

Legislative Assembly of Alberta

Title: **Tuesday, February 22, 1994**

8:00 p.m.

Date: 94/02/22

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

MR. SPEAKER: Please be seated.

head: **Government Bills and Orders**

head: **Third Reading**

Bill 7

Appropriation (Supplementary Supply) Act, 1994

MR. DINNING: Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill 7 standing in my name on the Order Paper.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Roper.

MR. CHADI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I couldn't let him get off that easy. I think before we vote yes on this Bill and approve it, we just want to reiterate some of our concerns. I would hope that the government would take heed and proceed with the appropriation Bill as it ought to be.

The one thing I want to reiterate, Mr. Speaker, is that the infrastructure program is now signed, and I appreciate that. I think it was the best thing that could have happened to the 110,000 new jobs that are supposedly created here in the province of Alberta in the next three years, particularly when in the entire Canada infrastructure works, the \$6 billion expected to be expended over a three-year period, the estimates range from between 50,000 to 65,000 new jobs that will be created. That's all across Canada, and it falls far short of 110,000 for Alberta.

I appreciate the fact that we have now agreed upon a motion that would develop a strategy to create these 110,000 jobs. Nonetheless, that \$40 million we will approve tonight is well needed, and we look forward to seeing that in action.

Again to reiterate. The funds for the infrastructure program lie in the hands of the minister responsible for economic development. We feel that perhaps it would be better served in the hands of the minister responsible for public works. It makes sense that public works ought to be the spot that it be administered through and that local governments drive the infrastructure program here in the province of Alberta and not just bureaucrats or ministers of the Crown deciding which project will go ahead or not. We agree and appreciate that there are no new funds, that the \$100 million coming into this entire appropriation Bill come from a transfer from capital to operating. This is something we can agree with.

I think that about sets our concerns. We will be watching that the funds, the \$100 million we're transferring over, is indeed transferred, and we'll be watching for reductions on the other side of the ledger.

So, Mr. Speaker, after those comments, I would now see to it that we proceed.

Thank you.

MR. WICKMAN: Just a very, very short statement on third reading of Bill 7 as it pertains to the infrastructure expenditure. Mr. Speaker, listening to CHED radio on Saturday when the Premier of the province was the guest and reference was made to this particular program, I found it interesting in that the Premier did acknowledge that a few years back the Federation of Canadian Municipalities were very, very strong lobbyists to get the infrastructure program in place. He acknowledged how the then mayor of the city of Edmonton, the Member for Edmonton-

Glengarry, along with the current Premier of B.C., who was then mayor of Vancouver, were the two driving forces behind that initial discussion in getting this whole ball of wax flowing.

He pointed out how he was the lone mayor from the big cities who opposed the infrastructure program. He opposed it at that particular time because the city of Calgary had already spent over a billion dollars of its own on infrastructure. What it does, Mr. Speaker, is send a certain alarm through both caucuses here in that we have two leaders that see things so much differently. We have one leader that leaves one major city in good financial shape but still recognizes the importance of jobs, jobs, jobs. We have another leader, on the other side, who leaves another major city in tremendous debt, talks jobs, but when the action comes right down to it, doesn't put the money where the mouth is.

So, Mr. Speaker, on that particular point, I rest my case. The people of Alberta judge on a daily basis what happens within this Legislative Assembly and what the two leaders do say on behalf of Albertans.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Provincial Treasurer to close debate.

MR. DINNING: Well, Mr. Speaker, you know how much I love to have the last word. It is a pleasure to rise on this Bill and have the last word, because the utterances from my colleagues from across the way – it is nice to hear the MLA for Edmonton-Roper standing up tonight and talking along the vein of promoting jobs, protecting jobs, because here's the hon. member who before Christmas was willing to put 1,200 employees of Gainers out on the streets without a job. Here's a man who was willing to abandon 5,000 hog producers in northern Alberta and leave them without a place to have their hogs slaughtered. Here's a man who was willing to abandon markets around the world, abandon hard-fought-for markets in hog production. [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Order. [interjections] Order.
The Provincial Treasurer.

MR. DINNING: Mr. Speaker, I'm glad those words are on the record. I was very glad, however, that the Member for Edmonton-Rutherford finished off his remarks about making a comparison between the former mayor of Edmonton, Laurence Decore, and the former mayor of Calgary, Ralph Klein. I can show you very, very clearly that during the time that Laurence Decore served as mayor of Edmonton the average unemployment rate was 11.2 percent. While Ralph Klein was the mayor of Calgary, the average unemployment rate was 8.2 percent. The numbers speak for themselves.

Mr. Speaker, I'm proud to move third reading of Bill 7.

[Motion carried; Bill 7 read a third time]

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

Bill 2

**Alberta Sport, Recreation, Parks
and Wildlife Foundation Act**

[Adjourned debate February 17: Mr. Zwodzesky]

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Avonmore.

MR. ZWOZDESKY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In responding briefly here in the last minute and a half I have, I just want to make it clear for the record that I do not oppose streamlining nor

effective, thoughtful cost cutting, nor anything that improves on what we already have, and so when this Bill first came out, I had wanted to give it some support. I read it several times. Regretfully, I can't find it in my heart to support it at this stage, and I'd like to just briefly comment on the reasons.

First of all, this Bill calls for the appointment of a board of directors by the Lieutenant Governor in Council, whereas that appointment should be made by an all-party committee of the House, in the open spirit that has been promised by the other side. Secondly, this Bill sets a very dangerous precedent by giving direct government involvement, if not interference, into a supposed arm's-length foundation that traditionally has been semi-autonomous. You're stipulating here that an MLA should sit on the board, and I think that's a dangerous thing to allow to happen. I can appreciate that government needs to know what's going on and needs therefore to have some liaison. That can be accomplished through a government employee.

8:10

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Sherwood Park.

MR. COLLINGWOOD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My colleague from Edmonton-Avonmore didn't really get an opportunity to finish summarizing remarks, but I'd certainly like to carry on from where he left off. I'm delighted to be able to participate in the debate on Bill 2 with the amalgamation of these two foundations. I must say that I share the concern of my hon. colleague in that there are some rather unusual structures that have been put in place in this particular Bill that, to my understanding, certainly are unprecedented in how these foundations and boards are structured, the reporting processes, the accountability processes, and the involvement of government directly rather than indirectly from a non arm's-length perspective.

I'll just reiterate that point again, Mr. Speaker. In what we understood would be a new approach to government that this particular government had promised, we would have expected that the new Bill would have provided for an all-party committee to determine the members of this much smaller foundation than the 16 and the 12 members that existed in the previous two. According to the Act, this will now have 10 members, I believe, who will be appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council, but unfortunately, again we fail to see the government deliver on what they promised they would. This is not being done by all-party committee; this is being done by the Lieutenant Governor in Council. Now, granted that was probably to be expected. We know that this government will tend to rely on its patronage appointments to make sure things happen the way they want to, but we now see a quantum leap to the point where we now have, in the legislation proposed, in section 2, a mandatory requirement that a Member of the Legislative Assembly be part of this board and have voting rights on the board as well as an employee of government, who is under the administration of the minister.

I think it's important to tell Albertans that, that it is now the policy of this government to intervene directly into the operations of these foundations, who have to this point in time operated quite nicely from the perspective of being non arm's length to the government, and making decisions that they are indeed and in fact accountable for.

There must be another agenda, Mr. Speaker. There is no other reason to have a member of this Assembly sit on that foundation. Those foundations can operate effectively, efficiently, and with full accountability without having a member of this Assembly sit on that board with voting privileges. Oh, yeah, they get fees for doing that as well, of course, so we must make sure that that's

pointed out as well. May or may not get a car. We're not sure whether or not they'll get a car for sitting on this board.

So, Mr. Speaker, it leaves open a fair . . .

Point of Order Imputing Motives

MR. SPEAKER: Is the hon. Member for Calgary-Mountain View rising on a point of order?

MR. HLADY: Yeah, Mr. Speaker. Standing Order 23(i), imputing motives. The member across the way has mentioned that I would be receiving funds or something for being on that board. I receive nothing for being on that board, but I do sit on that board.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Sherwood Park.

Debate Continued

MR. COLLINGWOOD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The concern therefore, Mr. Speaker, is that unlike the two previous Acts for each of these foundations, there is not a requirement built into the legislation that a member of this Assembly must sit as a voting member on that board. As I say, my understanding is that this is unprecedented in any legislation that we have in this province. Albertans have to be asking themselves why it is so important that a member of this Assembly be by legislation added as a voting member of these foundations.

The other point that has to be made with respect to this particular Bill is that again, unlike the two previous Bills, the objects of the foundation as described now in section 3 of the new Bill, at least with respect to the Recreation, Parks and Wildlife Foundation, are a bit more vague than they were under that previous Bill. From the perspective of wildlife and so on, Mr. Speaker, as it stands, right now the Recreation, Parks and Wildlife Foundation Act describes as the object of the foundation to include "the management, conservation or preservation of fish and wildlife." Now, that's fairly clear in terms of one of the objects of the foundation. The objects under the new Bill talk about "to develop and maintain fish and wildlife programs, facilities and services." That wording is fairly generic where they just simply substitute the last few words under those subsections. It was unfortunate that "management, conservation or preservation" could not have been preserved in the wording of the new Act so that we would have again clear direction for the new amalgamated foundation that as one of its objects it still had to be very cognizant of the fact that its object included the conservation and preservation of fish and wildlife in this province, because that's extremely important in the work of this foundation. That's the work that they do, and that's the work they need to continue to do. I'm disappointed that the objects now are blurred because of the new wording in the Act.

