

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA**

Title: **Thursday, July 13, 1989 2:30 p.m.**  
Date: 89/07/13

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

[Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair]

**PRAYERS**

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Let us pray.

O Lord, grant us a daily awareness of the precious gift of life which You have given us.

As Members of this Legislative Assembly we dedicate our lives anew to the service of our province and our country.

Amen.

**head: TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS**

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Public Works, Supply and Services.

MR. KOWALSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to table a report today titled Oldman River Dam Project: Review of Greggs & Associates Report, dated June 1989, a report commissioned by Alberta Public Works, Supply and Services.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of the Environment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Ralph?

MR. KLEIN: Sorry, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I'll file the report that I was going to file today, tomorrow. Thank you.

MRS. MIROSH: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to file the annual 1989 Chartered Accountants' report and the Certified General Accountants Association of Alberta 1988 annual report. Thank you.

**head: INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

MR. CARDINAL: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce to you and through you to the Assembly a former member of this Assembly. He's seated, I believe, in the members' gallery: Mr. Frank Appleby, former Deputy Speaker, MLA for 15 years in this Assembly. I'd like to get Frank to stand up and get the usual warm welcome from the Assembly.

**head: ORAL QUESTION PERIOD****Guidelines for Ministers of the Crown**

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, to the Premier. Yesterday we were dismayed to hear, frankly, that the Premier considered the

action of three of his ministers to be absolutely acceptable, even though it's obvious to all thinking Albertans that they are up to their ears in conflict of interest. When this government was new, it at least had some idealism. But now it's old and tired; it just doesn't seem to care. The reason I say that is that in 1973, 16 years ago, the then Premier put out under the Orders of the Day, and I quote:

Ministers shall not own, directly or indirectly, shares in any public company whose business might be materially affected by decisions of the Government of Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, my question to the Premier. Does the Premier agree with this policy, which was crafted when he was a member of this government?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, first let me say that I completely disagree with the allegations carried in the first part of the member's question because obviously, as we've explained in the House, that part of his question is a lot of baloney.

But, Mr. Speaker, coming specifically to the second part of his question whereby he asks of those guidelines, whether I still support them, I do, subject to the point I made to the House yesterday that since that time there have been certain legislative changes, and when the legislation has come in subsequent to the guidelines, I have taken the position that the law of Alberta is the law that we will follow.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, we'll talk about baloney a little later on with Mr. Pocklington.

My question, Mr. Speaker. We understand the legality; it's the morality that we're trying to get to. I want to ask the Premier: would the Premier say, then, that section 31 of the Alberta Energy Company follows the guidelines of what I just talked about, and if not will he change it?

MR. GETTY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I already dealt with that question just yesterday in answering the hon. member's first question. I would say this: in my review of the conflict-of-interest guidelines, which I felt were raised and appropriately so by the Member for Edmonton-Gold Bar, I will specifically concentrate on the Alberta Energy Company feature, because I think it is one that is unique to Alberta and to this Legislature.

MR. MARTIN: Then, Mr. Speaker, I wish they hadn't brought it in in 1980.

Following up from that answer, then, will the Premier show that he has just a small bit of idealism left, Mr. Speaker, and at least give us the commitment here today to amend section 31 so that ministers must either put their shares into a blind trust or at least refrain from voting on matters that come to cabinet?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, obviously one person doesn't amend legislation. Surely the hon. member knows that that has always been in our parliamentary system a function of Legislatures or Parliaments. But I would say this: I do feel that the specific nature of Alberta Energy Company shares as it relates to Alberta and elected members and members of the Executive Council is a unique situation that I would specifically request some type of independent assessment on so that we have it looked at separately from members of the Legislature or members of the Executive Council or as chairman of the Executive Council.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition, the second main question.

### **Gainers Properties Inc.**

MR. MARTIN: Yes, also to the Premier, Mr. Speaker. The vice-president of Gainers Inc. says that the company is having a difficult financial year and is in a sea of red ink. If that's true, it hasn't been for a lack of big lifeboats that the Alberta taxpayers have been asked to send in aid of that company: a \$55 million loan guarantee and a \$12 million loan. Now, there are approximately 1,000 Gainers workers and their families and northern Alberta's 2,000 pork producers and their families who want to know that their jobs and livelihoods are safe. Southern Albertans also want to know if they are getting their new plant or not. Apparently the Premier has recently had conversations with one Mr. Pocklington, his good friend. As a result of those conversations will the Premier give this Assembly today a firm guarantee that the Edmonton plant will at least be maintained at its current level for the workers and the producers in northern Alberta and that a new plant will be built in Picture Butte in southern Alberta?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, it is true that on June 30, accompanied by the Provincial Treasurer and the Minister of Agriculture, I met with Mr. Pocklington and another representative of his organization, but those discussions were private discussions that I wouldn't get into here in the Legislature, except to say to the hon. member that I am very pleased that finally they are sharing the government's concern regarding jobs for Albertans and that you could not have identified that when the former Minister of Economic Development and Trade and the Minister of Agriculture and the Provincial Treasurer worked to make sure that there was an opportunity to have a diversified food processing industry in this province, and therefore the government took certain steps to try and have that happen. I'm now interested that the hon. member is catching up finally to the same concern that the government had many, many months ago.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, handing out money to Peter Pocklington does not guarantee jobs; that's the point.

I want to come back because the Premier evaded the issue. I want a commitment from this Premier, who handed out in loan guarantees and loans \$67 million of taxpayers' money. Will the jobs in Edmonton be maintained, and will there be a plant built in Picture Butte: yes or no?

MR. GETTY: First of all, Mr. Speaker, again the hon. member's lead-in to his question is incorrect, and I guess we just have to get used to that because it happens day after day. But I would say this: we've had the discussion. There were problems that the company is facing. Ministers of the government will be working with the company to see if there's any way that there are solutions. However, there are no automatic guarantees of any kind.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, unbelievable; \$67 million and an answer like that, just because he's a good Conservative.

Well, Mr. Speaker, let's try one other line on this thing then. Will the Premier give a firm commitment that none of the taxpayers' money will be lost and there'll be no more taxpayers'

money going in terms of loans, collateral, or any other matter to Peter Pocklington?

MR. GETTY: Could I say again, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member in his initial opening to his question is wrong again. After all, a guarantee for which you are paid money is a commercial transaction. When you lend money and are paid back in a loan at an interest rate, you are talking about a commercial transaction. Now, Mr. Speaker, companies go up and down with the economy, with matters that face the agricultural industry in Alberta, the markets for pork and other things from time to time. All of these are complex matters but I want the hon. members to know that the government is working very hard to make sure that we have a healthy agriculture industry and agriculture processing industry in this province.

MR. DECORE: Mr. Speaker, since the Premier became the Premier of our province the Pocklington companies have received something in the vicinity of \$120 million in grants and loans and loan guarantees, and they have received easy access to another \$50 million. It is rumoured that ministers of the Crown have been calling industrial leaders, talking about the financial difficulties that the Pocklington empire is having. We know that Gainers has admitted financial difficulty, and we also know that the Premier has met with Mr. Pocklington, probably to talk about these financial difficulties. And we note very recently, in fact within just moments, that Gainers has called a press conference for today later this afternoon. My question to the Premier is this. Obviously, there's trouble. We don't want to know the details of that difficulty, but can you tell this House whether or not you and Mr. Pocklington have worked out a strategy to deal with his financial troubles?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member talks of rumours and such things, the business of press conferences. It's no responsibility of the government of Alberta. Now, as I said earlier in answering a prior question, ministers of the government have been meeting with Gainers, and they are looking at some of the problems they face. Perhaps the hon. Provincial Treasurer may want to supplement that question and the Minister of Agriculture as well. But we'll leave it at that.

MR. DECORE: Well, I'd like to put the question, then, to the Provincial Treasurer. There is obviously a deal being made. Is the Provincial Treasurer part of that strategy to save the Pocklington empire? Let's hear about the strategy.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, over the course of the last few days here we have, in fact, spelled out for you and detailed fairly fully, if you'd taken the time to watch the record, how in fact the government responds to these kinds of situations. I think the minister of economic development and the Minister of Agriculture have spelled out for the House and for Albertans the way in which the broad policy operates to ensure that diversification takes places to protect the kinds of jobs the Member for Edmonton-Norwood talks about, to ensure that there's an opportunity for diversification of the economy.

Now, all members can't have it on both sides. They can't have both sides of the sandwich. They have to get a little bit of butter in between there, Mr. Speaker, because you know what? If we didn't have the other side of that equation, we would be challenged and criticized for not protecting the jobs, quite prop-

erly so; not diversifying the economy, an event that's now taking place; and not providing some of the assistance to these industries that traditionally has been provided in other provinces across Canada. So from a traditional point of view we are responding in that fashion. We have outlined that fairly fully in a white paper which was published in 1985, called an industrial strategy for this province, where we talked about the way in which we would go after industry and go after diversification. And that's taking place here in this province, Mr. Speaker.

Now, specifically under the the general umbrella of providing assistance to diversification of agricultural upgrading, we have made a number of steps. The minister of economic development outlined those both in the question period and here during his estimates debate over two occasions, made fully clear to everyone what was happening, outlined, as the Premier has done here today, to ensure that the so-called Gainers group received assistance. We provided a loan guarantee which is being paid for, and that loan guarantee is a claim against good assets, and the proper agreement is in place. At the same time, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I hesitate to interrupt the hon. Provincial Treasurer, but the Leader of the Liberal Party has one remaining supplemental, and there might be something . . .

MR. DECORE: Is that called obfuscation?

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the minister of economic development, and I would ask for an answer rather than more obfuscation. With respect to that plant in Picture Butte you've not given answers as to the \$6 million that has been drawn. You've got no backing to show us that Albertans are being protected. My question to you is this, sir: what information have you got on the upgrading of the Gainers plant? What has been done, what was intended to be done, and is the program on target?

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, I'm happy to repeat for the hon. member as to what I've indicated in this House, as the Provincial Treasurer indicated, both when my estimates were before the Legislature and during question period, that \$6 million of the \$12 million loan has been accessed. There is an interest being paid on it of 9.6 percent, which is .6 percentage points above the money that we have offered to the small business and the farming communities. Within the agreement itself, as was made public when the loan guarantee and the loan were issued to this corporation by way of a news release by the former minister of economic development -- whereby he indicated it was a threefold purpose. It was for the . . .

MR. TAYLOR: What's he done for the money?

MR. ELZINGA: Would the hon. member like an answer or not?

MR. TAYLOR: Yeah.

MR. ELZINGA: Then be patient so that I can give it to him and he will not have to on a continuous basis ask for a repetition of it. If he listens once, he won't have to have it repeated again.

So let me indicate to them that it was for a threefold purpose. It was for the establishment of a plant in southern Alberta, allowing the corporation to negotiate with various municipalities

in southern Alberta. It was to upgrade the plant here in Edmonton so that we could maintain the very important jobs, and it's interesting to see the New Democratic Party twist now, whereby they said to us: "Don't give this man any money. We don't need the jobs. We don't need the food processing." They say now that we need it; it's interesting. I'm curious as to what they're suggesting as to whether we offer more money, if they're suggesting that. [interjections]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. ELZINGA: Also, Mr. Speaker, this was to be used for on-going operation costs so that this company could remain competitive in a very competitive business. Also -- and I've indicated this on many occasions -- as it relates to the actual loan, a declaration has to be signed that he is living up to the obligation of the agreement. The plant was to be constructed or construction was to have started by June of '89. That was extended to September '89 because of the concerns with the environmental assessment impact study. Again, the hon. members on other projects say we have to be concerned with the environment. Now they're saying, "Throw the environment out." Just another example of hypocrisy.

So I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that everything has been followed, and in the event that it has not been followed, I've indicated in this House before, to the full force of the law we will use every avenue available to us to make sure that this agreement is lived up to, because we are good stewards of the taxpayers' money.

#### **Proposed Shipment of PCBs from Quebec**

MR. CARDINAL: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of the Environment. As the minister is well aware, the Swan Hills waste disposal plant is situated adjacent to my riding of Athabasca-Lac La Biche. I understand that recently there were negotiations going on in order to transfer PCBs from Quebec. My question is to the hon. minister. Could he advise this Assembly as to what is the status of these negotiations now in relation to the PCBs?

MR. KLEIN: Mr. Speaker, there are no negotiations under way. I understand the province of Quebec has decided to send those PCBs elsewhere, and for the time being the matter is closed.

MR. CARDINAL: My supplement, Mr. Speaker, is to the hon. minister. If these negotiations that are happening between another part of the country, with Quebec, fail, where does the province stand in the future?

MR. FOX: Right between B.C. and Saskatchewan.

