

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA**

Title: **Wednesday, June 8, 1988 2:30 p.m.**

Date: 88/06/08

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

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

**PRAYERS**

MR. SPEAKER: Let us pray.

Each day in this place each one of us is expected to face the ongoing challenge of representing the concerns of all Albertans.

May God grant us strength and wisdom to carry out our responsibilities.

Amen.

**head: TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS**

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table the Alberta Fishing Education Program report.

**head: INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

MS LAING: Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure today to introduce to you and through you to the members of this gallery, 30 students from J. Percy Page school in the beautiful constituency of Edmonton-Avonmore. They are seated in the public gallery. They are accompanied by their teacher Julia Kendal. I would ask that they rise and receive the warm welcome of this Assembly.

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to rise in the House today to introduce to you and through you to all Members of the Legislative Assembly, the co-ordinator and volunteer instructors of the new fishing education program. The fishing education program follows on from the tremendously successful hunter education program. Both programs rely heavily on volunteer commitment, and the initiation of this program fulfills a commitment that was made some time ago by the former minister Bud Miller.

Seated in the members' gallery today -- I'll ask them to rise after I've introduced them -- are Mr. Lionel Dunn, the co-ordinator; the volunteer co-ordinators, Mr. Jack Laurie, Mr. Denis Akerstrom, Mr. Jack Easterbrook, Mr. Dennis Gogal, Mr. Terry O'Neill, and Mr. Bill Whalley. I'd ask them to rise and receive the welcome of the Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER: Government House Leader, followed by Innisfail.

MR. YOUNG: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is my pleasure today on behalf of my colleague the Minister of Special Projects, the Hon. Neil Crawford, Member for Edmonton-Parkallen, to introduce to you, Mr. Speaker, and to members of the Assembly, 22 students in grade 6 from the St. Martin school and their teacher Wil Micklich. They are here today on a field trip

to observe the Legislative Assembly. I would ask that they rise and receive the cordial welcome of the members of the Assembly.

MR. PENGELLY: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure to introduce to you and through you to members of the Assembly, the grade 5 class from the Spruce View school. They are accompanied by their teachers Mrs. Marguerite Baker and Mrs. Glenn Elverum and parents Rita Andersen, Debbie Pushie, Ann Jickling, Marcia Jewett, Margie Miller, and Eva Ferdinand. They are seated in the members' gallery, and I would ask them to rise and receive the welcome of the Assembly.

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure today to introduce to you and through you to the members of the Assembly, the Minister for Mines and Energy and also the Minister for the Arts from Queensland, Australia. Mr. Martin Tenni is in your gallery, Mr. Speaker, accompanied by Beverly Paton, his private secretary, and my executive assistant, Joel Thompson.

MR. CHERRY: Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure for me to introduce to you and through you, 21 students from the school in Dewberry in the Lloydminster constituency. They are a grade 6 class, and they are accompanied by their teacher Miss Arnell Hines and also Mr. Suzuki, who is here from Japan as an intern teacher for a six-month period. They are in the public gallery, and I would ask everyone to give them a warm welcome.

**head: ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**

MS BARRETT: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to designate the first question to the Member for Edmonton-Centre and the second question, if you please, to the Member for Edmonton-Avonmore. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Centre,

**Fee Schedule for Doctors**

REV. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, The July 22, 1986, agreement between the government of Alberta and the Alberta Medical Association clearly states that

the Minister recognizes the AMA as the sole and exclusive representative of Physicians in the Province of Alberta in respect of all matters relating to:

(a) the schedule of medical benefits . . .

Since that time, the AMA's fee schedule committee has been working diligently to determine the fairness and equity with respect to the AMA's position on which insured services need better funding. How is it, then, that the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care has arbitrarily breached this agreement with the AMA by announcing in a letter to the AMA dated May 30 that an additional \$1 million would go to items for which 13 cardiovascular surgeons could bill, a move which does not have the support of the AMA's board or its fee schedule committee?

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member will take care to continue reading the July 22, 1986, agreement between the government of Alberta and the Alberta Medical Association, on page 4 under article 3 he will note article 3.3:

Notwithstanding the foregoing, consultation may be carried out in any manner and at any level that is mutually agreed on.

In addition to that, it is indicated quite clearly in the agreement

that any issues which are unresolved may be decided by the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care.

In this particular case, Mr. Speaker, we proposed at a meeting on November 30, 1987, that there be some substantial increase in the fee schedule for cardiac surgeons. As a matter of fact, that formed part of one draft agreement between the AMA and the government of Alberta. During the course of negotiations the AMA advised me that they felt it would not be appropriate for the Alberta Medical Association to allocate those amounts to one particular part of the profession, and they thought it would be more appropriate if such allocations were done separately from the negotiations between the AMA and ourselves. We then advised that we would be allocating additional funds, and we advised in fact of the exact amount, on November 30, 1987, that would be allocated to cardiac surgery. The president-elect, the president of the AMA, and a number of others who were in the room were well aware of the intention that we had to add to that particular fee schedule.

REV. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the information I have is that they're currently sending out a letter to all doctors in the province denouncing this move. So on what rational or equitable basis has the minister decided to keep neurosurgeons, orthopedic surgeons, or eye surgeons or to cut back on eye exams or to close beds -- that that's all right but that it's okay at the same time to increase unilaterally the amount for cardiovascular surgeons by 35 percent?

MR. M. MOORE: Well, if the hon. member would do a little more homework, he would know that right across Canada there is a problem with respect to the amount of reimbursement to cardiac surgeons such that many provinces, Ontario in particular, have been losing their best cardiac surgeons to the United States. When we look at what kind of fees we provide to medical professions, we have to look, first of all, at what kind of educational experience and expertise they bring to our province in terms of medical care, and we also have to look at the market. Oftentimes the market may be different than the educational requirements. In Alberta we take some pride in being leaders in the area of cardiac surgery in western Canada. Certainly our heart, heart/lung transplants are not duplicated anywhere else west of Ontario, and we want to have not second best or third best but the best cardiac surgeons that we can possibly have in Alberta.

In addition to that, we have just recently announced the opening of a new cardiac surgery unit at the Foothills hospital in Calgary that we believe is going to reduce the waiting list in Alberta from the current three months or more down to just a few weeks. It's important that we have an opportunity through those hospital boards and those facilities to attract the very best cardiac surgeons. It's in light of all of those considerations and the consideration for the health of individuals with heart disease that we've made decisions to increase the cardiac fee schedule, which is still very substantially below what is offered these individuals particularly in the United States.

REV. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the amount for geriatricians and psychiatrists is also very low, and they would like to have some increase, in fairness, and it's for the AMA to decide who's to get it. Is it, then, by the crass political interference of this minister that it's his position to so undermine the hard work of the AMA's fee schedule committee in their job to determine what the equity is here? Would he rather this committee just

disband and allow him to allocate the funds willy-nilly to the medical specialists of his own political choosing?

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member's remarks are indeed quite ignorant. He hasn't taken the opportunity to read the July 22 agreement between the Alberta Medical Association and the government of Alberta. Neither has he taken the opportunity to read the legislation which outlines the responsibility of our government and the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care with respect to establishing fees paid to physicians for services performed for our citizens. The member should refer again to page 4 of the agreement, which says in section (f):

The Minister shall be the final authority respecting any unresolved issues.

The matter of an increase of the magnitude we're speaking about for cardiac surgeons in this province was an unresolved issue flowing from the negotiations between the AMA and our government on November 30, 1987. It is that responsibility that is clearly outlined not only in the agreement between the AMA but clearly outlined in the legislation that governs the responsibilities which I have, which was acted upon to ensure that there's an equitable, fair, reasonable fee schedule, consistent with the market for cardiac surgeons. I make absolutely no apologies, Mr. Speaker, for trying to attract and keep in this province the best cardiac specialists we can possibly have.

REV. ROBERTS: Well, I hope the minister gets the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Final supplementary.

REV. ROBERTS: . . . same letter of reprimand that Dr. Modry gets.

To the Premier, Mr. Speaker, to try to clear up this mess. Insofar as the representative from the board of AMA, in calling the Premier's office to request a meeting about this matter, was told, "Yes, but do you want to wait for the new Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care to be in place?" has the Premier also concluded that this minister has so alienated so many Albertans that it's about time to ask for his resignation?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I've never heard such nonsense from a member in this Legislature. Obviously, the member has written out his questions in advance, totally ignores the answers that the minister has given him, and continues on the process of reading them, regardless of the reply. Frankly, the government of Alberta over the years has put in place the best hospital and medical system in North America, and we're going to keep it that way.

MR. SPEAKER: Calgary-Glenmore, followed by Edmonton-Gold Bar.

MRS. MIROSH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the minister of hospitals. Can the minister indicate the amount of dollars that will be going into the health care insurance plan, and are other surgeons eligible for this fund?

MR. M. MOORE: Yes, Mr. Speaker. We've allocated approximately \$1 million to various kinds of benefits and a fee schedule for cardiac surgeons. There are 13 to 15 cardiac surgeons practising in Alberta now. That represents an increase in the fee schedules they will receive on an annual basis of about \$80,000. It will bring their total income up to somewhere on the

average of about \$300,000, and that of course has to pay for all of the additional expenses they have of staff and office accommodations and so on, which is still well below the example I used last December of dermatologists, whose average income is about \$330,000 a year.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

MRS. HEWES: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. This certainly appears to be a departure from established procedure. Surely the AMA is in the best position to determine what fees need adjustment or increase. Will the minister now undertake to sit down with the AMA and consult with them about urgent needs, or is this how fees are going to be set in the future?

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member didn't hear my earlier answers. We sat and discussed at length for several weeks with the AMA the 1988 fee schedule. During the course of those negotiations the AMA said to us, "We don't believe that we can agree to putting a million dollars into the cardiac fee schedule, because we have several sections and everybody else will want some extra too," even though they agreed that the market conditions were such in Alberta and in Canada that we needed to provide more assistance there. So the answer simply was for us to do this outside of the fee negotiations. On November 30 the AMA agreed that that should be taken off the table in the negotiations with them and that we should do it separately. Indeed, the additional money that's being provided, which is in our budget this year, did not come out of the 1.5 percent allocation to the AMA, which was the first proposal which I had made to them. So whatever we've done is perfectly in accordance with the agreement and was discussed at some length with the Alberta Medical Association.

### Family Stability

MS LAING: Mr. Speaker, my questions are to the Premier. We must recognize the woeful inadequacy of the federal government's initiative on family violence. It does not address the extent of the need for federal capital funds to build shelters and does not address the even more pressing need for essential support funding for these shelters. Our shelters need funding support for treatment programs, which is not provided by this government nor addressed in this federal initiative. Will the Premier commit himself to 100 percent core funding for existing shelters and commit new funding for the operation of the new shelter spaces which will be provided by this government initiative?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, if I follow the hon. member's question correctly, she is saying, first of all, that she doesn't like the program . . .

MS BARRETT: Oh!

MR. GETTY: Well, I gather that.

Then she has asked us to support the shelters that the program purports to build. If the program does provide needed shelters in this province and the agreement between the federal government and the provincial government is that the province will provide the operating costs, then, yes, the government will obviously provide the operating needs. I might also say, Mr. Speaker, that the government now is presenting 100 percent of

the core funding for shelters.

MS LAING: Mr. Speaker, it's not the program I don't like; it's the inadequateness of it.

In view of the long-term effects of witnessing violence, will the Premier commit his government to funding treatment programs for children whose mothers have been battered, to be established in the community as well as in conjunction with shelters?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, we'll certainly look at the representation the hon. member is making, but I should draw to the attention of the House that the hon. member and I have such deeply different views of the family, that the hon. member is dealing with matters that have progressed to a point where a family is coming apart or there has been a battered child. The emphasis that this government wants to put is strengthening the family, not separating it or dealing with the breakdown afterwards. The emphasis this government will be having -- we'll be coming up with initiatives and programs to support the family, because it's my belief, it's the belief of our government that family is the strongest resource this province has.

MR. TAYLOR: Put your money where your mouth is.

MR. GETTY: If any members . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Forgive me, hon. Premier. The Member for Westlock-Sturgeon will have opportunity for supplementary questions and therefore should not be interrupting, according to our own Standing Orders. Thank you.

MR. TAYLOR: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, We'll take up the point of order later.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. No need to shout, hon. member. The Chair has already made note of the fact that there would be a point of order. Thank you.

Supplementary question, Edmonton-Avonmore.

MS LAING: Mr. Speaker, is the Premier saying that he does not recognize what has been well documented in terms of long-term effects of witnessing violence by children, and how they need treatment in order to establish healthy families when they grow up? Does he not recognize that?

MR. GETTY: Yes, we do, Mr. Speaker, and I've said to the hon. member that we're prepared to fund the shelters and to assist any battered members of families, and we deplore whenever those things occur in our society.

But I want to tell her that the government's initiative is a shift from where she is preoccupied. Our initiative is to strengthen the family, to provide reasons why the family is stronger, why mothers will stay in the house, in the family while not having care outside of the house. We will have care in the home: parent care, not institutional care. In our society, Mr. Speaker, too often we have as a result of government programs the family being detracted from. The family has been under attack in North America. This government is going to support the family, and I welcome initiatives or ideas from anybody in this Legislature. We will be doing it as a government because I believe, as I said earlier, that the strongest resource that this province has are the people and the families building our

communities.