Another point that should be made is that while it does not actively fund-raise, the Recreation, Parks and Wildlife Foundation is very involved in volunteer programs and in bequests made to it of land that is to be preserved. Many community volunteer organizations participate in that program and are very involved in land that is now under the management of the Recreation, Parks and Wildlife Foundation to preserve that land. A major concern, Mr. Speaker, is that with direct government involvement there may potentially – and I say potentially – be some reluctance on the part of Albertans to continue to embrace and participate in this program to the same extent that they did before. Why? Because before it was arm's length. Now with having direct government intervention and involvement it is no longer arm's length from government, and there may be a reluctance on the part of

Albertans to participate as a result of that. So I think we might keep in mind that the bequests that have in fact been coming to the foundation and which form a very, very important component of the work that the Recreation, Parks and Wildlife Foundation does could seriously be in jeopardy because of this provision in section 2 that requires a member of this Assembly to sit as a voting member on that board.

Another thing I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that seems to be the direction this government is going is with respect to a concern that was raised by the Auditor General of this province. That's the annual report of the Auditor General from 1992-93. Again I'm speaking specifically with respect to the Recreation, Parks and Wildlife Foundation. The Auditor General reported in his 1992-93 report that the wildlife foundation "continues to make payments to Board members" which were clear violations of that Act. That didn't happen once; that happened year after year after year, time after time after time. Specifically the old legislation required that payments made to individual members of the foundation for their subsistence or travel expenses had to be payments which were "made from money voted by the Legislature for that purpose." As it turned out, there never were any funds voted by the Legislature for that purpose, so any moneys paid out to those individual members of that foundation were in fact payments that were made in clear violation and contravention of that Act.

8:20

The response of the government appears to be, from 1987-88 through to 1992-93: so what? The Auditor General reports, and here I'll quote:

Since I first reported this matter, the total amount paid in contravention of the Act is about \$325,000.

He goes on to say:

The continual disregard by the Board of its legislation is a matter of serious concern. The Act specifically prohibits the payments that are being made.

Again, Mr. Speaker, apparently the response from the government was: so what? The Auditor General finally concludes in his report this, and I quote:

I have been advised that the Foundation . . .

Speaking now to the Recreation, Parks and Wildlife Foundation. . . . and the Alberta Sport Council will merge effective April 1, 1994, and that appropriate legislative changes will be made to eliminate the problem.

Well, if you review the new Bill, Bill 2, and you review the previous Recreation, Parks and Wildlife Foundation Act, indeed that is true. That is what has happened. Now there is no provision in the new Bill that any payment made pursuant to the Act for subsistence and travel would have to be money voted by the Legislature for that purpose. In other words, they took away the problem by not having the vote in the Legislature.

Now, my understanding, Mr. Speaker, is that this government had made a commitment that moneys from lottery funds would in fact be embraced and form part of the votes of this Legislature. That I thought and my constituents thought was the way we were heading: that lottery funds would be treated in the same way the general revenue funds are treated. They come to this Legislative Assembly for a vote. Well, it appears that bringing those funds to a vote in the Legislature was just a bit too much of a nuisance for this government, so apparently now we've simply taken that section out of the Act, and members can have at it in terms of those funds to whatever extent they want without it being a vote in the Legislature for funds paid to the board members for travel and subsistence.

Mr. Speaker, we're going in the wrong direction. The cure for this should have been to bring forward that amount of money for

a vote in the Legislature. According to the Auditor General's report, that was the ill that needed to be cured. We simply had to bring that forward for a vote in the Legislature, and members could then access those funds for their travel and subsistence. But what do we do? What does the government do in creating this Bill? It simply wipes away the legislative requirement for a vote in the Legislature and says: no; you can just go ahead and have at those funds, and we don't need a vote in the Legislature.

So, Mr. Speaker, I say to Albertans that we're just heading in the wrong direction. There appears to be no commitment at this time on behalf of government to deal with lottery funds in the way that they had indicated they would, and we will continue to be using lottery funds for this foundation, for other foundations as simply a lottery slush fund. It's disappointing that we are not entitled to bring those matters to this Legislative Assembly for full debate, for full disclosure, but that's apparently not in the cards for this particular government. I again echo the comments of my hon. colleague from Edmonton-Avonmore: nothing to suggest here that we are against a reconciliation, a paring down, greater efficiencies in the delivery of these programs which the constituents who benefit from the two foundations as they exist now know and appreciate. Yes, indeed, we can deliver more efficiently the services and the programs that we offer now. For those reasons, what this particular Bill does is send a clear message to Albertans that we're heading in entirely the wrong direction in how we intend to deal with those inefficiencies to make them more efficient. It's just greater government involvement, more secrecy, and simply a lack of political will to come clean. It's again certainly consistent with what this government has been. The old saying: that was then; this is now - nothing much has changed. As I say again, it is unfortunate that we couldn't have had a fresh start as we look at the reconciliation of these two foundations.

In conclusion, the hon. member sponsoring the Bill has failed to deliver. It's not a new initiative. It's simply grabbing more power and more dollars. For those reasons, Mr. Speaker, I cannot support this Bill.

I thank you for your time.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Leduc.

MR. KIRKLAND: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will speak against the Bill, though when I looked at it initially, I certainly thought that there was some intent to capture efficiency there. In theory I think that that speck still exists. The efficiency, of course, appears when you're rolling two agencies into one.

However, it's public knowledge that the Recreation, Parks and Wildlife Foundation was one of those little spots that we filled with political patronage with a Mr. Moore some time ago. I understand the gentleman is a very intelligent and good leader. Since that time, if I recall correctly, he has assumed the chair of the interim board that actually is running these two organizations today. So in essence what the hon. minister is putting forth is in place. We're just doing some housecleaning here. That political appointment stuck out to me. It had a taint to it. So in fact when we got into the board structure itself, I think it had a black cloud over it already.

We're all of a suspicious nature. I think it's very unfortunate we have to drag that into it, but it further muddies the water, Mr. Speaker. When I think of the fact that we have to appoint MLAs to sit on this board, that further muddies those waters. It takes on very much, as I see it, a further collection of power of this sitting government in the boards of this province. The Act removes those two boards that have operated very effectively with grassroots individuals and good, solid Alberta volunteers. It removes

it from the arm's-length government intrusion and now involves the government very much into it. That to me means that in fact we're going to look at manipulation, so I have concern about that.

On the positive side, this government has consulted all those stakeholders that are involved. They did convene six stakeholder meetings, as I understand it, and they really sincerely indicated to these groups that in fact they were searching for those efficiencies. In chatting with two of those stakeholders from the Alberta Sport Council, they conveyed to me that in fact it was unanimous that there were efficiencies that should and could be found there. One of them, for example, was the Alberta Centre for Wellness, which receives, I believe, \$1.3 million to dispense at their will without a whole lot of accountability for it. That in their minds was an absolute duplication of the University of Alberta and the universities of Lethbridge and Calgary wellness centres or facilities that they ran there.

The second concern I have in that area, even though I say that they did consult, was that the stakeholders have met, Mr. Speaker, and they left their meetings without a clear definition of what the roles, the responsibilities, and the mandates were.

The other concern that is in their minds, Mr. Speaker, is that we have gone through this consultation process, we're into a situation where we're about to pass some legislation, yet we have not seen a final report or recommendation. Now, that causes a large concern and void in their minds, and they have to wonder if in fact this consultation was just another public charade. It would be very unfortunate that we, in fact, prostitute some of our volunteers and people to that degree. I would like to think we are a little more honourable than that in this House.

8:30

I have some concern with that lack of a final report. If it was very positive and it was very, very good for both structures, I think they should have probably shared it with that group. I would take it a step further and suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it should have been shared with the very people that are discussing it, not only that side but this side. If it is really a quality idea, I can guarantee you that we would support it, but when it is coloured by some of the taint that we've had and it's coloured by the lack of a final report, then it has to take on a bit of a questionable stance.

I see that we are now creating another – and the hon. Member for Sherwood Park used this term – "slush fund," much like the Wild Rose Foundation. That's clearly a slush fund. I dealt with that for many years on Leduc city council, and this here is going to take on that same aspect. I have a concern. As I say, Mr. Speaker, we have quality people that have run these functions at arm's length for years. They've done an admirable job of it. Ask them for accountability; they'll give it to you. But now we have been intruded by government. One has to be an MLA and also an employee, as I understand the Act, to be appointed to it. That's not necessary. It's functioned quite well without this intrusion over the years. I'm sure we can roll the two into the one board with the efficiencies that are touted, keep at arm's length, and achieve really what is purported that this government is pursuing, and that is, of course, efficiency.

It also takes on a bit of a similar approach to the appointment of superintendents to school boards, appointees to super health boards. Mr. Speaker, it is a collection of power by this government in the operational and functional boards of this province, which I think is a very large concern to all Albertans. It's a very large concern to me. I would have no hesitation in supporting this Bill if in fact we removed the political influence from it. I think it's a move in the right direction until we hit that particular point.

