

Legislative Assembly of Alberta

Title: **Tuesday, September 22, 1992** 2:30 p.m.
Date: 92/09/22

[Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair]

head: **Prayers**

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Let us pray.

As Canadians and as Albertans we give thanks for the precious gifts of freedom and peace which we enjoy.

As Members of this Legislative Assembly we rededicate ourselves to the valued traditions of parliamentary democracy as a means of serving our province and our country.

Amen.

head: **Presenting Petitions**

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to present a petition signed by approximately 300 Albertans in the Calgary area who wish to appeal a directive recently proposed by the Department of Alberta Family and Social Services stating that individuals who reside in 24-hour care facilities would no longer be funded by Alberta Family and Social Services for day programs.

head: **Reading and Receiving Petitions**

MR. DOYLE: Mr. Speaker, yesterday I tabled a petition in regards to a stop order for sewage going into the McLeod River. Could I have that petition now read.

CLERK:

We the undersigned residents of Alberta request that the Legislative Assembly call upon the government of Alberta through the Minister of the Environment to:

- 1) place an immediate moratorium on the draining into the McLeod River of raw sewage or wastewater from a stabilization pond by the Pine Shadow Estates Mobile Home Park near Edson, Alberta;
- 2) revoke Pine Shadow Estates Mobile Home Park's licence to operate and periodically drain a wastewater stabilization pond;
- 3) take steps to ensure Pine Shadow Estates Mobile Home Park addresses its effluent problem in a proper and environmentally responsible manner.

MRS. HEWES: Mr. Speaker, may I request that the petition I presented yesterday requesting dental care for children with cleft palate be now read.

CLERK:

We, the undersigned residents of Alberta, petition the Legislative Assembly to urge the government to afford clefted children full access to proper dental care so these children may grow to be healthy functioning parts of Alberta's future.

head: **Tabling Returns and Reports**

MR. FJORBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to table with the Assembly today the report of proceedings of the 83rd annual general meeting of the Alberta Land Surveyors' Association.

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to table four copies of the 1990-1991 annual report of the Department of Transportation and Utilities. This report also includes the tabling of the Alberta Motor Transport Board for the same period.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to file with the Assembly today the government's response to Motion for a Return 250.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. Solicitor General.

DR. WEST: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to file a status report on the impaired driving program. This is for 1991-92 and is an update on the various programs and their effect over the last year as it relates to impaired driving in the province of Alberta.

head: **Introduction of Special Guests**

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure today to introduce to the members of the House a longtime member of this Legislature for Vegreville, John Batiuk, who served this House from 1971 to 1986. He's seated in the members' gallery. I'd ask him to rise and receive the warm welcome of this Assembly.

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

MR. SIGURDSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I looked up into the public gallery today, I also recognized another former member of the Legislative Assembly. I know that he's here with a group. He's the former member for Athabasca-Lac La Biche, Mr. Leo Piquette. I'd like him to stand and rise and wave hello to a number of his colleagues.

head: **Oral Question Period**

NovAtel Communications Ltd.

MR. MARTIN: Well, I'm not sure who to direct this to, Mr. Speaker, but I'm sure one of them can figure it out. Despite this government's clumsy attempts yesterday to confuse the NovAtel issue, Albertans know that the government's bungling will cost them dearly for many years in the future. Yesterday we found that NovAtel is suing to recover \$7.7 million Canadian plus interest from GCI (Peru), a company it frankly should never have been doing business with to begin with. Today I would like to table a court document which shows that Tele Movil, a Peruvian telecommunications company, is also suing GCI (Peru) for \$60 million. Now, my question is to whoever wants to answer: I guess the Premier or somebody on the cabinet review board, somebody who should have been in charge of the purse strings. Will the Premier or whoever is on the board now admit that there's virtually no hope of recovering the \$7.7 million from GCI when there's another more substantial claim?

MR. GETTY: Well, Mr. Speaker, there have been allegations made by members of the opposition. Some are accurate; some are not. I will draw this matter to the attention of the minister, and I'm sure he'd be happy to respond at the first opportunity.

MR. MARTIN: Well, Mr. Speaker, this is the last opportunity we have in question period, so frankly that's not good enough.

Just to tell the Premier, the court document alleges that GCI (Peru) collected a secret commission of 10 percent on the NovAtel equipment supplied to the Peruvian company, Mr. Speaker. It looks like everybody profited except the people of Alberta. Surely they've done some research into this. My question to the Premier is simply this: how many other companies received or charged secret commissions as a result of dealings with NovAtel?

MR. GETTY: Again I caution the hon. member from trying to be his own lawyer. People allege things in cases, and quite often that does not happen to be the case. It's before the courts. I've said that I'd draw it to the attention of the minister. The minister will

respond. There will be a fall session. I don't know why the Leader of the Opposition feels that this is his last chance.

MR. MARTIN: Well, Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of things alleged, but the bottom line is that even this government has admitted that they've lost over half a billion dollars of taxpayers' money. So it's more than allegations.

My question comes back to this document. It also states that NovAtel admitted that its equipment was unsuitable for the market in Peru. They admitted that. My question to the Premier: what was NovAtel doing in a market where it admits that its equipment was unsuitable? In other words, why were they wasting Alberta taxpayers' money?

MR. GETTY: Again, Mr. Speaker, I must caution the hon. Leader of the Opposition: don't read too much into something prepared by lawyers.

MR. MARTIN: Well, the money just left on its own. Nobody's responsible.

Provincial Deficit

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I see – well, I can't note who's not here. I would like to come back to the Premier and talk about the deficit. We understand full well the responses we got about why we have a deficit. In April the Provincial Treasurer predicted a deficit of \$2.3 billion. In the six months since then, we know from the Minister of Energy that the nonrenewable resource revenue is down. We know that corporate tax revenues are down, we know that Alberta growth is down, and we also know that provisions have to be made for write-offs, and that's grown with NovAtel, MagCan, and others. It's clear that the deficit's going to be much higher than the Treasurer predicted. I'd ask the Premier: without giving us the rhetoric of the Treasurer and sugarcoating it, what is the actual size of the Alberta deficit at this particular time?

2:40

MR. GETTY: Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Leader of the Opposition has raised some matters that would be on a negative side of a deficit prediction. However, there are six months more to go. There is a difference in the Canadian exchange rate, a difference in price for oil and natural gas, volumes, royalties. I think it would be helpful for the House, and I will raise the matter with the Provincial Treasurer that sometime after six months, when our records are fully in, with a lookout into the future, he could well provide the members with an update on the budget in the fall session.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that. I hope that's a promise from the Premier, because we were told by the Treasurer that we would get regular updates. In fact, he talked about quarterly reports, and I'm wondering why we haven't got it at this session so we can deal with it.

MR. GETTY: Well, Mr. Speaker, the Provincial Treasurer is not here, as the hon. leader knows. I just said that I would ask him to give the House a report, so he should be very happy.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, we're not sure when the House is even going to come back or if it's going to come back. They seem preoccupied with the leadership convention. There's some concern about this. We still have to govern.

I want to come back to the Premier about yesterday's question to the minister for career development. The Treasurer also predicted 15,000 new jobs, and as the Premier would know, the figures from the minister's own department indicate that we've actually lost 3,000 jobs. The Treasurer was predicting a 7 percent increase in personal income tax. I just want to ask the Premier: where are the 15,000 jobs?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister of Career Development and Employment dealt with the matter yesterday, and the Leader of the Opposition is now merely repeating his question. I'd ask the hon. minister to deal with it again, if he'd like.

I should point out to him that there are initiatives under way that hopefully will help here in Alberta. We still have North America in the vise of a recession, not Alberta, it's true, although Albertans have been hurt. Things are just starting to flow. There was a tax cut effective July 1, a federal tax cut effective July 1. We hope that will help. The budget is starting to make its impact in terms of programs for forestry, housing, capital works, and other areas. The municipalities received \$200 million to help provide jobs. We see infrastructure as we travel across the cities of Edmonton and Calgary. We see LRT being built. We see highways. We see secondary roads. We see pavement. All are providing work for Albertans. I caution the Leader of the Opposition to look ahead at this province with confidence and not to constantly be so negative. It may well be the parting information I try to give him.

MR. WEISS: Mr. Speaker, if I may supplement the hon. Premier's answer. In fairness to the Leader of the Official Opposition he's correct in assuming that there is approximately an interim 4,000 lost jobs from the same period as last year. What the hon. member has not mentioned – and I'd like to file with the Assembly some copies of some projections that actually show where the 15,000 jobs are. In correct figures the 1991 actual was some 1,231,000 jobs and the projection for 1992 is 1,246,000. That is the 15,000 jobs, and that is what we will attain, not like the 200,000 lost jobs in Ontario that the . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please.

The hon. leader of the Liberal Party, the Member for Edmonton-Glengarry.

Agricultural Assistance

MR. DECORE: Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Minister of Agriculture told this House that he saw no need for a special emergency debate on certain problems affecting the agricultural industry in our province. The minister also said that the jury was still out on whether GRIP and the revised crop insurance program could adequately respond to snowed-in crops, frost, and other weather conditions affecting Alberta's harvest. The problem for Alberta farmers is a very clear-cut problem: not having enough cash flow. That's the problem that government must deal with. My first question to the minister is this: would the minister commit to setting up a program much like the program that's been set up in Ontario whereby farmers using the assets of GRIP and crop insurance are able to go to a commercial bank with government involvement and get moneys at prime rates? Would he allow for that to be set up in Alberta?

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that as of last spring a farmer could go in to his banker with his GRIP agreement and use that as security to get operating money at probably a rate of prime plus 1 or prime plus 2. The other fact of the matter is

that as a result of our farm credit stability program of 9 percent money, 2 and a half billion dollars long term, as a result of our Ag Development Corporation money out there at both 6 and 9 percent, the financial position of the Alberta farmer is in better shape than I think any farmer across this nation. That's why you see other provinces reacting with ad hoc programs at this point in time.

MR. DECORE: Mr. Speaker, the cash flow problem for farmers, particularly in this year of bad weather, means that profit margins are very narrow. I appreciate the fact that you can borrow money at prime plus 1 or prime plus 2, but when those margins are narrow, Mr. Minister, don't you see a reason for the provincial government and maybe even the federal government to involve themselves in a program that takes it to prime or below prime, that gives advantage to farmers?

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Speaker, if we're talking cash flow, there are various ways that cash flows to farmers in the fall of the year. The fall of the year is the key time for the grain and oilseed producer. It flows to him if he can harvest grain and haul it to an elevator. It flows to him if he can harvest grain but the elevator can't take it by going to the elevator company and accessing the federal government cash advance program. In the event of no production or very low production it flows to him through crop insurance revenues and through the gross revenue insurance program. Contrary to the feeling that some of the critics seem to be suggesting, people that had crops written off earlier as a result of poor weather conditions, as a result of hail, as a result of drought are already receiving cash flow from crop insurance and revenue insurance.

I think the fact, as I indicated yesterday, that under the leadership of Premier Getty we came out with some good long-term programs both in the area of financing and in the area of safety nets puts me in a position today to say that the programs are there and the programs are working. They're facing new tests, and we'll be assessing the way they react to those new tests, but no, I am not announcing anything more at this point in time.

MR. DECORE: Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that an Ontario farmer can go in and borrow at prime, and the minister is suggesting that Alberta farmers should go in and get it at prime plus 1 or prime plus 2. I guess the attitude the minister is taking is let them eat cake.

Will the minister commit to working with the federal government, using his initiative, if he has any, to get the same kind of program set up in Alberta? Explain to farmers why you can't do that.

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member simply isn't listening. I'm prepared to put the programs that this government has for agriculture up against the programs of any government in Canada or, for that matter, any government in North America. [interjections] I think many of those other farmers are going to envy the programs that our farmers can access. [interjections] If you think we don't compare favourably – I'm talking about the noisy centre now – to the gross revenue insurance program in the neighbouring province of Saskatchewan, after an NDP government got in and changed it drastically from the western Canadian program that our farmers and Manitoba enjoy, you know, I would hate to be a farmer there today.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Cypress-Redcliff.