MS LAING: Mr. Speaker, is the Premier saying that families in which there is battering and violence are the cornerstone of our society? Or is he willing to provide funds for the majority of men who assault their wives that receive provincial time or probation and need treatment in a provincial setting and not in a federal setting, as the hon. Solicitor General suggested?

MR. GETTY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I come back to my earlier reply. The hon. member has a fixation on a very small part of family problems. We are not going to zero in on that part. We will help, and we support initiatives in that area. But for me a family is a place where love is at work, not destruction and battery, and we are going to try and build in this province a greater strength of families. It may even be that we will be developing a department or a ministry to deal with family issues, because it is the strongest resource -- I repeat -- that this province has.

MRS. HEWES: Mr. Speaker, it's great to hear the Premier all for prevention and strengthening family life. There's money for heart surgeons. But let's do something about it. Will the Premier now guarantee to this House that there will be funds put into treatment programs for identified abusers as well as the abused to break this unfortunate cycle of violence that plagues family life in Alberta?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, there are funds, and there will be funds in the future. But family life in Alberta is so much broader than the image that the hon. member is trying to project in this Legislature. As I say, what we want to do is build families. We want to make sure that parents are at home to care for their families, and we reject the institutional type of thinking of the hon. members.

MR. SPEAKER: Member for Westlock-Sturgeon, main question.

#### **Alberta Capital Bonds**

MR. TAYLOR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The question today is to the Provincial Treasurer. Our caucus has received a number of complaints about delays which individuals are experiencing when they wish to redeem their Alberta capital bonds. In fact, the Toronto Dominion Bank on a call from us said they've had up to 800 clients whom they expect will have to wait for several weeks. To the Treasurer. In view of the fact that many of these bonds are held by our senior citizens and the money is very important, could he explain why there has to be a two- to three-week delay for people wanting to redeem Alberta capital bonds?

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Speaker, I can't confirm that there's a two- to three-week delay, but I can say, though, that in most cases where the bond is redeemed, the province of Alberta makes very sure that they get the cheques in the hands of the beneficiary as soon as possible, and that's been the process. I understand there have been some snags because of the fairly large number of people who are both buying and selling this very popular commercial investment instrument.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, the private establishments don't have that problem, so let's go further. Who will benefit by this

dragging of the feet in paying out the bonds? Will that interest lost by not transferring the money in effect be retained with the government? Is that why the government is holding things up?

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Speaker, again the member has not shown that there's been a dragging of the feet. Let me make it very clear that we have in place a system which responds very quickly. I know for sure that the interest cheques that went to all Albertans were received, in fact, before the June 1 deadline, and I can confirm with respect to the redemptions of those bonds that the same thing is the case. Naturally, when you buy a bond there's a settlement date, and that settlement date is June 16. We've given public notice to that effect, and that's the way the process operates. There is no foot-dragging in this case, and it's inappropriate to suggest that there is.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, the question wasn't on delay of interest; it was on a delay in cashing in the bonds. And I'm talking about the interest they lose by the government sitting on their fanny here rather than paying it out.

Mr. Speaker, can he give any assurance that in the new issue that's coming out, people purchasing will have any better luck when they go to cash their bonds?

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Speaker, it's unfortunate that the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon wants to take such a negative approach to a successful opportunity for Albertans to participate in the future of this province. That's what this bond issue is, and that's been the success that's been marked by the way in which Albertans have moved to assist the province over this period. I think this kind of doomsayer is what really drives investment dollars from this province. Here is an opportunity for Albertans to receive interest, for the dollars paid on borrowings by this province to go back to Albertans, and we hear nothing but negativism from the member across the way. It's shameful.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, his attitude is exemplified by the same attitude to the Principal investors: once you've got the money, the investor can go to hell.

What I'd like to know then, Mr. Speaker: what does the Treasurer plan to do to make timely payments of cash in future? After all, it is our senior citizens largely that are investing and trusting this government to pay out those bonds on time.

MR. JOHNSTON: It's; exactly the message, Mr. Speaker: that all Albertans trust this government.

MR. TAYLOR: After the next election.

MR. JOHNSTON: I agree with that message, and certainly that's the way in which we've operated. In fact, the trust will continue to the very important investments in these bonds. They're guaranteed by the province. We just yesterday increased the rate to make it competitive with market instruments. They have all the redemption factors that are seen in the marketplace, and they're a very important instrument to allow all Albertans to assist in achieving the future growth of this province in terms of investment in hospitals, investment in universities, investment in water management projects.

Let me repeat clearly, Mr. Speaker: the process is as effective as any process in terms of dealing with the public, the interest payments are made punctually in advance of the due date, the redemption process is as efficient as any, and the settlement

date is one which is accepted in the marketplace.

MR. TAYLOR: Talk does not make it so.

MR. JOHNSTON: So the member should learn what the marketplace is doing, because this system is recognized across Canada as being one of the best models, is being copied elsewhere, and is working very effectively.

MR. SPEAKER: Perhaps the hon. member making the interjections could at least be a little bit more inventive about some of the interjections.

Edmonton-Kingsway.

MR. McEACHERN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Premier. Why is it that the government raised the interest rate on the capital bond issue to 9.25 percent the other day instead of lobbying Ottawa to keep the interest rate low, as he said he would?

MR. GETTY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to advise the hon. member that not only Alberta is now strongly against increased interest rates by the Bank of Canada, but by Alberta's initiatives we now have the Premier of Ontario, the Premier of Quebec, the Premier of Newfoundland, and the other western Premiers all supporting this initiative of Alberta's. While we believe we will be able to make an impact on the Bank of Canada and on federal policies, in the meantime we want to make sure that Albertans are not disadvantaged, and we moved very quickly to make sure that we cared for Albertans in this case.

MR. HERON: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the Provincial Treasurer. Given that the average guaranteed investment certificate five-year rate with the chartered banks is somewhere around 10 percent, would the Provincial Treasurer please outline some of the factors which would make the Alberta heritage bond issue so successful at 9.25 percent?

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Speaker, it is important that an explanation be given, I think, as the Member for Stony Plain properly noted that we had to increase the interest rates yesterday on these Alberta capital bonds, both the 1987 issue and the 1988 issue that's now being sold, so that it does recognize what is contemporary in the private sector. Because we were caught since the date of pricing and the settlement date, we've had to increase the rate because the central bank, as has been noted by the other member, has increased interest rates on the short-term side. So to ensure that this instrument is contemporary and competitive with the private sector, we've increased it by 250 basis points, or a quarter of a real percentage, and now that bond is redeemable for six months. It's very similar to the guaranteed investment certificates for one year, and of course it compounds interest every six months as well. Because we had a commitment that we would keep our capital bonds equal to the market, we've also increased, obviously, the current rate being paid in the 1987 bond issue. To date, Mr. Speaker, the response has been very good, and I would imagine we will meet our target when sales end on Saturday, June 11.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Little Bow, followed by Ponoka-Rimbey. [interjection] This is not a supplementary. Thank you.

Little Bow, Ponoka-Rimbey.

### Flow Control on the Little Bow River

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of the Environment. Could the minister indicate when the engineering and the design work will begin on the Little Bow flow control for water?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks that matter has been before my attention on my desk, but there have been other matters that have preoccupied my attention, matters such as drought on a provincewide basis, matters such as storms and disasters. So the specific answer to the question is: shortly.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. Could the minister indicate whether "shortly" means July, August of 1988?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, once again that will depend entirely what the events that will emerge over the next number of weeks are. It's a matter of high concern and a high priority of the government. It's a matter, though, that also requires some very careful review and studying on behalf of the Minister of the Environment so as to ensure that everything is in place before such an announcement and such a project commences so that we do not perhaps have experiences that we've had in the past where there have been delays necessitated by engineering that wasn't quite as complete as it should have been.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, final supplementary to the minister. Could the minister indicate whether there will be some construction work initiated this year, such as site preparation, beyond just the engineering and design work?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, as I've indicated before in the past, part of the priority with respect to the whole project, of course, is going to be the Clear Lake situation, a lake that exists with no water in it. It's a matter that the member himself has petitioned the Minister of the Environment on, which should be viewed as part of the priority in the whole project. We would want to phase in a construction project for Clear Lake and the small reservoir or dam or weir itself over a time frame that might be within three to four years from conception to completion.

MR. TAYLOR: Speaking of reservoirs, a supplementary to the Environment minister, I've had a number of complaints about some of these small lakes and reservoirs being pumped out so fast now because of the drought, so the farmers who normally depend on them are running short. Does he have any policing system on the lakes and reservoirs to make sure they're not pumped down faster than the people use them on the edge?

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. That question is out of order. The main topic is the Little Bow flow control.

Thank you. The Member for Ponoka-Rimbey, followed by Edmonton-Strathcona, followed by Calgary-Buffalo.

### Home Education

MR. JONSON: Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Education. Members of the Alberta home schooling association have expressed great concern about what they regard as an inconsistency in how school board officers are dealing

with their home schooling situations. They think that they are not receiving the proper supervision and assistance. Is the minister aware of this situation, and has she come to any conclusions as to the validity of this claim?

MRS. BETKOWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I was fortunate to attend a meeting with the home schooling association of Alberta recently, and they raised their concern that under existing school legislation the opportunity for an inconsistency in terms of their treatment by various school boards across the province was possible. Bill 27, the Bill before the Legislature right now, provides for home schooling in section 23 of that Bill and also provides an opportunity for regulations to be passed which would direct superintendents as to how they will deal with the issue when it is presented to them. I think the consistency required will be recognized by the new legislation.

MR. JONSON: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Assuming that Bill 27 moves through to completion before the end of this session, will these regulations be in place in time for the new school year starting in September?

MRS. BETKOWSKI: I can't guarantee that, Mr. Speaker, because as hon. members will know, it is our practice within Alberta Education to circulate regulations widely in order to encourage discussion before they are passed through order in council. I can, however, assure all Albertans, including those interested in the home schooling regulations, that they will be widely discussed before the Bill is proclaimed.

MR. JONSON: Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Given that there will be the formation of these regulations, will there be an assurance given that the home schooling association will be able to sit down with the minister or her officials to have input into the development of these regulations?

MRS. BETKOWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I think this government's record in terms of input and listening to Albertans, particularly in the important area of school legislation, is unprecedented and one which we feel very strongly about. With respect to direct input on the regulations, I think it would be fair to say that proposed regulations, draft regulations, would be circulated widely, and I would welcome the input from various interest groups across the province.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, Edmonton-Belmont.

MR. SIGURDSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister assure the Assembly today that monitoring of the home schooling programs will remain under the authority of public boards of education and not be assigned to private schools?

MRS. BETKOWSKI: Mr. Speaker, a very important question; I'm glad the Member for Edmonton-Belmont has raised it. Yes, I can confirm exactly that, which is what appears in Bill 27 now. There's a very important natural justice procedure that has been built into the School Act in terms of appeals. Home education is deemed to be one of the questions of access to education under section 104 of the Bill, and therefore a decision by a superintendent representing the board on a home schooling contract would be appealable to the Minister of Education. It is certainly not my intention to propose amendments which would make that initial step with the private schools.

### Ministerial Powers

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Premier, and it concerns the exercise of ministerial powers. On April 21 the Minister of Culture and Multiculturalism earmarked two grants to the Alberta Foundation for the Literary Arts amounting to \$800,000 for TV and video purposes. Doubtless these objects are worthy, but these grants went beyond the minister's powers under the Act to the extent that the pursuits are not literary ones. Of course, TV and video are normally thought of as the visual arts. In his defence the minister correctly pointed out that script-writing is a literary element in these activities, but he has now told us that he is unable to say how much of the \$800,000 is for script-writing; i.e. he does not know how much of that was within his power and how much not. My question to the Premier, Mr. Speaker, is this: how acceptable does the Premier find it to have within his cabinet a minister who so casually treats his obligation to ensure that he only grants money that is within his power to do?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has raised this issue before in the Legislature, particularly, as I recall, under the debate on Bill 10. Frankly, I find that the Minister of Culture and Multiculturalism is performing his duties in a manner which I approve of a great deal.

MR. WRIGHT: Yes, Mr. Speaker, but does not the Premier agree that it is doubly important for a minister to be scrupulous in the exercise of his powers when the major part, perhaps all, of the money being granted is going to the minister's own constituency?

MR. GETTY: Well, Mr. Speaker, there will be occasions when that will happen. That's just a fact of life. You would not want the hon. minister to disadvantage the people who live within his constituency by in some way, because he happens to be minister, not allowing funds to flow into his constituency. For my part I would repeat what I said earlier. The hon. member may have some problems with the way the minister is handling his responsibilities, and that could be causing a great deal of trouble for the NDP, but the fact of the matter is that in terms of serving the people of Alberta, he's doing it very well.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Speaker, does not the Premier think the minister should be triply scrupulous when the money that he is granting is money which alone of all public expenditure does not come before the Legislature beforehand?

MR. GETTY: Yes, and ministers are, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WRIGHT: Well, not this one, it seems, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Inappropriate, hon. member. Inappropriate.