I indicated, Mr. Speaker, that I think it's an insult to the people that have functioned and run so many years in these capacities without political influence. I have confidence in these people that in fact they can continue to function without the government intrusion. That is the large area of this Bill that I cannot accept and cannot support. We have heard comments in this House in an earlier discussion today that by some of our comments, supposedly, we don't have confidence in our municipal politicians. Well, this really smacks of the same thing. It indicates to me that this government doesn't have confidence in the very people that made these successful.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, as I indicated, I think we are now building another slush fund. There's no need in my mind or estimation to involve the political processes here. The people that have functioned on and operated these boards over the years have done so very effectively. They will, I'm sure, in the spirit of co-operation and success in which they've operated, continue to operate the two boards in one given the chance, without the government intrusion. We know the government in power has a tremendous amount of influence, with all due respect to the Member for Calgary-Mountain View, if in fact he is already appointed to that board. I don't suggest that in fact he would take that board because I know he is very much an athlete, and I think in fact he also probably has some feeling for the wildlife park aspect of it. I wouldn't suggest that he would lead it in a path that they don't want to, but we know full well by his presence there that there's influence, whether he's the nicest guy in the world or not.

AN HON. MEMBER: He is; he is.

MR. KIRKLAND: Well, we could go into that discussion and debate. We'll save that for another day.

Mr. Speaker, those are the things that cause me concern. As I indicated, if those were removed, I would jump up and down, and I would support this Bill. But as long as we're trying to skewer the system and trying to collect power at the board levels in this province, I think, in fact, it does a disservice to those people who have spent so many hours making sure that in fact those sporting communities and those parks and recreation undertakings in this province are so well utilized and have been so well captured. I suspect that it now becomes open to manipulation, and that is a concern to me.

I have one other area I would just like to express concern about, and perhaps it's my lack of understanding of where privatization and provincial parks sit in this picture. I wonder if there's an impact here that I haven't been able to flush out, Mr. Speaker. Certainly, in closing comments perhaps one of these gentlemen on the side opposite could allay my concerns on that aspect.

Mr. Speaker, I think I've given you very good reasons why I can't support it, as much as I would like to support efficiency. I think in this case here if in fact we had removed the political influence and we had removed the political appointment aspect of it, it would be an excellent concept. Unfortunately, it fails again because I see it as manipulation.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. HLADY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The opposition keeps seeming to speak out of both sides of their mouths. On one side they want arm's length, and on the other side they want more government involvement. I don't know which you want here. We've had a lot of government involvement in both of these areas

before. We've had many employees of the Community Development department working and spending time in these particular areas. With the combining of these two foundations, what we've also been able to do is make it a much more effective, much more efficient organization. They're able to take on the duties almost completely of what's needed from the department, a lot less need for the people inside the department to have to work in this area.

Point of Order

Questioning a Member

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Fort McMurray, rising on a point of order.

MR. GERMAIN: Yes, sir. I wonder if the member opposite would answer a question for the Assembly.

MR. HLADY: Well, I mean, does he need to interrupt at this time, or would he put some of his time at the end of this towards that question?

MR. SPEAKER: The choice is the hon. member's.

MR. HLADY: I'll answer the question for him during his time after this. For sure; okay.

Debate Continued

MR. HLADY: Anyway, you're worried about arm's length. I think what we're doing is even creating more arm's length and less need for people inside the department to be involved in the foundation. The ability to move outside has really been very effective by doing that. We've saved a lot of taxpayers' dollars by moving the foundation to become completely independent. The need for employees to be involved will be much less from inside the department.

What we will see and one of the worries or concerns that the Member for Sherwood Park had is the ability for fund-raising. The cost in the past has been a lot of lottery dollars, but organizations, the Alberta Sport Council, in the past had done a lot of fund-raising out in the community. There was a lot of fund-raising, and I support the ability to fund-raise even more than they do now. I think they will be able to raise more funds than they have in the past. As a matter of fact, on a personal note, I believe and I support looking at changes to the tax laws in the future to allow corporations to put money more directly to the new foundation in whichever area they support or want. I think that is a better way to do the funding, and it's a more direct way of funding. By doing that direct funding, what we'll see in the future is a better use of the dollars. Instead of flowing them through a government system, you would have more direct use of the dollars in the specific areas where the dollars are needed. I think that's a more effective way of funding in the future, and we will, hopefully, see something along that line.

What is the Act going to achieve? Well, a few things: it will enhance the pursuit of excellence and the quality of life through personal wellness and the environment. When we had the roundtables inside the different areas, the associations met. People who were major contributors to the foundations met, got together, and they had the roundtables. They asked them the question: how would the best way be to make this new organization work? The people had their input. They wanted to see less government involvement. They wanted to see it outside the department. The department has responded to that very well. It will also facilitate and enhance activities, change the lifestyles and legacies. There is an opportunity for Albertans to make donations

in the form of land or money to the Community Development department and then back into the foundation. Through the foundation the lands can be put to the use that the donators want to make happen, want to see happen. It's a very exciting thing to see happening in this province.

With the combining of the two boards of directors, we've reduced from 28 down to 10 members on the board. Those members are our regional representation. They come from eight different areas of this province: one from Calgary, one from Edmonton, and six others from around. There is an MLA on the interim board, which is myself, and there is a member from the department to maintain a connection. Most of the funding does come from lottery dollars, and that is the connection to the new foundation. The need for other employees and government employees to be there has been minimized and removed, basically in all purposes almost completely.

8:40

What we will do is see a joint approach in raising funds from the private sector. So where we had two foundations before working and raising funds in separate areas, by putting them together, that gives them a little bit more power to work with, a little more ability to market themselves out in the private sector and attract funds to the new association. I think by combining these two organizations, we've been able to save on the number of employees that it takes to run this in a lot of ways, both in the existing foundations, which are being downsized, as well as inside government.

This is also going to remove any duplication. In the Alberta Sport Council as well as in the department before there were two lines. There was Alberta recreation and parks and the Alberta Sport Council. If there was an association that wanted to apply for funding, they had to put forward a three-year plan. They had to send a three-year plan to both associations, the Sport Council as well as recreation and parks. This is a doubling of the process, double the legwork. What we've done by combining the two and moving it outside of the department is we've allowed for the ability to really streamline the process in going through the one foundation outside of government. I think this will make it much more effective and more efficient for the individual associations to process and to apply for the money.

We've also made it easier for the associations to determine what they're going to do with the money. We've had less restrictions in specific areas so that they can work with that money. They still have to be accountable for it, tell us where they spent it, but at the same time this is going to allow them to work in their own individual organizations and see how it needs to be spent.

Those are a couple of the things that we've started to achieve in the area. I think what we'll see happening is that we've moved down, and most of the savings have come in the higher areas, such as in the administration. We're probably looking in that 20 percent area of cuts for the associations. That's something that is a fact in every department of this government. But they all came forward during the roundtables expecting that. They were ready for that and said, "If we're going to be part of it, let's make it happen." They were very positive about the cuts and said: "How do we make this happen the best way? How do we maintain as many dollars as we possibly can getting to the end users, being the athletes or the parks or into the wildlife areas?"

I think this whole concept is delivering the service back to the communities, back to the associations, to the end users. That's the goal of this whole process that we're going through. I think it's an exciting time to see this going on. The people at the local levels are very much in favour of this. They are appreciating it

and want to make it happen and are looking forward to seeing the budget at the end of this week and are looking forward to seeing it happen as of April 1.

The corporate sector has attracted \$1.5 million on top of the lottery dollars as part of the funding for the Alberta Sport Council in the past. I'm not sure of the exact figure for the past recreation, parks, and wildlife, but that is available.

It has created partnerships with the local communities and the volunteers and the sport and recreation associations as well as the corporate sector. It's also established the Be Fit for Life Network, thus improving the delivery and distribution of fitness-related support across Alberta. If we're going to go back to a positive and proactive approach to health, this is a major area that we need to concentrate on. In getting away from a sick system and responding to problems, what we're going to do is solve the problems and give something back. The Be Fit for Life Network is one of the major areas where that's really helping. Certainly this is part of the heightened awareness for all Albertans in active living.

The Wilbury Gang, a preschool leisure education project, provides resource materials to day care and preschool facilities. There's also been local funding for equipment, training, pilot projects, and coaching. The Olympic involvement has gone from 2 percent pre-Calgary to 26 percent of the Canadian team in Lillehammer. The whole process in the sport end of the development has gone on in this process and will continue. The new foundation is excited about setting goals for achievement and making sure that while we're developing and creating the interest at the introductory level, we will also have excellence at the top. The new foundation is excited about making that happen.

I think this has helped us in a lot of ways. We've had a strong infrastructure for a long period of time. We have the infrastructure; we have less dollars to make that happen. By delivering it back to the communities, I think we will find that we need fewer dollars to make that happen. We don't have it all tied up in the levels of bureaucracy in government that have been there in the past. By delivering it back to the communities, we will be able to work much more efficiently.

Over one million young people are involved in the combined programs and services through this new foundation. Putting the four of them together will also help us in an integrated way. It really brings together the four areas of involvement, and it affects over 75 percent of the people in this province, actually, at this time.

What are we going to do in the future? Well, as I mentioned a little bit earlier, expand the fund-raising. I think that's something we need to look at. The fund-raising in essence is going to come from the private sector, the corporate sector. When that happens and if we can make that more effective and more beneficial to both the corporate and private sectors, I think the benefit becomes much more direct to the new foundation. I think that's the way we should be looking, in my own personal view on that.

Refine the programs and services to obtain maximum impact for the customers. Continue to review administrative structures to find new efficiencies. A lot of the existing organizations are looking at combining and taking care of the administration, so you might have two, three, or four different sport organizations or wildlife and recreation organizations starting to work together, minimizing the number of administrators that are inside there. The number of administrators is not producing for them. If they can make it efficient and effective, they're going to save some money.

