

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Title: **Monday, December 7, 1981 2:30 p.m.**

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

## PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: **INTRODUCTION OF BILLS**

**Bill 259****The Heritage Savings Trust Fund Protection Act**

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce a Bill, being The Heritage Savings Trust Fund Protection Act.

This Act is very significant at this time in our history in Alberta. The Heritage Savings Trust Fund has some \$8.5 billion and could grow to a much larger sum in the next few years. With the possible passage of Bill 69 in this Legislature, we may add another \$2 billion to that fund. In light of that large amount of money that Albertans own and have invested in that fund, the Bill is to establish the office of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund auditor, under the Auditor General. This auditor would be directly responsible to the Auditor General, working with the sincerity, honesty, and good will of the Auditor General, within the format that has been established. The responsibility of the new trust fund auditor is to monitor the trust fund exclusively and to report directly to the Legislative Assembly of Alberta, as does the Auditor General.

As I've said, this Bill recognizes that the trust fund is one and one half times the size of the provincial budget, so requires a separate, identifiable audit department under the Auditor General. There must be direct accountability to this Legislature for the management of the fund.

[Leave granted; Bill 259 read a first time]

**Bill 224****The Human Rights Commission Independence Act**

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill No. 224, The Human Rights Commission Independence Act.

There are several provisions in this Act. The first is that a chairman will be selected by the Lieutenant Governor in Council, as recommended by the Legislative Assembly. Secondly, the Human Rights Commission would be directly responsible to the Legislative Assembly. Thirdly, a report will be tabled within the Assembly within 15 days of the commencement of the legislative session.

[Leave granted; Bill 224 read a first time]

**Bill 260****An Act to Limit  
the Exclusion of Rights Legislation**

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I would also like to request leave today to introduce a Bill, An Act to Limit the Exclusion of Rights Legislation.

This amendment provides that any Acts passed notwithstanding The Alberta Bill of Rights cease to have effect five years after being passed, unless re-enacted by this Legislature. This patterns The Alberta Bill of Rights after the constitution agreed upon by nine of the premiers, the Prime Minister of Canada and, hopefully by tomorrow evening, the Canadian Senate. This would bring it in line, also point out that the clauses in that area under The Bill of Rights would be revised.

The purpose of the Bill is to guarantee Albertans — as we all would recognize — that their rights in The Alberta Bill of Rights will receive the same protection now in the federal constitution.

[Leave granted; Bill 260 read a first time]

**Bill 247****The Solar Energy Development Act**

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill No. 247, The Solar Energy Development Act.

The main principles contained in The Solar Energy Development Act are to mandate the Research Council to conduct research and development projects relevant to the commercialization of solar heating, to maintain a continuing study of developments in the field of solar energy, and to prepare and submit an annual report in respect of each of these activities which will be tabled in the Legislative Assembly.

[Leave granted; Bill 247 read a first time]

**Bill 248****The Right to Sunlight Act**

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill 248, The Right to Sunlight Act.

Bill No. 248 is modelled on legislation which has been submitted in several states in the United States to the south of us, which would set out the question of the right people have to sunlight, and which must in fact be set out in statutory form if we are going to encourage solar development of any kind in the province.

[Leave granted; Bill 248 read a first time]

**Bill 250****An Act to Amend  
The Alberta Energy Company Act**

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce private member's Bill No. 250, An Act to Amend The Alberta Energy Company Act.

There are two important principles in Bill 250. The first is that notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the government shall at all times hold no less than 51 per cent of all the issued and outstanding voting shares in the company; that is, to move it from 50 per cent to 51 per cent so there is control by the government of Alberta. In fact, we would be turning it into a Crown corporation. The other principle contained in Bill No. 250 is that by

being a Crown corporation, the Alberta Energy Company would be totally answerable to the Legislative Assembly, and all questions raised with respect to it would be debatable in the Legislative Assembly.

[Leave granted; Bill 250 read a first time]

**Bill 252**  
**The Public Information and**  
**Personal Privacy Act**

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill No. 252, The Public Information and Personal Privacy Act.

Very briefly, the principles in Bill 252 are first of all with respect to the right of the public to be able to obtain public information with respect to the operation of government. That would include those papers or reports which have been compiled by government, except for certain specified circumstances. The legislation in that respect is modelled on legislation for introduced for many years in the House of Commons by the then member for Peace River, Mr. Baldwin. The other aspect of the Bill is with respect to the personal privacy question. That sets out certain standards with respect to the confidentiality of government files.

[Leave granted; Bill 252 read a first time]

**Bill 256**  
**An Act to Amend**  
**The Energy Resources Conservation Act**

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce private member's Bill No. 256, being An Act to Amend The Energy Resources Conservation Act.

The main principle in Bill 256 has been partly — but only in part — addressed by government legislation. This would set out more clearly the requirements of notice for ERCB hearings where people are affected by sour gas plants or any kind of energy development. It would set out very clearly the method by which the Energy Resources Conservation Board must advertise in the appropriate local newspaper or method of communication directly to the people affected by such a move.

[Leave granted; Bill 256 read a first time]

**head: TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS**

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Speaker, today I would like to table a letter written by me, the Member for Little Bow, and the Member for Spirit River-Fairview to the Auditor General. It's essentially the same letter delivered to the Auditor General by the Premier last week, asking the Auditor General to look into specific matters dealing with the audit of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. The only difference is that this letter is a little bit more specific ...

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I have to express some concern if our time during the daily routine is going to be taken up by tablings accompanied by explanations. I have a notion that most of us here in the Assembly have a fairly voluminous correspondence.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Speaker, I just wish to table it, and I thank you for the opportunity.

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to table the annual reports of the Alberta Housing Corporation and the Alberta Home Mortgage Corporation for the year ended March 31, 1981. While I'm on my feet, I'd like to file with the Assembly motions for returns nos. 125A and 126.

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table with the Assembly two reports: the annual report of the Department of Culture for the year 1980-81; and second, the Alberta Cultural Heritage Foundation, 1980-81.

**head: INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

MR. L. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, it's a real honor and pleasure for me today to introduce to you, and through you to members of the Assembly, a former MP from our riding, Mr. Stanley Schumacher. Stanley did a very fine job of representing our constituency for 11 years. He's seated in the members gallery, and I would ask him to rise and receive the welcome of the House.

**head: ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**

**Heritage Savings Trust Fund Auditing**

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question to the Premier is partly with regard to the letter that was tabled, also a statement the Premier made in the Legislature on December 3, 1981, in response to a question by the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo. At that time the Premier said, with regard to a letter to the Auditor General: "I don't see any reason why any member of this Legislative Assembly can't communicate directly to the Auditor General".

As well, Mr. Speaker, in my question I'd like to refer the Premier to The Auditor General Act, Section 17(1), which was quoted in one of the Premier's responses, and the indications are that: "The Auditor General shall perform such special duties as may be specified by the Assembly. Section 17(2) says: "special duties as may be specified by the Executive Council".

Mr. Speaker, my question to the Premier is: because it does not allow a member of the Legislature to send a letter directly to the Auditor General and in turn expect a response, would the Premier consider taking the letter that was tabled here today and having it presented to the Auditor General for response to this Legislative Assembly?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I'd certainly consider that. I find it puzzling that a Member of the Legislative Assembly doesn't feel that he or she can correspond with or send a letter directly to the Auditor General. That seems puzzling to me. If there's some difficulty with that, I'd certainly be prepared to look into it.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Would the Premier be prepared to come back to the House tomorrow, having given consideration to that matter in the interim, and report to the Assembly?

MR. LOUGHEED: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd be prepared to do that. Again, it's a matter of puzzlement to me what is really being requested. But I'll certainly read the Blues,

then try to respond to the hon. Leader of the Opposition tomorrow.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. In light of the events before us, has the Premier considered calling a recess to the Legislative Assembly until the Auditor General's report is tabled in this Legislature?

MR. LOUGHEED: No, Mr. Speaker.

#### **Oil Sands/Heavy Oil Development**

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my second question to the Premier as well. It's with regard to the Esso Cold Lake and the Alsands projects. I wonder if the Premier could indicate whether progress has been made with regard to those two matters, whether negotiations are proceeding, are at some kind of stalemate, or are not proceeding at all at the present time.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I don't have that information at hand at present. Perhaps it should wait until the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources returns. I know there are meetings of officials of the Department of Energy and Natural Resources with representatives of the Cold Lake project. That's really all I could report at this stage.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Premier. Is it the intention of the government to reach an agreement this winter, so that some of the winter work that could proceed can proceed?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, we believe the energy agreement of September 1, 1981, provided a very sound basis of commercial encouragement for the projects. If they have difficulties unrelated to the commercial terms, that's a matter that arises from a number of external factors that they as developers would have to consider themselves. For our part, we are always prepared to listen to representations. I anticipate that there would be discussions with the developers over the course of the winter months, but I can give the Legislature no assurance of the results.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Premier, with regard to the federal budget. Could the Premier indicate whether the latest federal budget added further deterrence to the progress with regard to these two plants?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned in the House last Thursday, I believe in answer to a question from the Member for Bow Valley, there's no question that the federal budget certainly had a negative effect on job creation in Canada. I do not have any information in regard to whether it had a negative affect directly upon the Cold Lake project the hon. Leader of the Opposition is referring to. In the course of representations and discussions in the next few months with the developers on that project, it may or may not develop that they may make some representations to us which refer to the federal budget of November 12, 1981, but I have no information in that regard at this time.

MR. SINDLINGER: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the Premier please indicate whether the developers

of either the Alsands or Cold Lake projects have advised the government that there's a deadline for decision-making, or a target date which has to be met, beyond which further development cannot occur?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I don't think the developers have set any firm deadlines for their management decisions. As far as I know, they are continuing discussion at the official level with representatives of both the Alberta and federal governments.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Speaker, could the Premier please advise the Assembly whether a target rate of return has been set on any heritage fund investments in either of these projects, such as that which the Alsands group has indicated it would like to have; that is, something in the range of 20 per cent on equity on a discounted cash flow basis?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, if and when we make investments in a project of that nature, we'll make those investments beneficial to the people of Alberta in the aggregate sense, in terms of our best judgment at the time.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Could the Premier indicate whether the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources is presently out of the House because he is negotiating with regard to these two plants? Or is the minister away on other energy business outside or within Canada?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources is outside the country. He's been on important tours in Japan and Australia.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Could the Premier indicate the content of those visits? Are they with regard to agreements with Canada, and specifically with Alberta, with regard to oil or gas, technology that could be better used in Alberta, or the sale of technology to these countries? Specifically, what is the purpose of the trip?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I think it would be inappropriate for me to start a long, involved answer. A report should await the return of the hon. minister. If the session is adjourned when he returns, I'm sure he'd be happy to do it when the House reconvenes.

MR. SINDLINGER: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the Premier please indicate whether ratification will be sought from this House prior to investing heritage funds in any of these energy projects?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, no that wouldn't be our approach and hasn't been to this date. As a government, we will make decisions of that nature and present the information to the Legislature. If they wish, the Legislature can ask for whatever accountability is required. They will be decisions made by a duly elected government, which we will stand by, in terms of their being in the best interest of the citizens of the province.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Premier. Have there been any preliminary discussions beyond the statement the Premier issued on July 21 last year with respect to possible investment in the ven-

tures beyond a debt basis, to include equity? I raise that with the Premier because of the decision to convert the Syncrude debentures into equity. At this stage, have there been any discussions with either of the participants about a significant equity investment by the province of Alberta, as opposed to debt instruments?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, nothing other than in an exploratory or preliminary way.

MR. SINDLINGER: A supplementary, please. If there is equity investment in either of these projects, could the Provincial Treasurer advise the Legislative Assembly whether there will be an upper limit on the amount of equity the Alberta government will take relative to the other participants?

MR. SPEAKER: The question could possibly be put in an unhypothetical way. Perhaps we could assume that's been done.

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, no decision has been taken in that regard at this time.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Speaker, could the Provincial Treasurer advise the Assembly whether the guidelines presented to the heritage fund committee — that is, 5 per cent of total equity in any particular project — will be considered and applied in these two particular cases?

MR. HYNDMAN: No they will not, Mr. Speaker.

#### **Water Management — TV Production**

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. It concerns a widely advertised television program, *On The Water Front*. It says in the add that water is essential for agriculture. Is the minister in a position to advise the Assembly whether this particular program, apparently paid for by the Department of Agriculture, will in fact be aired tonight?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, the Department of Agriculture has many programs on behalf of producers throughout the province that appear at various times. I don't have an answer, but I would be quite pleased to check into it and report back to the House.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. In terms of the production of this particular program, is the minister in a position to advise the Assembly that the position of the government with respect to water management, as enunciated by the hon. Premier a few days ago, is in fact the position being represented in this program, or is it the position outlined by either Mr. Martyn or Mr. McFarlane in their memos?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, I would have to take the question as notice. Agriculture deals with water as it pertains to irrigation. I would have to assume that that would be the direction the Department of Agriculture would be involved. I will certainly take the question as notice and report back.

MR. NOTLEY: A further supplementary question. It's my understanding that the CBC has chosen not to carry this particular program because it's controversial. [in-

tejections] Is the minister in a position to advise the Assembly whether it is the intention of the government to buy time on the private stations, and what the budget is? If the Minister of Agriculture is not in a position to answer that question, perhaps whoever is acting minister in charge of the Public Affairs Bureau could.

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, I stated that I would take the original question as notice. The information the hon. member provides is interesting, and we'll still accept the question as notice.

MR. NOTLEY: A further supplementary question. While the minister is taking these questions as notice, would he also find out the cost of this particular production and report back to the Assembly? Perhaps I could put that as a direct question to the hon. minister.

MR. SPEAKER: With great respect, it was put as a direct question.

MR. NOTLEY: I didn't get an answer.

#### **Health Care Insurance — Doctors' Fees**

MRS. CHICHAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the hon. Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care. Could the hon. minister advise the House of the status of negotiations with the province's doctors, the AMA?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, the negotiating teams met again on Friday afternoon. A carefully worked out government offer was put to the AMA negotiators for their consideration over the weekend, in the hope that it would be put to their membership for vote. I'm sorry to say that the AMA directors have decided not to put that offer to a vote, so I guess we have to go back to the table for some more work.

MRS. CHICHAK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the hon. minister take two supplementaries into consideration? Inasmuch as the doctors have indicated publicly that their request is for a 32 per cent increase and other figures seem to be quoted publicly, the questions I'm being asked are, what does it all mean and what is the real offer? Has the provincial government offered 11.1 per cent? Where are we at, and can we have some clarification on those figures?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could put it in simple terms if I just use the global figures with respect to each side. These figures have elements of recognition of overhead expenses, doctors' income component, and what are called additional benefits by way of substantive issues. The doctors have been talking about 32 or 30 per cent, plus substantive issues. Our last offer, which was rejected over the weekend, was for approximately 17.5 per cent in the global basis over one year. That includes the matter of substantive issues. I say "approximately" because it's very difficult at this time to put a precise dollar figure, and thereby a percentage point, on the substantive issues. But I believe I'm within one or two decimal points.