MR. WRIGHT: Since the minister has managed the remarkable feat of getting three strikes against him simultaneously, how many strikes does he need before he's called out by the Premier?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, how the hon. Member for Edmonton-Strathcona somehow manages to construe in his mind that this is a matter of three strikes against the minister -- I have usually noticed that when the opposition is bothered by a

minister, it is because the minister is doing his job very well.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, it might be that the opposition senses an election coming, and we don't want you to buy it too easily.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary question, please.

MR. TAYLOR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Premier consider setting up for those ministers who have the public funds with which to distribute their largesse -- like the hon. minister mentioned and also the minister for manpower and development -- an all-party committee to weed through the applications first?

MR. GETTY: Well, Mr. Speaker, the government is elected to govern. The ministers bring their recommendations before our caucus and Executive Council, and the decisions are made as a government.

Might I say to the hon. member that if he is concerned about upcoming elections, he concentrate on the one he's involved in right now, and watch where you turn your back over there.

MR. TAYLOR: Have you got a contribution?

MR. SPEAKER: Stony Plain, a supplementary.  
Please, no solicitation of funds in the House.

MR. HERON: Supplementary question. Will the Minister for Culture and Multiculturalism please briefly outline the procedure for approving grants, in particular the approval and timing of the Banff festival of arts grant?

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to do this in very short order. All of the festivals across the province, not just those that are located in Banff but those that are located in Edmonton or Calgary or throughout the province of Alberta, including those festivals that may be located in Edmonton-Strathcona, apply for grants and meet the requirements and are provided those grants through lottery dollars -- I'm very proud that we have that opportunity -- and through the department's programs themselves. The Banff Television Festival has been receiving lottery fund dollars for nine years.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

Main question, Calgary-Buffalo, followed by Calgary-Glenmore, Calgary-Mountain View, Wainwright, Edmonton-Kingsway.

### Alternatives In Education

MR. CHUMIR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is to the Minister of Education. Tolerance and understanding is most enhanced when people of different races and religions get to know each other and become friends. Now, as our society becomes increasingly multiracial and multireligious, it becomes increasingly important that our children go to school together and get to know each other in order to maximize understanding. Unfortunately, this government has adopted policies of funding and encouraging private and alternative schooling which segregate children on the basis of religion and race and which will serve to divide our children rather than bring them together in the future. I'm wondering why the minister has introduced a School Act

which so blatantly encourages private and alternative schooling which will segregate children from each other on the basis of race and religion.

MRS. BETKOWSKI: Well, Mr. Speaker, I take strong exception to the Member for Calgary-Buffalo saying that Bill 27 encourages those two actions. In fact, what Bill 27 does is acknowledge that there are options, acknowledge that there are choices which some people will make. If people choose to opt out of the public system, which is responsible and to which every child has a home, then they do so with having to pay, for example, for private schooling in an extraordinary way or with the monitoring that goes on in home schooling. But to say that the two are encouraged in Bill 27, I think in fact is in error.

MR. CHUMIR: Well, Ted Byfield thinks they're encouraged. He says that the door is now open to make major changes in our schools. He's happy and I'm not.

Now, could the minister tell us, then, if she's not encouraging private schooling, why she has specifically provided for the right of two families with seven children to form an accredited private school and thereby get \$1,500 of public funding per student. Why should we be funding this type of . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. member.

MRS. BETKOWSKI: Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member for Calgary-Buffalo and I go through this frequently, and we seem to go through it at each session. This is the third chance we've had to go around it, and now he has before him how this government responds to the importance of choices that need to be offered in the system.

The bulk of our resources as a province in terms of the Department of Education -- and by that I mean 97 percent of the resources of the Department of Education budget -- go to the public system. The bulk of the students in our province go to the public system; in fact, the same 97 percent. Why have we done this? Number one, we believe that choices are important for people to exercise. Two, we have a Supreme Court of Canada decision suggesting that, yes, the public system must be the first and foremost system and the first priority of government, but there should be options to recognize the rights of religious freedom and other individual freedoms through the private schooling system. Thirdly, and perhaps more topical to the day, Mr. Speaker, is the acceptance of recommendations out of the Ghitter report on tolerance and understanding, which recommends that private schools be eligible to receive financing of 75 percent of the school foundation program, which we are doing in this province, and also recommends that public schools be encouraged to provide or make arrangements for alternative programs: the very issues upon which this member will not support Bill 27, I assume from what I read in the newspaper.

MR. CHUMIR: Well, of course, we all know how this School Act doesn't encourage private schooling.

I wonder how it is that the School Act, then, proposes to exempt private school buildings from municipal taxation for the first time, and how much is this going to cost municipalities?

MRS. BETKOWSKI: Mr. Speaker, when we talk about inconsistencies, that was certainly one which was clearly occurring across this province. Some private schools which were offering education recognized and supported by the province, al-

beit in a different setting than perhaps the hon. member would like it to occur, were being asked to pay municipal taxes; others were not. What we have now done in the new School Act is to recognize that because education is being delivered consistent with provincial guidelines, those buildings should be exempt from property assessment, and that is occurring for all the private schools that are approved under the province.

MR. CHUMIR: Along the same lines of not encouraging segregation, why then has the minister added a provision to the School Act with respect to alternative schools which will encourage segregated religious and language schools to become part of the system and bring segregation right into the heart of a public system which was designed to mix children?

MRS. BETKOWSKI: Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is not going to get away with that point of view. He and I have a fundamental difference. His party, I suspect, and our party have a fundamental difference in terms of how we view public education. Public education, in my view, in the view of our government, is not a box with the lid closed. Public education is, in fact, a box with the lid open, which can recognize the needs of its community and, in so doing, stop a flow into private schools rather than saying, "This is the box, and there will be nothing else." I look forward to the debate on second reading in this Assembly. Also, I think it's exceedingly important to say that the recommendation for alternative programs was one of the primary recommendations out of the Ghitter report on tolerance and understanding for exactly that point.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Edmonton-Belmont, a supplementary on this issue, then Member for Calgary-Glenmore on this issue.

MR. SIGURDSON: Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Given that we now have schools that are boxes with lids open, I'm hoping that more money can go into those boxes.

Given that community schools offer something very special, especially for inner-city communities, which are made up of mainly new immigrant Canadians for the most part, will the minister now undertake to make a commitment that the funding for community school programs will be fully restored to an adequate level?

MR. SPEAKER: The time for question period has expired. Might we have unanimous consent to complete this series of questions?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed? Carried.  
Hon. minister.

MRS. BETKOWSKI: No, Mr. Speaker, I cannot give that assurance to the hon. member, as we have discussed on a couple of occasions in this Assembly. What I can tell him is that there are special needs throughout our system. Some of those needs exist in the urban areas; some of those needs exist in the rural areas. I think it's very important that we recognize the focus on the individual student, which is now the recognition within the new School Act. In other words, there are needs; there are ways that we can meet the needs of various people, but let's look at the individual and that individual's needs. In terms of the com-

munity schooling program, yes, it has done some important work in this province and that is why the schools continue to receive about \$37,000 more than every other school in this province: to continue with those important programs. Whether or not that pool of funding could be better distributed in order to meet some particular needs is a question that I have put to the community education association and to all members of this Assembly, and I look forward to the input on it.

MR. SPEAKER: Calgary-Glenmore, on a supplementary.

MRS. MIROSH: To the Minister of Education. Is the minister considering any further new courses or additional courses to address the tolerance and understanding issues and issues on the Holocaust?

MRS. BETKOWSKI: Mr. Speaker, much of the four-years' input with respect to the new School Act and the changes in our secondary curriculum came about from broad discussions across this province, including the discussions which surrounded the circumstances under which the Ghitter Committee on Tolerance and Understanding was established. As a result of those recommendations in the Ghitter report, many, many changes are occurring in our curriculum, in the way in which we audit, for example, all of the materials in the school for tolerance and understanding and in the course component.

I can tell the hon. member that in the social studies 30 curriculum under the discussion with respect to the interdependence of nations and the discussion on World War II, the issue of the Holocaust is discussed within that curriculum. Certainly we must be constantly diligent -- and our Premier said this yesterday -- as a Legislature but also as a government responsible for education to ensure that we're doing everything we can to ensure that tolerance is promoted, not just in the school, because education isn't the only answer. Children have to be given values with respect to tolerance from families. Children need to see adults, need to see their Legislature, need to see the people in their province, need to see all of society being tolerant and encouraging tolerance in every area.

MR. SPEAKER: The time for question period has expired. The Chair understands that there's a possibility of a point of order. [interjections]

MR. TAYLOR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was settling a point of order in the caucus here.

I was going to use two references. One is Standing Order 11(1):

Mr. Speaker shall not take part in any debate before the Assembly.

The second is *Beauchesne* 318, Mr. Speaker, which says: There are words of interruption such as the cries of "question", "order, order", "hear, hear", or "resign", which have been sanctioned by long parliamentary usage and if used in moderation, are not unparliamentary...

Mr. Speaker, all I'm saying is that I think I have a right to heckle. I think you were hitting at a basic right of democracy. Due to the fact that it was the Premier and he's so easy to heckle, not only by the nonsense of his statements, but he takes so long between sentences, it doesn't mean that I should retract my privilege of heckling, to make my point.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, by way of discussion of this



point of order, I'd like to cite *Beauchesne* 248, the fifth edition. It's very clear in the section dealing with decorum in the house and interruptions of members that section 248 says:

If the interruptions are excessive . . . the Speaker may intervene on his own authority to restore order in the House.

I believe that we would all want to applaud you for intervening at the appropriate time, Mr. Speaker, because without any doubt the interruptions have become most excessive by the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

On the purported point of order, it's a disagreement as to what's really happening here, in the opinion of the Chair. The Chair did indeed bring the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon to order in terms of the question period, and there was another reason for it. While the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon indeed does indulge in the matter of repartee or heckling or cackling or whatever, nevertheless it does seem to have become a bit of a difficulty for the decorum of the House, for the conduct of the House, in two ways. Number one, to use the same remarks and be shouting them all the time is meant to disrupt the flow of the answer that is coming, and some of that is indeed part of the question period.

The other difficulty is that it slows down question period, and the Chair is very concerned that in the last week we have not been getting anywhere near the number of questions in the question period. That really becomes a disservice to all hon. members of the House who wish to get into question period.

The fact that the Chair intervened -- it is well within the prerogative of the Chair to do so, and at that time the Chair was willing to cite and did indeed cite Standing Order 13(4)(b). Also, with regard to the quotations from *Beauchesne*, 248 does indeed bear unto the issue.

The Chair also noted that throughout the day the hon. Member for Westlock-Sturgeon seemed to make comments fairly loudly with respect to nearly every single question and supplementary that was raised in the course of the day. There were 37 of those, not necessarily 37 made by the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon, but then the Chair also didn't count the number of times it occurred twice on one particular question.

DR. BUCK: No wonder he has laryngitis.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes. That is a bit of an interjection.

The basic flow of this question period, of any question period, though, is that there should be the exchange, yes, but let's not do it at the cost, at the expense, of other members in the House.

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

head: **GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS**  
(Second Reading)

### Bill 21 Employment Standards Code

[Adjourned debate on subamendment to motion for second reading, June 6: Mr. Young]

MR. YOUNG: Question.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Kingsway, on the subamendment.

MR. McEACHERN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's a pleasure today to rise and speak to the subamendment moved by the Member for Edmonton-Avonmore. Just by way of a reminder, perhaps I would look back at the amendment to which this is a subamendment just very quickly. The amendment to Bill 21 . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member, I'm sorry. With due respect, it's discussion specifically on the subamendment. We're not going to go back to where the reasoned amendment is or any preamble. To the words of the subamendment, thank you very much.

MR. McEACHERN: Well, I had merely intended to read the amendment so the subamendment would make more sense, Mr. Speaker, but if you wish, I will pass over that and go straight to the subamendment, then, and hope the members can recall where we left off last time.

It is suggested that these words be added to the amendment moved by Mr. Strong to Bill 21. This motion was moved by the Member for Edmonton-Avonmore, to add to the end of the previous amendment

and because it contradicts the statement of government commitment, set out in the same speech, that the "government is committed to equality for women and will actively promote the full and equal participation of Alberta women in the life of the province."

Now, Mr. Speaker, the reason for that addition is that it clarifies why it is that we wanted to not read that Bill a second time. So having set the stage, I wish to speak to the subamendment in some detail.

The reason for the subamendment is that we see the Bill as pretty well silent on women's rights. We believe that in this society, women face particular difficulties in economic endeavours, whether it be on the work side of it or on the business side of it. Women do not get a fair shake in this society. Perhaps it's because they're expected to run a home as well as earn a living in this day and age, but in any case there is a need to promote affirmative action for women in this society. We believe that those ideas deserve a full debate in this Assembly, so we have proposed this amendment and think the Bill should be changed in light of some of the discussion we hope will ensue.

My colleague from Edmonton-Avonmore and some of my other colleagues chronicled a number of empty promises the government has made, referring to the Speech from the Throne, as indeed the amendment refers to the Speech from the Throne. The Minister of Labour has made claims for his Bill of balance and fairness, but we think there is no fairness in it for women. My colleagues have quoted statistics to show the failure of the government.

