

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Title: **Wednesday, March 23, 1988 2:30 p.m.**

Date: 88/03/23

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

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

PRAYERS

MR. SPEAKER: Let us pray.

We give thanks to God for the rich heritage of this province as found in our people.

We pray that native-born Albertans and those who have come from other places may continue to work together to preserve and enlarge the precious heritage called Alberta.

Amen.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF BILLS**

Bill 249
Legal Aid Act

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, I wish to introduce Bill 249, the Legal Aid Act.

This Bill will give Legislative authority to a legal aid system in Alberta. It will allow clients to choose lawyers who have expressed a willingness to do legal work in specific areas of law, assuring clients seeking legal aid that they will be represented by a knowledgeable and willing advocate.

[Leave granted; Bill 249 read a first time]

Bill 239
An Act to Amend the Remembrance Day Act

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill 239, An Act to Amend the Remembrance Day Act.

Mr. Speaker, this Act would provide that no company or department or agency of government or any municipality would be open between the hours of 6 a.m. and 12 noon on Remembrance Day. There is a series of exemptions allowed in the Act, including exemptions for hospitals, drugstores, tourism and public safety operations, and other like activities.

[Leave granted; Bill 239 read a first time]

Bill 252
Quality Child Day Care Standards Act (No. 2)

MRS. HEWES: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill 252, the Quality Child Day Care Standards Act (No. 2).

The Bill will establish provincewide standards regarding staff training qualifications, staff/child ratios, indoor and outdoor space requirements, and program enrichment in child day care centres.

[Leave granted; Bill 252 read a first time]

TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table copies of the 12th annual report of the Alberta Oil Sands Technology and Research Authority and the 1986 annual report of the Alberta Petroleum Marketing Commission.

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure to file copies of the 1987 annual report of the Farmers' Advocate with the Legislature Library, the author of which I shall introduce later.

INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, it is truly my pleasure to introduce to you two gentlemen who are sitting in the Speaker's gallery. They both have performed an outstanding service to the rural population of the province of Alberta.

But let me begin with an individual who is going to take his retirement on June 1 of this year and who has had 15 years of outstanding service to the farmers of the province of Alberta. He's had an extremely close working relationship with all Members of the Legislative Assembly and especially with the ministers of Agriculture in this province. Mr. Speaker, words cannot adequately describe the outstanding contribution he has made, and I would ask Helmut Entrup to stand and receive the warm welcome of this Legislative Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to also introduce the individual who will succeed Helmut on June 1. He has served as his executive assistant in this post. We're delighted that an individual with the strong qualities he has exhibited has consented to assume the role of Farmers' Advocate in the province of Alberta. I would ask the Legislative Assembly to extend their traditional warm welcome to Mr. Clifford Downey.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Glengarry, followed by the Minister of [Forestry, Lands and Wildlife].

MR. YOUNIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm delighted to introduce to you and through you to members of the Assembly, a group of nine students who are seated in the public gallery. They're from Queen Elizabeth high school in the constituency of Edmonton-Glengarry and in fact just down the block from my constituency office. They're accompanied by their teacher Mike Ettinger and student teacher Alan MacMillan. They're grade 10 students, although from the comments and questions they had when I met with them earlier, I assumed at the time they were grade 12 students. I would ask them to rise in the gallery and receive the warm welcome of the Assembly.

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you and through you to members of the Assembly, a former member of this Assembly who served the constituency of [Olds-Didsbury] in the year 1981, Mr. Gordon Kesler, who is sitting in the members' gallery. I'd ask him to rise and receive the welcome of the Assembly.

MR. SCHUMACHER: Mr. Speaker, it gives me pleasure to introduce to you and through you to the hon. members, His Worship Mayor William Doucette and Alderman Ossie Shaddy of the city of Drumheller. They are seated in your gallery, and I'd ask them to rise and receive the usual cordial welcome of the Assembly.

MR. SIGURDSON: Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure today to introduce to you and to all members of the Assembly, some 29 grade 6 students from the McLeod school, which is in the constituency of Edmonton-Belmont. They are accompanied today by their teacher Mrs. Donna Fry and parents Gisela Boschman and Rocio Scanlon. They are seated in the public gallery, and I would ask that they now rise and receive the traditional welcome of the Legislature.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to do something that may be a bit unusual. I would like to supplement the introduction by the hon. Minister of Agriculture in terms of some information and offer my congratulations and appreciation to Helmut Entrup, who has been the Farmers' Advocate in this province.

Helmut has served my constituents as well as many other constituents of other Members of this Legislative Assembly in many different ways and has resolved some very crucial issues that my constituents faced. I know that as an MLA I appreciated the attention he gave to those problems in the area of seismic work, oil and gas leases, property questions, communal property, irrigation, and a number of other items I could list.

One of the values of that program put forward and initiated under Mr. Entrup was the matter of a program being rather independent of government, in a sense, and independent of us as members of the Legislature. Because of that independence that the Farmers' Advocate was able to carry out in this province, we received good services. So I again just want to reinforce the introduction done by the Minister of Agriculture and express my appreciation.

MR. SPEAKER: Member for Edmonton-Kingsway, followed by the Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place.

MR. McEACHERN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure today to introduce two groups of people. First, I'd like to introduce 20 grades 5 and 6 students from Prince Rupert elementary school, in my constituency of Edmonton-Kingsway. They are accompanied by their teacher Doug Troock, by a student teacher Brent Kisilevich, and a parent Maxine Koning. I would ask them to stand and receive the warm welcome of the Assembly.

The other group, Mr. Speaker, is seven members of the Edmonton branch of the Principal protection association. I would like them also to rise and receive the welcome of the Assembly.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure this afternoon to introduce to you and to all members of the Assembly, some 49 students from Brander Gardens school. The students are in grade 6, and they're accompanied today by several teachers and several parents. I would ask them to stand and receive the warm welcome of the Assembly.

head: **ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**

Palm Dairies Purchase

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, to the Treasurer. We now have again another example of free enterprise, Conservative style, in Alberta. I'm talking about \$100 million from our Treasury Branches, which are backed by the taxpayers of Alberta, to one Mr. Pocklington. The entire province is scandalized that this individual seems to be able to get to this government to get

whatever he wants and how much money he wants. I'd say to the Treasurer and ask this question: will the Treasurer explain why Peter Pocklington has open sesame on the provincial Treasury? Loan guarantees and now the Treasury Branches: why does he have these advantages?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I think it's important to clarify the transaction the hon. Leader of the Opposition has referenced. Let's make it very clear that the Treasury Branches are a very strong and viable financial institution in this province, one which was meeting the needs of a variety of private-sector corporations at a time when in fact the opportunity for advancing loans within the financial institutions in Alberta was under some difficulty because the large banks were backing out. I think we all agree that that is the context of the economic environment we faced and some of the problems the private sector has faced.

The second point that should be on the record, Mr. Speaker - so that, I'm sure, if the member wants to pattern his questions, he would do it under the same understanding as I have, and then we can have a reasonable discussion, wherever possible, about the policy question at the heart of this issue. And that is that the Treasury Branches operate at arm's length from the government of Alberta. In fact, it is not the government that's making this loan; it is the financial institution, the Treasury Branch, that is making the loan.

So again, the third point with respect to the record, Mr. Speaker, is that the government was not involved in this loan, did not have knowledge of this loan, and in fact it was quite an objective commercial transaction. And the amount of the loan was not \$100 million.

Those are some of the facts, Mr. Speaker, that certainly would be relevant to any other questions which the member may have. I'd be glad, wherever possible, to provide additional information on this point.

MR. MARTIN: Well, Mr. Speaker, if the Treasurer wasn't aware that a loan of \$100 million was coming from the Treasury Branches, then he wasn't doing his job. And whether he wants to talk about being arm's length, it's still backed up by the taxpayers of Alberta. This particular transaction did not create one job. We bought up Palm Dairies. My question is to the Treasurer. The purchase price of this was \$52.5 million. Has he happened to check and find out what is supposed to have happened with the rest of the \$100 million? Has he at least done that?

MR. JOHNSTON: Again, Mr. Speaker, let me indicate that this is not taxpayers' money that's involved here; this is not government policy that's involved here. What we have is depositors' money being used to the advantage of all Alberta. That was the intention of this plan. I've lauded the merits of the Treasury Branches historically, and although the NDP opposition hasn't raised the criticism of financial institutions, this has in fact moved in to provide the advantage to Albertans of a missing part of the financial infrastructure of this province. So it's very fortunate that we do have that. This is not taxpayers' money. This is depositors' money, and these dollars were advanced on the basis of a commercial transaction. No, I did not know about the transaction. I was not aware of the terms; they were done by management, and of course management makes these decisions based on the standard credit tests. Can you imagine if we had to stand here and account for every nickel and dime of loans advanced by the Treasury Branches? I can assure you that the

Treasury Branches.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, this is quite a loan. I would remind that if Treasury Branches run into a problem, it is backed by this government, so we should show some concern.

If this is a standard credit test, I can't believe it. Would the Treasurer confirm that the only security put up for the \$100 million was Palm Dairies, which they bought for \$52.5 million? Would he confirm that?

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Speaker, I can confirm that in the normal kind of a commercial transaction the Treasury Branch will take all possible covenants, both existing, personal, and future. I can only say that that is the normal policy that has been provided to me by the people who manage the Treasury Branch, and I have no reason to expect that that is any different.

The second point that should be made, Mr. Speaker, this is entirely distinct and separate from the Gainers question, which I'm sure you'll be up on your feet in a moment asking about. This has had nothing to do with the Gainers transaction whatsoever.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, let's just imagine what would have happened if this company had been left in the hands, for example, of somebody in Nova Scotia, as was possibly done. Now, the member raises the question, and quite legitimately, about jobs. We also have to ensure that here in Alberta we have head office operations, that we have the jobs being generated here, and we have the opportunity for expansion to take place within this province. That's what province-building economic growth is all about, and that's what this entrepreneur did. Had it been done by somebody else, I'm sure it would have been a commendable move.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, what we have here is a slush fund for Peter Pocklington with the taxpayers' money.

I notice the Treasurer deliberately avoided the question. Is he saying that standard business practice by the Treasury Branches is to take his collateral, a \$52.5 million company, and give out \$100 million? Is that standard business practice?

MR. JOHNSTON: Again, Mr. Speaker, the member is misleading the House, probably unintentionally, with respect to the size of the loan and whether or not the \$100 million covenant, which has been mentioned somewhere in the paper, is in fact a \$100 million loan. That isn't the case. It's my understanding that the loan is essentially at the original price of the purchase of that asset, remembering that the asset itself had been sold for \$60 million and some approximately two months before that transaction was upset by the federal regulatory group, who said it was against fair trade practices. So we have established clearly what the price of that business was worth. It seems to me -- and I can only confirm again that the Treasury Branches took all possible safeguards, secured all possible covenants, and has a very good collateral for the amount of loan that they've advanced. This is a profit-making company, by the way, and "profits" I know is a naughty word for the socialists across the way.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary, Member for Red Deer-North, followed by Westlock-Sturgeon.

MR. DAY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Provincial Treasurer. I recognize that Treasury Branch loans are arm's length from the government, but can the Treasurer indicate whether similar financial considerations were or are available to other businesses, such as Red Deer's Alpha dairy?

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Speaker, again should Alpha dairy decide to work with the Treasury Branches, I'm sure they'd be able to arrange on a commercial basis a similar kind of loan based on their collateral, their ability to repay, and the value of the enterprise itself. That would be a normal kind of commercial transaction which, if Alpha dairy was dealing with the Treasury Branches, would be available.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, I too am amazed that the Treasurer didn't realize a \$100 million loan was being made by an arm of the provincial government. Could the Treasurer, in view of his statement that all possible security was taken for the \$100 million loan, explain what in the dickens was left to guarantee the \$67 million loan that was just made a few days ago?

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'll attempt to just review that one more time for the member. First of all, it is not a \$100 million loan. I made that very clear. It's my understanding that the loan is approximately equal to the amount of the transaction, \$50 million and some, depending on the current position. So that there is not any misunderstanding, there is no other additional loan provided to Mr. Pocklington for Palm Dairies above that amount, as far as I know. Therefore, the registration of the covenant is essentially to protect the company against future additions to Palm Dairies should he acquire additional assets. That simply would sweep it into the covenant.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, these are two distinct transactions. I made this point already, that the Palm Dairies side is separate from the Gainers meat packing side. With respect to the Gainers security, which the member raised, we have taken all possible protection to secure that loan. It has been reported to me, including, as I said in the House previously, the existing assets of personal covenants and any future assets which will be added in the case of the expansion of the plant in southern Alberta.

