

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Title: **Thursday, June 9, 1988 8:00 p.m.**

Date: 88/06/09

[The House resumed at 8 p.m.]

[Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair]

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

Bill 21
Employment Standards Code

[Debate adjourned on amendment to motion for second reading, June 8: Mr. Gibeault speaking]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Perhaps before we proceed, hon. member, yesterday the hon. Minister of Labour had risen on a point of order dealing with comments made by the Member for Athabasca-Lac La Biche. The Chair at that time had sent for the Blues. The Chair then ruled after reading the Blues. Unfortunately, the Blues only contained some of those remarks. The Chair has now had an opportunity to review *Hansard* and the comments made, and the Chair in the absence of the hon. Member for Athabasca-Lac La Biche feels it should be raised now, at the first opportunity. It clearly contravenes *Beauchesne* 319 about imputing motives and so on to the Minister of Labour in *Hansard*, page 1589. The Chair draws this to hon. members' attention now and will also draw it to the attention of the hon. Member for Athabasca-Lac La Biche when he arrives. But I think it's important for hon. members to know that the Chair is following up on that point of order raised by the hon. Minister of Labour.

Hon. Member for Edmonton-Mill Woods.

MR. GIBEAULT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I started in my discussion the other day on this amendment that is now before us in terms of Bill 21, the Employment Standards Code, just to reiterate, the amendment is indicating or asking that

this Assembly decline to give a second reading to Bill 21, Employment Standards Code, because it fails to achieve the goal, set out in Her Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor's speech of June 12, 1986, of assuring "that the laws of the province, for the present and for the future, will be responsive to the needs and the aspirations of employers and employees."

Mr. Speaker, I've had a chance to take a look at Bill 21 in a lot of detail, and in my opinion, on behalf of many of the constituents that I have discussed this with in Edmonton-Mill Woods, it is clear to many of us that Bill 21 clearly is not responsive to the needs and the aspirations of those who work for a living as opposed to those who own for a living. So while Bill 21 might be satisfactory to the employers, in many instances it really is not satisfactory to many of the employees. I want to talk a little bit tonight about several aspects of Bill 21 that I believe are deficient, that my constituents have indicated to me the concern they have about Bill 21.

Now, for example, the whole question of the minimum wage: Mr. Speaker, I know that the government recently raised the minimum wage from its measly \$3.80 an hour to \$4.50 an hour, effective in September of this year. I have a lot of stu-

dents in my constituency who were disappointed, who were looking forward to an increase in the minimum wage for the jobs they would have this summer. Unfortunately, they won't receive the benefit of this until next year. But in talking to many of them about that and about the Employment Standards Code, Bill 21, that is before us now, many of them really were quite concerned about the fact that there is no provision in Bill 21 for a regular review of the minimum wage, a fixed review of the minimum wage. We have just a provision that suggests that the Lieutenant Governor in Council -- in other words, the cabinet -- periodically review the minimum wage. But there's no requirement that it be done on an annual or other fixed basis.

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

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hon. Member for Stony Plain, on a point of order.

MR. HERON: Thank you, sir. It's with the greatest reluctance that I interrupt the hon. Member for Edmonton-Mill Woods by citing Standing Orders 23(b)(i) and 23(c) to remind him that we're not speaking to Bill 21, or the Employment Standards Code, nor the minimum wage, but rather the amendment. I ask Mr. Speaker to bring us back to reality and to keep us on track in the interests of the Alberta taxpayers.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hon. Member for Stony Plain, the Chair appreciates you rising on the point of order. However, as the hon. member knows, the Chair conducts the business in the interests of the members of the House. Very clearly the amendment before the House is a reasoned amendment dealing with Bill 21. The hon. Member for Stony Plain, however, under Standing Order 23 raises the point in question; that is, the hon. member's going, to have to stick to the amendment before the House and not deal with the contents of Bill 21. The Chair would simply make the observation, not finding for the Member for Stony Plain on the point of order but simply remind all members that we should be dealing with the question before us, and that is the amendment to Bill 21.

Point of order?

MS BARRETT: May I rise on the point of order? Even though you've made your comments, I wonder if I could have your indulgence for about a minute to explain something about a reasoned amendment and its natural, organic relationship to the matter at hand.

AN HON. MEMBER: Organic?

MS BARRETT: Yes, that's right.

You see, the reasoned amendment necessarily says why you can't give such and such a reading. Now, any argument that is constructed from that basis necessarily must also refer -- I mean, one must refer to why you can't give the second reading in this instance. But because it's a reasoned amendment, it must be reasoned against something else. Inevitably that means it will be reasoned against the contents of the Bill without at the same time violating the principle that we only deal with the principle of a Bill, if you see what I mean, Mr. Speaker. The reason I rise on that point of order is just, I guess, for the benefit of members opposite who continually raise this point of order but fail to understand the nature of reasoned amendments themselves.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Well, as hon. members know, *Beauchesne* 365 does not allow hon. members to ask questions of the Chair. The Chair would simply remind hon. members that a reasoned amendment is an amendment that opposes second reading of a Bill or third reading of a Bill on the premise that a principle has been left out of the Bill. However, that does not change the position of the Chair, that we're not in second reading of the Bill, we're in an amendment to the Bill. I simply ask hon. members to deal with the amendment before us; that is the question. We will deal at second reading with the principles of the Bill when we get to it.

MR. GIBEAULT: Mr. Speaker, in terms of trying to deal with the amendment, it clearly says that we're suggesting in this amendment to decline second reading for the reason that we do not believe the Bill before us is responsive to the needs of employees. I don't know if the needs of employees in Stony Plain might be different from those in Edmonton-Mill Woods, but I can only speak for those in my constituency. I want to say to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the Minister of Labour and his government that in my discussions with my constituents anyway, Bill 21 certainly does not meet their aspirations.

Many of those people who have been working at the minimum wage or just barely above it had indicated to me repeatedly over the last two years, ever since there was indicated on the part of this government that there was going to be a review of labour legislation in this province, that one of their aspirations, which is what we're talking about in this amendment, would be that there would be a provision in the Employment Standards Code for an annual review of the minimum wage, and not only that but that there would be fixed in the legislation an inflation indexing provision. Because we know that governments change and they have different priorities from time to time, and we know that this government, for example, didn't have the minimum wage as a priority for the last seven years. I mean, it wasn't increased since 1981, and finally after seven years they got around to making an adjustment to it.

But my constituents had that aspiration that if there's to be some element of fairness in the Employment Standards Code of the province of Alberta, that means there has to be a provision in the Employment Standards Code for indexing of the minimum wage to provide that those people who are at that minimum level -- and I'm talking, Mr. Speaker, about the clerks that work in the Zeller's store in my constituency and many of those service outlets, restaurants, and so on. Surely to goodness those people who work at the lowest end of the pay scale are entitled to have their minimum compensation increased for inflation. Because surely to goodness the Member for Stony Plain and other members of that government are not so heartless that they would deny the people who serve him pizza or burgers when he goes to a place of that nature in his constituency, and provide that kind of work and shift work, on nights, on holidays, and everything else -- when he wants a burger, they're there. Surely to goodness . . .

MR. HERON: Point of order, Mr. Speaker. I think the hon. member's inciting debate. He keeps mentioning that the hon. Member for Stony Plain believes this or that about the minimum wage. Believe me, I do not believe the minimum wage is under discussion, nor do I believe Bill 21 is under discussion, but rather the amendment, sir. I refer to *Beauchesne* 868 and Standing Order 23 again, sir, and appeal to your sense of fairness to keep this on track so that we may not get too far away from the

topic at hand.

MR. McEACHERN: On the point of order.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Point of order. Edmonton-Kingsway.

MR. McEACHERN: Yes, on the point of order. I think the Member for Stony Plain is far too sensitive. The member did not say that he thinks this; he said surely he doesn't think this. Therefore, he's covered his base and does not impute any kind of motive on the Member for Stony Plain. I would submit also that he's right on topic.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. member. The Chair appreciates the advice that may assist the Chair in making decisions.

The Chair could only reiterate what the Chair's already said. It's going to be a long evening. Hon. members are not to discuss second reading of the Bill by virtue of the fact that it's a reasoned amendment opposing the principles of the Bill. Obviously, an hon. member's going to have to refer at points to the Bill; Bill 21, that is. That does not mean hon. members should not deal directly with the amendments.

Hon. Member for Edmonton-Mill Woods.

MR. GIBEAULT: Well, certainly, Mr. Speaker, what we're talking about are the principles of labour and Employment Standards Code, Bill 21, which is before us now. I guess the question is: in a province like ours should there be in the Employment Standards Code a provision that talks about the minimum wage? I would argue that it should. I guess, then, that the next principle of such a provision would be: should there be a provision to provide for protection of that earning power; in other words, a provision that would provide, for inflation protection, an automatic increase each year?

You know, if the cost of living goes up 4 percent, shouldn't the minimum wage go up 4 percent? Now, that's a principle, Mr. Speaker, and I would suggest on behalf of the constituents -- who are largely women and young people in my constituency who work at retail outlets and at food services, restaurants, that kind of thing. They have told me very clearly that they believe that as a matter of fundamental justice, as a matter of principle, it should be in the Employment Standards Code of a progressive province, that there ought to be a provision to make sure that the minimum wage is reasonable to start with, and that once it has been set, there ought to be a provision in there not unlike the provisions in other Acts which provide for indexation of our salaries. The Member for Stony Plain is one of them. I mean, we get this benefit. If the inflation rate goes over a certain amount, we get an automatic increase, and I know in his heart of hearts that the Member for Stony Plain and all the other members on the government side surely cannot stand up in this Assembly and deny the people who provide those important and valuable services in their constituencies at or just barely above the minimum wage the basic protection of that minimum earning power with some kind of an inflation protection provision in the Bill. I just can't believe that.

So that is the basic principle we're talking about here. Should there be a provision for protecting the integrity of the purchasing power of the minimum wage of people who are paid that minimum wage in the province of Alberta? I believe there should be. So I'm proposing to the Minister of Labour and to

his government that there ought to be an amendment there, perhaps. I encourage them, and I plead with them . . .

MR. YOUNG: On a point of order.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please.

Point of order, Government House Leader?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, *Beauchesne*, fifth edition, section 745(2) is quite clear that when one is dealing with an amendment such as we're dealing with here, "the amendment must not be concerned in detail with the provisions of the Bill." All we're hearing is one detail, and that is just plain not acceptable. That is the purpose of committee study of the Bill, committee stage, and if the hon. member wishes to make amendments dealing with that particular point in the Bill, he's quite entitled to do so at committee stage. What he is not entitled to do, unless we all agree in the latitude which he is currently exercising and which is not his right to do in this Assembly, is to talk to a detail of the Bill in this manner.

Mr. Speaker, it is the opposition which put this amendment before the House at this stage of the reading, and that's a very different matter than committee stage. It's now the responsibility of the opposition to sort itself out and get down to earth and understand the appropriate procedure of this Assembly, beginning with the hon. member, who has at this point wandered far from the amendment on which he alleged he was speaking this evening.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: On the point of order, Edmonton-Highlands.

MS BARRETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I point out or perhaps restate: part of the amendment reflects a dissatisfaction with the Bill because, it says, the Speech from the Throne from 1986 said:

"that the laws of the province, for the present and for the future, will be responsive to the needs and aspirations of employers and employees."

The issue that my colleague the Member for Edmonton-Mill Woods is speaking to -- that is, an issue of inflation protection -- is something that has not been met in the Bill and is one of the primary reasons that the entire caucus of the New Democrats in the Alberta Legislature does not want to give second reading to this Bill, Mr. Speaker. It is our principal position that inflation protection should be in legislation. Surely, given the amendment, we have every right to illustrate that by examples.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Well, hon. members, with regard to the point of order raised by the Government House Leader under *Beauchesne* 745, the Member for Edmonton-Mill Woods clearly has dealt three times consecutively with section 33 of Bill 21 -- that's the minimum wage regulations -- which is clearly, according to *Beauchesne*, a matter that comes under committee study when one deals with it clause by clause or, in this House, section by section. The Government House Leader I think is quite correct. The hon. member is going to have to come back to the purpose of the amendment before the House. A mention of a minimum wage at some point probably deals with Bill 21. However, it does not fit into the context of a reasoned amendment when one deals at some length with a section of the Bill before the House. Now, would the hon. Member for Edmonton-Mill Woods come back to the amendment before us.