MR. KLEIN: That's right; someplace between B.C. and Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I would think that if something fails to happen relative to the shipment of PCBs from St-Basile-Le-Grand to another jurisdiction, Alberta's offer would still stand on humanitarian grounds. However, the PCBs would have to be accepted on our conditions, and that would be, over a long period of time, first to accept the liquids, then the solids, and then the transformers.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Vegreville.

### **Loans and Loan Guarantees to Peter Pocklington**

MR. FOX: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In respect to the \$67 million benefit package that the government approved for Mr. Peter Pocklington on March 3, 1988, we now know that only moments before approving the loan and loan guarantee, cabinet made three significant amendments to the rules that govern loan guarantees, making it possible to conceal both the source of the loan and details of the loan. Now, at the time the \$67 million package was approved to Gainers Properties Inc., a \$67 million debenture was held against the assets of Gainers Properties Inc. by a numbered company, 369413 Alberta Ltd., a company that is one-third owned by the Softco director, Mr. John Karvellas. I would like the minister of economic development to tell us in the House today: who or what was the government trying to hide by changing the loan guarantee rules only moments before approving the loan guarantee to Peter Pocklington?

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, I know it's contrary to the hon. member's thinking, because he does deal in what he considers cloak and dagger items. This was a very straightforward item. I'm happy to share with the hon. member -- and I regret that I did not have the information at my fingertips yesterday -- that the only reason the order in council was changed was to allow any company that has our loan guarantees the opportunity to go to the lending institution of their choice so that they could have or could participate in a lower interest rate. Whereby we were offering that loan guarantee to him, the loan guarantee is made public. The lender's name is the only thing that we altered as it relates to these loan guarantees, so that it would be of benefit to any company that does participate in our loan guarantee program.

I should indicate to the hon. member, as I indicated yesterday outside the House, that it was coincidental that it happened to happen at the same time. As the hon. member is aware, too, I was not the minister of economic development at that time, but I want to share with him that the information that has been passed to me is just as I've indicated to him today.

MR. FOX: With respect, the minister was a member of cabinet, albeit with very little influence at the time.

Is the government not concerned that it has placed Mr. Karvellas in a possible conflict-of-interest situation by allowing him to, on the one hand, manage hundreds of millions of dollars of Crown assets through Softco and, on the other hand, allowing him to be an apparent beneficiary of a government loan guarantee?

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, I'm amazed, and I would suggest to the Legislative Assembly that what we do is offer the research individuals for the New Democratic Party somewhat more money so that they can do a thorough job of their research activities. Because the hon. member should be aware, if he's not aware, that we process and walk through the various stages of the loan guarantees up until the order in council is passed. Once that order in council is passed, the actual administration and the policing of the loan guarantees themselves fall to the Provincial Treasurer. I'm amazed, and I would suggest to the Legislative Assembly if the hon. member's unaware of that, that maybe we allocate a slight additional amount of money to the

research staff so that they can do a more thorough job and be more factual in the presentation of the facts, rather than continuing to twist the truth as he consistently does.

MR. FOX: These are all facts, Mr. Speaker, and I'd like the minister of economic development to tell us whose loan has been secured by the \$55 million loan guarantee approved by cabinet March 3, 1988. If it's not Mr. Karvellas' company's money, whose is it?

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member obviously doesn't listen. I indicated to him under whose jurisdiction that does fall. If he doesn't want to pay attention to the facts, I would only ask him to do one thing: not to continue to twist the facts as he consistently does.

### **Primary Highway Connector Agreement**

MR. WICKMAN: Mr. Speaker . . . [interjections]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. WICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, recently it has come to my attention that the department of transportation has embarked on a very extensive and costly proposal entitled the primary highway corridor agreement. This agreement not only forces the cities of Calgary and Edmonton to possibly incur costs that are well beyond their means but also calls for the realignment of Highway 2 as it reaches the city of Edmonton boundaries. Considering that the city of Edmonton transportation department has stated that they believe that the proposed changes will have significant land development impacts for Blackburne, that particular neighbourhood, and will also affect future development in the Ellerslie and Lewis Farms area plan, my question is to the minister of transportation. Has his department prepared an analysis of what the total cost for the Highway 2 realignment will be, especially since the city of Edmonton estimates that the economic impact for the Blackburne land acquisition alone will be \$20 million?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, the interchange referred to by the hon. Member for Edmonton-Whitemud is basically one that is an ongoing discussion between the city of Edmonton's transportation officials and our officials. I don't have the details at my fingertips, but I can say this: there was an indication some time ago as to identifying where that interchange would have to go and then ensuring that the city was aware of that so that land acquisition, which is the city's responsibility, would in fact take place.

MR. WICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, is the minister aware that this additional cost of up to \$200 million over and above the original ring road proposal, which incidentally will accommodate up to a 16-lane highway horizon and which matter went to the executive committee of the city of Edmonton council very recently -- that they placed an amendment within that agreement that would pass on any responsibility financially to the provincial government because they object to the imposition of those type of extra tax dollars being forced upon them?

MR. ADAIR: I'm not aware of that particular amendment.

MR. WICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Can the minister tell me as to whether his department did consult or what the consultative process was with the existing property owners south of Ellerslie Road that will be affected because of the proposed new realignment?

MR. ADAIR: As I said a little earlier, Mr. Speaker, the discussions between the transportation department of the city of Edmonton and our officials has been ongoing for some time relative not just to that interchange but the west interchange, the northeast interchange, and others at the same time. What would be needed down the road was identified, and at that particular point in time that was the type of intersection that was going to have to be placed at some point in the future, and that those lands should not be used for something else. It's basically a program where you're doing some preplanning, if I can use that particular term, Mr. Speaker, to ensure that the properties are identified that would have to be involved in the interchange itself.

### Review of Science Curriculum

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Education. There's been continued concern expressed in the media and by a concerned public in Alberta with regard to science education policy in Alberta, and most recently the Alberta Association of Professional Engineers, Geologists, and Geophysicists has criticized the program as further watering down science education. In response to a question I raised earlier in the House, the minister said he would continue to consult with people until we get it right. Could the minister advise the House of any further steps or action he's prepared to take to consult with a broad group of people to ensure we get the right science curriculum for Alberta?

MR. DINNING: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I am able to provide some information to the hon. member. As the member knows, we have delayed the implementation of the new science curriculum until September of 1990. In the meantime we will be consulting with a number of Albertans, but specifically I have asked a group of Albertans to give me advice on our objectives and where we're attempting to go in science education: the work we've done to date and the work we must do over the next eight months before we make a decision as to whether we will proceed, beginning in September 1990.

With your indulgence, Mr. Speaker, if I could inform the members of the Assembly who the members of that committee are. They are Dean John McDonald, of the Faculty of Science at the University of Alberta; Dr. Brian Bietz, general manager of a consulting firm here in the city; Mr. Gwyn Morgan of AEC oil and gas; Mr. Tom Chambers, who is the past president of APEGGA; Mrs. Sharon Kalinka, who is the chairman of the Medicine Hat school district; Mr. Gil Johnson, president of the Southern Alberta Institute of Technology; Dr. Bob Church, who is a professor of biological sciences at the University of Calgary; Mr. Gerrit Cunningham, who is a teacher at a high school in Calgary; Dr. Penny Coddington, of the Department of Chemistry at the University of Calgary; and the MLA for Ponoka-Rimbey, who also serves as the Education caucus committee chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I'm going to be relying on all of these people to give me the advice that's necessary to ensure that what we are trying to accomplish -- that is, to give our children the very best

science education, to make sure that we are on the right track. I'll be relying on these people as well as a number of other Albertans.

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. In view of the criticisms the minister has received with regard to the science program, can he provide any evidence that this new approach will provide a solid basis for science education for the young people of Alberta?

MR. DINNING: Yes, -Mr. Speaker, I can. We're taking a number of initiatives, but I'd like to share one of them with all members of the Assembly because I believe they would be interested. What came to my desk yesterday was the first draft of the first of two texts that we will be using in the grade 7 science program. It's entitled *Science Plus: Technology and Society*. Mr. Speaker, this kind of approach -- and remember that we're not just talking about high school science here; we're talking about improving science education throughout all grades, 1 through 12, but specifically in junior and senior high school. This new science text focuses on any number of exciting scientific concepts and the application of those concepts, and that's the important point. We can talk about gravitational force and micro-organisms and erosion, but when we begin to apply them to architecture or food preparation or to environmental issues, that is what is going to make science come alive for our young citizens so that they're not just rote learning chemical or physics concepts but applying those concepts to everyday life here in this province so that science is useful and exciting and challenging for those kids.

MR. BRADLEY: Further supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I applaud the minister for the blue-ribbon team of people he's putting together to advise him, but will he give assurance to the House that he will ensure the broadest possible consultation and give consideration to all concerns that have been addressed to him by the general public, by industry, by the education community, and others in the province prior to proclaiming the new science curriculum?

MR. DINNING: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we will be consulting widely, as I've mentioned earlier, with not only that committee but members of the university academic community, teachers, parents, the general public, as well as the scientific, business, and research communities in Alberta. One of the things we'll be sharing with them is the fact that this initiative that we're taking in science education was in many ways spawned by recommendations by the Science Council of Canada in their 1985 report *Science for Every Student: Educating Canadians for Tomorrow's World*. The theme behind this report is science, technology, and society. We will be talking with those people in the community, hear their concerns to react to them, to incorporate them into the curriculum so that we can share with those communities our intentions, and so we can find that common ground. The common ground, Mr. Speaker, is to give our students the very best science education. The wider objective is to create a far better scientific literacy for all of our citizens in this province.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place.

### Funding of Environmental Groups

MR. McINNIS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. When the Minister of the Environment was lured over to the governing party, he was supposed to be a breath of fresh air. He was supposed to be a new face and someone committed to protecting the environment. Things have come a long way. Now we have insult and slander for environmental groups. He accuses organizations representing 300,000 Albertans of having hidden motives without offering any proof whatsoever. I would like the minister to set aside some of the cheap shots and either come up with the proof or admit that he supports only one group in this province, and that's the friends of the big blue Tory machine.

MR. KLEIN: Well, my goodness gracious. The hon. Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place is in very, very good form today, especially in terms of insults and innuendo and rude remarks. But this is nothing new to this particular individual, which has become quite typical of his style and, I think, quite representative of the party he represents as well. I thought that perhaps the hon. member would go away over the break and come back with some new, fresh thoughts and some new ideas.

MR. MARTIN: Answer the question.

AN HON. MEMBER: What was it?

MR. KLEIN: There never was a question, so this simply gives me an opportunity to . . . [interjections]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. Perhaps the hon. member can have a more concise question in his first supplementary.

MR. McINNIS: Environmental groups are working very hard to sustain the environment of this province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question. Ask the question.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. I hesitate to interrupt the hon. member, but I mentioned yesterday that the rules call for no preamble for supplementals. [interjections] Order please. If there's a point of order to be raised at the end of this, I'll deal with the point of order, but no one can deny that there was an agreement that there would be no preamble. The hon. Leader of the Opposition, I would suggest, should set an example for all members who are asking questions by not using these preambles to supplementals. [interjections] Order please.

MR. McINNIS: I'll make it very simple. The question is this: why does the minister reject funding and full participation for environmental groups in the process when he gives money to car dealers, tire salesmen, and party hacks?

MR. KLEIN: Mr. Speaker, funding will be given to the municipalities. The municipalities in turn will receive applications from individuals and legitimate groups. The municipalities that receive the funding will decide if those groups will be given intervenor funding. There is one group in particular, and that is the group of citizens from Prosperity, the area directly affected, that I have insured, absolutely, will get intervenor funding. In addition to that, the federal government

-- and they will be participating in this exercise -- will also provide a pool of funding for intervenors. So I think there should be a sufficient amount of money available for those people who want to make legitimate, honest representation to the review board -- legitimate representation to the review board, not representation that has behind it some political motive.

MR. McINNIS: Well, it's the same old slander, and there's no proof.

I would like the minister to explain how he can stand here and say he's going to give the money to municipalities while specifically ruling out the Friends of the Athabasca and specifically ruling in the Prosperity farmers. Who is controlling this fund?

MR. KLEIN: Mr. Speaker, I don't want to sound insulting, but if the hon. member ever had to go back earning money as a researcher, he would surely starve, because he obviously . . . I would refer to *Hansard* as of yesterday. I simply said:

And where do you draw the line? We can start with Friends of the Peace and Friends of the Wapiti and Friends of the North and the Southern Friends of the North and the east friends of the west and west friends of the east and the friends of John McInnis.

And that's where I would draw the line.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark. [interjections] Time.