MR. SINDLINGER: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister indicate whether or not the new offer presented by the government to the doctors which was

just referred to, entailing a 17.5 per cent increase, was based on an increase in premiums paid by Albertans?

MR. RUSSELL: No it isn't, Mr. Speaker. I've been trying to indicate to the public lately the cost of any potential agreement we might come to. When I spoke to the Alberta Hospital Association convention last week, I mentioned that the package now being asked for by the AMA would mean a doubling of existing medicare premiums if the premiums are going to be asked to support it. If the premiums don't support it, some other source of income will. But I think that perhaps helped put it into perspective.

MR. SINDLINGER: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister indicate whether or not consideration would be given to eliminating health care premiums in their entirety for Albertans?

MR. RUSSELL: Well, Mr. Speaker, that's the proposition put to us by the federal Minister of National Health and Welfare, who believes that medicare is free. We hadn't realized that. Apparently there's no cost to it. We have often been asked to consider eliminating medicare premiums but don't agree to that proposition. It's a way of directly relating the costs of health care to costs to the consumer.

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question to the minister, for clarification. In his answer, the minister indicated that had the proposition put by the medical association been accepted, if the doctors accepted, there would be a doubling of fees if that were the way in which it was paid. However, specifically with respect to the government's 17.5 per cent offer, is the minister saying to the House that that will be accommodated totally from general revenue, or will some increase in fees in fact be anticipated?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, that decision hasn't finally been made. I think it's important to get the message to Albertans, especially the ones urging substantial income raise in the fee benefit schedule, that that direct relationship be made. An option we'll have to consider in drawing up the budget for the next fiscal year is whether those added costs will come from medicare premiums or from some other source. At this time, I've tried to give an indication of the scope of change that would be necessary to meet those costs.

MRS. CHICHAK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the hon. minister indicate what proportion the premiums are paying for medicare costs? Does the minister have the information on hand as to what percentage of the real cost the government is paying in total medical care support?

MR. RUSSELL: At the present time, Mr. Speaker, it's approximately one-third. If all medical care premium revenue were directed to the medicare program only, it would cover one-third of the costs and nothing for hospitals.

MRS. CRIPPS: A supplementary to the minister, Mr. Speaker. What is the government's position on overhead costs? That's a point very often raised.

MR. RUSSELL: I don't believe there's any disagreement between the government and the Alberta Medical Association on that issue. We think the *bona fide* increased costs in their overhead should be met, and that those should not be deducted from the doctors' incomes. We've tried to establish that. There's some difference of opinion as to what overhead is, and we're certainly willing to reach agreement on that as quickly as possible.

MR. GOGO: A supplementary question to the hon. minister, Mr. Speaker. Are fee schedules in other jurisdictions in Canada a criterion in determining the fee schedule with the Alberta Medical Association in the province of Alberta?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I understand it is an element that is put on the bargaining table. For example, the other highest provincial fee schedule at the present time is British Columbia, I believe. That is one yardstick for measuring incomes. The other one, of course, is to use the available federal statistics with respect to net incomes of any provincial group. I think it's fair to say that Alberta doctors have the highest at the present time.

#### **Sugar Beet Industry**

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. Has the minister had any recent meetings with the Alberta Sugar Beet Growers Association in southern Alberta with regard to the problems they're having processing their sugar beets this fall?

MR. SCHMIDT: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MANDEVILLE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. There has been some suggestion that the sugar beet growers put up their own processing plant. Has there been any discussion with the Minister of Agriculture or the Minister of Economic Development with regard to making funds available on loan from the heritage trust fund to put up such a factory in southern Alberta?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, I've had no such request from the sugar beet growers, either of a change in the processing of their product or for a meeting on the production of sugar beets.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister with regard to the closing of the Picture Butte plant two years ago. At that point in time, was any commitment made by government that the Taber plant would have a capability of processing all the sugar beets grown in southern Alberta, without a significant reduction in acreage? Could the minister indicate what commitment the government made with regard to that?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, I can't recall the commitment at the time. I would have to take that as notice and check back. But in regard to the sugar beet growers themselves, the meetings we have had — and that had to entail last year's production — were involved basically with the contracts and the opportunity from a transportation point of view. After the original meeting, the problem of transportation of sugar beets apparently was solved in signing the contracts, according to the producers themselves. I've had no contact with them to date in regard to a problem for this year.

**Public Affairs Programs — Agriculture**

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. It concerns the foray of the Department of Agriculture into the television business. What is the policy of the department with respect to the production and advertising of programs such as *On The Water Front*? Is it the position of the government that public funds should only be expended on programs which accurately reflect the policy of the government of Alberta?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, the extension department of Agriculture enters into all kinds of uses of the media, including television, for passing information to producers throughout the province on varied subjects in areas of production. As a rule, the programs deal directly with production in a way that is acceptable to the producer, and meets that need between the information media through Agriculture directly to the producer for his or her use.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. The minister has answered the question with respect to objective material. However, where the government is dealing with areas of subjective assessment, what policy guideline does the Department of Agriculture follow, with respect to the production of television broadcasts or extension material, in areas where there is a very definite difference of opinion? Is the position of the Department of Agriculture that where public dollars are expended, those programs accurately reflect the position of the government?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware of any differences of opinion. The presentation of information to producers may vary somewhat from the individual producer's method of production but, in a general way, I see no opposition collectively. In fact, the intent in the use of the material presented is to give that flexibility to producers throughout the province.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. I'm pleased to hear the minister's response, although I suspect there may in fact be a difference of opinion over *On The Water Front*. However, my question does relate to the production of information dispensed by the government generally. But since it relates directly to the Department of Agriculture in those areas where there is debate among the people of Alberta, what policy guidelines are followed before public dollars are invested in any production on a controversial matter? Does it follow that government policy must be accurately reflected before public dollars are invested?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, I'm unaware of any controversy that exists. If the hon. member is referring to the question asked previously, which I took as notice, I suggest that I take it as notice. Perhaps he has information and some preconceived idea of the end result of a program of which I'm not aware at present.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Agriculture with regard to the co-ordination and monitoring of this kind of information. Does the Minister of Government Services monitor the terms of reference or guidelines for advertising or production, whether television, radio, or paper articles that leave

the government? Does each department have its own set of guidelines? Or does no checking at all go on, which seems to be the case in this instance?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, we in the Department of Agriculture have our own services in providing extension. We have our own checks and balances for the release of that material, making sure that the basic material is designed for whatever specific use the original design was intended, and is handled within the department. Each article, whether it be written or appears through the media of radio or television, has the scrutiny of our own department.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Is the minister indicating that that scrutiny is just by deputy ministers and other senior officials, not by the minister himself?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, I've had the opportunity to read and see some but not all of the information generated through the department.

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question to the minister. A production of this kind would cost many thousands of dollars. Who would authorize it, then? If the minister hasn't seen it, would it be the deputy minister? Who would authorize the very considerable expenditure of public funds on the production, plus advertising, of this kind of program?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, the basic planning of the collection of data and the method by which it is to be transmitted to the producers throughout the province, is part of the budgetary aspect. If we are to use the medium of television, of course there is a cost involved. As minister, I have the opportunity to discuss the programs in the planning stage and, from that point of view, have the opportunity to agree with the expenditures collectively and, if they are programs of a fair monetary size, individually. Of course, television falls into that category. So yes, I do have the opportunity to agree on the direction one is taking.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, bearing the minister's answer specifically in mind, did the minister know anything about this program? Was it discussed with the minister in any way, shape, or form, considering the fact that a lot of dollars are involved in the production — as well as advertising costs — of what would be an hour-long program? Has the minister the foggiest idea of this program? Was there any discussion at all between the minister and any officials of the department on this particular program?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, I'm aware of the overall program. It would appear the hon. member is discussing a particular finished product. If that is the same presentation the hon. member alluded to and which I said I would take as notice, I can't answer any further. He's talking about a finished product of which I'm not aware.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. I'm not suggesting that the minister is going to be a censor, sitting down and watching television programs, but was the minister at any time advised that the department was going to undertake a substantial investment of

public dollars on a program dealing with the management of Alberta's water resources?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, we spend a fair amount of money each year in water management, irrigation, and other aspects of production through the department. I see nothing different with this approach from any we have through our extension department over the period of years, or for any other programs we've had this year.

MR. NOTLEY: One final supplementary question. Was the minister given any information about this program, yes or no?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, I've answered that question.

#### **Edmonton Municipal Airport**

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask a question of the Minister of Transportation. Could the minister advise the Assembly what action the government is taking as a result of the light airplane crash in Edmonton last night?

MR. KROEGER: Mr. Speaker, we haven't taken any action. The MOT is doing the investigation, as they do in all accidents of this kind, so we wouldn't be involved at this point.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Speaker, could the minister please advise whether or not any consideration has been given to removing the air traffic from the city limits of Edmonton to the outskirts?

MR. KROEGER: Well, Mr. Speaker, that's not a decision we'd be making. The city of Edmonton would be involved. [interjections]

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. Inasmuch as heritage savings trust funds are being spent to build airport terminals as well as air facilities around the province, would the province give consideration to constructing similar facilities outside the city limits so there wouldn't be a repetition of what happened last night?

DR. PAPROSKI: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NOTLEY: Just let him answer, Ken.

DR. PAPROSKI: I wonder if the minister would indicate to us whether the emergency measures ordinarily in place were activated or in place in this particular case to deal with this type of accident?

MR. SPEAKER: Emergency measures in place? The reason I'm asking a question about the question is that if the regulations governing emergency measures are a matter of public knowledge, of course the question would be out of order. But if it involves some kind of action, that's something else.

DR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Speaker, I'll clarify it. I meant disaster services.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Minister of Municipal Affairs, who I understand is

responsible for disasters. [interjections] Can the minister indicate whether the government's preference is to have a contingency plan to move the airport facilities outside the city or an emergency contingency plan when a jumbo jetliner crashes into a building?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, first of all, the questions directed to me would be in my capacity as a member of Executive Council responsible for disaster services and not as Minister of Municipal Affairs. I can advise that the emergency procedures that come into play in such an event with respect to both the city of Edmonton and the Royal Alexandra hospital in fact were implemented last evening. As well, I can advise that a review of those emergency procedures carried out by the director of disaster services indicates that the emergency procedures were handled well and that the response from fire, police, hospital, and city officials was extremely well co-ordinated and appropriate, in accordance with the emergency procedures outlined previous to the action occurring.

Mr. Speaker, the only other thing I can add from a safety point of view is that this government and the government of the city of Edmonton, I believe it's fair to say, are extremely concerned about occurrences of the nature that occurred last evening and will be undertaking to review both our procedures with respect to disaster preparedness, which is appropriate regardless of whether the airport is moved or not. We will be having discussions with the city of Edmonton with regard to the future of the airport. One shouldn't suspect that that would necessarily lead to some kind of immediate decision to alter the plans, but that's certainly something our government will be discussing with the city of Edmonton.

MR. SINDLINGER: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. The minister has discussed some remedial plans; that is, in the nature of contingency plans. Can the minister please indicate what preventive plans are in place?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, that would not be my responsibility, but I might refer the hon. member to various preventive plans in place with respect to the operation of the Edmonton municipal airport. He might want to check with the city of Edmonton and with the federal Transport people. Indeed, accidents of that type are rare. A lot of people expend a lot of effort to make sure they don't occur.

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Transportation. What discussions, if any, has this minister undertaken with MOT concerning the extensive use of the municipal airport by very light aircraft? The minister's predecessor talked about Villeneuve airport being an alternative for light aircraft, which would make it safer for major aircraft to come in and out of the Edmonton municipal airport. What discussions have the Minister of Transportation or any member of the provincial government had with federal authorities with respect to that question?

MR. KROEGER: Mr. Speaker, I've had no conversation with them at all, because the disposition of that sort of thing now falls under the Department of Economic Development.

MR. SINDLINGER: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker, with regard to ancillary facilities being constructed

outside the city of Edmonton. I again place the question to the minister as to whether or not any consideration is being given to constructing ancillary facilities outside the city limits so there no longer would be a need to land within the city?

MR. KROEGER: As I've already said, Mr. Speaker, I haven't responded to this at all in any way. First of all, the accident itself is now under investigation by federal authorities. Secondly, the ongoing negotiation we have with regard to airports doesn't relate to this specific accident in any way. A lot of light aircraft have been moved to use Villeneuve; the flow has been reduced here. But beyond that, I would have to hold any further questions for the Minister of Economic Development.

#### **Surface Rights Report**

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, my question to the hon. Minister of Agriculture is with regard to the report regarding surface rights that was done during the summer months and was tabled in the Legislature. Could the minister indicate what the process will be for handling these recommendations? When we will be able to look forward to some of the recommendations being put into force by way of regulations or legislation?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, if one looks back over the period of a year and a half, it was the amendments that were brought forward to The Surface Rights Act that created interest throughout not only members of the Assembly but the province, and that created the legislative committee and, the end result, a report. It would be our intention to review the report with the view in mind that, because of the total report itself, The Surface Rights Act should be rewritten. At the time of making a few amendments, it was also suggested that a total new Act would be required. So the intent would be to review the recommendations and come to the Assembly with a New Surface Rights Act.

#### **Sulphur Emissions**

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Speaker, over the weekend the Minister of Environment made a comment that consideration would be given to holding down sulphur emissions from sour gas plants in Alberta to that level which it is at present. My first question to the minister is: what is the status of that decision, and when can we expect a regulation to that effect?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, it is still our intention to hold the existing plants at the emission rates they now are, if that is the question.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. My understanding was that the total sulphur emissions for the province would be held at the level they are at present. My question to the minister is whether or not this new regulation would be conveyed to the ERCB, which is now considering expansion of the Jumping Pound and Quirk Creek sour gas plants?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, in the comments I made Friday evening, in reference to a recent document put out with regard to an interprovincial/federal document. I mentioned that one recommendation was that all provinces attempt to control the total SO<sub>2</sub> emissions within

the jurisdiction of the province. One suggestion in that report was that we then attempt to maintain the present total emissions so that they would be essentially the same in the year 2000. My comment to that was that I think that we in the province can work toward that objective, keeping in mind that new plants that come on have much tighter standards than some of the older plants that eventually will be phased out. So by the year 2000, barring unforeseen circumstances over which we have very little control, as you know, insofar as we are not sure about the total amount of coal development that will take place in the province, nor are we sure about the escalation of tar sand plants in the north — other than that, we should be able to keep total emissions close to what they are at the present time.

MR. SINDLINGER: A final supplementary, please, Mr. Speaker. The Jumping Pound and Quirk Creek plants are old, and my question would be whether the old standards or the new, tighter regulations, to which the minister just referred, would apply to those plants. Perhaps the minister might indicate what the emission level would be for both those plants under both cases.

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, I think the hearing process is still on, and I don't think I could accurately comment on the emissions that will eventually be reached. An information letter, which essentially lays out the sulphur recovery guidelines for gas processing operations, was made public at Calgary on November 4, 1980. Perhaps the member should obtain this document and review it, because basically it lays out the emission requirements.