Mr. Speaker, this is not the first time that people had expectations in this province about equality for women and were disappointed. This government created some rather high expectations a few years ago by commissioning a study -- I'm not sure if it was the late '70s or early '80s -- in which the government hired a rather expensive consultant to check the discrepancies in the wages of women and men in the Alberta public employees. What they found was that men were paid on average over \$17,000 annually. You can see it was quite a few years ago, because today it would be much higher than that. Women received only \$11,000 on average. Now, after the consultants factored out all seniority and training differences between the two groups, they found there was still a discrepancy of some \$3,000. The government's reaction to that study was, "Oh, well, we don't necessarily agree with the report." Having commissioned

and paid for it with taxpayers' dollars, they then said, "Oh, well, maybe the report doesn't make any sense." But nobody disputed the facts as presented by the report. Nothing was done, and here we are, six to eight years later, and we still have the same problem.

Mr. Speaker, about that same time it was revealed that four women employees of this government had salaries so low that they qualified to have their salaries topped up by social services. I suggest that's scandalous. No employer should be proud of that, particularly a government. And the fact that we have not really progressed much and see no affirmative action in this Bill today tells me that the government has not changed its views. They still think that's okay, I guess. This Bill should not be passed, as debate on this amendment will show. Women's economic rights should have been addressed in the Bill, and they were not.

[Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair]

This government set up an advisory council on women's issues, and I want to ask the Minister of Labour: what input did he get from the council? Did he specifically talk to the council and ask them what they thought? Were there some things they could have told him about women's issues in this province that he could have incorporated into his Bill? Or is this council just so much window dressing? Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Labour should have consulted the women's advisory council. Now, whether they'd have been much help or not is another question, but I would like him to at least tell us whether he did or didn't and what help he got from them. The reason he should have consulted them is, of course, that some 77 percent of all part-time workers in the province are women. In fact, in the group between 24 and 54 years of age, which are the main earning years, 88 percent of them are women, and it is in the unorganized workers of this province that women form the biggest part -- I've just given the numbers -- and that is where we have the least protection.

On the other side where you have unionized workers, they can at least try to fight for their rights and be organized in some way to demand that certain things be allowed. But unorganized workers are not really in that position. They are often treated very badly by their employers, and the only protection they have is the government of Alberta, if they are willing and able to protect them. But this government doesn't seem interested. That burden, Mr. Speaker, then falls most heavily on women.

I would like to ask the minister: why do the provisions for prorating benefits apply to vacation pay only? There's really nothing else. You know, UIC benefits and private pension benefits, statutory holidays -- none of these things are prorated for part-time workers. Mr. Speaker, we're all familiar with the fact that big department stores and other companies often hire women, sometimes women in their 40s or 50s who have already raised their families and now want to go out and earn a little money, get out of the home. They hire them as part-time workers and then work them up to 37.5 hours a week. Well, that's just scandalous that anybody would be allowed to do that. Why is it that somebody can be called part-time and be worked more than 25 or 30 hours a week? This Bill should have dealt with that problem, and unless I missed something in it, I don't see anything there that deals with that. And that burden falls hardest on women. That's why the minister should take another look at that and do something about it.

This government has appointed the Minister of Consumer

and Corporate Affairs, the Hon. Elaine McCoy, to defend the rights of women. I would ask the minister: did he consult with her? In fact, I've been somewhat impressed with some of the statements made publicly by the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, so I guess one can assume she's had some rather sharp differences with some of her colleagues in caucus moving them along into the 20th century and, hopefully, pointing them toward the 21st -- although I'm not sure that she's really heading for the 21st, Mr. Speaker. But I do wish the Minister of Labour would have consulted with her. The reason I say I'm not sure she's headed for the 21st is that I can't help noting her penchant for wanting to educate and inform people about their rights and not really doing anything to protect them. It seems to me that the time has come for her, as Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, and for the Minister of Labour to start putting some teeth into the kind of protection women need in this society. You can't just go on saying, "Well, we'll educate them." It takes a long time, and some people have difficulty learning. So those of us who are in charge of making the laws have to make them fair and try to help and protect those people who are being taken advantage of, and in this society a large number of those are women, particularly in the field of part-time workers, which is dominated, as I've already said, by women.

Oh, the Minister of Labour made some cosmetic changes. I couldn't help but smile when he talked about maternity leave on equal terms for men and women -- for a couple, that is, if they happen to be adopting a baby. Well, that's a good idea and reasonable, and I appreciate it, but I wonder where the commitment is to the women who actually bear the children themselves and are going to therefore be responsible for our future generations and the well-being of our society in the future. I listened with some concern to the Premier's answers in question period today where he seemed to have the view that women should stay barefoot and pregnant in the kitchen. I don't think those were his words quite, but basically . . . [interjections]

MR. OLDRING: Point of order.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. Point of order, Red Deer-South.

MR. OLDRING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Citation 23(b)(i). I recognize that the member seems to feel an obligation to fill up his full 30 minutes, but we're dealing with a very narrow subamendment in front of us. I haven't heard him refer for at least five minutes to the subamendment itself. He seems to be wandering all over the map. I wonder if perhaps the Member for Edmonton-Kingsway has, in fact, lost his copy of the subamendment. I know he was going to read it and didn't have the opportunity to. But surely, Mr. Speaker, he can focus back in on the subamendment in front of us so we can get on with the business of the Legislative Assembly.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Speaking to the point of order, Calgary-Mountain View.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I understand the subamendment, it has to do with equality for women, promoting the full and equal participation of Alberta women in the life of the province. In the view of the hon. member speaking, the government is not actively promoting that, even though they say so. He was in his remarks, in fact, alluding to the present participation of Alberta women in the life of the province.

He was also alluding to what he believed were the attitudes expressed by one of the members opposite. I felt, as I was listening to him, that he was very much speaking directly to the point of the subamendment, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. member. It would appear to the Chair that the Member for Edmonton-Kingsway was, in fact, talking about portions of the subamendment before the House, although the Chair would like to make very clear that we're not dealing here specifically with women's issues but a subamendment to the amendment to Bill 21.

Edmonton-Kingsway.

MR. McEACHERN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I didn't really feel, because I thought what I was talking about was women's concerns, that I needed to keep saying over and over again what the amendment was. If the Member for Red Deer-South has difficulty remembering for more than five minutes what the subamendment . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Let's come back to the subamendment, hon. member.

MR. McEACHERN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: Don't waste our time.

MR. McEACHERN: You want to take more time?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Edmonton-Kingsway.

MR. McEACHERN: Well, he was standing, and I thought we weren't supposed to have two up.

So, Mr. Speaker, I'm a little worried about the government's commitment to, in this case specifically, the idea of maternity leave. I want to refer to the Bill which the subamendment directly addresses. The relevance is that the amendment says that because the Bill

. . . contradicts the statement of government commitment, set out in the same speech,  
that is, the Speech from the Throne,

that the "government is committed to equality for women and will actively promote the full and equal participation of Alberta women in the life of the province".

Now, I would maintain, Mr. Speaker, that women who are pregnant are at a bit of a disadvantage in earning a living. So it seems to me it's up to society to in some way compensate and help them through that period if we are to have a healthy future generation to perhaps earn the money that's going to go to our pensions when we get older. So we might all consider that we have a stake in this.

I want to refer to the Bill on page 28 where it talks about entitlement to maternity leave:

61(1) A pregnant employee who has been employed by an employer for a continuous period of at least 12 months is entitled to maternity leave without pay.

How very, very generous. That's really going to take us a long way into the 21st century.

To the Minister of Labour, I really think you should start looking at other jurisdictions and open your ears to what's going on in the world. I would maintain that we won't be 10 years into the 21st century before . . .

MR. HERON: Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Point of order, Stony Plain.

MR. HERON: Mr. Speaker, in rising to a point of order, I draw attention to section 23(b)(i), 23(c). I would like to point out to all members of this Assembly that it was the New Democratic Party which set the very narrow parameters of debate with their subamendment. It's a self-inflicted limitation, and I really believe that if they cannot speak to the subamendment, they call the question and get on with speaking to the amendment, get on with the Bill. I can only exercise my right, my right to stand, as the only method and protest, through raising a point of order, and in doing so demonstrate to my vibrant, no-nonsense constituents my unwillingness to be a silent partner to the opposition's abuse of House time and thereby wasting the taxpayer's dollar. Mr. Speaker, I appeal to your sense of fair play to keep the opposition members to the tight limits they have set for themselves in speaking to the subamendment. The hon. Member for Red Deer-South has done an admirable job in bringing this to your attention. I, too, wish to bring it to your attention. I wish to put it as a matter of record in *Hansard* that I object to the flippant use of this Assembly's time.

In raising this Standing Order, I would also like to point out to the opposition members that they are not gaining any ground out there. I'd like to do them this favour. I'd like to say that *Hansard* over the past two days, the past two evenings, the past six hours, will illustrate unnecessarily reading the subamendment into the record at least 10 times, where three consecutive speakers last evening quoted from the Charter of Rights and read sections. There are limits to filibusters, and there are limits to good debating procedures in the House. But clearly, I think we as sensitive Albertans have an obligation to bring to your attention from time to time that Standing Orders are being violated, and we have to protest, I think, through the only method available to us. Mr. Speaker, I appeal to your sense of fair play.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: On the point of order, Calgary-Mountain View.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Yes, Mr. Speaker. First of all, to correct the impression left by the hon. member, last night the House was debating Bill 22. It's a different Bill than that which is in front of us and which is the subject of the subamendment. So I just think his points on that were out of order in terms of the point of order he raises.

He was concerned that the reference being made by the hon. Member for Edmonton-Kingsway was not confined to the narrow parameters of the subamendment, which, Mr. Speaker, has to do with the participation of Alberta women in the life of the province. At the moment he was being interrupted, he was addressing section 61 of the Bill under division 10, which had to do with pregnant employees. Now, I can't imagine there would be another section of the Bill that could be interpreted to be more specifically narrow in addressing the participation of Alberta women, in that I would assume one could only reasonably conclude that when speaking of a pregnant employee, that section could only be referring to women.

I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that I believe the member's comments were very much directed to the confines of the subamendment in front of the Legislature this afternoon.

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, speaking to the point of order. The hon. Member for Calgary-Mountain View has, I think, just

made the point that in actual fact the Member for Edmonton-Kingsway was addressing the committee stage of the Bill. He was quoting from a section of the Bill and was addressing that section, which is classic committee stage of debate.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. members. Two points: one, the Chair is well aware of Standing Order 23(c), which deals with both repetition and matters that have been decided by the House; and secondly, the Chair is mindful of the decision made last evening under Bill 22 on the same point, and that is, dealing with a subamendment, a member would only speak to one section of a Bill in dealing with that debate.

The Member for Stony Plain raises an extremely important point. However, the Chair is at times in a quandary as to determine what is repetition and what is not. The Chair obviously doesn't know until it hears a second time whether it's repetitious. I would ask the hon. Member for Edmonton-Kingsway to come back to the point dealing with the subamendment. Being as the hon. member has already used an example of a section in the Act, perhaps he could restrain himself only to that section.

MR. McEACHERN: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. But I guess I do find myself a little bit confused. One member from the other side stood up and said I must refer to the amendment -- in other words, he wanted me to read it over and over -- and then this member stands up and says I mustn't read it over and over. Now, reading the amendment over and over isn't really what's at stake. What I'm talking about -- and I'm using this point from the Bill to illustrate my point -- is that the government has not addressed women's issues, which is the point of the subamendment. So I don't know why it is that one can't use an example to illustrate one's general point.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hon. member, we've dealt with the point of order. Let's come back to the subamendment.

MR. McEACHERN: Okay; I will go back to the point I was making.

Now, if we are going to help women have equal opportunity in economic affairs of this province, then we have to address the problem of what happens when they become pregnant. We do all want a viable future society, as the Premier said this morning. We want healthy families. So if we're going to do that, we're going to have to start doing something positive, some affirmative action which will help the women look after themselves. I mean, we all know the statistics on poverty of single family parents and that sort of thing. We do know, for example, if we want to talk about moving into the 21st century and leading the way, that Quebec has already instituted a program where they give a \$500 grant to couples when they have their first child and a \$3,000 one when they have their second. That at least goes some way to helping the costs of producing children in this society. As it's women that bear the brunt of that, then I think that's a very important point.

It's true that some unions are able to negotiate contracts wherein there is some money for pregnancy leave. But the unorganized workers, Mr. Speaker, are not in a position to negotiate for that. So unless an employer, out of the goodness of his own heart, is prepared to take some cognizance of the hardships visited particularly on single women who may become pregnant, I don't see who else is going to protect these people. I think it's up to the Minister of Labour to go back and look at his Bill and

build into it some affirmative action.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is a very serious problem. The statistics are not good in this area. For instance:

Forty-six per cent of working women solely support themselves and their families.

So the need is very great

Sixty per cent of single parent families which are headed by women live below the poverty line as opposed to 10% of single parent families headed by men.

