they have the education, the experience, and the ability to perform.

Just in capsule form I'd like to point out some of the difficulties faced by women in the business world when they request equal treatment. A businessman is aggressive; a businesswoman is pushy. A businessman is good on detail; she's picky. He loses his temper because he's so involved in his job; she's bitchy. When he's depressed or hung over, everyone tip-toes past his office; she's moody, so it must her time of the month. He follows through; she doesn't know when to quit. He's confident; she's impossible to deal with. He stands firm; she is hard. His judgments are her prejudices. He's a man of his world; she's been around. He drinks because of the excessive job pressure; she's a lush. He's not afraid to say what he thinks; she's mouthy. He exercises authority diligently; she's power mad. He's closemouthed; she's secretive. He climbed the ladder of success; she slept her way to the top. He's a stern taskmaster; she's hard to work for. He's witty, and she's sarcastic.

[Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair]

So in conclusion, members of the Legislature, I think there is no question in my mind that the critical aspect of the equal pay for work of equal value concept is idealistic, and it will not survive in the real world. The idea that two jobs -- for example,

one where women generally are represented and the other with mostly men -- can be compared as to their value, to me is a hopeless proposition. But I think it's important that the values of the skill, the effort, the responsibility, and the working conditions have to be taken into consideration. We need a removal of these barriers and an encouragement of women. Sadly, without a political will being forced on a male-dominated society, it's not going to happen.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. TAYLOR: Yes. Mr. Speaker. In rising to support the spirit of the motion, first of all, I feel I had to because it seemed that all the women in the House were supporting the motion and all the men were against it. I wanted to say that I'm one man that is for the motion. It's not because I have seven rather talented daughters that are very involved in the community and that I have to answer to but just to point out that as a parent and as a businessman through the years, I have become quite aware that there is a gender gap or ghetto for women employees and for women in general.

In supporting the Bill, of course, following the tradition -- I had earlier introduced a Bill called 213, which was talked out, where I essentially used exactly the same words as this Bill, which has been borrowed, of course, from Manitoba and Ontario. But there I tried to limit it, just hoping that I would be able to slide it by these eagle-eyed right-wingers and dinosaurs, and I tried to limit it just to the public service. I must compliment the mover of this particular Bill for having more courage than I and for making a frontal assault on the bastion of male prerogatives over there -- or what they think are male prerogatives. I'm afraid her Bill is going to be destined to the ash can, as mine was.

I want to try to hammer out once again that the free market does not set most wages, most salaries. In other words, tradition and precedent have more to do with setting salaries than free market does. Otherwise, why is a preacher that goes out to save souls paid so much less than an entertainer that goes out to maybe run the souls the other way? I thought I'd give the Member for Red Deer South a chance to come in here and explain his ...

ANHON. MEMBER: North.

MR. TAYLOR: Red Deer North; I'm sorry. Red Deer South is actually maybe more to the point.

It's just the natural progression now to attack this one last frontier. We have got away, as I've mentioned before in this House, with discrimination based on religion, based on colour, based on where you were born. The last discrimination today is with respect to sexual persuasion. This is where the government can help. The government moves in to help a consumer against a powerful utility owner. The government walks in to help the public against insurance cartels. The government will step in and help the consumer against an international marketing bloc, if you want to call it. So therefore there is a tradition of government stepping in to even out the ground rules, to set it up so that in time, then, the law of supply and demand can take over.

But I believe that the women existing in the gender ghettos of pay in the service -- and this even applies to the government service -- are not going to get out of it unless government takes a proactive position. Maybe it'll take a generation or two. They're willing to do it in so many areas. Every one of the

members on the other side is willing to leap to their feet to defend a farmer or a trapper or a businessman or a travel agent or a hotel keeper or a retailer, but when it comes to a broad group of women that are only asking for simple justice to get under way, then I believe . . . I know you're not going to adopt the whole Bill, but if we at least introduced it into the public service, the public service being the largest employer of people, men and women, in this province, it would be quickly followed by the international or large corporations; then after that it would filter out in time to the small companies and employees by just the normal competitive marketplace. But unless we start it some place, unless we put it into place in some area, this will not happen.