MR. GIBEAULT: Mr. Speaker, I don't believe I referred to any particular section of the Act. Correct me if I'm wrong, but the Blues will show that I don't believe I referred to any section of the Act, but I am talking about the principle of a minimum wage in the Employment Standards Code. Now, it could be that the government, of course, is so ashamed of their record in that regard that they'd rather not have any discussion of it. But, Mr. Speaker, I want to tell you why I am concerned about such an important principle in such an Act, and I want to refer to the amendment here. We're talking about the Lieutenant Governor's speech, which is supposed to be an indication of the government's intention for legislation. They said on June 12, 1986 -- and we're going back almost two years now. As we all know, this Bill has been in a great, long period of gestation here, but on June 12 they said that they wanted the laws of the province to "be responsive to the needs and aspirations of employers and employees."

I want to tell the members of this House that one of the reasons why I happen to be so concerned about the question of the minimum wage is because I used to work for employers who didn't believe there ought to be one. So we're talking about an important principle. Should there be a minimum wage or shouldn't there? If there should be, should the earning power of that wage be protected against inflation? I am arguing, Mr. Speaker, that it should, and I am arguing that the government is deficient in this regard because it has not provided for that in the Bill. When I was a student at high school and university -- one of the reasons why I have such a concern about this -- I worked at a convenience store one summer. The minimum wage at that time was \$1.80 an hour, and the manager of that particular convenience store said, "Well, you know, the only reason I'm paying you \$1.80 an hour is because the law says I have to. If I could pay you 50 cents an hour, I would." I want to tell you that that experience made a very profound impact on a very young mind, and it showed me that there are people in this province who don't care about people as human beings but only consider them to be cost factors in the equation of their profit margin. Mr. Speaker, I was offended by that. I thought that the minimum wage . . .

MR. HERON: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: On a point of order, Stony Plain.

MR. HERON: Mr. Speaker, the other evening it seemed to be acceptance in numbers, and I am now rising the third time this evening to raise a point of order. The House leader rose on a point of order. I might add that three times the Speaker has ruled that you must get back. There seems to be a total disregard for your rule, sir, and I ask that you now, as you did the other evening, come down hard and come down hard on the side of the taxpayers. I submit, sir, that the taxpayers are at stake in this silly little game we're playing. The other evening, sir, you came down, and you passed over two or three of those speakers. If it's necessary to come down so hard in judgment to save those taxpayers money and to save our time in the House and to get to the point, I would ask that you do so, sir.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. member.
On the point of order, Edmonton-Belmont.

MR. SIGURDSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just to the hon. Member for Stony Plain. There are three strikes and you're out,

so I hope this satisfies you. Because the Speaker of the Assembly in his last ruling, if I am not mistaken, said that he called the Member for Edmonton-Mill Woods to order on the point that was raised by the Government House Leader. The Government House Leader was responded to by the opposition House leader who said that the amendment that is being addressed by the Member for Edmonton-Mill Woods is being addressed at this very moment and that it is from the Lieutenant Governor's speech of June 12, 1986:

that the laws of the province, for the present and for the future, will be responsive to the needs and aspirations of employers and employees.

I think that's on topic when an hon. member of this Assembly stands up and speaks about the needs of his constituents and takes it from a personal example going back to when he worked at a convenience store. I don't see anything wrong with that. I don't see it as being off the topic at all, Mr. Speaker, because what he's doing is talking about relaying a personal opinion about how he had worked through the summers to get through his education. The same thing is going on today. He's not at all referred to any section of Bill 21 that I remember since my arrival a short while ago. So, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that if anybody's out of order, it's the Member for Stony Plain, not the Member for Edmonton-Mill Woods.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: On the point of order, Cypress-Redcliff.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Speaker, according to *Beauchesne* 745, as the Member for Stony Plain was quoting, if you really believe what the Member for Edmonton-Belmont was saying, I've got a bridge for sale for you in Manyberries, and there are no rivers.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Edmonton-Strathcona.

MR. WRIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would respectfully submit that the matter is in order, because the amendment we are speaking on is one that asked that the Bill not be read a second time because of the lack of achievement of the goals set forth in the Lieutenant Governor's speech of a couple of years ago:

that the laws of the province, for the present and for the future, will be responsive to the needs and aspirations of employers and employees.

The government has signally failed in that goal: so we submit in this amendment. One of the principal ways in which it has fallen short of that goal is not to index the minimum wage. Of course, you can be repetitive in making these points, I agree, with respect, Mr. Speaker. But the point itself is not off topic.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order and the point just made by the hon. Member for Edmonton-Strathcona. He's right on. The hon. member speaking had been indeed repetitive, and we should be guided by the point made by the hon. Member for Edmonton-Strathcona that the repetition should have to cease in the future comments from the hon. member.

Also, Mr. Speaker, he indicated he had a profound experience, and I'm waiting with bated breath to hear whether there was anything profound occurred at any point in his life, but we'll continue waiting.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Athabasca-Lac La Biche, on the point of order.

MR. PIQUETTE: Yes, I'd like to make a point to the hon. House leader. We feel that the members opposite are the ones who are being very repetitious here in this whole debate. They keep standing up and repeating the same argument, which is, I think, good for us. We congratulate the Member for Stony Plain for standing up as many times as he has, because it does help make our job more easy.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hon. members, the Chair will reiterate the comments made a few moments ago that the purpose of the reasoned amendment is that a member will be addressing the principle of the Bill that is not in fact in the Bill and will only address those issues which in fact are not in the Bill. That's the purpose of a reasoned amendment.

Now, the Chair ruled a few moments ago with regard to the hon. Member for Edmonton-Mill Woods on the minimum wage question, and the Chair quoted section 33 of the Bill before the House by its correct name, Minimum Wage. That's why the Chair ruled when the hon. member for the third time mentioned minimum wage. Now, the Chair has no quarrel with those hon. members with the reasoned amendment arguing in favour of a principle that's not there but should be there. The Chair is only questioning those members who continue, in the view of the Chair, to refer to the Bill before the House for second reading, which this Bill is not. We're dealing with an amendment to the second reading of the Bill. The Chair does not sustain the point of order raised initially.

Will the hon. Member for Edmonton-Mill Woods please address the amendment.

MR. GIBEAULT: Mr. Speaker, the last comment I'd like to make about the principle of the minimum wage in the Employment Standards Code is simply that this was one of the issues that was discussed at the J. Percy Page composite high school during the '86 election when all the candidates were there. I spoke about the question of the minimum wage and how it hadn't been increased since 1981, and my opponent, my predecessor, couldn't seem to bring himself to deal with that issue, and the facts of history now speak for themselves. So obviously I think it's an important issue for many constituents in Edmonton-Mill Woods and people around this province.

But to go on to other principles, Mr. Speaker, in terms of this amendment. Now, is this Bill -- this is what the amendment is talking about -- "responsive to the needs and aspirations of employers and employees?" Well, we talked a little bit the other night about the provisions and the lack of provisions as they affect the equality of the sexes, men and women. There's one other item that I didn't have a chance to discuss the other evening that I want to talk about now, because any labour legislation -- and the Employment Standards Code, Bill 21, is now before us -- if it really was responsive to the needs of employees, there would be a provision in there talking about the whole question of sexual harassment.

Now, I can hardly believe that that is not referred to in this Act, but I couldn't find it. I don't know about the Minister of Labour, but surely to goodness, if he's been paying attention to developments in the workplace not only in this province but across the country and North America, he knows or he ought to know that the problem of sexual harassment in the workplace is an increasingly troublesome issue and a particularly abominable development in many places throughout the province and elsewhere. But certainly Alberta is what we're concerned about here, yet nowhere is there in Bill 21 a reference to the problem

of sexual harassment. Are we really concerned about providing a piece of legislation that will set out the employment standards environment for workers for the next period of years, if we don't have in that particular piece of legislation some reference to how sexual harassment must be condemned for what it is: disgusting exploitation of workers who are vulnerable? Yet I couldn't find a reference in there. There are no penalties I could find for that kind of behaviour on the part of employers.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that kind of leads into the next portion of this Bill which concerns me; that is, that I do not find in that Bill the kind of language and the kind of tone that talks about enforcing the employment standards of this province. Now, we talked about that earlier in this legislative session, and we discovered that anyone who's got a concern about employment standards not being met can file a complaint with an employment standards officer. We discovered that when you do that, it's just about like buying a lotto ticket; you've got about five chances in 10,000 of getting a conviction against an employer that does this kind of thing. So whether it's sexual harassment or whether it's people not paying the minimum wage or whether it's people not paying vacation time, we've got to have a commitment from this government that they are going to enforce the legislation that they themselves have proposed. Mr. Speaker, we just haven't had that before. I haven't seen anything in Bill 21 that suggests to me that the government is really concerned that we have to send a strong message to employers that violations like sexual harassment and the others I've mentioned are simply not acceptable in Alberta in the 20th century. We're not living back in the olden days, yet . . . I mean, 1988, and I look at this legislation and I have to wonder: where has the Minister of Labour been all these years? It's most unfortunate, and I am puzzled how the minister can in good conscience put forward Bills of this nature without dealing with some of these serious contemporary problems in the workplace totally ignored in this particular Bill.

Now, Mr. Speaker, another principle in a progressive Employment Standards Code for our province would deal with the principle about wages and how they are dealt with in the case where they may be reduced. There's been instances of that in the past as the economy has taken some very difficult times in the last couple of years in our province. In this particular Bill all we can find about reduction of wages is that an employer has to give some notice about reducing wages. There's no question about negotiating a reduction of wages. Now, for those employees that are fortunate enough to be covered by an employment contract, either through their union or professional association or something of that nature, there is a process for changes in wages, whether they go up or down. We discovered the other day, my colleague from Edmonton-Centre discovered, that the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care is not prepared to respect agreements with the Alberta Medical Association. But normally speaking, people that have agreements in place with the government, whether they be union contracts or professional agreements of one sort or another -- there are provisions for that. This Code here simply says that we have to give some element of notice.

I would suggest that a progressive -- and that's what the government members like to refer to themselves as: Progressive Conservatives -- provision in an Employment Standards Code in our province would say that in the case where an enterprise runs into some financial difficulty, there will be some negotiation with their employees about reductions that might take place. Hopefully that negotiation process would ensure that not only

are the hourly paid employees or the people at the bottom of the scale being asked to take a reduction but that there will be a reduction at the management level and by the senior management of the enterprise. The Bill here that's before us provides nothing about that whatsoever.

The other thing, of course, Mr. Speaker, that we need to have here in a progressive piece of legislation has got to be some provision for, in the case of reductions of wages, some sort of notice. Even in the United States there's now this concern about notice that has to be provided to the government in the event of plant closings. There are discussions about whether that should be two months' notice or more than that. Surely to goodness when we're talking about people's wages, their purchasing power, the money that they have to pay for the expenses to support their family, we can have in a progressive piece of legislation two things: one, that there will be some negotiation about that with employees, and secondly, that there should be some justification to the government on the part of the enterprise for the need to do that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this Bill that is before us, Bill 21, I would submit to the Assembly simply does not meet those requirements of the Lieutenant Governor's speech of June 12, '86. It simply is not responsive to the need of employees in my constituency and, I would suggest, from around the province. For the amount of money that was spent, some half a million dollars, tooting around the world, all over the place, trying to come up with some ideas for progressive legislation in labour relations: this I would suggest with respect is a failure in that regard. Most of my constituents will be lucky if they earn \$500,000 in their entire lifetime, and when they know that the Labour minister and his friends tooted around the world, going to Japan and Germany and all over the globe at taxpayers' expense and came up with this, the Employment Standards Code, Bill 21 -- not to mention Bill 22 which we'll be dealing with later -- most of my constituents are extremely disappointed.