MR. SINDLINGER: A final supplementary, please, Mr. Speaker. Would the decision or criteria for the level of sulphur emission in regard to these plants be 96 per cent or 98 per cent depending upon the level attainable or the cost of attaining that level?

MR. COOKSON: I think both factors are considered, Mr. Speaker. Certainly we have to consider the total cost of the project. For example, if a project is processing a very minimal amount of tonnes of sour gas per day, we would have a certain standard for that type of plant. If it is removing a larger volume of this material per day, then we would have different standards. The standards are basically on a sliding scale, so essentially we would take into consideration the cost and the total amount we could practicably remove.

MR. SPEAKER: The time for the question period has elapsed, but if the Assembly agrees I have already recognized the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview for another question. Possibly we could handle another short question and short reply.

#### **Ex-Principal—Northland School Division**

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could direct this question to the hon. Minister of Education. It flows from the minister's decision to suspend the Northland school board. Has the minister had an opportunity to meet Mr. Morris Rees and to review Mr. Rees' dismissal, in light of that dismissal on the future teaching career of that particular gentleman who was the centre of much controversy surrounding the Northland School Division last year?



MR. KING: To the best of my knowledge, Mr. Speaker, my office has not received any request that I should meet with Mr. Rees. I know that it has not come to my personal attention. That being the case, I have had no reason to review the circumstances surrounding Mr. Rees' dismissal.

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

### head: GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

16. Be it resolved that notwithstanding any provisions of the Standing Orders, the estimates of the Capital Projects Division of the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund and all appropriation Bills as herein defined, shall, unless earlier disposed of, be dealt with as follows:

- (1) In this resolution
  - (a) "Appropriation Bill" means
    - (i) Bill 69 — Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund Special Appropriation Act, 1982-83, and
    - (ii) any Bill introduced in the House to appropriate the funds covered by the Estimates;
  - (b) "Estimates" means the estimates and supplementary estimates of the Capital Projects Division of the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund that have been referred to the Committee of Supply during the 1981 fall sittings, and includes the resolutions before the Committee of Supply relating to them.
- (2) The Estimates shall be considered by the Committee of Supply on 5 separate sitting days after and including the day upon which this resolution is adopted and if, on the 5th day, the Committee has not voted upon all of the Estimates by the following time limit:
 

10:00 p.m. if it be a Monday, Tuesday or Thursday,  
or  
4:30 p.m. if it be a Wednesday, or  
12:00 noon if it be a Friday,

the Chairman shall immediately interrupt the proceedings and shall forthwith put a single question proposing the approval of every resolution then necessary to complete consideration of the Estimates, which shall be decided without debate or amendment, and the Committee shall forthwith rise and report.
- (3) A motion in the House
  - (a) that the Speaker leave the Chair and the Committee of the Whole meet to consider an appropriation Bill, or
  - (b) that the House receive a report of the Committee of Supply on the Estimates or a report of the Committee of the Whole on an appropriation Bill

shall be decided without debate or amendment.
- (4) An appropriation Bill may be introduced in the House at any time after the receipt of the report of the Committee of Supply on the Estimates covered by the Bill, when the Order of the Day is Government business.
- (5) An appropriation Bill may be read a second time, considered by the Committee of the Whole, reported therefrom to the House and the report received, on one sitting day.
- (6) If an appropriation Bill is moved for second reading, and if, on that day, at the time limit defined by paragraph 2, all appropriation Bills have not yet been

read a second time, the Speaker shall at that time interrupt the proceedings and put the question on second reading of every appropriation Bill then awaiting second reading, which shall be decided without debate or amendment.

- (7) If, after all appropriation Bills have been given second reading, any appropriation Bill is before the Committee of the Whole for consideration, and if, on that day, half an hour after the time limit defined by paragraph 2, there remains any appropriation Bill not reported by the Committee, the Chairman shall at that time interrupt the proceedings and put . . . every question necessary to complete consideration of all appropriation Bills still before the Committee, which shall be decided without debate or amendment, and the Committee shall forthwith rise and report.
- (8) If an appropriation Bill is moved for third reading, and if, on that day, at the time limit defined by paragraph 2, all appropriation Bills have not yet been read a third time, the Speaker shall at that time interrupt the proceedings and put the question on third reading of every appropriation Bill then awaiting third reading, which shall be decided without debate or amendment.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I move Motion No. 16 on the Order Paper. I think a number of observations can be quite concisely made with respect to what is indeed an important motion. Many hon. members would agree that . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I hesitate to interrupt the hon. minister, but in order to avoid misunderstanding, especially on the part of those who may be listening or reading *Hansard*, I think it should be pointed out that two motions are numbered 16 on today's Order Paper. One of them, of course, is under Motions other than Government Motions. It's my understanding that we're now dealing with Motion No. 16, which is a government motion.

MR. CRAWFORD: Yes, indeed, Mr. Speaker. I have not acquainted myself with the other Motion No. 16. Therefore, I move Government Motion No. 16, standing in my name on page 2 of today's Order Paper.

I think a number of hon. members might agree that it would be more agreeable to deal with the matters before the Legislative Assembly at the present time without the need for a motion of this type. It is my purpose to speak of that need and to say what the motion actually does. In so many respects it speaks for itself. In its wording, the motion sets out a schedule of time during which the remaining estimates of the capital projects division of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund for 1982-83 may be considered and adopted by the House. That is all it does. By implication, it takes note of the fact that many days have already been spent on consideration of those estimates, but by declaring a number of additional days, the motion itself really establishes a total schedule for the consideration of those estimates.

Mr. Speaker, certain statements have been made which I think it may be relevant for me to comment briefly upon in speaking to the essence of the motion. When I say "certain statements", I speak of ones that will be quickly well known and understood by all hon. members. I'm speaking primarily of some of the statements made by members of the opposition. I think they, in their quiet moments and away from the cameras, would agree that a lot of those statements are very foolish indeed. I have the

press release the hon. leader wanted me to have today, talking about a free speech league. I would only say this, Mr. Speaker. Over the history of all parliaments and throughout the history of our country, many things have been done to guarantee free speech. For any person to stand in his place and say there is not free speech in this Legislature would be saying there is not free speech in the Mother of Parliaments, in the Parliament of Canada, or in any legislature or parliament in the world. [interjections] That's what they'd be saying, Mr. Speaker, everyone can see that such foolishness that is put forward in this way lacks merit. The hon. gentleman made these statements in regard to free speech which all Canadians prize so highly, knowing that their remarks are a sham and foolishness.

Mr. Speaker, what is really involved, of course, is whether or not certain estimates pass. Those estimates deal with subjects such as the provision of moneys for libraries, irrigation, reforestation, for the development of grazing reserves to improve that aspect of our agricultural industry, land reclamation, urban parks — going beyond Calgary and Edmonton in these estimates to provide amenities in that respect for the cities of Medicine Hat, Lethbridge, Red Deer, Lloydminster, and Grande Prairie — and a considerable amount of research in a number of fields: testing of food products, agriculture in the larger sense, the oil sands, and the health and safety of workers in the province. Those are the areas in which funds are proposed to be committed. When hon. members say they do not want to proceed, it's in respect of those matters that they do not want to proceed.

As is well known, Mr. Speaker, the real question is the amount of time to be available for estimates. That is what the motion deals with. It has been more than fair. We ask what other legislatures would do. I don't know how anyone could stand and say that doesn't matter, that's not relevant. I don't know how anyone in a parliamentary tradition could say that the customs and practices of the Mother of Parliaments, the House of Commons, and the other legislatures in Canada do not matter.

Look first at the size of the estimates in the House of Commons. In their regular budget — and this is not our regular budget this fall. The government is presenting a smaller sum by far than would be presented in the spring sitting under the main budget. The government is presenting the capital projects division for the beneficial purposes I've described. In comparison with the budget we're talking about now, the regular federal budget is some 150 times larger than the estimates we have under consideration. For those estimates in the House of Commons, 150 times larger than what is proposed before the Assembly this fall, the House of Commons allows 25 days. They don't expect it to be any different. That's the arrangement it has long been. For these estimates this fall in this Assembly, given the additional days provided for in this resolution, we will have provided 23 days the other day I even had the question from one of the members of the media why we didn't go the extra two days. That's fine. I don't mind questions like that, but 23 days for a budget which is less than 1 per cent of the 25 days spent in the House of Commons in Ottawa. I might add just one more thing in regard to when estimates are being spoken to in the House of Commons. Members may speak only once, for only 20 minutes. In Westminster, the number of days provided is 29 — 23, 25, 29.

How do other legislatures and parliaments handle things, in the sense of the provincial legislatures in western Canada? Here again, we come to some of the foolish

remarks that have been made. One of the ones that interested me most, in particular considering some of the language used, was Manitoba. As a matter of fact, a portion of the resolution before hon. members was significantly taken from the item in the Manitoba *Standing Orders* called compulsory vote on items of estimates. That standing order was brought into the Manitoba rules in 1975 or 1976. The reasons it was brought in by the NDP government of that day must have been adequate or it wouldn't have been done. For the moment, we will refer to Manitoba rule No. 15 as the "NDP jackboot". [interjections] Next we have the "Blakeney garrotte", Mr. Speaker. In Saskatchewan, the rule that applies in Committee of Supply provides that after a given date, no member shall speak more than once or for longer than 20 minutes, and none shall rise to speak after 1 a.m. Because of the 1 a.m. limitation, they weren't able to treat themselves to the sort of thing my hon. friends and colleagues in British Columbia were treated to the other day by going through the night. But that's another matter and has nothing to do with the prairie provinces, so comparable in so many ways in regard to their background in parliamentary tradition.

Mr. Speaker, what has really happened is that my hon. friends in the opposition have set themselves up a little partnership. I have remarked before that if they're not strange bedfellows, at least they often share the same bunk. That deserves repetition. I really raise that in order that the hon. Leader of the Opposition — and I make this suggestion to him — might reconsider some of the things in his mind in regard to that particular marriage. Strange things happen in marriages, Mr. Speaker. Not all of them end happily, and perhaps not all of them commence with higher hopes. But, Mr. Leader, I would be careful of the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview. I say that for this reason: I'm going to leak a document.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. CRAWFORD: I'm going to leak a document that came to me in the mail not long ago, addressed to me personally. It shyly asks that I send \$250 to help Grant Notley. That's what it says. It goes further and says that if I send less, that will be all right. [laughter] It is accompanied by a letter, dated fall 1981, in which one of the hon. member's henchmen writes me saying they need the money because Grant gets more attention and, more important, more action every day. They say that. Having mentioned that it's one of the hon. member's henchmen, I might say it's a Mr. Basken. The letter then goes on to say that Peter Lougheed cannot ignore him as he does the rest of the opposition. [interjections] That is the view and opinion of the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview of the hon. Leader of the Opposition. [interjections] Wedded bliss. I don't think the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview will say to me that he didn't know about it, that he hadn't heard of it, or that he didn't approve of it anyway.

MR. NOTLEY: Did you send the cheque, Neil? That's the important thing.

MR. CRAWFORD: Don't worry about the money.

Mr. Speaker, what is proposed here actually allows two more weeks from when I gave the oral notice, because it included Friday — substantially two more weeks of opposition days at the end of a fall sitting. For what purpose? For the consideration of estimates in respect of

which 17 days had already been spent. The record of previous years is that hon. members of the opposition required an average of five. They say that we should not find a way of bringing on the matter the way any other legislature would in disposing of it. We say that there is no merit in what they propose. They're saying: put it over till spring, do it some other time, don't do the work now, do it some other day, Mr. Speaker. I have never understood the merit, by itself, of delay in important work. That is just one proposal being made.

In concluding, Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 20, I give notice of one clear day. At the next sitting of the House, immediately before the order of the day is called for resuming debate on government Motion No. 16, and on any amendments proposed thereto, I will move that the debate shall not be further adjourned.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, in speaking to this motion, I think we have to set the principle in place first of all. After I set the principle in place with regard to this motion, then I can respond to what the hon. House leader has said in the last few moments.

The principle is very clear: for years and years and years in this Legislature, there has never been an incident where closure was necessary. There were large majorities and few people in the opposition. They were given time to speak on every subject. They were given time to ask every question that was necessary. There was never closure in this House before. There was never limitation of debate by government by a formal resolution presented to members of the Legislature. Freedom of speech, the right of members of the Legislature to represent their constituents in a very responsible manner, flourished in this Legislature until this motion was introduced last week and is now being formally debated on the floor of this Legislature today.

Mr. Speaker, that is a sad situation. It only compounds the atmosphere and attitude of this Legislature following the incidents that we had in the last two weeks, where a point of privilege was a situation that was raised. Now it is questionable whether any member in the Legislature can raise a point of privilege without it being clearly . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I thought we had disposed of this point of privilege. It must be a matter of some concern to all members of this Legislature that what occurred here was so little understood. There were some serious breaches of privilege inside and outside the House, which in other times perhaps would have been dealt with fairly severely. There were allegations of gagging and that free speech had been cut off in the House. There were direct allegations of unfairness by the Chair. Hon. members know that when they were elected to this Assembly — they freely allowed themselves to be elected — they were elected . . . I'm sorry, I'm going to be a few moments longer. If any hon. members wish to leave or resume their seats, I'll just pause.

In fact, I hoped that we had done with that situation, but it appears we haven't. Hon. members, especially members who have been in the Assembly for previous terms, know what the *Standing Orders* and the parliamentary traditions are. They came to a House which has certain rules.

I am not aware of any game where you have a built-in right to chew out the referee, to use the common expression, when you don't like the way the game is going. That is what occurred here. The impression has been given that free speech was denied in this Assembly. The fact is that

that was never denied, notwithstanding a motion which purported to appeal a ruling which was not in fact made. The motion dealt with a ruling denying the opportunity to speak, whereas in fact all the ruling said was that the discussion of the point of privilege would have to await an occasion when all members involved directly would be in the Assembly. In other words, a member was not to be accused behind his back.

Now, the matter had first come up some four days before. As it turned out, it was dealt with three days later, on Friday, November 27, as the very first order of business, right after prayers. It was dealt with for two hours. Every member who wanted to speak spoke. In fact, they came quite close to using their full allotted times. I'm not aware of any member who wished to speak in that debate who wasn't given the opportunity. There was full, free speech within all the rules of fairness, with everybody involved present in the House, and that's as it should be. Not only that, the time of the Assembly that week was taken up on that point for over seven hours in total.

I don't propose to say any more about it. The topic is not open for debate. We'll continue with this debate. But I would say that I have to regret the charges made that free speech was denied by the Speaker in this Assembly. I have very limited means of dealing with charges of that kind. I'm not free to run to the cameras, the tape-recorders, or the papers. But it does seem appropriate that the matter should be concluded once and for all. I think what I have just said should be sufficient reason for saying that any further reference to that matter, which has been ruled on by the Assembly, in this or in any other debate will be totally out of order.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Speaker, may I just make a couple of observations.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Has the hon. member a point of privilege or a point of order? If so, would he state it, so I may know whether I must recognize it.