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

Taxation of Principal Group Investors

MR. MARTIN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this to the Deputy Premier. Some depositors in Principal Savings & Trust and holders of investment certificates in other Principal companies find themselves in the rather absurd position today of having to pay interest-income tax on money they have not received and may never receive. In most instances, I might say, this is adding insult to injury, and this will be especially hard on seniors who are living on a fixed income. My question is: what steps has the government taken with their kissing cousins federally so that they might come to their senses? In other words, what representation has the provincial government made to give a tax break from the federal government?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, that matter is under the jurisdiction of the Provincial Treasurer, and I'll refer the question to him.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I share the same view as the Member for Edmonton-Norwood, that there has been a difficult circumstance created by the way in which the rollovers of certain contracts have taken place between the period January 1, 1987, and June 30, 1987, in that under those contracts that rolled over, there was a realization of income that is interest earned and that was not received. When the failure of the two contract companies took place, obviously that money was locked in. What has happened which is of record is that the liquidators of the contract companies attempted to, first of all, pay out some money to the contract holders. That has been done; some 30 cents has been paid out. That in some small way may help pay any tax liability.

But, secondly, Mr. Speaker, a point which I have some concern about is that when the liquidators attempted to establish the plan and therefore establish the losses in the two contract companies, the judge in his wisdom indicated he would not establish the plan and therefore the losses until the Code inquiry had completed its investigation. What does that mean? That unfortunately the losses, which may well have been effected in that year, are not known and cannot therefore be offset against revenue.

Simply, Mr. Speaker, on the second part of the question I intend to write to the minister of revenue federally to express my view that we should find some way to accommodate this disadvantaged tax situation for those contract holders.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate hearing that but time is of the essence. What specific suggestions, then, will the Provincial Treasurer be making to the federal Conservatives about this very serious matter?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I do agree it's a serious matter. There are several provisions which we are investigating at the present time. I think the lead here should come from the federal government, because, in fact under the tax sharing agreement they are the ones who pass the legislation, who effect the collection, and who do the enforcement. We are in the tax sharing agreement. There are some items we could do ourselves, and we are reviewing those right now, and that will be one of the items I'll include in my letter to the minister.

MR. MARTIN: Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Specifically -- I recognize this is a federal problem, but it's affecting many people in Alberta. When and if -- I'll try not to be hypothetical here -- the federal government doesn't do it, because they haven't done anything yet is the provincial government prepared to provide tax relief for the Principal people in Alberta?

MR. JOHNSTON: Again, Mr. Speaker, that's one of the items we're looking into. We have had discussions with the federal taxation people already on this issue. It's been drawn to our attention by the liquidators of the two contract companies in a letter they wrote not just to us but to all contract holders. I would intend that we'll take fairly tough action with the federal government to see that some benefit or some easing of the tax liability can be effected.

MR. MARTIN: Yes. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that we have to talk to the federal government. So far they haven't moved. But my question is: specifically what will the provincial government do to take over this absurd situation and give some help to

the seniors especially? This may be the final straw. What will the provincial government do?

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, again, Mr. Speaker, the range of possibilities is just that. We have to examine those choices. We have to do that which is best for those people who are affected. We have to do it in concert with the federal government, and we will be discussing all those possible avenues. For me to make any recommendation at this point would pre-empt the discussions which obviously are taking place between the two governments right now to find a solution to this, as opposed to finding some way to antagonize either party. We want to work in the interests of the contract holders, and that's our objective.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Provincial Treasurer. In view of the hardship that's obviously been worked on these investors -- and it's adding insult to injury because it is obviously at least partly the problem of the provincial government, the predicament they're in -- would the Provincial Treasurer agree to forgo the provincial share of the taxes, at least, in the case of this hardship?

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Speaker, since the member has raised that -- I have been thinking about that honestly, and that is one of the range of possibilities that could be done. But unfortunately, I'm not too sure how you come up with a way of doing it, and that I hope can be resolved. But I'm trying. I can't make any commitment; it's an idea which I'll take back for discussion purposes. But you can imagine, those of you who have to do your taxes this year, how difficult it would be to do that calculation: what amount of money was involved, whether or not the total income is involved. There's a variety of problems which exist under that. Moreover, the computation, the calculation, the confirmation, the collection is done by the federal government.

Treasury Branches Loans

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, we go back to this rather intriguing -- some people have a straw into the heritage trust fund, but Mr. Pocklington seems to have a pipeline into the heritage trust fund. I'd like to ask the Provincial Treasurer if indeed -- I don't understand why he said there was only \$50 million loaned out. A \$100 million debenture to me means a \$100 million loan. Now, where does he come up with the business that you only have \$50 million out on a \$100 million debenture, which, by the way, only had interest changed on March 3 here in 1988?

MR. SPEAKER: The Provincial Treasurer and the House, there's a difficulty here. This is not a fresh new question. This is nothing more than another series of supplementaries to a question that was already raised by the Leader of the Opposition. That's not an effective question period, to be having the same questions being asked in the same day.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, I respectfully submit that it isn't. It's to do with all the financial dealings of Mr. Pocklington, but it's not a supplementary to the loan. I'm talking about the debenture.

MR. SPEAKER: Let's not argue the rationale. Provincial Treasurer, if you wish.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I guess there is one item that is different in this question, and that is that there seems to be some confusion as to the source of funds. It is not the heritage fund. It is another fund called the Treasury Branch fund, and that is operating, as I say, as a commercial banking enterprise.

With respect to the covenant, Mr. Speaker, obviously the Treasury Branch decided it would raise or register a general blanket indenture. It's not the amount of the loan. The loan is only covered by the official contract between the two parties, and that provides for any possible increase in the loan outstanding. The amount of the loan is not \$100 million, as I've said several times. It is my understanding it's in the order of \$55 million.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, I guess we'll have to go back at that another day. How a \$100 million debenture is registered for a \$50 million loan is very intriguing.

Could the Provincial Treasurer tell me: when Mr. Pocklington's companies Fort Gary Fidelity Trust and Patrician Land Corp. all went into insolvency in 1979-83, did the provincial Treasury Branches lose any money in that insolvency action?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I can't give a specific answer to that. My impression is that we did not lose dollars, because this was a federally incorporated corporation under the federal trust legislation, and the deposits were protected, therefore, by Canada Deposit Insurance Corporation. But as to the actual losses or the transactions between CDIC and Mr. Pocklington, I don't think it's appropriate for me to deal with that in this Legislature.

MR. TAYLOR: For the Treasurer's information, Mr. Speaker, CDIC lost \$360 million on that liquidation, and I'd be very interested in knowing, and I'm sure the taxpayers of Alberta would, if the provincial Treasury also lost some money.

Could we go a step further, Mr. Speaker. The Capri Drilling company, which was owned by Mr. Pocklington, had some loans outstanding in the early '80s. Could the Provincial Treasurer enlighten the House as to whether Capri Drilling went out on any of the loans that were guaranteed by the provincial Treasury Branches?

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't think it's appropriate, again, for me to pursue an endless list of corporations which may or may not be associated with Mr. Pocklington. How would I know whether or not the company has any involvement with the Treasury Branches or for that matter the Treasury Branches have any credit interest with Mr. Pocklington in any other corporate enterprise, any more than I do not know where he does his VISA or MasterCard banking? I have no idea where that takes place.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, it's rather transparent that this front bench is incapable of stopping the stickhandling of . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Member for Westlock-Sturgeon, please, supplementary question. We've been through this yesterday.

MR. TAYLOR: Sorry; I didn't think he was in so much trouble that you had to get up there that quickly.

MR. SPEAKER: With or without the trouble, you're still out of order, hon. member. Please, the question.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, the next question is Alberta Newsprint, which is a new multimillion dollar project out here that's been guaranteed by the front bench, but there's a refusal to say who some of the principals are. Could the Treasurer tell this House whether Mr. Pocklington is one of the principals in the new Alberta Newsprint corporation put forward and lobbied for by John Zaozimy, an ex-minister of this government?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, while I haven't got a list of the principals of that company, I think I can confirm fairly precisely that Mr. Pocklington is not involved.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Speaker, supplementary to the leader of the Liberal Party's original question to the Treasurer. Is the Treasurer telling us that the fact that the dates of the transaction re Gainers and the transaction re Palm, which was the same date -- his knowing everything about the transaction re Gainers and nothing about the transaction re Palm, was mere coincidence?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, it's my understanding that it's a simple coincidence that the dates of the documents and indentures were the same date.

Adoption of Native Children

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Social Services, and it's with regards to the adoption of native children back into native homes. I raised this question in the fall Legislature and have had to deal with a number of cases. I'd like to ask the minister whether the policy with regards to taking as many native children as possible back to the reserves is still in place or whether there's been an adjustment to that policy since the fall session.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I think I would just like to correct the preamble of the hon. member's question, because I believe that it wouldn't be fair to say that we have a policy of taking as many native children as possible back to reserves. We certainly have a policy in terms of looking at the very large numbers of native children who are in permanent, temporary guardianship care of the department in speaking to a permanent home for them. The new Child Welfare Act obviously speaks to their cultural heritage as being one of the components, one of the components only, that is looked at, in terms of there being many others, and we should obviously be speaking to the best interests of the child when judging what is best.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, supplementary to the minister. Has the department considered, in this program and in the considerations, leaving native children who are currently in white homes in those homes in terms of adoption or as a foster parent arrangement and initiating the new policy in terms of children who come on stream who are available for adoption?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, that's a very important question because obviously in a very short time, just the last few years, the native community appropriately has expressed great distress about the number of children who have come into the permanent care of the Department of Social Services, hence the government. This has not created a permanent situation for these children, and with so many of them it certainly wouldn't be possible to imagine that the native community would be able to look after all the children who are presently in care. We've

had great success in working through individual cases with the foster parents and with the native community, in placing children in permanent homes.

I can't tell you offhand what the percentage has been in terms of foster parents achieving private adoption or, alternately, the children going to the native community. But I can say to the hon. member that in most instances this has been achieved, in terms of a permanent placement, very successfully. But unfortunately, there are a small number of cases -- a small number in terms of a relative sense -- that have not been achieved with concurrence on both sides. These have been very distressful to all those people involved.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary to the minister. Could the minister indicate what type of ongoing assessment is being made in terms of this new program that came in with the legislation? Is the minister doing that personally? Is there someone in the department monitoring it and reporting to the minister so that a good assessment can be done at all times?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, there are a number of people involved, obviously, under the direction of the director of child welfare services, also the Children's Guardian's office. In both instances, whether we're talking about the department's role or the Children's Guardian's role, they have access to many professionals. I can assure the hon. member that we spare no resources in bringing professionals to the cases that are controversial, in order to provide the very best of information. But I think all hon. members will realize that even with that not all professionals will agree on what should be the permanent future of a child. In many cases they end up in court.

MS LAING: To the Minister of Social Services. Has she done any kind of follow-up or assessment on children who have in fact been repatriated; that is, taken out of permanent types of placement, where they've had ongoing care in one home, and been returned? And what kinds of results have come out of that?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, there are various ways, I guess, that an approach would be taken. There are in many instances on reserves across the province social workers who are working for the reserve. As well, at any time where there is a need for the family who has taken responsibility for an individual child, certainly the Department of Social Services is available to them if there are problems.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Gold Bar.

MRS. HEWES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the minister. In the same vein, I would like to have the minister explain to the Assembly about follow-up. Are there opportunities for return to the original home, which may be non-native, if the child doesn't adapt to a home in the native community? Or, if the child doesn't adapt to the original one, is the child simply transferred to another home in the native community?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, it would be judged on an individual case basis. If, unfortunately, there was a breakdown in the adoption that took place, certainly in looking at the best interests of the child, all people who had expressed an interest would be contacted, and normally workers do a very thorough job of follow-up.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Are efforts being made -- when this happens to the native children removed from a home where they've probably been almost all their lives with the exception of a couple of months, are there instances and are we trying, besides having them back with their parents or relations, to keep a way that they can go back and visit the parents that actually brought them up and looked after them for the number of years?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, obviously another important point in terms of not severing relationships important to the children. As I said, in the greatest number of instances there has been a successful conclusion and agreement in terms of what is judged to be in the best interests of the child, and certainly the families stay in contact. We have excellent foster parent families in this province. For those who have native children, they are making more and more of an effort to make sure the native children are in contact with their roots.