Mr. Speaker, because of that extreme level of disappointment, the lack of provisions that will really provide for the needs and the aspirations of my constituents over the coming number of years, I would at this time like to move a subamendment to the amendment of my hon. colleague the Member for St. Albert. I have copies of the subamendment for all hon. members here. Perhaps while it's being brought to the Chair and to hon. members, I could read it into the record. I'm moving this subamendment to the amendment made by my colleague from St. Albert by adding at the end of his amendment the words:

and because it is an insufficient return on an investment of more than half a million dollars of public money.

So, Mr. Speaker, assuming that that is in order, I would like to make some additional comments about that.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The subamendment is in order, Member for Edmonton-Mill Woods.

MR. GIBEAULT: Mr. Speaker, half a million dollars probably is not much to the Government House Leader and to some of his buddies around there. They pop off a half a million here and there; I guess it's petty cash for some of these folks across the way. But you know, people that are trying to get by on \$3.80 an hour or even the \$4.50 from the government that's coming up in September, people that are even . . .

MR. YOUNG: Point of order, Mr. Speaker. The subamend-

ment is very precise. The subamendment says:

because it is an insufficient return . . . of more than half a million dollars of public money.

That does not speak in any respect to my wages, anybody else's wages; it doesn't speak to the fact that there were two or three union people on that body. It doesn't have anything to do with that. The hon. member is really now on a very fine point, and he should stay with it, Mr. Speaker. Failing that, I would request that you pass on to the next speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: On the point of order, Member for Edmonton-Kingsway.

MR. McEACHERN: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order. Is the House leader really so narrow that he can't see that you don't get your money's worth if you don't get a decent minimum wage? I mean, it's such a clear and easy point that he can make that you don't even wait for him to get to that point. You jump up before he ever makes the conclusion from the premise. Half-way through the premise you're jumping up, and that's nonsense, sir. [interjections]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. [interjections] Order please. Would hon. members in this Assembly please address the Chair. Secondly, would hon. members please observe the Chair.

Quite correctly the hon. Government House Leader's raised a point with the subamendment proposed by the Member for Edmonton-Mill Woods. It's a very narrow amendment, and as a result the debate is going to have to be very narrow, dealing with that point. We're no longer dealing with the amendment to Bill 21; we're dealing now with the subamendment, and its area is extremely limited. So the hon. Member for Edmonton-Mill Woods is asked to keep his comments within the confines of the proposed subamendment.

MR. GIBEAULT: Yes, Mr. Speaker. You know, a lot of my constituents who have concerns about public expenditures would support this subamendment, because we're really talking about an investment of taxpayers' dollars that's almost half a million dollars. And what did we get for it? Well, when you spend half a million dollars tooting around the world, you don't build a school in my constituency where it's needed. You don't provide eye examinations for a lot of people who need it. You don't provide a whole lot of things . . .

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

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

DR. REID: This is a discussion on the investment of 25 cents per Albertan; it is not related to the construction of schools.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Point well taken, Minister of Labour.
Edmonton-Mill Woods.

MR. GIBEAULT: Mr. Speaker, if I had kissed off half a million dollars of taxpayers' money, I'd be a little sensitive about it too.

But let me just talk to this issue here that we've raised now in the subamendment, of whether or not this is a sufficient re-

turn on this public investment of almost half a million dollars. Well, first of all, of course, we know that there was no need for that travel all over the globe because all the laws of jurisdictions around the world are available through the Legislature Library. The hon. Leader of the Opposition had a whole cart of books here to try to make it easier for the hon. minister, all the legislation from Germany, Japan, and all the jurisdictions where we could have perhaps gotten some useful ideas. We didn't have to have people going all over the world first class, Mr. Speaker.

Secondly, I have to wonder about what the minister learned when he was having his globe-trotting visit to all the countries of the world. Because, you know, in Germany and other countries where he visited -- he ought to know that in many of the European countries the standard for holidays, annual vacation, is in the neighbourhood of five to six weeks. I don't see that anywhere in the Employment Standards Code. So what did we get for a half a million expenditure? I want to know . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hon. member, please use the normal parliamentary form of address of other hon. members.

MR. GIBEAULT: . . . if the Minister of Labour could stand in his place tonight and tell us what provisions of the Employment Standards Code he picked up and included from Germany and from Japan and all the other countries he visited, because I don't see too much that's from Germany. Many of those countries -- Germany is one of them -- have some very good provisions in their employment standards and labour relations legislation. I don't see them here in ours, Mr. Speaker.

Now, we spent this half million dollars of taxpayers' money. On behalf of my constituents, who are paying the highest level of taxes they've ever paid in this province now, yet they see that many of the corporate people in the province are getting away with paying nothing -- yet we've had the Minister of Labour make this commitment of this expenditure of public funds, half a million dollars or thereabouts. What did we get for it? I just want the minister to stand in his place and tell us that, because I don't see what we got from Germany and what we got from Japan that is in Bill 21. This Bill 21 is hardly an improvement over what we had before, Mr. Speaker, and that's why I proposed the subamendment. On behalf of my constituents, I don't believe this was a sufficient return on the investment.

Another provision that's common in the countries he visited are provisions about overtime. In Japan and Germany overtime is greatly restricted because they know there that they have to do that in order to ensure that the maximum number of people have access to the labour market. You end up with agreements, and my colleague the Member for St. Albert has spoken about this before, about compulsory overtime agreements. We don't see anything about that in the Employment Standards Code. So really, Mr. Speaker, people in my constituency that earn average amounts of wages, you know . . . I mean, some people are unemployed; then I would say that maybe the average wage or salary in my constituency is in the neighbourhood of \$25,000. You take the tax off that; it's somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$3,000, \$4,000. That's a lot of money to a family, and we've had . . . You take \$3,000 or \$4,000; the minister spent \$500,000. It's . . .

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

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Government House Leader.

MR. YOUNG: The hon. member is really caught under rule 745(2), and I would now ask, Mr. Speaker, since he's been called several times on it, that you pass on to the next speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: With respect, hon. Government House Leader, the Chair has raised this issue twice now with the hon. Member for Edmonton-Mill Woods. The Chair has made the observations with regard to a section or two of the Bill that the hon. member has been addressing. The hon. members request that you come back to the very narrow confines of the subamendment before us. Would the hon. member do so?

MR. GIBEAULT: I believe, with respect, that I have. The subamendment is talking about whether or not we got value for the money that was spent on the Labour minister's travels around the world, and I'm trying to indicate on behalf of many constituents who have called me about this extravagance that was spent here whether or not we did get the value. I'm proposing, and I say it again here, that I want the minister tonight to stand in his place and tell us: where is it in his Bill, Bill 21? The ideas that he got from Germany and Japan: let's see. Did we get value? That's what we're trying to determine here, Mr. Speaker, in the subamendment.

I don't believe it's there, and if the Minister of Labour believes that we've spent with some justification half a million dollars of taxpayers' money, I challenge him to stand there in his place tonight and tell us where in Bill 21 are the provisions that there are in Germany about five to six weeks' holidays, in Germany and Japan, where he went to visit, about overtime agreements, and all the other countries he visited where they have more progressive provisions than there are indicated here in Bill 21 here tonight. Mr. Speaker, I'm looking forward to the minister's comments so I can try to explain to my constituents, my long-suffering, taxpaying constituents, why we had to kiss off half a million dollars for him to toot around the globe.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hon. members . . . [interjection] Hon. member. Before proceeding, the Chair had raised the question of the point of order raised last day by the Minister of Labour, and as the Chair indicated then, the Chair would await the return of the hon. Member for Athabasca-Lac La Biche.

Hon. Member for Athabasca-Lac La Biche, on that point of order last day the Chair had sent for the Blues, based on the point of order raised by the Minister of Labour, page 1590 of *Hansard*. The Chair in reading the Blues, the transcript at that time, ruled that the hon. Minister of Labour did in fact not have a valid point of order. Since that time the Chair has acquired the full transcript of yesterday's discussion and would refer hon. members to page 1589. The hon. Member for Athabasca-Lac La Biche at that time had said, and I quote:

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 . . .

Further on it stated:

He believes that they will not, I guess, become a political reality in this province . . .

The Chair would draw hon. members' attention to *Beauchesne* 319(3) regarding:

. . . to impute to any Member or Members unworthy motives for their actions in a particular case . . .

The Chair, then, would issue a supplementary ruling to the ruling issued last day. The hon. Member for Athabasca-Lac La Biche did in fact impute motives, in the view of the Chair, to the

hon. Minister of Labour, so the Chair would uphold this point of order raised by the Minister of Labour and requests the hon. Member for Athabasca-Lac La Biche to withdraw the comments.

Hon. Member?

MR. PIQUETTE: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I did not intend to impute motives, but if by my statements of last night I did, I do withdraw those statements.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I thank you, hon. member. That's most gracious.

The hon. Member for St. Albert, on the subamendment.

MR. STRONG: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's a pleasure for me to rise this evening and offer my comments and support in support of the subamendment introduced by the Member for Edmonton-Mill Woods. I think I'll read that subamendment into the record so that I can distribute it to all my constituents. The subamendment reads:

. . . and because it is an insufficient return on an investment of more than half a million dollars of public money.

[Mr. Musgreave in the Chair]

It's my belief, Mr. Speaker, that the minister's basic underpinnings, his foundations for traveling at the taxpayers' expense was to create a level playing field in legislation for Albertans, to bring fairness and equity for Albertans, to bring Albertans into the 21st century and, in addition, legislation that would be responsive to the needs and aspirations of employers and employees. Quite frankly, that hasn't happened. Because when we look at the subamendment, what we have to examine is: did Albertans get full value for the \$500,000, taxpayers' dollars that were spent by this minister and his entourage touring the world to bring expertise from the countries he visited back to Alberta and put that expertise to use in creating some fairness and justice for working Albertans?

Now, Mr. Speaker, I intend to prove that the minister certainly did not do that, that there might be some fairness here for employers but there certainly isn't any fairness for employees. I couldn't agree more with the Member for Stony Plain jumping to his feet saying, "We're here to save the taxpayers' dollars." That's exactly what this subamendment calls for, and exactly what the Member for Stony Plain should be getting up and addressing is a waste of a half a million dollars, taxpayers' dollars, on what we didn't get here in Alberta, and that's some fairness and equity in labour legislation.

A half a million dollars. Basically, Mr. Speaker, that half a million dollars was spent on the Labour Legislation Review Committee's final report. That's all the public hearings that were held here in the province of Alberta. That's the free vacation, the vacation that the taxpayer paid for, all the printing costs, and everything else leading up to the introduction and handing out of the final report of the Labour Legislation Review Committee. Let's examine some of those general policies to see whether Albertans got full value for the \$500,000 that was spent at this minister's discretion. I would like to remind the Minister of Labour that when we talk about fairness for employees in the province of Alberta, normally that fairness is upheld and protected by what trade unionists refer to as umbrella groups of labour. Well, when the minister started this thought on going on a tour, he had a great deal of difficulty in getting who he wanted

initially on the committee. Did this Minister of Labour go to the Federation of Labour here in the province of Alberta and consult them about who he was going to appoint?

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order relevant to the usual one that we keep quoting, 23(b)(i), the immediately preceding remarks of the hon. Member for St. Albert could in no way be associated with the subject under discussion, which is the subamendment, which is an extremely narrow one. That is the fault of those who drafted it. But those who drafted it have put the discussion in this extremely narrow context, and those who wish to address it will have to stay within that extremely narrow context. The recent remarks by the Member for St. Albert have absolutely nothing to do with this and could not be associated with it by any stretch of a distorted imagination.