MR. SINDLINGER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have a point of order in regard to the decision you've just made. It's section 12(2), if I recall correctly. It's simply this, sir. In my judgment, you've been gracious and generous in the application of your decisions for this Legislature. Over the three years I've been here, you have offered a great deal of latitude. I respect that and appreciate it. I'm sure all other members do too. We just had a good example of that this afternoon when the Attorney General was speaking. For example, he went on about some campaign literature and to make oral notice as well, neither of which are strictly relevant to this motion being considered today. He could quite easily have been ruled out of order. One of us could have risen on a point of order, but out of courtesy we allowed him to go on. In any case, it introduced some levity into the proceedings, and there's nothing wrong with doing that from time to time.

You, sir, as arbiter of the rules, could have got up immediately and said: point of order, this is out of order; it's not relevant to the motion being considered here. So I applaud you for the latitude you've given us in this debate and in other debates as well. However, there's one point here, and that is the reference to the decision made previously. It's my understanding that most of the things we go on in this Legislature are based on common law. Common law is based on what goes before, precedence, *stare decisis*. The decision in regard to the point of privilege referred to earlier has now become part of our

common law. It's a precedent upon which we must base our actions in this Legislative Assembly. So it's not unnatural that from time to time references will be made to that decision, just as references are made to other decisions as we go along. Notwithstanding the fact that there might have been some acrimony, bitterness, or distaste for what was done inside or outside the Legislature at that particular time, we must bear in mind that that precedent is now established for us. As we would refer to other precedents, we must also refer to this one, bearing in mind too, sir, that we shouldn't try to reopen the debate. Nevertheless, we should have the opportunity to refer to it and use that for a basis for any discussion or debate we have in the Legislature.

MR. SPEAKER: I appreciate the hon. member's remarks. Certainly, to whatever extent that particular ruling may be of use, as I think I mentioned shortly after it was made, it belongs to the House, and I can't deal with it any further. Of course, I may be confronted with it at some time, but that's not the point. The point is that that particular ruling or occasion is now being raised, as I understand the hon. Leader of the Opposition, as an example of denial of free speech. That is why I felt it was my duty to lay that to rest, perhaps at some length, to say that that may not be used. It's a debate that is closed, and it may not be used as an example of the denial of free speech.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, I would like your guidance. As I understand the rules, you as the ultimate servant of the House must follow the decisions of the House. While you chair the proceedings of the House, as an hon. member you must follow the same guidelines as other hon. members, as I look at the rules. That being the case, I would ask you to consider very carefully, sir, the advisability of the statements you've made this afternoon in reopening a subject which you yourself declared closed some days ago. I would say that if you're going to apply the strictures to all hon. members of the House, the person who must beyond any shadow apply those strictures absolutely scrupulously to himself must be the Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Fair enough. I have to agree. But I also have to say that when a matter of that kind is raised again, as I thought it would not be, I must deal with it, and I have dealt with it.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order with regard to the rules. I was cut short in terms of where I was going in my debate, but my intent was to indicate that whatever happens in the House becomes precedent. There was an incident, which I started to describe, that at that point in time we felt limited some of our ability as members of the Legislature. I still have concern about it being a precedent, Mr. Speaker, but I certainly wasn't going to use this forum to make my case or my change. I have another avenue through which I wish to do that at a later date. I'm not going to reopen that argument at this point and certainly will stick to the agenda.

Mr. Speaker, clarifying what I felt this motion means to members of the Legislature, to me it certainly means I am restricted in the ability to represent my constituency and Albertans. That's the principle being violated by the motion presented to this Legislature. It's the principle that will be violated by this large government, all these Conservative members who sit here, as they vote for it

today, tomorrow, or whenever the vote comes before us in this Legislative Assembly.

The point I was going to make when I referred to the incidents of a couple of weeks ago related to the incident before us at the present time is that the precedent we set in this Legislature lives with us from this day on. Mr. Speaker, the hon. House leader on the Conservative side of the House has indicated to his colleagues, to other members of this Legislature, that it's all right to restrict freedom of speech in this Legislature, to restrict the rights of members. Why? Because they do it in the House of Commons. There are only 25 days of debate on supply. That's the House of Commons; that's not Alberta. The hon. member talked about Saskatchewan and the rule there that restricts a member from speaking more than once. That's Saskatchewan; that's not Alberta. That doesn't say anything about the tradition and the rights of members in the Alberta Legislature. We're different, and I know that in this Legislature we treat things differently. We treat things independently. We can make our own decisions of how we want the democratic process to work.

I think that should be a tribute to us in Alberta, not a condemnation. I think it's very unfortunate that the House leader was able to say that. He went on to say that in Westminster, the supply estimates are discussed for only 29 days; the Mother of Parliament should set an example for us. Well, they do Mr. Speaker. In some of my remarks later this afternoon, I'm going to point out where there are some great examples with regard to the birth of freedom of speech, the beginning of free speech in this land of ours, a heritage we continue to nurture in this Legislature. It all started with the Mother of Parliament in England, the British Isles. We can be proud of that because we are benefiting from that today. Albertans are benefiting because of that precedent, because of the difference.

Mr. Speaker, there is no argument that says we must follow the style of other legislative jurisdictions when we are enabling and facilitating the democratic process in Alberta. Nothing says we have to follow it. We in this Legislature are a senior court. We are a senior administrative body in the province of Alberta, which means we can establish our ground rules. We do that, Mr. Speaker. That's why each member follows *Standing Orders of the Legislative Assembly*, which we support by *Beauchesne*, *Erskine May*, and other authorities, so we can fulfil and accomplish in this Legislature the business of government, the public affairs of this province.

Mr. Speaker, today we're coming to a point where this government is again saying to Albertans: when you send your member to the Legislative Assembly of Alberta, his speech, his ability to ask questions, his ability to give direction to government is going to be curtailed. We are now attempting to set a precedent that is the most unfortunate precedent ever to be set in Alberta. One of the senior administrators of this province, Mr. Manning, was asked a few days ago if he had ever heard of closure or any thought of closure in this Legislative Assembly. The answer was a very clear no. Well, here we have it.

In 1981, the province of Alberta is not allowing greater freedom of speech but is taking actions to restrict the freedom of speech before us. Mr. Speaker, I think that is unforgivable and should not be accepted in this Legislative Assembly. For 185 years, I've come to this Legislature with the opportunity — hopefully, with the ability — to ask questions, give direction to government, and serve the people I represent. I can't do that under the kinds of

restrictive rules this government is going to impose upon me and my colleagues on this side of the Legislature.

What is the real focus of this debate, and why is the government concerned? Mr. Speaker, I think it's very clear. The government wants to avoid scrutiny of the spending of this government, the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, \$8.5 billion; a budget in this province of \$6 billion, the highest expenditure per capita of any province in Canada: a tremendous responsibility for government. That's a lot of money. Here we are in this Legislature saying we should be doing other things: going on our holiday, getting ready for our Christmas break, preparing for whatever in January, not remembering the primary responsibility we have when we come to this Legislature; that is, to scrutinize, to investigate the responsibilities before us. The one responsibility that is added to Alberta legislators is scrutinizing the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. That's a bigger responsibility than other legislatures in Canada have today. But we ask the question, why doesn't the government want us to scrutinize the Heritage Savings Trust Fund? Why can't we look at all the details? Why can't we have management letters? Why can't we find out why \$60 million has been lost by bond investment? Where's the documentation? What management procedures are put in place to prevent that from happening again?

Mr. Speaker, none of that information has been presented to us in this Legislature. If we had't had a leaked document — which the hon. House leader took very lightly today, feeling that he had to have a leaked document to be part of the company of this Legislative Assembly. If some responsible citizen hadn't provided background information to us, most likely we would have passed by this situation. We would have adjourned three weeks ago. The government would have felt it was responsible. We would have thought we had done our job, but we haven't yet. That's why we intend to stand up in this Legislature to speak and to press the government for information, accountability, and responsibility.

If they haven't anything to hide, Mr. Speaker, the government can provide all that documentation. There is no reason why we cannot have information with regard to the trader's notes that lost the \$60 million. There is no reason why this government cannot tell us what management procedures are in place. There are no reasons why this government can't present to us in this Legislature the management letters we have been demanding. That would make public business be done in public. That's what we're demanding. We're saying that's the important thing.

What has this government done to us? How have they reacted today? They are bringing down closure and saying: look, we're not going to give you that material, you little opposition; go away, go home, because you're not going to get it; but if you're going to stand up there and ask questions and try to be responsible, the way we're going to get rid of you is give you a little backhand and push you aside. That's what this closure motion does, Mr. Speaker. It gives us a backhand. Send us home and say, don't ask questions, little boy, because it's not your responsibility to do that; we're going to look after the affairs of this government in Alberta; Behind closed doors, we will invest and spend \$8.5 billion, plus another \$6 billion.

The Premier stood up in a most arrogant fashion today when the question was asked, are we going to know about the agreements with Alsands and the investments in the north? Will we know something about the details? Will we have a right to approve it in this Legislature?

Like a little backhand, the answer is, no, I'm not going to let you guys have any say in this. It's not your money. That money belongs to the Conservative party of Alberta. It's the Premier's money, not the people of Alberta, not the citizens of Alberta. It's not the 2 million people who have a share in the Heritage Savings Trust Fund who really own the natural resources of this province. It's the Premier and a few members of cabinet who make the decisions. The rest of us take the backhand. The backhand is all we get. Is that responsibility, Mr. Speaker? There is no way that's responsibility. The responsibility of the democratic process means that all members of the Legislature are involved in decision-making.

[Mr. Crawford left the Chamber]

The hon. House leader wants to go out and have a press conference. I know he doesn't want to sit in here and hear the truth. Most likely somebody out there has a TV camera, so he can tell his side of the story. [interjections], so the people will know the truth when this great man comes out of the House, this great House leader walks out of the House and tells the real side of the story. The story is always from one side, not two.

The Premier says, we are responsible for the Heritage Savings Trust Fund; trust us. That's a bunch of nonsense. When you can't get the information and see the information documented, how can you trust them? I think that's nonsense. The people of Alberta are going to be asking that question shortly. Do I really have any involvement in the Heritage Savings Trust Fund? Our surveys show they feel they have no involvement in the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. They don't know what the benefits are.

The other day in the Legislature, I raised the 15 per cent loans for small business men and farmers. The government couldn't even understand that question. They said, we give that money to Hydro-Quebec, and we made that decision in cabinet. But our small business men and farmers, who are facing bankruptcy in many situations, don't count. They're not going to stay around Alberta too long, so maybe it doesn't matter. That's the kind of treatment this government gives the people of Alberta. The closure resolution we're talking about is the kind of treatment given to this Legislative Assembly, the treatment given to the opposition, because it says, just get out of here boys because you don't need the answers; we're responsible and we're looking after things.

Mr. Speaker, that kind of attitude can lead to the breakdown of government, lead to somebody replacing these people who feel they have all the answers. Historically in Alberta, that's what happened. Unfortunately, that kind of attitude might have been presented in 1971 by a government, the members of the government, and their cabinet, that they really weren't listening to the people. They got replaced. The Social Credit replaced the UFA government. I read the history on that. The very same kind of attitude was there. They thought they knew all the answers for the people. The only thing is that Social Credit took from 1935 to 1971 maybe to portray that kind of an attitude. I say "maybe" because I'm not quite convinced of that. This government and that kind of callous attitude towards public responsibility has been in place for 10 years.

Mr. Speaker, that's really not good enough. I think this government can do a lot better. When there is such a small opposition on this side of the House, such a large government, I think there has to be greater tolerance involved in the democratic process. We in the opposition

feel we have a responsibility for accountability and to ask many, many questions. I remember opposition leader Peter Lougheed standing in this spot saying the very same thing about 12 years ago: we have to stand on this side of the Legislature and ask questions, and we're going to ask questions till we get all the information.

Mr. Speaker, that's what we're doing today. We are doing exactly the same thing. If the sequence of events occurs, we're going to be on that side of the House and they're going to be on this side. The arrogance is there, the callous attitude towards the public, the resistance to questions being asked. I think the setting will change.

Why do I feel this motion is not necessary? There are a number of reasons. We on this side of the House have been very responsible since the inception of our questioning, since the inception of the debate on the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. First of all, the focus of this issue came to light by a memo from the Auditor General to the Deputy Provincial Treasurer. As we all recall, that memo was the concern that lit the fire and found that this government wasn't doing a responsible job in accounting for the Heritage Savings Trust Fund.

I'd just like to refresh our memory with those words so that we know why we should be concerned in this Legislature, and is one reason it isn't necessary to bring in closure, but it is necessary to bring answers into this Legislature. I'd like to quote from page 2 of that memo, which I tabled in this Legislature a few days ago. I think any Albertan who read this paragraph would be concerned and upset if we in the opposition did not ask questions and did not pursue not only the loss of the \$60 million but the use of investment money by this government in other areas. I'd like to read that section for our memory. This is the Auditor General to the Deputy Provincial Treasurer:

It would appear that traders should be in a position to explain the rationale for purchases and sales transactions long after the event and should be able to provide information on the results of their activities to senior investment management. There is considerable [and that's a very key word] scope for collusion between an investment trader employed by the Treasury Department and someone in ... the brokerage houses, which could result in fraud.

Mr. Speaker, if that didn't excite anyone in this Legislature, raise concerns, I think we'd all be very irresponsible. As we all recognize, over the past weeks the government has taken a very callous attitude towards that very statement. But that's why we're here in this Legislature. We are administering the public affairs of this province. When a statement like this is made by the Auditor General, that means we must look into every nook and cranny. We must look not only into the investment division of the Heritage Savings Trust fund, but into the investments to other provinces. We must look into the investments in the capital projects, under the Alberta division: all over the place, Mr. Speaker. We must seek to find the answers.

I would think that Conservative backbenchers on that side of the House feel that no corruption, fraud, or collusion could happen. They go home and say, everything's great in good old Alberta. They're fooling themselves, because any organization that deals with the billions of dollars we deal with in the Heritage Savings Trust Fund can create temptation for one of the employees, hopefully not the employer. Temptation is there, and fraud and collusion could happen. If we don't investigate and dig into the details, we're irresponsible.

We should also realize this: the Heritage Savings Trust Fund is still in its infancy stage in Alberta. It is not a program that's been here for a number of years. When the Social Credit government lost in 1971, there was \$300 million ...

MR. JOHNSTON: Not in cash.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Not all in cash — that's accurate. The same as the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, with certain investment amounts, some to the municipalities and various allocations across the province. The Auditor's report of that time will show that there was \$300 million. Mr. Speaker, the point is that the patterns, the investments, the handling of that amount of either cash or investments as it could be classed at that time, or borrowings, had followed traditional patterns of checks and balances. For years and years, it had been administered and looked after. The Heritage Savings Trust Fund, though, follows a different format. That should cause us concern.