Reclamation of Imperial Oil Site

MR. SHRAKE: Mr. Speaker, last winter the Minister of the Environment and the mayor of the city of Calgary jointly announced that they would be funding a study with Imperial Oil on the reclamation and cleanup of the old contaminated Imperial Oil site in Calgary, about a 104-acre site. Could the minister please advise us on the status of the funding for the reclamation of this site?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, several months ago an announcement was made with myself and Mayor Klein of Calgary that Alberta Environment would be participating with the city of Calgary, and presumably Imperial Oil as well, on a one-third/one-third/one-third funding basis to fund a study looking at the reclamation potential of this particular site. That followed a task force that was set up in 1987 that had representatives of the city of Calgary, the Calgary board of health, Imperial Oil, and Alberta Environment. About a month ago we announced that the Alberta government would be prepared to cost share reclamation of that site on a one-third basis to a maximum of \$2 million.

MR. SHRAKE: Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. An awful lot of concern was raised over the site, especially over, I guess, the lead contamination of the park. Could the minister please advise on the security or safety of this site now?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, in 1987 the city of Calgary erected a chain link fence around the site in question.

MR. SHRAKE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The site is adjacent to the Bow River in Calgary. Is there any possibility of leeching out of pollutants or any contamination into the Bow River?

MR. KOWALSKI: Well, presumably, Mr. Speaker, there's always the possibility, but the results of the testing that has taken place so far indicate that there's no groundwater contamination, no effluent flowing into the Bow River.

MR. SHRAKE: Final supplement. How is the reclamation, the reclaiming of the site, to be undertaken? Could you explain the details?

MR. KOWALSKI: I don't have all the details, but my understanding is that the recommendation will be presented to me, and to the city and Imperial as well, that in essence the topsoil should be taken off, excavated. I don't know the depth to which it would be, but essentially that contaminated soil then would be either taken, landfilled at another place in Alberta, or removed to Swan Hills, where it would be burned.

MR. SPEAKER: Calgary-Buffalo, followed by Calgary-Forest Lawn.

MR. CHUMIR: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the minister might tell this House why the sudden change of heart after so many months of stonewalling on this issue. What principles has the government established to deal with situations of this nature?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, I certainly don't know where the Member for Calgary-Buffalo gets his information to suggest there was any stonewalling. All along I've indicated that the Minister of the Environment and the province of Alberta would be very, very happy to work with the city of Calgary and Imperial Esso in working towards this. A task force was established with representatives from Alberta Environment shortly after it became known that there was a contaminated site, and in fact I guess some 15 meetings have been held, with Alberta Environment participating in them, in the last year.

MR. PASHAK: To the Minister of the Environment, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to ask him why the citizens of Calgary and the people of the province of Alberta should pay for the cleanup of a land site that was contaminated by the operations of a big oil company.

MR. KOWALSKI: Well, Mr. Speaker, it's my understanding that the city of Calgary purchased the land site from Imperial Oil for the citizens of Calgary. The owner is the city of Calgary. The province of Alberta and, I think, the citizens of Alberta are being very much forthright and being very much generous in agreeing to participate with the city of Calgary and the citizens of Calgary in the cleaning up of this particular site, which I understand will be rezoned to a recreational area at the conclusion of the reclamation.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Highlands, followed by Edmonton-Gold Bar.

Funding of Health Units

MS BARRETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Last year Albertans were treated to various and sundry cuts from the Alberta government, including those on hospitals and medical care, health units, and deinsured medical services. Recently the opposition has been treated to a particular brown envelope that indicates that the Minister of Community and Occupational Health knows of the consequences of those cuts, particularly in the health units. One of the startling facts -- and this is the one I'd like the minister to answer the question regarding. The documents says that the minister's office had to answer way more phone calls of complaints, and that resulted in a reduction of about 50 percent in service to the local health units from the department. Can the minister explain what remedial action, if any, he took to deal with this matter?

MR. DINNING: Mr. Speaker, the matter of reproductive health is a matter that's of concern to all members of this Assembly, and it's a matter of concern to this government. That's why we stated in our throne speech last Thursday, when Her Honour read it, that we were going to be introducing a comprehensive reproductive health strategy, and members can look forward to receiving that strategy in the days ahead.

MS BARRETT: Didn't quite answer the question.

Nonetheless, Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister with respect to page 3 of his briefing notes, which indicates that a further decline in home care services for the elderly and the sick can be expected under the budget he's about to reveal. Can the minister explain or justify this sort of sneak attack on the sick and elderly when his own documents and the Hospitals and Medical Care minister's own documents show that it is cheaper by a long shot and more humane to offer home care services through local health authorities than it is to institutionalize those people?

MR. DINNING: Mr. Speaker, the member is absolutely right. Quite in keeping with our department's mandate and philosophy, our objective is to keep people healthy and independent and living in their own communities and their own homes. That's why we have a home care budget in this province for the current fiscal year in the order of \$31.5 million, serving some 25,000 Albertans in order to enable them to stay in their own homes, healthy and independent. The hon. member will have to wait for our budget when it comes down to see what kind of continued, ongoing commitment we will make to home care for our seniors in this province.

MS BARRETT: Supplementary question to the minister of non-answers. Maybe we'll turn to birth control then. The minister says, "Well, wait for the budget Thursday night." Fair enough. But the minister surely also knows from the briefing notes, which I'm sure he received, that the consequences of the cuts to the local authorities under his control resulted in an increase in teenage pregnancies and an unbearable burden on the local health units to provide preventive health services to families. What action did the minister take during the last year to fix that problem? Not next year; currently.

MR. DINNING: Mr. Speaker, we are looking ahead in this government, and we are looking ahead to a comprehensive reproductive health strategy that will see funding going to our 27 health units for sexuality education and counseling and for birth control clinics and sexually transmitted disease screening.

MS BARRETT: Kind of like closing the bam door, Mr. Speaker, after the horse bolted. You know, pregnancy docs have a result.

Final supplementary to the minister then. These briefing notes . . . Oh, by the way, I'll file three copies of these briefing notes.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, hon. member. *Beauchesne* 362 needs to be brought to mind. [interjection] I'm sorry, Leader of the Opposition. The Chair has chosen to overlook twice the comments being made about certain briefing notes, but I refer everyone to *Beauchesne* 362:

Reading telegrams, letters or extracts from newspapers as an opening to an oral question is an abuse of the rules of the

House.

And it goes on further, so I invite all hon. members to read it. Thank you.

Could we have the question?

MS BARRETT: Mr. Speaker, I wasn't reading them. Please. I mean, I think it's pretty obvious that if I'd been reading them, it would show.

My final supplementary to the minister. The information the opposition has from within his own department is that he had an awful lot of increase in phone calls from parents whose children can't get their needed speech and audio services at the local health units. Has the minister addressed this problem, and will he announce plans to correct the problem?

MR. DINNING: Mr. Speaker, I am aware of the concern of a number of Albertans who are not able to get access to adequate speech therapy and audiology services. Through the 27 health units, we have, I believe, some 14 health units that are able to provide adequate speech therapy services. It's my intention, in working with my colleagues in the departments of Hospitals and Medical Care, Education, and Social Services, to be able to bring forward to my colleagues a proposal that would see us expanding those services for all Albertans.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary, Edmonton-Gold Bar.

MRS. HEWES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Lots of talk about prevention, but we still have too much evidence about its absence. To the minister: will the minister simply undertake to establish family planning clinics in all public health units across the province and to provide the resources necessary?

MR. DINNING: Mr. Speaker, I have to make some question of the hon. member's leading comments, and it's along these lines. This government provides some \$300 million in funding to preventive health services in the public health area, in the mental health area, and the occupational health and safety area. That commitment is there, it's real, and it will continue.

As for sexuality education, birth control clinics, and sexually transmitted disease screening, the member will have to await the government's announcement on its reproductive health strategy.

Abortion Policy

MRS. HEWES: Mr. Speaker, on January 28 of this year the Supreme Court of Canada struck down that section of the Criminal Code requiring women to have the approval of a therapeutic abortion committee prior to obtaining an abortion. These committees are now illegal and have been disbanded by all provinces. We ask ourselves then: how is it that three Alberta hospitals -- in Drumheller, High Prairie, and Lloydminster -- continue to operate committees? This is a very sensitive issue, and there has been incompatibility if not outright conflict in statements made by the Premier and ministers on this very issue. The conflict has created anxiety and consternation among women, families, and communities, and it's urgent that it be dealt with and resolved. My question is to the minister of hospitals and health care: will the minister show some leadership and require those hospitals in Drumheller, High Prairie, and Lloydminster to disband these illegal therapeutic abortion committees and conform with the law?

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, first of all, to correct two misconceptions by the hon. member: all provinces in Canada have not abandoned abortion committees, as was suggested by the member; and secondly, the hospital in Lloydminster is in Saskatchewan and under the jurisdiction of that province, not Alberta.

Dealing with the other two hospitals in question, in High Prairie and Drumheller, we have as a matter of stated policy said that we believe hospitals should abandon the abortion committees that have been in place for many years and that doctors would be required under a section of our hospital regulations to have the patient have a consultation with a second doctor before proceeding. It's not our intention to try to control hospital boards in this regard. We have said, as well, that hospital boards have the freedom to decide whether or not an abortion will be carried out in their hospital. Hospital boards also have a fair degree of latitude to determine the method of carrying out medical practices in their own hospitals.

My best advice to people who may be concerned about the way in which a particular hospital is carrying out the policies with respect to abortions at this time is to speak directly to the hospital board or the administration and try and find out from them why they're undertaking the procedures in a certain way. I believe that if we were to try to force those two particular hospital boards to do something differently, then of course they would have the option of deciding not to do any abortions at all, in which case we would not have improved in any way the access the hon. member might be wishing would occur.

MRS. HEWES: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Will the minister tell the Assembly, who it is in the cabinet that's in charge and responsible for making statements dealing with this issue? It's very difficult when we do have inconsistencies coming from our provincial cabinet. It's a very sensitive issue, and the Alberta citizens don't need opinions that are all over the map.

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is correct in saying that it is a very sensitive issue, and it's one where the opinions cross all political parties and certainly have a great divergence.

I have had the responsibility for communicating publicly the position of our government with respect to the provision of abortions in our hospital and medical care system since the Supreme Court decision came down in January. The communication has been that we have taken an interim position -- an interim position only -- that the province will fund abortions only when they are carried out in approved hospitals by approved physicians and that they require a consultation.

Beyond that, we are waiting for the federal government to determine what they intend to do with respect to the provisions of the Criminal Code which were struck down by the Supreme Court decision. The responsibility for . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, hon. minister. Sorry. Might we have unanimous consent of the House to complete this series of questions?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed?

Supplementary, Edmonton-Gold Bar, please.

MRS. HEWES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. May I ask the minis-

ter: did the minister consult with the minister responsible for women's affairs prior to establishing the second opinion requirement?

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I wanted to add that with respect to consultation with the federal government and any comments by our government with regard to the position they take, that responsibility rests with the Attorney General, and he is in communication with the federal government and other provinces in that regard.

Insofar as the decisions we've reached thus far in this government, they've been made in our cabinet and discussed in our caucus before being made public, and that will continue to be the case.

MR. SPEAKER: Final supplementary.

MRS. HEWES: Yes, Mr. Speaker. To the minister again. Has the minister received a legal opinion on the legality of requiring women to seek a second opinion? There appears to be differing opinions coming from the college and from the AMA on this matter of being able to have an abortion. If so, what is the legal opinion?

MR. M. MOORE: It is our view, Mr. Speaker, that the hospital regulations in Alberta do not in any way contravene the Criminal Code of Canada.

MS LAING: Mr. Speaker, to the minister of health. Is the minister of health saying that he will let two hospitals break the law, as articulated by the Supreme Court decision in its interpretation of the Charter of Rights, in keeping in place therapeutic abortion committees or that he is going to allow them to break the spirit and intent of the Canada Health Act by denying access to health care for women seeking abortions?

MR. M. MOORE: Well, the hon. member, Mr. Speaker, is wrong on both occasions. First of all, it's certainly not in any way clear that those two hospitals are breaking the law. The Supreme Court decision, as I understand it, didn't deal in any way, shape, or form with the conditions under which hospitals operate in the province of Alberta. Secondly, the Supreme Court decision did not deal in any way, shape, or form with a firm requirement that every hospital in this country provide abortion services. So on both counts, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is quite misinformed.