MR. SIGURDSON: Mr. Speaker, I can appreciate that the minister might be a tad sensitive about this particular subamendment, but I think he ought not to be. The Member for St. Albert is only trying to show that the entire trip and the investment of a half million dollars is insufficient and, therefore, for that reason this Assembly ought to hold up the entire Bill. Now, the reason the minister rose to his feet is because we started going back to the point where the appointments were made. I think you can take the first committee appointments and speak to that and show, perhaps, what the potential could have been. We could have looked at other individuals serving on that committee and had an entirely different kind of report. Therefore, the member is indeed speaking to the amendment. It could have been. What it could have been, Mr. Speaker, is not what it is, and because of that "it is an insufficient return on an investment of more than half a million dollars of public money."

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: What the debate is all about is "an insufficient return on an investment of more than half a million dollars of public money." I would ask the hon. Member for St. Albert to deal only with that subamendment.

MR. STRONG: Mr. Speaker, this book was a culmination of the expenditure of \$500,000 of taxpayers' money. I recognize, too, that the minister probably is a little thin-skinned. But he did have some good things in this final report. You know, there were some good recommendations. I thought we might get our money's worth. I'll read from page 85 of the Labour Legislation Review Committee's final report, where some of the general policies by the participants were these, and that's in B:

- (i) Albertans support continued maintenance of comprehensive employment standards which ensure fairness and protection for all employed Albertans. Standards are expected to be contemporary, easily understood, and structured so that employers and employees are both aware of the rights and obligations which accompany the employment relationship.

Now, that sounds great. I thought for a minute that we were going to get our half a million dollars' worth. Unfortunately, with the legislation we have before us that hasn't happened.

There's another part here, same page:

- (iii) Albertans support the principle that ongoing or direct government involvement in the employee-employer relationship must be minimized.

I support that too. Yet when we look at an expenditure of half a million dollars, taxpayers' dollars, Albertans' dollars, what do we find? Did the minister respond to the needs of employees in the province of Alberta in his legislation? Mr. Speaker, I'm

ashamed of this government for introducing legislation that failed to meet up with the commitments that were promised to Albertans for the half a million dollars plus that was spent by this government globe-trotting around the world, printing books with lots of fair sayings in it, but not delivering in the legislation that we see before us in the Assembly: clearly a waste of taxpayers' dollars, an absolute waste. Because you can look in the legislation and what do you find? Do you find the fairness? Unfortunately not.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I thought the Minister of Labour would be up speaking and justifying the expenditure of a half a million dollars, Albertans' dollars, in this regard. I thought surely he had the courage of his convictions in getting up and speaking in opposition to this amendment to justify his position in spending one half million of taxpayers' dollars.

The minister made fair comment in one of his points of order 25 cents per Albertan, two bits. There are many Albertans that didn't feel they got sufficient usage of that half million dollars. If the minister had to go out and get a thousand dollars' worth of quarters, I'm sure I could find as many Albertans as it took to give that thousand dollars out for those that didn't feel they got fair value for the dollar that this minister and this government spent in reviewing labour legislation to bring it into the 21st century, because that just didn't happen. Biggest bang for the dollar do you get the value for the dollar? That's exactly what this subamendment speaks to, insufficient return on \$500,000. And, Mr. Speaker, is that all? That was all up to this final report of the Labour Legislation Review Committee, but I'm sure that since then there was a lot more spent, and I question the dollar value on that to see whether we got the dollar value worth on the whole process.

Part of this \$500,000 was spent on touring the province, listening to working Albertans' concerns and complaints. That's what they were there for, to get full value for that money, but did they get it? I'm afraid not because if we look at part and parcel of this half million dollar cost that's contained in the final report of the Labour Legislation Review Committee, there are many failings. Let's start with specific major concerns. This is what he and his committee signed off for the expenditure of a half a million dollars. Here:

Specific Major Concerns

- (i) Employers and employees recognize that effective labour relations evolves, fundamentally, from ongoing and frank communication between employers and employees. Albertans consistently identified encouragement and facilitation of communication as a major concern.

Did Albertans, working Albertans, get full value for the money that this minister and this government spent? What kind of communications have we got? Communications that the minister dictates, and certainly that isn't full value on the dollars this minister and government spent.

Let's go down further, Mr. Speaker, and let's come to recommendation (iii) of those Specific Major Concerns:

- (iii) For several reasons the number of part-time workers in Alberta is rising significantly.

The only thing they left out is why. Why is that happening? We should have got some value for that dollar, and the reason should have been in here for the half million dollars, Mr. Speaker.

Employees and trade unions repeatedly raised the issue of availability of benefits and application of standards to this group of workers. It was argued that legislation does not fully address the particular needs of these workers and that changes are needed to ensure that standards for, and benefits available to, full time workers are fairly pro-rated for those working on a

regular part-time basis.

Mr. Speaker, that's right in this report. That is part of the half million dollar expenditure of this government and this minister. In touring the world, what did we get? Their own report that was signed by the minister. Has this come true? Again, Mr. Speaker, another reason we as Albertans did not get full value for the \$500,000 this minister and this government spent.

Let's go on further, Mr. Speaker. Let's talk about what this minister brought us back from all the countries he toured besides a suntan. What did the minister bring us back from his trip into the United States? Did we get full value for the trip he made to the United States? I don't see any benefit in the minister's legislation before us indicating that we got any value in Bill 21 for the trip he made to the United States of America -- no benefit at all, unless it was to delay the implementation of the minimum wage in the province . . .

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Point of order, Member for Vermilion-Viking.

DR. WEST: This may be stretching the point of order, but under 23(i), "imputes false or unavowed motives to another member," I do believe the Member for St. Albert is insinuating that our minister in his travels around the world on behalf of Albertans in their best interests to study legislation that hadn't been reviewed in 25 years -- 25 years since labour legislation has been reviewed in this province . . . The Member for St. Albert is imputing false motives on behalf of our minister in traveling throughout the world on our behalf, and I beg a decision on that point of order.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the hon. member getting in. I think it would be better for him to make those points in debate, which I think is really what he's doing. He's taking issue with a point that's being made by the hon. Member for St. Albert. He doesn't agree with that point. I think it would be more appropriate for him in disagreeing with the point to stand up and debate the subamendment on the floor rather than doing it under the auspices of a purported point of order. So it just seems to me that it's a matter of fair opinion or fair comment that the hon. member is making in his remarks this evening. I know that those opinions are not shared by all members of the Assembly, and if those who disagree with him would also exercise their right to debate on the subamendment, I think that's quite open to them as an alternative. But I don't think it's correct to be bringing it up in the guise of a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Thank you.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: My advice is that the hon. member may be implying an ineffective committee, but I don't think the hon. member is imputing false motives to the hon. Minister of Labour.

Member for St. Albert.

MR. STRONG: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If the minister wasn't out in the sun, I'd have to withdraw my remarks, because he couldn't have got a suntan if he wasn't out in the sun.

To carry on, I was talking about the minimum wage and the delay in the increase in the minimum wage. I ask through you, Mr. Speaker: did the minister bring us back from the United States a delay in that minimum wage? Because again, if you go back to what this minister spent the money on -- and those were

the facts in this final report of the Labour Legislation Review Committee -- one of the things they talked about that he encouraged was that the minimum wage rate be reviewed on a regular basis and adjusted when necessary. Well, again, we can look at the Bill we have before us and see a total absence of any mechanism to increase that minimum wage on an annual basis. There's no review process. In addition to that, Alberta had the lowest minimum wage and still has the lowest minimum wage in Canada. Again, the implementation of the immediate increase to the \$4.50 an hour level was held back, delayed, by this minister until September 1 of this year. I sure don't think that's fairness and equity, and I sure don't think it's full value for the half million dollars we spent in getting what we should be calling the best, the 21st century in labour relations, in the province of Alberta. Certainly we didn't get full value for our dollar.

Mr. Speaker, let's look at the minister's tour of West Germany. What did we get back from West Germany? What can the minister point to in his legislation that we have before us where we got any value for the \$500,000 this minister and this government spent? Where is any indication of that? I have read very thoroughly the final report of the Labour Legislation Review Committee -- causing significant dollars to be spent of those \$500,000 in printing this -- and the only thing I can remotely come close to is a communication process under the minister's legislation that doesn't even remotely come close to the line of communication they have in West Germany.

[Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair]

Let's go on further: the United Kingdom. What did the minister bring us back, what expertise, what fairness, what equity from the United Kingdom that we can look to in the legislation we have in front of us that shows us as members of the Official Opposition and Albertans whether we got full value for the money that was spent? There is nothing, Mr. Speaker, in his legislation that shows us there was any value from the trip the minister made to the United Kingdom. But I guess we could say -- and I've read the report again -- that what the minister brought us back was a polarization in the trade union movement. Because if the trade union movement doesn't get polarized, this minister and this government are going to terminate their existence and, in doing that, are terminating the very standard of living of Albertans. Is that what we got for our half million dollars? That certainly to me is not full value for the \$500,000 this minister spent.

Let's go to Japan, Mr. Speaker. What do we see in the legislation before us that gives us any value, any sufficient value, as a return on our investment of half a million dollars? Nothing that I can see, except perhaps in reading of the minister's travels and some of his comments and his committee's comments that are contained in the final report of the Labour Legislation Review Committee expressing something about commonality of interest. Did we get full value there? Certainly an insufficient return, because the commonality of interest in the culture in Japan is totally different from what we here in Alberta face, where the cost of our standard of living differs. The cost of heating our homes in an Alberta winter totally differs. So if this minister brought back commonality of interest from Japan to the province of Alberta as expertise, I see no return for Albertans on the investment of their tax dollars in the expenditure of \$500,000.

Mr. Speaker, let's go back a while ago to the minister's travels again and say, "Did we get full value for that?" Let's

look at the trip that he made to Australia. What did he bring us back from Australia that gave us full value for the \$500,000 he spent, his committee spent, and this government spent in bringing us back the final report of the Labour Legislation Review Committee? In reading those pages, the only thing I could refer to as any expertise that was brought back from Australia was a competitive market economy.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Excuse me, hon. member. Order in the House, please. Order in the House, please.
St. Albert.

MR. STRONG: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It seems some of these Tory backbenchers . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. Order please.
St. Albert.

MR. STRONG: Well, Mr. Speaker, what did he bring us back? A competitive economy? When we look at the legislation we have before us, labour legislation to me, to any fair-minded individual, deals with exactly that: labour legislation. A set of rules that creates the rule book for employers and employees to act with some sense of fairness between the parties: that's what legislation should bring to the province of Alberta, not competitive economies. Those competitive economies are dealt with in other areas, but certainly not in labour legislation. So certainly in my view and in many Albertans' views there is a totally insufficient return on the money we spent for this minister traveling the world.

New Zealand, Mr. Speaker? I read that. I couldn't come up with anything remotely close to what he could have brought back from New Zealand as any type of return, expertise, betterment of Albertans that I see in the labour legislation we have before us as Bill 21, the Employment Standards Code. I'd like to ask this minister: exactly what did he bring back for Albertans? What expertise did he bring back for Albertans with respect to Bill 21, the Employment Standards Code, that is deserving of even one quarter, one 25-cent piece, of that \$500,000 expenditure? A total absolute waste of the taxpayers' money.

Mr. Speaker, we can examine the tone of the legislation. Look at the tone of the legislation in the preamble. I've read the preamble and can find nothing where Albertans get a significant return on their investment made on their behalf by this government and this Minister of Labour. Absolutely nothing, Mr. Speaker. So certainly there was insufficient return on an investment of over half a million dollars. Why even when we look at this legislation, you would have thought that this minister in expending half a million dollars would have developed some fairness. That's what the minister stated to the general public here in Alberta: fairness and equity. But when we look at the legislation we have before us, we find that not all Albertans are deserving of this minimal form of legislation that we see before us in Bill 21, the Employment Standards Code, because this minister has excluded from it certain classifications of individuals, Mr. Speaker. If the basic underpinning to this minister's legislation was to create a level playing field, if the minister was truly responsive to the needs of Albertans, we would see before this Assembly legislation that met that concern, those employees' concerns and those employers' concerns. Yet for half a million dollars, what did Albertans get? Unfortunately nothing; worse than what was there before. Fairness and equity

totally absent.