New players, new people, a new organization, and maybe an inadequate organization, are involved. I cite two examples: one, the Treasury Department did not have adequate management procedures in place to have the movement of the bond market documented in a responsible manner. That's pointed out in the report. Another good example in terms of the Department of Hospitals and Medical Care and the Walter C. Mackenzie centre: there we had a loss or a mishandling of funds. Change orders were found in a desk drawer of one of the employees over there; a change order that was going to impose greater expenditure from the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. Mr. Speaker, we found that administrative procedures were not in place. Let's take another example: Kananaskis. When we started our discussion of Kananaskis a few years ago, the amount of money — I don't recall the original sum — was \$40 or \$50 million. Now we're up over \$200 million. At that time, a good administrative procedure that documented the things that were going to happen in the Kananaskis was not in place. There was inefficiency in administration. Those were only three programs where we happened to find some inadequacies. It may not be the responsibilities or fault of the ministers in charge. Maybe it was the fault of some of the senior administrative officials. But someone had not put his finger on good management procedures and said, look, we are investing millions and billions of dollars on behalf of Albertans, and we haven't good management procedures in place. There were three.

Well, Mr. Speaker, when we see something like this written in an Auditor General's report — and it was not in a public report. That's what concerns us. That's why we're saying, through Bills and various procedures, that all these documents should be in the Legislature for our information as members of the Legislature. We're saying there could be other examples in other departments. Who knows if all the administrative responsibilities are taken in the Department of Environment? Who knows whether all the management procedures are in place in the ministry of workers' compensation to look after that \$1 million of research going on? Do we really know whether or not they're there? We haven't been able to ask those kinds of questions yet. The hon. minister hasn't been able to tell us about all the administrative procedures in place to assure that there is accountability. In the Department of Education, who knows whether all the administrative procedures are in place so that accountability can occur? We

don't know that, Mr. Speaker. If we don't have two options before us — being able to ask questions as long as necessary and to speak on the subjects as long as necessary — then we can't do our job. Closure, which is the result here today, prohibits us from taking a responsible position and doing a responsible job in this Legislature. That's unfortunate.

What other reasons are there that this motion is not necessary? We have made requests in this Legislature. In numerous question periods, I have asked the Provincial Treasurer whether the three management documents could be tabled; that's number one. Number two is: when the \$60 million was lost, whether there could be a window, whether those traders' notes could be placed in this Legislature, or any other kind of evidence that would indicate the background of why the \$60 million was lost. We also asked for the management procedures to be presented in this Legislature. They weren't, with the reason that if we allowed these kinds of things to become public, the integrity of the system would be lost. Well, Mr. Speaker, the only thing that would really be lost is that the government wouldn't have confidential information. Information would be presented to the Legislature to know that responsibility had taken place. If the government had presented that information in a responsible manner four or five weeks ago, this motion today would not have been necessary. The government chose to take a very dug-in position, to say no, the opposition doesn't need it, and they didn't give it to us. So it is the fault of the government that we're at the stage we are today, but it's a reason for this motion not to be necessary.

What else? Bill 258 was another option we presented in this Legislature. We said that all management letters in the future could be presented to this Legislature so that the Auditor General, on making any observations, could present those observations to either the select committee or the members of this Assembly, so that we could make responsible decisions. With that amendment to The Auditor General Act, all management letters would have come before this Assembly. Most business could have been done in public. If they had been able to support Bill 258 at that time, that would have been a feather in the government's hat. The point I make is that that was an option to government by which they could have avoided a situation where they feel very strongly they had to bring in a motion of closure.

Mr. Speaker, who's really responsible for bringing in this motion for closure? I know the government over there would like to blame the opposition and say that because we're asking questions we're keeping the Conservatives here too long, that the only way they can get rid of us is to bring down closure. That's partly right, but the fact of the matter is that if the government was responsible, had taken some responsible actions in presenting information to this Legislature, they would not have required a motion of closure at this point in time. I can only say that the fault and the responsibility for this motion totally lies with the government and not the opposition.

One act of the government which they thought may be accepted by members of the opposition was the letter presented to the Legislature by the Premier which indicated that they would refer this matter to the Auditor General for a special report. Mr. Speaker, that sounds very good, that the Auditor General will review the matter and write a letter back to members of the Legislature saying, all is well. But in my questions to the Premier I said very directly, does that mean that the documenta-

tion of the loss will be presented to us? Does it mean that management procedures put in place will be presented to us? Does it mean that any management letters will come to us? There's no guarantee of that in the Premier's letter and in the Premier's remarks. We may be in the same position we're in at the present time: a lack of information as to what is really happening with the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. I think we have to be concerned with that. The Premier put forward a letter which was supposedly a way of getting rid of the opposition and giving us that backhand, saying to us that the Auditor General is looking after it; don't worry about it fellows, everything's okay. I'm sure the Auditor General will do a very responsible job. But I think the thrust of our debate and our concern has to be to have good and documented information about the actual situation, not general impressions or attitudes about a certain happening.

Mr. Speaker, this letter that was presented here to this Legislature by the Premier as something as a token offer to us in the opposition to call off our long debate, call off our filibuster, is not good enough, because it doesn't show in any way that the government really wants to do public business in public, that the government really wants to give information to this Legislature so that informed and accurate debate can occur. So we don't accept that. That's why today we tabled in this Legislature a letter which is a little more specific, requiring the Auditor General, hopefully with the support of the Premier and this government, to require more in-depth kind of information rather than general observations. To me and to my colleagues, that's very, very significant and important.

What is the other reason this motion is not necessary at this point in time? Mr. Speaker, the supply we are discussing in this Legislature does not become invested or directed into various programs until after March 31, 1982. That means there is no reason we couldn't debate this matter until March 31, 1982. We could have adjourned the Assembly over the Christmas break. The Auditor General's report could have been made available to us in January. Debate on supply and on Bill 69 could have continued, because neither one requires approval or assent until March 31, 1982. The people of Alberta would have been impressed by this government if they would have said to them, look, we're an open government; we want to provide information to the opposition; we don't have to pass the legislation or the supply until into 1982; we're going to take some time and are going to discuss it in a responsible manner; we're going to allow the opposition to ask as many responsible questions as it can. But that option was not even considered by the government. The government said, we must get rid of that opposition, get them out of our hair; maybe they're getting too much publicity, saying too many things; we're going to give them the backhand and send them home. That's what the government is going to do. So this week that's the big reward we get for our work in the Legislature: closure, the backhand, and off home we go. Well, we're not going to lay down and fight. We think this debate must be told to the public. We think the public of Alberta wants to hear how the members of the opposition are treated, that there really isn't consideration for the democratic process.

Those were some options the government had, Mr. Speaker. They could have given us documents in this Legislature. They could have given us a promise that management letters would be presented to the Legislature in the future. They could have answered our questions in question period. They could have held off the vote that is

being demanded during this week until March 31, 1982. Those are very easy, very responsible, and legal things the government could do. There is no law that prevents the government from doing any one of those things.

I want to refer very quickly to the legal document I presented to this Legislature, which shows very clearly by legal opinion that the management letters could have been presented in this Legislature. What concerns me about that is that I gave a legal opinion, presented a neutral, non-partisan as far as I'm concerned, opinion in this Legislature. On the other hand, the government didn't have the courtesy to even having someone in their department review the document, nor did they have the courtesy to hire their own legal advice to give an opinion on the other side. The steps were very clear. The Provincial Treasurer said, it doesn't matter; we don't have to give a legal opinion; we've got a big majority on that side of the House; we don't want to give you the documents; we're not going to give them to you; we're going to outvote you, so who cares about a legal opinion. I think a man of the legal fraternity giving that opinion is rather a condemnation of the fraternity that hopefully the hon. member respects considerably.

That's all we got, but it's the type of attitude that's presented by this government towards opposition. It's a type of attitude that says don't worry, we'll look after the job; you fellows stay on your side of the House, vote for us, follow us, and then go home. Mr. Speaker, as I've said, that's not good enough. We've given the options to government to provide: responsibility, to provide us with documents so we could do our job and this motion of closure would not have been necessary. But that was an option the government didn't want to take.

I said earlier in my remarks that I wanted to talk about the historic rights of members of Parliament and of the Legislature to freedom of speech, which I feel are being eroded and damaged by this motion of closure. First of all, if we look at an historic sketch with regard to freedom of speech, we find that the word "parliament" first appeared in the English language in the 13th century. That's a long time ago, Mr. Speaker. We find the word is derived from French: "parlement", which means deep speech. I think that is very meaningful to us in this Legislature: parliament, meaning deep speech. What that really means is it allows members of the Legislature and of Parliament to speak, to ask questions, and to take their responsibility. We look further and find that Anglo-Saxon chronicles tell of William the Conqueror having very deep speech with his witan or great council. The precedent for freedom of speech, the right to speak out and give your point of view was set even in the time of the councils of William the Conqueror. We look back to the year 1275; the Statute of Westminster referred to the king's great council as the parliament. Inherent in the name "parliament" is therefore the right or privilege of deep speech.

Mr. Speaker, this implies depth and thoroughness in discussion. We as an opposition are trying in the best way we can, in spite of this government which has clearly shown a disregard for any meaningful discussion by invoking closure on us in this Legislature, to preserve this long-established tradition of deep speech. Freedom of speech is essential to the independence of a parliament, a legislature, and certainly for the protection of members in the discharge of their responsibilities. As well, the importance of this privilege is entrenched in the Bill of Rights of 1689, which states:

That freedom of speech, and debates or proceedings

in Parliament, ought not to be impeached or questioned ...

That's what we're talking about today. The right to freedom of speech, the right to question your government, was allowed and protected back in the 13th century. Mr. Speaker, we note what is certainly happening today.

I'd like to follow with quotes from *Erskine May*, Parliamentary Practice, 18th Edition, and some background that I think are relevant to the debate today, pointing out that there are privileges enjoyed by custom and statute. One of those privileges is freedom of speech.

Some privileges rest solely upon the law and custom of Parliament, while others have been defined by statute. Upon these grounds alone all privileges whatever are founded. The Lords have enjoyed them, simply because "they have place and voice in Parliament" ...

... At the commencement of every Parliament it has been the custom for the Speaker,

"In the name, and on behalf of the Commons, to lay claim by humble petition to their ancient and undoubted rights and privileges; particularly to freedom of speech in debate, freedom from arrest, freedom of access to Her Majesty whenever occasion shall require ..."

In other words, freedom to have access to government.

"... and that the most favourable construction should be placed upon all their proceedings."

Mr. Speaker, it says that all opportunity should be given to members for freedom of speech. That freedom of speech should be protected in the proceedings of a legislature or the House of Commons.

The Lord Chancellor replies to the Speaker's petition that ...

And I read as follows, which is relevant to our freedom of speech:

"Her Majesty most readily confirms all the rights and privileges which have ever been granted to or conferred upon the Commons, by Her Majesty or any of her royal predecessors".

The practice of claiming these privileges developed gradually.

Mr. Speaker, the right to freedom of speech is rooted there, in the long tradition and custom of Parliament. Hopefully, it can endure in this Legislature.

When did that right begin? I read from *Erskine May*:

In 1536, there is a definite demand of access to the Crown, in 1541 comes the demand for freedom of speech ...

Mr. Speaker, that's a demand for freedom of speech by Speaker Moyle back in 1541.

... and in 1554 the three claims of freedom from arrest, freedom of speech, and of access, were made together. By the end of the sixteenth century the practice seems to have become regular.

Mr. Speaker, I think that is very noteworthy: by the end of the 16th century, the concept of freedom of speech became regular. Where are we today? What century are we in today? A lot of time has passed. That was an agreed format, an agreed custom, an agreed practice in the House of Commons and in the legislatures in the 16th century. What's happening today in this Legislature? After all those years, a custom that has worked well is now going to be eroded by this government. It's not acceptable in the province of Alberta.

What else does *Erskine May* say about the privilege of freedom of speech? I refer to Chapter VI. The topic



Necessity of Freedom of Speech makes the point in terms of necessity.

Freedom of speech is a privilege essential to every free council or legislature.

Just a flat statement: "a privilege essential to every free council or legislature". Mr. Speaker, on that basis I think we should accept that principle. One, it's a long-time custom; two, *Erskine May* says it's basic to a free council or legislature. He goes on to say:

"... The members must be as free as the houses; an Act of Parliament cannot disturb the state; therefore the debate that tends to it cannot; for it must be propounded and debated before it can be enacted".

It says that you must be able to discuss the item with all ability, with all information, hopefully with all intelligence, with all information from your constituents, and as fully as possible before it can be enacted. I think that's the intent of this Legislature. If it is the intent and has been the historic intent, supported by one of the great authorities in terms of parliamentary procedure and practice, then I think we should adhere to it in this Legislature.

*Erskine May* goes on to say:

This important privilege has been recognized and confirmed as part of the law of the land.

Mr. Speaker, as far as this author is concerned, it's the recognized law of the land, the law that should be accepted. There should be no way that a government with a large majority should be able to take away the freedom of speech or rights of a member of the Legislature. It's an important privilege that has been recognized and confirmed as part of the law of the land, accepted by all legislatures, not to be ignored.

*Erskine May* goes on to say:

"There could be no assured government by the people, or any part of the people, unless their representatives had unquestioned possession of this privilege. . . ."

Mr. Speaker, "unquestioned possession" of the right to speak. The best authority with regard to parliamentary practice tells us this in this Legislature.

If the government is going to bring down this motion of closure, they have violated a custom, an accepted procedure, and a right that is needed by representatives as an unquestioned possession. I think that is most unfortunate, because we in Alberta can be different. We can lead in parliamentary procedures and show that there's a greater amount of freedom of speech in this Legislature than there may be in any other parliament of the Commonwealth. I think we can be proud of that. Mr. Speaker, as the president of the Speakers of Canada, you would be able to take that to the various legislatures, not only in Canada but to other legislatures, and say we have some special rules we're very proud of: we have protected to the nth degree the right of freedom of speech; there has been no erosion in our Legislature. That would be a great day, when the Speaker of our Legislature, without hesitation or any doubt, could go to any other parliament or any other meeting where our Speaker is representative of this Assembly and be able to make that statement. It's a very proud statement. There may be times, and it seems as if the government feels this is the time, when closure is necessary. But I would recommend to the government that it should reconsider the move it has made, in light of the responsibility and the possibility of infringing on basic rights of members in this Legislature. Here one of our best authorities, that we all adhere to in this Legislature, tells us we shouldn't be doing what we're doing

today. Mr. Speaker, that's unfortunate.

I'd like to quote another quote from *Erskine May* that only supports the dropping of this motion of closure and supports the concept of the greatest amount of freedom of speech that's available to a member of this Legislature. This is from a book by White on the English constitution, page 440. He says:

"He would have been a bold King indeed who had attempted to stop discussion in the House of Lords".

Mr. Speaker, it talks about the king stopping discussion in the House of Lords. In the same context of this Legislature, I don't think there's any minister, back-bencher, or anyone else who would want to really stop discussion, but we have the motion of closure that will do just that.