MR. SPEAKER: Before the Chair calls Orders of the Day, I'd like to make a brief statement to the House which will give some clarification to some of the House procedures yesterday. Yesterday the Member for Edmonton-Centre requested, under Standing Order 40, a motion be debated because of its urgent and pressing necessity. Inadvertently a debate arose surrounding the urgency of the motion in question, brought on perhaps by a point of order which was raised by the hon. Minister of Community and Occupational Health. However, after reviewing Standing Order 40, I note that only the mover shall be allowed to explain the urgent and pressing necessity. I draw this to the attention of all members who may in the future wish to use Standing Order 40 as a means in which to debate a motion. I would also expect that the mover of such a motion would be

able to express the case of urgency in a very brief and succinct manner, perhaps a couple of sentences. So the Chair apologizes to the House for yesterday having allowed other members to speak to the matter of urgency when Standing Order 40 is quite clear that it is only the mover who has that opportunity.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

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

Moved by Mrs. Mirosh:

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

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

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

[Adjourned debate March 21: Mr. Gibeault]

MR. GIBEAULT: Mr. Speaker, I was looking forward to the throne speech with a lot of anticipation on behalf of my constituents in Edmonton-Mill Woods, because I was hopeful that the government in the past year would have listened to many expressions of concern about tragically high unemployment and related problems. But I have to say after looking at it very carefully that it was a very, very big disappointment. The throne speech that was presented to us tells us that this government is completely out of touch with the reality faced by my constituents in Mill Woods.

As I mentioned, the unemployment situation has reached crisis proportions, Mr. Speaker. Some 12 percent of the people of this city, tens of thousands of them, are unable to find productive employment to support themselves and their families. The throne speech says that the economy is gaining momentum. Where's the evidence for that? What can I point to for my constituents who come to me and tell me very tragic stories of economic hardship and the resultant family breakdowns? Where am I to refer them to where these jobs are? There are more than 50,000 people in this city alone, let alone the province as a whole, who are without productive employment, and this throne speech leaves nothing for any of those people to be hopeful about. It is a tragic, tragic letdown.

If this government had any vision, Mr. Speaker, it would have introduced some dynamic new initiatives. It would have introduced, for example, by looking at other examples in jurisdictions like Manitoba, something called a jobs fund that would have as a main priority getting people in this province back to work. It would have looked, if it had some vision, at an Alberta works program that would have provided support to the municipalities of this province to regenerate the infrastructure that is decaying, providing thousands of jobs to the construction sector, which is particularly hard hit. If it had some vision, it would have announced a new business start program, particularly for the young people of this province because they face a particularly high rate of unemployment. But none of those initiatives were there.

It's sort of a lot of, "We're hoping that the economic situation improves, and basically just let the private sector, our friends like Peter Pocklington, run the economy for us." Well,

that's just not cutting the mustard, Mr. Speaker. It's not providing the economic opportunities and the jobs that are so desperately needed by my constituents and those around the province of Alberta.

I would say in addition that many of my constituents are particularly disappointed, coming from a constituency that is one of the ethnoculturally most diverse ridings in the province. Many of my constituents are disappointed that there was no initiative to begin a process of introducing measures for employment equity; that is, to make sure that people of all ethnic backgrounds have equal opportunities to access the jobs in the public service of the province. Now, Mr. Speaker, the federal government has done that. There are some deficiencies in that particular area, but they have a visible minority employment program. The city of Calgary has taken some leadership steps in that particular area, doing an analysis of their own work force, comparing it to the population characteristics of the city as a whole, and therefore coming up with some affirmative action programs to ensure that all the groups in our society -- in this particular case the city of Calgary -- have access to the opportunities of the public service of the jurisdiction involved. But this throne speech says nothing about that. There is no initiative in that whole area from this government. Mr. Speaker, people in my constituency are very disappointed about that.

I want to turn a little bit now to the whole question of excellence in education. Mr. Speaker, the reference to that is in the throne speech there. It's puzzling for me that the government would make that reference, because they introduced the School Act, Bill 59, last year, and if any of the MLAs on the government side are getting mail and phone calls like I am, it's obvious that that document does not have any support in this province. I've had over 100 letters, I'm sure, criticizing Bill 59 for many weaknesses that people in the constituency -- school trustees, teachers, parents -- have seen, and we're looking forward after more than a year now for the government to introduce an Act which in fact reflects the concerns of the people of this province.

One of the principles which was mentioned in the throne speech, Mr. Speaker, is that of access to quality education. I was interested to see that, because Edmonton-Mill Woods is an urban constituency. It's not somewhere out in a rural area, sparsely populated. It's a densely built up suburban constituency. The fact of the matter is that junior high school students in my constituency do not have access to quality education in their community. They have to be bused out of Mill Woods entirely to places outside the community. They have to take bus rides -- as many as three buses -- to get to their junior high school. It can be over two hours on the bus, Mr. Speaker. They are denied extracurricular experiences that normally are available to children in urban areas like the city of Edmonton, and because of these extensive busing arrangements and numerous transfers and so on, parents have fear for their children's safety.

Urban Albertans are entitled to better than that, and this throne speech has offered nothing to show any sort of initiative to provide community-based facilities for junior high school students and senior high school students which are currently missing in constituencies like mine, the new suburban areas. Mr. Speaker, I can tell you that the people of Mill Woods, the parents of Mill Woods, that have been struggling for facilities like that are sickened when they read the press reports that the public cheque book seems to be wide open for people like Peter Pocklington and still we seem to have to be groveling to get a few dollars to build a new school. The contrasts are appalling,

Mr. Speaker, and my constituents are certain to remember that come election time next time around.

Mr. Speaker, they talk about quality education. Well, we had the announcement earlier that there was going to be a 2 percent increase in funding for basic education. The inflation is running at 4 percent. So what does that mean? Well, it only means that the cuts are going to be less severe this year than they were last year when there was a 3 percent cut added to inflation and it made it somewhere in the neighbourhood of 7 percent less purchasing power that was available to school boards. This year it'll be somewhat less. It'll just mean there'll be fewer teachers laid off, there'll be fewer support staff people laid off, and the class sizes will increase somewhat less than they otherwise would. But to say there's a commitment to quality education is nothing less than a fraud, Mr. Speaker.

In terms of health, I have to say that I was shocked to read this statement in the throne speech, Mr. Speaker, where the government says:

My government is convinced that good physical, mental, and emotional health leads to a life-style which provides the vitality necessary for strong families and vibrant communities . . . my government is committed to substantially increase efforts to prevent disease, to promote health, to develop community care alternatives for institutional care, and to nurture individual independence.

Mr. Speaker, did we have an election and change government, or is this statement coming from the same government that no less than last year deinsured eye examinations for the people of this province, cut chiropractic and physiotherapy coverage that keeps people out of hospitals, deinsured contraceptive counseling services? I could go on with a whole long list of cutbacks and chiseling on services that are available to the people of this province. Now, Mr. Speaker, my constituents realize that that's nothing short of hypocrisy, and again they're simply not impressed.

I also have to express my very severe disappointment that there is not a single comment in this entire throne speech about the Workers' Compensation Board. Mr. Speaker, is this government so completely out of touch that they are not getting extensive letters and complaints from my office, my colleagues' offices, from people around this province, from the Injured Workers Association of Alberta? Do they not see the demonstrations that are out here every Friday morning, the injured workers who have been abused by the bureaucracy that currently is administering the workers' compensation plan in this province? There's not even an acknowledgment in this document, Mr. Speaker, of a problem, for goodness' sake. There are families who have been destroyed by not having their claims recognized, appeals that have taken months and months, years sometimes, and in the meantime people have lost their homes and their families have disintegrated.

Mr. Speaker, I have tried to meet with the minister about this. No action has taken place over several months. We've even tried to bring this to the attention of the Premier. You know, there are all these ads about open government that are advertised all the time. Well, we tried to have a couple of constituents come and ask for a meeting with the Premier to bring these problems to his attention, and we couldn't get anywhere near his office; the security guards made sure of that. So much for open government. Let's just be honest and say that the people of Alberta are not welcome here; they're not welcome by this government. This government doesn't want to hear their problems.

My constituents and I condemn this Conservative govern-

ment for its lack of compassion for the injured workers of this province. There were reviews instituted in Manitoba last year, and one is going to be instituted this year in British Columbia. They're talking about a complete overhaul of the system for workers' compensation in Ontario. Mr. Speaker, until we get a full public inquiry into the Workers' Compensation Board, this government can expect to continue to be harassed without mercy from the members on this side to get justice for the injured workers of this province.

Mr. Speaker, there's a section in the throne speech that talks about "enhancing employment opportunities." I would suggest that a much more appropriate reference or heading in that section would be "enhancing poverty opportunities." What does it talk about? Well, first of all, it doesn't talk about the minimum wage in this province: \$3.80 an hour, and it hasn't gone up in seven years. This government likes to tell us and remind us about how Alberta is number one. Yeah, we're number one all right about the minimum wage: lowest in the country, lower than Newfoundland and Prince Edward Island that have far less resources than we do. Mr. Speaker, this continues to be a national disgrace and an eyesore on the record of this government.

Secondly, there's some reference in this section on enhancing poverty opportunities about government efforts for employment creation. Well, what have we got there? We've got these make-work projects that simply requalify people for unemployment insurance. The maximum these people are paid is \$5.50 an hour, usually less, and they know right from the very beginning, Mr. Speaker, that in 16 months or so they're going to be out of work, back on unemployment. They've got no future, no benefits, no pension, zip all. These are people who are being put into a new class in this province, a whole class of people who are poorly paid, marginalized workers who have no future in this economy, no role in this economy. A government that can't do more than that ought to fold in the cards and let somebody else have a try. That is nothing less than an insult to the unemployed people of this province.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to talk a little bit about taxation. There wasn't much referred to in the throne speech about that, but my constituents know that the tax system we have in this province, along with the federal system, is certainly not fair. Like many people, I have just recently completed my 1987 income tax return, and on \$25,538 of total income I paid \$3,493 in tax. That's, about 14 percent of my income. My constituents and I don't mind paying taxes for worthwhile and valuable services to the people of this province. We are extremely disturbed, however, when we see that the corporate sector pays nowhere near a fair share of the tax burden in this province, and my constituents are outraged when they see case after case of government waste and handouts in the millions of dollars to their friends.

Mr. Speaker, there is no reference to an effort to enhance the fairness of the tax system. I guess we can't expect that from the corporate government on the other side. But my constituents are going to continue to press for and demand, as they should, fair tax regimes in the province of Alberta and in our country.

[Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair]

I want to say a few things about the women of my constituency, Edmonton-Mill Woods, who were appalled that they were barely mentioned in this throne speech document. There is no reference here from a government which would have had some vision for new, bold legislation for equal pay for work of

equal value. No sir. This government seems to be quite content to let that system of substantial variations between the wages men make and the wages women make go on. There does not seem to be any commitment whatsoever to promote fairness for working women through the advancement of pay equity legislation, so of course the women of this province have been let down one more time by this government.

Another issue of concern to many of the women in my constituency is the whole area of quality child care. Some of the child care centres in this province, Mr. Speaker, are not fit for animals. We don't have any standards to speak of for child care workers, other than having a first-aid certificate. Can you imagine allowing. . . [interjections] Mr. Speaker, we have higher qualifications, basically, for people who monitor parking meters than we have for the day care workers in this province. They're paid the most marginal wages, and it's an absolute disgrace that our children have been given such low priority by this government.

Mr. Speaker, during his comments on the throne speech the other day, the Energy minister told the House that he was expecting some honesty from the members on this side. I was surprised for him to make that comment, because if I had a leader, a Premier, who told people he was working out of the office when he was golfing, I don't think I'd give anybody lessons about honesty.

Mr. Speaker, this throne speech is a total failure in terms of both economic and social policy, and my constituents in Edmonton-Mill Woods are anxiously waiting for their next opportunity to express their feelings at the ballot box about a government that is so morally bankrupt and devoid of any ideas to get average Albertans back to work.

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

MR. NELSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is indeed a pleasure to rise and speak to the Speech from the Throne. First of all, I would like to commend Her Honour on again giving a well-rounded speech and exceptionally well done. And to my colleagues who moved and seconded the speech, again a very good job and very well done.

Mr. Speaker, the Speech from the Throne, of course, generally outlines many of the programs the government is going to identify during the session and during the year but doesn't always necessarily identify the whole package of initiatives the government may take during those legislative periods. I'm sure our hon. friends opposite, if they get their heads out of the sand, would recognize that. There's no sense in putting the whole package out for them to go out and wave the flag, and I think it's very commendable that the government, in its wisdom, has taken the position it has.

If we look at the throne speech and look at it in the positive sense it has been given, there is a message in there, Mr. Speaker, a tremendous message of positive activity within the province of Alberta, the regaining of some momentum that was lost during a difficult period of time created by situations that were not under the control of Alberta. And yes, some of the activity that's positive is also created by activities that are offshore. I guess you could name those in the main as being prices of energy and what have you.