Mr. Speaker, if we pick up again the final report of the Labour Legislation Review Committee, I believe the numbers were \$450,000 of the \$500,000 that was spent. Do we as Albertans and we in this Assembly see a return on the money we spent? All one has to do is read it. I'll read part of it. In section 21 on page 94 it says:

... overtime agreements [shall] not be a condition of employment.

This minister and his committee recommended banning overtime agreements. That's what we spent the money on. What happened? Now when we look at the legislation, overtime agreements aren't banned. They're still there, but we spent -- oh, oh -- \$500,000 on a report that was signed by three labour representatives who went on the tour with the minister. Is that the fairness and equity this minister promised? Is that full value for Albertans' \$500,000? Certainly not a sufficient return.

AN HON. MEMBER: Dramatic pause.

MR. STRONG: Yes, dramatic because I'm not finished yet.

Mr. Speaker, let's go back to specific major concerns in the report. The report -- this is what Albertans spent their money on, all those public hearings. Was this minister listening to Albertans when they appeared before those hearings? Was he listening? Was he giving them their quarter's worth, their 25 cents' worth? Was the minister giving them that quarter's worth? He said that's all it cost. Did they get their quarter's worth? Obviously not. Again, an insufficient return on their tax dollar that was spent compiling this booklet. Let's look at it. Item (ii), and these were specific major concerns:

In a complex and rapidly changing environment such as recently experienced by Albertans . . .

I guess the minister was talking about the economic destruction wreaked in the province of Alberta over the previous four years. That's what he was speaking to. It says:

... labour relations is a complex, stressful and critical activity.

I can certainly attest to that. It is. But I give full value for the money I get paid. I guess my beef here tonight in the Legislature is: did Albertans, did this Legislative Assembly -- all members -- feel we got a sufficient return on the half million dollars this minister and this government spent under the illusion of bringing fair labour legislation back to the province of Alberta. They sadly failed.

I'll carry on, Mr. Speaker.

Employers and employees recognize that those responsible must understand the system, and have the capacity to seek creative solutions to new and difficult problems.

That sure sounds good, Mr. Speaker. It sounds excellent. You know, when I initially read this, I thought "My goodness, Albertans are finally going to get some progressive government out of this Progressive Conservative Party." Unfortunately, that just hasn't happened. This \$500,000 expenditure is just one of the ways Albertans didn't get a sufficient return on their tax dollars, certainly when it comes to labour legislation. [interjection] Hon. member, if you want to get up and support your Minister of Labour, feel free.

Ongoing education of participants, and provision of relevant and timely information to them, were viewed as major concerns.

Mr. Speaker, great words. Fine words. Lofty statements.

This is an excellent paragraph, and I can certainly concur in what it says. Unfortunately, when we examine the legislation, what happened? Did this minister have a memory lapse when

he got his people in his Department of Labour to write Bill 21, the Employment Standards Code, in the interests of Albertans responsive to their needs? Another waste of money, insufficient value for the dollar that was returned. If you look at section 2 on page 86 of this final report, you will find that the minister failed miserably, failed to measure up to these fine statements, this fine paragraph in this book that he spent half a million dollars -- well, maybe \$450,000 -- of our money compiling in working Albertans' interests.

Again, if you look at the legislation, you'll find that this Minister of Labour is no different from the Minister of Career Development and Employment. What the minister has done is create for himself the right to dictate whatever he wants. There isn't any employee input, and that's basically what this says -- employee input again sadly lacking in the legislation, because the minister has the right to appoint those he thinks, I guess, bow down before the party or have the right political connections or whatever. To put them on councils, on little study committees: is that full value for the \$500,000 this minister and this government and that committee spent in touring the world -- the taxpayer holiday, rainbow tour, that taxpayers in Alberta paid for? If they would have got a return on their money, then certainly I'd give the minister my two bits. He wouldn't even have had to spend government money. I would have gotten him the half million if we could get some fairness. But did we get the fairness, Mr. Speaker? Unfortunately, no. We sure didn't get the fairness, and I can go on further.

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, no.

AN HON. MEMBER: Please do. Please.

MR. STRONG: Yeah, I will. Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Official Opposition ...

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. member. Ready for the question?

MR. STRONG: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Point of order, St. Albert.

MR. STRONG: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure I got all the time that these across the way used of my time in jumping to their feet on points of order.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. member. The Chair is not at liberty to change Standing Orders.

Hon. Member for Edmonton-Kingsway on the subamendment.

MR. McEACHERN: Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's an important debate we're into tonight. We need to seriously consider whether or not this Bill is worth reading in view of the subamendment which says that the Bill is "an insufficient return on an investment of more than half a million dollars of public money." [interjections] I should be allowed to read part of the subamendment anyway.

Mr. Speaker, this government spent half a million dollars of taxpayers' money on this legislation, and it's my contention that they didn't get their money's worth. The Minister of Labour suggested that it was only 25 cents a person. If given a choice, not too many people would spend 25 cents to go backwards.

Because if you consider it this way, there's no improvement in the current abysmal situation they're in, and the rest of the world is moving ahead in terms of labour legislation. People in other jurisdictions are taking account of women's problems of ...

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. The Chair hesitates to interrupt the hon. member in an obviously very interesting debate, but it's important that we have some degree of silence within the Assembly so the hon. member speaking can be heard by all hon. members, particularly the Chair.

Edmonton-Kingsway.

MR. McEACHERN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. [interjections] No, I assure you I have some new points to make tonight.

I said not too many people would want to spend 25 cents to go backwards. It isn't so much that the legislation is that much worse than what we've already got, although it certainly entrenches some unfortunate things, but there is no progress and the rest of the world is progressing in terms of pay equity for women, in terms of taking care of people that work part-time and that sort of thing. And that's what this Bill was meant to do. It was meant to protect the unorganized workers. So I don't see why people should have paid the 25 cents apiece, as the minister put it, to take a couple of steps backwards.

Now, perhaps, Mr. Speaker, one of the fundamental problems was the way he chose his nine members for his committee. He said that he wanted representatives from three different groups -- the labour group, the employer group, and from the general public -- but he handpicked all of them and biased the committee before he started. He didn't, for instance, ask anybody from the Alberta Federation of Labour or the building trades unions or some of the other major unions, so the people that he had ... Well, I suppose I'm not really going to pick on those nine members particularly, because the report they brought back was not bad, as the Member for St. Albert said. But the final draft of the legislation, which was the final result of the minister's and his own close advisers' decisions, does not reflect any of the progressive points that were in that report.

So, Mr. Speaker, this Bill cost not only the half a million dollars for the globe-trotting but also cost a lot of people that made presentations to that committee, who wrote briefs for that committee. It cost a lot of dollars, because time is dollars and a lot of people had a lot of input, as the minister himself said. Now, it would seem to me that they wasted those dollars and wasted that input, because the final result, Bill 21, the Employment Standards Code, certainly does not live up to its billing. So, Mr. Speaker, the taxpayers not only wasted half a million dollars they gave the minister to do some globe-trotting when he could just as easily have got the information from the library, but they wasted a lot of other money in trying to make sure the minister brought in progressive labour legislation at the end of it all, and he did not. So this labour Bill should not be read a second time, because it represents an insufficient return on the investment of actually more than half a million dollars of public money.

Mr. Speaker, the minister says his Bill speaks to fairness and equity. If it did, if it spoke to fairness and equity as promised, then the people of Alberta would have got their money's worth. But it doesn't and therefore they didn't, so it should not be read a second time.

Mr. Speaker, in the preamble the minister lists fairness and equity as one of his main goals, but actually it's interesting to note the position of that particular point. It's the second point

The first point -- and I think there's some significance in this -- is that it is critical to the capacity of Alberta to prosper in the competitive worldwide market economy of which Alberta is a part. I think that's the real agenda of this Bill. What the minister is really trying to do is to make it possible for employers to streamline and become more competitive. We're moving into a free trade deal with the United States, we're encouraging the takeover of small companies by big companies by doing that, we're encouraging competition between Alberta workers and Alabama workers or, worse yet, Mexican workers. If that's what we got out of our half million dollars, then I'm sure the workers of this province are terribly disappointed. I mean, I hate to think how we're even going to maintain jobs at \$4.50 an hour if we have to compete with Mexicans that'll work for 65 cents an hour. So the people of Alberta did not get their money's worth in that regard, and I think the minister has set the tone with the first part of his preamble.

The other parts are nice sounding but they have no teeth. He talks of, as I said, fairness and equity, and that's just a pipe dream and certainly this Bill doesn't bring it forth. He talks about open and honest communication. It's words, Mr. Speaker, that amount to nothing. You can find the section in there; he spends several pages talking about open and honest communication. But where's the fairness to the ordinary worker? When you think of that committee that he set up, where were the representatives of the unorganized workers, the people who have a part-time job, some of the working poor who work at minimum wage? None of them were on that committee.

I think the minister and most of the members of that committee had no idea what the average person in Alberta -- the working poor, the unorganized worker -- has to put up with. So this Bill does not address those questions, strangely enough. Yet the minister, of course, looked at New Zealand, where the labour legislation is much better than here. They went to West Germany and seemed to take the wrong advice from there, went to the United States and looked at the number of states that have right-to-work legislation. I guess that's what they brought home: that idea that somehow the employer should have it all and the employee should just be a pawn in the game.

For instance, in this Bill there are no prorated benefits for part-time workers. It's high time that we started to deal with that problem in this Assembly and in this province. We pointed out under an earlier subamendment that it's mostly women who get caught in that particular problem, so I don't need to go over that point again. But it's just worth reminding people. So with the kind of discrimination we have against the working poor, Mr. Speaker, this Bill should not be read a second time, because we just didn't get our money's worth. The people of Alberta have been taken for a ride.

There are no real teeth in the labour standards enforcement side of things in this province either, Mr. Speaker, and this Bill does nothing to address that. I have a couple of cases from my own riding of people who have been badly treated by employers. I went to the labour standards people on their behalf, and it was not a satisfactory result. I'll save the details for another time, but it just tells me that this government has no real intentions of taking care of the people who can't take care of themselves in this province, and this Bill does nothing to address that problem. There are no improvements in that regard. So again, this Bill should not be read a second time because it's not worth the money, the half million dollars it cost to produce.

AN HON. MEMBER: We're on the subamendment, Alex.

MR. MCEACHERN: Yes, I know. The workers, whose money was spent on this Bill -- and I'd remind you that it was mainly workers' money, because corporations in this province don't pay very much taxes, as we pointed out to the Treasurer a number of times; it was the workers' money that was spent -- have got nothing for their money. Instead, they've been cheated in a sense, because they were given expectations that there would be some improvement in their lot in this province. The government made a big promise a couple of years ago in the Speech from the Throne saying that after the Gainers strike they didn't want to have those kinds of problems in the province again and they were going to treat workers fairly, and so therefore they were going to revise the labour codes in this province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this committee went off and did a lot of work and brought back a fairly good report, in some aspects anyway. But the Bill doesn't reflect that report. Bill 60, the first egg laid by this committee, if you like, was really an abomination and so bad, in fact that it was just allowed to die on the Order Paper. Everybody in the province reacted with great anger. We got incredible numbers of submissions and phone calls and letters telling us that Bill 60 was of no value whatsoever, and worse than that, it made labour relations even worse. And so, Mr. Speaker, the government said, well, they would go back and do it again. And they did. They went back and did the same thing again. Now, why didn't they at least address some of those problems raised out of Bill 60? But no, the labour legislation comes back with all the same problems in it.

Mr. Speaker, if the Labour minister can't learn any lessons from traveling the world, spending half a million dollars of taxpayers' money, and he can't learn any lessons from his committee's report but still ends up making legislation the way he wants it made as he did in Bill 60, and then when everybody in the province tells him it's no good, maybe he should go ask the Minister of Education how you're supposed to react to a lot of criticism about your Bills. She at least made some changes. I didn't say she made it perfect.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hon. member. Hon. member, order please. Please use the normal parliamentary form of addressing another member.

MR. MCEACHERN: Did I not say the Minister of Education? [interjection] Oh, okay. Sorry, Mr. Speaker.