Again, the burden falls most heavily on women. So the Minister of Labour needs to take cognizance of our amendment and go back and redraft that Bill and build in some affirmative action program for women. Another rather frightening statistic:

The percentage of women who are the heads of poor families increased from 12% in 1961 to 36.5% in 1985.

So the problems of working women in this province are getting worse, Mr. Speaker, not getting better.

The divorce rate in Canada is about 40%. However, between 1970 and 1983, the divorce rate in Canada doubled.

Now, that may not be such a bad thing, Mr. Speaker. It probably means that . . .

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. Minister of Labour, on a point of order.

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, we are addressing labour legislation, not the divorce statistics for this country of Canada, and we are addressing labour legislation in the province of Alberta alone.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. minister. Perhaps the hon. Member for Edmonton-Kingsway now would come back directly to the subamendment before the House.

MR. McEACHERN: Sure. It is directly related, Mr. Speaker. I just didn't finish the quote because he cut it off halfway, you see.

To follow up with what I just said:

Women continue to care for children in about 85% of all divorces.

So you see, it is very directly related.

Seventy-five per cent of husbands default on their maintenance payments.

So the divorce rate is very germane to the point I was making. That leaves women vulnerable to the problems created by divorces, so that's why that was a relevant point.

The number of children living in poverty rose by 23% between 1980 and 1985.

So again, we are leaving our women and their children at risk, and it's getting worse and not better.

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

This minister says that his Bill is pointing us toward the 21st century, yet I see nothing there that is progressive in this direction in the way of affirmative action for women. One final statistic in this section:

After a divorce, a woman's income drops by 30% to 40%, while a man's income [goes up] by . . . 70%.

So, Mr. Speaker, the plight of women in this society is really rather sad in the economic world. The minister has a duty to go back and rewrite that Bill and build in some affirmative action -- either that or we should not give this Bill second reading be-

cause it fails to meet the government's commitment to equality for women.

Mr. Speaker, women may be a minority group in this Legislature, but they're not in the province and they're not in society as a whole. So the government is going to have to start taking cognizance of women's ideas, because they are not going to stay a minority forever in this Assembly. More and more women are getting more and more involved in politics. I for one look forward to that, because they'll bring a perspective to this Assembly and to the laws of the land that will see to it that women and children are taken care of in a way that we're not doing at this stage. I'm afraid to say or admit that the males of this society have not understood or addressed women's issues adequately over the previous decades, and now is the time and this minister is doing nothing about it. A simple example of what I'm talking about:

In 1985, women made up 9.8% of the federal parliament, 10% of judges, 16% of union executives . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. member. With due respect, membership in the federal House and other Parliaments has precious little to do with this particular subamendment. To the words of the subamendment, please.

MR. McEACHERN: Well, I was just pointing out their lack of positions of power, hence perhaps that's one of the reasons why they don't have much economic power either. This Bill doesn't address that. What I'm talking about is affirmative action for women because they are the main victims of the part-time economic society we have now, and this legislation is meant to address the problems of the poorer workers in this society, the unorganized workers that can't organize themselves, three-quarters of which are women. So all I'm pointing out is that as they reach positions of power, that will change. I'm afraid the Tories are going to miss out on the change.

Mr. Speaker, I look through this Bill -- and I waited and wondered in anticipation of it what the government would do about pay equity. I don't see any provisions for pay equity in this Bill. We should pass this amendment and defeat this Bill unless the minister takes into account the problems that are addressed by pay equity. Now, pay equity is something that I think is not all that well understood. However, I have a fairly short and clear description of it here that I think is worth putting into the record.

Pay Equity involves the issue of whether work done primarily by women is systematically undervalued because the work has been and continues to be done primarily by women. That is, whether wages paid to women employed in historically female work are lower than the wages would be if the jobs had been and were performed by men.

So that's the criteria by which you judge the need, I think, for pay equity. I think most of us from our own personal experience would know that the problem raised here is, in fact, a serious one and one we should address.

Now, what you do about it is another thing. This document I have, which I just read from actually, is *Pay Equity and Job Evaluation*, put out by Manitoba Labour. They have made some moves in the direction of pay equity. A couple of points might be worth noting. It would be a good idea for the minister to take a look at them and perhaps follow in this direction. In trying to evaluate jobs, this is the way it's described here:

Job evaluation involves a process of comparison of jobs in order to determine the relative position of one job to another in a wage or salary hierarchy. Every employer who pays wages of different levels has some form of job evaluation,

ranging from the boss' gut feeling as to the worth of the tasks being performed to a formal and systematic job evaluation system sometimes supplemented with market surveys. It is the use of formal and systematic comparison procedures that is usually referred to as "job evaluation".

Job evaluation is concerned with the content of jobs, not with the performance of individuals or innate abilities of particular workers.

And it goes on to describe in a little more detail the idea of pay equity.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Manitoba legislation -- I'm not sure what stage it got to in terms of being passed when the government there fell, but nonetheless, they did have a Bill before their Assembly and there was a schedule and a plan to move that society forward with pay equity legislation. I challenge the minister here: if he wants to move us into the 21st century, if he expects us to pass this legislation, then he should take a look at what Manitoba is doing. He should take note of what Quebec is doing. He should take a look at other jurisdictions around the world and get on with putting some affirmative action into his Bill if he expects our support.

[Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair]

Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of facts, figures, and statistics that show the need. I've read some of them, and my colleagues have read some, but there are one or two more I would like to read into the record that show how women are not treated fairly in our present society. This has been going on for a long time, and it is not getting better. In fact, it's getting worse in some cases.

In 1939, the wage gap in North America between the average amount of money earned by men compared to the average amount earned by women stood at . . . 63%.

In Alberta, in 1987, the wage gap was 65%.

Two percentage points better after nearly 40 years, Mr. Speaker. I suggest that's scandalous. I suggest that the Minister of Labour should address that problem, and he has not.

Nationally, the figure was 64%.

So it's no better.

This statistic is based on full time workers. When part time workers are taken into account, the wage gap is 52%.

Mr. Speaker, it's the unorganized workers, the people, many of them working part-time. We just said over three-quarters of the people in part time are women, so that just shows the extent of the problem.

Fifty-three per cent of Canadian women of the age of 15 or greater are now in the work force. Sixty-eight per cent of married women are working.

It's not because they want to, in many cases; it's that two incomes are needed to make a living in this society.

Women represented 71% of all part time workers in Alberta in 1984.

It's worse than that now. It's 77 percent, and when you narrow it down to the 24 to 54 age group that I mentioned a minute ago, it's over 88 percent.

The largest single employer of women in Canada is the federal public service.

I suppose that in Alberta the Alberta government is probably one of the biggest employers of women.

Only 34% of working women are unionized.

So most working women are left to the protection of Bills like this, and if Bills like this don't protect them, who's going to? They will just continue to be exploited as they have been in the past.

In 1982, Alberta men's annual earnings were greater than

Alberta women's earnings at all educational levels. The biggest discrepancy was in the group with university degrees. So even when they get a good education, even when they go through the school system and beat men at their own game and get to what should be a good job with equal rights, they don't get equal rights: they don't get equal remuneration.

Forty per cent of the labour force is female, and 34% of these women are single, widowed, divorced, or the heads of single parent families.

Eighty-two per cent of women can expect to be financially responsible for themselves at some point in their lives.

Mr. Speaker, I think those statistics are an indictment of this government's record in the past, and this Bill is an indictment of their plans for the future.

Bill 21, the Employment Standards Code, which should be meant to protect the unorganized workers, does not do that. I think this minister has listened to his business friends far too much and not stopped and talked to the working poor, to the disenfranchised, to the unorganized. Mr. Speaker, those people need their advocates too, and I'm proud to stand up in this Assembly and stand up for the unorganized working women of this province.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Athabasca-Lac La Biche, to the subamendment.

MR. PIQUETTE: Yes, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I also rise to support the subamendment. I'd like to read this amendment.

and because it contradicts the statement of government commitment, set out in the same speech, that the "government is committed to equality for women and will actively promote the full and equal participation of Alberta women in the life of the province."

The subamendment introduced by our elected woman representative in the Official Opposition in charge of women's issues, really gets to the meat of the real problem with Bill 21. If the government is really serious in terms of enacting legislation which will bring us into the 21st century, we find when we study Bill 21, the legislation submitted by the Minister of Labour, it really does not meet that mark at all. It basically is actually going backwards in many respects. If the women of Alberta, the unorganized women of Alberta in the labour force, are going to take this labour Bill and say that they can go to their employer and seek much better wage conditions and better treatment in terms of their part-time endeavours in the work force, in terms of being able to get some fair play in many of the industries that hire women -- for example, I give the example of the garment industry, which is one industry which employs mostly women.

If you look at many of the labour standards complaints that come in, many of these women are very often paid on a part-time basis, 37 hours per week, on a three-month basis, and very often they're let go without any cause and then rehired at a later time. This is a kind of very continual process, and this Bill does not address any kind of prorated type of protection for the women working on a part-time basis. It actually seems to encourage that trend to hire women at a substandard wage level. If it would have been men employed in those particular industries, a long time ago they would have sought much better working conditions, much better protection in terms of salaries, and would not be open to the kinds of abuse that many of these unconscionable kinds of employers are using today.

I can see that with free trade we're going to be actually com-

pounding this kind of situation in the future, because we're going to be opening up the doors to foreign competition in terms of our garment industry and we're going to be probably having to face a situation in this province where even the sad situation that exists now will be increasing in incidence. And so the minister not to have addressed pay equity in this Bill, the question of the part-time worker in this legislation, is really unconscionable, because women at work represent the majority of the part-time workers in the work force.

At this time only 34 percent of women work in an organized union type of work force, and so we take a look at the result we have 66 percent of women who are working today working in conditions where they are having to bargain on an individual basis with their employer. That is not at all possible, because you take a look at the low minimum wages that we're offering to the part-time worker in terms of no protection in terms of pension plan, no protection in terms of maternity leave -- and this is all continued under Bill 21.

When we take a look at how we've addressed the issue of discrimination in the workplace, of people having different race or culture or language and where we've not permitted this type of inequity to exist in our workplace, we have not done the same thing for the women at work. Why aren't we doing what we have done for what we saw in the past as intolerance shown by many members of our society? But unless we move ahead very forcefully on this issue in terms of pay equity and the protection of the unorganized women in the workplace -- and I could also mention the men in the workplace at the same time, but since we have a larger number of women in part-time employment today, their problems are a lot worse.

Thirty-three per cent of all women employed in Alberta are employed in clerical work.

If you look at the phenomenon that's developing, it's that you have a lot of the part-time job employment companies basically now set up to take advantage of the part-time kind of legislation the government encouraged in the past and which will continue in the future under Bill 21. They work on the basis that many companies today, in order to cut down on overhead expense in terms of not having to pay out any kind of benefits or any kind of vacation pay, will be using employment agencies to fill the jobs in the clerical staff, and they keep switching people around from job to job. Even though they could be hiring a full-time person for that particular job, they find much benefit in terms of simply rotating women workers in clerical positions from one jobsite to the other. It's simply done on the economic basis, and if we're going to have a Bill which encourages that kind of activity in the workplace, companies -- even those companies who may wish to have full-time women employees in their work force -- because of the kinds of allowances made by the Minister of Labour and the government here in Alberta, are forced to compete on the same basis. So we are encouraging, in fact, the widespread use of this kind of tactic in the workplace. And that is really a shameful kind of situation that this government does not seem to be addressing.

If we're going to be making sure that women are equal to men in the workplace, we have to close those kinds of gaps that exist in our present legislation. Like I indicated, working with many large companies from 1975 to 1982 when I worked in my own publishing firm with many companies, with the Edmonton Chamber of Commerce and small businesses out there, in conversations I had with many of the employers, they indicated that because of the growing phenomenon of the part-time workers that were being used by other firms, they had to employ the

same kind of tactic in order to reduce their overhead costs. So in a free market economy, unless there is proper legislation to make sure that we do not discriminate on the basis of gender or on the basis of religion or language or whatever, we are going to see this happening more and more in the future.

As I again indicate, under free trade I think this will be a phenomenon growing by leaps and bounds, because we're going to be again most likely hiring immigrant women workers, part-time women in the work force, to try to somehow save some of the jobs that are being attacked by the free trade agreement in terms of, for example, the garment industry, where they're going to be competing against women who are working at slave labour rates in Korea or in Mexico, which through American companies will now be allowed to compete directly against Canadian jobs. We're going to be basically setting up slave labour camps in many of our industries if we do not enact legislation which protects the women in the workplace.

Forty-six per cent of working women solely support themselves and their families.

Regardless of what the Premier said today, that he's in favour of . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hon. member, the Chair hesitates to interrupt, but we're dealing now with *Beauchesne* 299: the question of relevance and repetition. The Chair should be hearing the arguments pro and con to the question under discussion, and having heard them once, there's no need for the Chair to hear them continually. The Chair would make the observation that those points have been made several times before. Whether the hon. member has access to that is another matter.

Would the hon. member come back to new arguments why the House should adopt the subamendment now before the House.

MR. PIQUETTE: Well, I think it's very worthy of repeating the argument, singly because the government doesn't listen. So I guess we have to repeat to make sure that some of these . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hon. member . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Order.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hon. member. Now. The hon. member is quite in error with having to assert that comments must be repeated. The Chair has just indicated there is no necessity for that. The Chair appeals to the hon. member to put forth new arguments that would influence this House to adopt the question before it.