Let me deal with some of the issues here. Let's deal with the issue of leadership. That seems to have been a question raised by members opposite. Let's deal with leadership and honesty with leadership. We have in Alberta, Mr. Speaker, one of the

finest leaders in this country. We have a leader who is not only leading this country but is a leader amongst the first ministers of this country. As we all know, when he took over the helm of the government, he was chairing the first ministers' conferences and led us through a number of very difficult issues on the national scene. Let us not be fooled by the many doomsayers over here or the edited press reports by many who may lean towards some socialism. The Premier leads the province and leads well. There's not an empty well of money that can be thrown around every time someone or some organization squeaks. He recognizes, as do most Albertans, that we must develop a needs list rather than a so-called want list, as the opposition seems to think is appropriate. Want lists are unfortunately not one of the things we can continue to appropriately expand on.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to talk about my constituency a little bit and a little bit about the economy of the province and a few other issues. First of all, as the Leader of the Official Opposition indicated, he thought his constituency was the finest in the province. I beg to differ with him. I think mine is the finest in the province, and I'm sure every member would think theirs is also. But we have a lot of things going for us in Calgary-McCall. We have generally a pretty good, stable population. We have a tremendous amount of cultural organizations in the constituency that participate in the political system, that work hard. We have many varying economic groups, some of reasonably good income, some not so good. We have many single parents, and most of these single parents are out working, trying to raise their families and using our day care and schooling systems. And it is not easy. Nobody suggests it is easy, and thereby the government gives every assistance possible.

The Member for Edmonton-Mill Woods just talked about day cares in the province. Mr. Speaker, I have to admit that day cares in Calgary-McCall are fine, fine places to send the children. I would sure like the member over here from Mill Woods to identify those day cares that he says are not fit for animals, because quite frankly, I would like to visit one of those myself. I think the standards of day care in this province are excellent, generally speaking. For those doomsayers that can't see the bushes for the trees, I would suggest maybe they take the blinders off and go in and recognize some of the abilities and some of the good things that are being developed in our day cares by free enterprisers, free thinkers, under the system that's been developed, that is in some ways overregulated and maybe even overcontrolled. I can assure you that in general terms the day cares in this province must be rated among some of the best in the country. Yes, like any circumstance, I guess we can all criticize. It's too hard to talk positively about things and too easy to be negative.

Mr. Speaker, we have all had some difficult times over the last year with regard to education, health care. Funding in education, it has been suggested, has been dropped considerably. Bill 59 has certainly been a concern. There's no question that there have been concerns in the community. But let's just take our heads out of the sand for a little while and identify what's been going on since some of these things happened. First of all, to the credit of the Minister of Education and many, many members of at least the government side, we've gone into the communities and the minister has been all over the province to discuss Bill 59 and the educational needs of the various communities in this province. We have listened and have, I hope, listened well to those groups and citizens who feel they have considerable concerns relevant to education. In my view, when the new Act is presented to the Legislature, it will be in

tune, we hope, at least with most of those suggestions that have been presented to the government and the government members.

Funding, of course, has already been announced: that there will be a slight increase in that to the province in our education system. But I think I'll leave that issue for others to discuss at the appropriate time as budgets come about, and I think we'll all recognize where we're coming from.

Mr. Speaker, the issue of the economy regaining momentum. Again, as the opposition has said, "It's our position that we have to criticize." Yes, maybe they have to criticize, and maybe even some of the members on the government side have to criticize occasionally too. But when there are some reasonably good things in the community that are happening, I think we should all say: "I'm proud to be an Albertan. Are you proud to be an Albertan?" I would suggest that most of us that are clear-thinking, positive-thinking people will say, "Yes, we are proud to be Albertan, and proud to be a part of the mosaic of our country."

Mr. Speaker, in the last couple of years things have started to improve. And yes, we went through that tough time. But isn't it interesting for the doomsayers over here to suggest that there is so much unemployment. Yes, we must admit that there is some unemployment that we don't like to see. Nobody wants to see people out of work. They want to see people enjoying themselves, creating opportunities for themselves and their families, and anybody who suggests anything different is fooling themselves and some others. But Alberta today has the largest number of people actually employed ever in the history of this province. Now, I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that not only is that a positive in the province; that has to be a commendable item this government can pat itself on the back for.

Let's take some blinders off some of these doomsayers and naysayers. Why has this happened? Why are we getting all these jobs created in this province? Well, it's been created because government has taken initiatives. Government has taken the position that we are going to create economic diversification. And how are we going to do that? We are going to create an environment in this province that the private sector will feel comfortable with and confident in to achieve their goals of job opportunities and, yes, profits for the company. I know over here "profit" is a bad word. Profits create jobs; profits create job opportunities.

Mr. Speaker, the accomplishments that can be discussed relevant to the economic diversification of this province are many. And yes, there are situations where the government is a participant in these activities, such as Syncrude, which gives the government and the province of Alberta, the people of Alberta, tremendous returns on that investment. Yes, there are situations where loans are made, loan guarantees. And what does it do for the province? It creates industry, and industry creates jobs. Head offices create more jobs and bring decision-makers to the province so they may better understand the opportunities here.

It's interesting to note that we talk about loan guarantees. I don't see the opposition jumping up and down and suggesting, "Hey, our farmers shouldn't have any guarantees on loans out there." I mean, there's \$153 million in loan guarantees out there to nearly 14,000 farmers. Does the opposition say, "No, that shouldn't happen"? Well, maybe they are, but don't want to say it because they're frightened of the larger community out there. I'll tell you, there are some people in the city that say the farmers shouldn't be given those kinds of things.

Let's examine some of the other issues relevant to the growth and opportunities made available by this government. I don't

see the opposition suggesting there should be no loan guarantees for the development of our forestry industry or for the development of the magnesium plant in southern Alberta, and giving opportunities to our many citizens that are in those areas. I guess the question needs to be asked, Mr. Speaker: how many jobs are these activities going to create for Albertans? Well, it's many thousands, and when you consider that 2,000 direct or indirect jobs will be created by the Daishowa activity in northern Alberta, we should be pretty proud that the government has taken a position and participated in that.

Mr. Speaker, there was a suggestion the other day that we're creating hardships for many. One of them was regarding libraries. I haven't heard one comment from our opposing side here that has identified that \$7.25 million was allocated to Alberta's five regional library systems on Monday of this week. Now, is that a positive, or is that a negative? Obviously, we're not going to hear about it from the opposition, because they don't recognize those kinds of initiatives. Take, for example, the post-Olympic initiatives to promote Alberta to the world: a \$64 million initiative to enhance our hospitality industry and tourism into this province. All we heard the doomsayers over here say during the pre-Olympic period was how wrong everything was: Mount Allan, Canmore, everything. Isn't it amazing how well those particular projects performed to our many visiting and homegrown athletes for the Olympic Games? Absolutely a phenomenal show put on by a group of phenomenal volunteers in the city of Calgary and some from throughout Canada that were brought in for various activities.

They talk about honesty, Mr. Speaker -- honesty. Well, let us talk about honesty. Let's talk, as was brought up here this afternoon, briefly about Manitoba. What a great job they are doing. Well, I was talking to someone just this week about Manitoba, and I wrote down a couple of his comments. The first comment he made after returning from Manitoba was: "They have the best record of mismanagement of any government in this country. They have a \$10,000 debt for every man, woman, and child in that province, and every poor child that gets born has got a \$10,000 debt." Mr. Speaker, they have a \$600 million a year payment to service their debt on an annual basis, and the highest debt in the country.

Did you know that of the NDP members in Manitoba, not one of them has any business experience? And yet the PCs have 149 accumulative years of business. Did you know that the Seven Oaks hospital division in Winnipeg is still closing hospital beds? Did you know that the air was free in Manitoba until they started taxing it? That's what the NDP does for you. They have a surcharge on income and a payroll tax, and the auto pact had a \$62 million deficit in 1987. And you know, the premiums are now going up 40 percent in Manitoba. I should also mention to you that the trucking industry in Manitoba are talking about bringing their fleets to Alberta because they can't afford Manitoba, and it could be a \$6 million to \$7 million loss in the auto pact there. That's what socialism does, folks.

Mr. Speaker, I for one, and I know my colleagues on my side of the House, will stand up for Alberta. It's interesting to note that some, particularly the NDs over here -- and I don't know why I'm being so kind today. I should revert to my honesty and call them what it really is: a bunch of Commies. And that'd be right on. That's honesty, Mr. Speaker; that's honesty. [laughter] I don't know what the socialist Liberals are laughing at it for, but that's honesty.

It's interesting to note that some of our fine news media that we have in Alberta -- and there are some that don't think the

hon. Leader of the Opposition wants to stand up for Alberta -- did a tremendous job in suggesting that he, along with his socialist colleagues, should get off the pot and start standing up for Alberta. The biggest problem, Mr. Speaker, is that they're listening to their friend Eddie from Oshawa who, if he didn't have a free trade agreement in Oshawa with the largest amount of American capital in this country, would probably not even be in office. Now, you tell me why Eddie doesn't want the rest of us to have the same opportunities in western Canada of free trade that he may have in Oshawa. So quite frankly, I think Albertans are a little wiser than that and will identify the positive work of the federal Conservatives and the initiatives taken by our Premier and our government in Alberta to better equip Albertans for the future.

They always seem to talk about the working people, yet they've never defined what a working person is. Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that all of us, whether we're blue collar or white collar, whether we drive a bus or whether we drive a taxi or whatever, we're all working people. We have managers and we have investors. I often wonder how much a social agenda would, in fact, cost Albertans and how many jobs a socialist agenda would cost Albertans. Mr. Speaker, all I hear -- and I want to be honest -- from my Commie friends over here is social trivia and drivel. I have not heard one positive bit of agenda from this group of people since they have been here.

They talk about the issue of women and how free trade would impact to benefit women. Mr. Speaker, it's been determined that more and better opportunities for jobs for women and men will be made available once we have a free trade agreement in place -- lower consumer prices and greater choices in goods and services for women and men. We will have a retention of our Canadian values and our social programs, institutions, higher family incomes, and in all likelihood, tremendously wider economic opportunities for our youth who are trying to achieve some of their goals for tomorrow. I know that there are concerns about families, and women in particular, losing certain things like family allowances, maternity care benefits, child care, pensions, medicare, and so on. These have not been touched by a free trade agreement. The free trade agreement -- and I think we're all interested in it -- is supported by people who have examined it: the Canada West Foundation, the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, the petroleum industry's IPAC and CPA, the Council on Canadian Unity, chambers of commerce, and many others.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to deal with some of the initiatives of the government as they impact Alberta. I say Alberta, because not only do they impact my constituency of Calgary-McCall but they do impact Alberta as a whole. They impact my constituency in a very positive way. We have a tremendous number of programs that are attuned to the agricultural community. As I indicated a few minutes ago, some 14,000 Albertans in our farming community, with \$153 million in loans which are guaranteed by the government, are given tremendous assistance. Other farmers have received moneys under, a \$2 billion farm financing program at a 9 percent interest rate for up to 20 years. The Alberta Agricultural Research Institute that was established will help provide research and development so that we will maintain a competitive position for our farmers and food processors. And this goes on and on and on.

Mr. Speaker, it's unfortunate that I can't go through and read the whole list of initiatives and positive things of this government. But in trying to diversify, and especially into the areas of forestry and tourism that will bring us into the 21st century with

a tremendous bang notwithstanding the opportunities in our agriculture and energy industries, it is my belief that the people of Alberta are well served by the government of the day and will continue, to be well served by well-meaning people that are in this Legislature, especially those that represent the government.

Mr. Speaker, I feel comfortable that I can sell to the community of Alberta the initiatives of this government and the positive tones that are being placed in the community today. There will always be concerns that we all will have, but considering the economic times we have just been through and the positive atmosphere this government is creating in looking after the needs of Albertans, I think we have a lot to be grateful and thankful for. Mr. Speaker, I commend the government, and I commend all Albertans for their continued support of the initiatives and the programs and their own initiatives in the community.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MS LAING: Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege and an honour to rise in my place today to respond to the Speech from the Throne, which was delivered last Thursday by the Lieutenant Governor, Helen Hunley. It painted a picture of a prosperous Alberta, of Albertans untroubled by the present state of the economy and by the present state of the education and health care systems. It painted a picture of an Alberta with a generous social safety net and of a people with no fears about what the future holds for them and their children and grandchildren.

It's really hard to reconcile this picture that was painted here in this Assembly last Thursday in the throne speech with the experiences of ordinary Albertans that I confront on an almost daily basis in shopping centres, at town hall meetings, in my office, and through letters on an ongoing basis. The very day the Speech from the Throne was read, after I returned to my office I received a frantic call from a mother of three who is on social assistance, desperately seeking a home for herself and her children. That night I heard a woman speaking about conditions in the inner city: of homelessness -- something new in this decade, something that replaces transiency; in fact, real homelessness -- of increased reliance on the food bank, and this too was reported in the paper, of the coming of soup kitchens and soup lines, and of the desperation and despair of the people she works with.