I was just drawing a parallel and suggesting that maybe the Minister of Labour should try to take account of what people said about Bill 60 in the new Bills and he hasn't. So if he couldn't learn the lesson after a couple of tries, maybe he'd make a third try to listen to some of the things we're saying.

Now, if he doesn't intend to do that, Mr. Speaker, then I suggest he start to stand up and defend the position he's at, because I'm really disappointed that the only thing the government seems to be able to do is holler about points of order. They don't seem to have any idea of defending the legislation as it exists and saying that it's good enough. Does that mean that they're ashamed . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please, hon. member. The hon. member is straying substantially from the subamendment arguing whether or not other members are involved in the debate. Would the hon. member come back to the subamendment before him.

MR. MCEACHERN: Of course, Mr. Speaker. It would seem

that if they were proud of it, though, they would've been defending it. So I don't think they got their money's worth, and I don't think the people of Alberta got their money's worth. Everybody knows they didn't get their money's worth, but yet we're going to go ahead with that Bill anyway. So I don't understand the thinking of this government.

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

Mr. Speaker, just to summarize, I'll say that the fruits of the labour committee -- the first gestation was the report; it was quite good. Bill 60 was lousy. Bills 21 and 22 do nothing to address those problems. In fact, they've made labour relations worse in this province. There is no help for the unorganized. There is no protection for the unorganized workers. There's no improvement in working conditions. There's no level playing field -- that favourite expression of the Minister of Labour. There is no fairness and equity. All there is is a streamlining of the control of the employer so they can become more competitive with Third World countries, so it will fit better into the free trade mold.

Mr. Speaker, the workers of this province did not get their money's worth -- not even 25 cents worth.

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

MR. PIQUETTE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I also rise to support the subamendment, and I'd like to read that into the record.

By adding at the end of it:

" , and because it is an insufficient return on an investment of more than half a million dollars of public money."

On August 1, 1986, nearly two months after the government promised to review our labour laws in the throne speech, the Minister of Labour announced that he would form a committee to travel the world and the provinces in search of models that would help to improve our labour laws. In announcing the review, the minister said:

Comparable legislation in other industrialized jurisdictions will be studied to determine if there are concepts which could usefully be incorporated into the Alberta system. The committee will travel to meet with and learn firsthand from those who have different labour legislation.

That was a promise that the minister made in this House two years ago. You recall that this was in the midst of the Gainers strike, that this whole review of the Labour Code would be helping to prevent such occurrences as the Gainers strike.

After an expenditure of \$450,000 by the minister and the traveling companions visiting industrialized countries in their travels around the world and their travels in Alberta meeting with the public, we find that that commitment the minister made before the House has not been fulfilled, because many of the recommendations or the labour legislation he heard about in other countries and in other provinces and in this province have not been complied with in the present legislation in Bill 21. In the six countries, including the Federal Republic of Germany, the United Kingdom, the United States, Japan, Australia, and New Zealand, they heard many worthwhile ideas to make sure that the kinds of strikes which were occurring in Alberta because of the Gainers strike would be responded to, and at the same time would be putting in place labour legislation which would be looking at the role of labour and the role of employers in the workplace for the foreseeable future.

As one member pointed out, it was 25 years since the Al-

berta labour legislation had been reviewed. So we as the Official Opposition and members of the public were believing that the half million dollars that was spent by this traveling committee in formulating conclusions or opinions in the Labour Legislation Review Committee Final Report released to the public in February, 1987 -- that we'd be getting our money's worth. However, I think it's been a kind of phony investment, a phony return on our investment, because many of the recommendations are not in keeping with what the public in Alberta here -- organized labour, unorganized labour, part-time workers -- and recommendations that he heard from other industrialized countries. These recommendations have not been complied with in Bill 21.

Now, talking about the cost. We have spent approximately half a million dollars in the drafting of this Labour Legislation Review Committee Final Report, but it does not include, however, the expenses incurred bringing up to this point the introduction for second reading of the Bills which flow from this review. How much was that in extra costs? The drafting and printing of Bill 60, which was introduced on the last day of last session . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, hon. member. With respect, those items that are now being raised have nothing to do with this particular phrasing of the subamendment.

MR. PIQUETTE: Well, we are trying here to make the point that the half million dollars spent in terms of the subamendment . . . I'd like to again read that into the record. The subamendment we are debating is:

. . . because it is an insufficient return on an investment of more than half a million dollars of public money.

We are here trying to make the point that the moneys expended in terms of the enacting of this Bill to Bill 60 have not at all complied with the recommendation of the final report of the Labour Legislation Review Committee. We are now into Bill 21, and the printing costs associated with that production are again some more waste of money, because it has not reflected in terms of the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, hon. member. The Chair hesitates to interrupt, but the problem still is that the wording of the subamendment deals with the half million dollars of public money which is the reference back to the life of the committee and to nothing beyond that printing cost at all. It's with respect to the committee itself. I'm sure you'll take that into consideration.

MR. PIQUETTE: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The question we must ask ourselves is: what did Albertans get for this money? How did the firsthand meetings and consultations across the globe assist nearly one million working Albertans whose employment will be regulated by the proposed Employment Standards Code? We don't think they got a lot.

Firstly, as our leader pointed out in the Assembly, there are hundreds of volumes in the Legislature Library that treat the subject of comparative labour legislation. If you recall, we tabled in the House a whole pile of literature from the Legislature Library that the minister could have consulted rather than his globe-trotting around the world. As far as we know, this was not the jumping-off point for the review. If it had been, a lot of good information would have been unearthed at relatively low cost. Or if the minister was really not interested in listening

to labour to begin with and not ready to listen to what other very reformed labour legislation in other industrial worlds is presently in force, then he could have simply saved us a lot of money and sat down with his business partners and enacted the same legislation, not taking into consideration the employees' involvement in the whole mechanism of the workplace.

Secondly, the minister has chosen to ignore some of the practices that he saw, or was he only interested in the ones that met his own preconceived ideas? For example, why did he not learn that in West Germany, as in many European countries, holidays range from five to six weeks regardless of how long an individual has been employed with the same employer? Why did he not adopt this philosophy to what he has introduced? In Japan and Germany the use of overtime is greatly restricted out of fairness and recognition that employment must be shared more evenly in a changing economy. How is it he came home from his expensive trip overseas and introduced a law that increases the potential for the use of overtime and quite unfairly forces workers to accept overtime agreements?

We cannot be altogether surprised that the minister's trip and this review . . .

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

MR. SPEAKER: Member for Stony Plain.

MR. HERON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm not frustrated or exasperated, but I'm driven by a practical, commonsense value for the taxpayers' dollar to cite section 23(b)(i) and also *Beauchesne* 309, where the hon. Member for Athabasca-Lac La Biche stands up and reads a long, lengthy speech -- he's taken us from Mexico, sir, to the working poor to the Gainers strike to German holiday entitlements, all the way through, which are so far off the subamendment that one cannot be patient enough to sit through now the fourth night of discussing subamendments and say, "Well, I'll be tolerant; I'll be patient; I'll listen to this . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: Drivel.

MR. HERON: . . . chatter and drivel -- that's right, that's as good as word as any -- and keeps on going night after night, without standing up and saying that there are Standing Orders in this House. We have to appeal to you, sir, and give you assistance from time to time to bring those Standing Orders to our attention.

Now, you know, Mr. Speaker, we could stand here for just a moment when I'm bringing this point of order to your attention -- and the subamendment is very clear, in that it says: "and because [there] is . . . insufficient return on an investment." Now, I think if we're looking from economic return, we'd simply look at half a million . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. member. You're now straying into debate. Thank you. But the point is well made that West Germany really has nothing to do in terms of this particular subamendment.

I'm sure Athabasca-Lac La Biche has now carefully honed the rest of his argument.

MR. FOX: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, for clarification . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I'm sorry, this point of order is finished, hon. member. I didn't recognize you before. I didn't see any action over there.

Athabasca-Lac La Biche, please.

MR. PIQUETTE: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think the trip to West Germany has everything to do with the expenditure of half a million dollars on the return.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. member. Thank you. Please get on with the discussion on the subamendment. You've been called to order on that.

MR. PIQUETTE: We cannot be altogether surprised at the minister's trip and the money that of course, he spent the half million dollars, and this review did not produce the results that one might have expected.

When questioned two years ago the minister admitted that he had not consulted the Alberta Federation of Labour or the Building Trades Council as to the appointments he made to his committee. Now, in his commitment that he made in the beginning of that whole review process, he indicated that

Comparable legislation in other industrialized jurisdictions would be studied to determine if there are concepts which could usefully be incorporated into the Alberta system. The committee will travel to meet with and learn firsthand from those who have different labour legislation.

And he indicated at the same time that he would be using the same process in the province of Alberta.

Now, I find it very surprising, if his whole committee's purpose was to listen to other labour legislation and the concerns of the labour organizations and unorganized labour in Alberta -- and to learn -- that he would not have paid attention to the concerns that were raised and approved by the final report of the Labour Legislation Review Committee. I find it astounding, for example, that we find there is nothing in this Bill that, you know, does not restrict compulsory overtime agreements between employees and employers. That was one of the recommendations that was made and agreed by the minister in his own report and signed by him. So obviously, the return on our investment of half a million dollars, just simply on that one point is in direct conflict with what the minister indicated at the beginning of his tour. The evidence in this Bill and the proposed Labour Relations Code prove that this is not true. In fact, the legislation before us ignores some of the very important recommendations that were made in his own report. What a greater waste of money than this could we have imagined by the Alberta public?

This Bill does not live up to the very high price tag associated with its development, and for this reason we cannot grant it second reading. In view of the fact that in the report -- and I read on page 86, part 3:

For several reasons the number of part-time workers in Alberta is rising significantly. Employees and trade unions repeatedly raised the issue of availability of benefits and application of standards to this group of workers. It was argued that legislation does not fully address the particular needs of these workers and that changes are needed to ensure that standards for, and benefits available to, full time workers are fairly pro-rated for those working on a regular part-time basis.

Now, when we look in Bill 21, was this carried out by the minister? Was this fairly carried out to the part-time workers of Alberta? If it was not then the minister must admit that it's been a wasteful expenditure of spending time listening to the average Albertans who made these recommendations and for him to ac-

tually agree to sign this final report released in February of 1987.

I go on:

The use of replacement workers during a strike or lockout was consistently identified as a major concern, though views differed widely on choices available to employers. Employers generally held that no restrictions should apply, while employees and trade unions felt prohibition or restrictions of various kinds should apply.

Now, there were two sides to the story: the employers' side and the employees' side. But where did this legislation go? Did it try to arrive at a fair resolution of the problem? Of course not.

DR. WEST: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Member for Vermilion-Viking.

DR. WEST: I don't want to take issue with the hon. member's discussion of the amendment, but he's drifting off into a debate on the actual Bill. The amendment specifies a waste of money on the investment in the world trip that the minister took, and I think this is drifting off the topic again. So I again quote section 23 and ask him to come back on topic, and I'd ask for your judgment on that, sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Vegreville.

MR. FOX: Mr. Speaker, if I might, on the point of order. It seems the members for Vermilion-Viking and Stony Plain are interested in making editorial comment rather than points of order. It seems to me that any member speaking on a subamendment needs to make the case. Surely if a member contends that a Bill not be read a second time because of an insufficient return on an investment of more than half a million dollars of public money, you have to make an argument referring to what the money was spent on and what was purported to have been achieved. The construction of such an argument by the hon. Member for Athabasca-Lac La Biche is intended to convince the members opposite of the merits of the position he holds. That seems to me to be the logic of debate.

MR. SPEAKER: The matter of relevancy with respect to the subamendment is naturally a difficult situation for all members to work with. As had been the case with other subamendments, with the narrowing of the area in subamendments dealing either with this Bill or with Bill 22, second reading, of course, gets us into the situation where we're not able to deal with the details of a particular Bill.

The Chair's been listening carefully to the arguments being presented by Athabasca-Lac La Biche, and in actual fact it's much more of arranging of discussion from the report rather than the Bill, although reference is being made to the Bill. So the Chair will allow Athabasca-Lac La Biche to continue but will not allow Athabasca-Lac La Biche to give us any more examples, because three are sufficient.