### Alberta-Pacific Project

MR. MITCHELL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of the Environment. The minister has said that no construction will proceed on the Athabasca pulp mill until all environmental approvals have been given. Last week the municipality approved the permit to allow site clearing and excavation to commence without environmental approvals. Any reasonable person would define site clearing and excavation as construction. Will the minister tell us what kind of secret guarantees he has given the company that they would take the apparent risk of proceeding with these costly construction initiatives without proper formal environmental approvals?

MR. KLEIN: Mr. Speaker, that is a very good and legitimate question, one I would be very, very happy to answer in an honest and straightforward way, as I have answered the other questions. I have written to the manager of Alberta-Pacific, and I said that notwithstanding the fact that a development permit has been issued by the county, I think, along with my federal counterpart, Mr. Bouchard, that it would be imprudent at this time to proceed with any work, and if he were to proceed without benefit of a construction permit or a permit to operate, then he would be doing so entirely at his own risk.

MR. MITCHELL: Will the minister please confirm, then, that he will take to the courts an injunction to ensure that they don't proceed at their own risk, or at our risk, to ensure that they don't start something that will inevitably lead and create more pressure for this plant to proceed?

MR. KLEIN: Oh, Mr. Speaker, I think that's carrying things a little too far. These people have been in business for some time,

and I think they understand very, very well the risks involved, and I think they can take whatever action is appropriate.

MR. MITCHELL: Has the minister placed that directive to the company in writing, and if so will he please table that directive in the Legislature at this time?

MR. KLEIN: Mr. Speaker, it really is a private communication. I have given the hon. member the substance of the letter and I think that should be enough. Certainly the written documentation is there, but as I say, it's a private communication, and I don't think it would be prudent for me to table it in this Legislature.

Thank you.

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

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Innisfail.

### Trade with Iran

MR. SEVERTSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There have been reports in the news media that the Alberta government has been dealing with Iran without the permission of the federal government. My question to the Minister of Economic Development and Trade. Had there been consultation with the federal government during and prior to the visit?

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, I'm happy to report to the Legislative Assembly that we have worked under the guidelines of the federal government and we did work very closely with the embassy in Tehran when there was a group of businessmen in Iran. The national oil company of Iran has also indicated their desire to establish a purchasing office in Calgary. They have a procurement budget of some \$1 billion. We feel that sales can be made to that country, which is slowly stabilizing, to the tune of somewhere between \$60 million and \$70 million. But we will only do so under the guidelines as set down by the federal government, and we've indicated that on a consistent basis.

MR. SEVERTSON: Most Albertans realize the importance of trade to Alberta. Could the minister tell this House: what kind of trade can he expect from this visit?

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, the purpose was to encourage a greater working relationship between those individuals involved in the oil industry so that we can make sales of supplies, especially relating to the service sector of the oil industry. As hon. members are probably aware, each billion dollars' worth of sales has the creation of jobs to the tune of some 19,000. We are very reliant on trade within this province, and we're going to continue with our aggressive nature of trade, recognizing the enhancement that it does play in the quality of life within this province.

MR. SEVERTSON: Does the minister think that the political climate of Iran is stable enough at this time to be working on trading arrangements?

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, that is a decision that is left to the federal government. As I've indicated, we rely on them for advice as it relates to external affairs because the jurisdiction

falls directly under them. We follow their guidelines. We are under the impression that the situation is stabilizing somewhat as it relates to the information that does flow through to us from the federal government.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Highlands.

### Guidelines for Ministers of the Crown (continued)

MS BARRETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday the Premier waxed endlessly to say that it was his view that there was nothing the matter with the government's code of conduct or ethics, and then he said he would review them. It's hard to tell which part he's serious about. Either he's really saying that he believes in what his cabinet ministers are getting away with, in which case the review might be a whitewash, or he's saying that their conduct is unethical but he doesn't want to admit that. My question to the Premier is this: if the Premier is serious about this review that he says he's going to conduct, will he start it by declaring right now that from now on he will forbid cabinet ministers who have financial interests in companies which may become a discussion during cabinet from entering into those discussions or in any policy declarations thereon? Basically, will he start right now to implement one of the basic recommendations of the Parker commission report?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, that happens now.

MS BARRETT: Mr. Speaker, if I heard him right, he said, "That happens now."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MS BARRETT: Yeah, I understand.

Is the Premier saying that he already tells the minister of forestry, the technology minister, and so forth to get out of the cabinet meeting when any subject comes up related to the Alberta Energy Company? Is that what he's saying?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. The time for question period has expired. Is there unanimous agreement to complete this line of questioning?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I've dealt with this several times over the past few days. The ministers declare their ownership.

MS BARRETT: Mr. Speaker, let me ask the Premier this. If he's already saying, "Leave the room when these subjects come up; don't participate in the discussion," then what's this so-called review about? Which is it, Mr. Premier?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I find the question remarkably inept, I guess is the best word for it. Because we've already discussed in the House, in response to the Member for Edmonton-Gold Bar, the need from time to time to always see if any judgment matters such as conflict-of-interest guidelines, or legislation, for that matter, such as the Legislative Assembly Act, should be looked at to see that while you think it is very good,

you nevertheless perhaps could improve on it. I told the House on June 30, and I even told the member's leader today -- it's remarkable that they are both asking the same question; again you wonder about the research dollars -- that it's always possible that there may be by some review, either direct or independent, that you can improve something in a judgment matter such as conflict-of-interest guidelines. I made that commitment to the Member for Edmonton-Gold Bar. Maybe the hon. Member for Edmonton-Highlands is upset because the Member for Edmonton-Gold Bar beat her to the punch.

MS BARRETT: Tell the truth, Don; he participated in that decision.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please.

Might we have unanimous consent to revert to the Introduction of Special Guests?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Contrary? Agreed.

Hon. Minister of Economic Development and Trade.

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

MR. ELZINGA: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and thank you to my colleagues for allowing me the opportunity to introduce a number of friends that I'm delighted are here with us in the Legislative Assembly. There is a group from the Sherwood Park nursing home, and rather than go through them on an individual name basis, let me indicate to them the delight of this Legislative Assembly that they could be here to witness question period with us today, and to indicate to Mr. Smith that I hope he has many enjoyable hours with the cards. I would ask those of you that can, because there are a couple in wheelchairs, to rise and the others to wave so that we can extend to you a very warm welcome of this Legislative Assembly.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark, on a point of order.

MR. MITCHELL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to debate a point of order under section 495 of *Beauchesne*. This section deals with the requirement that a minister present, or any member present, documents cited. I refer specifically to section 495(1), 495(2), and 495(7). Section 495(1) says:

A Minister is not at liberty to read or quote from a despatch . . . without being prepared to lay it on the Table.

Section 495(2) is broader in defining what that means:

It has been admitted that a document which has been cited ought to be laid upon the Table of the House.

The fact is that the minister cited a document, a communication with the company, about not proceeding to construct -- that is, to excavate or to clear the land -- without proper environmental approvals. A communication can be construed as a document. If it is not a document -- that is, if the minister has not put it in writing -- then we have an even more serious problem. Considering that the last time the minister asked the company to do something -- that was to delay its public meetings -- it didn't do

it, another verbal communication would be absolutely meaningless. I have enough confidence in this minister, as limited as my confidence is, that he would at least put that kind of communication in writing.

If he put it in writing, then I refer him to section 495(7).

When a letter, even though it may have been written originally as a private letter. . .

As he said, maybe it's a private letter.

. . . becomes part of a record of a department . . .

I would assume that this letter would be put on a file of correspondence with Alberta-Pacific and therefore is a record of the department.

. . . it becomes a public document, and if quoted by a minister in debate, must be tabled upon request.

Mr. Speaker, I am requesting that it be tabled now.  
[interjections]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. The hon. member has made extensive reference to *Beauchesne* 495, which contains seven subsections, but I believe the Chair feels that subsection 5, which he did not mention, is really applicable in this case. Subsection 5 says:

To be cited, a document must be quoted or specifically used to influence debate. The admission that a document exists or the reading of the salutation or address of a letter does not constitute citing.

So it is the ruling of the Chair that this letter was not specifically cited by the hon. Minister of the Environment.

MR. MITCHELL: Point of order. The fact is that it did influence debate, one; hopefully it would influence . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Sit down.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. Order. The Chair has made a ruling, and that is the ruling. There is no further debate on it, hon. member.

#### **ORDERS OF THE DAY**

#### head: **WRITTEN QUESTIONS**

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I would move that Written Question 148 stand and retain its place on the Order Paper.

[Motion carried]

145. Mr. Wright asked the government the following question: With regard to the agreement between the government of Alberta and the Canadian Security and Intelligence Service, CSIS, concerning the release of information held by departments of the government to the service,

- (1) what policy, if any, exists governing the exercise by ministers or other officials of the decision whether or not and to what extent to comply with requests for disclosure of information collected under statutory authority;
- (2) will the government table copies of any such policy in the Legislative Assembly; and
- (3) where CSIS has been provided with information pursuant to the terms of the agreement, in each case



- (a) on what date was the request for information received,
- (b) on what date was the requested information provided, either in whole or in part,
- (c) what was the name and position of the person who authorized the disclosure of the information,
- (d) what department or departments provided the information, and
- (e) pursuant to the provisions of which section of which Act or Acts had the information originally been collected?

MR. ROSTAD: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table the answer to Question 145.

146. Mr. Wright asked the government the following question: Prior to the conclusion of the agreement between the government of Alberta and the Canadian Security and Intelligence Service, CSIS, concerning the release or otherwise of confidential information held by departments of the government to the service, was any otherwise confidential information ever disclosed by the government to the CSIS or its predecessor intelligence organizations or any other security and/or intelligence organizations, and where such disclosures occurred, in each such instance,
- (1) what was the name of the agency from which the request was received,
  - (2) on what date was the request for information received,
  - (3) on what date was the requested information provided either in whole or in part,
  - (4) what was the name and position of the person who authorized the granting of the request for information either in whole or in part,
  - (5) under what statutory authority was the request granted either in whole or in part, and
  - (6) pursuant to the provisions of which section or sections of which Act or Acts had the requested information originally been collected?

MR. ROSTAD: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table the answer to Question 146.

#### head: **MOTIONS FOR RETURNS**

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move that all motions for returns appearing on the Order Paper, except motions for returns 179 and 180, stand and retain their places on the Order Paper.

[Motion carried]

179. Mr. Hawkesworth moved that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing a list of all those assets which comprised the initial portfolio of 354713 Alberta Ltd. at March 31, 1987.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleague the Provincial Treasurer, I advise that the government is prepared to accept the motion for return.

[Motion carried]

180. Mr. Hawkesworth moved that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing a list of all those assets which comprised the initial portfolio of S C Properties Ltd.

MR. HORSMAN: On behalf of my colleague the Provincial Treasurer, I advise that the government is prepared to accept the motion.

[Motion carried]

#### head: **MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS**

206. Moved by Mr. Decore:

Be it resolved that the Legislative Assembly rescind its resolution supporting the Meech Lake Constitutional Accord.

MR. DECORE: Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask that this House repudiate the position it took on the Meech Lake accord. When Canadians reviewed the matters that gave substance to the Constitution Act of 1972, there was a very extensive debate. In fact, I was lucky enough to have participated in that debate as a representative for some hundred or more cultural groups in Canada, specifically with respect to section 27 of the Constitution.

When the position of the government was brought forward, when that Act was brought forward, it was given over to a special task force of Senate and House of Commons representation, and various interest groups, including the one I mentioned my own involvement in, came forward and spoke to the draft legislation. Interest groups said that such and such perhaps was left out of the Constitution Act, or interest groups said that enough attention wasn't paid in this area or that area. You'll recall that women's groups actively spoke out and said that they weren't properly dealt with in the terms of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. Native groups spoke out. Many, many groups spoke out to show the flaws in the legislation that was intended or the omissions in that draft legislation that hadn't been considered. Nobody can be perfect. Nobody can set out exactly the legislation that will meet all of the needs and desires of Canadians. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that that system is perfected by having proper public input, proper public review of something so necessary and basic as those matters which pertain to our Constitution, the Canadian Constitution.

Now, Mr. Speaker, not very long ago I asked the Premier of our province to define "distinct society." I would like to suggest that he had great difficulty in giving a proper definition of that term or that clause. It would appear now that the Premier of British Columbia has grave misgivings about those two words "distinct society." It would appear that his interpretation must be at variance or must be different than the Premier of our province. The Premier of Manitoba has expressed concern about those two words "distinct society" and says that he needs time in the province of Manitoba to examine those words, to have hearings, to see what sort of impact that might have on his constituents, on people who may be of a cultural background perhaps other than French and English; he wants to hear from labour unions and business groups. He's had an incredible response in that request. I would like to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that that has been to the benefit of Premier Filmon in helping him to try to understand what these two words "distinct society"

mean and what anything else in that agreement means or pertains to. We now see that the Premier of Newfoundland has expressed misgivings about the Meech Lake accord and has drawn our attention to his misgivings of the words "distinct society." We now see that Mr. McKenna, the Premier of New Brunswick, is worried about the definition of "distinct society."