At a town hall meeting the week before, one of my constituents spoke in response to a film on technology. He was a man in his 50s, and I detected in his voice the strain of depression and despair. A couple of days later he phoned me. He'd been laid off nearly two years ago, after working from the time he was 14 years of age. His UIC ran out a year ago; he's now on social assistance. That's hardly the future I think we want for Albertans.

I hear from parents with children in classrooms built for 25 to 30 children now accommodating 35 children -- hardly a good learning environment. And I hear from parents whose children are bused. I have numerous letters from small businesspeople wanting a loan guarantee for \$5,000, \$100,000, or maybe at most \$1 million to build manufacturing plants in this province and in this city. I hear of their frustration and their anger, and "I'll take my plant to another province," when they get no encouragement or support from this government.

Mr. Speaker, there is little in this throne speech that offers solace, hope, or encouragement to these Albertans. It is my belief that the mark of a society, of a government, is how it treats those who are not in the mainstream of the powerful and the advantaged -- be they disadvantaged, disabled, children, or ordi-

nary people. This government seems more concerned with addressing the wishes of the advantaged and the powerful than with addressing the needs of many average Albertans. My concern with this throne speech is that it creates a picture of reality that does not reflect how life is lived in this province by ordinary Albertans, and that in ignoring that reality in the throne speech, the government will ignore the needs of those people.

I would now like to address some of the specific issues in the throne speech. It pays homage to the Winter Olympics just concluded in Calgary and the thousands of volunteers who made it the success it was. And, indeed, we all share in the gratitude expressed to them.

The government takes much credit for the Meech Lake accord. I have already expressed my concerns in this Assembly in regard to that accord, and those concerns become stronger as each day passes. As for the promised Triple E Senate, time will tell whether changes in that honoured institution or, in fact, changes to any of Canada's institutions will be achieved under the new amending formula. Nevertheless, we welcome Quebec to the table at federal/provincial and interprovincial conferences.

The speech refers to the Canada/United States free trade deal. Mr. Reagan refers to it as an economic constitution for North America, although they may have to pull Mexico kicking and screaming into that constitution. Many of my constituents refer to it as a sellout of our resources, of our sovereignty, of our way of life. Many are afraid; some don't understand it; and the majority of them want more unbiased information. Information was not forthcoming in the fall session during question period, and there appeared to be an unwillingness to allow debate of the deal, which was, in fact, adjourned after only five speakers spoke. Seventy-eight Members of this Legislative Assembly were denied the right to present their views and ask questions on behalf of their constituents.

The Speech from the Throne gives a glowing report of the recovering economy in Alberta: 1.152 million Albertans employed; a record. According to Stats Canada, in 1981, 1.152 million Albertans were employed. So this is not a record; there's no net change. But in 1987, 123,000 Albertans were unemployed, whereas in 1981 only 46,000 or just over one-third as many Albertans were unemployed. That is a big change: from 3.9 percent to 9.6 percent of the labour force unemployed.

Another troubling trend: in 1981, 1.007 million, or 87.5 percent of the labour force, were in full-time work, and the remaining 12.5 percent were in part-time work. However, in 1987 only 973,000, or 84.5 percent of the labour force, were in full-time work, while the numbers in part-time positions had increased from 144,000 to 179,000, or 15.5 percent of the paid labour force. With that increased part-time employment came all the attendant problems of lack of job security and benefits. In addition, in 1987 fewer people were working at the upper end of the wage scale and many more were working at the lower end of the income levels.

In the two top categories -- that's \$796 and \$568 per week -- 12.2 percent of the labour force works at that level now as compared to 13.4 percent in 1981. The numbers in the middle categories have also slipped. In the categories \$528 and \$526 per week the slippage has been from 21.3 percent in 1981 to 16.2 percent in 1987. In the lowest categories of \$366 and \$330 per week we have an increased number of people: from 48.9 percent of the paid labour force to 56.4 percent. So in 1987 the labour force is characterized by a higher rate of unemployment, up to 11 percent and 12 percent in Edmonton; increased use of part-time workers; and greater numbers of workers working for

less. Not much to brag about, I'd say.

In regard to assuring excellence in education, I look forward to the new School Act. Certainly there was much to be changed in Bill 59, and I applaud the minister if she has heard and addressed the concerns brought forward to her by the people of this province. I would hope that the advancement of the secondary education in Alberta policies would advance and be cognizant of the needs of children as a priority, that teachers will be well-trained to present new course materials and that new courses will be piloted rather than instituted so they may be changed to best meet the needs of children. I would hope also that the minister will discontinue the wasting of money on achievement exams at the grades 3 and 6 levels. Such examinations contradict the implementation, intent, and spirit of true education that fosters exploration, creativity, and innovative thinking. Instead, much time is spent teaching children how to take exams; that is, how to put the answer in the right space on the answer paper.

[Mr. Musgreave in the Chair]

I would call on the government to demonstrate their commitment to excellence in education by restoring funding to community schools. The cost as a reduction in funding of these schools is of grave concern. I would also call on the minister to ensure that class sizes allow for teachers to meet the education needs of all children. It seems to me that the government cannot hold to its claim of excellence in education in the face of an increased enrollment of 2,000 children in the school system while there are 1,000 fewer teachers in the classroom. I would also suggest that equity funding grant capping, which may well be a factor in the three and a half week old strike, needs to be removed.

The Speech from the Throne makes much of promoting good health and medical care. One would have hoped that the Premier's commission would have included people involved in frontline delivery of services, perhaps a bedside nurse and a nursing assistant or two, as well as recipients of such care. I welcome the government's recognition of the necessity of good physical, mental, and emotional health. But what will this mean in practical terms? Deinsuring of many health care procedures and reduction in funding to the excellent programs of the Alcohol and Drug Abuse Commission are cause for concern that this commitment is but empty rhetoric.

The government continues to fail to realize that pregnancy is possible in women beyond their teenage years, that unwanted pregnancies can occur in women in their 20s, 30s, 40s, and even their 50s, and are especially problematic in premenopausal years, and that women in their early 20s experience a rate of unwanted pregnancy similar to that of women in their teens. When is this government going to recognize women's right to reproductive choice through access to publicly-funded contraceptive and family planning counseling and procedures and through access to abortion? It appears that this government is more concerned with controlling women than it is with extending to them choice and freedom. This is no more blatant than in the minister's demand for and willingness to fund second opinions for women requesting abortions when he will not fund birth control counseling. This requirement for a second opinion contravenes the spirit and the intent of the Canadian law as encoded in the Charter of Rights and is a waste of the taxpayers' money. It is a statement of this government's unwillingness to accept women as fully moral persons and, as such, their right to protection of liberty and security of persons. It is a position that holds

that unless women are controlled, they would make decisions less moral than those made by the rest of society. In a democratic society founded on the principles of justice and equality, surely this position is untenable.

In referring to the agriculture sector, which we have heard much about from the person next to us, we see that there are continued farm foreclosures, a continued high incidence of suicide in the farm population -- 40 per 100,000, twice the national average -- and capping of equity funding for rural school boards. From this we must question the government's commitment to a rural way of life. We welcome private telephone lines, but if schools are closed, there will be an inevitable erosion of rural communities.

We have heard much of the diversion of the economy. Travel through rural Alberta and my own constituency have looked at these issues. Many people are disenchanted and disgruntled, including business and manufacturing people, with the government's policy. The common wisdom is that small business creates the most jobs. But small business has great difficulty getting loans or loan guarantees. Many spoke of the government's favouritism for megaprojects and rich multinationals, never mind their friends like Peter Pocklington. The Canada/United States trade deal is set in the context of a commitment to diversification, but trade is founded on specialization, not diversification. An area develops and specializes and trades with other areas from their area of specialization, so in the past we have traded resources for products from other countries because we have been resource rich.

If we look at the trade deal, we can see that the increased trade deal can only mean increased specialization, not increased diversification. As I've said, Canada in the past has been resource rich and the U.S. has been competent at manufacturing. Under the trade deal the United States will have unfettered access to our resources at a price common to both of us, so we as Canadians cannot take advantage of our own resources to sell them cheaply to local companies to stimulate development of our own local industries.

We must compete, we are told, in the marketplace. Well, let us look at what goes into competition, what goes into the unit price of goods. There are raw materials, transportation costs, technology, energy, and labour. Canada is very different from the U.S. A northern cold climate means that we have high energy costs. We have long distances and small populations, so we have large transportation costs, and we have disadvantaged regions. We cannot change that, so we have to compete where we can compete. We have to save money where it is possible to save money. We are told that we can develop economies of scale -- that is, megaprojects -- but we have heard from people all over Alberta, and indeed Canada that megaprojects are contrary to the nature and wishes of small, independent Canadian businessmen and manufacturers.

The other way we can compete is to reduce labour costs, because we cannot reduce energy or transportation costs. And the way we do that is through a reduction of wages to compete with workers in many U.S. states with minimum wages less than \$3 an hour, states with no minimum wages, and with Mexican workers who make 60 to 90 cents an hour. Last week on national TV we saw the dire straits and the abject poverty of those Mexican workers working for Canadian and U.S. firms at 90 cents an hour.

We also have to deal with the states with right-to-work legislation. We would be asked to reduce the tax burden by companies, and we would see that that tax burden, those taxes, are

what support our social programs, our unemployment insurance, our medicare, our child care initiatives, equal pay for work of equal value, affirmative action programs. In addition, companies may not be willing to pay the taxes to support these programs, but if they are, these programs, as unemployment insurance in eastern Canada, may be characterized as unfair trade practices and subject to countervailing duties.

In addition, our regional and industry-specific subsidies could be designated unfair and countervailed, even as UIC was. Even the Canada West Foundation has said, "Free trade between the two countries will inevitably lead to wages being equalized between Canada and the United States," and further that "There could therefore be market pressure for reduction of these social programs or their elimination." So much for saying these programs aren't on the table. The pressure on companies would be from companies saying, "Reduce taxes; get rid of those programs or we will not locate here," or "We will relocate in the southern United States where there is a more favourable manufacturing climate -- and no heating bills to boot -- cheap labour, and a reduced level of taxation and less generous social programs."

We have been told how many jobs will be lost in the textile manufacturing industry, in food processing, in data processing, as head offices are centralized in the U.S.; 180,000 have already been lost to the U.S. through this move. But we are not told how new jobs will be created, although we are told they will be created. We are told of job dislocation -- that is, getting fired -- and the need for retraining, but not of programs to alleviate the suffering of job loss or of programs to provide for retraining or even an assessment of how to establish training for the newly unemployed: men and women who are immigrants, who do not have English or French as their first language; women who have children who may be unable to be at school; women who may not be able to relocate because they are married and living with husbands who, although making low wages, would make more than them. So these questions are not answered.

We are told of consumer savings, as the few remaining tariffs are removed, but we are not told how the lost tariff revenues will be regained except through increased personal income tax and sales taxes on everything, including food. We are told of cheaper TVs, cars, et cetera, but not how we will support the unemployed. And what good is it to have a cheaper TV if, in fact, you are one of the unemployed?

We are told of increased investment but of no guarantees that foreign investors will process Canadian raw materials here in Canada using Canadian workers. In fact, there is much in the trade deal that would suggest otherwise. We are told of the dismantling of barriers to trade and access to American markets but not that such access guarantees that the Americans will want to buy our goods. We are told of the disputes-settling mechanism, but rarely is it made clear that it will only interpret American law and compliance with it. It is in an era of growing U.S. protectionism and the omnibus trade Bill that is before the Congress and that may well include Canada that we are given this lack of information.

The trade deal, as I see it, is a solution for politicians bankrupt of ideas as to how to deal with the changing economy in society based on an ever increasing use of technology. It betrays a lack of understanding of our world and a lack of courage to confront the real issues and challenges that face us.

In regard to the Speech from the Throne I will return to another area, the social programs. We see that there is much needed to counter the hardship and despair caused by last year's

cuts, but an additional \$20 or \$30 a month will not be enough. We need to look at a system that means that so many people are unemployed or underemployed and live in poverty. This government has been expressing great concern about ensuring that individuals and families receiving aid are truly needy. Otherwise, it is held, such aid will rob them of initiative and their self-determination. I could wish the government would be as concerned and diligent in its treatment of large corporations. It is often said that we as socialists would be intervening in everything, whereas the government across the way does not favour such intervention. Well, governments intervene whether we like it or not. The question is, on whose behalf? The government across the way intervenes on behalf of the corporate sector while monitoring and abandoning individuals and families to the food bank.