MR. SIGURDSON: With respect, Mr. Speaker, on that very point, I note . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Point of order, Edmonton-Belmont.

MR. SIGURDSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The point of order that you brought the member's attention to: that very point is that I, too, heard both the hon. Member for Edmonton-Kingsway and the hon. Member for Athabasca-Lac La Biche cite the figure of 46 percent. However, Mr. Speaker, with due respect, I heard the argument from Edmonton-Kingsway, but I've yet to hear the argument from Athabasca-Lac La Biche, and the argument may very well be different, although the figure 46 percent is the same.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the difficulty of reaching a conclusion, if something is repetitive, until the Chair has heard it. The Chair is well aware of that difficulty.

Hon. Member for Athabasca-Lac La Biche.

MR. PIQUETTE: Yes. I was beginning to indicate that since 46 percent of working women solely support themselves and their families, the whole issue of pay equity -- that's the reason why it's such an important amendment that we have to address in this House today. If we were looking at a very minute part of the female population, then the government could completely disregard, I guess, our argument. But when we are talking of the thousands upon thousands of families in this province who are solely dependent on the livelihood of the woman in the workplace, for this government to not realize the importance of this amendment is completely beyond me.

It's completely understandable to women who are out there in the work force, attempting to stay off welfare and to stay off social assistance. Because really what we are doing now with a lack of protection for the part-time worker and for the whole issue of pay equity for the woman in the workplace, we're setting ourselves forth where we're actually telling women heading families as single parents to go on welfare. That's basically what we're saying for them to do. There's really no incentive for them to get off welfare and to seek self-fulfillment in the workplace and to make sure they are teaching their young children the value of work, the value of self-esteem.

I really question the motives of this government when they ridicule the amendment we have made, that it is frivolous in the workplace today. If they even look at the whole issue here in their throne speech: they made this issue supposedly a very important part of their political agenda, and then in the first Bill that is presented in the House which should have some teeth in the matter of pay equity for women and in terms of the part-time worker and also the domestic worker -- that we have to have some fairness in the system. The government is the only one who is able to do that. You will never find a company in a free market society, if they are faced with competitors who are not fair and equitable and just to their workers, doing that on their own. Because the free market forces -- if you're on an equal level of competition, the same playing field, you're going to basically create a situation where you're encouraging, through lack of legislation, a continuation of a practice which a long time ago should have been changed in this province and in this country.

Unless we have leadership by the government that is actually listening to the majority of people out there -- and any time you enact legislation you cannot be listening to only one side of the issue. Unfortunately, the Minister of Labour, in his world travel and in the development of the legislation -- we can only conclude one thing: he believed that to listen to the employer was more important than to listen to the concerns of workers in Alberta; I believe more so in terms of the unorganized workers in Alberta, which are represented mainly by the women in our society. He believes that they will not, I guess, become a political reality in this province, that we can continue to basically hide this issue and continue discrimination against women in the workplace and that there won't be any, I guess, political fallout, whereas, because of the political contributions of big corporations and businesses who are friends of the government on the other side, if he listens and tries to be fair to the workers in this province, then of course his political party will suffer the political loss of revenue from their corporate friends, which is totally,

really, out to lunch on this issue, because the role of a government is not to listen to any one particular . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hon. member, the Chair is having some difficulty understanding how the hon. member is advancing his cause to support the subamendment by the lack of political contributions. Could the hon. member come back to the point before us, and that's dealing with a very specific subamendment to the amendment to Bill 21.

MR. PIQUETTE: Well, the point I was making was that there are not enough single women making political contributions to the PC Party to be listened to. That's basically the point I'd like to make on that issue. And that really goes back to, again: who do you listen to when you're making legislation? This government has failed to enact legislation which protects the part-time women workers in the workplace by having no proactive type of benefit for the number of hours they work during the week or the number of months they work during the year. There's nothing which protects that. If you fall between the crack, you have nothing. It basically encourages companies to exploit that loophole, and these loopholes are very gaping.

DR. REID: On a point of order.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. A point of order, Minister of Labour.

DR. REID: I would refer the Speaker to section 319(3) of *Beauchesne*, where

a Member will not be permitted by the Speaker to indulge in any reflections on the House itself . . . or to impute to any Member or Members unworthy motives for their actions in a particular case.

I think the Member for Athabasca-Lac La Biche just did that in relation to the motives for this legislation in the Bills I presented on April 15, 1988.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. minister. The Chair would reserve any decision until the Chair has had an opportunity to pursue what was actually said.

Athabasca-Lac La Biche.

MR. PIQUETTE: I was interrupted here by *Hansard*. Did the Speaker indicate that I should withdraw that statement? Is this what the Speaker indicated?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: That would have been the gist of the hon. Minister of Labour, not the Chair, hon. member.

MR. PIQUETTE: Okay, continuing on the issue of families and why it's so important for the pay equity and the whole issue of the need for legislation which protects women in the workplace and the need for that subamendment to be agreed to by all members of this House because it is a section in the Bill which is very definitely deficient -- I know the minister agrees with that. He understands that it is true what we're saying here from the other side of the House, because he is aware of the statistical information. I think if he's been in business at all -- I don't believe he's been in business; he's been in the medical practice -- but if he's actually been in the business world and actually seen the instances and the conniving that is out there in terms of how companies can use the present legislation and the future pro-

posed legislation of this government in Alberta -- that there'll be very definitely a further deterioration. You're not going to see any improvement in the wage gap which presently exists between men and women in Alberta.

As a father of two daughters, I guess I feel that this is unfair for them. You know, I value my daughters as much as I value my sons, and for the government to be putting in place where there's a difference between male and female and how they can actually acquire an equivalent education in Alberta and be working for a provincial government as an employee, for example, and be discriminated because of gender when they have an equal kind of basis . . . Again, we look at the statistics from the provincial government, and we have a great gap between people of similar education even because of the fact that the promotional policies within the public service sector -- it's still predominantly male and not moving that quickly in the other direction.

It's so discouraging that after the labour Bill of last year, which the minister decided to go out there and rewrite for the spring sittings of 1988, we have not moved. We have not closed that gap in the legislation which exists under the old Act, and actually it's a regressive piece of legislation that this government should be thoroughly ashamed of. Even though Alberta has never been at the forefront of labour legislation, and just because the minister probably understands the political thought of Albertans, which tends to be, to some extent, antilabour in its orientation because of a lack of understanding of the real working of democracy in the workplace, there's a belief in this province shared by many Albertans that unions and organized labour are somehow destructive to the proper workings of our industrialized way of living as opposed to understanding that it is part of the democratic choice people have in terms of the freedom of association. But we hear this government almost encouraging the other side that, you know, we are not going to be any kind of pro-worker type of government; we're not going to be pro-women in terms of trying to address the kinds of disparity which have been allowed to develop over the centuries, where women were seen as a second-class kind of individual in our society.

I thought we had, in the last 20 years at least, made some progress in terms of educating ourselves about the silliness of making differences in terms of how people are treated in the workplace. But we see now, in June of 1988, a government that introduces legislation which is still placing women in a second-class category; that is still not interested in making sure that wage gap -- the kind of treatment of women by employers who like to categorize them 68 percent or 71 percent of the time in terms of part-time work; that still believes, somehow, that the whole family is the same as it was in the 1940s and '50s when, in fact, the statistics indicate that 46 percent of women now are the main breadwinner in the family because of the dislocation of our society. I mean, in our industrialized world, in our computerized world we have created all kinds of stresses and strains on the family. That's why we have high divorce rates, and we have to admit that there are problems out there. But to turn a blind eye and say that they don't exist like the Premier attempted today to do is just totally ridiculous. We have to come to the reality of the situation which exists in our present world. To try to pretend that we can live in the past escapes me completely. We have to live now and in the future. Legislation has to be enacted to be addressing the reality of today's world, not the realities of what some hon. members would like to see it be. If the government would like to really work on behalf of saving



the family and making sure that it's an institution which is highly regarded, then it can address that in another piece of legislation to actually perhaps compensate women who choose to remain home, to have some access to pension plans and to perhaps higher tax benefits for their husband to be their sole wage earner. But to attempt to deny today in the society we have that women are not an important part of the work force when it's fast approaching 50 percent of the work force at the present time is to deny reality.

The minister should be showing leadership. He comes, I believe, from a background which believes in fairness and justice for everyone. Obviously, the amendment here that we have introduced is a way by which the minister can tell his colleagues that yes, he agrees that we are prepared to entertain amendments to Bill 21 which will make sure that the disparity, that the part-time worker issue, the issue of the domestic worker, and the issue of pay equity are addressed in this Bill. Then we can all go home after this long spring session and feel good about ourselves, that we have been fair to all Albertans regardless of gender.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Associate Minister of Agriculture.

MRS. CRIPPS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to get in on this debate. Looking at the amendment, I'm pleased to say that the government is committed to equality for women and will actively promote "full and equal participation of Alberta women in the life of this province." I can assure the hon. Member for Athabasca-Lac La Biche that each and every one of us wants equal opportunities for our sons and our daughters.

Mr. Speaker, I think I want to emphasize "equal" opportunities. I don't think the women of this province or my daughters want unfair opportunities; they just want equal opportunities. And I think that Bill 21 is trying to establish, in fact, equal opportunities. For instance, the Bill sets out standards under the Employment Standards Code. It establishes minimum wages, working conditions, minimum hours of work and overtime, vacation and vacation pay, general holidays, general holiday pay, termination of employees, and parental benefits which are equal for all three: men, women, and part-time workers.

On the minimum wages: they apply equally to women, to men, and to part-time and full-time workers. Hours of work and overtime: again, apply equally to full-time employees and part-time employees, which is very, very important, as the member indicated, for female workers. Vacation and vacation pay provisions are nondiscriminatory, whether the worker is full-time or part-time. After two years they must receive two weeks; after five years they receive three weeks, regardless of whether they're a man, a woman, a full- or a part-time worker.

Mr. Speaker, those provisions of this Act allow for jobs for women, and job sharing if the women want that, because they allow for part-time employment. Again, all employees benefit from the code's general holiday provisions once qualified, and all people have to qualify on the same basis.

Mr. Speaker, termination of employment provisions applies to all employees, full- or part-time. Following three months employment, the employer must provide notice of termination or pay in lieu of that regardless of whether you're male or female.

The particular point that was made by the Member for Edmonton-Kingsway was of interest to me, because he was talking about maternity leave and having benefits paid especially for maternity leave. Mr. Speaker, one of the things that that would

do is disadvantage women of child-bearing age. What we want to do is give all women an opportunity to work, and we certainly don't want to disadvantage women from obtaining a job because an employer in the long term cannot afford them. What we have done is provided equal benefits, but the maternity benefits apply only to the female employees, and certainly most members will recognize the reality of that. Qualified employees receive 18 weeks unpaid leave. Mr. Speaker, there is an advantage to the employee there.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hon. minister, you're dealing with the Bill and not the subamendment before us.

MRS. CRIPPS: Well, I'm dealing with the point that the member makes that women are disadvantaged, because quite frankly that's an aspect that is a definite advantage for women and probably in the long term costly for the employer because he has to replace the worker. The adoption of a child is equal regardless of which parent wants to take the leave of absence.

The members for Edmonton-Kingsway and Athabasca-Lac La Biche also talked about pension benefits. I might draw the hon. members' attention to a debate of April 10, '84, page 389, where there was a very good discussion on pension plans and pension benefits and allowing for expanded pension plans which would allow women in the work force, and particularly women who are part-time employees, to participate in pension plans. The members would find it very good reading, because it goes over the litany of problems that women had. And I'm happy to say, Mr. Speaker, that under the Employment Pension Plans Act any employee is entitled now to participate in a pension plan. I know that that's a big step forward for many of the women who were working part-time and who could not participate in that plan.

Mr. Speaker, going back to the original amendment, again the government is committed to equality for women and will actively promote it. The government has appointed a minister responsible for women's issues, and that minister is an advocate for women and for women's issues.

Mr. Speaker, women want equal opportunities, and they want to be treated equally in the workplace. Bill 21 does that.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hon. Member for Edmonton-Mill Woods, on the subamendment.

MR. GIBEAULT: Yes, Mr. Speaker. The subamendment that is before us this afternoon talks about the question of the Lieutenant Governor's speech, the throne speech, which talked in glowing terms about "the full and equal participation of Alberta women in the life of the province." And it would be my contention, Mr. Speaker, that we should decline to give this second reading because in fact this Bill that's before us as proposed simply doesn't do that. And I want to suggest a couple of points that would support that proposition.

Now, the Bill that is before us. Bill 21, the Employment Standards Code, really is the minimal or lowest standards that apply to the people of this province who are not fortunate enough to have someone to negotiate or work on their behalf, whether it be a union or a professional association or a Members' Services Committee for MLAs to look after their welfare -- no one to do that for them. So we've got this Bill, the Employment Standards Code, which proposes to do that.