I think that just for the case of simple justice -- as I've mentioned, we got rid of hiring according to rank, religion, race, but the last frontier we have to cross is to make sure that women that are working in the marketplace get paid the same for work of equal value. They say it's hard to determine. Well, when you look at the civil service that hires tens of thousands of people in this province, do you mean to tell me that they have not set up a salary scale, set up a system, and decided what each job should be paid? They don't work on a competitive system within the civil service. If they ever have, they long since forgot it. They used a commission to set it up. They use a salary commission to decide what the pay should be. Because of the huge size and the hiring position of the government, it's only remotely attached, in maybe some of peripheral areas and some of the top jobs, to what the private sector is doing. The pay for the vast majority of jobs in the civil service is decided by a commission. This is all we're asking here, that that commission be enlarged to equal pay for work of equal value.

[Mr. Musgreave in the Chair]

Also, this Bill covers the area that says that there shall not be discrimination, and people shall not be brought down. So those of you males, especially the inadequate types, that are holding jobs that are overpaid need not worry. All you have to do is just keep showing up as you have been doing, look alive when the boss looks at you, don't fall out of your chair until 5:30, and you'll still be paid. So it's not a question of men suddenly being robbed of jobs or men's salaries being brought down. It can be done within the present structure, so I ask you just to -- I know we're going to have to talk at you time and time again -- think about it from the point of view of justice, the point of view of justice and equity of one large segment of our population that we have chosen not to protect. We hide behind the curtain of free enterprise and competitiveness and say, "Well, that's the best we can do."

Thank you.

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

AN HON. MEMBER: Highlands.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Highlands; sorry.

MS BARRETT: I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, it's a constant temptation when recognizing the Member for Edmonton Highlands to refer to her as "the Member for Edmonton Shortlands." I know it is. Nonetheless, I would like to . . . [interjection] The mealy-mouthed Member for Calgary McCall wants to know why I

don't sit down. I'd like to point out that the reason I don't sit down is because I want to speak to Bill 217, which, by the way, as an elected member of the Assembly, I have every right to do. [interjections] Yes, the member did, actually.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order.

MS BARRETT: In any event, Mr. Speaker, I want to lend my support to this very important Bill and comment on some of the evaluations made of it by other people. First of all, I note that the Member for St. Paul talked about how it is that the government can recognize that equal pay for equal work is acceptable, but really this other stuff's just a bit too radical. Let me point out that in Canada we've had equal pay for equal work legislation since 1956, and the wage gap has only very narrowly come together in that period till 1987. In other words, it doesn't work by itself to have equal pay for equal work.

The member, in sponsoring the Bill, noted that for the first time in 25 years, no doubt related to the economic recession, the wage gap in Canada and Alberta actually widened last year. Now, when I say last year, I regret I must speak about 1985-86, not '86-87, because that's the latest year for which statistics are available. If that hadn't happened, and if, for example, in Alberta the wage gap had incrementally begun to narrow on the basis which it had done prior to a widening in Alberta -- just within the Alberta public service, okay; those are the statistics I'm referring to -- it was pretty easy to calculate that it would have taken, under equal pay for equal work regulations, to the year 2030 for equality of pay to potentially have been achieved. Now, that's just within the Alberta public service. The Alberta public service, it must be acknowledged, certainly is a few percentage points in advance of Alberta overall when it comes to the wage gap, and I do mean it is slightly narrower within the Alberta public service. But it did itself commence a period of rewidening last year, and that threat remains constant unless we have the mechanism by which we can prevent that from happening.

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

Now, the Member for St. Paul cleverly referred to an analogy whereby we might pay a truck driver exactly the same as we pay a brain surgeon. Well, I'd like to remind the Member for St. Paul and all other members of the Assembly that that is in no way an assumption nor an assertion of pay equity legislation. The assertion is that we have the ability as human beings to judge on a grid system the relative merits of work being performed and the skill, responsibility, work conditions, and so forth involved in the performing of that work. We -- as a matter of fact, human beings -- decide those things every day when we employ people, when we assign them job titles, and when we assign them salary ranges that go along with those job titles. The assumption is and the assertion is that when it comes to skill, responsibility, amount of exertion, conditions of work, and so forth, it is possible to weigh out those factors and come to a conclusion, such as comparing a truck driver's job to a stenographer's job. And there is absolutely nothing preposterous about this.