That is something that should have been resolved and determined and helped through proper review, public review, because I think the difficulties that now are shown to exist in those two words would have come forward. I think there could have been a perfection, because nobody wants to deny the right of Quebec to be happy with its role in Canada. And I should put an asterisk here, Mr. Speaker, to note that Quebec is not left out of the Constitution. That 1982 Supreme Court of Canada case clearly makes it a fact that the province of Quebec has its obligations, is obligated under the Constitution Act of Canada. We didn't do that. I'm suggesting again that that's what happens when you move too quickly on an issue. That's what happens when 11 people perhaps working too late at night, wanting to go home, wanting to get back to their provinces, are prepared to accept something that hasn't had the kind of weighty review that it needs. I think Alberta should go back and have that kind of review, the kind of review that Premier Filmon has taken his province through.

Now, the evidence is clear, Mr. Speaker, that the words "distinct society" have and do give difficulty. The province of Quebec, I would like to suggest, has defined "distinct society" in a way that our Premier and perhaps our minister of inter-governmental affairs didn't contemplate when the Premier of Quebec took the position he and his government did on the language laws of the province of Quebec. I don't think that was contemplated. I don't think Mr. Horsman and Mr. Getty thought that could happen. They were anxious, and I give them respect for attempting to get this matter of Quebec's feeling of wanting to be part of the Canadian constitutional makeup -- I give them credit for attempting to move it along quickly. But sometimes when you move in haste, errors aren't seen, and I think an error has now occurred. I think Quebec is defining "distinct society" in very narrow terms.

I'm worried, Mr. Speaker, that if we got somebody like a Premier Duplessis elected as the Premier of Quebec, he could very well use the override provisions of the Constitution and link it to the accord and the distinct society clause and say, "I don't want any people from Cuba" or "I don't want any people from Jamaica" or "I don't want any people from Senegal" preserving and enhancing their cultural backgrounds, something that section 27 of the Constitution clearly gives us. That override provision, the same one that was used just not very long ago by Mr. Bourassa, could be used to say that a distinct society for Quebec means that we've got to practise the French culture totally and completely and that we've got to practise the French language totally and completely.

Now, I'm sure that when Mr. Horsman and Mr. Getty were dealing with Mr. Bourassa, they didn't think this was possible. But we do have the case that a Duplessis existed in this country when he, with such lack of sensitivity, started dealing with the religious group the Jehovah's Witnesses, when he tried to legislate their having any sorts of rights or privileges to practise their religion. It's a fact. These words "distinct society" can give this same sort of difficulty. To a lesser degree we see it in the sign laws that were passed.

Mr. Speaker, women's groups have spoken out as well. The

council on the status of women nationally has spoken out and said that they fear that the same thing could happen to them in the context of override and distinct society. Native groups have spoken out and said that there is a possibility of jeopardy to their way of life, to their culture. Certainly multicultural groups have spoken out strongly and said that they're very concerned about the possibility of their being shoved out, not being allowed to preserve and enhance their culture. So in substance, this Meech Lake accord goes wanting. It doesn't give us what I think the signatories to this agreement intended.

Mr. Speaker, the other reason we should repudiate Meech Lake is for reasons of priority in dealing with issues that affect all of Canada. For many years, perhaps 15 or 20 years, the Canadian political scene has been dominated by issues of Quebec. I'm sure we can all remember those words, "What does Quebec want?" That's something that went over and over through each year for perhaps 15 or 20 years. What did we have to do, as the remainder of Canada, for Quebec to make them feel comfortable, to ensure that they preserved and enhanced their language and cultural rights? It was appropriate to do that. It was timely to do that. It was necessary to do that. In fact, it was so necessary that the country perhaps faced the possibility of an explosion. But it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that after 15 or 20 years Canada has to look at some other issues that to people in other parts of Canada may be as important, or more important, in their minds as those issues that have been dealt with before.

Mr. Speaker, one of the issues that Albertans have rallied to is the establishment of the Triple E Senate. I don't think it's fair for -- Mr. Wright is noting, in fact, that not all Albertans, I take it, have rallied to this. The majority certainly have. And I don't think it's fair to say that Mr. Getty or Mr. Horsman or his party or another party have been the sole dreamers and believers in this initiative. I think this initiative started with some farmers, with some businessmen who were able to convince Liberals and Conservatives and NDPs. In fact, resolutions were passed in Manitoba by the Liberal Party there affirming, confirming this concept of the Triple E. And again our party nationally affirmed and accepted the concept of Triple E.

Lots of work has yet to be done on Triple E. I think that agenda is an important agenda. Albertans think it's a very important issue to be dealt with by all of Canada. I guess we feel it's important, Mr. Speaker, because we feel that we've been getting the short end of the stick economically. Every time we reach for the stick, we get the short end. I talked about this a little earlier when I was asking questions of the hon. minister of intergovernmental affairs with respect to whether he's done some analysis after the professors Mansell and Percy analysis. That showed that Albertans over a five-year period, 1980 to '85, have paid out much more money to central government than central government has given back to us in any form whatsoever. That's been a disparity. I think that disparity continues today. I think that's been a historical disparity for probably as long as Alberta's been here.

Canadian Press statistics not long ago noted that in terms of economic regional development grants, in spite of the fact that there was a boom in eastern Canada and a very serious recession in western Canada, Quebec and Ontario were getting the lion's share of those economic regional funds. No consideration was given to the fact that there was a recession in western Canada. The Macdonald commission said that Confederation was out of whack. They noted that if Alberta had left Confederation in

1981, there would have been a \$21 billion increase in the income of Albertans and a very substantial decrease in the income of people in Ontario. Economists tell us that that situation is probably half today; Alberta would increase its income for its people by about \$10 billion a year. So this is an important issue to us.

But again I suggest the difficulty was allowed to arise when Mr. Horsman and Mr. Getty signed this agreement which calls for unanimity, which calls for every province and the federal government to accept the terms of any constitutional change, to accept Senate reform. Now, Mr. Horsman and Mr. Getty are looking at provinces that can't even agree to signing the Meech Lake accord, let alone a Senate reform initiative. How could you have ever believed that unanimity could have worked under those circumstances? How could you believe, Mr. Speaker, how could anybody believe that Quebec would give up power that it has enjoyed for eons in Canada? And how could one expect that Ontario would give up power to Alberta or to Saskatchewan through the Senate reform initiative? Although the intent was grand, although the intent was noble, I think the facts now clearly show that we got snookered, that we were taken.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it's time to admit that we made a mistake. I suggest that if we repudiate Meech Lake, there will be such a fast movement to get Senate reform going by Quebec and Ontario, who are the main proponents of Meech, that we'll be surprised. And I think that with some adjustments, a parallel agreement that's being suggested by Mr. Filmon and others, we can perfect that which is imperfect in Meech now. Mr. Speaker, we have to insist that the negotiators that go back to do this say very clearly and categorically that Senate reform has to be done now, not that we'll talk about it in the future, not that we'll have a session once a year to talk about it, but that we're going to do it, and that the word "effective" -- we're going to start working on that word now to make sure that Alberta and Saskatchewan and B.C. and every other province are happy with what that word "effective" is going to mean.

I think we got snowed, and we're being delayed. We can overcome that difficulty of delay by repudiating and getting this matter moving much more quickly. So, Mr. Speaker, I'm asking the minister of intergovernmental affairs to show some leadership on this issue, to show that Albertans can get what they want, that they won't continue to get the short end of the stick as they've been getting -- or to prove to this House that all of the things that have happened in legislation and the concerns of women and natives and minorities are wrong -- and that Senate reform is going to happen in the kind of terms that we want it to happen by a specified scheduled time line, not by something that's airy-fairy and wishy-washy.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to enter the debate in this Assembly on the subject of Meech Lake. Because of the nature of the motion proposed by the hon. Member for Edmonton-Glengarry, it is quite clear that all aspects of the Meech Lake accord are a free game for public debate in the course of this afternoon. I think it would be useful therefore, Mr. Speaker, to take the hon. leader of the opposition and members of the Assembly back through the process as to what actually took place leading up to this proposed constitutional amendment.

Now, I agree with those who have said, including the hon. member, that constitutions of Canada should not be changed

quickly or without careful consideration or appropriate discussion and careful analysis. That's quite true. Nonetheless, a Constitution cannot, like any other set of laws, remain frozen in time forever. As said Lord Tweedsmuir some years ago: it is like the law, an elastic garment which clothes the nation, and it must grow with the nation. It must not be too tight, or it will bind the nation and it will rupture, causing disintegration within society, and it must not be too loose, or it will trip up the nation. It is therefore an extremely important part of the national existence, the Constitution of our country, the rules by which we govern ourselves as a nation. But within a federal state such as Canada in this Confederation of ours, it is even more difficult to develop a Constitution which will provide the type of garment we need to clothe the nation.

We are all aware of what took place leading up to the Constitution Act of 1982. Members who were in the Assembly at the time will recall the intense debate which took place not only in here but throughout Alberta, and the anguish felt by Albertans at the unilateral move being proposed by the then Liberal Prime Minister of Canada, Pierre Elliott Trudeau, supported by the hon. Member for Edmonton-Glengarry, to force upon Alberta a Constitution which would have centralized beyond all imagination the power of government in the hands of the central government in Ottawa. Now, we fought off successfully -- and with the help of NDP governments, I might add; in the adjoining province of Saskatchewan, one clearly distinguished Premier of that province -- the efforts to bring about that constitutional change, which was rejected by eight of the 10 provinces. Of course, it cut across party lines, and we found ourselves at odds with Conservative governments in the provinces of Ontario, Newfoundland, and New Brunswick. I'm sorry; I must correct myself: Newfoundland was quite on side. And the eight provinces together fought this matter through the courts to the Supreme Court of Canada and, I may say, Mr. Speaker, in the courts of Westminster, in anticipation of this matter arriving on their desks with divisions from Canada's old parent.

Well, I won't go back through all the history leading up to what took place, but it was a period of intense debate. The Constitution Act of 1982, when it was finally approved, was approved by the federal Parliament and nine of the 10 provinces. And that was considered to be good enough, according to the judgment of the Supreme Court of Canada that there was enough provincial participation at that time to legitimize the Constitution for Canada. It is quite true that the courts have said that Quebec is not left out of the Constitution. Of course it's not left out of the Constitution, because it must be part of it as a province of Canada. But the fact is that Quebec was subject to the Constitution of Canada rather than believing that as a province it was fully part of it. And I say, Mr. Speaker, that there is a vast difference between being subject to a Constitution and feeling that you are part and parcel of that Constitution. It is not a satisfactory situation to have any of the partners in Confederation left out in the sense that they do not feel fully part and parcel of the Constitution.

So what took place after 1982? Well, an election in Quebec took place, at which time a Liberal government under the leadership of Premier Bourassa was elected. That government set out, in consultation with the federal Parliament and with every other province, to develop a set of requests by which Quebec could find itself fully part of the Constitution of Canada. Those consultations took place over a number of months and were the subject of discussions with individual provinces and with the

federal government. As a result of those discussions a conference, the Premiers' Conference, was held here in Edmonton in the fall of 1986, in August. At that time the Edmonton declaration was issued. Our Premier chaired that Premiers' Conference, and it led to the Edmonton declaration, by which it was determined that Quebec's five requests or proposals would be the subject of constitutional discussion between the provinces and the federal government, with the hope that it would lead to a constitutional accord.

Alberta, because of our intense interest in constitutional reform, made certain that our number one constitutional priority, that of Senate reform, became the number one constitutional agenda item to be determined immediately upon the resumption within the constitutional family and framework of Canada of all the partners in Confederation. We believe strongly as a government and continue to believe strongly that it would be entirely improper, unjust, and unwarranted to force upon any province or partner in this Confederation Senate reform that was not acceptable to that partner. Now, that's what partnership is all about.

So we knew that it would take intense discussion. And we knew this as well: that under the amending formula in the Constitution as presently constituted, it would be possible to bring about Senate reform with the consent of the Parliament of Canada and seven of the 10 provinces containing at least 50 percent of the population of Canada. Indeed, an attempt to bring about Senate reform which would truly have emasculated the Canadian Senate -- and there are those who think that would be a good thing -- but which would forever, in my view, have prevented meaningful Senate reform from taking place was indeed proposed and was agreed to in principle by enough Premiers that it would have seen the light of day despite Quebec not being part of the constitutional process. That would have come about had not an election taken place in Ontario. The election of a minority Liberal government scuttled that proposed Senate constitutional change.