2:50

Farm Income

MR. HYLAND: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Associate Minister of Agriculture, and it's dealing with the problems from the recent snowfall in southern Alberta on August 22 and the windstorms that came along with it. [interjection] I should tell you that the windstorms came before the hon. Member for Westlock-Sturgeon went down to review what had happened, so it wasn't his wind that made it happen. He came after the wind.

MR. TAYLOR: Their MLA was in the Caribbean.

MR. HYLAND: Their MLA, Mr. Speaker, was there five days in advance of the hon. member from the opposition coming to look at the damage.

Mr. Speaker, my question to the minister. Some of the special problems that happened to speciality crops and row crops – the snow damaged them almost to the extent of hail, and there is a problem with the cost associated with putting row crops into the ground with their GRIP coverage. I wonder if the minister can assure the Assembly that she and the crop insurance corporation will get together with those farmers so we can examine a more effective way of getting closer to the cost of production, as we do in grain.

MRS. McCLELLAN: Mr. Speaker, the member raises a very important issue on specialty crops, and certainly the weather-related events of August have indicated some special circumstances that we do need to look at. I would remind the member and all members that because of the program that we introduced in 1990, the enhanced crop insurance program, we were able to introduce new and specialty crops into the insurance program. Previous to that we did not have that ability. We have made a commitment to the growers and the associations of specialty crops that we will work with them throughout this fall and early winter to address some of the problems that have been identified through these weather-related events. One of the major issues is the pricing issue, and it's raised with contracts that are often held by those specialty crops. So, yes, we will commit to work with our associations and our growers in those areas.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Speaker, my second question is related to the cash flow as it stems from the GRIP program and the crop insurance program. I wonder if the minister can name an approximate time period when growers could expect an interim payment for this crop year and also the final payment for the '91-92 crop year under the GRIP program.

MRS. McCLELLAN: The cash flow needs of farmers are certainly uppermost in our mind, and as the minister indicated, and rightly so, the payments are flowing to producers who have suffered losses, write-offs under crop insurance.

Revenue insurance, members will recall, is paid in three stages: an interim payment in the fall, a second interim payment in the spring, and a final payment when all of the calculations from those grains have been reached. We have made a commitment to our producers that we will initiate the interim payment for this crop year as early as possible, as soon as the farmers have the harvesting data that is required for that payment.

The final payment for the last crop year, I would remind members, is made in two ways. For on-board grains we can make that payment once we receive the final calculations from the pool accounts. That traditionally is in place for a payment in early

January. For off-board grains and crops again we will make that final payment as soon as we receive the information. That information we get from the National Grains Bureau, who in turn collect it from a variety of sources. So as soon as we have that information in place, we are prepared and in a position to make those final payments.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Calgary-Forest Lawn.

Advanced Education Funding

MR. PASHAK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This fall, as in past years, we've seen hundreds of qualified students turned away from Alberta's postsecondary institutions. In fact, in the Minister of Advanced Education's own backyard some 487 qualified students were turned away from the University of Lethbridge. My question is to the Minister of Advanced Education. Given this demand and given that increased numbers of years of formal education will be required for most new jobs created in the future, how does the minister justify his directive to universities and colleges that they reduce their budgets by 2 percent over this year's level of spending?

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure the hon. Member for Calgary-Forest Lawn is aware that although Alberta has some 700,000 fewer citizens than British Columbia, we have 4,000 more students in university. We have the highest participation rate in the country. I think members should realize that we're in the real world. What this minister did, while focusing on the needs of the students of Alberta, who as a matter of policy we encourage to attend the postsecondary system, was ask the postsecondary institutions through the deputy minister to submit their budgets, which they do every year, in this case on a scenario, not a mandate and not an order, if they were to receive a zero increase in budget in terms of grants by this government or a minus 2 percent increase in budget as given by this government. I don't think that's unusual.

MR. PASHAK: Mr. Speaker, on a related issue, there are hundreds of graduate students at our universities who provide an invaluable service to Alberta with the research work they do. Yet this minister proposes that graduate students should pay the full cost of their education. My question is again to the Minister of Advanced Education. Is he willing to take responsibility for the loss of our own research capabilities and the resulting decline in our competitive edge that would result from this kind of directive?

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, I think it's extremely well known across Canada and perhaps across North America that our universities are indeed outstanding. My own University of Lethbridge is fourth in 57 in Canada and number 3 in western Canada. The University of Alberta is in the top 10 of research institutions in Canada. The University of Calgary is outstanding.

My responsibility given to me by the Premier, Mr. Speaker, is to administer the Department of Advanced Education in such a way that we have access made available to as many students as possible. The hon. Member for Calgary-Forest Lawn says that I proposed. I don't understand what he reads or what he hears. I'm seeking ways of assisting our postsecondary institutions to maintain quality and access and find more money. I simply pointed out to a high school class in Calgary, many of whom want to go to university, that we had to look for new ways and new ideas – I hadn't got many from the institutions on how we could

continue to fund the system – and would it be appropriate if the public purse continues to fund 80 percent of the postsecondary system, including your first degree, if it was an option that in future those going back for subsequent degrees should pay an increased amount of tuition for those subsequent degrees, but the public would continue to pay 80 percent of the first degree?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Calgary-Buffalo.

Administration of Justice

MR. DICKSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Last June the Solicitor General attempted unsuccessfully to substitute court ordered treatment for a young sex offender in the Phoenix program with less intensive counseling, an attempt, sir, described at the time by the judge involved as ludicrous. Now I understand that the Solicitor General has intervened in other youth court proceedings since June. Will the Solicitor General end his campaign to directly influence the judges of our family court division?

3:00

DR. WEST: Mr. Speaker, I ask for your judgment. There could be a sub judice rule here on reapplication to the court. [interjections]

Speaker's Ruling Sub Judice Rule

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. The Chair is unaware of any matter before the court that would make the question sub judice. Maybe the Solicitor General knows.

DR. WEST: Mr. Speaker, with all due respect the Crown does have a case presented back to the courts on this issue. [interjections]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. It's up to hon. members who ask the question and who reply to know whether or not there is that element present. The hon. Solicitor General says that the Crown has an appeal before the courts, so we'll accept his word.

Is there a supplemental question?

Administration of Justice (continued)

MR. DICKSON: Mr. Speaker, this question to the Attorney General: will the Attorney General advise this Legislature what concrete steps he has taken to preserve the independence of our judiciary from the political interference of the Solicitor General?

MR. ROSTAD: Mr. Speaker, that is a basic tenet of our justice system, that the legislators will not interfere with the judiciary. If the hon. member and the leader of the Liberals, who are both lawyers, have any evidence that the Solicitor General has in fact interfered with justice, I'd like to have that and a case will be made. Otherwise they should not try to make political hay out of nothing.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Banff-Cochrane.

Tire Disposal

MR. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Discarded tires are causing an ever increasing environmental problem in the province

of Alberta. In point of fact, there are about two and a half million tires that are discarded every year. [interjections]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. EVANS: Apparently the opposition doesn't think this is much of a problem, Mr. Speaker, but I assure you that it is a problem throughout the province of Alberta.

I know that the Minister of the Environment has been investigating a number of tire recycling initiatives. However, recently the newly appointed Tire Recycling Management Board has recommended that incineration be the method used, at least on an interim basis, to deal with this problem. My question is to the Minister of the Environment. Given that recommendation, what is the status of tire recycling initiatives in the province of Alberta?

MR. KLEIN: Well, very basically, Mr. Speaker, the tire recyclers, those two firms, Environmental Rubber and L.M. Marketing of Okotoks, still have the door open to them to come forward with proposals that meet the advance disposal fee package. Those negotiations broke down. I met with both groups today and the Tire Recycling Management Board, and there was some agreement that the door is still open. At the same time, the Tire Recycling Management Board will be negotiating, only negotiating, with the two cement kilns in the province, Canada Cement Lafarge and Inland Cement of Edmonton.

Now, I want to make it abundantly clear that if there is a proposal to burn tires in cement kilns, that will involve an adjustment, an amendment to their operating licence. That will also involve advertising and public notice being given and objections obtained. If there is demonstrable objection, then that will result in an environmental impact assessment.

MR. EVANS: Well, I know that particularly in my constituency of Banff-Cochrane, which may be utilized for this process, there's considerable concern about the present capacity of the kilns at Exshaw to handle this kind of an issue. There is the issue of where the capital costs will come from to take care of upgrading of stacks and scrubbers. There are concerns about where the smoke and the other by-products of this process would go and what the impacts would be. What will the minister do to ensure that all of these problems are addressed, not only in my constituency but around the province of Alberta?

MR. KLEIN: Well, of course the Bowman-Tollefson report on incineration determined that in fact you can, providing you do certain things, incinerate quite safely and in an environmentally sound manner. However, before any permits are amended and before any steps whatsoever are taken to incinerate tires, the incinerators will have to meet all the environmental tests. In other words, they will have to demonstrate to the department that they can meet all the requirements and all the standards of the Clean Air Act and would have to install any equipment necessary to ensure that if tires are burned, they're burned in an environmentally safe manner.

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

Liquor Control Board

MR. SIGURDSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct a question to the Solicitor General. It would appear that the half billion dollar NovAtel loss failed to provide enough lessons for

this government. Now the Solicitor General, it seems, is prepared to privatize the Alberta Liquor Control Board, thus volume discounting liquor to private stores that this government used to sell at retail. So my question to the Solicitor General is this: how can the minister justify the privatization of the ALCB when all it will do is turn over a profit maker to friends of the government while drying up a premium revenue source for the provincial coffers?

DR. WEST: Not so, Mr. Speaker. There are a lot of premises in that question that are absolutely not true. The revenues back to the province of Alberta required by this government will be kept consistent with the last ones delivered here.

MR. SIGURDSON: Well, Mr. Speaker, if that's not the case, then perhaps the Alberta Hotel Association has something wrong, because with respect to the sale of hard liquor and off-sales, they said this in a release this summer:

Implement this quietly so we don't create any problems for government. It is imperative that we not receive any press, as this could influence the implementation and/or expansion of the program.

We have more secret deals going on. So in order to make sure that there is fair and equal access so that we know the price that we're getting for all of the goods that are sold in the retail stores . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Table it. Table it.

MR. SIGURDSON: Sure. Do you want copies? Get me 83. Give one to everybody. Obviously they missed it. Here, share it. Get the information. I even highlighted it for you so you can find the appropriate spot.

Will the Solicitor General today agree that he will release all of the specific information about the financial resources and the financial income of the ALCB other than that just offered in the annual report of the ALCB?

DR. WEST: Mr. Speaker, I think there was an unprecedented occurrence in this Assembly in the last session when both years' and the present year's audited report of the ALCB were filed in this Assembly. So we're right up to date, and all that information is available to the member if he would like to do his research.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Calgary-McKnight.

Advanced Education Funding (continued)

MRS. GAGNON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In recent weeks the Minister of Advanced Education has made some outrageous and ridiculous statements. He has stated that actors should be hired to teach university classes and, as was already mentioned today, that students should pay the full costs of their second degree. Albertans are appalled at these verbal assaults and insults. My question to the minister is this: are these statements simply a way of masking the minister's inability to develop a rational plan to deal with the funding and accessibility crisis in this province?

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, as I stated earlier, Alberta has the highest participation rate in Canada in the postsecondary system. That's a fact. It's a fact that Alberta leads all of Canada in terms of funding postsecondary, the highest of any province in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I suggested that when we have institutions such as the University of Alberta, which has one faculty member for every

six and a half students, and there are 20,000-odd students, have we not come to the point where we should be utilizing technology. What I suggested as a way of handling these students coming in, these huge classes was to utilize the excellent technology we had developed right here in Alberta. How the hon. member interprets that to be hiring actors and so on is beyond me.

3:10

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Supplemental question.

MRS. GAGNON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. One way to resolve the crisis is to broker university degrees in colleges. Grande Prairie College and the U of A have concluded a deal which is gathering dust awaiting the minister's approval. Why hasn't the minister responded to the U of A/Grande Prairie College proposal?