MR. PIQUETTE: You mean I'm not allowed to make more examples about how money has been wasted in terms of a report that was spent on here and the results in the Bills, so that we have to draw conclusions from basically what has been achieved by the trips around the world to enact labour legislation? We have Bill 21, so I have to refer to the final report and from there try to see what has been accomplished in Bill 21 in order to see whether we have accountability of the minister's expenditures. I

have to draw to the Speaker's attention that this is exactly the argument I'm using. I need to relate the expenditures of this review committee's travels and its achievements in Bill 21, whether they correlate with what has been recommended by the final report. Am I correct in my arguments, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: Well, with due respect to the hon. member, one is not supposed to ask a question of the Chair, let alone ask it twice. The Chair has had similar discussion with the Member for St. Albert in the members' lounge a short while ago as to what some of the confusion was the other night.

The Chair gave direction to the Member for Athabasca-Lac La Biche. It is then up to the member to listen to what the direction was and then not to get up and to question it. The direction was that three examples are sufficient on this subamendment. The member may indeed continue to talk about what the words of the subamendment are, and the member can read that as well as anybody else in this Assembly.

Please continue.

MR. PIQUETTE: My arguments have indicated this evening that because of the deficiency of Bill 21 we can really conclude that there has been insufficient return on an investment of more than half a million dollars of public money. I would like to ask the minister whether he can justify his expenditure of half a million dollars in view of the fact that there is contradiction between the result of his final report from the review committee and his present legislation that he has introduced in the House. Why isn't the minister defending his expenditure of half a million dollars? Because the Alberta taxpayers are demanding accountability, accountability in terms that if the government is going to be appointing task forces or review committees -- and the minister here, at his own discretion, indicated to the Alberta public that he did see a problem with the existing Alberta labour standards and that there needed to be a total review, that we had to move into the 21st century in terms of labour legislation.

Also at that time of two years ago, basically a lot of strife within the construction industry of Alberta and the whole resulting effect of the recession, and the minister promised that through this review committee we would be receiving sufficient return on that investment of spending half a million dollars, in terms of setting up a review committee that would travel to six industrialized countries, travel through Alberta, setting up special meetings in order for all parties to have their say in the matter. And from there, the minister, hopefully from the review committee's recommendations which came out in February '87, would then write legislation that would hold an unbiased view -- an unbiased view -- of rectifying existing labour legislation which over 25 years did not respond to the realities of Alberta. We did not conform with even what the United Nations had ruled about the fairness of the Alberta labour code.

So he was responding to the kind of pressure which had built up in the province of Alberta during the boom time and during the recession of the early 1980s to make sure that Alberta would be well served by this expenditure. Because after the opposition criticized him for this expenditure, he indicated in the House time and time again to all members of the Legislature that the reason for this review committee and the expenditure of half a million dollars was to ensure that the government did not rush and institute changes in the labour code without full consultation, without even seeing, for example, what had transpired elsewhere in the world, so that we make sure that Alberta has not isolated itself in its own little cocoon here over the years and

that it would relate itself in the global economy. I recall those words vary clearly in the House. You know, he was trying to be fair in this whole question of the review of the Alberta labour code.

So the Official Opposition would not today be demanding that this Bill not be read a second time if the minister had lived up to those commitments. And we would not also as Official Opposition be attacking this minister for lack of accountability of this expenditure of half a million dollars if we could see that this final report and Bill 21 would bear some semblance -- you know, the recommendation would show some semblance and some consistency in terms of what he heard, what he saw, and what he's now presently enacting. So the minister has failed to be accountable to the Alberta taxpayers, which are made up mainly of workers: part-time workers, full-time unorganized workers who choose not to be organized, and the organized labour in this province who, through freedom of association, have decided to combine themselves in an association to negotiate for them before their employers. He has failed in all those respects.

The Bill basically represents an attempt to listen to one party, which was not what the minister was indicating to this House when the expenditures of half a million dollars were first announced in this House. He clearly indicated at that time that he would be listening to both points of view and be an unbiased arbitrator in his enactment of this legislation. Unfortunately, the minister has failed miserably in that task, and I guess it's very similar to the baloney bucks of Canada which have been passed around, where \$3 is worth \$1 in this ...

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, hon. member. This current phrase has nothing whatsoever to do ... The matter of repetition: to have said three times that "the minister has failed" is really gilding the lily a bit too frequently. Say the point; let's get on, because more and more we'll have to refer back to repetitious debate.

The hon. member has roughly about four minutes or so.
Thank you.

MR. PIQUETTE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: You really don't have anything more to say, do you?

MR. PIQUETTE: The member does have a point, at this time of night.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. When the Chair recognizes a member, hopefully the member will start quite quickly so we don't get back into the same situation we were in a couple of nights ago.

Thank you.

MR. PIQUETTE: I would like to conclude, Mr. Speaker, by indicating to the House that fairness and equity in the workplace is the mark of a civilized democracy, that there has to be a level playing field when we enact labour legislation. If we believe in the free market economy, the government's responsibility is to make sure that both parties, both the worker and the employer, understand their responsibility in the marketplace. The expenditure of half a million dollars was to make sure that we could go on with the present system of our market economy, so that both the worker and the employer would have fairness and a level

playing field, so that no employers would face unfair competition by other companies enacting unfair labour agreements with their workers, or treating their unorganized workers and women in the workplace -- creating situations where they are unfairly treated in terms of benefits and pay equity, et cetera. This labour legislation and the result of that process leave these people unprotected on a level playing field which is very much marked in favour of employers.

Therefore, I fully support the Member for Edmonton-Mill Woods' subamendment that reads that we have not ... Where is my ...

MR. SPEAKER: All right, hon. member. Thank you. All hon. members have read it. Thank you. It's quite unnecessary.

Is there a call for the question?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. SPEAKER: Member for Calgary-Mountain View.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to be able to join in the debate this evening on this subamendment to Bill 21. The question is whether the province of Alberta, the people of Alberta, got a good return on their investment of public dollars in the cost of sending the Labour minister and a group of people on a task force around the world a couple of years ago. And I agree with the subamendment put before us this evening, that really we didn't get what we paid for. At least we paid for something, but it's certainly not anything that we can say is worth the expenditure. Because of that, it's a good enough reason for us not to give second reading to Bill 21.

You know, what did we get for this -- we've used the term "half a million dollars." I think -- and I use this term advisedly -- that's perhaps a conservative estimate of what the actual cost of that task force might be. But I think it's not been contradicted, so I don't think it's a wrong estimate or guess as to what this task force cost us. But you know, for that, what did we get?

Well, Mr. Speaker, the first thing we got was that the group came back after going around the world and they gave us a summary report, an interim report with a very, very cursory, superficial -- well, I don't know whether I'd say superficial -- certainly a very cursory précis of labour legislation in each of the countries visited. Then at the conclusion of the report there were a number of questions asked, and this, I gather, was for people appearing before the committee later on. You know, half a million dollars for 12 questions is pretty expensive per question. But that wasn't all that we got, Mr. Speaker. We finally got a final report from this committee, and it had a whole series of recommendations.

Well, that wasn't the end of our half-million-dollar investment. First of all, a year ago we got Bill 60, which attempted to incorporate a labour code for everybody who worked in the province, both unionized and non-unionized. Now, by this time the half-million-dollar expenditure was over with, and I don't think there were any more of these activities credited to that Bill. But in the last year now since Bill 60 was first tabled, it's been cleaved in half, so to speak, with Bill 21 and Bill 22. So we started off sometime ago, two years ago, on a trip, and we've now ended up with Bill 22. But does Bill 22 bear any relationship to all of this activity ...

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. member. We're on Bill 21.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: I'm sorry; I apologize. Mr. Speaker. I appreciate your pointing that out. Bill 21. Does Bill 21 bear any relationship to the initial activity generated by this trip by the minister overseas? Well, it does, but only in some very peripheral respects and in ways that -- we could have gotten Bill 21, virtually the same Bill, without this group traveling overseas.

I've been asking myself ever since the announcement was made that the minister was going to take this review committee on a worldwide tour, and I wondered: did he have to go overseas at all? I didn't think he did, but to put the best construction on his intentions, we hear the government often in this Legislature talk about how we have the best in the world right here in our little corner of the world in Alberta. So I presume that in going overseas, it was the intention of the Labour minister that he wanted to bring back the best information he could: the best ideas, the best approaches, the best working conditions, the best opportunities that exist for unorganized workers in those countries that he traveled to around the world.

Well, I'm sure that that was his intention, but is that what we got? Is that what we have in Bill 21? Well, Mr. Speaker, I guess my expectations or aspirations aren't perhaps as high as the minister's. I'd be satisfied if we had the best labour standards in Canada. So I'd like to just make a little bit of a comparison with what we ended up with in Bill 21 after having spent a half million dollars for the minister and his committee to travel around the world, compared simply to some provisions existing in other labour legislation just in Canada, information that the minister could have gotten not with an expenditure of more than half a million dollars, but for, let's say, \$150 he might have just put some money in a pay phone and called the B.C. Labour minister or asked him to send legislation from British Columbia.

Let's just say, for example, on -- well, how about straight-time workweek? Here we have in Alberta a 44-hour straight-time workweek. But what do we have if the minister had paid \$1.50 for a telephone call instead of \$500,000 to travel around the world? Just call somebody in the Labour ministry in British Columbia: what would he have found out? A 40-hour workweek in British Columbia. Well, I don't know; maybe that's not the best in Canada or the best in the world. But for another -- I don't know -- \$150, he could have made a phone call to the Labour minister in Saskatchewan and asked them, "What is your workweek?" A 40-hour straight-time workweek in Saskatchewan. How about Manitoba, our other sister prairie province . . .

MR. SPEAKER: With due respect, hon. member, let us not go through all 10 provinces and two territories.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I appreciate your comment. I just want to compare us to the prairie provinces. I'd just say this, that had he called the Labour minister in Manitoba: a 40-hour work week. Now, you know, here we have 44 in Alberta.

Other things he could have talked about while he was on the phone. What about the minimum wage? It's going up to \$4.50 in Alberta on September 1. Maybe that's something he did learn by calling those other labour ministers across the country, but which would compare favourably with Saskatchewan. Manitoba is \$4.50, Ontario \$4.55, Quebec \$4.55, and so on. So finally we're coming into the average, I guess, for the rest of the country. I guess the minister is content to be average, not the

best but average, at least when it comes to the minimum wage.

How about, Mr. Speaker, statutory holidays? Again, in that phone call -- maybe another 25 cents for the next minute -- he could have found out: in British Columbia, nine statutory holidays; or Saskatchewan, nine; in the Yukon or the Northwest Territories, nine. But here in Alberta it remains at eight. I take it that it's the first Monday in August I don't know; maybe we'll get that off this summer. Anyway, that seems to be the difference. He could have called and found that out.

What about the issues of maternity leave? Or here we have three provinces in Canada that have a concept called paternity leave: Saskatchewan, six weeks after 12 months; the same in Manitoba; Quebec has it for two days. Alberta: no mention of it at all. British Columbia: maternity leave 18 weeks. In Alberta 18 weeks after 12 months. The point is this: instead of half a million dollars to travel around the world, for the sake of \$5 or \$10 in telephone charges the minister could have simply found out what the legislation was in the rest of Canada and have made it his target to be the best in Canada as opposed to being the best in the world. He would have saved a tremendous amount of money. I think we would've achieved something far more remarkable than Bill 21, which is in front of us.

[Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair]

I'd like to know, for example -- for the cost of his half million dollar trip he mentioned that he went to New Zealand and Australia. Well, I'm interested in that because as I understand Bill 21, there are certain individuals in Bill 21 that are excluded from these minimum provisions in the Employment Standards Code. Among them are farm workers. Well, I wonder what the minister learned when he was in New Zealand and Australia about the condition of farm workers and the working standards that they have in those two countries. Why is it that none of those conditions or standards are found in Bill 21? What did we get for him going all that distance to two countries with economies very similar to our own, dependent on agriculture, in which their workers are covered? Why didn't he learn from that experience and try to bring some of that back to this country so we could be more in tune with what they've achieved in those countries? You know, for the expenditure of half a million dollars I would have at least liked to have seen -- and I hope I hear maybe before we're done the third reading of this Bill -- something from the minister about that.