Mr. Speaker, *Erskine May* goes on to point out that there is statutory recognition of the privilege of freedom of speech, not only custom but statutory recognition:

This recognition by law of the privilege of freedom of speech received final statutory confirmation after the Revolution of 1688. By the 9th Article of the Bill of Rights, it was declared "That the freedom of speech, and debates or proceedings in Parliament, ought not to be impeached or questioned in any court or place out of Parliament."

The right of freedom of speech was put into law. Mr. Speaker, we as members of this Legislature have a duty to maintain that privilege. *Erskine May* points that out in his book, saying that:

The Speaker, having claimed and statutory recognition having been granted to the privilege of freedom of speech, it becomes the duty of each Member to refrain from any course of action prejudicial to the privilege which he enjoys.

Mr. Speaker, I think that statement places the responsibility not only on each individual member of this Legislature to maintain the freedom of speech in that Legislature, but it places responsibility on the Premier as the chief administrator of this province, on the House leader, and on any other cabinet minister to refrain from any course of action prejudicial to the privilege which he enjoys or which a Legislative Assembly enjoys.

Mr. Speaker, as far as I'm concerned, it's conclusive that the right to freedom of speech was given to us in this Legislature, a right that we should not take lightly or erode by a quick motion of closure so the Conservative Party can get out of this Legislature and go home for the Christmas break. The reason is not good enough. The trade-off is unbelievable. We are trading off rights of members in this Legislature for the right to go home and have the Christmas break. Mr. Speaker, that's not good enough. If the government could point out to us that there is some pressing business outside this Legislature, so that we should trade off our debate and our right of speech for that pressing business, then maybe they would have a case. But in the House leader's opening remarks, there was no indication, not one indication, of the urgency of stopping this debate and the urgency of trading off the right to our freedom of speech and to interrogate the government. There was not one reason to trade off this great, historic principle; a custom, a law passed in 1688 and given to us in this Legislature as a privilege and a right. This government, in a backhanded manner, in a very quick motion of the hand, will say to future legislators that you don't need that privilege and we're going to take it away by the precedent we're setting in the closure motion.

Mr. Speaker, that is a very, very unfortunate and irre-

sponsible situation. It's not a responsible course of action. It is a selfish course of action, where each member on that side of the House is thinking about their holidays, their break for Christmas, and other things they're going to do. I don't know of any pressing ministerial responsibilities. They're going to trade that off for, this privilege that we have enjoyed for years and years in this Alberta Legislature. How can we vote for a thing like that, Mr. Speaker? It's unacceptable.

When a person took on the responsibility to be an elected member of the Legislature, they took a responsibility to be in this Legislature for day and night on end if necessary, to debate topics of concern to Albertans, the priority topics of our constituents. That's why we're supposed to be here, Mr. Speaker. If we want to leave the Legislature, there's an easy process. I don't say this in any negative way, but my hon. colleague felt he had other responsibilities and took the course of action he wished to take. That was a very responsible way to handle the matter. Others here could take exactly the same course of action if they so desired. Nobody is stopping them. Everybody can make that independent decision. If they feel that there are other urgent matters outside this Legislature in the next two weeks, in the next two and a half months, that are more important than the accountability of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, the accountability for billions of dollars, the accountability for the needs of Albertans — and there are some needs out there. Albertan farmers are facing very difficult problems ahead, not totally recognized by this government because they're looking at themselves too much. There are small business men faced by very difficult problems in terms of interest costs, medical people who are concerned about their income and whether they can really earn a reasonable living in this province, and people in Cold Lake, Fort McMurray, and Bonnyville who really do not know what their future is, whether they should stick with their investments and lose more money, whether the government is with them or not.

There are problems out there in good old Alberta that are not being recognized by the members of this Legislature, particularly on the Conservative side of the House. They're willing to say, let's ignore those things. Let's just close up the House and go home and self-indulge, that that's a better action, and kind of forget Albertans as a whole. Mr. Speaker, that's really not good enough. They can do better than that. They were elected to be responsible.

Every once in a while, just to refresh my memory I take out a little pamphlet that I carry around, "What Do We Stand For?"

All the great promises are in that little document, a million and one little promises. They were going to do all things for all Albertans; all forgotten. When they gained the seat of power, after making these promises, Albertans were forgotten. Albertans were no longer part of government. If you read this little document that was sent out to impress all Albertans, it sounds like they're going to do some great things, that they're going to be responsible in their government management, that they're going to be really concerned about Albertans. I quote a couple of things that look very interesting. For example, "The public has a right to know" and "We believe that public laws should be made in public" — number one items.

Mr. Speaker, the persons on the other side of this House couldn't care less where the laws are made. If they really believe they should be made in public, let's with-

draw the motion of closure, take it out of this Assembly and put it in the back rooms where it should be. It deserves no place in this Legislature. If any backbencher, any Conservative, really believes in what the Premier told Albertans — that we believe public laws should be made in public; the public has a right to know — there is no way that your conscience can allow you to vote for the motion before you. There is no way because if you believe those two tenets, you believe in staying in this Legislature and taking your responsibility. But if you believe that that was just a statement and who cares, we have a lot of votes and we're going to buy some votes again the next election and fool the people in Alberta, then vote for the motion. I'll be able to tell some of your predecessors and people who follow you in other legislatures that the day you lost freedom of speech was the day that your predecessor, your uncle, or whoever it was who was in the Legislature at that time, didn't have the courage to stand up and fight for freedom of speech or the basic tenet of the Conservative Party, that public laws should be made in public. They had no courage at all. When this vote is taken, the people across the floor who vote for it can certainly hang their heads, because they haven't done themselves, their constituents, or any future legislature to follow a favor. As I pointed out in my debate, the history of freedom of speech is clear. By custom and by law it was our right and our privilege to have it in this Legislature. It is now being eroded.

The next area I would like to talk about is closure itself: the use of closure, the impact of closure, and what it's done for Canada and other places it was used. How do people feel about it? When we look at the history of closure, we have to look at one of the early Acts of Canada, an Act to incorporate the Canadian National Railway. As we all recall, there were many hours of debate and concern about the treatment taken at that point in time. As I recall the debate from my reading, the concern was over whether clauses two and three of the Act could be passed after clauses four and five. There was some significance in the Act that indicated that was the procedure the government wanted to take. The opposition fought the matter until closure was brought down. The opposition fought for a long period of time. The government said, we don't want to hear any more of this. The opposition said, you're gagging us as government. They used that term even in those days. Finally the government brought closure down, the Act went through, and we lived with that situation. I'm certain it didn't benefit the CNR any. One of the concerns at that time was expenditures, the money men of Toronto, the wasting of funds, and the government wouldn't listen to any of those arguments. Mr. Speaker, the CNR really hasn't fulfilled its obligation even yet. Maybe a little more debate at that point in time, without closure, could have set better financial and administrative ground rules for the Canadian National Railway in Canada. Maybe we wouldn't have the situation we have today with VIA Rail. Who knows? Closure had impact on the passage of that legislation. I feel that there was inadequate debate that had long-term ramifications.

The second one we could look at, Mr. Speaker, was the Naval Aid Bill in 1912 and 1913. It was actually the real use of closure in Canada. It was introduced by the Conservatives on December 5, 1912, for a money grant of \$35 million. The Prime Minister, Borden, had the House rule No. 17 amended to define circumstances and procedures for applying the rules of closure on that date. He gave his reasons for introducing closure as follows:

"The present position of the House is painful to its credit and incompatible with the performance of its inherent functions. When obstruction reaches the point of destroying Parliamentary Government it must be arrested, condemned, and banished," he argued. "Liberty of speech ought to be preserved: but, as Mr. Gladstone said, it must be prevented from descending into frivolity and license."

Mr. Speaker, I thought that could have been one of the reasons the government might have advanced at this point in time with regard to closure, that potentially we were obstructing the process of the Legislature. I don't think that was really what the filibuster has done, as we in this Legislature can well recognize. We haven't been destroying parliamentary government. I feel that the right to speak freely thus far has not resulted in any frivolity and licence, but in responsible and necessary questions.

The Leader of the Opposition at that time had a response to closure. I would like to echo that response with regard to the government's concern about closure and obstruction. Laurier's response said:

"The poison he offers us to-day will come to his own lips at some future day; we are in the minority; we can be gagged [that could apply to us] we can be prevented from expressing our opinions; they can trample upon our rights. But, Sir, the day of reckoning will come and it comes as soon as we have a dissolution of the present Parliament."

Mr. Speaker, maybe that's what has to happen in this situation. If we're going to be gagged, if we can't have freedom of speech, maybe what we need is a dissolution of the Legislature. We go to the polls and ask the people about the right of freedom of speech. I wonder what they would say out on the hustings if we gave various examples from this Legislature, which we can list very easily, where the opposition has not gotten information, where the government hides many, many documents that should be presented in this Legislature — if we were to tell Albertans that that's the way it is in their Alberta Legislature. I would have to say, Mr. Speaker, that there are many Albertans today who really believe and understand the difficulty in getting information from this government and making representation to this government.

In that debate, we find not only Mr. Laurier responding but Mr. Oliver as well. I think he echoes some of the same concerns. This is Mr. Oliver speaking to the House of Commons on May 8:

It was not until my right hon. friend and his followers undertook to manage the business of this House by physical force ... by physical force, by establishing an endurance test in which they failed, that there was any unwillingness shown on the part of this side of the House to come to an arrangement as to taking the vote. Since that time my right hon. friend has seen fit to ignore the precedent of Canadian Parliaments, and on the strength of his majority ...

That's the situation we have in this House.

... to assume responsibility for the conduct of debate in this House. Having assumed that responsibility, it is not for him to say what the Opposition insists on. The Opposition only insists on the right of debate, the right of free speech, the right of a free Parliament and of a free people.

Mr. Speaker, that was on May 8, 1913, with regard to that very same closure debate on the Naval Aid Bill, asking and demanding the very same things we are talking about here in this Legislature today under this vote of closure. Those will be the things we lose. Members of

Parliament in those days saw the same ramifications of a motion of closure, that the opposition insists on the right of a debate, the right of free speech, the right of a free parliament and of a free people. That's what we're talking about here in this Legislature today. That is what we want to protect as well as we can.

Where else can we look for information? We can look to the pipeline debate of May, 1956, when closure was brought down on the House of Commons. I'd like to cite the comments of two members in that pipeline debate who I feel support my arguments, my concern, with regard to a closure motion. First of all, I'd like to cite Mr. Churchill:

What are the checks and balances in this system to offset an all-powerful government?

Asking that question in the pipeline debate, which we must ask ourselves today — that was May 15, 1956. He goes on to say:

There are three main checks; the freedom of election, the freedom of assembly and the freedom of organization. If you can have free elections and if you may assemble freely, and if you have the freedom to organize, you can effectively check a government which tends to be all powerful. The checks and balances are mutually inter-dependent; one alone cannot be overthrown. As long as they remain it is the function of the opposition not only to see that they operate but also to prevent gradual and insidious encroachments.

MR. SPEAKER: I hesitate to interrupt the hon. Leader of the Opposition. Possibly he could assist the Chair with a little difficulty I'm having. As the hon. Leader knows, the rule is that debating in this Assembly is done by the people who are elected to the Assembly. That of course includes the hon. leader. I don't know to what extent we're going to be listening to all kinds of quotations in this debate. It would seem to me that if the hon. leader wishes to adopt the thoughts of others, incorporate them into his debate and make them his own, he can do so. But we're now having the third example of debates in other parliaments, on other occasions, being introduced here, very similar to what might be if these long-gone parliamentarians were to come back here and act as members of the Legislative Assembly.

I realize that a certain amount of quotation is often done in the Assembly. Especially on technical matters it's very difficult to avoid quotations if you want to be exact. Perhaps the hon. leader could assist me and just explain in what way should be some exception should be made to this time-honored parliamentary practice, and why debate given on other occasions should be read quite extensively here on this occasion.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Speaker, in regard to your point of order, I note that you referred to a couple of things. One is reading, and you well know my opinion about people reading things in the Legislature. We had a little comment about that the other day in regard to one of the members. On the other hand, there is reference to other *Hansards* or other debates in other places. I note that when the hon. House leader is arguing a point of order, he quite often makes references to other parliaments or to Westminster. I don't see anything too encumbering about something like that. I think it's worth while for us to look back and reflect on what's preceded us so that we don't make the same errors again and so that we benefit from the wisdom and experiences of

others.

I think we have a similar situation here. Naturally the subject before us, the matter of closure, is very broad and difficult. It's been addressed by many parliaments before us. I think it would be beneficial for all of us if we could bear in mind those things the hon. Leader of the Opposition is bringing up today in regard to what has gone on before us. I too would have some misgivings if the member, or any other member, went on reading at length about some such subject. Nevertheless, in listening to the hon. member this afternoon I think he's being very prudent in the selections he's made, inasmuch as they're all appropriate and relevant to the subject. Furthermore, he's being very succinct in those excerpts that he has taken. I think the comments he's making right now certainly bear a great deal of relevance to what we're talking about.

I would ask you, sir, in making a decision about this and in your consideration of the debate to follow on this motion, to bear in mind that since this is such a broad subject, the greatest latitude be given to those who are citing other authorities and precedents.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, I certainly agree with the comments the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo has made. Might I just be offered the opportunity to say that you did set a fairly broad leeway, sir, because we had the hon. Government House Leader reading a fund raising letter into the record. I suppose if we could read a fund raising letter into the record, which is totally irrelevant to the debate, there is absolutely nothing wrong with reading debates into the record that relate to the issue at hand.

Mr. Speaker, as I read *Beauchesne* — this is the bringing together of decisions that have been made throughout our parliamentary history, not just taken citation by citation but looking at the breadth of the debate that occurred. As you know, Mr. Speaker, there are many citations in *Beauchesne* that relate directly to occurrences in the House of Commons. As long as any member in this House is relating a quotation to a point — and that was what the Leader of the Opposition was doing — then clearly that is in order. But I would say to you, sir, that we've already started a fairly generous application of the rule of relevance. In view of the fact that you didn't interrupt the Government House Leader, it would seem to me appropriate if the Leader of the Opposition is at least allowed to relate instances from the federal *Hansard* as they directly relate and are relevant to the issue at hand.

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the discussion on the point of order is somewhat akin to the discussion on the issue itself. It may be that at some point differences in degree are so significant as to be differences in kind. What the hon. member has just referred to as reading a fund raising letter into the record was, I think, the direct quotation of one sentence from the letter. That strikes me as being somewhat different from quoting verbatim the hon. Mr. Churchill's speech in the House of Commons in 1956, which I think went on for more than three hours.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, speaking to the point of order, I think that you in your wisdom will have to allow the largest of latitudes because I bring to your attention that the closure Bill has never been brought to the floor of this Legislature in the history of this province. I have spent

most of the afternoon looking at past precedents. Surely the government House leader or the government must have some reason for bringing the guillotine Bill in, known as the closure Act. We will be looking forward to debate on both sides of the Assembly as to what precedents are being cited to bring this Bill to this Assembly before the people of this province.