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, Grande Prairie Regional College is a very successful college, as is the University of Alberta. They have come to me asking for the opportunity of degree completion programs. They've received my blessing as long as they can find the resources within the system with which to do it. If the hon. Member for Calgary-McKnight is prepared to rise in her place and advise this minister as to where additional funds can come from when we're now spending the highest per capita in Canada, if the hon. member wants to change hospitals or change any other program, then I think it's incumbent upon the hon. member, recognizing the difficult times that this province is in, and advanced ed has to play its role. It's not sufficient to propose ideas without a suggestion as to how the taxpayer is going to pay for it.

Canadian Airlines International Ltd.

MR. SHRAKE: Mr. Speaker, a very sad story is unfolding in this province. Air Canada . . .

MR. TAYLOR: Yeah, it's the leadership campaign.

MR. SHRAKE: Sometimes it would be better to remain silent and be thought a fool than to open your mouth and remove all doubt. [interjections]

Speaker's Ruling Interrupting a Member

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. [interjections] Order please. There's a finite time available for question period. It's really totally nonproductive for all hon. members to be sitting here listening to the noise coming from that end of the Chamber back and forth. So order please. Let the hon. member ask his question.

Canadian Airlines International Ltd. (continued)

MR. SHRAKE: Mr. Speaker, this is a very serious matter. In the last couple of years Air Canada launched a very savage, deliberate attack on Canadian Airlines, trying to break this Alberta company. It's cost Air Canada almost \$250 million. Canadian Airlines has lost over \$70 million. To the employees of Canadian Airlines it's very serious. They have tried. They've put forth, they've guaranteed one-month's salary out of their salaries for this company for a three-year period: almost a hundred million dollars trying to save this company and save these jobs. But they failed. It was not enough. This will cost this province thousands of jobs and millions and millions of dollars. So my question to

the Premier is: did our Provincial Treasurer sit down with these employees and try to help them in their efforts?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, the Provincial Treasurer has spoken about this, not in the Legislature, but I can confirm that the Provincial Treasurer, not on his own but acting on behalf of our government, met with the employees' association, met with the management and executive of Canadian Airlines, encouraged them, discussed options with them, tried to help them through a combination of efforts of the employees, American Airlines, Canadian Airlines, other participants, to put together a package that would allow the company to continue in operation, a separate operation from the direction it now appears to be going with Air Canada. The government of Alberta was prepared to put up a guarantee of a considerable amount of money, and we were very disappointed when we found that others were not going to be there to help bring about a successful solution to this matter. Then the directors of Canadian made the decision to pursue the amalgamation with Air Canada. That disappoints us. We would much prefer that Canadian continue to operate as a separate entity here in our province.

I think all Albertans and members of this Legislature realize that Canadian was a more competitive company. Canadian actually had a lower cost per flying mile and was able to provide a service more efficiently than Air Canada. It was very disappointing that with all the efforts of the employees they were unable – and certainly Alberta was there to help in every way we could – to put a package together.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Supplementary question?

MR. SHRAKE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Air Canada has run lines knowingly selling fares below what it cost them to run it. They should be investigated under the anticomboines Act to see if there are unfair practices in this thing.

My question is: is this merger with Air Canada a done deal yet, or is there a chance that the company could still salvage and save those jobs and those people their livelihood?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, it's my understanding that the employees' association is still working at trying to find a solution that would allow the company to continue as a separate entity in Alberta. Alberta will help in every way possible. I'm not sure of the final date upon which the Air Canada/Canadian merger forecloses the possibility of an arrangement once again being put together with American Airlines or another airline, but American is there, willing to be part of a package. We will be there, and we will be there with substantial assistance. We do not believe that the matter is completely closed, so I would say directly to the directors, directly to the management, and directly to the employees of Canadian: the government of Alberta is prepared to help you in every way possible, and while there is still hope, we will be there trying to help.

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

Conflicts of Interest Act

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Almost a year and a half has gone by since this Assembly passed conflict of interest legislation. The Ethics Commissioner was hired nearly six months ago to administer this Act, but until now it hasn't been proclaimed, so it's not the law of the province yet. I'd like the

Attorney General to tell us when Albertans can expect their representatives in this Assembly to be bound by conflict of interest rules. Could he tell us when this Act will be law in Alberta?

MR. ROSTAD: Mr. Speaker, I would hope that all members would feel themselves spiritually bound by the Conflicts of Interest Act, notwithstanding the fact that it has not yet been proclaimed. I've had discussions with the Ethics Commissioner, and there are some technical problems that have to be cleared up from the transition from the Leg. Assembly Act to the Conflicts of Interest Act. We are working through those, and it'll come as quickly as possible.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Well, I find it difficult to understand how it takes a year and a half to attend to some technical details, Mr. Speaker. It leaves the impression with me that this government doesn't have a commitment to cleaning up this particular area of legislation. Even if this Act were proclaimed this week, disclosure statements by MLAs might not be made public until January of next year. Our new Premier will be chosen by that time. I'd like to ask this Premier if he would admit that the real reason for the foot-dragging is that he, his government MLAs, and his cabinet members don't want to make public any disclosure statements until after the next Premier is chosen and a general election held.

3:20

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I enjoy discussion and debate with the hon. member often in this Legislature, but the government put in place the investigation by Chief Judge Wachowich, the government got the report, the government introduced the legislation, and the government was responsible for the legislation being passed. The hon. member is surely groping for something to raise now which I think doesn't bring any credit to him or to the Assembly. The Attorney General has just explained the situation. All he has to do is wait, and he'll see that it proceeds on an orderly basis to have the full implementation of the legislation. I'm frankly disappointed in the hon. member for making those kind of charges.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. The time for question period has expired. Might there be unanimous consent to revert to Introduction of Special Guests before calling Orders of the Day?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Opposed? Carried.

head: **Introduction of Special Guests**
(*reversion*)

MR. DINNING: Mr. Speaker, I had the pleasure of meeting with a group of parents and students and representatives from the Plamondon area this morning. My colleague the MLA for Athabasca-Lac La Biche could not be in attendance because he was doing constituent duties in Grassland. They are here this afternoon to watch the proceedings of the Legislature. They're led by Mr. David Fréchette, director of the Francophone association of Plamondon and Lac La Biche, along with Mr. Philip Ménard and his wife, Suzette. He was the president of the school committee. They are here, some 15 of them, with parents and students from the Plamondon area. So on behalf of my colleague Mike Cardinal, the MLA for Athabasca-Lac La Biche, may I ask them to rise and receive the warm greetings of the Assembly.

head: **Orders of the Day**

head: **Government Motions**
Constitutional Referendum

28. Moved by Mr. Getty:

Be it resolved that the Legislative Assembly of Alberta approves the text of the question to be asked of Albertans on the referendum under the Referendum Act, Canada, which reads: "Do you agree that the Constitution of Canada should be renewed on the basis of the agreement reached on August 28, 1992?"

[Adjourned debate September 21: Ms Betkowski]

MS BETKOWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to participate in this historic debate, one which I am sure will have a very lasting effect upon this country; of that I have no doubt. It is a risk, but it is a risk with a purpose, that being the effectiveness, the resolve, and the opportunity for Canada and for all Canadians. The risk is that Canadians are being asked as individuals to make a choice. Along with that choice goes a personal assessment of the good and the bad in the Charlottetown accord and a lonely moment when the choice is made.

The accord itself is not about people; it is about ideals and principles and negotiations and compromise. It is a unanimous agreement among people as diverse as this great country, and that is its greatest strength. The Premier of this province, Don Getty, was one of those people. He took a risk at a huge personal and political cost to stand up for his and our province, but to his credit and to the surprise of many the acceptance of Alberta having a say in the fundamental nature of our Constitution and our legislative form won the day. Now a fundamentally reformed Senate to reflect the equality of the provinces will be in the package we vote on on October 26.

I would like to mention as well and take the opportunity to say a special word of thanks to the Deputy Premier, the Member for Medicine Hat. The member and I have had our disagreements, but we have also shared our hope for this country. To him I say thank you for his competence and for his commitment to his constituents, to this Legislature, to Albertans, and to Canadians. To my other colleague the Minister of Municipal Affairs, the Member for St. Albert, I say thank you for his passion and the courage to effect some real change for the aboriginal peoples of Canada, and, finally, to Oryssia Lennie and all other members present and past of the public service who I suspect will be waiting for October 27, when a chapter of Canadian history will close, hopefully with a united Canada as a result, to all of you at the table behind the scenes, an appreciation from one Canadian, the Member for Edmonton-Glenora.

The French have three words, and they are "liberté, égalité, fraternité." The United States has "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." I have often thought that Canada should mint a new coin, and on it should be etched the words "unity, equality, and respect."

Canada is not Canada if not a united country. While the constitutional accord is important, it is not an end in itself. It is a means to an end, that end being an efficient, dynamic, compassionate, and progressive society able to compete in a world market, able to withstand the rigours of a highly competitive marketplace, able to create an environment where producing wealth is complemented by a highly efficient government providing necessary services at the least cost to the economy. That is why I want a united country, Mr. Speaker, so that we can get on with the job of creating a sustainable economy in Canada.

It's not just me that feels that way. Certainly we heard that as a privilege that I had to be a member of the select standing committee that went around this province, and I quote from the rapport du comité spécial de l'Alberta sur la réforme constitutionnelle:

Les Albertains sont préoccupés par l'ampleur du déficit fédéral et la dette nationale, les dépenses fédérales et provinciales et les politiques de taxation, et par les obstacles au commerce, au droit de circulation et d'établissement à l'intérieur du pays. Ils ont souligné que, plutôt que la Constitution, c'est l'économie qui devrait être la toute première priorité de tous les gouvernements [du Canada.]

On the issue of equality, Mr. Speaker, as I stated in my remarks in this Legislature on April 27, 1992, the principle is one which is reflected in many of Canada's essential institutions. The principle is recognized in the amending formula, which treats all provinces equally for the seven out of 10 test; in the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, where regardless of race, religion, gender, we are all equal in the eyes of the Charter. The equality of all the provinces is now enshrined in the Senate package, the equality of persons before the health system, the equality of English and French as languages and as a founding principle of Canada, not to undervalue other languages and cultures in our society but to provide the model on which the equality of value of all languages and all cultures in Canada is based.

Equality quite simply means the exact opposite of dominance. It refers to the value of separate entities. It does not mean that entities must be the same. This accord recognizes the equality of women and men, of aboriginal and nonaboriginal, of provinces one to the other, of Francophone and Anglophone, of value of country of origin, of all Canadians. Equality is the lifeblood of our country and is the thread of hope that has kept Canadians united for 125 years and will be, I hope, the thread that lets us be our own distinct society for hundreds of years to come. For me it is the principle which speaks most positively to my Canadian soul.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, respect, the third principle which this Legislature's select standing committee presented to Albertans: respect for differences, respect for initiative and drive and competence and strength, but at the same time respect for the less strong, respect for the laws of Canada, respect for differences, be they differences of opinion or nationality or perspective.

3:30

The perspective of what Canada is is as diverse as the individuals who make up this country, but those respective visions of the country are pulled together with a redefined commitment as to why we are Canadians, which the Charlottetown accord provides the answer to. It is the answer to that question – why am I a Canadian? – that each and every one of us will have to face as we provide the answer in the voting booth alone on voting day on October 26.

Robertson Davies is a great Canadian writer and a professor of English at the University of Toronto and wrote in one of his early plays: let the geniuses of easy virtue go southward; let Canada do with me as she will; I will stay. Well, so will I, Mr. Speaker; so will I stay and do whatever I can to see that a vote on the referendum affirms the yes side and is a vote for Canada. I know that I am but one Canadian whose vote has no greater value than any other vote by any other Canadian, but the choice I make is a choice for the future at a time when cynicism and negativism threaten to tear us apart.

I, too, welcome the results of the Maastricht treaty vote in France this past weekend. I followed with interest the debate as the no side gained its voice over the course of the campaign, and I waited with bated breath for the results of the referendum and its close majority, but its majority nonetheless. I don't believe we

can take for granted a yes vote, but I will do whatever I can to ensure that it is the outcome here in Alberta and in Canada. I will vote in favour of this resolution, Mr. Speaker, and I will vote in favour of this question on October 26.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. Member for West Yellowhead.