So we knew that that could have taken place, and we therefore went to the table determined to do certain things. Number one, we wanted to make sure that immediately following the resumption of all the partners in Confederation as full participants in the constitutional process, when we came next to the table certain things would be met. Number one, Senate reform would be the next constitutional item requiring approval before anything else could be done in the Constitution, and that is in this Meech Lake Constitutional Accord. We also determined this: that when we next moved to the constitutional table, we would do so only -- only -- as equals at that constitutional table. We insisted that the principle of equality of the provinces be built into the next round of constitutional discussions. Now, there are those, including the leader of the Liberal Party who just spoke in this Assembly, who are prepared to give up that principle of equality of the provinces and to send Alberta to the constitutional table as a second-class province. That is what the Liberal leader has proposed to the Assembly this afternoon. He is prepared to abandon the principle of equality that we fought for and obtained within the Constitutional Accord which was passed by this Assembly unanimously. Now, I know that the Liberals were not in the House.

MR. DECORE: We don't agree with it.

MR. HORSMAN: Ah. They didn't know whether the bells rang to bring them into the House or what they were ringing for.

Maybe they thought it was teatime or nap time or something. Who knows? Perhaps it was because they didn't want to embarrass their national leader and their national party. Now, the leader of the Liberal Party has made reference . . .

MR. DECORE: We're embarrassing them now, by saying we don't agree with them.

MR. HORSMAN: Ah. Indeed, you should be embarrassed, not your national leader, quite frankly. In this case he has shown, I think, remarkable leadership, because he recognizes the principle of equality of the provinces. That's part of Meech Lake. Don't forget that. I'm going to keep on hammering home the point, and maybe I'll get it through the heads of the Liberal . . .

MR. TAYLOR: Devine is backing out.

MR. HORSMAN: Oh, and I've wakened up the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon. It's nice to have him part again. Oh, it's wonderful, Mr. Speaker, when he brays. His beautiful voice drifts across the Assembly. Unfortunately, not much sense to it, but nonetheless. Now that he's awake, let me just repeat to him this. I'm going to keep on pounding this point home. When we next go to the constitutional table to discuss Senate reform, we are going to go there as equals.

MR. DECORE: You're never going to get it.

MR. HORSMAN: Ah, the leader of the Liberal Party is nervous and anguished about this point, because he knows very well that he is prepared to give up equality for second-class status at the constitutional table on Senate reform. He is. And I'm going to keep on making him nervous in this Assembly and wherever in Alberta. [interjections] Well, I'm getting to them, aren't I, Mr. Speaker? Isn't that interesting? When you make a point they don't like, they start making noise. Well, keep it up.

MR. DECORE: We will.

MR. HORSMAN: I know you will, because that's all you can do when a point is being made that you don't agree with; you make noise.

Okay, let me repeat: when we next go to the constitutional table to discuss Senate Reform, it will be as an equal participant with the federal government, with Quebec, and with Ontario. Now, the Liberal leader today said this: how could anyone believe that Quebec and Ontario will give up power to the other provinces? He said that, didn't he? Well, how could anybody believe, in this Assembly today, that if Quebec and Ontario wanted to deny Senate reform under the current amending formula, they would have without any doubt an absolute veto on doing so? Yet he's prepared to accept that. He's prepared to turn Albertans into second-class citizens, just like his former federal leader Pierre Elliott Trudeau tried to do to this province time and time again. That's the fact Mr. Speaker, and I'm not going to let him forget it as this debate goes on, as it will during the course of the next time.

Well, we've heard some other things today. We've heard about the distinct society. I want to take a few moments to talk about the distinct society. One of the things I want to add to what our Premier indicated the other day made Quebec a distinct province within Canada is this: that unlike every other province

and the two territories, Quebec has a civil code which is not based upon on the English common law, which was based upon the French civil code. The hon. leader of the Liberal Party is a lawyer. One would have thought that he would have known that that was the case. I can hardly imagine anyone learned in the law would not understand how distinct, in fact, that makes Quebec within Confederation, a very, very distinct feature of Quebec within the Canadian family. Despite that distinctiveness, it has worked. It has worked since Confederation, hasn't it? Has it bothered Albertans or Ontarians or New Brunswickers, the fact that Quebec has had the civil code of France as the basis of their civil law as opposed to the common law foundation which we have in every other province? Hardly. Yet it is a very major distinct feature of Quebec society. So I want to add that element so the Leader of the Opposition, who obviously didn't know it, because he would have mentioned it -- I want to add that to enlighten him.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: He's not the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. HORSMAN: Oh, I beg your pardon. Did I say the Leader of the Opposition? I very much regret having said that. If he ever gets that far, I'd be surprised. But in any event, that is a very major element.

Now, the concern about this notion of distinct society and what it means has unfortunately been tied in by some in Canada, and today by the leader of the Liberal Party, to the use of the notwithstanding clause which exists in the Constitution of Canada today. The Constitution Act Canada passed in 1982 provides a notwithstanding clause. Now, it does so because the framers of the Constitution Act of 1982, including Alberta, fought for and obtained it to preserve the supremacy of Parliament over the appointed courts. That is why the notwithstanding clause is in the document.

MR. DECORE: What?

MR. HORSMAN: The leader of the Liberal Party says, "What?" Well, let me repeat it for him. The notwithstanding clause is in this Constitution to provide for the supremacy of the parliaments of Canada over the appointed courts. Now, the leader of the Liberal Party knows all about how courts are appointed. He knew all about it before the change of government in 1984. He knew all about it. He knew how the courts were appointed. Well, I for one as a parliamentarian am not prepared to submit the will of the people through the elected process to appointed courts. Parliament must remain supreme. That's why the notwithstanding clause is in this Constitution. It was fought for and it was there because the provinces insisted on it, and I can assure you that the leader of the government of Saskatchewan at the time, Premier Blakeney, was as strong in support of that as was Premier Lougheed. So that's why it's there.

Now, it was used, and I think unfortunately perhaps from our perspective here, in Quebec recently in order to protect language laws which from our perspective do not appear to affect properly the laws affecting the English language within Quebec. But I say this to this Assembly, Mr. Speaker: that's their business. It is the business of the Assembly of the province of Quebec to make laws respecting the people of Quebec, just the same as it is the responsibility of us as elected members of this Assembly to make laws respecting language for this Assembly, as we did last

year, for the people of Alberta. Mr. Speaker, I said it outside the Assembly and I will say it here: if I had to recommend to the members of this Assembly to use the notwithstanding clause to protect the Language Act which we passed last year, I would do so. I would do so, and I would go to the people of Alberta and have no hesitation about telling them why I did so.

So to mix that into the distinct society clause and to heap opprobrium upon Quebec for having done so may be popular, may be popular here, may be popular in British Columbia or other provinces, but I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that it is the prerogative of the parliament of Quebec to make decisions with respect to those laws. That's why the notwithstanding clause is in the Constitution Act, and I for one will fight to see that it stays there. But it is not part of the Meech Lake Constitutional Accord of 1987. Those who try and blend the two together, as the leader of the Liberal Party tried to do today, are misleading the people of Alberta and the people of Canada. It is not part of the Meech Lake Constitutional Accord. It is not, in the view of our best constitutional experts and lawyers, part of the distinct society clause. It is a red herring.

Now, we had some additional comments today with respect to immigration matters from the leader of the Liberal Party which are so farfetched as to defy imagination. I don't think he's read the Meech Lake Constitutional Accord with respect to immigration, because what it does quite clearly is provide an immigration section which was a great gain, quite frankly, and constitutionalized the principles of the Cullen-Couture agreement. Now, Mr. Cullen was a Liberal minister of the federal government.

MR. TAYLOR: Ten different policies.

MR. HORSMAN: Ten different policies, says the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon. What is wrong with having 10 different policies in a country with 10 equal partners? What is wrong with having 10 different policies?

MR. DECORE: What about letting whites only into one province? Is that good?

MR. HORSMAN: Nonsense. That would be constitutionally -- there's nothing in this Constitution which undermines, in the distinct society clause, the provisions of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. There is not, and anybody who tries to stretch it is really stretching it along the lines of the stretching job tried to be perpetrated by the Liberal leader's former federal leader, Pierre Elliott Trudeau, when he appeared before the House of Commons Senate committee. My goodness. He was all against the Meech Lake accord. Do you know why? I'll tell you why. He was against it because it restored to the provinces their proper role within Confederation, particularly with regard to cost-shared programs. That's the fact, and it struck and strikes at the heart of the centralists, who want to govern Canada from made-in-Ottawa policies. We saw as a province, as no other province did, what happened when that took place under the national energy program. Sure, Pierre Elliott Trudeau and the leader of the Liberal Party of Alberta don't like this accord. They don't like it because it restores and makes clear the fact that this is a country composed of equal partners within Confederation and will not subject Alberta again to second-class status, as advocated today in this Assembly by the leader of the Liberal Party of this province. And that's a fact, Mr. Speaker.

Now there are other provinces who are in the process of reviewing this matter. It is quite within their prerogative for them to do so, quite within their prerogative.

MR. HORSMAN: You know, I'm not going to pretend to tell you what will happen as a result of all those reconsiderations or discussions which take place. Obviously, elections have taken place in three of the provinces since this accord was signed. I look at it, and I see the signature there of Brian Peckford, of Newfoundland. There's a new Premier there. It has of course been ratified in the Newfoundland Assembly. It is possible that a new government might take it back and have it reviewed. I see the signature of Howard Pawley, an NDP Premier of Manitoba, no longer there. That's what happens in Canadian parliaments. I also see the signature of Richard B. Hatfield, no longer there because of an election process within his own province.

MR. DECORE: He lost.

MR. HORSMAN: But he did not lose the election because of Meech Lake, and if anybody suggests that, they are really imagining things and dreaming in technicolour.

I've had discussions with each of the governments, Mr. Speaker, as a result of my responsibilities as chairman of the task force on behalf of the Premiers reviewing the subject of Senate reform. More will be discussed on that issue during the weeks and months ahead as this Legislative Assembly meets to discuss matters such as the Senatorial Selection Act, so I won't go into that today. But I've met with those other provinces, and I'm hoping they will come forward in their review with good suggestions as to how we can continue constitutional reform. It's obvious that constitutional reform is not at an end. As I said earlier, this elastic garment which clothes the nation must continue to grow.

There are other things which must be dealt with once Meech Lake is part of the Constitution of Canada. The subject of provinces: how the territorial governments will eventually emerge into provincial status will be the subject of debate and discussion. There will be issues relating to aboriginal rights which must, of course, be dealt with. But I say this, Mr. Speaker, as well. Leaving it to the Legislatures of the provinces to do so in the proper and effective way to deal with the circumstances which exist within their own provinces is the best way to do it, rather than having something imposed upon us by the government of Canada. What we did with respect to the Metis settlements and the legislation which will come forward to be constitutionalized affecting the Metis peoples of Alberta is the proper way of dealing with constitutional matters within the realm of provincial government responsibility, rather than have constitutional change forced upon us either by the central government or by other governments sufficient in number under the current amending formula to deal with aboriginal rights.

I just say this too. The notion has been put about that all future constitutional amendments will require the consent of the federal Parliament and all other provinces. That is not the case, Mr. Speaker. The Constitution Act of 1982 provides now that there are five matters which can only be amended with the consent of all parliaments in Canada. What was added were those matters which relate to the unanimity or equality provision:

- (a) a principle of proportionate representation of the provinces in the House of Commons . . .

- (b) the powers of the Senate and the method of selecting Senators;
- (c) the number of members by which a province is entitled to be represented in the Senate and the residence qualifications of Senators;
- (d) [aspects of] the Supreme Court of Canada;
- (e) the extension of existing provinces . . . and
- (f) . . . the [creation] of new provinces.

Now, those were the things which were added to those things which already require the approval of all parliaments. But everything else in terms of future constitutional change, Mr. Speaker, will be done under the amending formula I already referred to, which requires the consent of the Parliament of Canada and seven of the 10 provinces with at least 50 percent of the population.

So the notion that all future constitutional change will require the consent of all parliaments is rubbish. Yet that is one of the things that is put about by the opponents of Meech Lake. For example, the constitutional change which will come about as a result of the Metis settlements will be done by an amendment requiring the approval of the federal parliament and this parliament here. That's provided for in the Constitution of Canada. That won't require the consent or approval of any of the other provinces, because it affects only the Constitution of the province of Alberta within this constitutional framework in which we operate.