Some of the nice things we will hopefully be able to do and would like to continue to do are sponsoring the Alberta Games and the Alberta Seniors Games. This again creates and promotes

the interest of different levels of Albertans. We'd like to continue to seek out the sponsorship of the parklands. I think as we move into a new phase of interest in the environment in our society, that is something we'll continue to develop as we go along.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank you for your time, and that's all I have to say.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for St. Albert.

MR. BRACKO: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I guess this Bill is appropriate at this time, for the Alberta Winter Games start a week this Thursday in St. Albert. I've had the privilege of being part of the games right from the initial time we applied for the games. This was a very interesting process. We put a lot of work into it, the committee and the city of St. Albert recreation department. We went to many of the businesses, the chamber of commerce, which were all involved in this process. Everyone worked hard at it. Then came the time to do the lobbying, when the three members came from the Alberta Sport Council to interview the three different municipalities vying for the games. I know - I was part of the lobbying team - we did an excellent job on that. We went out of our way, the various people involved in this. We know the winter games, whether they're the Seniors or the Alberta Winter Games, are an area that elevate Alberta, the athletes from the different zones. Throughout the years I've watched the students and seniors and others involved in the games, and they got a better understanding of the different communities in this province and were proud to be Albertans. This continues, and we'll continue with this.

We know in St. Albert that it started off with small committees, and now it's getting into high gear, as the games are a week and a half away. This last two weeks we had an additional 1,500 volunteers, to meet the need of 4,500 volunteers. Very enthused, very committed, and a terrific experience for our community, for community building and making it the community it is.

However, Mr. Speaker, we could've gone through the same process in a different municipality, put all the time and effort into it, and if we hadn't had a government member, chances are the games would have never come to that community. For never in the history of the Alberta Winter Games has a municipality got the games that didn't have a government member. It's sad to say, and history will be made in St. Albert this year, for it will be the first time that a community has the Winter Games without having a PC member.

8:50

AN HON. MEMBER: You did though.

MR. BRACKO: Pardon me? That's what I said. Yes.

Ladies and gentlemen, not only are there volunteers but the tremendous corporate sponsors who take part throughout this province. We want to thank them, each one. The games elevate. However, you allow politicians in, and they always manage to bring it down to a lower level. This is sad, sad for this province and sad for Albertans. We look at it. You put in a politician - an MLA has to be on this committee, in the new Bill - and again you know right away there's mistrust. We know that when the games have been awarded to municipalities that had Tory members; it's unfortunate that that's the case. So the mistrust is out there, and part of the political process at this time is looked down upon because of the way things are done by governments.

It's a tremendous opportunity, combining the two boards to make it more efficient. In fact, I would say add the Wild Rose Foundation to this. Make it more efficient. I'll never forget the

first time I saw a Wild Rose Foundation annual report. They'd given out \$1.87 million, and you know how much it cost to give that money out? Five hundred and fifty thousand dollars. Again I just want to say this: \$1.8 million they gave out, and it cost \$550,000 to give it out. It's just hard to believe the incompetence of that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: How much? What? We didn't hear you back here.

MR. BRACKO: Thank you. I'll tell you later again. I'll in fact write it down for you.

Of that, \$80,000 went to board members to agree as to which ones it would be given out. You know, I went through a list of the board members, and guess which party they belonged to? I didn't find one that I knew about which didn't belong to or was a friend of the government.

Ladies, gentlemen, if they combined the Wild Rose Foundation, got rid of the MLA in there, made it where it would be efficient and run by the community so this could again be elevated higher up to where it should be, I could support it, but I really have a difficult time with the political interference here. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I'm unable to support it, although many good things are in there. It's a shame.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Medicine Hat.

MR. RENNER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure to rise to speak to this Bill, in favour of this Bill. There are a couple of reasons I'm in favour of this Bill, and I guess the main reason is that this Bill quite simply, as one of the members opposite has already said, is a housekeeping Bill. What it does is combine two existing organizations into one. In doing that, it will save some \$500,000 in cost of delivery and part of the costs that the member opposite has just been speaking about. That \$500,000 will be passed on directly to Alberta sport, recreation, parks, and wildlife participants. I think this Bill is very, very important, that members take this Bill seriously and think about what this Bill really does.

Mr. Speaker, I had the pleasure of presenting a couple of the grants on behalf of the Alberta Sport Council over the summer. I'd just like to relate to you and to the members of this House that one of the groups that was a recipient of the dollars - we're not talking a lot of dollars here. I think this was a cheque for less than \$1,000, but this was going to the canoe and kayak club in Medicine Hat. On the surface it looks like the council is subsidizing the operations of a group such as this. Certainly there's no doubt that the group was very happy to get the funding that is supplied by this organization, but the important thing about it is that when I went to present the cheque, it was to buy some used kayaks that this club had just acquired. If anyone has never seen a kayak - I now have sat in one. I just about didn't fit, but I did sit in the kayak. The group was so excited about these used kayaks. To look at them, to me it wasn't that impressive, but they were very excited about these kayaks because they were getting involved in training for competition and racing. This one kayak they had was a racing kayak that was worth \$5,000 new. They had acquired it for only \$1,000, so the group had gotten together and they were repeating this thing.

In the whole time that I spent with the group, they really didn't talk so much about kayaking and racing and recreation. They talked about such things as leadership and citizenship and the fact that these young people were off the streets, that they weren't out involved in getting into trouble and doing all the kinds of things

that we always hear about, all the terrible things that young people do these days. These young people were there, they were involved with their kayaks and their racing canoes, they were learning how to run meetings, and they were involved in so many other things. Really, the kayaking and the recreational aspect was secondary to what these young people were able to achieve through their involvement.

I think the money we spend on this type of organization is so well spent and really comes back to earn itself many, many times over in all of the spin-off benefits that come out of these organizations. So if we can save \$500,000 on administrative costs and, in turn, turn that money over to these organizations, I don't see how anyone could possibly think of voting against this Bill, Mr. Speaker.

There are a couple of other points that I would just like to cover very briefly, Mr. Speaker, about the work that these foundations do. I think it's important that we don't lose sight of what these organizations do. The Member for Calgary-Mountain View mentioned that a good reason for the success of these organizations is that they are getting the partnership, they are getting the involvement of the private sector. As a matter of fact, for every lottery dollar that's spent, another \$5 is contributed by the private sector or by local groups, so there is a tremendous spin-off effect. There is tremendous community involvement, and there is tremendous corporate and private-sector involvement with these. I think that is essential, that everyone be aware of how much support there is in the community for these programs.

I think the member opposite has spoken about the sponsorship of major events, one of which is the Alberta Winter Games. There are all kinds of major sporting events and recreational events that take place across this province every year. This organization will continue to support these events and ensure that Albertans are not only competitive on a national and world-class level but, more importantly, that Albertans have the opportunity to participate and be involved from a recreational point of view in addition to the competitive side of things.

I think it's also worth noting that the organization will continue to seek out sponsorships of parklands for the use of future Albertans. Through parks and recreation, funding goes to maintain all kinds of recreational parkland areas. I took a recent trip past the Oldman dam this fall, and getting back to kayaking again, I don't know how many members are aware that down behind the Oldman dam there is an artificial kayak course that's been created specifically for the purpose of training in kayaks. These are the kinds of facilities that we have in this province, and these kinds of facilities can be used with the support of this program.

Mr. Speaker, I really don't have a whole lot more to say. I just want to reiterate the fact that this is a very logical move. It has the support of all of the participants involved. It has been through public discussion. The groups themselves approve of this. We are saving a lot of administrative dollars by combining these two organizations, and I really can't say anything more than I urge all members to support this Bill.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

9:00

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Rutherford.

MR. WICKMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wanted to speak out a bit on Bill 2 that's in front of us. I really wish I could sit here and say that I support Bill 2. I really, really wish I could. I can't, and I can't for a reason. It's one thing to talk about efficiencies within the system. It's one thing to talk about consolidation, preserving the taxpayers' dollars, but that's not what Bill 2 is all about.

Somebody made reference to Bill 2 being sort of like a housekeeping Bill. It's no housekeeping Bill. You look at the Bill carefully, very thoroughly, which I intend to do, and I'm going to point out that it's much more than a housekeeping Bill. It is much more than just a consolidation to attempt to achieve some efficiencies within the operations of government. To me the Bill reeks of one thing: another example of a power grab, a power grab by the government to retain, to hold exclusively.

What I find ironic about it, Mr. Speaker – we talk in terms of a foundation that is basically funded by lottery funds with some private dollars being raised; in terms of the overall picture, not a major, major expenditure as compared to some government departments or some other government agencies. This afternoon in the House we debated Motion 502, the restructuring amendments to the Workers' Compensation Act, Workers' Compensation Board, that we're going to set up an all-party legislative committee, not a power grab on the part of government but a fair mechanism that would see meaningful input by MLAs, not exclusively for government MLAs but, rather, a legislative component to give direction, to give guidelines to a government agency that has hundreds of millions of dollars in terms of a budget. Every member on that side of the House that was in the House, every member – minister responsible for workers' compensation, take heed of this – every one of them on a standing vote voted no. They would not support that concept that would have seen an all-party legislative committee in place to monitor, to set the guidelines for the operation for the WCB. Yet when it comes to something that is a little different in the sense that there's access to lottery funds – and when there's access to lottery funds, we know what happens there, Mr. Speaker. I tell you, it's ironic. The last speaker made reference to having been here for one year, not even a year. It will be a year June 15; we're reminded of that date constantly. Already twice he's had the opportunity to make presentations of grants from lottery dollars to groups. Mr. Speaker, I've been here five years next month, five years on March 21. Do you know how many opportunities I've had to present cheques for grants?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Zero.