MR. DOYLE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to add my comments on the yes side of the vote on October 26. I speak knowing what it is like to be a Canadian. I was born of Irish immigrants to this country and educated and raised in New Brunswick and in the St. Lawrence River area of Ontario, and I have worked in every province west of New Brunswick. If fact, I was born in a French community in New Brunswick, and I realize the importance of French as a language and a culture that must be enshrined in any Constitution that is voted on within this country. I realize the importance of other cultures within this country.

We must congratulate those who worked so hard over the last months, including our Premier, but not forget those others around the table and my member of the House of Commons, Mr. Clark, who was head of that team and brought this to a final end.

Mr. Speaker, the environment is a most important issue that's been addressed in this Constitution, and it has brought to the forefront with all the Premiers across this country and all citizens of this country that our environment must be protected from one end of the country to the other.

The education system, Mr. Speaker, is an issue that has been addressed by many provinces. We must find a way of having education throughout this country so one can move from a school in one province to a school in another province and pick up as though there were no time lost.

The hard work of the Premiers, the hard work of the minister responsible, and the hard work of all the backroom people has led to this historic moment, where now we on the yes side of the Constitution have to fight hard to make sure that Canada will be a strong country from one coast to the other coast and from sea to sea to sea.

Mr. Speaker, the record of the no side is sometimes one to listen to, a party with only one elected person, and the mouthpiece from the leadership of that party perhaps has not addressed the real economy of Canada and the real need to have a strong Constitution to assure us that we can return to a good economy from one side of this country to the other. The movements in this Constitution will allow us to develop a good economy with tourism, with developments in forestry, a good understanding for all developments, and good job creation throughout this province.

I was one who was on the side of abolishing the Senate completely, but with the results of this Constitution it is much better than the situation we had before with all appointed Senators. Of course, over time, Mr. Speaker, and looking back on the strength of these Senators, who will now be elected, they perhaps will have more strength – it was encouraged by Mr. Clark – than perhaps the minister of any government in any province; in fact, sometimes more strength perhaps than the Premier of one province or another.

Mr. Speaker, the elected Senate portion indicates that it can be elected or appointed by the Legislature of the day. Perhaps some governments across Canada will choose to appoint three members of the Senate, but I would hope that all parliaments across Canada would allow the election of Senators to make sure all who are voting on the rights of all Canadians will in fact be elected by those they speak for.

Mr. Speaker, with that I would like to compliment the Premier and others who took part in this historic debate. We'll stand strong on the yes side of the vote on October 26.

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

MR. MITCHELL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, too, am privileged to rise today and speak on behalf of the yes forces in this referendum campaign.

I would like to add to others' my congratulations to the Premier of Alberta for his efforts in wresting this agreement and the advantages that it provides for Albertans. I would like to congratulate the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs for his key role in achieving those things within this agreement as well. I would like to make special mention of the staff in the Department of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. I once was a member of that department. I know of those people and what they do, and I can imagine the sense of mission and purpose that they brought to these negotiations and the support that they've provided for this government and its seniormost officials: the Premier and the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs.

I would also like to say that I wish that each and every Albertan could watch and listen to the cases that have been presented in the last two days in this Legislature. I believe that they have been powerfully argued, that there is little doubt if one assesses these arguments that yes should be the vote of Albertans.

I would like to open by mentioning one particular issue which I think requires to be emphasized, and that is the importance of recognizing disabled persons in the Canada clause. I would like to congratulate Mr. Clark on his recognition of this omission, and I would like to state that I and my caucus support Mr. Clark in that recognition and understand and believe that he will ensure that it is brought into the Constitution as soon as possible.

I in my capacity as Treasury critic have been asked to argue this case from an economic point of view, and I will do that. That will be in fact the largest part of the substance of my address. I believe very, very strongly, Mr. Speaker, that the choice before us is not a choice between this agreement and some other agreement. Anybody who suggests that is extremely naive. This agreement is literally in my estimation a miracle. Take 11 first ministers, four native leaders, two leaders of territories. You bring them together after literally years of public hearings, legislative and parliamentary committees, open constitutional forums, TV debates, town hall meetings. You put them into a process of negotiation amidst a swirl of different interests, emotional positions, factual positions, a range of concerns, a range of challenges. The thought that they could possibly, conceivably come up with an agreement of this nature or of any nature is literally a miracle. To say that there is a choice for some other agreement is to be fundamentally wrong and is to be fundamentally naive.

3:40

Nor does a no vote in this referendum offer a choice of constitutional bliss. Perhaps I say this partially with tongue in cheek, but there is a vestige of reality when I say that once Quebec were to leave, we'd all remember how concerned and angry we'd been in the recent past with Ontario. Of course, as things evolve we start to see that Ontario is bigger than the rest of us, so they're getting more. Well, I guess we'd have to let them go. Then the four of us in western Canada would look and say: "B.C. is bigger than all of us, and they're getting more. Well, I guess we better let them go." Pretty soon Edmonton would be looking sideways at Calgary and saying: "Geez, Calgary's getting

more than Edmonton. We better let them go." The fact is that there is never going to be, I expect, constitutional bliss in this country. If it weren't constitutional issues or regional issues, there would be some other range of issues. I can't imagine nor am I aware of a country that does not have tensions, that does not achieve some sense of vibrancy and energy and evolution and development because of those tensions. If they're not regional, as they are in Canada, then they are religious or they have some form of economic expression or they in fact are regional, as they are in other countries. They are based upon and premised upon a range of issues. A no vote does not give us constitutional bliss. A no vote does not give us a country free of issues, a country free of tensions. Anybody who proposes that that would be the case is fundamentally wrong and fundamentally naive. I believe that very strongly.

Mr. Speaker, it is, I believe, a choice between this agreement and at best political instability or a choice between this agreement and at worst the breakup of the country. The last suggestion is very problematic. There are those who will disagree and those who will agree, and we could argue about that forever. Let's set it aside, and let's look at my first contention: the choice between a yes vote and political instability with fundamental economic consequences. I'm going to use an anecdote to describe how this struck me first.

I went to my banker about a week ago to renew our mortgage. My wife and I had decided that we would go one year with an open rate. Of course, my banker very interestingly said: "Mr. Mitchell, you know I think you would be making a mistake to go short and to have an open rate. What happens if this country votes no on October 26? You know what will happen? Interest rates will skyrocket." He used an example which I think is very telling. He said that earlier this year the president of the national bank of Germany said to sell Canadian bonds. Why? Because Canada is unstable given its current constitutional circumstances. Interest rates jumped two percentage points.

We can look back at a series of economic market events that occurred during the Meech Lake debate. For example, in May 1990 international markets dumped \$2.2 billion worth of Canadian bonds in a single month. Why? Because that was about the time that the Meech Lake negotiations were becoming extremely stressed, a great deal of instability during that period of time. Throughout 1990 twenty-one percent fewer Canadian bonds were bought than the previous year; banks in the United States began to spread the premium between U.S. and Canadian rates because of political instability. We could go on with many, many examples, but the consequences of the international market's view of our instability are that interest rates go up in order to attempt to protect the value of our dollar, deficit reduction is therefore frustrated, capital costs rise, economic growth and economic potential are severely limited.

It isn't a question of us in a sense having our cake and eating it too. We can't define what we want to do in the sense of a no vote here and expect that somehow the rest of the world will conform. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that at a time when this country has become increasingly focused on the need to develop international economic competitiveness, why would we turn around and risk engendering severe political instability which will lead to an economic instability, which I believe will have serious consequences for the future of whatever would be left of this country?

There are many economic positives in this agreement which can be and have been overly diminished. I look at the Senate. Clearly, the Senate will have an impact on regional economic inequities, first of all because of course it will have power to veto issues over natural resources. The Premier made the point

yesterday that it isn't just oil; it will be a range of natural resources. Those are key elements of regional economic development in this country.

It is also true, Mr. Speaker, that the Senate will be able to speak from its perspective on regional balance on redressing regional inequities. Now, people will say they have no power to do that. I would argue that one of their most fundamental powers will come from the fact that they are elected. Elected members have a forum, they are listened to, they have a moral suasion, and they will begin to change and alter people's views at the core, at the central government of this country, and people's views across this country because of the power that will come with that stature.

The Senate – and this hasn't received any kind of widespread recognition – will have the right, unfettered, to veto federal appointments to various regulatory agencies and in particular the appointment of the governor of the Bank of Canada. That is a veto that cannot be overruled by a joint sitting of the Parliament and Senate. That is extremely significant. How many times over the last number of years have we heard the argument that interest rates were set with a central Canadian perspective, that interest rates were based upon what Ontario needed and what Quebec needed? Those interest rates are set by an individual, an individual who has been appointed exclusively by a Parliament, by a government that hasn't had the benefit of regional perspectives that will be brought by a Senate. The Senate will have absolute authority, a simple majority, to overrule any appointment that is proposed for that position and a range of other positions.

For example, the CBC is a national agency that it would seem to me would fall under this particular appointment procedure. The CRTC, the National Energy Board, the atomic energy commission, and so on and so forth: this will give the regional perspective that will be embodied in the Senate a huge amount of authority over decision-makers who affect our regional economies with every single decision that they make. That is a power that should never ever be diminished and should in fact be emphasized.

Section 36, Mr. Speaker, emphasizes the importance of regional economic development and provides for the federal government to make agreements with provincial governments to promote regional economic development. Section 25 addresses the issue of federal spending power. Why it is significant economically, among other reasons, is that it calls for federal spending power to be limited in a way that will ensure greater efficiency and reduce overlap. How many of us understand intuitively that overlap and inefficiency in government have direct and negative economic consequences? It's also true that this agreement clarifies powers with respect to labour market development and training. That clarification will allow authority to be focused more efficiently and more aggressively at the provincial level. It will allow energies and resources therefore not to be dispersed in, I believe, one of the most significant areas in the future for making us economically ready, economically competitive, particularly on an international scale.

Mr. Speaker, it is said by the forces of no that somehow disagreement does not emphasize or provide for equality across this country. In fact, it is true that there are certain distinctions. Aboriginal people will have a certain distinction. The French culture, for example, will have a certain distinction. It is a fundamental error to say that because somebody is distinct they can never be equal or we can never be equal to them. Men and women are distinct. Does that mean they will never be equal? Different groups in different parts of our society have many distinctions. Does that mean that they can never be equal? No. The fact of the matter is that distinction does not necessarily and in fact does not mean inequality.

3:50

What I would like to argue again from an economic perspective is that we may have some ideal view, some extreme view of what exactly equality should be and how it should be embodied in this agreement. If that view of equality is not now in this agreement, it is because the process and the nature of interest and the nature of forces in this country would not allow it to occur. I would argue that to do away with this agreement, to risk political instability because of this agreement and therefore the economic consequences that will surely follow will have a different kind of impact on equality. If we do not secure our wealth in this province and secure our economic success in this country, if that begins to fritter away, Mr. Speaker, then the consequences are that we will not be able to pursue equality in many, many significant ways. We potentially will not be able to sustain the equality of educational opportunities which is fundamental to equality of all people in this country, the equality of access to health care, the equality of access to a variety of services. There is much at stake in this agreement, and it is not an agreement that I believe can be discarded.

While it is true to say that voting yes in this case will not solve all of the problems of this country, it is also true to say, Mr. Speaker, that voting yes will at least give us a chance to go on solving those problems, to secure what is very, very remarkable about this country, what is special about this country, to ensure that the role that this country plays for Canadians but also has played and can play in the world will not be lost on October 26. It's for these reasons that I am voting yes.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Culture and Multiculturalism.

MR. MAIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Before the Assembly today is probably the most important question this nation has faced since it came into being 125 years ago. We're being asked to deal with an important question here in the Legislature today on the basis of the motion: "Do you agree that the Constitution of Canada should be renewed on the basis of the agreement reached on August 28, 1992?" That is a big question that has raised with it a number of other smaller questions. You and other members have heard them in the coffee shops, on the streets, and in their own homes. What does the deal mean? What's in the deal? Is it any good for Canada? Is it effective? Will it be good? Will it be bad? These are difficult questions to deal with, but ultimately we boil down to the one basic question: do you agree that the Constitution should be renewed? There are only two possible answers to that. They are yes and no. To make the right choice, that most difficult choice, we have to be well informed.