Well, Mr. Speaker, my time is up. I just conclude by saying that if the leader of the Liberal Party wants to abandon what was won for Alberta, to send us back to second-class status at the constitutional table, I for one will not support his motion.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I remind hon. members how the Meech Lake accord came about. It was in response to the five points that Mr. Bourassa set forth as being the points that, if conceded, would allow the province of Quebec to join the community of the other provinces of Canada in agreement with the 1982 amendment to the Constitution. Those points were

- (1) recognition of Quebec as a distinct society; (2) a greater provincial role in immigration; (3) a provincial role in appointments to the Supreme Court of Canada; (4.) limitations on the federal spending power, and (5) a veto for Quebec on constitutional amendments.

Mr. Speaker, I remind hon. members that that, compared to what had been the demands by the province of Quebec, was a modest menu indeed, and unless we grasp the opportunity of responding to that initiative, it may be lost forever. Therefore, it is important that the Meech Lake accord, in some form or the other, be achieved. Just to throw the thing overboard is not helping anybody, in my respectful submission.

That is not to say that there are not parts of it which need improvement, and that was our approach the last time round. There are a number of points which have been identified as in need of improvement. Not all of them are of equal weight, but that is something else. The fact is that the accord was not all that bad. It was, in fact, a remarkably creditable achievement in the 19 hours or whatever it was that the Premiers took to make their response to these five points, which basically consisted in saying, "Well, if it's all right for the province of Quebec, then it must be all right for the rest of us," plus some extra things thrown in like Senate reform. So that is what we feel.

The last time round, which was in the fall of 1987, there was a certain amount of urgency to get matters as clear as possible before the pending federal election. That urgency has passed

now, and we believe we can have another go at trying to get some of those improvements. Some of them, I believe, deal with matters that were almost an oversight, which is understandable in the short length of time the matter was considered and considering that it was not considered widely outside legislative Chambers in its short history.

If hon. members will look at the amendment I am about to propose, they will note that there are a couple which, I think, probably could almost be nodded through, if they alone were what was bothering people. Certainly that applies to number 4, "that the words 'or territory' should be added after the word 'province' . . ." This deals with the right which I think most hon. members would consider reasonable: that the territories should be consulted about appointments to the Senate or to the Supreme Court of Canada.

MR. DECORE: A point of order.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The leader of the Liberal Party is rising on a point of order.

MR. DECORE: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member for Edmonton-Strathcona has now put before the Assembly his intended motion and he is now speaking to that motion. The amendment calls in the first sentence to add at the end of it "and replace the resolution with one affirming the accord . . ." et cetera, et cetera.

I would draw the Speaker's attention to page 176 of *Beauchesne*, section 578.

(1) An amendment proposing a direct negative, though it may be covered up by verbiage, is out of order . . .

(3) An amendment approving part of a motion and disapproving the remainder is out of order.

I had a copy of the *Oxford Dictionary* brought to me, and just for the benefit of my friend from the Strathcona constituency I'd like to define for him the word "repudiate." Oxford states it means: to disown, to disavow, to reject, to refuse to recognize or obey, to discharge.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that this amendment and all the discussion that my friend has made and alluded to with respect to the amendment is out of order.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. member. I would refer you to *Beauchesne*, citation 572, at page 175, which says:

An amendment to alter the main question, by substituting a proposition with the opposite conclusion, is not an expanded negative and may be moved.

But I would invite the hon. Member for Edmonton-Strathcona to move his amendment if he is going to be speaking about it. He is not limited about speaking to the main motion, but at the same time I think we should have it on the floor if he is referring to it in his remarks.

MR. WRIGHT: Well, certainly, Mr. Speaker, I can move it any time. I was just referring to a subject matter which conveniently was set out in the proposed amendment. Further on your point of order, if I may respectfully concur with what has fallen from you, Mr. Speaker, is also the fact that there's nothing wrong about accepting a motion and adding to it, which is all that's happening here. But I do move this amendment, Mr. Speaker, and will deal with that now, that Motion 206 on today's Order Paper be amended by adding at the end of it:

and replace the resolution with one affirming the accord var-

ied by a protocol designed to require negotiation of the following amendments to the accord:

1. that comprehensive public hearings both nationally and provincially be required for these and future amendments to the Constitution;
2. that there be no change to the amending formula in the present Constitution as it affects the formation of new provinces;
3. that the Constitution be amended to provide that Senate reform, including abolition, be made on the votes of Parliament and the legislatures of two-thirds of the provinces comprising at least 50 percent of the population of Canada, i.e. to conform to the present general amending formula;
4. that the words "or territory" should be added after the word "province" in sections 6 and 2 of the schedule to the accord, relating respectively to section 101(c)(1), (4), and section 25(1), (2) of the Constitution Act of 1867;
5. that there be included in the accord a commitment to hold a First Ministers' Conference to discuss aboriginal rights, in particular self-government, by amending section 13 of the schedule to the accord to add a new subsection (c) to section 50(2)(c) of the Constitution Act, 1982, and renumbering section 50(2)(c), section 50(2)(d), and the addition of a new section 50(3) to ensure that the Prime Minister invites representatives of aboriginal peoples and territorial governments to participate in all matters that affect aboriginal rights;
6. that section 16 of the schedule to the accord be amended by adding to the list of those provisions of the Constitution not affected by the provisions of the accord, section 28 of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms;
7. that for the words in section 7 of the schedule "is compatible with the national objectives" there be substituted the words "meets national standards";
8. that the Senate be abolished and consequential amendments made to allow Parliament to make laws on the vote of the House of Commons alone, until meaningful Senate reform shall have taken place;
9. that section 1 of the schedule to the accord be amended by striking out section 2(2) and substituting "The role of the Parliament of Canada to preserve and promote, and the role of the provincial legislatures to preserve, the fundamental characteristics of Canada referred to in paragraph (1)(a), is affirmed";
10. that section 2(1) of paragraph 1 of the schedule to the accord should be amended by adding the words "a multicultural" before the word "Canada" where it last occurs.

The subject matter is nearly all confined to the accord as it stands. In two respects it goes beyond that but is intimately connected with the process. The first

that comprehensive public hearings both nationally and provincially be required for these and future amendments to the Constitution

arises from the very process that we saw happen with the Meech Lake Accord in which there was no necessity for that at all and, in fact, very little of it. The other one is abolition of the Senate in 8. Since Senate reform is part of the Meech Lake accord, it's germane but goes considerably beyond what the Meech Lake accord speaks of.

Taking them in order, Mr. Speaker . . .

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

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Glengarry on a point of order.

MR. DECORE: You've brought to my attention 572, which I interpret as an amendment intending to alter the main question. We're not talking about altering the main question; we're talking about an amendment which directly flies in the face of the motion. The motion calls for "repudiate": for disavowing, for rejecting, for doing away with the Meech Lake Accord. What my learned friend is now proposing is that we keep the Meech Lake accord. That is not in any way, shape, or form acceptable. It's not friendly. It's not in any way altering an aspect; it intends to keep the Meech Lake accord, which the motion says should be rejected out of hand.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hon. member, I believe what you're attempting to do is to make a point of order on the point of order. I have interpreted 572 as allowing this amendment to be in order.

I hesitate to also at this time interrupt the Member for Edmonton-Strathcona, but the time allotted for this item of business has now expired.

MR. WRIGHT: I move to adjourn the debate on this point, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you. It's been moved by the hon. Member for Edmonton-Strathcona that this item of business be adjourned. All those in favour, please say aye.

HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Opposed, please say no. Carried.

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

**Bill 205**  
**An Act to Provide for**  
**Equal Pay for Work of Equal Value**

MS M. LAING: Mr. Speaker, I rise today to present to this Assembly for its approval, Bill 205, An Act to Provide for Equal Pay for Work of Equal Value, a principle that work would be evaluated in terms of its inherent value and that payment would be in accord with that value. It would apply to the employees in the public service sectors, employees of employers with contracts with the Crown in right of Alberta, and boards and commissions of the Crown.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to read a story that speaks to the crux of the matter of this Bill, and I will file for the information of the members of the Assembly copies of it. I quote:

John Jones earned good wages from a firm of outfitters by braiding military tunics. He fell ill and was allowed by the firm to continue his work in his own home. He taught his wife his trade, and as his illness became gradually more severe she

did more and more of the work until presently she did it all. But as long as he lived it was taken to the firm as his work and paid for accordingly.

When, however, it became quite clear, John Jones being dead and buried, that it could not be his work, Mrs. John Jones was obliged to own that it was hers, and the price paid for it by the firm was immediately reduced to two-thirds of the amount paid when it was supposed to be her husband's.

Mr. Speaker, I would first describe the context in which this Bill is presented. I would then suggest ways in which the legislation can be enacted and address the many arguments presented by the naysayers in this Assembly, in the business community, and from right-wing institutes such as the Fraser Institute.

[Mr. Jonson in the Chair]

In 1972 Canada ratified Convention 100 of the International Labour Organization, which states, and I have a copy of it here:

Each member shall, by means appropriate to the methods in operation for determining rates of remuneration, promote and, in so far as is consistent with such methods, ensure the application to all workers of the principle of equal remuneration for men and women workers for work of equal value.

Thus nearly two decades ago Canada committed itself to implementation of equal pay for work of equal value. Indeed, such legislation has been passed by the federal government and the governments of Quebec, Manitoba, Ontario, the Yukon, and Prince Edward Island.

Mr. Speaker, nobody would argue that such legislation is the final solution to pay inequities experienced by women, but it is a start. Certainly wage discrimination continues despite the fact that the laws are on the books in some areas. This discrimination indicates how deeply held are the values, prejudices, and practices that underlie the economic injustice experienced by women. Indeed, they go back to Biblical times, and I would quote:

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

In our terms, that's 60 cents on the dollar.

AN HON. MEMBER: About the same.

MS M.LAING: Yes.

And what can this be but a blatant undervaluing of women and women's labour? Stats Canada in 1987 reveals that not much has changed. In 1987 full-time female workers in Alberta earned 65.1 cents on the dollar that full-time male workers earned, lower than the Canadian average of 65.9 cents on the dollar. Translated into dollars, for Canada that's an average earning of \$21,012 for women and \$31,865 for men. In 1987 Alberta statistics indicated that a women with a university degree working full-time earned on average \$31,259, while a man with a university degree working full-time earned \$44,891. Therefore, we see that the woman with a similar education worked full-time for 69 percent of what her male counterpart earned. A woman with a postsecondary certificate earned 64 percent of what a man with similar qualifications earned, and a woman with a university degree earned approximately what a man with an incomplete postsecondary education earned.

We must surely ask: is this fair? Well, some people would say, "Yes, it is, because women get married." And according to



Walter Block of the Fraser Institute, "marriage enhances the husband's income and reduces that of the wife." What Mr. Block and those who think like him seem to be saying is that the economic costs of marriage should be borne by women alone and that it is fair that man's economic earning capacity be enhanced by the fact that he has a support system at home to do society's most valued work, or what we hear is society's most valued work, the caring of children, and that that work frees him to earn to his capacity, while women are put into a situation where the societal norm of marriage and child care means they are economically deprived. The tragedy of this economic deprivation is writ large in times of divorce, when the man's standard of living, according to Statistics Canada, increases by 73 percent and that of the woman and her children decreases by 42 percent. It also means that women and children are entrapped in situations of violence and are denied personal autonomy founded in economic independence.

This attitude, that women experience economic inequality because of time spent raising children, also reveals a lack of appreciation of the value of caring for children and the skills developed labouring in the home: skills of initiative and self reliance, of autonomy and flexibility and scheduling; skills of communication and crisis intervention, of budgeting and problem solving. For all that society does not value this labour when it is done by women, it does consider it quite a marvel when a man manages to care for children and manage a home and applauds the single-parent father who provides for his children while holding down a full-time job, albeit at half again the salary a single-parent mother would earn. More importantly, in the context of the concern that women don't have continuous employment in the paid labour force, we must recognize that men change jobs, they move from one employer to another, and we do not penalize them for not being employed with the same company for all their working life. Indeed, we know that men do require retraining and upgrading to develop new skills that are unrelated to the past skills they have had.

However, if we rule out marriage as the cause for women's lower status in the economic world, we are still confronted with pay inequities. The Fraser Institute determined by looking at Stats Canada figures in 1988 that overall, never-married females earned 93.4 percent of what never-married men earned, an inequity that the institute dismissed. However, few men would believe that they were being fairly treated if they earned 93.4 percent of what their peers earned. We often hear that women are less educated and less committed to their careers, and that's why they are victims of economic disparity. Research shows that this is but another victim-blaming ploy. Traditionally women's work employment careers have had shorter career advancement ladders. For example, women working in the clerical sector have limited opportunities for advancement within that sector, and they face discrimination in obtaining nonclerical jobs and thus advancement out of the traditional female job ghetto. In addition, a Canadian parliamentary task force determined that on average Canadian women in the paid labour force are better educated than their male counterparts and that the patterns of long-term paid labour force participation interruption by women are not as pervasive as is suggested and generally held as an excuse for women's low pay.