I think members will have to be discreet when they are quoting from other Assemblies, other people, other parliamentarians. I'm sure that we do not want to hear Churchill's speech verbatim. If the hon. former prime minister, one of the greatest parliamentarians we have known in the British parliamentary system, makes a point, we can certainly use that as a precedent. I think it is very, very important that we do use . . . I am sure we will be hearing from a former great Tory, the former prime minister of this country, the Rt. Hon. John Diefenbaker, what he thought about closure. I'm sure the Tories will be squirming in their places when we hear portions of some of the speeches when we are talking about precedents. I'm sure hon. members will try to be discreet in their use of quotations, but I think it is very, very important that these quotations be allowed.

MR. SPEAKER: Under the circumstances, I'm sure the hon. Leader of the Opposition will be duly grateful to the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo, the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, the hon. Member for Clover Bar, and I would invite him to extend his gratitude to me for this intervention. It has to be a question of degree, of course.

Just so there isn't any problem in regard to identity, I don't think we have reached the United Kingdom Parliament in the quotations. I'm not aware that we have. If I'm not mistaken, the great Mr. Churchill referred to by the hon. Member for Clover Bar and the hon. Leader of the Opposition was the hon. Gordon Churchill and not his namesake, Winston, across the water.

In any event, seriously speaking I realize there's a question of degree, and it may be difficult. In fact, it's impossible to draw a line exactly wherever there's a question of degree, certainly in the line of debate. But I have to have some concern about the amount of encouragement this may give to extensive reading for the remainder of this debate. Therefore, I ask the hon. leader to show some due restraint.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, thank you very much. I'd like to summarize the comments of the other two people I was going to quote. I think they are very applicable and ones I support in this Legislature. The hon. Mr. Knowles, a very long-time parliamentarian in the House of Commons, made it very explicit in his remarks that he was concerned that an opposition didn't have the opportunity to express its point of view, indicate its concern about various matters in a motion of closure. He also pointed out and quoted — Mr. Speaker, I was going to refer to that as well — comments of one of our earlier prime ministers, Mr. King, who indicated great concern with regard to closure and the use of closure in Parliament. However, I would like to quote some famous words attributed to John Pym. Mr. Knowles used these in his remarks, and I think they're very applicable to the debate we're having today with regard to closure. He said:

Parliaments without parliamentary liberty are but a fair and plausible way into bondage. Freedom of debate being once foreclosed, the essence of the liber-

ty of parliament is withal dissolved.

When we think in terms of the debate here, I suppose we could also say that once closure is brought down on Bill 69 and there's a limited amount of debate with regard to Bill 69, once the estimates are brought under the control of this motion of closure, those estimates of supply will receive a minimum amount of questioning because of the limited time. That quote is very applicable to that. When there is a limit in the freedom of debate, "the essence of the liberty of parliament is withal dissolved." In other words, parliament to that time, as soon as we pass this motion of closure, certainly moves us to a point when we might as well dissolve the Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to bring us to a more recent debate in the House of Commons in terms of the constitutional debate. Some very current remarks were made with regard to the concern of the use of closure. With your permission, I'd like to read very quickly about one long sentence of the Rt. Hon. Joe Clark, the Leader of the Opposition, on October 23, 1980, just a few days over a year ago. He was very concerned with regard to Trudeau's government bringing about closure of debate on the constitution. As well, I think this summarizes and echoes some of the feelings I have. I think the Conservative government on the other side of the House that believe in this leader, follows him to the letter, doesn't deviate from his concern and his objectives, and shows total loyalty, should listen to what their hon. leader said on October 23, 1980:

There has been, by the imposition of closure by this government, a very deep abuse of the privileges of the House of Commons, and the privileges of all Canadians who are served and represented here.

Mr. Speaker, those were the words used in the opening remarks of my speech today, the same concern.

My hon. friend from Victoria has indicated this is the third time in history — the third time in history — that this measure has been used. And was it used on some minor, niggling question, some matter of no moment to the people of Canada? No. This extraordinary measure to limit the ability of Parliament to speak ...

Mr. Speaker, we could even apply it to the situation we have before us here in Alberta. We're spending \$8.5 billion, 88 per cent of those dollars in terms of investment, or expenditure if we wish to say that. The decision-making rests with the cabinet, with the Premier and a few cabinet ministers. Only 12 per cent had been allocated to us in this Legislature in terms of the capital division, but by this vote of closure we lose that 12 per cent because at the end of the period of time allocated for debate, a vote is forced upon us in this Legislature. Whether or not we have raised all the concerns we have, the vote is taken. At that time, we as members of the Legislature lose 100 per cent of the control or involvement in the determination of the future of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. The Rt. Hon. Joe Clark, a great leader in Canada, leader of all these members in this Legislative Assembly ... The hon. Member for Vegreville shakes his head. If you want a different leader, stand up. I'd like to hear a speech during this Legislature. We'll keep it going for another week so you can. But, Mr. Speaker, a leader in Canada saying that important matters before a House of Commons — I interpret he would feel the same about important matters before this Legislature — should not be faced by the rules of closure. So I can only say that members of this Legislature should follow their leader and accept the very same ruling.

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate until 8 o'clock this evening.

MR. SPEAKER: In effect, the hon. leader wants us to call it 5:30.

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, before moving the adjournment of the House, I would like to advise hon. members that we will resume consideration of this resolution this evening at 8 o'clock. Tomorrow afternoon at 3:30, government business having been designated for one hour, we will resolve into Committee of Supply for the consideration of some estimates. At 4:30, we will revert to private members' public business, as is the case on Tuesday. At 8 tomorrow evening, the House will sit. We will resume consideration of this government resolution, at which time the motion on closure will be put.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree to call it 5:30?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

[The House recessed at 5:27 p.m. and resumed at 8 p.m.]

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, going on from where I left off just before the break at 5:30, I want to say that the motion of closure before us has as my focus and concern the erosion of the freedom of speech and the rights of members of the Legislature. It's on that basis that I have made my points. I've pointed out to this Legislature that the implications for the motion certainly indicate that that freedom of speech is taken away from us as members of the Legislature. I've pointed out as well that there are a number of reasons why that motion was not necessary in this Legislature. For example, a number of times in question period we have asked questions of the Provincial Treasurer asking that documentation of the \$60 million be presented and tabled in this Legislature; that traders' notes be tabled; that the management procedures put in place should be tabled; and as well all management letters should be tabled. Mr. Speaker, the government didn't listen to that request. They've brought us to the point where we are today.

The other reason I've given for the motion not being necessary is that Bill 258, which indicated that all management letters in the future should be, must be, tabled in this Legislature. As well, the government didn't accept that option as a way and a technique by which this Legislature, specifically the opposition, could get information, and we would not have to go through this long debate we're having at the present time.

I've pointed out that historically the right to freedom of speech started in the 13th century, was formalized in 1688, and was not only a matter of being a law but as well was a precedent; it was an accepted fact in all legislatures and Parliament since that period of time. In terms of the history of closure, I've pointed out that closure never did answer the question, that closure certainly was not an acceptable way to go. We have never had closure in Alberta; that principle was never used in this Legislature. But today we're facing a motion of closure, which is totally unacceptable to me and not satisfactory in the administration of this province.

Mr. Speaker, I left off by pointing out that other

parliaments — the Parliament of Canada — have used closure, but it has not brought any significant benefits to the House of Commons, nor to Acts or programs that followed that closure. I've indicated that great parliamentarians in Ottawa, the British Parliament, and other Canadian legislatures as well, have been very concerned with a motion of closure that was said to gag the opposition, that was to take away the freedom of speech of members of the Legislature, that violated a historic principle. That was unacceptable by those legislators.

Historically, closure became a parliamentary practice and the first incident of closure was many, many years ago, 1881 in fact, where a Speaker Brand at that time in the British Parliament was concerned about the length of a debate and wanted to terminate that debate because he felt obstruction was in process and that that type of debate was unacceptable. Historically, as we may recall, Irish Members of Parliament deliberately protracted the debate during a sitting with the unconcealed purpose of obstructing the business of Parliament. At that time, Speaker Brand said this in defence of the closure being brought forward.

The dignity, the credit and the authority of this House are seriously threatened. [Speaker Brand declared] and it is necessary that they should be vindicated.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that the dignity, the credit, and the authority of the House was seriously threatened at that point in time not by a filibuster, but the government's motion of closure. Mr. Speaker, at the time the situation was a closure that was necessary to stop obstruction. I think that may have been necessary at that point in time. Not only possibly through comments in the Legislature this evening, but comments outside of the House, the Conservative government in this Legislature has charged the opposition with obstruction, of stopping the business of the House. Well, that argument doesn't hold water. I looked at the Oxford Dictionary in terms of what obstruction means. It means:

Blocking or being blocked, making or becoming more or less impassable; hindering, esp. of Parliamentary business by [talking against time].

Mr. Speaker, I would suppose the relevant point here is the phrase "hindering the parliamentary business". What then is meant by parliamentary business? In the first place, parliamentary business refers to that which appears each day in the Votes and Proceedings of this Legislative Assembly. For just a few moments, I'd like to look to see how much parliamentary business has been done and how much we in the opposition have obstructed the business of this House in any way or deterred it from following through in a logical and consistent manner.

Mr. Speaker, 22 government and non-government motions have been discussed in this Legislative Assembly so far. Secondly, 18 government Bills have received Royal Assent. Thirdly, five private Bills have received Royal Assent. Five government Bills have been read a third time and three government Bills are in Committee of the Whole. One government Bill has been given second reading. Eleven public Bills other than government Bills have been given second reading. There are 26 public Bills other than government Bills waiting for second reading, and 21 notices of leave to introduce a Bill are still standing on the Votes and Proceedings.

With all this having been done this sitting, how can we ever feel that there was any obstruction by the filibuster, by the debate, from this side of the Legislative Assembly. I believe we on this side of the Legislature have done our

work. We believe a lot of work has been done. All the work that's important to the government has received attention and received our consideration and debate. If you would note *Hansard*, I think that in a number of instances we have debated various Bills on third reading in this Legislature, which is unusual historically. Over the last 18 years I have very seldom seen a significant amount of debate go into third reading because, one, we felt it was necessary to give the last bit of information to the ministers before they received Royal Assent, but secondly, to indicate to this government and to this Legislative Assembly that we have information, a point of view from our constituents or from other Albertans that needed to be expressed and had to be expressed. And that's exactly what we did.

In the second place, at least from the perspective of the opposition, parliamentary business is that of getting a greater amount of information. The more information we get from the government, the more parliamentary business we have done. That is what our filibuster was all about. That was one of the reasons behind the filibuster: we wanted to get as much information as we could.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, we have said very clearly in this Legislature that we wanted to have specific information with regard to the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. Well, how much information have we secured by this questioning? Since October 26, 1981, the day the filibuster began, 418 various types of questions have been asked of the various government ministers on 24 capital projects. That is a very significant number of questions. If you look at it in terms of dollars, that would be only one question per \$100 million being spent, which is maybe not enough questions even yet. On the other hand, it is something an opposition as small as this one can be very proud of.

The really shocking thing is that less than 10 per cent of these questions were asked by government members. Ninety per cent of those questions were asked by this side of the House. Some 72 members on the other side of the Legislature, very obviously the major number of members, only asked 10 per cent of those questions, Mr. Speaker. We could certainly say that they have 10 times more members than we do. One would almost think that the Conservatives on that side of the House, the members of the government, really don't care about the \$400,589,802 we are voting on. They're so confident that the ministers have everything in hand, that everything's great, that there are no problems, that they don't have to ask questions. They come to Edmonton, collect their pay cheque every month, get on a committee, supplement their income, and they can have a full-time job as a member of the Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, if that's the way it is, that full-time job means that the ministers and the members of this Conservative government come into the Legislative Assembly and take their responsibility. If they're going to make it a full-time job, then they should start asking questions about what is happening in the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. They should know what's going on. They should have been asking their Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care why there were problems over at the Walter C. MacKenzie health centre.

In Environment, many questions could be asked with regard to the dam on the Oldman River, other structures across the province, and irrigation rehabilitation. But I didn't hear many questions, Mr. Speaker. Many, many questions of that kind could have been asked. Many questions could have been asked of the Minister of

Education. But this government is satisfied that the ministers have it in hand.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we don't think they have. That's why we have to ask questions. We have found in instances that they have not. Kananaskis, the hospitals, the investment of the investment fund, losses of some \$60 million; and the backbenchers don't even care why or how it's lost. They say it's okay, it's all right. We've got lots of money; we've got some more to spend. What's \$60 million? That's the kind of situation we have in this Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, how does the government answer this type of situation? What is their answer to it? They feel at this point in time that we've asked too many questions and that we haven't been responsible. They're bringing in closure because they feel that we in this Assembly have asked too many questions.

As I've pointed out very clearly, we haven't stopped any kind of debate. We haven't deterred the progress of this House in any way. All the major business is done, except Bill 69 and the supply estimates that are before us. Everything else has been completed. Mr. Speaker, those are the last two items of importance on the agenda because we feel a number of questions must be asked before we can give approval. But the government says, you can't ask questions.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker. It raises questions in my mind. Albertans raise the same questions. They say to themselves, what is the government hiding if they can't give you the information? What is this government hiding? Why can't they give you the information? I say, I don't know. There's nothing legal against it. It's all for political reasons; maybe they haven't got the answers. With regard to the \$60 million, I tell them very clearly that there are traders' notes — one on Monday, Tuesday, and another on Wednesday — but the bonds could have gone up and down and fluctuated very quickly each day. There could have been gains and losses a number of times that were never recorded by the Provincial Treasurer's department or in their responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, that occurred not only one year. If it occurred once, then we could say that, oh, something wasn't quite right, and somebody wasn't on top of their job. But it occurred over a three-year period. That's the best information we've got at this time. There was bad administration, somebody not on top of their job, and no accountability.

Now we get to a point where the government is going to close us out before we can really find out what they're hiding. Mr. Speaker, I think they're hiding the fact that they have no back-up data to show how they lost \$60 million. They haven't any documents. The money invested out of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, the money of the taxpayers of Alberta, was sitting out there in a sea, in the trader's hands, at his disposal to do whatever he wanted to do with it. He felt no more accountable to government than this government feels accountable to this Legislature, Mr. Speaker. That's the situation we're faced with. This government will not come clean and tell us that. It's easier to hide the information and make people think that everything's great in good old Alberta, that there's nothing wrong.

Well, Mr. Speaker, in public business, if the government can document all the bad investments, the decisions that were made, all the traders' notes that show it was a legitimate investment and a risk that was supposed to gain a profit, if all that kind of thing can be documented, we on this side of the House would be satisfied. The

people of Alberta would be satisfied. The Premier could go on government-paid television and tell all the people across the province, don't worry about it. The \$60 million was lost; that's right. But don't keep your attention on the loss of \$60 million. What you do is divert your attention over to the fact that we gained \$140 million.