Mr. Speaker, in my role as the minister responsible for the Public Affairs Bureau some of the responsibility falls to me and to the energetic, enthusiastic, creative, and hardworking people who work in the Public Affairs Bureau. They in concert with the people at Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs have worked very, very hard to keep government and the people of Alberta informed, and we will continue to do that. Every household in the province of Alberta will be receiving this brochure beginning next week. It describes in detail the process that led us to this point today. It details what the Horsman committee found out from Albertans. It details the basic points that are in the Charlottetown accord and then provides an opportunity for people who need more information to phone a variety of 800 numbers and other places to seek more information.

Mr. Speaker, this is the beginning of an important element of this campaign, and that is the information campaign. What is in the deal? What does it all mean? How can voters – Canadians, Albertans – be better informed? We are going to be using television, we're going to be using print, we're going to be using radio, we're going to be using forums such as the Alberta Legislature, as we're doing today, to make the case for the content of this most important accord.

We're going to be prudent; we're not going to be extravagant. It is critically important that the information be placed in the hands of the voters so they can make a reasonable and reasoned choice on October 26.

Now, not only the government of Alberta will have much to say. There will be more persuasion. There will be other arguments. There will be more detail coming from a variety of sources. The federal government, of course, will be providing its own information packages in a variety of means, and there are campaigns abroad in the land, campaigns on the hard yes side, campaigns on the hard no side. Ultimately, Mr. Speaker, when the smoke clears, there are two choices, and one of them is no. It's advocated by some. You have heard in this Legislature arguments for yes. My colleagues have enunciated those concerns. The Premier, the Deputy Premier, members of the committee, members of the opposition including their leaders and their entire caucuses have given you solid reasons for the yes side.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address my remarks to the substance of no and deal with those arguments because I find them flawed, I find them weak, and I find them suspicious in their motivations. There is a document that has been circulated by a federal party that advocates no. It outlines six reasons why this deal should be rejected and why the people of Canada should vote no. I'd like to deal in some brief way with those six points because I think it's important that they be placed in context.

The first point that's raised is that the consensus report will not bring constitutional peace but will just bring more negotiations. Of course it will. There is much yet to be discussed: the actual makeup of the Senate; future first ministers' conferences will deal with aboriginal issues; much more negotiation must take place on economic union and bringing down interprovincial trade barriers. Mr. Speaker, the fact that negotiations will continue is no reason to vote no; it's a very good reason to vote yes.

Mr. Speaker, this document says that this will weaken the Canadian economic union. My colleague from Edmonton-Meadowlark has just made the case that the economic imperatives on October 26 will compel Canadians to vote yes because of the dire consequences of voting no. I can't speak from any vast knowledge base about world economics, but I can tell you about an experience I had when I was in Hong Kong during the summer of 1990 when the Meech Lake accord was teetering on the brink of collapse. I saw in the faces of business leaders there and I saw in the conversations around lunch tables and at gatherings the nervousness about what would happen to Canada and the terror that offshore investment would see as moving to Canada. It wasn't going to happen until the constitutional question was settled, and that is still the case today. Until this matter is settled, the offshore investment that built this nation, built North America, will be parked in the absence of a firm footing upon which government decisions can be made.

[Mr. Jonson in the Chair]

This document describes the triple E Senate, which members of this Assembly describe as a miracle, as less than two Es. Mr. Speaker, as I view the triple E Senate, I'd like to add one more E.

This exists. Where is the alternative Senate? Those who find failure in this model, where's the alternative that's on the table for our discussion? It does not exist, and this one does.

This document speaks of regional equality and the lack thereof. The people that I talked to didn't want regional equality. That model was rejected. We were seeking provincial equality. That's what Albertans told the Horsman committee they wanted, and that's what our Premier sought and stood firm on. That is what we have today: provincial equality. You've heard its effectiveness described in a variety of ways. Let me just give one small example. Imagine a House of Commons with a small majority, or a minority government – very likely with the proliferation of federal political parties we have now – and imagine the power that accrues to a Senate that can move decisions one way or the other in that type of House of Commons, in that type of a parliament. If that's not effective, it doesn't exist.

Mr. Speaker, this document talks about the proposed Constitution being completely inflexible. It makes the argument for no on the basis of unanimity required for further discussions. I would confess to the House and I would confess to my colleagues that the unanimity feature of Meech Lake was one that was bothersome to me. I have seen the results of the last several months of discussions, and I have seen unanimity not required in a Constitution but brought about by the sheer force of will to make something happen and to create a better Canada. Unanimity was brought to bear on this document. And not just 10 provincial governments and a federal government: aboriginal groups; territorial governments; three different political parties; 10 different provinces, large and small; two competing and irreconcilable, in the minds of many, views of the founding of Canada. There's unanimity there. It tells me that dealing with the substance and with some minor changes that somebody may suggest in the future, unanimity is not a roadblock; unanimity is no reason to vote no.

4:00

This document suggests that we should vote no because it provides no strong antidote to Quebec separatism. Mr. Speaker, the antidote to Quebec separatism is Quebec separatism. This document provides the people of Quebec with a place in Canada, as Albertans said they wanted. They wanted a Canada with Quebec in it, and reasonable people and the majority of Quebecers want that as well. So the notion that somehow a constitutional document will put an end to Quebec separatism: I'm afraid that will continue irrespective of what kind of a Constitution is designed because those viewpoints will continue in Quebec, and the only antidote is separation. I don't advocate it, our government doesn't advocate for it, and most Canadians do not seek it or want it and would be shocked, disappointed, and sad to say the least if that were to happen.

Mr. Speaker, this document ends with saying that the constitutional proposal, the unity package from Charlottetown that's described in our brochure, is at odds with the Reform Party's vision of a new Canada. There are a number of visions of Canada, and the Reform Party's vision is the basis of that party's existence. But on many points it's irreconcilable with reality today in 1992 in Canada. There are other visions of Canada. The Charlottetown accord brings together the vision of Canada that Canadians want. It was a broad consultative process. Ideas were brought together, compressed, reduced through countless hours of work to the agreement that's before us today that we are asking Canadians to go ahead and agree on. The document that outlines the objections is flawed. It's weak. It makes no compelling case to reject years of work and to reject the possibility of a new

Canada in which all Canadians will live more peacefully, in more harmony, and much more prosperously than they are doing today.

There's one more important point that must be made, Mr. Speaker. The referendum that takes place on October 26 puts power in the hands of Canadian people. It takes the governance out of the Legislatures and puts it on the street. This is an important point that should not be missed. There is a responsibility that everyone in this Chamber and other elected Chambers senses and feels when they are elected to this place to make these bodies, and that responsibility is to be fully, completely informed, to weigh the issues, to seek different viewpoints, and then come to the conclusion that makes the best possible choice for their constituents and for the province and for the nation. That power on October 26 moves from this room to your living room, and on that basis it's imperative that Canadians be well informed and make those reasoned choices. Canadians would ask no less of us, and we must ask no less of ourselves on October 26.

Mr. Speaker, as we've heard conversations about triple A – abolish, abolish, abolish – and triple E or quadruple E, I would bring us to a conclusion today on seven Cs. On the basis of consultation – the most vast consultation process in our land – on the basis of the consensus reached, on the basis of the content of the agreement, the context in which it was arrived at, the consequences of a no vote, the conclusion on October 26 must be for Canada. It must be yes.

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

MS MJOLSNESS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am pleased to participate in this important debate on the motion before this Assembly today and add my support to the agreement that was reached in Charlottetown on August 28, 1992. I base that support on a number of things. When I first read through the agreement, I was very impressed by the number of inclusions that were in the agreement. I think it's important that we recognize that what is contained in the agreement are principles, and they are the foundation, I believe, that we can now build upon.

I believe it was a tremendous feat that we reached consensus among the provincial leaders, the territorial leaders, the aboriginal leaders, all of those people who were involved in this negotiation process, because not only was consensus achieved but compromises were made on behalf of all Canadians. No one received exactly what they wanted, Mr. Speaker, but that is what negotiations are all about. I will admit that I was a bit concerned in the initial stages of the negotiations because it seemed to me that what was happening, what was prevalent in these negotiations in the beginning was that we heard Alberta wanted such and such, Quebec wanted such and such, Ontario wanted such and such, and it seemed to me at that particular time that no one was really speaking on behalf of Canada. But I think things changed, and I do believe that the outcome was very positive indeed for Canadians. As some members of the Assembly have said: in fact, it was a miracle. Everyone compromised, and I believe that compromise resulted in the consensus that was only achieved because each leader showed respect and understanding towards one another during those negotiations. For this I'm thankful to the Premier and to the Deputy Premier, for their co-operative spirit in which they participated on behalf of all Albertans and on behalf of all Canadians.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the principles outlined in this agreement are crucial principles in unifying our country and building a strong Canada. I hope that all the provinces and all the

territorial governments and the federal government respect these principles and take them very seriously.

There are many components of the agreement, and it's obvious that we can't get into each one specifically, but I'm very encouraged, Mr. Speaker, to see the policy objectives laid out in the agreement in relation to the social union. For example, we see in this agreement that we have given recognition and a commitment to a universal, publicly administered, accessible health care system for Canadians. I think this is very important. We see a commitment to provide "high quality primary and secondary education" to the citizens of this country. We see in the section under the social union that we will protect "the rights of workers to organize and bargain collectively." We will provide "adequate social services and benefits" to Canadians in areas such as "housing, food and other basic necessities." I believe that these objectives that formulate the social union in this particular agreement are a very crucial aspect. The national social programs in this country I believe differentiate us from other countries and certainly contribute to the pride that I feel as a Canadian.

Also contained in the agreement, Mr. Speaker, is the economic union, in which one objective that I believe is important to mention today is "the goal of full employment." I believe that these very important fundamental principles outlined in the agreement are extremely crucial and that all governments must have an obligation to them. I believe that this is very encouraging.

Mr. Speaker, the accord recognizes the distinctiveness and uniqueness of Quebec. We have taken a giant step in recognizing the rights of our aboriginal people. We achieved a reformed Senate. This was very important to many Albertans, more important to some than to others, I will admit. Some feel that we should abolish the Senate, some feel that it's not as effective as it could be or should be, and some feel very strongly that we need gender parity in our Senate. I strongly agree that we do need gender parity, gender equity. I think that the new Senate needs to reflect the true makeup of our population. I will remind members that women did not get the vote, did not legally become persons by accepting the status quo and simply saying that if we hang in there long enough, things will change. It did not happen that way. If we believe in equality, we must be proactive. I believe we had a golden opportunity to take a bold step to ensure gender equality within the Senate, a step which I feel is absolutely one that we should have taken.

Having said that, I realize that we do have a reformed Senate. It's new and much, much improved over what we had in the past. However, I would like to see the equality achieved. I'm sure that with time, as some members have suggested, we will reach equality. I would like to see it in my day, Mr. Speaker, but I don't believe that I will live to be 300 years old, and if time tells a story, we know that we've progressed very slowly in this area.

4:10

Mr. Speaker, initially I was concerned with the devolution of powers to the provinces, but as I considered the various areas that became exclusive provincial jurisdictions, I realized that they are areas that potentially are a duplication of services such as recreation, tourism, training, housing: they're all outlined in the accord. I do not believe, though, that we should see this as an opportunity to abrogate our responsibilities in these areas, and if in fact federal involvement decreases in these areas, I believe that the provincial governments have got to increase their involvement in these areas. I do know that individuals and agencies involved in various areas like housing want and deserve clarification of the implications of the transfer of powers. I would hope that would be forthcoming.

One concern that I think should be raised and has been raised previously in the Assembly is that persons with disabilities are requesting a change in the Canada clause as they want equal and full participation. I'm very hopeful that their concerns will be addressed, Mr. Speaker. I understand that what they want is inclusion of their rights in the legal text. In fact, there is some consideration being given to that as we speak, so hopefully that will be solved.

It's not a perfect deal, Mr. Speaker. As I talk to people, I realize that every individual has a different interpretation of what exactly "perfect" is, but I do think it's important to recognize the concerns that Albertans have with this agreement. It's important that we present a balanced view of this agreement to Albertans, because I believe that they want us to be fair with them. They want to get the information, and they want to decide for themselves. I believe that this accord is very positive. It's a very positive major step for all Canadians, and I am hopeful that Albertans will weigh the positives against the negatives and certainly vote yes on October 26.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that our country's future is at stake, and I do not believe that we can gamble with the prospect of voting no on October 26. So I say let's get on with building a unified Canada in this crucial time in our history; let's get on with dealing with the serious economic and social issues that we face as Canadians. I will be doing all that I can to urge Albertans and my constituents to vote yes on October 26.