Another often-given suggestion that women enter nontraditional areas of labour as a solution to wage inequity denies the value and necessity of labour traditionally done by women and begs the question: who will then do this undervalued but essen-

tial labour? Such a solution fails to address the systemic inequities experienced by women and again blames women for what is a pervasive social injustice. The result of economic inequity is poverty for women and their children. Fifty percent of single-mother-headed families live in poverty -- not at the poverty line as we often hear, Mr. Speaker, but in poverty, with its wide-ranging implications for health and well-being of these women and their children. Sixty-one point eight percent of children in female-single-parent families do not have their basic needs met because they live below the poverty line. It's important to recognize that most of the mothers of these children are working at jobs that epitomize the economic injustice this Bill in some ways addresses. The children, the babies that are born to parents that live in poverty, have lower birth weights. They may evidence permanent brain damage as a result of lack of proper nutrition during the mother's pregnancy. They die at twice the rate of children from more financially secure families. These children suffer more illnesses, educational delays, and an ongoing increased higher death rate than children from the upper classes. This is the price of injustice, a price paid not only by women but by their children, society's children. In the years to come, society at large will have to deal with the long-term effects of the poverty and deprivation these children have experienced.

In response to the call for pay equity legislation, we hear it can't be done. You can't compare apples and oranges. Of course, we know that nutritionists compare apples and oranges all the time in terms of the intrinsic worth of calories and vitamins and minerals present. We also hear that we can't find a system that would work, or that it will mean business will fail or women's employment levels will fall. The one I've heard in this Assembly is that women's initiative will be destroyed. Well, Mr. Speaker, human history is the saga of human beings overcoming the status quo and doing what cannot be done. What is required is a vision of a more just society and the political will to create that society. In my time, seeing I'm old, I have heard the same arguments used against equal pay for equal work legislation, but when it was implemented the business world did not collapse. Vast numbers of women did not lose their jobs, and women's initiative and desire to work was not destroyed. Quite the contrary.

Where equal pay for work of equal value legislation has been brought in in other countries and other provinces, the business community has not been destroyed. The women's employment rate has in fact increased, and women's self-esteem and sense of self-worth has increased so that they have been more willing to move into more advanced career patterns. Pay equity legislation has not meant that women's earnings on average are equal to the earnings of men, but the gap has been narrowed considerably. For example, Australia, which implemented pay equity legislation in 1972, has seen the gap reduced by 18 percentage points. Women's earnings have increased from 62 to 80 percent of men's wages, and increasing numbers of women are employed.

Many schemes have been developed to evaluate equal value or comparable worth, as this legislation has been implemented. Many of these schemes, however, suffer from gender bias because gender bias is so pervasive in our culture. In some cases, skills required to do the work traditionally done by women are ignored or underrated. For example, people skills may be ignored or rated as less valuable than mechanical skills, or equipment traditionally used by men, such as drills and jackhammers, is considered more specialized than equipment traditionally used

by women, such as typewriters, switchboards, and video display terminals. Gender bias must then be studiously avoided as jobs are evaluated in terms of the skills, education, and training required, the effort required, including mental and physical effort, and also initiative and ingenuity, dealing with stress, working conditions, and responsibilities. Such an action must be proactive. Canadian human rights legislation is based on complaints. We need proactive legislation.

One method used to implement pay equity, then, would involve that all jobs in the workplace be graded in terms of these factors and placed on a grid. The placement of a particular job on the grid determines the salary structures. Appeals could be heard and there could be fine-tuning. It has worked, and I have case studies to prove it. Implementation of pay equity legislation at best addresses the issue of wage discrimination within firms and thus is only a partial solution. We also need to address the issue of the undervaluing of work where the majority of workers are women -- in child care, for instance. But that is the subject of debate for another day.

Finally, I would address the concern that the government has no place interfering in the marketplace, a philosophy founded in Adam Smith's belief in the "invisible hand" guiding the marketplace to create a just and equitable society. Well, Mr. Speaker, that hand is not only invisible; it is nonexistent. It has not been there to ensure that we have child labour laws to end the exploitation of children, something that increasingly marks the unfettered Third World economies, or limitations on hours of work and ensurance of safe conditions of work. The marketplace has not determined that there will be unemployment insurance, pensions, workers' compensation, and family allowances, initiatives that the voices of the marketplace are now raised against, as they would have us return to past conditions of poverty and misery. Nor has the marketplace cried out for environmental and consumer protection legislation. Nor did the marketplace of its own accord bring in equal pay for equal work legislation.

To the statement that the government has no place in the marketplace or in determining wages, we must answer that the government intervenes all the time, for governments determine the rules that govern how we shall work and live together and how we shall share our resources. In a just and equitable society even the government has set minimum wage laws. Law in a democracy is the collective expression of the public will. I believe that we consider ourselves a society ruled by the law, and the law is there that we as a society may promote, protect, and maintain that which we value. Certainly the right of every individual to have access to the opportunity of demonstrating their full potential, the right of every individual to protection from systemic discrimination that thwarts their aspirations, must be a matter of central importance to the law. And make no mistake, Mr. Speaker, it is not individuals in designated groups such as women who are unable to achieve equality on their own, as those blaming women for the economic injustice they suffer would have us believe; it is the obstacles in their way that are so formidable and self-perpetuating that they cannot be overcome except through external intervention. It is unacceptable simply to wait for market forces to correct the inequality and injustices that are inherent in the pay inequities women experience.

To remove the barriers women have faced through the ages is the job of the law. Economic equity for women will not occur unless we legislate it and make it happen. I would ask for support for this Bill to make justice for women a reality.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Member for Calgary-Foothills.

MRS. BLACK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise today to speak against Bill 205. The Bill does respond to a very real problem, but I'm not convinced it offers the right solution.

The problem is a substantial difference between the wages of men and women in both the private and public sectors. It's a fact that women in general earn less than men. Bill 205 is based on the assumption that the male/female wage gap is due to the existence of systematic practices which discriminate against women and inadequate legislative protection against the problem. It consequently assumes that the answer lies in reform of legislation. No one disputes that there is a wage differential between men and women in Alberta as well as across Canada and that this must be addressed. The dispute is in the way this problem should be rectified.

Mr. Speaker, in Alberta, as across Canada, the concept of equal pay for similar or substantially similar work is widely accepted and enforced. As a society we believe that where two people, be they male or female, perform work that is comparable, remuneration for that work must be equal; otherwise, it is considered discriminatory and illegal. The Individual's Rights Protection Act of this province guarantees in legislation that employees cannot be discriminated against on the basis of gender. Section 6 of this Act explicitly provides for equal pay for similar or substantially similar work. Further, Alberta's Human Rights Commission administers and enforces the provisions of this Act. Since 1982-83 the commission has received 23 complaints on the grounds of unequal pay for similar work. Ten cases were found to be justified, and the employees involved received appropriate monetary reimbursements. So, Mr. Speaker, Alberta has taken clear steps to ensure that people performing equal work receive equal pay. In this regard our province has recognized and entrenched in both legislation and in practice a concept which is universally espoused throughout this country.

The issue of equal pay for work of equal value, however, is a completely different matter. This is a concept which is not universally accepted. Pay equity is the term used as a shorthand reference for equal pay for work of equal value. Right now seven provinces and the federal government have announced that they will pass legislation on pay equity. Only B.C., Alberta, and Saskatchewan do not have pay equity legislation. We have, as I have already outlined, equal pay laws: equal pay for work that is the same or substantially the same. The question arises, Mr. Speaker: what does pay equity do? Basically, it is nothing more than the comparison between jobs. It is a job evaluation scheme.

Let's suppose for a moment that you are an employer. You have a multiservice organization. You have a president, professionals, manual workers, clerical workers, and among other employees, you have nurses and outside workers. For all these jobs you have job descriptions and classifications. Each of the jobs is classified according to a set of criteria, and then wages are set more or less in relativity. What pay equity says is that those criteria used for evaluating each job must be equal and equally applied. There are usually four evaluating criteria: responsibility, skill, effort, and working conditions. Each job is given points. The more responsibility, skill, and effort and the worse the working conditions, the more points the job gets and the more it pays. But what about the nurse and the outside

worker? The notion of equal pay for work of equal value is dependent upon the comparison of the worthiness of completely dissimilar types of jobs. The construction of a pay scheme based upon adding up scores is subjective and is misleading in that it suggests that such numbers could accurately reflect the value of someone's work.

Bill 205, Mr. Speaker, is grounded in the vague notion that it is possible to judge and compare the value. That is the subjective worth of one type of job to another. Such job evaluation requires the use of criteria which in themselves may be discriminatory, assigning significant weight to certain job characteristics while perhaps eliminating others from the list of criteria altogether. The point is, if an attempt is made to judge or evaluate the worth of a job, it must be subjective. When human subjectivity enters the picture, some form of discrimination will also be present.

I pose the question to each of the members present today: would any one of us feel confident in numerically grading the value of the position held by the nurse or the outside worker? And in the case that any of the members here would actually feel confident in judging the comparative worthiness of such work, how many of us in the House do you think would come up with the same scale of numbers? That's what pay equity asks us to do.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us ask: does pay equity work? More importantly, does pay equity close or eliminate the wage gap? The answer: frankly, I don't know, but I don't think it does. The jury is still out on that decision, Mr. Speaker. Pay equity has not been in place in Canada long enough to know whether or to what extent it actually addresses the problem of the wage gap-

In 1987 Alberta had the highest wage gap of all provinces for full-year, full-time earners. At the same time, however, Alberta has experienced the most rapidly closing wage gap. The fact that Alberta does not have a pay equity scheme in its public or private sector does not appear to have taken away from this province's progress in improving women's place in the work force. It is obvious, then, Mr. Speaker, that the pay equity scheme is not the only answer to the problem of the wage gap. There are many reasons that we have a wage gap, and what we must consider is whether Bill 205 even addresses the real factors that have caused the wage gap.

In my opinion, this Bill under debate today is built like a house of cards, under the assumption that the public service wage gap, which sits at about 29 percent, is driven primarily by gender discrimination within the public service. The facts show, however, that the issue is far more complex than this assumption indicates.

Many other factors have been demonstrated to contribute significantly to the existence of wage differential. The most obvious one is something called job segregation; that is to say, more women have fewer skills than do men. I think this is what we should be discussing today, Mr. Speaker: what constructive, reasonable policies we can be working on to get to the heart of this problem.

Fewer management positions are held by women because statistically fewer women apply for them. In 1988 out of 7,632 total applicants for managerial positions within this province's civil service, only 1,486, or 19 percent, were female. So we can see, Mr. Speaker, that career patterns of women in Alberta's civil service are not the result of rampant gender discrimination as the opposition would have us believe. Rather, these career

patterns reflect in large part the result of personal choices. The wage gap is further, in part, a consequence of insufficient education and training. So the evidence shows that forces other than gender discrimination are causing the wage gap in the public service. A more reasonable analysis of this issue would take these factors into consideration. We must take note of the fact that studies estimate that only between 5 and 10 percent of the salary gap is in fact due to gender discrimination.

As we are all aware, the Alberta dialogue on economic equity for women was initiated last year. Now, this is what I see as a reasonable response to the problem. The dialogue asked women all over Alberta: what do you need or want in your particular circumstances in order to achieve economic equity? Some of the answers were employment benefits, part-time work, flexibility in the workplace, education of girls, training for women returning to the work force, and solutions to the difficulties experienced by employed mothers as they try and balance the dual responsibilities of work and family. Mr. Speaker, women need choices; they need equal opportunities. The answers to these problems are the answers to economic equity for women and the decreasing of the wage gap.

I was fortunate. From the time I was a very young girl I knew I would go to university. That was a given; it was not optional. My father had tremendous foresight. One of his favourite sayings was: "You will get an education; you will get a degree. You can put it in your back pocket and leave it there for as long as you want, but if you need it, it's there, or if you want it, it's there." That degree gave me a choice, and it gave me entrance to the work force. I started working in 1974 in an industry that was traditionally male oriented. I've seen and been part of the experience of working in a male-dominated industry. I've been part of and have experienced the tremendous advances women have made over the last 15 years. Women have come a long way since 1974. I remember the days when I wasn't allowed entrance into certain associations or clubs because I was "a girl." [interjection] No, I still sometimes get called Mr. Black here, so it still applies.