[Mr. R. Moore in the Chair]

Now, Mr. Speaker, this throne speech that the government put before us when this session started talked about its commitment to "the full and equal participation of Alberta women." But I want to argue that this Bill simply doesn't do that, and that would be a good reason why we should decline to give it second reading. In terms of employment standards, Mr. Speaker, we discovered earlier in this session that although there are a lot of nice words in the employment standards that apply in this province, when somebody tries to get a conviction here, the odds are abysmal, something like 5 out of 10,000; you know, the odds of winning the lottery. And as I said before, the Employment Standards Code really applies to those who do not have anyone to negotiate or bargain on their behalf, and the majority of those people are women. Most of the people who work in the service industry are women, and most of the people who work in the unorganized sector are women. So when we're talking about the Employment Standards Code, we're really talking about women by and large.

Now, if the government really had, as they proposed in their throne speech, this commitment to "the full and equal participation of Alberta women," there is no question that Bill 21, the Employment Standards Code, which is before us now, would have had a provision in there for a regular -- read "annual" -- review of Alberta's minimum wage, because as I said before, most of the people who work at the minimum wage are women. And that fact that it doesn't, that there is no provision for a regular and a direct review of the minimum wage, it's going to be something probably like we had before where it takes every seven years, usually just before an election comes by, until the government gets around to reviewing this and causing some kind of an increase to take effect. So I ask, Mr. Speaker: what kind of a fairness proposal is that, when we have such a wishy-washy provision in the labour code, section 33, that does not require the government at any time to conduct a regular review of the minimum wage?

Nor does this provide for the very minimum, Mr. Speaker, some indexing for inflation so that those people who work at the minimum wage -- and as I said before, the majority of those are women -- do in fact have some minimum protection for their earning power, minimal as it may be. Even that is not provided in this Act. And so, Mr. Speaker, that has not encouraged me to try to support second reading of this Bill, because so many of the women in my constituency in Edmonton-Mill Woods who work at the minimum wage or just above it don't have any protection, any assurance if Bill 21 is passed for a regular indexing of the minimum wage nor for some review on a regular and an annual basis by the government to go beyond the minimum wage.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if we can provide within the Legislative Assembly Act and other provisions for MLAs to get regular reviews and have their compensation adjusted for inflation, not to mention reviews by Members' Services Committee and others, why is it that we can't put that kind of provision in the Employment Standards Code, in Bill 21? "Why can't we provide at least as much protection for the people who are on the very bottom, the working poor, the majority of whom are women, as we do for those of us who are at a much more comfortable level in the employment scale?" I ask.

This Bill discriminates against women. It just does not provide the kind of protections that would do something serious in order to fulfill that pledge that was made in the throne speech for "the full and equal participation of Alberta women in the life of this province." And so, as such, I cannot in good conscience

lend my support to second reading of this Bill.

Now, if this government was really serious about that nice phrase that they made in the throne speech when they had all their friends here and the media people were watching -- and there was a lot of pomp and circumstance for that occasion, as I recall -- if they were serious about that commitment, Mr. Speaker, in Bill 21 we would have a provision for equal pay for work of equal value. Now, that has been implemented in jurisdictions across this country and across North America: at the federal level, in Ontario, in Manitoba, and in a number of jurisdictions. And for a province that likes to stand up repeatedly and talk about how Alberta's number one and we're the leader and we're the best, that just doesn't cut the mustard in Bill 21. So again it's really another indication that this Bill simply does not have contained within it provisions that would complement and conform to the Lieutenant Governor's speech that made that commitment to "full and equal participation of Alberta women" in the work force and in the life of this province. And until we've got some kind of solid commitment in that regard, Mr. Speaker, I'm not inclined to give this second reading.

My colleagues have gone over the statistics, sad and shameful as they are, of disparities between the earning potentials of women with similar education making somewhere in the neighbourhood of 60 to 65 percent of what men make. I'm ashamed of that, Mr. Speaker. I take no comfort in that whatsoever as a man, and I want to see something in Bill 21 that will deal with that. I want to see that come forward. I want to see a time when my children grow up and we can have statistics before us that show that women and men with equal education and training and experience command equal compensation. As I said before, the statistics are clear. You can take them from StatsCan, you can take them from the Advisory Council on the Status of Women, you can take them from various sources, and they all say the same, that there's a tremendous disparity there. And Bill 21, Employment Standards Code, simply doesn't address that.

Now, another area where this Bill falls far short of the government's commitment during that throne speech for that "full and equal participation of Alberta women" is the whole area of the fact that it totally ignores domestic workers. I don't know if the Minister of Labour has a domestic worker or not; I can tell you that I don't. But there are many women -- in fact, it is almost exclusively women that take on the role of domestic workers, Mr. Speaker, and predominantly, as you may know, immigrant workers. And I for one am really disappointed in the minister and his government that they have chosen to simply ignore this whole group of people who are most vulnerable and have now under Bill 21's proposals virtually no protection whatsoever.

Now, what kind of a situation is that? How can a minister on behalf of his government stand there before us and allow a situation like that to exist? In fact it's specifically exempted. Now, why is that? Can't we bring ourselves to include in the Employment Standards Code of this province a provision that will provide for domestic workers, people who do a lot of the dirty cleaning and work like that that a lot of us would prefer not to do? Some of us are wealthy enough to hire other people to do it. Surely to goodness we can provide that they be covered under this particular Bill, the Employment Standards Code, that they could be protected by the minimum wage provisions, that they could be provided with some minimal protection in terms of lodging complaints with the employment standards branch when there are problems. Although as I said before, the enforcement record is so disgraceful that I would hardly encourage anyone to

do that until such time as we get some commitment from this government to enforce that code and get some convictions, to send a message to employers that it will not be tolerated in this province that there be violations of the Employment Standards Code.

So we've got that whole class of people, Mr. Speaker, who are largely employed by wealthy people in this society to look after their children and to maintain their homes. Those workers, the domestic workers, have simply been eliminated from the coverage of this Act. And this minister knows, because I've got a copy of the letter that was sent to him by the domestic workers association of Alberta asking to be covered by the Employment Standards Code. He has obviously chosen to ignore that representation, and I would like him to stand in his place today during our debate and explain just exactly why that is, why he's not prepared to accommodate a basic amount of respect for domestic workers, as other workers in our society. Is it perhaps because of the fact that they're predominantly women or that they're predominantly immigrants? Is there some sort of sexist or racist connotation there? Or why is it that he just refuses to include those people under the Employment Standards Code?

Now, Mr. Speaker, the other part of Bill 21 which is completely deficient in terms of meeting that goal that was stated in the throne speech, to provide full and equal participation of women in our province, is the fact that part-time workers' interests are really not protected at all in Bill 21. Now, the majority of part-time workers in our province are women, and the minister knows that there is a trend in this country and in this province for additional part-time workers. There may be many women -- and men, perhaps, to a lesser degree -- who would avail themselves of part-time opportunities, but one of the reasons that many of them can't is that there are very often in most part-time employment situations virtually no benefits payable, and if there are, they're not prorated on the basis of the hours that would be comparable to full-time employment. This has really got to be addressed, Mr. Speaker.

There could be a very arguable case for having part-time employees in many enterprises. I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, that in my previous occupation at the regional media centre for the schools in central and northern Alberta we had a number of part-time employees on our staff, and they were covered by the collective agreement of the support staff there of the school district. That provided for prorated benefits in terms of a variety of benefits -- holiday pay and pension benefits and many others, time off for various kinds of things -- and a lot of those benefits were prorated. But that is the exception, Mr. Speaker.

The Employment Standards Code applies, as we mentioned earlier, to women and to men, but predominately women, who are not fortunate enough to have the protection of either their union or a professional association or someone to argue on behalf of their interests and their welfare in the workplace. We can't rely on employers who are enlightened, because there are some but there are certainly not enough of them. The majority of Albertans do not come under the protection of any of these collective agreements, and those who do certainly enjoy a benefit in this province. But surely to goodness, if this is a government that in their throne speech talked about "the full and equal participation of Alberta women" and in their social policy document called *Caring* and indicating their compassion, if that was really true, I want to challenge the government to put forward an amendment so that the interests of part-time workers, the majority of which are women, are duly protected. Let them have a prorated share of all the benefits that are available to full-time

workers. You know, Mr. Speaker, and I'm sure the minister and others know that one of the reasons many employers go to part-time workers is for that very reason: because they don't have to pay benefits to their part-time employees.

Well, Mr. Speaker, you know and I'm sure all of us know that whether we work full-time or part-time, at some point in time we're going to retire. Sixty-five? Maybe it'll be earlier than that -- who knows? But when you retire, you've got to have a pension. Otherwise, we're going to be having a whole slew of people who will be totally destitute. The figures already show, for anybody who cares to look at them, that the majority of seniors who are in a poverty situation are women. Why is that? Well, that's because in large part a lot of them either worked at home and didn't have access to a pension plan -- and we need to look at the whole issue of a homemaker's pension -- or those who did work maybe worked on a part-time basis, and so they were excluded from participation in the pension plan. But if we're serious about resolving that problem, if we don't want to continue to end up with a disproportionate number of seniors, those being our mothers and our aunts and our sisters and women throughout the province, being in a destitute situation, I would suggest that in Bill 21, the Employment Standards Code, and in legislation that deals with pensions we've got to provide for provisions that have part-time workers covered by all the benefits available to full-time workers on a prorated basis. There simply isn't a provision in Bill 21 to that effect.

[Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair]

So, Mr. Speaker, I would simply say that I, for one, simply cannot in good conscience offer support for second reading of this Bill until such time as those particular provisions are enhanced or amendments are proposed that will give some substance to the rhetoric that came forward during the throne speech.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hon. Member for Edmonton-Glengarry on the subamendment.

MR. YOUNIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I've been listening to debate here and find that some interesting points have been made. I think it's very important that we look closely at the value of this subamendment that we would not give the Bill second reading because it does not live up to the promises made in the throne speech. I think in discussing the whole issue of working people in the workplace and how people are treated in it, it must be obvious to anyone who understands what's happening in the workplace that although by and large throughout history all people who do not have control of and access to wealth and power have been victims of the workplace in one way or another, the fact is that women have been much more greatly victimized than men, and their capacity to produce wealth has been much more taken advantage of and much less rewarded in the workplace. And what this government promised in the throne speech was to do something about that.

Now, I also think it's important to note that one of the implications of what was said in the throne speech is that this government realized that women were not being treated equally. And it says:

[The] government is committed to equality for women and will actively promote the full and equal participation of Alberta women in the life of the province.

Well, the fact is that you don't have to actively promote some-

thing that exists, and therefore the throne speech that was given was an admission that over a decade of government by this party had not achieved equality for women. Now, I would argue that, if anything, it had made the situation worse, but the government admitted it had not made the situation better and it was about time they finally got around to doing something about it. What is reprehensible is that this Bill we're looking at this Legislature in this session is supposed to represent doing something about it. It's supposed to be, according to the government, trying to create some of that equality, according to one of the previous Conservative speakers. Well, that's just utter balderdash, and if anything, it will make the situation worse. It certainly will not do anything to make it better.

One previous speaker commented that he found it incredible that the government wouldn't support our amendment. Well, I would find it incredible if they did, because this is a government of the rich, by the rich, for the rich. It's a government of those who run the working place, by those who run it, for the benefit of those who run it. Part of their benefit has been their ability and their willingness to exploit female workers to a greater extent than they exploit male workers. For that reason a Bill brought in by such a government would undoubtedly, even if it just stuck to the status quo, do everything it could to make sure that that lesser or unequal position of women was maintained in the workplace. I think that from that point of view the Bill is tremendously successful in living up to Conservative philosophy, which would protect that inequality to the benefit of those who run the workplace.

I think it's important to point out that the Bill itself says that its philosophy, which is shocking, is to . . . As it says:  
a mutually effective relationship between employees and employers is critical to the capacity of Albertans to prosper in the competitive world-wide market economy of which Alberta is a part.

Now, what that means is that this is a government that sees its role as protecting the position of our businesses in a worldwide economy. And if that worldwide economy allows others in other countries in other jurisdictions to run sweatshops, to make women subservient -- in some parts of the world virtually slaves -- then Alberta better do it too, because that is the way they can remain competitive in a world market. Certainly they're ensuring that that is the only way we'll be able to do it under the free trade deal. I think as a package that represents their philosophy, doing nothing to create equality for women is in fact what we could expect this government to do. Bill 21 lives up to that greatly.

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, 23(i). The member is imputing motives to the government. That is, he has said that the government has deliberately disadvantaged women in their own employ. That's absolutely wrong, and he should retract it.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. Edmonton-Belmont on the point of order raised by the Associate Minister of Agriculture.

MR. SIGURDSON: Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. On the point of order that was raised by the hon. Associate Minister of Agriculture, she quotes from our Standing Order 23(i), "imputes false or unavowed motives to another member." Now, I think the Member for Edmonton-Glengarry was not speaking specifically about one particular Member of this Legislative Assembly,

and if he did, I'm sorry that I missed it. Perhaps that member, if that member is present, ought to rise and call that to the attention of the hon. member who was speaking.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Anyone else on the point of order?

The Chair would tend to agree with the hon. Member for Edmonton-Belmont. Under the Standing Order there could be a dispute of facts. Statements that were made, it would appear to the Chair, are statements that are made very often within this Assembly.