Thank you.

MS McCOY: Mr. Speaker, I'm honoured to participate in this discussion as well. After all the meetings and discussions large and small, the seemingly endless discussions in coffee shops and in caucuses and in living rooms and Legislatures, frankly I'm delighted we have finally come to this point where we can now vote on the deal.

People ask me, of course, where do I stand on the unity deal. On the deal itself I say to them, "Well, yes and no," but on the unity vote I am one hundred percent yes. Now let me tell you why.

About 18 months ago several of my constituents wanted to put a presentation in to our Horsman committee, as we called it, and had several meetings and then came to my house one evening to finalize their paper. As we were discussing the points that they wished to bring forward, one person said: "You know, we haven't asked ourselves this question yet. The question is, do we want to be Canadians?" Everybody around the table without even thinking instantly said yes. Then I asked them the question, "Well, why?" That was a much harder question to answer. There were people there who had been born and raised in Canada, people who'd moved here as adults, some who had moved here as children, but one after the other they began to say why they wanted to be Canadians. This is what they submitted and wrote themselves in their presentation.

In Calgary West, we want to be Canadians because we believe in certain values. We believe in fairness. We believe in respect for individuals. We believe in achieving balance. We believe in sharing among individuals, communities, provinces and territories. We believe in equality and we believe in diversity and we believe we can be both equal and different [all at the same time.]

I believe that the accord resonates deeply with those values, so I, too, wish to congratulate our Premier, our Deputy Premier, Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, and Minister of Municipal Affairs. I know that they personally had to dig deep down into their souls not once but many times for the strength and

courage to keep going and to truly act out and on those beliefs and values that we all share.

In particular I hear the principle of diversity echoing throughout the accord. We've established a framework which gives explicit recognition that provinces are equal, and at the same time we've set up a mechanism by which their differences can be accommodated. I'm very pleased that there's room in the accord which allows us to achieve balance and to honour the principle of diversity, equality, and being different all at the same time and allows for some diminishing of duplication and overlap in government services.

Some have said that this is not a deal at all; it's only an agreement to agree. I disagree with that point of view. I think the framework we have allows each of us to accommodate our own diversities while recognizing equality. The last thing we should want is a coffin Constitution. Instead we have a living document.

The issue of diversity has been raised in another way also, and of course that is the question of gender equality or a quota system as is being proposed for women in the Senate. I do not support quotas. As Canadians we believe in equality, that it is possible to be equal and different at the same time. In effect, we believe that gender is not an issue. So how, then, can you turn around and designate some seats purely on the basis of gender? What about respect for individuality? Is there anything to say that that number of three women would represent my views more completely than any of the other three Senators? Of course there is not. We all know from our own experience in our caucuses, in this House, and in our own constituencies that gender is no guarantee of unanimity.

A gender quota is wrong for another reason. It implies that only female Senators need to concern themselves with representing women. I believe that all Senators must represent all women and men. It's a politician's duty to represent all constituents and to help others reach a consensus on each issue as it arises. When I look back on the leaders that I have admired, I see Churchill, I see J.F. Kennedy, I see Thatcher. What made me respect them was not their gender. What made me respect them was their ideas, their beliefs, and their performance. Last night PBS aired part two of its special on the Kennedys, and it dealt at length with the career of Robert F. Kennedy. He was adored by American blacks, the poor, the powerless, and they adored him not because he looked like them, not because he was poor like them, but because he understood their concerns and committed himself to fighting for them.

I believe what is important for Canadian women is not that we elect a certain percentage of women, although I should always hope that it would be a high percentage, but that 100 percent of our Senators believe in the equality of all Canadians.

For those reasons, Mr. Speaker, I too will be urging all Albertans to vote yes on October 26. Thank you.

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

4:20

MR. McEACHERN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm proud to join in this discussion, this historic debate, and of course I will be supporting the yes side on the referendum and urging all my constituents and all Albertans to do the same. It isn't just a yes because it's better than the no; it's an enthusiastic yes. I think the Premiers and Joe Clark did a heck of a good job. The Premier of Alberta and the Deputy Premier and the other members of cabinet and their staffs took the Alberta case to the constitutional discussions, but also there they met with a number of other people

that also had political agendas and different agendas, and they sat down and did something that I didn't believe could be done.

[Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair]

I didn't really think that Robert Bourassa's political agenda could be accommodated at the same time that Alberta's agenda could be accommodated. I didn't believe that Bourassa's agenda with native affairs could be reconciled with the agenda of the aboriginal peoples, yet we saw the ministers sit down and solve the Senate in one day. I said: "Well, that's fine; great. I can't believe they did it, but I'll be interested to see the details." Then they sat down the next day – I gather that Mulroney sicced Bob Rae on Bourassa – and they solved the native affairs thing. And so it went; it just snowballed. These Premiers came up with a resolution, with a consensus that when I read it, I was extremely pleased.

Now, somebody can call it a miracle if you like, but I think it was just people who wanted to keep this country together. I don't think it was accidental that you had people like Roy Romanow there with the experience he had and four New Democrat Premiers, quite frankly, who were prepared to help keep this country together as were the other people at the table. I particularly commend Joe Clark for having co-ordinated it. So I don't think we got just a second-rate agreement. I think we got a first-class document that can set the direction for the future for this country, that will keep us together.

The first day's work on the Senate was much better than most people realize. I know a number of people are saying, "Oh, you know, you didn't get the triple E," but my reading right from the very first, even before I got the full text, was that the Senate was going to be much more effective than most people thought. I think the Premier proved that beyond a shadow of doubt yesterday when he outlined six good reasons why that Senate will be effective, so I'm not going to go back over them again. I'm just going to say that the information is there for anybody in this province who wants it. If they want to find out how effective the Senate will be, they just need to read it.

Now, there is one aspect of it that I want to address, particularly after the previous speaker. It would have been nice if it had been agreed that the Senate should have gender parity. That was not in the cards, and so be it, but we will see a move in that direction. New Democrat governments across the country will lead the way in various provinces, and we will see a gender parity Senate somewhere down the road. Also, I hope we will see – and we might even start out with this. I think we should consider it seriously here in Alberta, to again lead the way. The Premier likes to talk about leading the way, electing the first Senator. It has started a direction that we're all moving now, and that is to see some kind of proportional representation in the Senate rather than a straight first-past-the-post for geographic regions. I think that should be considered.

So the Senate will turn out to be quite effective.

I just want to touch quickly on some of the other issues of substance. Of course I'm thrilled that there's a social charter in the Constitution. The economic charter is also all right. It's not fully developed yet, and that's left to some political accords. By the way, on the number of political accords that still have to be worked out that Mr. Manning complains about all the time, I find it quite ridiculous that he should complain. Of course in a democratic country like this you have to have discussion and settle problems by having meetings between different levels of government and different groups of people, and so you end up with some political accords. Isn't that the democratic process? You don't

put all of those political decisions into the Constitution. What we've got in the Constitution is good, basic agreements that should be in the Constitution and with some prescriptions that say that certain other matters will be settled by political accords, which is exactly what they should be. The fact that we haven't nailed them down in the Constitution is not a problem. In fact it's a plus, because lots of things change as the society changes, and you can't have a Constitution that is so rigid that you can't change it down the road.

A couple of points on the economic side. I agreed with a lot of the things that the Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark said earlier about the importance of the economic union that we have, and the Constitution perhaps didn't deal with those in great detail. I was very proud to see that we were able to get the words "full employment" in as a goal. I think that's great. There were a number of other points that were okay too, and they've been covered, so I won't talk about them, but there were a couple of things that weren't in there that are equally important as far as I'm concerned. For example, the federal government originally wanted to put in a statement that would say that the governor of the Bank of Canada would only concern himself with inflation when setting the interest rates in this country and not be concerned about the state of the economy and how much unemployment there might be. I think one of the great abilities of the group of people that came up with this document was to know which divisive things that were not essential had to be set aside rather than continue to beat your head on a brick wall knowing you're not going to get agreement, and they set those aside and got the agreement on those things that could be agreed upon. I'm really glad that one got set aside, because I don't agree with that as an economic policy or a monetary policy.

There was another aspect of the monetary agreement that they wanted to push also, and that was that the federal government would set the tone of the kind of monetary and fiscal policy that the country should have and all the provinces would sort of have to fall in line. Well, clearly, if that were the case, when you have the federal government, even though a couple years later after they got us into this recession with their high interest rate policies, even though they realized the error of their ways last spring when they brought in their budget and would have liked to have been able to stimulate the economy, they could not because they've got this huge, huge, deficit. Yet Ontario, when faced with the situation where their economy was collapsing, did not have such a big debt hanging over their head and were able to go ahead. Nobody wants to do that, but they felt obliged to bring in a \$10 billion deficit budget and in fact have brought in a second one, knowing full well what they're doing, having made some adjustments and changes to the second budget compared to the first and perhaps having explained it better. They would not have that flexibility if the federal government had insisted on imposing their policies on all of the country and all of the provinces had to follow the same kind of fiscal management policies.

Just to take it one step further, Saskatchewan also has a big deficit, left to them, I must admit, by nine deficit budgets in a row from a Conservative government. They did not have the flexibility that Ontario had and in fact had to run a tight budget, even though they would have preferred to run a stimulative one. So you do need those kinds of flexibilities across this country if this country is to survive. We are very different from region to region. We have very different circumstances, and those have to be allowed for.

Of course, I was thrilled about the aboriginal self-government clauses. I won't go into detail on them at all, because others have covered it, except to say that I do hope that it moves forward the

problems that the Lubicon have had and resolves that situation. It's a problem that has really been a blight on this province and on this country for far, far too long. It's time that was settled. I hope the momentum that comes out of the aboriginal self-government accords that still have to be negotiated gives the momentum to settle that particular one rather quickly.

The section on devolution of powers I think bothered quite a few people, but on looking at it, there are no powers given away by the federal government that are really crucial to the federal government. We do have a country which is very diverse, and the provinces are quite capable of taking care of a lot of issues. The division of powers that was decided back in 1867 doesn't have to be followed slavishly today. Quebec needed some things to feel more in control of their own society, and the things that were given with that thought in mind are issues that the other provinces can take up or not take up as they please in some cases, and we can handle them. That's not a problem. I was quite pleased with the way that was settled. In fact, I think one of the things that some people forget – and I think a number of New Democrats, I might say, have felt that there were too many powers given away to the provinces and the federal power was weakened too much. So I wanted to look at the federal spending power just very, very briefly.

4:30

Section 25 of the agreement says:

A provision should be added to the Constitution stipulating that the Government of Canada must provide reasonable compensation to the government of a province that chooses not to participate in a new Canada-wide shared-cost program that is established by the federal government in an area of exclusive provincial jurisdiction, if that province carries on a program or initiative that is compatible with the national objectives.

A lot of people take it to mean that we would never, for instance, get a universal day care program right across Canada because of that clause. Now, maybe what they don't stop to think about is this: that the federal government has never had the right to initiate programs in provincial jurisdiction areas before. This gives it that right, so that's a new and unique right for the federal government. A province that objects will be faced with the alternative of losing the tax dollars that are collected by the government or coming up with a comparable program that goes along with what the government did. Provinces were given the right to look after the public welfare in the BNA Act, and the federal government only got into UI, unemployment insurance, and into medicare because the provinces all agreed. Now the federal government could initiate a program and the provinces will have to fall in line or lose the revenues that would be accrued in lieu of taxes to pay for that program by the federal government.

So I think the federal government has quite a lot of chance to influence this society. I think the provinces also have a chance to influence the direction of our political union.