Or, for example, in some of the countries like West Germany or Great Britain, what do they do about overtime agreements? For half a million dollars did we learn, for example, whether their experience in those countries is similar to that of ours in Alberta? Last year somewhere in the neighbourhood 10,000 complaints to the employment standards branch: five prosecutions. I don't know whether that's a record that is comparable to those other countries, but I can't honestly, Mr. Speaker, believe that it is. As I understand, some of those prosecutions in Alberta . . .

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

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Point of order, hon. Member for Drumheller.

MR. SCHUMACHER: It seems to me that I've heard all this before, and I'm wondering whether the Member for St. Albert happened to drop his notes on the hon. Member Calgary-

Mountain View's desk when he left the Chamber. It seems like it's repetitious.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: On the point of order, Edmonton-Belmont

MR. SIGURDSON: Mr. Speaker, I've been waiting for one of the hon. members to stand up and talk about repetition, because it seems to be a habit coming from the other side. But, Mr. Speaker, *Beauchesne* 292(2) says, and I quote:

The rule against repetition is difficult to enforce as the various stages of a bill's progress give ample opportunity and even encouragement for repetition. In practice . . .

MR. SCHUMACHER: That's not the right page.

MR. SIGURDSON: Please allow me to finish on your point of order, hon. member. I'm quoting again:

In practice, wide discretion is used by the Speaker and the rule is not rigidly enforced.

AN HON. MEMBER: You're not Tommy Douglas, you know.

MR. SIGURDSON: I didn't think that I was.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, I think that clearly points out . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: What citation is that?

MR. SIGURDSON: *Beauchesne* 299(2), fifth edition.

AN HON. MEMBER: You said 292.

MR. SIGURDSON: Oh, I'm sorry. That's for a headache, which you people seem to give me frequently.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the rule clearly states that it is difficult to enforce, and there is even encouragement for repetition.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hon. members, on the point of order, no one is perhaps more familiar with the difficulties of enforcing Standing Orders or *Beauchesne* than the Chair. The hon. Member for Drumheller is quite correct with regard to repetition. Several members have raised the matter of the subamendment under question with regard to visiting countries and the matter of overtime, so the Chair would find that indeed is repetitious. Perhaps the hon. Member for Calgary-Mountain View could use a different tack when addressing the subamendment.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for those comments.

It just seems to me that if the Minister of Labour had put this half million dollars into a fund and out of that fund he could have paid people who in the past were cheated by their employers out of pay due to them, he would have gone a lot further in achieving fairness in labour standards in the province in a practical sense than he did by spending that money on a trip for this review committee to visit these countries all over the world.

As far as enforcement, though, the point still stands. What did he bring back from those other countries that is reflected in any way in Bill 21 that would lead us to believe that vigorous enforcement of these standards will in fact achieve greater fairness for those who are unorganized in the workplace of Alberta? What did he learn from those experiences overseas? Because

I'm convinced, Mr. Speaker, that he obviously did not, if he had traveled to those countries to see how they in fact do enforce their employment standards.

Mr. Speaker, I was also interested in the makeup of this committee. I think if the hon. minister had taken a different approach, a different philosophy towards the makeup of this committee, even from the very beginning, he would have done two things: he would have achieved greater fairness in the final legislation put in front of the Legislature, and secondly, he would have saved money. Let's take, for example, the concept, if he had pursued it, of an all-party committee of the Legislature: representatives from the government, the Minister of Labour, and other representatives from the other three parties.

If they had formed the membership of that committee, Mr. Speaker, first of all, can you imagine the idea of traveling overseas to 12 countries or however many he visited? First of all, that notion, I think, would have been discarded at the first meeting. They might have gone across Alberta. They might have gone across Canada. And they would have found, perhaps, some of this information which I alluded to earlier in my comments this evening, which they would have been able to do at much less expense. I'm sure that if the Minister of Labour had had members from other parties on his committee looking over his shoulder, instead of going overseas we might, all of us, have gone down to the library or seconded some staff from his department to do the bibliographies and the literature searches to prepare documentation for that committee, which would have given them probably every bit as good quality information as he got traveling overseas, but they would have saved money in not having brought about those expenditures of travel and accommodation.

What if the minister had made appointments from umbrella organizations? Would there have been a greater commitment at the end of it to actually follow through with the recommendations that such a committee would have made? It would certainly be my contention, Mr. Speaker, that if an all-party committee had looked through this, had gone over all the ins and outs, when a final report was brought forward it would have reflected some consensus from different political viewpoints within the Legislature, and it would have achieved speedy passage because it would have reflected a much greater fairness in that legislation.

The same, I think, Mr. Speaker, would have occurred had the hon. Labour minister had representatives from the Alberta Federation of Labour or the Building Trades Council of Alberta and the Northwest Territories on his committee as representatives of those organizations. Then that committee could have really gotten down to talking frankly and honestly about the problems facing labour and working people in the province. There would have been a commitment at the end of that process to a series of recommendations all the way around. The minister then, I think, would have felt more commitment himself to that report, and the final Bills, Bill 21 and Bill 22, would have more accurately and adequately reflected such recommendations. All of those things could have happened without the expenditure of half a million dollars in traveling around the world. Nevertheless, the minister traveled around the world but didn't take any of these, I think, very positive suggestions that weren't made just tonight, but they were made even while this committee was in its formation stage.

The minister and his committee traveled to Japan. Now, I would have thought, Mr. Speaker, especially when we see in the preamble to Bill 21 the recognition that Alberta has to prosper in

a competitive worldwide market economy, that when he went to Japan, that committee would have been very interested to see how it is that Japan has been able to blossom economically in the last 30 years. You know, for me, if he had learned something from that trip, half a million dollars would have really been insignificant if some of that experience and learning could have been applied to the Alberta environment.

For example, Japan has made a commitment to a full employment economy, and that has implications for every aspect of their labour relations and their labour market strategies, whether it be for unionized labour or for those who are non-unionized. I note from the minister's own report that only about I think the figure was, 29 percent of the work force in Japan is unionized. But one of the things that this interim report mentioned that I would have liked the minister -- and I think that if he would have been able to incorporate it in this legislation, it would have been well worth the expenditure on his trip to Japan. Japan not only has a full employment economy but places considerable emphasis on consensus-building between management the private-sector owners of companies in Japan, those who work in those businesses, and government. In fact, the minister in his interim report made considerable reference to the roundtable conference. The cursory summary of his trip to Japan goes on for three out of the four or five pages, in fact, emphasizing or talking about consensus-building in Japan. Now, that's great. I think that's very interesting. If we can learn from Japan and duplicate in this province some of the things that they've been able to achieve in that country, so much the better. But frankly, I don't see where in Bill 21 any of that information has been reflected. I just don't see anything in that direction reflected in Bill 21.

You know, for example, in Japan they're really concerned about those who work in depressed industries, and they have a whole strategy in Japan to help people who are in declining industries to get out of those industries and begin work in others. For example, special benefits are incorporated in their legislation for displaced workers who are 40 years and over. Where in Bill 21 is any kind of an effort made in that direction? Or they make subsidies available to enterprises that hire labour discharged from depressed industries, or they provide incentives to firms who choose to retrain or rehire rather than fire their excess labour. Where in Bill 21, for example, are any small, modest steps being taken in that direction? I quite honestly didn't see them.

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

I would have much preferred that if the minister could have even incorporated a few of those concepts. We've just got to start on that road. I think it would have made a major difference to labour relations in this province over the next 10, 15, and 20 years. As I understood the minister from his opening comments, this is the Bill, this is the framework under which labour and management in the future will operate, and it's to take us into that 21st century so we can be more competitive. If the minister had only learned that in those countries that have been successful, the adversarial system has been reduced. Those countries with which we're really competing in this world are the ones that are working hard to train and give an adequate standard of living to their workers as incentives for greater productivity. But I don't see any of that reflected in this Bill.

Mr. Speaker, he visited Australia. There are all kinds of programs that Australia has implemented in their legislation that are

helping them in their labour relations. I don't see any of that reflected in Bill 21. I'm sorry that a minister and his task force would travel so far and spend so much money and not come back with any of these ideas. For example, their programs to assist rural women, to help them get employment . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Order please, hon. member. We appreciate the trip from Australia to Japan and now to these various other issues, but there have in the course of the member's remarks been a fair number of citations as to various issues involved as well. So in the last few minutes remaining perhaps the member could come through with real flair and capture the excitement of the whole House with regard to the subamendment.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: I appreciate your comments, Mr. Speaker. Thank you very much.

I'm just saying that the minister and his group had traveled to Australia, and I'd hoped that he had learned from that experience and that some of those ideas in their labour legislation could have been incorporated in Bill 21. I don't see that emphasis at all reflected in Bill 21, and for that reason I believe that the expenditure of half a million dollars was a waste. As a result of the minister and his group having been overseas to these other countries, he's not come back with a Bill that really will help this province enter the 21st century.

I think there are lots of examples where we could take these ideas from around the world -- from West Germany, from Australia, from Japan, and lots of other countries the minister didn't even visit -- and incorporate them. You can't just take something from another country holus-bolus and incorporate it into a different country and a different environment such as we have in Alberta, but if the minister had learned about the concepts and tried to at least incorporate them to some extent into our environment here in Alberta, I think that money would have been well worth the expenditure. It really would, I think, Mr. Speaker, have helped this province prepare to compete with some of these countries of the world in the next 10, 15, and 20 years, because we really must have enlightened legislation that creates a high standard of living for our people so that we're not thrown off to the peripheries of the world economy, so that we do make the right strategic decisions now in order that those who come after us, the future young people, do have meaningful work, a safe environment, and feel that their contribution to the province is recognized and worth while.

I think there are many things we could learn from all of these countries where they have done this successfully. I'm sorry to say that none of this is reflected. I think the hon. Minister of Labour unfortunately has taken some of the more, perhaps, regressive -- I guess for want of a better word I'll use that term; it's not the one I'm satisfied with -- experiences in other countries on which to build this Employment Standards Code, Bill 21. For example, one might be recent labour legislation in Great Britain and parts of the United States. I'm sorry that's the direction he's chosen, given the broad sampling he had of labour legislation throughout the world. It's really unfortunate when there was so much to learn. He had the world at his feet to be a student of the world. Unfortunately, we've come back to repeat many of the same errors that we've made in the past in this corner of the world. It's still a great place to live, Mr. Speaker, but for many Albertans it's not.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Minister of Social Services.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to spend a couple moments participating in the debate on what I understand to be a subamendment and was most intrigued by the discussion about the so-called waste of public money. I think some of my hon. colleagues have been far too quick in chastising the hon. members opposite in their repetition. As I listened to the comments and I heard time and time again, telephone, telephone, telephone, just get on the end of the telephone, I began to realize that we have missed a whole incredible opportunity here, because we have indeed a very large travel allowance in this Legislature. We have MLAs going from inside their own constituency to other constituencies. Mr. Speaker, why would they do this? We can use the telephone. From now on we will have all hon. members confined to their constituencies, and when they want information, they will pick up the telephone.

Further, Mr. Speaker, why do we have constituency offices? Hon. members can sit in their offices in the Legislature; they're already being paid for. Our constituency offices, as I understand it, cost us at least \$2 million-plus a year. Telephone, hon.

members; your constituents can phone you. What better mechanism? We have had a lesson given to us tonight. It is obvious that face-to-face consultation is no longer appropriate. Hon. members, there is no synergy in a group of people getting together and talking. We can do it on the telephone.

Mr. Speaker, I think this deserves considerable debate, and in view of the time I move that we adjourn debate.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed, please say no.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion carries.

[At 10:40 p.m. the House adjourned to Friday at 10 a.m.]