Edmonton-Glengarry.

MR. YOUNIE: Thank you. As one who has indirectly through that generalization been called any number of names by some members, I appreciate your reasonable attitude. But I will refer to something said by the member who just raised the point of order. I will try not to attribute any unavowed or unpleasant motives in it, because I would not do that about an individual member.

The minister talked about the importance of equality and said that this Bill does that by giving an equal minimum wage. Well, giving everybody equal access to poverty is hardly what I would call a kind of equality we should be horribly proud of. But I will concede that the Bill would ensure that everybody who has to work at minimum wage will live equally in poverty. That is true. Where the difference comes in and where this Bill and nothing else this government ever does or ever will do, I am sure, creates an inequality is: where over and over in the workplace workers are not protected by a collective agreement, you see male employees paid \$5 an hour to stock grocery shelves, for instance, where female employees are paid \$4 an hour. Everybody thinks that's a nice form of equality, and I'm sure if the workplace had its way, they'd lower them both to the equality of minimum wage and maximize profits thereby.

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: A point of order, Minister of Labour.

DR. REID: The hon. member is addressing the Individual's Rights Protection Act where there are specific provisions for the same pay for equal work or substantially similar work that exists, and the quotation he just made is absolutely wrong.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Well, that could be a dispute of facts. The point is well taken.

The hon. Member for Edmonton-Glengarry.

MR. YOUNIE: Thank you. I was speaking of cases where people doing exactly the same work are given different job descriptions by an employer so that he can find some way to justify paying some inequality. What I'm saying is that it is unforgivable that something in this Employment Standards Code does not make sure that for the same workplace and the same type of work, there will be protection and they must be paid the same salary. I don't think that is too much to ask in an Employment Standards Code, although I do believe that the government that brought in the Bill would see that as too much to ask.

One member raised the whole issue of maternity leave and pointed out that that has to be unequal because only one of the two sexes in fact belongs to the maternal category who would qualify for maternity leave. I would suggest that that is not the

only alternative we could look at under an Employment Standards Code. If we wanted to make it, in this case, more equal, I would suggest one alternative that might be interesting. That is to say: "Well, one of the two parents should be with the child for at least the first 18 weeks, and therefore we will allow either of the two parents -- and they can decide in consultation with each other -- to be at home with the child." So the mother could take the first nine, and the father could take the next nine, and within their jobs, they could share that. I don't see anything wrong with trying to do it that way. I think it would certainly give an amount of equality. It is certainly something I wouldn't have minded being able to do in my job when my child was born, to share some of that experience in the first part of life. It was a part of equality I didn't have.

I would also point out, perhaps, and I hope I won't be interrupted on the point of order I was before, that if any group within the Canadian society proves a certain point, it is the Conservative Party right across Canada; that is, that you don't have to be a male to be a male chauvinist. This party proves it over and over again by the kinds of laws they enact, by the kinds of attitudes they take in debate. I think this Bill is one that very much proves that and proves that this is a government that will never work to live up to the throne speech promises. Now, to some extent maybe I should feel guilty in arguing that I'm angry or disgusted that a Conservative government did not live up to that promise of providing equality and equal opportunity for women in our society. I never expected them to.

I thought it was almost shameful that some Tory propagandist wrote that throne speech and then forced someone we all respect as much as Her Honour to have to publicly read what were obviously political promises on the part of a party that wanted a throne speech that they could take quotes out of to mail out in their next election campaign literature. Indeed, the promises made in the throne speech were so much at odds with the philosophy of the party and the history of the party and the kind of government and laws they've provided that I don't expect we'll ever see this government pass a labour standards code or any other Bill that will protect women in the workplace to the extent that they protect men in the workplace, or protect anybody in the workplace to the extent that they should be protected. If that happens, I will be glad to support them. Until then I must support this subamendment that asks the Legislature to decline to give second reading to this reprehensible and inadequate Bill.

Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Ready for the question?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

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

REV. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MS MIROSH: He's already spoken.

REV. ROBERTS: I don't think the record shows that I've spoken on the subamendment, Mr. Speaker, and I would like to address a few remarks to it.

Insofar as I represent a constituency which is comprised of . . . Mr. Speaker, 62 percent of my constituents are women, so I have a very great interest in making sure that Bill 21, the Em-

ployment Standards Code, that is before us is a Bill that is going to be, as again I'd like to say, as progressive as it is conservative in terms of what it does for women in the workplace. But the subamendment -- as we've been directed, Mr. Speaker, of course -- looks at how it is that this Bill can come forth now without due regard for what was in the throne speech just two years ago. The Member for Edmonton-Avonmore's subamendment is it take into due consideration the fact that the

government is committed to equality for women and will actively promote the full and equal participation of . . . women in the life of the province.

Insofar as it is our opinion in the Official Opposition New Democrats that this Bill does not do that, we feel we should not support its second reading. I think that's a pretty crucial point, because it's not just our ideology or our particular axe to grind, it's not just the experience of women whom I represent as their MLA in the Legislature here but is in fact the government policy -- stated policy, in government language -- a government promise even two years ago in the throne speech that the government is committed in all its endeavours to equality for women and actively promoting the full and equal participation.

Yet perhaps as another example of, as we know, the Premier having difficulty following through on his stroke . . . You know, he gets very enthusiastic about something. Out on the golf course you have to keep your eye on the ball and follow right through. It seems that in this regard as well, together with other issues such as the Lubicon or the Triple E Senate or the Husky upgrader, the tornado relief or the nurses' place in the health care system, the Premier gets a real fix on something, it gets in the throne speech and the backswing is up -- a lot of enthusiasm -- and you think it's going to go someplace, but the follow-through just isn't there: a kind of a slice or a hook in one direction or other.

The nurses are a case in point, Mr. Speaker. I think that of the number of women I represent in Edmonton-Centre, a lot of them do work in hospitals, both the Edmonton General and at the Royal Alexandra hospital, and increasing numbers of them are not working full time as nurses. Some of them are part-time nurses or part-time registered nursing assistants or nursing aides, some are working in the rehab side, some as dieticians, nutritionists, social workers, and so on. who are engaging in these jobs on more and more of a part-time basis. So the low wages that go with this, the safety that's at question . . . The question of overtime, particularly, is a very crucial one for these women. There are other arguments in terms of them having a say in the planning of certain facilities in which they work insofar as often parking lots are put at quite a distance from their place of work, and the safety to and from their place of work to their parking lot is something that's not addressed. But these are all just issues that a number of women working in the health care system on a part-time basis are having to face, and we would like to see this Bill 21 be fully cognizant of those kinds of issues for these kinds of women in these workplaces. Far from actively promoting the full and equal participation of women in the province, particularly in the life of the health care of the province, this Bill is certainly deficient in that regard.

As we know, Mr. Speaker, women do live longer than men. Their longevity is some three or four or five years more than us Alberta men. Perhaps they have something to say about how they can talk about their health and how they can bring their health bias to a workplace. Perhaps if the government had been actively promoting the full and equal participation of Alberta women in terms of the Employment Standards Code, there

would be a lot healthier resolutions and sections as a result.

A lot of the other women I represent, Mr. Speaker, are women who work in the service sector -- certainly, again, many in part-time, very low-paying jobs in restaurants, hotels, other areas of the hospitality and retail service sector, many of them working as secretaries and other often very low-paying jobs. Again, there's just not due consideration being paid to these kinds of women in these kinds of employment sectors. There are a number of them, and I've spoken to them, who go to the Grant MacEwan College downtown here or the Alberta College downtown or the Alberta vocational college downtown. They're all preparing, it seems, for work in a world of unfairness where they are going to be entering careers that . . . Unlike members of government caucus who are quite used to bringing home \$50,000-plus a year with full benefits and all of that, these women will not be bringing home anything near to that income level, and the benefits that accrue are negligible at best.

My impression is that this Bill was not made with a bias of women at heart but, in fact, was probably made over a few drinks at the Petroleum Club, where the old boys just got together and really just put it to them. It's no wonder this government is out of touch, Mr. Speaker; it's no wonder this Bill is so radically different from the experience of average Alberta working women, where more and more it takes two incomes to even pay a mortgage for the average family, to feed the children, clothe them, save for the future, and pay taxes. Many women are increasingly having to work in very difficult situations just to make that kind of income pay for the family needs. So it is the area of the middle income, and I'm sure the next election will be fought for those in middle income and the middle class. Increasingly women of the middle class are wanting progressive values to be brought to bear on their years in the workplace so that much better consideration of both working hours and overtime pay, of the minimum wage that many of them work at, of vacation pay, of termination notices as listed in this Bill . . .

And parental benefits, Mr. Speaker. I'm interested to see that perhaps there's some extension of maternity leave provided under Bill 21 here, but it seems to me that many women would say that there should even be some maternity pay, that in fact some allowance should be given if they're not in organized labour where they can negotiate that kind of benefit. Why shouldn't there be some allowance for some women who, having worked at a place for 12 months or more and then becoming pregnant, might not just have maternity leave but a maternity benefit? I know employers might balk at that, but I think it's a very crucial area for their valued place in the workplace, and government should look at that kind of question as well -- or other entitlements, particularly with respect to health care benefits and, as mentioned before by the Member for Edmonton-Mill Woods, prorated benefits that many of them as part-time workers don't enjoy.

So the real agenda, as we're saying, is not that as outlined in the Speech from the Throne just two years ago. It seems to me that the real agenda, as we heard the Premier even intimate earlier today, is that the government wants to keep women barefoot and in the kitchen. Bill 21 contradicts the government commitment set out in the Speech from the Throne but rather wants to continue to not have government committed to promoting women but rather the government is committed to looking at a few women's issues, Mr. Speaker, and then actively to make it difficult for women to realize their full contribution to reform of the economic arrangements that we have before us.

There were only two women on the panel that went around:

two out of nine. I would like to hear from the minister in debate of the views that they brought forth in terms of representing women's experience. I'd like to hear from the minister what other women's groups he consulted with with respect to his tour and his study and just what new thing he learned from them and from their experience that changed the minds of the seven men who were on the committee and, rather, made it have some progressive parts with respect to women's particular and unique concerns.

So where is the fairness in this, Mr. Speaker? Biblically we're told that we're all, male and female, made in the image of God, and the sense of equality in that created force, that male and female are working hand in hand in a partnership -- it's that image that we are made in and must continue in all forms of our work and our life and our legislation. But I would submit that this Bill is not made in this image but rather made in the image of Judas, in a Judas who betrays what is before us, betrays Her Honour the Honourable Lieutenant Governor's intention in her Speech from the Throne, and kisses the women who are working in so many sectors, kisses them good-bye, and for that reason must not be supported at second reading.

Thank you very much.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The debate is closed, then, on the subamendment -- order please -- to the amendment to Bill 21.

Before proceeding, earlier this day the Minister of Labour rose on a point of order with the hon. Member for Athabasca-Lac La Biche, quoting *Beauchesne* 319. The Chair is prepared to make a ruling. The comment was made by the Member for Athabasca-Lac La Biche that not enough single women were making contributions to the PC Party to be listened to, et cetera. The Chair would draw hon. members' attention to *Beauchesne* that deals with matters affecting individual members and not parties as such. Therefore, the Chair could not sustain the point of order by the Minister of Labour.

However, the Chair is concerned that the language being used is becoming somewhat inflammatory. Members are well aware that Standing Order 23(i) relates to imputing motives. Such comments as, "The hon. member wants women barefoot and pregnant," and so on frankly are drawing pretty close to the area of not only uncomplimentary but somewhat inflammatory. Hon. members know better than to use that type of language. It is not the intent, surely, by hon. members to draw the Chair into this type of discussion. Now, if we're going to continue dealing with this type of legislation for some time, the Chair would request hon. members to be a little more courteous to other hon. members in the use of their language.

Now the Chair will sit down so the Member for Edmonton-Highlands can take her place so the question can be put on the subamendment.

Those in favour of the subamendment, please say aye.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Opposed, please say no.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The subamendment fails.

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

Downey

Mirosh

Zarusky

Totals:

Ayes - 11

Noes -- 36

[Eight minutes having elapsed, the House divided]

[Motion on subamendment lost]

For the motion:

Barrett	Mjolsness	Taylor
Gibeault	Roberts	Wright
Hewes	Sigurdson	Younie
Laing	Strong	

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hon. Member for Edmonton-Mill Woods, on the amendment.

MR. GIBEAULT: Yes, indeed, Mr. Speaker. I want to get in some comments this afternoon on the amendment to the motion that is before us, which basically is talking about how we decline to give this Bill a second reading because it's really not in conformity with the thrust of the throne speech which indicated that . . .

Against the motion:

Ady	Drobot	Moore, R.
Alger	Fischer	Oldring
Anderson	Fjordbotten	Orman
Betkowski	Getty	Payne
Bogle	Heron	Pengelly
Bradley	Horsman	Reid
Brassard	Hyland	Rostad
Cassin	Isley	Russell
Cripps	Johnston	Schumacher
Day	Jonson	Sparrow
Dinning	Kowalski	Young

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please, hon. member. According to Standing Orders, the House now stands adjourned until tomorrow at half past 2.

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