I want to go to the last point that almost everybody has raised, and that is the consequence of voting no or, in a more general sense, why you should vote yes. I think the accord is good, so I think we should be voting yes. The consequence of voting no is a very serious one, and I'm going to put a slightly different twist on it than others. I think that while we have been over the last 10 years debating the Constitution in this country, Brian Mulroney has quietly been effectively curtailing the powers of provincial and federal governments to control their own economic affairs through the free trade deal with the United States and then the NAFTA, and basically what we've done is given away power to the North American union or to multinationals. We have basically deregulated and said, "Whatever the companies want to do, that's fine by

us." Now, we've seen the consequences of that in energy, for example, and finally now we have the minister scrambling to try to figure out how to reregulate the energy industry. So the consequences of that are really serious.

It seems to me, then, that a no vote will probably mean that Quebec will go. If Quebec goes, then this economic union that we've entered into with the United States and are now entering into with Mexico will mean that Canada will last as a nation about another 20 years and then we will become American citizens, because this country will fall apart. If on the other hand we vote yes and the Constitution is settled for the time being, we can turn our attention to economic matters and to those free trade agreements. You will find that the federal government has already decided to spend over \$3 million propagandizing this country about what wonderful things the free trade deal is doing for us, and so that is going to be the next big political fight. If we say yes and settle our constitutional problems, we can turn our attention then to these economic matters, and perhaps this country will survive 40 or 50 years. Unless we come to realize that if we are going to protect our sovereignty we really do have to protect our economic sovereignty, we will not have our political sovereignty forever in this country.

Most of us know that we want to build a different society in this country than what the Americans are building, and if you vote yes on this constitutional agreement, then we will have some chance of doing that. If we vote no, then I have real fear for the future of our country. Therefore, we should all vote yes on the Constitution.

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

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, thank you very much. This weekend I'm going to experience an anniversary: I'm going to reach my 47th birthday on the 27th day of September. This momentous occasion in my life of course comes in the 125th year, the 125th birthday, of the country of Canada. I only say that because 25 years ago essentially, in 1967, I had reached the age of majority, and in 1967 Canada experienced its centennial anniversary, a time of great euphoria throughout this country. It was a time that Canadians looked at one another and said: "I want to know you. I want to understand you. I want to experience what it is that your forefathers brought to this country. I want to understand more about your culture." Canadians en masse went to other parts of this country to try and understand what Canada is all about and to try and understand one another. It was a time of tremendous euphoria and tremendous pride. We had gone through the debates prior to that about determining what flag Canada should have. It's true that there were those in this country who cried when the Maple Leaf was invented as the new flag of Canada. But we went forward.

The last 25 years of my life, virtually all of my adulthood, has been spent in a questioning of what this country is all about. For the last 25 years Canadians have questioned what it is to be a Canadian. We've spent innumerable amounts of hours, days in self-analysis. We've had doubts about what it is to be a Canadian. We've lacked confidence in ourselves. We've been confused; we've been uncertain. There's no doubt at all in my mind, Mr. Speaker, that in the year 1992, after 25 years of debate with respect to the question "What is a Canadian?" very few Canadians really are in a position to answer that question. I'm not sure in my own mind that Canadians know what it is to be a Canadian. I'm not sure that Canadians even want to know what it is to be a Canadian, and frankly the most difficulty I have with all the

questions is that I'm really confused in my own mind whether or not Canadians really care about being Canadians in 1992. The rest of the world looks at us with absolute envy, and as Canadians we look at ourselves with jealousy. We have lost the confidence that we had in the year 1967, the year of our 100th anniversary.

In 1992 we have to take the gamble to renew ourselves as Canadians. We have to go back to the basic question: what is it to be a Canadian? Do we care about being a Canadian? It's remarkable to me that in the year 1992 we could have not only a nonpartisan approach but in essence a tripartisan approach across this country and have 10 Premiers, two leaders from the Yukon and the Northwest Territories, major aboriginal leaders, and the Prime Minister of this country come together in a consensus, a consensus to renew what the question should be about Canada, an opportunity for all Canadians to look at themselves and an opportunity for all Canadians on the 26th day of October to in essence give Canada a chance for the future.

Mr. Speaker, if all of us would read history and go back to the last five centuries and take a look at European and western history, one would find that in the last decade in each of these centuries remarkable changes have occurred in whatever part of that western and European world that existed at the time known at least to the historians that most of us would read. It was in that last decade the changes, the incredible changes that would lead into the next century, really occurred. We have a chance in Canada to be a part of the last five centuries of history. We have a chance in Canada in 1992 to look into the mirror and ask the questions: do we want to be Canadians, and do we really care? I for one want to be a Canadian, and I really care about this. It's really important that all of us stand up and between now and the 26th day of October let all our constituents in all parts of this province, and in fact all Canadians throughout this whole country, know our feelings about the need to be Canadians and the importance and the need for Canada to go into the next century as a united country. It would be absolutely wrong to abandon all the work of the last 125 years to ensure that our children and our grandchildren have an opportunity to live in this country as we know it in 1992.

I'm deeply moved. I'm really incredibly moved to know that there are people in this Assembly who believed with a tremendous degree of intensity over the last number of years in the vision and the need to renew. In fact, I'm sure there were many lonely moments, many lonely nights, and many lonely days when people like our Premier Getty and our Deputy Premier, Mr. Horsman, and our Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, and like you, Mr. Speaker, the MLA for Drumheller, were involved with other men and women in this Assembly trying to convince, first of all, ourselves that it was important to renew Canada in 1992 and it was important to give Canada a chance to move into the 21st century. There were others who said that, ah, it couldn't be done, it could never be done. Those doubters will probably emerge with their own discussions and their own points of view between now and the 26th day of October. But for me, as a person who has always been in awe of what occurs in this building and as a person who has always felt it was a tremendous privilege and a tremendous honour to have earned the respect of his constituents and to have a place in this Assembly, when I look at the work that's been done by our leaders in this Assembly, I applaud them and give them tremendous credit for having the courage to stay with the subject at hand and to work hand in hand with other individuals across this country.

I also want to recognize and to say thank you to my Member of Parliament, the Rt. Hon. Joe Clark, who oftentimes has come under some criticism not only from Albertans but from other people across this country. He is the Member of Parliament for

Yellowhead, and I'm very proud of the role he's played with respect to this whole subject matter as well. There are some individuals in our constituency who will take a different view than the one I take, and I intend on meeting them head-on and head first in this whole debate prior to the 26th day of October, 1992. That day can become very important to the history of Canada. It has to become very important if we want to have a continued history in Canada. There's no doubt in my mind that Canada can go into the next century and that it can be strong, even stronger than most people would believe it can be.

We must give Canada a chance. I'm voting yes on the 26th day of October, and I'm asking all my constituents to do exactly the same.

4:40

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. Premier to conclude debate.

MR. GETTY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll be very brief. I would like to express my thanks to the members of the Assembly. I felt that they in a way rose to the challenge of this issue, and I think the debate has been of exceptionally high quality. I only wish that many, many Albertans could have the advice and thoughts that have been expressed by the members of this Assembly on this issue. It is a challenge for us to get this information out to the people of Alberta, and I hope the people who report the Legislative Assembly might see that they have a responsibility as well to know that this information is going out to the people that they communicate with.

There are only two things I would touch on because some of the members on both sides of the House have reflected on them. One is the matter of whether you could do this again, and I think it was the Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark who pointed out the difficulty of trying to bring this group together. He is so right. In the end we were working with 10 Premiers, the Prime Minister of Canada, four aboriginal groups, and two territorial leaders. Therefore, there were 17 representatives, all with essentially a different point of view on very complex matters. Members could only consider 17 opening statements. Think about it as you're about to try and work to consensus: 17 opening statements. Knowing people in political life, you could say that might average 20 minutes per opening statement: 340 minutes of opening statement; not a debate, not an exchange of views, just a statement of positions. Then think of trying to bring all those relatively rigid, different positions expressed in so many different ways, in different languages, all together. At the time you would just shake your head and then say: "Well, let's try. Let's start to do it."

One other thing to think about is that in those meetings at the beginning, there was distrust. There was suspicion. There was fear. There was shyness. There was awkwardness. There were problems with language, and there was a general sense of not knowing one another and not knowing how to work together. So to pull together that kind of different base of people from so many different backgrounds into a co-ordinated effort on complex matters, because I think we have the most complex nation in the world - think of pulling them all together into virtually unanimity, certainly unanimity on everything that required unanimity, and of course seven and 50 percent on everything otherwise necessary in the Constitution.

Some members referred to the term "miracle." That term was used with a first minister, with me, and I have used it in describing the achievement of getting everybody together from such a strange background. I can remember it was a particularly black day, a low day in negotiations. We were in Ottawa, and I think everybody felt we had now hit the wall. It was failure, and we

broke up with that sense. It only remained to gather together the next day to confirm the failure. As you can imagine, it's one of those lonely moments the Member for Barrhead mentioned. In my room I thought, well, I'd better make one more attempt – this was to close the gap between the province of Quebec and the province of Alberta – one more attempt.

I had my secretary attempt to find Premier Bourassa. In fact, it was difficult because he had checked out. When a Premier in a key moment of a low day like that checks out of his hotel room, a lot of rumours start. People start to think, "Well, then it really is over." But he had moved to another hotel, and it happened to be in Hull. It was on a large park; I forget the name of the hotel. It was late at night, and he was sitting there staring out at the dark. You can imagine that if you're on a park – and it was different than most hotels in Ottawa – he was staring out, as he described it, at quite a black landscape. But he said, "Don, it's quiet, and I moved because I had to get away and think, and think about what happened today."

So I talked to him about: did he realize how firm, how "rigid" I guess was his term, Alberta felt on the matter of equal provinces? Because if he did – and I didn't want to leave miscommunications by anything I said or anything any member of our staff said to one another. But this was an absolute bottom line now. We were no longer talking about negotiations; that this was equal was essential. He was reflecting about the fact of the concept of two nations and that it just was irreconcilable with the idea of 10 equal provinces. I was frustrated, and I said to him: "Then why did you come to the meeting? Why did you come to the meeting, because I've told you – and we're friends; we've worked together for years. Why would you come because there's going to be a failure?" The frustration for me was that Quebec would have publicly again been experiencing a failure in a full First Ministers' Conference, the 1982, the Meech Lake, and now again.

4:50

I can remember that we talked well into the night, and then he said, "I'll tell you, Don; let's both go to sleep and let's hope for a miracle." That fact has been mentioned by several members here in this debate. Well, the next day we were able, at the lowest point in our negotiations, to find a way to reach out to Quebec and give them the sense that we badly wanted them to stay and be part of the future of Canada. They in turn were looking for such a signal, and they reached out towards Alberta. It happened so quickly, almost in an offhand kind of moment in very intense debate, but the Premier of Quebec said it, we immediately moved to confirm it, and at that moment I knew we'd had the breakthrough. I thought back to the night before when we discussed that there was no possibility of reconciling this. Yet in fact we had gone to sleep thinking, well, maybe there will be a miracle, and here we've almost been able to do it.

So that was a special moment in time. I don't think it's possible to reproduce those types of relationships, the way Alberta has worked with Quebec over the years. If that Premier of Quebec hadn't been there and this Premier of Alberta, I don't think we'd have ended up with the package we now have. I thought I would point that out to members as a sort of special insight into the kind of thing that led to what we're able to vote on today.

I'd just conclude by again thanking the members for the quality of their debate, the strength of their conviction, and hope we can now put this behind us and get out and tell Albertans about it.

Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: On the motion as proposed by the hon. Premier, those members in favour of the motion, please say aye.

HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Those opposed, please say no. The motion carries unanimously.

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

5:00

[Eight minutes having elapsed, the Assembly divided]

For the motion:

Adair	Gagnon	Mitchell
Ady	Getty	Mjolsness
Anderson	Gogo	Moore
Betkowski	Hawkesworth	Musgrove
Black	Hewes	Oldring
Bradley	Horsman	Pashak
Brassard	Hyland	Paszkowski
Bruseker	Isley	Payne
Calahasen	Jonson	Roberts
Cardinal	Klein	Rostad
Clegg	Kowalski	Severtson
Day	Laing, B.	Shrake
Dickson	Laing, M.	Sigurdson
Dinning	Lund	Sparrow
Doyle	Main	Stewart
Drobot	Martin	Tannas
Elliott	McClellan	Taylor
Elzinga	McCoy	Thurber
Evans	McEachern	Trynchy
Ewasiuk	McFarland	Weiss
Fischer	McInnis	West
Fjordbotten	Mirosh	Zarusky
Fowler		

Totals: For – 67 Against – 0

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Let the record show that the Assembly has passed this motion unanimously. [applause]

head: **Government Bills and Orders**
head: **Second Reading**

Bill 54
Constitutional Referendum Amendment Act, 1992

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to move second reading of Bill 54, the Constitutional Referendum Amendment Act, 1992. Talk about an anticlimax.