Now, one of the reasons it's important to do this is because the growth occupations for women in Canada are in the low-paid service-sector industries. We have proven through a time-series study of the Alberta public service that the bulk of the high-paying end of any given job is occupied by men while the

bulk of the low-paying end of any given job is occupied by women. I think that what we have to look at is a way to redress this situation. Are we ever going to get rid of, say, service-sector jobs which are necessarily low paying? No, because everything is always comparative, and we have to look at our ability to take low paying out of the category of, necessarily, in poverty. That's the way to look at that question. As it is, too many women are in very low-paying jobs without opportunity or encouragement for advancement and as a result live in poverty.

Now, I believe that somebody always pays the price for inequality. My question back to the members, particularly government members who have spoken on this issue who claim to represent the best interests of justice, is this: why is it that women are always being asked to pay the price for that inequality? It is a systemic assumption that women are best positioned or perhaps are best assigned to be martyrs to subsidize the rest of an economy by being low paid or consigned to working within the low-paid job categories or industries. A member said that, you know, while women constitute 52 percent of the Alberta public service, only 35 percent of women in the public service enroll in training programs. Well, that may be true, and we're going to have to do something about that. That falls into the realm of affirmative action, although I'll just bet you the member didn't mean to imply that.

Now let's look at another little fact though. The fact of the matter is that the bulk of management personnel, in the order of 90 percent within the Alberta public service, are men and the bulk of nonmanagement personnel are women. We have to look at that too, and I think that falls into the category of affirmative action, not pay equity. What we are talking about is being able to compare jobs of a dissimilar nature but which can be broken down into constituent components whereby weights, collectively determined, can be assigned.

Now, I note that the Member for Banff-Cochrane keeps talking about how it is that -- you know: "Can you imagine the NDP or the AUPE . . . accepting an arbitration board or a labour board decision about pay rates?" That's a quote. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I can, because this political party actually understands and concurs with the collective bargaining process. We understand what it's like to work as a collective. That is the way New Democrats work; that's what we believe in. We don't believe that the hierarchy assumed under the nature of employer versus employee necessarily gives all the power to the employer. We believe in leveling the playing field so that those things can be negotiated, and that is exactly what is called for within the pay equity series of mechanisms.

Now, the Member for Calgary McKnight waxed on for a moment about my late friend Grant Notley. Well, I used to work for Grant Notley, and I take exception to anybody who wants to question his integrity when it comes to what he had to say about pay equity. He never avoided talking about equal pay for work of equal value, Mr. Speaker, and to all members of the Assembly. I know that because I worked for him and because I helped him in preparing stuff that he talked about in this very Assembly. A selective drawing of one statement from my former mentor is not particularly appreciated, given that even though raised in rural Alberta, a place where pay equity would never have been talked about when he was a young guy, Grant was sincerely pro pay equity. In fact, just like New Democrats from coast to coast in this country, we're the front-runners in pursuing a policy of pay equity.

I would like to add that the New Democrats also put our money where our mouth is. We were the first political party to have a recognized and sanctioned women's section designed for the purposes of promoting equality for women within our party. We were -- and these things weren't popular when they were introduced -- the first political party to make a special fund to provide for support for women candidates so that we could have equal numbers of women and men running in equally winnable ridings. [interjection] Oh, it's true. The Grits can't boast about that. They must, I'm afraid . . .

MR. TAYLOR: Don't forget; 25 percent of our caucus is women.

MS BARRETT: Yes. They must reduce themselves to directly copying our Bills. Yes, I realize I've got about 15 seconds left.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, despite lack of popularity, we were the first political party to call for pay equity, and by God, we still support it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair assumes the member is adjourning debate.

MS BARRETT: Yes, Mr. Speaker; thank you.

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

HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

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

[The House recessed at 5:30 p.m.]