Today women are equally represented in our universities and colleges, very unlike when I attended. Fifty-three percent of all university students are women. Perhaps a more exciting fact is that women are more and more entering programs of study and professions that have never been traditionally anything but male dominated. Forty-two percent of agriculture students are women, 45 percent of business and commerce students are women, 37 percent of medical students are women, and 40 percent of law students are women. I'm pleased to say that in this room. This trend is very encouraging, Mr. Speaker, and it is a trend that will do much more for women's economic equity in the long run.

Since 1971 this government has undertaken a number of initiatives to ensure that women have an opportunity for full and equal participation in all aspects of life in this province. The Alberta plan for action strategy, first announced in 1986, is intended to enhance women's economic and social equality by continuing to promote women's participation in all areas of Alberta society. In 1977 the women's program of the personnel administration office was created to provide measures to assist female employees in achieving their career potential in the Alberta public service.

Another example of a proactive program is the Stepping Stones role model program, under which junior high students have the opportunity to explore nontraditional careers. This is a

point I have a soft spot for, because I hope that when we go out to these programs, we say: "Get a degree. Put it in your back pocket, because some day you might want it or you may need it." And that comes right in place in that Stepping Stones program.

The government has also recently established an equity initiatives area within the apprenticeship and training branch of Alberta Career Development and Employment. By ensuring equality of opportunity in occupational choices for women, economic inequality will be reduced and the wage gap will be decreased. I believe that increasing educational opportunities and encouraging women to consider a wider range of career options will have a much more substantial and permanent impact on reducing wage differences.

This legislation, as far as I am concerned, is not a solution. It does not offer proactive policy which gets to the root of the problem. True equality is seized, not granted. The government programs I have just outlined will give Albertans the tools necessary to seize these opportunities.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I strongly oppose the adoption of any Bill that would enforce equal pay for work of equal value within our public service. In Alberta we believe in equal pay for equal or similar work. In any given field there can be no distinction between wages received by female and male employees, but to judge the worthiness, the intrinsic value of a job through a mathematical formula and then to scale the resulting numbers and compare the value of dramatically different kinds of work is bound to be contentious. It would run counter to all that our economic systems stand for.

Albertans believe in a free enterprise economy where wages are determined by the forces of the economy rather than by the subjective evaluation of a job's worth. It has long been this government's position that the public sector must not lead wage settlements in the private sector. In addressing the issue of the wage gap, Mr. Speaker, we cannot start from an assumption of gender discrimination. To adopt a Bill that does so would be pointless, not to mention costly, since it does not seriously consider the true reasons for wage differential.

Thank you.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Member for Edmonton-Gold Bar.

MRS. HEWES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to speak today in support of Bill 205. This Bill, to be sure, will not solve all the problems of inequity, but it certainly will go a long way to making a beginning and hopefully giving this government a chance to show a little leadership on the issue.

Mr. Speaker, we're talking here about a question of fairness and justice. Surely the dialogue on pay equity has enormous repercussions on how we look at work and how we value work for money and how we have consistently undervalued the work of women. The circumstances here in Alberta beg for legislation. It's long overdue. Times are very different now than they were 20 years ago. It's time for this government to take a proactive leadership position, a leadership role to reduce the inequities that are so demonstrable, so abundantly clear to us.

Mr. Speaker, the need for pay equity extends well beyond simple equality. Low wages hurt all of us, all society. People living in poverty create a demand for all kinds of subsidies and supports: housing, child care, education, health care, living allowances. So inequities and inequalities of these kinds put im-

mense demands on the rest of our system.

Statistics Canada figures show us that one in six Alberta children are living in poverty. I'm embarrassed even to have to state something like that in this House. That's a scandalous statistic. It should be a source of great embarrassment to the government and should force them into action. Well, what kind of families are these children in? Families with only one income are four times more likely to be in poverty than those with two incomes, and 60 percent of single-parent families headed by women are poor. These families are four and a half times more likely to be poor than those single-parent families headed by men.

Well now, why is this? Mr. Speaker, we're not talking about women with extensive connections in our world and postsecondary education and opportunities, women in professions. We're talking about women here who are often trapped in dead-end jobs and jobs which are significantly undervalued. I quote from the document Person to Person, the Alberta dialogue, and the quote is from a working woman. On page 14 it says, under the heading Pay Women Fairly:

A secretary is in effect an administrative assistant. If a man did the same job he would have that title and more money.

That in fact is precisely why we need legislation. It is not working. If the systems and the legislation that are presently in place were working, we would not have the disparity. It would not be there. The figures are incontrovertible.

The problems that have been listed with regard to job classification and accompanying wages I think are nonsense; they're smoke screens. We've had job classification systems in place since the beginning of modern industrial times. Who decides that the male clerks get paid more than clerical people? Job comparisons and evaluations may not be an easy task, but they're certainly not impossible by any means. The provincial government would have us believe that these are much too difficult to get into, but pay equity evaluates jobs in a systematic and equal fashion according to, as has been said before in the House, four criteria: skill, effort, responsibility, and working conditions. Now, Mr. Speaker, we have a tradition in this province for the government to provide mechanisms that will allow for an equitable or a level playing field, but I submit to you that gender wage disparity is going to continue unless this government takes a proactive position at the place they should start to take it, to send a clear message that unfairness in the workplace will not be condoned. The place they should take it is where this Bill suggests: in the public service.

A year or more ago, Mr. Stan Scudder, who was chairman of the Human Rights Commission, made a request to the government to do a study on equality in pay for women. Now, Mr. Scudder's study was not accepted. It didn't seem to be necessary and was replaced by the one that I referred to, called Dialogue. One has to assume, Mr. Speaker, that the reason the chairman of the Human Rights Commission asked to do this study was because he was receiving requests and documentation that made him know and his commission know that it was necessary to do it, that that Human Rights Commission saw the disparity and wanted to review it and be able to make recommendations to this government about what was necessary.

The government in its wisdom decided against that request and instead did this study called Person to Person, which I have not found to be very valuable either in its content or very impressive in what it has provided to us in the way of recommendations or action on the part of government. In fact, there's

been no real action as a result of it. The women's advisory council, that intrepid group, now have announced to us that they're going to take a look at it. They're going to study why some women are earning less than men in the same occupation. Now, I'm grateful that they have taken up this challenge. Hopefully they'll make some recommendations that the government will not be able to ignore, that they cannot simply continue to turn their head.

Mr. Speaker, pay equity legislation will change how people think about not just men's work and women's work but how all work is valued. I believe it's an important step for us to take at this time. Opponents of pay equity tell us that it will be the death knell of the free market system. I think, then, that the question is begged: why would anyone keep a system that is based on paying women unfairly? If that's what is keeping the free market system alive, then surely there is a major injustice here. The goal of pay equity is to pay fair market wages to jobs historically done by women. Wage rates should be based on the characteristics of the job, not on the gender of the individual holding it. Every time a woman receives a cheque, someone is deciding how much they're going to be paid. Pay equity would ensure that the criteria used to make that decision are equally applied to everyone.

Mr. Speaker, the concern is sometimes raised about government interfering by imposing social reforms, and that's not a new concern. We've heard that free enterprise is going to be destroyed, that companies are going to leave the province, that harmony in the workplace will cease, and that employers won't be able to compete each time new legislation is introduced. None of these threats have occurred in other places where this legislation exists. We don't have a free marketplace at present. Government interferes with the system to protect employees when the market goes beyond what's fair and appropriate. It also intervenes by providing grants necessary to keep major companies from bankruptcy. Employers even interfere in the system by price fixing. We have minimum wage laws. We have wage setting and controlling of product markets. Women are not separate from this system, but as consumers and workers they're an integral part of it. They should be paid as important contributors to the economy and to the quality of our lives.

Well, where is it at now? This system that is not described as being effective and useful by our government, where is it at? In other nations it has been in place, of course, for well over a decade. In Australia, in the U.K., and in many European countries it works extraordinarily well. In Canada, as has been stated and our graphs show, seven provinces have proactive legislation. Quebec has legislation, and of course the government of Canada has legislation. The government of Manitoba put out recently a very interesting newsletter called *Equality at Work*. This is the Conservative government of Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, obviously very proud of what they have been able to achieve in a very short time, and it's working in Manitoba. This document, by the way, has an interesting graph on who's got it and who hasn't. Alberta, of course, is absent from the graph.

The document Dialogue attests to the fact that many businesses and industries also recognizing the fairness are in fact creating their own systems of pay equity. Our own University of Alberta has done it recently. Why not do it? What's the objection? The myths have all been dispelled. Most of them are just nonsense. None of them have been proved, Mr. Speaker.

Who supports it? Well, all fair-minded people support it. The women's advisory council study certainly, I'm sure, will

support the need for changes. The Human Rights Commission's request supports the fact that there are problems in existence that we need to deal with.

Who and what would be threatened by it? Well, some people say unions. That's not true. Unions are very supportive of this legislation. Would jobs be lost? No. There is no indication anywhere that jobs are lost as a result of this kind of legislation. Would it ruin the economy? Would it destroy businesses? There's no way. Besides, why should women alone bear the responsibility and the burden for that? Will it provide benefits? Unquestionably. Workers that are paid equitably and fairly are good producers. There is no question in my mind that we need fairness in our workplace in order that we have productive workers.

[Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair]

Mr. Speaker, it's been suggested that this is not the piece of legislation that's going to solve all the problems of inequities for women, and I accept that; there are going to be continuing problems. But now is the time to take the step. Now is the time for this government in Alberta, which has been light-years behind other governments in dealing with inequities that exist in women's lives, to become proactive. Of course there are many other steps that need to be taken, but this is a major one in solving the barriers that exist for women. I suggest that we cannot leave this one to chance; we cannot leave it to the marketplace.

I invite the government to show some leadership here, show that they really mean to be fair and just to all parts of Alberta society. Just go for it, be heroes, and support the Bill.

MR. PAYNE: Mr. Speaker, I guess I'm responding to the previous appeal from the member over there to "go for it." I'm assuming that the antecedent of the word "it" is additional debate, so I would like to go for it.

MR. FOX: Say something intelligent.

MR. PAYNE: I've also been encouraged by the Member for Vegreville to say something intelligent. I will attempt to do that, but I seriously question his ability to evaluate whether I'm successful or not.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I truly regret that I'm unable to support the Bill before us this afternoon, but for several different reasons than those advanced by my colleague from Calgary-Foothills. Frankly, because of the dramatic changes our society has undergone over the past half century, we've encountered the ensuing dilemmas, contradictions, and stresses of a culture in flux. Central to this societal change has been the large-scale movement of women into the workplace. This has of course happened for a number of reasons, and it wouldn't be that productive to elaborate on those reasons today. My reason for addressing the issue today is to recognize that these changes have placed immense stresses on the role of women in our society. Women may face inequalities in the work force, including the public service, as part of the problems that come with a changing social climate. Now, we as a government need to respond to such injustices and attempt to create fairness, and I think, in fairness, that that's been the thrust and objective of the proponents of the Bill before us today.

Mr. Speaker, I think it's fair to say that I share the concerns that have been expressed about the wage gap that exists between

men and women across Alberta today and, particular to this debate, within the public sector. I believe it's something our government must take seriously since it ultimately manifests itself in the social and economic well-being of the province as a whole.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in response to the debate we've heard this hour, I feel Bill 205 is not the answer to the problem. For one thing, the limited indications we've seen of how well pay equity has succeeded in other jurisdictions should serve more as a dire warning against rather than as support for the adoption of Bill 205.

The entire notion of equal pay for work of equal value is an old one, originating within the International Labour Organisation in Europe in 1918, documented in the Treaty of Versailles. Later, in 1957, the European Economic Community recommended itself to the concept.

Mr. Speaker, I like to regard myself as having an open mind. Frankly, I'm reluctant to deny myself even the remote possibility of additional enlightenment from the proponents of this Bill. As a consequence, I would like to suggest that we adjourn debate this afternoon.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Having heard the motion of the hon. Member for Calgary-Fish Creek, all those in favour, please say aye.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Opposed, please say no.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Carried.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, it's proposed this evening to assemble in Committee of Supply to consider the estimates of the Department of Labour and tomorrow morning to consider the estimates of the Department of Recreation and Parks. By way of advice to the Assembly, it is proposed on Monday afternoon to deal with second reading of the Senatorial Selection Act and in the evening to revert to estimates in a department yet to be identified, but I will let members of the Assembly know.

I would move that when the members assemble this evening, they do so in Committee of Supply and that the Assembly stand adjourned until the Committee of Supply rises and reports.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Having heard the motion of the hon. Government House Leader, all those in favour, please say aye.

HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Opposed, please say no. Carried.

[The House recessed at 5:29 p.m.]