MR. WICKMAN: You've got it: zero. As a matter of fact, I've been to presentations – and there have been numerous held in Edmonton-Rutherford; prior to that Edmonton-Whitemud – where the government sent a member of the public employ to make the presentation of a cheque because it would be ungodly to have a member of the opposition present a cheque for lottery dollars. So you see, Mr. Speaker, the power grab that is there, the power grab of setting up a foundation, setting up a board with a government appointed MLA to oversee the distribution of these dollars.

Right off the bat, when we look at the Bill, the very first thing we see – I just want to go through the Bill here a bit. I've got a bit of time here. We're going to go to page 2. We start right off the bat, section 2(1):

The "Alberta Sport, Recreation, Parks and Wildlife Foundation" is established as a corporation . . . 10 members . . . there must be one member of the Legislative Assembly.

That one Member of the Legislative Assembly, it's a safe assumption, would be a government member. Even before the Bill is discussed, a government member stands up and says: "It's me. It's me. It's me." How can that be? We haven't even discussed the Bill yet. It hasn't had second reading. It hasn't gone to committee. It hasn't had third reading. It hasn't been proclaimed. And he stands up: "It's me. It's me. It's me." It's amazing.

AN HON. MEMBER: And no fees.

MR. WICKMAN: And no fees. It's amazing; it's like magic. That magic doesn't happen on this side, Mr. Speaker. It's almost hilarious, except it's a very, very serious matter. It's just a bit too serious. It's amazing, Mr. Speaker, as we go on through the Bill and we talk in terms of this consolidation of power.

We go to the next section, section 3: "to raise funds to be used in assisting the Foundation in the carrying out of its objects." Now, most of those funds that will be raised will be a small portion compared to the contribution that will be made by lottery dollars, which are dollars owned by virtually all Albertans, because most Albertans in one way, method, or another do buy a lottery ticket, play a video machine, whatever the case may be.

Now, lottery dollars have a very, very unique history within this Legislative Assembly, and it's been pointed out many, many times that one smells something funny when it comes to the distribution of lottery funds. It's been pointed out how government MLAs run around with all these cheques, how the Member for Redwater there used to get phone calls to be here or be there because his big brother from Barrhead would be handing out a cheque to some nonprofit organization, how he found out because those groups would contact him. We persisted. Year after year after year we stood up in this House and we demanded that those dollars be fully accountable and that they be debated and approved by this Legislative Assembly rather than allow the minister responsible for lotteries to control those funds, year after year, six years in a row that I can recall – the first year I hadn't watched – supported by the Provincial Auditor, who every year, I understand seven years in a row, recommended that those dollars be diverted into general revenues and be accountable like all other public dollars. Finally, finally, finally, the minister stood up one day and said: it's going to happen. We rejoiced over here, saying: ah ha, it's all going to be in the open; government will no longer have control of these lottery funds; they're going to be accountable. But no, that's not the way it's going to happen. We see here a mechanism now being put into place where millions of dollars of lottery funds will go to potentially good causes. However, very cleverly, a government MLA is appointed to that particular board, that particular foundation to, I assume, report to government as to how these dollars are going to be spent.

We go on to page 3, section 4(1)(e): "make grants in accordance with the by-laws to any person or organization." I pointed out before, Mr. Speaker, who has the opportunity to make these grants, these presentations.

Now, when we go on to section 5(1), this is where it really starts getting interesting. I don't know if the minister doesn't trust the private member, the backbencher that will be on this foundation, but there is a mechanism here that the minister maintains control and probably answers to the Deputy Premier, the real power behind the throne on that side of the House. We start seeing here in 5(1):

The Foundation may, with the approval of the Minister . . .

There's that control.

. . . make by-laws

(b) governing the making of grants.

So you see, we have a system that goes full circle, where government cleverly sets up this foundation, appoints a government member who will report to the minister responsible for community development, who I assume will then report to the Deputy Premier. I don't think from there the Deputy Premier has to report to anyone, because I think he is kind of controlling that shaky boat on the other side there. I understand, anyhow, that the

other Premier is going to take off again and he won't be around for some time.

9:10

Okay; we stay with 5, and we go to 5(2). We see: "A by-law does not become effective . . ." blah, blah, (a), (b), ". . ." and approved by the Minister." Again that control mechanism: the approval. The minister must give that approval.

We follow right down. The very next section, section 6(1). "The Minister may give directions to the Foundation." That's ironic, because this afternoon when we sat in this House, debated a motion that involved hundreds of millions of dollars to give direction to an agency, every government member stood up and said no. Yet here every government member, I would venture to say, would stand up and say yes to this particular Bill although it's the same concept. Except there is a difference: these are dollars that can be used for political gain, whereas workers' compensation dollars are a little tougher to do, a little tougher for some minister or MLA to get up there and start deciding that we're going to look after this injured worker in Barrhead or Stettler but we're not going to look after this injured worker in Edmonton-Rutherford, particularly if it's an all-party committee giving that direction, because we would sniff out pretty quickly what was happening, Mr. Speaker, given the opportunity to do that.

Let's flip the page. At the very top of the next page: "The Minister may make regulations." Again: "The Minister may make regulations . . ."

Point of Order Second Reading Debate

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The hon. Minister of Labour is rising on a point of order.

MR. DAY: Mr. Speaker, *Beauchesne* is very clear in reference to second readings. Unless I've missed something, second readings are to be dealing with the principle of a Bill. I hear a clause-by-clause, page-by-page analysis going on here. I wonder if the member could be brought to heel.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair would point out to the hon. member that it is not clause-by-clause study that we are undergoing this evening.

Debate Continued

MR. WICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, it's the principle of the Bill that I'm addressing. On this side we heard a member get up and say that it's a housekeeping Bill. In principle I see much more than a housekeeping Bill. I see a Bill that reflects in principle the opportunity for government to carry on a system that I think is morally wrong. I think it disenchant Albertans, and I'm simply trying to point it out. I did miss one clause there, but I won't go back to it. I'm simply trying to point out that as we go through this Bill – and I'm going to wrap up here fairly quickly, because during committee stage we'll have more opportunity to further debate this clause by clause. There are a whole lot of other members of this caucus that want to speak on this Bill as well, and I don't want to go into their time. How long have I spoken? Twelve minutes, and out of eight sections, I believe I referred to the minister around seven times. So it's very, very clear in principle that this is not a housekeeping Bill, that this is not a Bill to give in principle independence to community members to make decisions when it comes to the distribution of lottery dollars. It is nothing but a power grab. It is the continuation of the style of government we've seen here for five years.

I'm going to venture to say that many, many of these dollars that will be distributed will be attempted to be funneled to groups that may offer some political gain. I would hope that those members of the foundation who will be appointed by the government members – which makes it very difficult – have the strength, that they have the . . .

Point of Order Imputing Motives

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Calgary-Mountain View is rising on a point of order.

MR. HLADY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Standing Order 23(i), imputing motives: suggesting that we would use this for political gain. I would like him to withdraw that, please.

MR. WICKMAN: Even the front bench had to laugh at that one.

Debate Continued

MR. WICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I would hope that the maximum other nine members of the foundation that are selected from the community, appointed by the government are going to have the courage, are going to have the fortitude, are going to have the common good sense to stand up against government and say, "We're appointed to do what we feel is right," and heed what the community tells them and not what the government tells them through their Deputy Premier to the private member that is put there to speak on behalf of government or to push, I would fear, a government agenda.

On that note I'll conclude, and thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MRS. ABDURAHMAN: Mr. Speaker, I certainly will rise to speak against Bill 2 at this time. This Bill is just another example of a power grab. It's certainly not creating improved efficiencies, although we're hearing numbers being bandied around this evening of \$500,000. If the member who had brought that number forward had tabled the document to show where these efficiencies are going to be gained, he may have added some credibility to his numbers. Certainly I will never be against any form of efficiency and where we can see money being saved for the benefit of Albertans.

Really when you take a close look at how this Bill 2 has come into being, it's certainly been a top-down process. In fact, I would suggest there hasn't even been what I would say a credible top-down consultation taking place. The sports and recreation community has certainly not been involved or been invited for input on this amalgamation. I think that's an insult, quite frankly, to people who have dedicated years and hours of their time as volunteers to the government of Alberta and to Albertans. That's very remiss of the government not to have asked their opinion.

Where does all of this fit in the larger picture? I think not only myself as an Albertan and a Member of this Legislative Assembly are at a loss what this wonderful plan, that's supposed to be in existence, is actually going to do for Albertans. We look at privatization that went all wrong. It was a joke. It surely showed us there was not a business management sense in this government. We're looking at a health care system that nobody seems to be able to rationalize how we're going to get to the point of a wellness system. We now see family and community support services being threatened in the way that it's going to be funded.

[Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair]

AN HON. MEMBER: It's irrelevant.

MRS. ABDURAHMAN: It's not irrelevant. It all fits together in the larger picture of efficiencies of government. When you look at the section dealing with wellness or active living programs, that has not been addressed in Bill 2. I'm hearing it suggested that these things are irrelevant. They're not irrelevant. It's all tied together, because when you're looking at a wellness health system, whether it be in the sports area, whether it be in the way we designated funds through Bill 2 to community groups, it's all part and parcel of a larger picture. This government has failed to show Albertans what that picture is, other than creating fear and uncertainty within Albertans. There's no guarantee that the active living programs or the wellness promotion that was there before indeed is going to exist.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that what used to be two arm's-length Crown corporations now, under Bill 2, are going to be under direct control of this government. My colleague has certainly shown how Bill 2 gives direct control to the minister. That certainly is not giving power back to the people. Albertans have every right to be fearful of what we see as a trend in this government to gain more and more control of the moneys. We're seeing it through the way municipal governments are going to be funded. We're seeing it through hospitals. We're seeing it through education. And here's another example: we're giving a government who has proven that they're fiscally not responsible more of Alberta taxpayers' money.