This Bill, Mr. Speaker, is brought forward to the Assembly today in order to empower the federal government under the Referendum Act, Canada, to carry out the referendum by which Albertans will advise this Assembly of their views on the question which has earlier been agreed to and which will be formalized in the brief subsequent motion which will be brought forward following Royal Assent to this Bill. It makes it very clear that the question must be acceptable to the members of this Assembly. We've already made that absolutely clear. Secondly, the referendum must be held before the resolution authorizing the amendment. The Constitution is voted on in this Assembly, and the result of the referendum as determined by the majority of ballots cast in Alberta is binding on the government of Alberta, which shall as soon as practicable take whatever steps within its compet-

ence that it considers necessary or advisable to implement that result.

On this basis we are embarking for the first time in the history of Alberta in dealing with matters affecting the Constitution of Canada to ensure that every Albertan who is eligible to vote has the opportunity to do so. Thereby, it is absolutely certain that the power rests in the hands of the people, and we as servants of the people will carry out their wishes in the true democratic fashion contemplated in the original Act which we brought forward in the spring sittings of this House.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Calgary-Forest Lawn.

MR. PASHAK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd just like to report to the Assembly that our caucus supports Bill 54. During the debate on the original referendum Act, I expressed some reservations. I indicated it is important that we have a clear, concise question. I think we've just approved a clear, concise question, so that concern has been alleviated. The second concern had to do with limits on spending. When I raised these issues during the debate on the referendum Act, I was assured that we'd have regulations in place that would deal with these issues. I know we don't have those regulations in place because we're not going to be bound by provincial regulations when it comes to the conduct of this referendum. However, I still have concerns in this area, and when we move into Committee of the Whole, I'll present questions to the minister at that time.

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

MRS. HEWES: Mr. Speaker, thank you. I'd just like to report to the House that the Liberal caucus supports this amendment wholeheartedly, as we did the Bill in the spring of this year.

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

MR. EWASIUK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, too, want to rise and express my support for the amendment and, of course, the motion we dealt with before this matter came before us. In speaking to the amendment, I'd like to quote from an article I have here written by Arthur V. Mauro, who makes statements that I think really address the issue we are dealing with today. With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to read it into the record.

It talks about On Being a Canadian. This is something the Minister of Public Works, Supply and Services spoke about, of us being Canadians and what responsibility we have as Canadians. I think this article sort of addresses that particular area. It says:

I am the son of immigrants. When my grandparents and parents arrived in this country, Canada did not ask what language they spoke - whether they favoured French or English - whether their loyalty would be to a specific province or region. They were asked to make this land their home and give their best to make the nation a little better. For this commitment, Canada offered freedom - equality before the law and the opportunity for a better life than what they had. Both parties honoured these covenants.

I have been the beneficiary of that covenant, and I have an obligation to my grandchildren that they too will have the opportunity to live in a country culturally diverse but unified in purpose. I am doubly concerned today because in recent years, a corrosive anger has developed across this country. No longer do we talk of compromise or conciliation, but rather of confrontation.

This negativism should concern all of us as Canadians. Every day we see another addition to our litany of complaints. But when will someone speak out for what we stand for as well as what we are against? When will we begin to acknowledge the freedom, the opportunity, the social benefits, the incredible achievements of a young country with a diverse and dispersed population?

We have created here in Canada something unique. Perhaps we lack emotion in the expression of our patriotism, but there is no less a love for the land and the quality of life it has provided. Each of us has an obligation to speak out in defence of this national dream. It is time we stood up, not on behalf of our regional or provincial interests, but on behalf of Canada. If we fail in this great endeavour, we will stand condemned as the generation that forfeited a nation in pursuit of narrow regional, or personal, interests.

[Motion carried; Bill 54 read a second time]

[On motion, the Assembly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole]

head: **Government Bills and Orders**
head: **Committee of the Whole**

5:10

[Mr. Jonson in the Chair]

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I'd ask the committee to please come to order.

Bill 54

Constitutional Referendum Amendment Act, 1992

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments, questions, or amendments to be offered with respect to this Bill?

The Member for Calgary-Forest Lawn.

MR. PASHAK: Well, I'm concerned about the possibility that we may not get a yes vote. It's going to involve a lot of persuasion, I think, on the part of members of the Assembly. There are people out there that maybe are going to vote no; they have considered their point of view and come to a thought-out position on it. There's going to be a group out there that may be concerned about politicians these days and what's happening to the economy, and they may express their frustration.

I think there's going to be another group out there that is going to want to feel that both sides in this issue are treated fairly, that both the yes side and the no side are made available to every potential elector. I know that in the Australian case they do send out statements to all electors in referendums setting out in 2,500 words or less both sides of the argument. I just wonder if the government has any intention of doing anything like that in terms of the referendum question. That's the first question I'd like to put to the minister. I think it would be important to do that, by the way, in the sense that it's really important that people on both sides feel that this election is conducted as fairly as possible, that both sides have a full opportunity to have their voices heard.

A second issue has to do with spending limits. I know that this is going to be conducted under the federal Elections Act, but provisions of the federal Referendum Act provide for the person that's going to be conducting the Referendum Act federally to modify provisions of the Canada Elections Act, and I don't know what sorts of limits are going to be placed on third-party intervenors or this kind of thing. I wonder if the minister has any information about that, if he could tell us whether the federal government is coming down with a set of regulations that would govern just who can spend money, what the total limits will be.

I think those are my major concerns, Mr. Chairman.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Chairman, since we have adopted the federal process for conducting this particular referendum, the federal legislation will govern. In the federal Referendum Act, which will govern, there are particular references made in sections 13 to 26 of that legislation which will deal with restrictions on spending and require the creation of yes or no committees in Canada. They will have to be registered. Contributions will have to be made to those, and they will have to be audited and reported on. Now, this is for any expenditure over \$5,000 on either side of the question. There is a spending limit based on the number of electors in the electoral districts the committee intends to support or oppose the referendum questions, multiplied by 56.4 cents per elector. That, of course, will have to be dealt with under the federal legislation.

With respect to the matter of the activities of governments, the Act does not specifically bind the Crowns in this country; that is, the Crown of the federal Parliament and of the provincial Legislatures. Therefore, it is with great care that this government intends to put out the facts on the material in the consensus report and eventually the full legal text which I referred to yesterday in the debate on the motion. Those will be made available to those who wish to obtain copies, and 1-800 numbers are provided by both federal and provincial governments to provide information. But those of us who are going to go out and campaign actively on the yes side – and I assume it would apply to everybody in this Assembly – will have to do so under the aegis, if you will, of the yes committee which is to be established in this province, assuming we're not going to spend more than \$5,000 individually. It's going to have to be clear. Those who wish to oppose will have equal access to the process for establishing no committees. We are relying on the federal process. I hope that will be satisfactorily understood by people in the province here and, of course, in other provinces in Canada.

I hope that will answer the question. I won't go into all the details included here except to point out as well that those properly registered yes or no committees will gain access to the airwaves of the country under the regulations which are going to be established by the CRTC. That will permit both sides of the matter to be aired as well. Therefore, I think a very fair process has been considered by the federal government. The broadcasting issue, of course, will be one of considerable interest to all who are involved in this matter.

So I think the matters have been adequately covered by the way the federal government has set forth its process.

HON. MEMBERS: Question.

[The sections of Bill 54 agreed to]

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill 54 be reported.

[Motion carried]

MR. GOGO: Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee rise and report.

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair]

MR. JONSON: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has had under consideration certain Bills, and the committee wishes to report the following Bill, Bill 54.

head: **Government Bills and Orders**
head: **Third Reading**

5:20

Bill 54
Constitutional Referendum Amendment Act, 1992

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill 54, the Constitutional Referendum Amendment Act, 1992.

[Motion carried; Bill 54 read a third time]

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, in the interests of very important business today, I would seek the unanimous consent of all members of the Assembly that we now stop the clock.

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

HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

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

head: **Royal Assent**

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, His Honour the Administrator, Justice McClung, will now attend upon the Assembly.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Sergeant-at-Arms, admit His Honour the Administrator.

[The Premier and the Sergeant-at-Arms left the Chamber to attend the Administrator]

[The Mace was draped]

[The Sergeant-at-Arms knocked on the main doors of the Chamber three times. The Associate Sergeant-at-Arms opened the door, and the Sergeant-at-Arms entered]

SERGEANT-AT-ARMS: All rise, please. Mr. Speaker, the Administrator is without.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Sergeant-at-Arms, admit His Honour the Administrator.

[Mr. Deputy Speaker left the Chair]

[Preceded by the Sergeant-at-Arms, His Honour the Administrator, Justice McClung, and the Premier entered the Chamber. His Honour took his place upon the Throne]

JUSTICE MCCLUNG: Pray be seated.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: May it please Your Honour, the Legislative Assembly has, at its present sittings, passed certain Bills to which, and in the name of the Legislative Assembly, I respectfully request Your Honour's assent.

CLERK: Your Honour, the following is the title of the Bill to which Your Honour's assent is prayed: Bill 54, Constitutional Referendum Amendment Act, 1992. This is the Bill to which Your Honour's assent is prayed.

[The Administrator indicated his assent]

CLERK: In Her Majesty's name His Honour the Administrator doth assent to this Bill.

SERGEANT-AT-ARMS: All rise, please.

[Preceded by the Sergeant-at-Arms, the Administrator and the Premier left the Chamber]

[Mr. Deputy Speaker took his place in the Chair, and the Mace was uncovered]

head: **Government Motions**
(*reversion*)

Constitutional Referendum

31. Moved by Mr. Horsman:

Be it resolved that the Legislative Assembly, pursuant to section 12 of the Constitutional Referendum Act, 1992, approves the substitution of a referendum to be held under the Referendum Act, Canada, and, further, approves the question on the referendum, under the Referendum Act, Canada, which reads: "Do you agree that the Constitution of Canada should be renewed on the basis of the agreement reached on August 28, 1992?"

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, in saying a very few brief remarks in conclusion, we have been part of history these last two days, and I wish the excellence of the debate could be shared by every Albertan and indeed every Canadian. Every member who has participated in this debate has made me proud to be a member of this parliament.

Now, of course, it is our responsibility as members of this parliament, this provincial Legislative Assembly, to go forward from here and communicate with our constituents, all 2 and a half million people of this province, not all of whom can vote but all of whom will be affected profoundly in the future by the results of what has taken place here today and what will take place on October 26, 1992, in this the 125th year of the existence of Canada.

5:30

You know, one of the things I read by an author in the course of these last few months – John Dafoe writes for the *Globe and Mail*. He put it very succinctly, I think, when he said that an idea beats no idea every time. If we are armed with the knowledge of what is in this constitutional accord, we will be able to go out and combat the ignorance that exists about what really is there, and if we are prepared to share our commitment so evident here in the last two days and beyond that, back through the whole process, we will be able to defeat that other enemy, that enemy of apathy, an enemy which is profound but I believe can be defeated and will be defeated.

The Premier has left the Chamber. But as I said yesterday evening in my remarks in the debate on the motion as I gave tribute to him, as did the leaders of the opposition and the Liberal Party in this Assembly, we can all be proud that we have been led by such a man in these days. History has been made today, and it's up to us now to make sure that the history of Canada as we can influence it in this province will continue to make this country complete, vital, and vigorous in the decades which lie ahead.

I ask for unanimous support again for the motion I have put before the Assembly today.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: All those in favour of the motion of the hon. Deputy Premier, please say aye.

HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Those opposed, please say no. Let the record show it's carried unanimously.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, I move that the Assembly now adjourn and stand adjourned until the time and date to be determined by Mr. Speaker after consultation with the Lieutenant Governor in Council.

[The Assembly adjourned at 5:34 p.m.]