I look forward to increased involvement of the community in providing services, but I hope the government does not use this as an excuse to abandon its responsibility to fund these programs. The community has a limited number of charitable dollars and volunteers, and indeed volunteers often spend precious hours fund-raising, hours better spent on service delivery. More importantly, the well-being of people -- adequate food, clothing, and shelter, education, and health care, be it physical or mental health care -- is a matter of right and must not be left to charity. I value a strong volunteer sector, but they, too, have their limitations. Volunteers need to be properly trained, supervised, and briefed by paid staff. The question I have to ask some days: are these volunteers taking away jobs that should be part of the paid labour force, especially in a time of high unemployment? The government's trends are indeed worrying unless proper care is taken.

Mr. Speaker, I now wish to speak to the needs of a group of society who received but one mention in the Speech from the Throne; that is, women. Although I welcome the minister's initiative in regard to mentors for women, it fails to address the root cause of difficulties facing women. In a recent survey of women and women's groups two major concerns were raised: lack of pay equity -- that is, equal pay for work of equal value -- and secondly, violence against women.

In regard to the need for equal pay for work of equal value, my constituents and constituents across the province surveyed supported this at a level of 65 to 70 percent. It is pay inequities that lead to the reality that 60 percent of single-parent families headed by women live in poverty, that women earn 65.1 cents on the dollar as compared to men, that women with as many as two university degrees earn less than men with high school or less.

The second issue is violence against women. One in nine women in this province is battered by her partner. Sixty percent of women homicide victims are victims of wife assault. Eighty percent of abused women are assaulted when they are pregnant. Where are the solutions to these problems which affect a significant number of our citizens? Indeed, many workers with expertise in the area of violence against women say that the primary prevention strategy against violence in the family is to empower women through legislation of equal pay for work of equal value and affirmative action. In addition, we are often told there are limited dollars that will have to be targeted to prevention rather than intervention. Again, a primary form of prevention is intervention: shelters and support for mothers, treatment programs for children in order to break the intergenerational cycle of violence.

Mr. Speaker, there is much that is not addressed in this

throne speech, much that has been unnoticed. We have heard no mention of quality day care that would further empower women and break them out of the cycles of violence and poverty in which they are often trapped.

Mr. Speaker, this Speech from the Throne has addressed the issue of how to achieve the good life, but it does not question what, in fact, is the good life. I would have hoped for a commitment to a life of justice and freedom for all peoples, including all peoples of Alberta, Canada, and the world. I would have liked a vision of a future committed to the well-being of all, that we seek trade alliances with many nations, that we commit development aid to Third World countries to eradicate the causes of war. I would have wanted such a vision and that it included all peoples -- women, men, and children.

Thank you.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Member for Stettler.

MR. DOWNEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to start off this afternoon by once again congratulating the Lieutenant Governor on her gracious presentation and congratulating my colleagues from Calgary-Glenmore and Lloydminster for their additional light on the subject -- somewhat more light, I would suggest, than we have heard from the opposition benches this afternoon.

I heard the Member for Edmonton-Mill Woods talking about additional funding for municipalities and medical services. He mentioned the optometrists and the chiropractors. Both speakers this afternoon have mentioned the subject of minimum wage. The last speaker, the Member for Edmonton-Avonmore, went on at length denigrating a major initiative that would help to pay for some of the things that these people are talking about.

[Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair]

A number of weeks ago, Mr. Speaker, I was asked by a group in my constituency to address the subject of free trade, and I'm happy to be able to do that again here this afternoon. When I was asked to speak there, I was asked to outline some of the pros and cons. I think, generally, the main pro is prosperity, and the cons can all be classified in the area of adjustments that will have to be made to realize that prosperity. Members on this side of the House are prepared to make those kinds of adjustments and to realize that prosperity and to work towards it.

Some of what I'm going to say here this afternoon you've heard, I'm sure. I'm not going to make any apologies for that, Mr. Speaker, because it's been my observation that it bears repeating for some of the members opposite for them to finally get the message.

The United States is Canada's largest trading partner. Trade between the two countries was approximately \$170 billion in the last fiscal year, and it is interesting to note that this is the largest trade account between any two sovereign nations in the world. By way of comparison, I believe Japan trades with Canada in the neighbourhood of \$13 billion per year, so our trade with the U.S. is more than 13 times that. Currently 80 percent of the trade between the countries is free of any major barriers. This agreement lays the groundwork for the removal of tariffs and barriers to trade on the remaining 20 percent between Canada and the U.S. Over 30 percent of our national income comes from export and trade, and over three million Canadian jobs depend on trade: farmers, fishermen, manufacturers, and service companies.

In the field of energy the agreement is basically an entrenchment of the status quo. It reflects policy changes introduced in the energy sector over the last three years and the move towards price and market deregulation and the reduction in the level and nature of government intervention. Canada exports over \$10 billion in energy products annually. Over 80 percent of that comes from Alberta, Mr. Speaker, and it exports billions more in downstream products in the form of various oil and gas derivatives. The agreement is built on an existing general agreement on tariffs and trade rights -- GATT rights - and obligations. As each other's best customer they have agreed on fair treatment should there be any controls on energy commodities. Both remain free to determine whether and when to allow exports, and they continue to monitor and license exports.

One of the objections that has been brought out by the media and opponents of the free trade package is the idea of proportional access to Canada's energy supplies. The provision is not really new. Canada is a member of the International Energy Agency, which consists of 16 member nations. The IEA can be considered a western nation counterpart to OPEC, which is perhaps more familiar. The IEA has provisions relating to proportional access which are very similar to the provision in the free trade agreement. This provision ensures that Canada will honour all contracts at a reduced proportional level for all consumers, Canadian and American. Basically, proportional access is based on historic volume and contractual agreement. We must keep in mind that the probability of invoking the proportional access provision is not very great. We hope it is a case of being the exception rather than the rule, but of course if OPEC tightens up or turns off the taps, we are in a scenario where it could happen.

Going a little further, Mr. Speaker, to look directly at what the agreement does for Alberta, over 75 percent of Alberta's exports go to the United States; 50 percent of Alberta's gross domestic product comes from the export of goods and services outside of Alberta. Half of these goods and services are exported out of Canada. In terms of jobs for Albertans, for each one billion dollars in exports there is a corresponding increase in jobs for Albertans of between 16,000 and 25,000 jobs.

In the field of agriculture Canada had three objectives going into the negotiations: to improve access for farm products, to make that access more secure, and to preserve Canada's agricultural policy instruments. The agreement meets those objectives, Mr. Speaker, while at the same time it does not impair federal or provincial price support programs to farmers.

The agreement prohibits export subsidies on bilateral trade -- that is, trade between Canada and the U.S. -- and this is the first time in history that any two governments have agreed to prohibitions on export subsidies in the agricultural sector. If we want to look at the significance of that, certainly a big part of the difficulties we are facing in the agricultural grain sector in this province has been caused by export subsidies, and competing export subsidies, between the European Economic Community and the U.S. There is a major GATT discussion coming this summer, Mr. Speaker, and if Canada and the United States as friendly cohabitants of the North American continent can't achieve an agreement something like this, we really wouldn't have a whole lot of credibility, even, at those GATT discussions.

In Alberta about 57,000 farmers produce a wide variety of agricultural products. Albertans consume only 23 percent of the beef, 40 percent of the pork, 20 percent of the wheat, and 50 percent of the feed grains produced in the province. The rest of

it is exported, and the bottom line on that is that if we don't have markets or we are inhibited in access to our major market, agriculture in this province would have to shrink by 50 percent. Currently Alberta's agri-food exports to the U.S. are valued at close to \$400 million annually. One in three jobs in Alberta relies directly or indirectly on agriculture, and that includes all of the support sectors, fuel suppliers, machinery dealers, hardware stores, and communities which largely make up the Stettler constituency. The agreement will give us more secure access to the U.S. market for our major agricultural and food exports such as livestock and meat, grains and oilseeds. Under the agreement we have maintained the existing market system for dairy and poultry products. We have also maintained the right to implement new supply/management programs and import controls in accordance with GATT rules.

The Alberta economy is based very largely on agriculture and energy. The third-largest sector of the Alberta economy is tourism, which generated about \$2 billion in revenues last year. It's a pretty narrow base for the kind of prosperity that we to a large extent continue to enjoy. It's a narrow base, and diversification is really important. The agreement will provide us with opportunities to add value and to upgrade our market opportunities in agricultural products. Investment will be more attractive with secure and enhanced access to the United States market. New opportunities for manufacturing, high technologies, and service companies -- for instance, communications equipment, computer and data applications -- will be the result.

And we have some very exciting things happening in Alberta. We need to do everything we can as a government to support and expand markets for those areas. Easier transborder access will assist diversification in the forest industry: wood products, plywood, strandboard, and pulp. Again, it will assist diversification in agricultural processing, which will benefit from reduced input costs, and also in tourism and business travel. Essentially all border duties will be eliminated over a five- to 10-year period starting January 1, 1989. While there will still probably be limits on the amount an individual can transfer across the border for nonbusiness purposes in view of some differences in our tax regime, there will be no duty at the border.

Indirect benefits on real wages and inflation will mean increased consumer spending, which in turn will provide more opportunities for small- and medium-sized retailers, manufacturers, and service companies. A more open investment climate, fewer federal restrictions, increased access for U.S. investors, and a more deregulated energy industry will broaden investment prospects.

Free trade has generated a lot of debate and discussion. *Maclean's* magazine did a poll back in 1985 which indicated that at that time only about 2 to 5 percent of Canadians thought it was an issue at all. That has risen to 50 percent, Mr. Speaker, so they are concerned about what it will do. That is a factor of a number of things, and certainly politics is one of the big ones. Now, we're looking at a federal election here within the next year and a half. We're looking at a media group that is finding this the main issue of the day and certainly with a broad enough scope to give room for discussion. And we're looking at governing parties that are seeing this as a major achievement and have been pressed by those first two factors, perhaps, to getting out and selling. It's a good opportunity to meet people, Mr. Speaker, but in my own opinion, it should not be necessary. The benefits should be so obvious that I shouldn't have to be here telling people about them.

I just want to paraphrase from *Maclean's* magazine of a month or so ago. Donald Macdonald, the former Liberal cabinet minister, and former Premier Peter Lougheed were part of the country's negotiating team, and in fact that was an interesting combination. Free trade advocate Donald Macdonald said that it is a difficult position to sell to the public because it requires careful and often lengthy explanations. Macdonald declared that you can scare people in one sentence, but it takes a paragraph or a page to alleviate specific concerns.

And I quote Dennis Rice, a strawberry grower from Manitoba, who says:

Let me again emphasize that those who agitate against free trade are not doing so in the name of compassion and patriotism. Arguments against free trade contain all the anguish of a slave master who is being told that his right to hold other human beings in bondage is no longer acceptable.

Let's rise above the petty complaints and scare tactics employed by narrow interest groups and politicians looking for media exposure. I urge all Albertans of vision to demonstrate their confidence in our province, in the strength of our people, in our resources, by expressing their support for this historic agreement. Through freer trade with the United States and with all other nations lies prosperity for Canada and for the province of Alberta.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hon. Member for Edmonton-Belmont.

MR. SIGURDSON: Well, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. If I seem to be a tad critical of the throne speech, I don't think it will come as a surprise to any of the hon. members here. After all, we've got a collection on the opposite side of many, many members who have gone out and praised this what I deem to be a rather shallow and empty piece of literature. But you know, I do want to focus in on a couple of points, and they begin on the first couple of pages of the throne speech. I, too, want to share with most members of the Legislature my congratulations to the people who volunteered in the Olympic Games in Calgary, Kananaskis, Canmore, and Rocky View. I very much enjoyed looking at a number of the games and the athletes, and I think it was a job very well done. [interjections]

As I move down to the next title, Mr. Speaker, it seems we have an awful lot of oratories here in the Legislature. Most of the time they're dormitory, but today they're a little oratory. I would suggest that after the next election an awful lot of them are going to be somewhat more migratory. However, we'll get over that; we'll get on with that. [interjections] Suppository, was that, Bill?

Today I want to go on record, Mr. Speaker, as saying that while the government supports a Triple E Senate and has advocated a Triple E Senate for a long period of time, I happen to share with a number of people the idea of a Triple A Senate: abolish, abolish, abolish. I don't think we need that kind of patronage any more. What we've done by saying that we want a Triple E Senate, especially in a province that has sent every one of its Members of Parliament from one political party to Ottawa, is said that they're ineffective, that they haven't been able to represent the interests of Alberta or western Canada inside their caucus. This is just another lame excuse to blame something on somebody else for objectives that we should try and take on ourselves.