I would say that when you go into significant policy changes, the one thing that you should always do – and this government hasn't learned anything from its previous past errors. They don't consult the key players. If they consulted the key players, we might end up with a Bill of amalgamation that would make some sense. This makes no sense, other than control. [interjection] You couldn't speak like me if you even attempted it. So don't.

9:20

Mr. Deputy Speaker, are we indeed seeing an increase in bureaucracy here? They're suggesting no, but they haven't demonstrated that. Where is this reduction and decentralization actually going to be taking place? I would suggest that the first thing we have to do is hear from this government how indeed through this amalgamation we are going to deal with the fact that we have different administrative points, whether it be the Recreation, Parks and Wildlife office in Edmonton, the Sport Council in Calgary. We've got the Percy Page Centre here in Edmonton. Are they indeed going to look at consolidation and how we deliver through Bill 2? I haven't heard that being addressed. Or are they using this as a mechanism of taking some of the bureaucracy and transferring it to support this new foundation? Because indeed there'll be no reduction. It's purely a transferring of bureaucracy.

I would suggest that this new Bill may significantly impede the ability of the new foundation to carry out one of the most significant parts of what was the old Recreation, Parks and Wildlife Foundation, and that's the opportunity for people to donate property to the foundation.

Now, why would I make a statement like that? Well, I'll tell you why. The last thing that people want to do is donate significant properties to something that's controlled by any government. Why would you want to donate something that's controlled by government? There's no way. So I would suggest to you that Albertans would be very reticent in coming forward with significant donations to a foundation that's controlled in this nature, and I'd hope the government will take serious consideration of that. I use an example: the Wagner bog in the county of

Parkland. This is something that's happened. Are we going to see more of these donations, ensuring that lands that need to be protected for future generations indeed will be protected through this new process which is controlled by government?

Now, it's been addressed by my colleagues that the objects of this new Act certainly are lacking. They don't even address preservation or conservation. So one has to ask: what is going to happen to the projects that are now under discussion with the present foundation, ensuring that natural areas will be preserved in perpetuity? One must also ask: where do significant agencies such as Ducks Unlimited, the fish and wild game association table their recommendations and concerns? I haven't heard anyone on the government side address that. The people who represent these bodies are true volunteers in Alberta. Surely they should have been consulted. How will they indeed ensure that what should be protected within the province of Alberta will continue to be?

We've addressed the concern about the fact that we're looking at a government MLA and civil servants being part of this foundation. That's the principle of control. Are you suggesting that it isn't government interference? Are you suggesting that we once again will have a foundation that is based on volunteerism? I would say to you that Bill 2 – and I was trying to be generous when I started out looking at this Bill, saying: yes, an amalgamation has to have some efficiencies. But when you actually look at it and look at the composition of that foundation, it's patronage all the way. There's no doubt in my mind about that.

I would suggest that you could make it a little bit more acceptable if you start to look at some amendments when it reaches committee stage, the makeup of the board and the lack of what I would call the true volunteer infrastructure. Certainly you have to look at the delineation of the objects of Bill 2. It's sadly lacking. You have to examine the infrastructure to support this foundation. I've addressed that to a small respect. I haven't heard anyone on the government side tell us how you're going to save that \$500,000 and how the support system is going to change from the present way it is for the two bodies that we're amalgamating.

AN HON. MEMBER: Try listening.

MRS. ABDURAHMAN: I've done a lot of that, hon. member.

Why is the Wild Rose Foundation not part of this Act? If you're going to amalgamate two, have you examined including the Wild Rose Foundation? If you're truly sincere about saving Albertans tax dollars through amalgamation and efficiency, you will certainly look at that. Before this Act becomes law, I would suggest it's imperative that you go to the grass roots and get input. We've seen this lacking time and time again with this government.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Crown corporation must be fully accountable to the Auditor General and to the Legislative Assembly, not to a minister, and this can only be ensured if it remains at arm's length from this government.

Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Edmonton-Roper.

MR. CHADI: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I rise as well in support of my colleagues speaking against this Bill. I think this Bill is flawed. I believe it can be a good Bill, and I believe some amendments at the committee stage are in order. I think the concept is a good one. When we start to streamline government by the amalgamation of different boards, particularly ones that are related, I don't believe anyone can argue with the logistics of it. I do have concerns, as my colleagues have suggested, with respect to the appointments to the board by the Lieutenant Governor in

Council, as opposed to an appointment by an all-party committee of this House.

I think that when you look at what's happened in the past, particularly with the amount of money that the lotteries take in – I mean, we're talking a billion dollars here in lotteries. When you talk about funds to the tune of a billion dollars, that's almost 10 percent – 10 percent – of the amount of money, the revenues that this province takes in. That's a substantial amount of money, and those funds are in the hands of one minister, one department. We go on and we start talking about further power grabs. We're suggesting here that an MLA or a minister be responsible for the expenditures of these funds in this particular amalgamation, in this foundation. I think it's ludicrous.

We have to start to come together and suggest that coming together would be wise in saying that an all-party committee would be in order here. We can no longer accept and I think Albertans can no longer accept the fact that a billion dollars, 10 percent of our budget almost, is being spent and being disbursed by one department here in this House.

So the concerns that my colleagues have raised are certainly legitimate ones. I think I could support this given some amendments, and I would look forward to those amendments coming through in the committee stage, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

I want to just rest my comments at this point in time until I see what happens in the committee stage. I believe we can make it work, and I look forward to being part of seeing this thing work.

Thank you.

9:30

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Edmonton-Ellerslie.

MS CARLSON: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The Member for Calgary-Mountain View stood on a point of order on imputing motives. If this is not so and grants are not politically motivated, then I would respectfully request that he let me hand out the next cheque.

The Member for Medicine Hat stated that this is not a house-keeping Bill. Well, clearly that's downplaying the nature of this Bill. What we have is a Bill that does downsize and streamline. Those are all very commendable efforts on the part of this government, but in there they tuck in this one little part that will now allow a member to sit on the board, which is a very dangerous precedent to establish, I think, at this point in time by this government given their record over the past few years. It certainly puts into jeopardy any ability of those foundations to operate on an arm's-length basis.

Now, there's a couple of members on that side who seem to have a problem with that definition. It clearly means allowing the foundations to operate independently without interference from government intervention. When you've got an MLA sitting on your board, then you're going to have government intervention and interference at every step of the way. So what we have then, in fact, is more government, not less government, which is what this Premier has been promising all along. I think it's important that we share these facts with the public. What happened to openness and accountability in government when you can elect board members based on their ability and their credibility within this province, not merely based on their allegiance to a particular political party? I thought we were going to see an end to that. I thought that was what your government was leading people to believe. Clearly, from what's happening in this Bill, it's not the case.

As this Bill reads, there's no protection and distinction of moneys nor programs that would otherwise preserve equity and

fairness in the divvying up and application of funds under this proposed scenario. So what does that really mean? One more slush fund?

There's nothing left here to maintain the integrity of each of these foundations and keep them from just becoming a melting pot that can be allocated any way that the minister in charge and the MLA on the board decide and see fit. This is very unfortunate, because these foundations have done a very credible job in the past of fulfilling their mandate, and it's certainly a discredit to the individuals that have worked there and especially the volunteers who have added depth and credibility to these foundations. Again, what you're doing is dismantling something that has been the very basis of growth in this province in the past through both of these foundations and developing just one more slush fund for this government that has no credibility.

For those reasons, I cannot support this Bill.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Bonnyville.

MR. VASSEUR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: Not another one.

MR. VASSEUR: Another one, yes.

At first glance when I saw the amalgamation of the proposed Bill, I thought: here we go; it makes sense; there is an opportunity to consolidate some costs here and show some real leadership in incorporating some of the management and having the one board of directors looking after these two bodies. Again, I saw it: here's an opportunity for this government to show some leadership by doing exactly what they said they were going to do and having a joint committee of the Legislature, members from both sides, to do the appointments for the board members. Obviously, that is not the case. They even have the audacity to put an MLA on the board.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, there's no argument about the importance of what the Alberta Sport Council has done in the past or what it's going to do in the future. I mean, it has funded things like the Canadian national teams. It funds all the regional Winter Games, the Summer Games. It has done a lot of good things for the province. Many of the members from across stood up here and said that it's not used for any political gains at all, at all, at all. I can tell you that it is. I can tell you that through the sourcing of that fund, within seven days prior to the last election there was a cheque delivered to an organization in my riding. Unfortunately, a hundred thousand dollars wasn't quite enough.

Here's a chance for this government again to show some real leadership. All we have to do is go back to the way that we used to handle the CRC grants. Here's a chance to go back to the municipalities and the communities that used to be part of the decision-making of the distribution of these funds. We used to sit on council and invite community groups, and the money was distributed on a per capita basis. What a fair way to do things. Now we have to distribute the money according to the political stripe. We see that time and time again. Again, if there's a cheque to be delivered in the community of an opposition MLA, if it's not an MLA from the Conservative side that can deliver the cheque, it's one of the public servants. So next time I would like to give the cheque too. You can come too. We'll both be there.

Unfortunately, I think this proposal and the reason why we cannot support this, Mr. Speaker, is that it's just a renewed vehicle for further distribution of the lottery funds through political affiliation. Thank you very much.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Fort McMurray.

MR. GERMAIN: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Listening to the debate tonight, I had an amusing thought when the hon. Member for Medicine Hat described the opportunity that confronted him moments before his life flashed in front of him, and that was that he could have jumped in a kayak at the Medicine Hat kayak club. I'm happy to inform the members of this House that I, too, have done a little kayaking. I used to. I want to suggest to the members . . . [interjections] You know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, this House is getting just as bad as my two sons. They're alleging that I'm marginally over my prime too, and nothing could be further from the truth.

The hon. Member for Medicine Hat and I would have made a very interesting picture kayaking down the Owl River. The Owl River, Mr. Deputy Speaker, so say the old-timers, used to have some fish in it until 20 years of Conservative rule drove all the fish away. I don't ascribe to that theory – that's just what the old-timers say up there – but I do know that with the fish gone . . . I'm sorry.

**Point of Order
Questioning a Member**

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

MR. HLADY: Thank you. Mr. Speaker, I was wondering if the Member for Fort McMurray would like to ask me his question now.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I take it that's that time-release capsule.

MR. GERMAIN: That's a very good point.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was not familiar with the protocol here, so I wanted to make sure that I didn't lose my opportunity to speak by asking the question at the beginning of my commentaries. I will time my commentaries to end sufficiently quickly enough that the hon. member, who has graciously agreed to answer a question, will have the question presented to him at the end of my commentaries. I thought that when he was rising he wanted to . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Do you have another point of order?

MR. HLADY: He will ask the question. Will I have time to answer it in his time?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Only time will tell.

MR. HLADY: Okay.

9:40 Debate Continued

MR. GERMAIN: Thank you. I thought the hon. member was rising on a point of order that it would have been impossible for the Conservative government to drive the fish out of Owl River, but maybe they do acknowledge that. [interjections] Well, the minister of community service invites me to come kayaking with him. I'm happy to do so.

I want to talk about the Bill now, if I might, Mr. Speaker, before people question the relevance of my commentaries tonight. The first point I want to make is that it seems to me that throughout time there has always been a territorial clash between issues revolving around wildlife preservation, parks preservation, and the

environmental recreation of quiet spaces. Some of these uses are compatible indeed with recreational concepts, but others are not so compatible. For example, I am sure there are lots of people who are involved in wilderness areas that would not particularly be interested in four sheets of ice and a curling rink and a community lounge being built smack dab in the middle of their area. It seems to me that when we amalgamate these two pieces of legislation, we run the risk of blending together uses that are on their surface compatible but beneath the surface are a brewing cauldron of incompatibility. The issue of incompatible objectives has to be brought forward when we are discussing this piece of legislation.

Now, the Member for Medicine Hat – and he reminded me of it by commenting on his kayaking experience – probably did not know and did not realize that when he began his comments tonight, he would start this fire storm, and I'm sure that he's personally embarrassed. Would that member ever want to stand up and say to me, the Member for Fort McMurray, that I am not worthy enough to take a thousand dollar cheque to our local kayak club and deliver it? Would the Member for Calgary-Currie ever want to look me in the eye and say: "You can't deliver a cheque in Fort McMurray. In fact, we'll send a government employee up at full fare simply to deliver the cheque so that you will not deliver the cheques that are involved in these programs"?

AN HON. MEMBER: In your constituency.

MR. GERMAIN: In my constituency.

Some of the government members in the front row look at this debate; they look at it with astoundment. They say, "Why would this level of paranoia exist?" Well, the level exists because there is an underlining evidentiary basis for that particular concern to be raised. We had an hon. member here who's been five years in this Legislative Assembly working hard for the people of Alberta and is not worthy enough to go deliver a cheque to his constituency when his constituents get some form of Sport Council grant. Why? Why would this debate take on these emotional overtones, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if that was not the underlining concern?

Now what we have: in the interests of efficiency. We heard those same interests last time around when the Minister of Municipal Affairs introduced his liquor store privatization in the interests of efficiency. Now we see that maybe there are some cracks in that veneer. There are other people around Alberta who have picked up that analogy of the thoroughbred dog turning into a mongrel right in front of their eyes. We have the situation in this particular Bill that when we invite – we don't subtly ask for it. Not like a coy maiden looking for a kiss, but we come right out and scream "political opportunism," because we're going to absolutely control the entire foundation at the ministerial and at the MLA level. Why would the government expose itself to that kind of commentary in the interests of efficiency? No, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if they really intended to be efficient, they would adopt the excellent suggestion from the hon. Member for Bonnyville, who incidentally I'm envious of. He says that just before the election as a result of his efforts he got a hundred thousand dollar grant in the community. Maybe they should have tried that in Fort McMurray; we could have used the hundred thousand dollars. Who knows what the result would have been?

We have a situation here where if we truly meant to have efficiency, we would just simply go back to a per capita disposition of the funds and get away from the cheque presentation, get away from applying and going on bended knee with your project or your objective and asking for money. Asking for whose money? Asking for your own money back on bended knee.

If we were really interested in efficiency, why wouldn't we collect all of those lottery foundations and lottery distributors of cash? The Deputy Premier once a year files in this Legislative Assembly a stack of annual reports that would choke a horse from all of the different community involvements that he has, all of the involvements where they give out lottery funds. Why wouldn't this legislation consolidate them all and be done with it? That's what efficiency means.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I am concerned about the issue of efficiency, because in the transition comments there is no employment loss in this particular proposal "until the Foundation . . . directs." So does that mean that the amalgamating employees at this time do not know their fate, or does it mean that indeed there won't be any employee loss? Then that must put in some doubt the issue of efficiency.

I now turn to the hon. Member for Calgary-Mountain View. The hon. member made a commentary earlier that he had already been appointed to this board. He'd already been appointed to this board. I took his clarification comments later to mean that he had been appointed to the transitory board that he believes will become the board when this legislation is pushed through this Legislative Assembly. Okay. Well, the question, then, that I have for the member – and it's a question that is of some interest to all Albertans, because we heard the hon. member opposite, the Member for Edmonton-Rutherford, comment on the amount of fees paid to board members. The member rose on a point of order earlier, imputing motives. My question to the member is this: will he today in this Legislative Assembly assure the Legislative Assembly and the people of Alberta that he will not now and not in the future take any fee or honorarium for sitting on this particular board? That's my question to the hon. member.

Speaker's Ruling Speaking Twice in a Debate

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Tempting as the question might be, the tradition and custom of the House is that in second reading only the mover of the Bill may speak a second time. There is, however, a provision, and that is that if we can get the unanimous consent of the House to waive that for this moment, then I will recognize Calgary-Mountain View. Otherwise, I'm not entitled to do so.

All those in favour?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Opposed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

Point of Order Questioning a Member

MR. GERMAIN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, may I speak to that point by way of a point of order? The hon. member said he would answer a question. The only reason that it wasn't in his time was because he was afraid of using up all of his precious time.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I realize what you have said is true, that the hon. Member for Calgary-Mountain View when he was speaking was asked whether he would entertain a question and he said that he would entertain it at some later time, which would be during your speech. That undertaking on his part does not prevent him from explaining to you outside this Chamber whatever he may wish to do. However, I was just citing the rules

of the Legislature, and the only provision that we have for getting around that is unanimous consent. We did not receive unanimous consent, and so we'll have to go on without further points of order.

MR. ZWOZDESKY: I'm sorry; this isn't right.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I think, Edmonton-Avonmore, if you have a point of order, that's fine, but to stand up and shout "This isn't right" is a challenge to the Chair.

MR. ZWOZDESKY: I'm sorry. I sat down quickly because you stood quickly. I was going to go on to say that *Beauchesne* 482 clearly spells out what's going on here. You've called for the vote, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The vote was such, under 482, that the member desiring to ask a question during debate received consent from the member asking, and let's proceed with the answer, please. That was the ruling.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hon. members, for your further edification, we are first and foremost in this House governed by the Standing Orders of the Legislative Assembly of Alberta. Standing Order 23(a) clearly states:

speaks twice to a question, except in the case of a mover concluding debate or explaining a material part of a speech.

So that's the ruling that I understand, and I've just had communication from the Table. I'm not at liberty to invent new rules here.

If the point of Fort McMurray's question is truly to elicit information from Calgary-Mountain View, he's free to do so outside the precinct, but if we're going by the rules of the House, that's the ruling that is there.

Hon. Member for Edmonton-Mayfield.

9:50

AN HON. MEMBER: Point of order.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have made the ruling, hon. member.

Edmonton-Mayfield.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, not to reflect on the last ruling, but there are many traditions of this House. One of them happens to be that 482 is respected. Many times in second reading and in committee the other side rises to it. However, we shall not dwell upon the matter. At the request of this side, we'll speak to the issue.

Debate Continued

MR. WHITE: The issue at hand here is pure and simple political patronage. We all know that; we understand it. Waiting for a rise from the corner and not seeing one, I'll continue.

There's a privilege in this House that allows one to say a certain number of things about the other side. The liberty is taken from that side many, many times, as we know. Certainly Stockwell does it and does it very well. [interjections] I'm sorry; the Member for Red Deer-North. He does it well.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order. The night is young, but I would hope that we would be able to allow the member for Edmonton-Mayfield to carry on his debate on second reading of Bill 2.