As we turn to the second page of the throne speech, Mr. Speaker, I see the headline "Economy Regaining Momentum."

AN HON. MEMBER: That's true.

MR. SIGURDSON: Oh, it is true; there are some marginal increases. No denying that; nobody doubts that. But you know, with an unemployment rate of 8.9 percent in the province, we have a very long way to go to get down to what we had only a few short years ago or to get down to what the province of Ontario enjoys today. We have to start moving in a direction that is going to foster the kind of employment securities that unemployed Albertans and underemployed Albertans are looking for.

AN HON. MEMBER: Free trade will do it.

MR. SIGURDSON: We'll come to that point soon.

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

Mr. Speaker, with an unemployment rate of 8.9 percent in all of Alberta, I as an Edmonton MLA find the unemployment rate in Edmonton to be astonishingly high: 11.6 percent, or 47,000 unemployed Edmontonians. Forty-seven thousand: 42 percent of the unemployed population now happen to reside in the capital city. Yet what do we see from the government in the way of programs for capital city needs, a government that, quite frankly, through its cutbacks contributed to unemployment in this city? What do we see in the way of programs? Nothing, absolutely nothing. For young people between the ages of 16 and 25 who are looking for work -- their unemployment rate is five to six points higher than that of their seniors who are looking for work -- what does that do? What does that do, being out of work for a year or two years? As you start to go to the employers and put down on a résumé that you've been at home for an extended period of time and the employer says, "Well, what can you offer me?" you'd have no value. Pretty soon those people, those young people who have the potential for lifelong productivity, find that they're starting to believe they have very little to offer and very little value.

Social costs: the social costs, that have been very well documented, go hand in hand with the unemployment. Alcoholism goes up right along with the unemployment rate; suicide goes up right along with the unemployment rate. Wife abuse, spouse abuse: that, too, goes up along with the unemployment rate.

Mr. Speaker, it's important that we develop some programs for people that have no skills at the moment. It's important that we develop programs that are going to encourage people to gain some skills so that they're going to have a value and a sense of worth when they go out into the workplace. It's not happening now. Some ministers on the front bench would argue that it is, but when I asked last fall what kind of monitoring programs were in place to check on the job subsidy programs that we offer as a province, what was the response from the minister? "There are no monitoring programs, none at all; can't afford them. We'll throw money at a problem; hopefully, the private sector will pick it up, and they'd be fools not to. We'll throw money at a problem and hope that the unemployment rate just goes down."

Mr. Speaker, what happens when the subsidies end? What happens when we can no longer look at STEP at \$3.80 an hour -- or at \$5.50 an hour for some of the more fortunate people? What happens when PEP has to be cut back? Our employment alternatives: what happens to those people who are in those programs currently or those people who want to get into those

programs? The unemployment rate: it will probably go up. But you know, at some point the government is going to have to deal with the question of job subsidies. How long are they going to continue? Are they going to continue life long or only for as long as the private sector refuses to invest in our Alberta economy?

Also, Mr. Speaker, on page 2 of the Speech from the Throne I see the subtitle "Assuring Excellence in Education." I'm particularly pleased to see that the government now considers that education should have the highest priority. Perhaps it's a tad cynical, but I wonder if after all of the cuts to education, all of the political fallouts that came, the government is saying, "Yes, education is the highest priority," or is it saying, "We're saving our political tush." I wonder if what it is that all of a sudden so many parents were phoning MLAs -- I know they were certainly calling my office and my colleagues' offices, and I'm sure they were calling your office as well. I wonder if what it was was that the response was more political than desirous. More political, I think; more political.

We're promised a 2 percent increase in education; we'll have to wait until tomorrow to see if we have any more. But 2 percent in education, coming from the Premier when he was on tour in southern Alberta -- 2 percent doesn't make up for the 3 percent cut of last year or the added inflation rate of last year or the added inflation rate of this year. In fact, we still have a net loss. Two percent this year isn't going to do anything to increase the rate from 63 percent up to that 85 percent rate that has been recommended in the Kratzmann report and in the Minister's Task Force on School Finance in Alberta of 1982. We've got a long way to go; we've got a very long way to go.

The Member for Calgary-McCall asked me to be positive. Well, let's be positive for a minute. Bill 59: one of the positive things that came out of Bill 59, Mr. Speaker, was that it united everybody. Teachers, trustees, parents, an awful lot of students, parents of the noneducable, parents of Catholic students, parents of the public students: they all got together, and in a positive way they said, "We're opposed to what the government is doing." In a very positive way they did that, and I want to give credit where credit is due.

Mr. Speaker, that Member for Calgary-McCall also said that Manitoba was having problems with a couple of districts here and there. Well, what about the school districts in rural Alberta? We kind of have a few problems there too. I know that the Minister of Education wants to get in on this. Going to have the opportunity sooner or later. Probably come estimates we're going to discuss all kinds of wonderful things like equity grants or corporate pooling or any other way we can get some money away from other people.

But there are school districts in this wonderful province that are having difficulty meeting the educational needs of our children. The reason they're having difficulty is because they don't have a tax base and the government has cut back on its percentage. Now, I know that the minister is going to stand up and say: "Oh, he's wrong; we have an increase. We're number one on a per capita basis." I'm so accustomed to that, that on a per capita basis we fund higher than anybody else. But the fact is, Mr. Speaker, that we have dropped from 85 percent in 1970 to just over 63 percent today, and that's why the rural school districts are having so much difficulty funding education. Where's the priority? Where's the priority on education? I hope that tomorrow night we see the priority. I really, truly hope, for the sake of children that are in the classroom today, that the government has something more to back up what I deem

at this point to be a rather shallow commitment.

One of the interesting items mentioned numerous times in the throne speech was the free trade issue.

MR. SCHUMACHER: That's going to solve the unemployment in this province.

MR. SIGURDSON: You know, I kind of doubt. I don't have the faith that the Member for Drumheller has. I don't think it's going to solve the unemployment crisis we have in our province. In fact, I think that with the kind of foreign control of the economy we have today, what we're going to do is see that when we have a bit of a recession south of the border, those good folks are just going to shut down the branch plants. [interjections] Well, you know, Mr. Speaker, I'm not the only one that feels this way. Now, some of my friends who represent the governing party have this belief that only New Democrats and the occasional Liberals feel this way. But I want to go back to 1983.

AN HON. MEMBER: Why don't you go back to 1965 and the auto pact?

MR. SIGURDSON: Let's go back to 1983, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Might we go back to Standing Order 13, subsection 4(b). Hon. member, please continue.

MR. SIGURDSON: I'm trying to look at the standing order, Mr. Speaker. That was done with such...

MR. SPEAKER: It refers to the other members of the House rather than yourself, hon. member.

MR. SIGURDSON: Oh, thank you, Mr. Speaker. You've got a tough job.

Anyway, to go back to 1983. And I'm going to warn you that it's going to get a tad tougher, because what I'm about to say is going to probably raise the roof. This is a quote. It says:

Don't talk to me about free trade. We'd be swamped. We have in many ways a branch-plant economy in certain important sectors. All that would happen with that kind of concept would be the boys cranking up their plants through the United States in bad times and shutting [down]... entire branch plants in Canada. It's bad enough as it is.

Who do you think said that, Mr. Speaker? A New Democrat? One of those radical Liberals from eastern Canada?

AN HON. MEMBER: No; Mr. Mulroney.

MR. SIGURDSON: Mr. Brian Mulroney; very good. And what did he say during the election?

Free trade is a danger to Canadian sovereignty. You'll hear no more of it from me.

Brian Mulroney said that, and all of the Tories fell in behind, just like today where they're falling in behind, marching to a drummer. I think it's rather sad, Mr. Speaker, because it wasn't all that long ago when a different leader of the Alberta Progressive Conservative Party said -- and I think I can quote almost directly, because I pinned it up at one point -- that perhaps we have 10 years or a decade to diversify the economy.

MR. SCHUMACHER: We're doing it.

MR. SIGURDSON: That was more than 10 years ago. But you

know what's happened?

The Member for Drumheller says, "We're doing it." Well, you know, I'm glad the museum of palaeontology is in your constituency, my friend, because after the next election you've got a home to go to.

Mr. Speaker, the government has said that in 10 years we've done nothing; we've become more dependent upon natural resources than we ever were before. And what are we going to do now? It's sort of like the last prayer of the dying man. We're going to open up the doors. Unfettered access: unfettered access to what we've put together in Canada, unfettered access from our American friends. "Come on over; you don't need to have any checks or balances anymore. Just come on in; take what we've got. It doesn't matter." That's what we're offering. That's what this group is offering -- the group in Ottawa -- the group in Alberta blindly following.

MR. SCHUMACHER: Unfettered access to the world's largest market.

MR. SIGURDSON: Mr. Speaker, did you want to stand up and say something to...

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair is prepared to give unfettered access to the Member for Drumheller after the present member finishes speaking.

MR. SIGURDSON: Well, Mr. Speaker, that being the case and seeing that my colleague is fully prepared to participate in the debate, I'm just about to wind down and allow him to take his place, on the condition that he do so. Because I know he has an awful lot to offer; I see by his notes that he's got an awful lot to offer.

Mr. Speaker, we talk about investment. I heard it from the Member for Stettler. I want to conclude by saying that of the profits that are made today in Canada, the billion-dollar profit that's made in Canada, if it's reinvested -- and it's highly unlikely that it is; it goes back to the parent company -- 17 jobs are created for that billion dollars' worth of profit. Profit is not a dirty word, providing that you make sure that there are some safeguards that come back to Canadians who help make those profits, that they not just go back to countries where the home corporation is. Because for the same \$1 billion profit that's made by indigenous industry, 5,700 jobs are created. What a difference. If the government wants to abdicate its responsibility, let it do so. Let it go to the people, and let it go soon, before we tie ourselves into something that we weren't promised in 1984.

Thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Calgary-Mountain View.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I realize that time is running short this afternoon, so many of the comments I wanted to make about this Speech from the Throne and replies to some of the comments made this afternoon I'm going to have to forgo to get right to some of the important points that I think need to be brought to members' attention.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, it's been alleged in this Legislature this afternoon that the auto pact is equivalent to free trade. Well, I want to set the record straight on that. First of all, the auto pact is not free trade; it is a managed trade arrangement. [interjections] Ah, there's a big difference. It's a big difference

because it provides jobs and investment in Canada in exchange for duty-free access to our market. This is.

MRS. CRIPPS: That's what we want.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: I'm glad to hear the associate minister say that's what she wants, because under the trade deal signed between Mr. Mulroney and Mr. Reagan, it's not possible for us to get that kind of an agreement. It will prohibit that kind of an option being available to this country.

Now, there have been a number of industries in this country that indicated their interest in establishing the sectoral arrangement with the U.S. The Canadian chemical industry was one sector that asked for that, because they saw how it had operated in the Canadian automobile industry. But as I tell you, Mr. Speaker and all members of this Legislature, because this deal has now been signed, that option is no longer available to this country.

But perhaps the associate minister is more aware of another sector of the Canadian economy that is part of free trade, that being the manufacture of agricultural implements. We've had free trade in this country in the agricultural implement sector since 1948 and for the last 20 years have been running deficits in farm machinery trade. In 1986 it was close to a billion dollars. Now we find that the last manufacturer in Canada of farm implement dealers, that being Massey Ferguson, has announced that it is closing its plant. And it's just part of a long-term trend since 1974. In the decade from '74 to '84 Canada lost 5,582 jobs in the farm machinery sector. But in the motor vehicle sector -- this is the auto pact, the managed arrangement as opposed to free trade -- despite a major shakeout in the years 1979 to '80, jobs have grown in Canada by almost 5,000 in the years be-

tween 1974 and 1984.

Mr. Speaker, if you want to compare a free trade arrangement, that being farm implement machinery, we've seen what happens in comparison to the auto pact, which is a managed trade arrangement, which is much different and which has actually resulted in benefits to this country. And yes, it would be fine if we had a trade deal in which we went sector by sector and made those kinds of arrangements, but this deal prevents us from doing that.

Given the time, Mr. Speaker, I wish to move adjournment of debate.

MR. SPEAKER: Having heard the motion by the hon. Member for Calgary-Mountain View, those in favour, please say aye.

HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: Those opposed, please say no. Motion carries.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, by way of information for the Assembly, the House will sit tomorrow evening for certain important matters.

MR. SPEAKER: Having heard the information from the Government House Leader about tomorrow evening's business -- that's useful indeed for direction of the House -- the Chair takes it that the House regards the clock as being at 5:30.

[At 5:26 p.m. the House adjourned to Thursday at 2:30 p.m.]