MR. WHITE: Thank you, sir. There are lottery funds going into this particular little slush pot, and it hasn't been so before. We all know that the two agencies that are being brought together by this particular Act that is ill conceived have been operating quite

well for a number of years. The efficiencies gained by this cannot be seen. My colleague from Edmonton-Rutherford pointed out six or seven times that in the Bill the minister is mentioned but pointedly mentioned: the responsibility of the minister. Yes, every Bill has that. We know that. That's how the Queen's business is done. But this particular piece of business is a little different, and we all recognize this.

In the grand scheme of things, yes, they're very small dollars. But in paying – we can't use "paying." We can use terms like assisting one to make a decision on a number of areas. These are highly charged political dollars. These strike at the heart of where every single one of us in this room has done and perhaps continues to do our volunteer time. These are the hard hours that are put to these things that make our society much, much better.

Now, when you're currying favour, it's easy to see from where these political dollars can be best used. They're best used certainly in sport, certainly in recreation . . .

MR. WICKMAN: In certain ridings too.

MR. WHITE: . . . and in certain ridings. Thank you. We all know that. We can see it coming a mile away.

Then for this government on the prospect of having mega mega dollars coming their way – because we're quite aware of the increase in the lottery funds. The funds available to spend by this government through this manner and through others, direct expenditures, are mounting and mounting rapidly. I'm told that there is a quirk in the works insofar as the accounting, because the accounting does not have to be looked over any longer by the Minister of Justice. It's by another minister now. When you take these funds and you expense – unlike any other regular business that could not expense a capital good in one year, Alberta lotteries are able to do that with impunity. We have no idea in this House, because it certainly isn't made public. As much as the minister keeps telling us that all of these things are public – not the Minister of Justice, I might add, but the former minister – this is not the case, but he doesn't say that in the House for fear of being contradicted, of course. So here we are putting off the profit of these funds so that this coming fiscal year there will be massive amounts of money. Where are they going? Under the direct control of that one minister, the superminister, the one that controls a great deal of . . . [interjection] The minister of the front bench? [interjection] Of the Alberta advantage; right. Yeah, we all know now where the Alberta advantage reigns, and it's to the right of the Premier, the guy that takes over the chair when the other guy takes off. We know who that is, and we know exactly what happens to the power. These are highly charged political dollars, and they're all co-ordinated and dispensed by one minister. I would suspect that there's a lot of jealousy of this minister not just in the front row but perhaps in the other rows too. Certainly not on this side. I mean, we don't envy a guy that gets to lay out funds as he sees fit, at his beck and call.

Point of Order Imputing Motives

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

AN HON. MEMBER: I was waiting for it.

AN HON. MEMBER: What took you so long?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. Government House Leader has a point of order.

MR. DAY: Let's call it Standing Order 23(i). I'd like to also cite the comments just made by the members opposite who said they were waiting for this; why did it take so long? They know that imputing false motives will eventually get a reaction. They were giving testimony to that. They repeated a number of times before I stood up, "What took you so long?" So they were anticipating that. They're also provoking the wrong type of debate, which Standing Orders clearly talks about. Mr. Speaker, you've had to make some difficult rulings tonight; I appreciate that. We would like a clear ruling on this. When they use phrases like "political dollars," "politically charged," "patronage," this type of thing, this is clearly imputing motives. This is the group who said the exact same type of things about the community facility enhancement program. When you looked at the sheets, where were the heavy dollars running and more dollars than in many government departments? To the opposition ridings. So we'd ask for a clear ruling on this.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Do you wish, Edmonton-Mayfield, to respond?

MR. WHITE: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to speak to that matter, certainly. We spoke earlier in this House of those same matters: one, that if it's not in *Hansard*, then it didn't occur. Now, if the comments from any colleague show up in the Blues, then the member opposite may have something to say about it. You may not have been in the Chair at the time, sir. The second item is imputing motives. The Member for Redwater explained clearly: this is a political forum, folks. I hate to tell you this. I started off the remarks, and you'll remember full well that that side of the House and this side of the House say a lot of unkind things to each other and about each other. That is one of the privileges of being in this House. Sir, I ask for the ruling.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Well, whether the present occupant of the Chair was or was not here is not really the question. Certainly during the course of debate this afternoon we did hear at the invitation of the Chair from the hon. Member for Redwater, who said, yes, there is some imputation of motives. However, the overriding comment made by the chairman at the time, I think you'll find, is that imputing unworthy motives back and forth really does not enhance reasoned debate. We talked about why people are doing something and infer or directly state that they have unworthy intentions. That really doesn't help debate and is precluded from debate by the very item that stands as 23(i), and even unavowed, whether they be worthy or unworthy, motives or intentions.

10:00

The Chair at the time appealed to both sides to please respect the integrity of members opposite them, and that's more or less what I would repeat right now: if we can deal with the merits of the Bill or its lack of merit without somehow characterizing it as fitting in with bad motives of members either named or implied.

With that, we would invite Edmonton-Mayfield to again explain his reasons why he might oppose or support Bill 2.

Debate Continued

MR. WHITE: I thought I was quite clear, sir, that I was in opposition to this particular Bill. I had not heard before that political motives were all that nasty. I stand corrected, and I certainly will do my best to steer clear of any. Perhaps you could explain it to me some other time, sir. Those kinds of feelings

certainly not only dwell within this Chamber alone. We do wish to continue this debate along, and therefore I'll move adjournment of debate.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Mayfield has moved adjournment of debate. All those in favour, please say aye.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Those opposed, please say nay.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Defeated.

Do you have a question?

MR. WHITE: Surely, sir, I moved debate – the motion lost. You do not lose your place. [interjection] No, you don't. Oh, no, you don't.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Chair is hoping for advisement on that issue.

The hon. Member for Edmonton-Mayfield may continue.

MR. WHITE: Thank you kindly. There is something to be said for reviewing the words of other members in this House. I just reviewed some spoken earlier today by the Member for Calgary-Varsity when he was explaining why he did not support a Bill with regards to the WCB. It was Bill 202 put forward by this side of the House. He was saying something to the effect that all of these should be arm's length. They should be far enough away so that when there are some decisions made in this Chamber – I think it was something to the effect that we steer and they are the power.

AN HON. MEMBER: They row.

MR. WHITE: They row. Thank you kindly, sir.

The intent clearly was that there was a hands-off. This Chamber set policy and set that direction and off the functionaries went to do that. Well, this is diametrically opposed, absolutely. It's the antithesis of the argument being made right now by that side. This is hands-on. This is control. This is definitely.

A member, I think this House has heard already, has been appointed to this particular position prior to the passage of the Bill – it's a wonder how it can be done – and in clear violation of the principle enunciated by the Member for Calgary-Varsity. Now, I would perhaps like to hear – we have a fair bit of time. Certainly he hasn't spoken on the matter. I will not be the one to ask him any questions on the matter, of course, because we've been through that little charade already, but certainly it behooves him to explain how on one hand he wants to wash his hands clean of a government's involvement in something very, very, very, very clearly in the realm of public good, in the administration of those funds for injured workers versus those that are doled out at the will of a minister with perhaps the assistance of someone from the other side, doubtfully but perhaps. I for one would dearly like to hear the arguments. Certainly the arguments have been made in this House for efficiency in the deliverance of this particular service. I for one simply cannot buy that.

Here we're dealing primarily with – and I think everyone on the other side would admit, even those that were perhaps members of the same party, perhaps not, that they were appointed to these boards for one reason. They weren't there to line their pockets with the small fees they were getting. They were there to try and do the best job they could. Now, fundamentally when you're having these volunteers that are covered in some small way for some of their expenses and you have two sets of volunteers looking at two completely different realms of activity in this province, then I would think that is a very reasonable approach to deliverance of that service. Certainly it was – it appeared to be anyway – hands-off. You did not have those that set policy and those that administered the policy getting intermixed. Now, every time one goes to put a member of this House on a committee, a lot of other members on that committee then therefore defer to that person, regardless of the brainpower that is brought. It is because that member of this august body has influence on further appointments and on policy. So the Member for Calgary-Varsity can't have it both ways. You cannot make both of those arguments in a matter of hours and have that kind of argument stick.

Mr. Speaker, in light of the hour I shall again move adjournment on the matter. [interjections] Unacceptable? Oh, yes, I think you're right.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Community Development in summation.

MR. MAR: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I thank some hon. members from both sides of the House for their thoughtful comments and move second reading of Bill 2.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Community Development has moved second reading of Bill 2. All those in favour, please say aye.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Those opposed, please say no.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Carried. Call in the members.

[Several members rose calling for a division. The division bell was rung at 10:09 p.m.]

[Ten minutes having elapsed, the Assembly divided]

For the motion:

Ady	Evans	Mar
Amery	Fischer	McClellan
Black	Forsyth	McFarland
Burgener	Haley	Oberg
Calahasen	Havelock	Pham
Cardinal	Herard	Renner
Clegg	Hierath	Rostad
Coutts	Hlady	Severtson
Day	Jacques	Smith
Dinning	Laing	Stelmach
Doerksen	Lund	Taylor, L.
Dunford	Magnus	Thurber

10:20

Against the motion:

Abdurahman	Dalla-Longa	Vasseur
Bracko	Germain	White
Carlson	Kirkland	Wickman
Chadi	Nicol	Zwozdesky

Totals:	For - 36	Against - 12
---------	----------	--------------

[Motion carried; Bill 2 read a second time]

[At 10:22 p.m. the Assembly adjourned to Wednesday at 1:30 p.m.]