Well, who excuses a thief? That's diversion of attention to another topic. It's nice to keep saying, oh, but we gained a bunch over here. Who takes responsibility for the loss? We've been six weeks trying to determine that, six weeks in this Legislature trying to find out who will take the responsibility for the loss. The Provincial Treasurer tells us, oh, I'm responsible for all the Heritage Savings Trust Fund; trust me, I know where it's all at. Mr. Speaker, we don't know whether he knows where it's all at. He doesn't know where the \$60 million got lost. It can't be documented. There's nothing on paper. The Provincial Treasurer says, I can't give you that documentation because it would give away our little secrets in the back room. We in the select committee received a window of investments for the period of — was it one day? We saw there was a certain gain in profit and that the investment had an earning. Well, that was great, Mr. Speaker. We peeked through the window and saw a little bit of trading activity going on. We saw that the investments could make a little money. But do you think this government, specifically the Provincial Treasurer who is responsible, would give us a window into a \$60 million loss? No way, because we'd see the truth. We would see that the government is hiding something. We would find that they're hiding maladministration. We'd find that there's no documentation back there, that the Provincial Treasurer sent a whole bundle of money in a basket — a blue basket so they'd know it was from the Heritage Savings Trust Fund — over to the trader and said, have some fun. So the trader had some fun. He just documented on Monday, on Tuesday, on Wednesday, and Thursday. He just said, it's still here, Lou; don't worry about it. But the Provincial Treasurer says, that's okay, I know you're looking after it. So three years later, all of a sudden it comes out in a report that we're losing \$60 million — \$13 million, \$43 million, \$3 million. Then all of a sudden we have a letter as of February 20, 1981 from the Auditor General that kind of wakes up everybody, that says, Lou, you've got to look after your job here:

It would appear that traders should be in a position to explain the rationale for purchases and sales transactions long after the event and should be able to provide information on the results of their activities to senior investment management. There is considerable scope for collusion between an investment trader employed by the Treasury Department and someone in one of the brokerage houses, which could result in fraud.

Mr. Speaker, after that missal came from the Auditor General to the Deputy Provincial Treasurer — and I'm sure it was laid immediately on the Provincial Treasurer's desk — we're now told that the Provincial Treasurer sat up in shock and said, well, we've got to do something about this. We don't have any of the facts — nobody will tell us anything — but the story we get is that the Provincial Treasurer immediately put some management procedures in place. We can't find out what they are. Most likely my colleagues will be standing up in this Legislature in 1982, and we'll be saying, here's another loss: well, too bad. We'll say, document it; and they'll say, too bad. Give us the management letter: we haven't got one, too bad. Again, we'll never get information. That's

the way it goes. A basketful of Heritage Savings Trust Fund meetings down to one of our trader's houses — I don't even know which one it is; they won't even tell us; not even that, and that's public business. We should at least know who's fiddling with our money. The basket is picked up by a trader and he has a great time. Man, he can make \$100 million a day.

The hon. Member for Edmonton Whitemud was telling us the other day that when the interest rate changed one Thursday we made \$100 million in a day. But how much did we lose the next day? How much did the bond market jiggle during that period of time? Was every jiggle in the bond market registered? Did the trader make some notes? Is he doing that today? Mr. Speaker, this Provincial Treasurer, who feels he's so responsible, has it all in hand, can't even tell us that, can't even tell us whether each jiggle is registered. That's where collusion and fraud can occur, because if they're not registered, it says here very clearly that "an investment trader and someone in the Treasury Department" could be taking a little rake-off. That's why I stand in my place and ask this government to produce documents to assure me that that never happens. They can't, and they won't. One, I don't think the traders' notes are there. Two, I don't think there's any kind of documentation of that \$60 million loss that will satisfy Albertans. The government's trying to hide it and cover up. Cover up and hide is all it is; a continuous cover up and hide. It's not the first example. I could go on and name many examples in this Legislature where the government takes the same approach. But the worst concern here is with the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. The Premier goes on television tonight, Mr. Speaker, and says the Heritage Savings Trust Fund is the savings of the Alberta people and that if we have trouble in the next 10 years we can gradually move from our present economy that's relying on natural resources to one dependent on taxes from the people of Alberta. Mr. Speaker, the government doesn't even know where they've lost \$60 million. Most likely there are many other millions of dollars we don't know about. The fact of the matter is: how do we know we've got enough money for a 10-year transition period? I don't think we have. One, we can't document our losses; maybe they're a lot more than \$60 million. Secondly, we'll never get the money back from the other provinces of Canada. That's a fact of life. It will take 25, 30 years with a very low interest rate. As we know, the capitals division is invested across the province. That's not recoverable money. The fourth division is the investment division that we feel is not managed properly. That's the only conclusion I can come to when the government does not reveal the facts behind the scene.

I think it's incumbent upon the Provincial Treasurer to quit giving those generalized answers he has given for four to five weeks. It's time he stood up in the Legislature, debates this motion of closure, and says, I'm not for closure, I'm for open government; I want to give the people of Alberta and members of the opposition all the material they want to understand the situation. If the Provincial Treasurer can't do that, we can only say he's hiding something. We can only say that he won't come clean. I think that's a terrible way to take responsibility in the public arena. Mr. Speaker, the Provincial Treasurer could condemn closure and stop this motion at the present time by coming forward and saying, I'm open; I have nothing to hide; I can give the information that is necessary to prove to every Albertan that \$60 million was lost in a legitimate way. It is all documented. That's what

we're asking, Mr. Speaker. I think it's important that that's repeated and that the Provincial Treasurer hear that, because if he doesn't hear it tonight, every Conservative member across this province is going to hear that question. They're going to be asked, where is the \$60 million, what are you hiding? I know that's a fact, because last weekend I was in three different communities representing my constituents at five different meetings. A number of people came to me and said, don't give up, we want to know where they've lost the \$60 million, what the reasons are for it.

What was one of the prime questions asked at the Premier's dinner in Lethbridge? Where is the \$60 million? The people wanted to know. They want to know that today. Mr. Speaker, it's incumbent upon this government not just to knock us aside, push us out of the way, but to produce the documentation. Their answer to us in this House is the motion of closure which says, just get away, go home, spend Christmas with your family — and that sounds nice. But we on this side of the House also have a shared responsibility with our families in that we have taken a public responsibility. That means we must hold the government accountable and do everything within our power to assure ourselves that the government is accountable. Mr. Speaker, that's not happening tonight and not going to happen this week. That's a very unfortunate situation.

I had other information I wanted to cover tonight, Mr. Speaker, with regard to this whole concept of closure. It just about makes me laugh when I look back to the spring session and go through the Speech from the Throne. I've listed on the outside cover four pages that I think are of interest: 1, 10, 13, and 21. The kind of nice things this government says are very interesting, but it never follows through. The first was:

Alberta's future has been jeopardized in recent months as a result of federal government actions, both in pursuing unilateral plan to patriate the Canadian constitution and in presenting energy proposals which have adverse implications for Canadian unity.

Concern about unilateral action. Mr. Speaker, tonight we're talking about a motion of unilateral action by the government that is going to wipe out our freedom of speech as members on this side of the House: the right to question the government. On page 10 of the same speech:

My government is prepared to enter into meaningful discussions with the federal government . . .

Nice words, Mr. Speaker, to talk about meaningful discussions. If you're going away from home to the federal government to talk about meaningful discussions, it's incumbent upon the government to have those same meaningful discussions about their accountability as to how they handle or mishandle the public purse in the province of Alberta. That's the responsibility of government. You don't change the rules away from home, Mr. Speaker. The same rules that apply within your home apply otherwise. Use the ones you use away from home in your own Legislature. Double talk by this government.

It goes on to say:

Only through co-operation and agreement with the producing provinces can the federal government establish . . .

And so on. Co-operation and agreement sound so great. Mr. Speaker, all we hear in this Legislature are unilateral words that we're going to close down the debate and it's finished; we don't have to listen to you anymore; we're going to give you nothing; you're just a small bunch of



representatives on that side of the House; minority groups don't mean anything to us because we have lots of power and lots of money; we're going to run right over the top. Mr. Speaker, it's nice to write in the throne speech the objectives of this government that apply to the principles of their behavior. There is no consistency.

Page 13 goes on:

During the past year, my government has benefited from the co-operation and advice of leaders of trade unions and industry. In keeping with recent advances

...  
And so on. The government has accepted advice and co-operation — sounds great in here. But I'd like to ask those leaders of trade unions and industry whether or not they really were listened to. I travel around and talk to businessmen in this city, and at the present time I find that's not necessarily the case. But in terms of this government's actions it sounds good. Page 21:

I leave you now to the business of the session, with full confidence that as elected representatives your debates and your votes will reflect your understanding of the public interest of all people of Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, that's what the heritage fund is all about. It's a matter of public interest to the people of Alberta. It's on the top of their minds. Every Albertan knows this government lost \$60 million. There is no question in their minds that that loss is real and realized as it is. But the people of Alberta are saying: how did they lose it; can't you get the documentation; that's in my interest because that's my money. In his glowing annual report on the Heritage Savings Trust Fund the Provincial Treasurer said to Albertans, you're part of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund; we want you to participate; there's something in it for you. I raise the question with all Albertans, as we did in our television ad: how do you as Albertans benefit from the Heritage Savings Trust Fund; how are your interests looked after? Person after person after person said, we don't know; we have no share of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, none at all. Well then, it must all belong to the Provincial Treasurer and the Premier. They're the ones who handle it. They're responsible for it. That's what we're talking about here. They should take an interest in Albertans, in their responsibility.

What do Albertans want? One, they want accountability, but they also want benefits. Tonight we're talking about accountability: the opportunity for the opposition to be able to speak, to be able to ask questions, to be able to get information from the Premier and from the Provincial Treasurer specifically, as to how that \$60 million was lost, and ask questions about how all the other estimates of supply were handled, and [if] they are documented. Is every dollar accounted for? I don't know, because this government will not give us the information.

Mr. Speaker, I think this government has really betrayed the citizens of this province. They're doing this to cut off our filibuster and our freedom of speech. That's the object of closure. I want to say that in the last few days we've received many letters and phone calls supporting our position for a greater amount of information, supporting it as responsible, taken by a responsible opposition in the face of what at this point in time I feel is a very irresponsible government.

Mr. Speaker, it's so true what John A. Macdonald said in 1869. "Given a parliament with a big surplus, and a big majority" — and that's this Legislature — "you can debauch a committee of archangels". Mr. Speaker, I

think that applies completely to the environment we're in here today.

AN HON. MEMBER: Except for the archangels.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Except for the archangels.

Mr. Speaker, I think there are many reasons why this government should either withdraw this motion for closure and recognize their responsibility or, when the motion comes to a vote, that all members on that side of the Legislature should vote against it. If they don't, they set a precedent in this Legislature which reduces freedom of speech in the future. Once a government uses closure it's easy to use it again and take away the rights of all members.

Mr. Speaker, I think it's of great concern that this government is taking the action it's planning to take in the next day or two by voting in closure. I'd like to move an amendment by adding at the end of the motion before us as follows. I have copies for all members.

(9) This Assembly formally expresses its deep regret at having to employ the above noted time management mechanisms in an effort to speed the business of the Assembly so that Members need not be too inconvenienced by the exercise by Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition in their legitimate right to freedom of speech.

Mr. Speaker, this says that it's too bad that the government has to take these kinds of steps to try to take away freedom of speech from us as members of the Legislature, only so they can speed up the business of the Assembly, so that government members, and maybe other members of this Assembly, are not inconvenienced by the position we on this side of the House have taken that public business must be done in public, and that we as members of this Legislature should have answers to all the many questions that can be asked about the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. If the Conservative government wants to admit that the reason it has brought this resolution in is to try to bring about time management, and to try to speed up the Assembly by using that kind of technique just so that members can get away on their holidays and do whatever they want to do, but ignore public business, then let's put it in the motion and admit that's the kind of action they're taking. That's all there is to it. As I said in my opening remarks, there are no reasons that this government must close the House in a hurry. The supply estimate and Bill 69 do not have to be passed until March 31, 1982.

Earlier the hon. House leader, the Attorney General, stood in his place introducing this motion, and did not give any reasons for bringing about closure of this Legislature. There were no concrete reasons, no events occurring ...

DR. BUCK: They have to go to Hawaii.

MR. R. SPEAKER: ... that say this Legislature must close within a week or 14 days; not a reason, Mr. Speaker. If there were good reasons, such as the Premier rushing across Canada to collect funds for the Conservative Party, then I could understand it. But not even that reason was raised, because maybe the Premier has collected all the funds necessary for the next election. There were no reasons other than they want to get rid of the opposition, send us home and shut us up so we can't disclose this information that's behind the hidden doors, that would tell us what happened to the basketful of

Heritage Savings Trust Fund money. That's the only reason I can think of; I don't know of any other.

You ask the question: what to hide? But in my amendment maybe I raise the true reason. They're saying, let's get rid of those guys; we're going to put some time management in; they've been around long enough; they've already asked enough questions; they've embarrassed us long enough; they've put us on the defensive; they're on the offensive. And the only way to get out of the situation is to opt out, close them out, and create closure. If that is the truth of the situation, Mr. Speaker, and because of our action, our fight for the freedom of speech, we're inconveniencing a number of members across the way, then let's admit it. Let's put it into an amendment. To me, that's what it is.

If the government denies that's the real reason, then have them come up with some other reasons. All these backbenchers who are sitting around waiting and writing speeches, and are going to stand up for the freedom of speech, stand up and tell me you don't want to get home to go on a holiday; stand up and tell me you don't have some other appointment that's more important than this Legislature. [interjections] Tell me you have to go home and feed the cows or something. If there is a better reason than this, the government should tell us. To this point in time, they have not. What is the rush? Why close us out? If it's only for their own convenience, so they can go away, close it up and forget about the responsibility to Albertans, it's not good enough.

Mr. Speaker, I move this resolution at this time.

DR. BUCK: Take the muzzles off the backbenchers, Lou.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address the amendment to the motion. I was a little hesitant in getting up because the Member for Drayton Valley had implored the Leader of the Opposition to get up so she could get up. I'm looking forward to hearing from the Member for Drayton Valley sometime in the debate; she always has something to say. There are also other members of this Conservative government I'd like to hear from in this regard.

Mr. Speaker, I have to indicate support for this subamendment, and I have to express my deep regret that we have closure before us today too. In years past. I can recall when closure was being contemplated for the House of Commons for things like the pipeline debate in 1956, as well as the flag debate and, most recently, the constitutional debate. On all those occasions I remember Members of Parliament feeling deeply aggrieved that their freedom of speech had been impugned. That being in Parliament, I had difficulty understanding the serious nature of the problem. Now that we have closure being invoked on us and I'm a participant — I could never have imagined that I would be — I wonder if I shouldn't be standing here stamping my feet, flailing the air with my arms, or feeling deeply aggrieved. Notwithstanding the fact that five days have passed since this was introduced, I can say, however, that I'm not bleeding anywhere. I don't think I'm going to die over this thing, but it's caused me to give more serious thought to what closure really means, and what it means in this situation.

We've talked a lot about freedom of speech and a filibuster, but I'm not too sure the word "filibuster" appropriately describes what we in the opposition have been doing for the last seven weeks. I believe we have been doing nothing more than our obligation, our responsibility, and our duty as opposition members. It's

incumbent upon us to ask questions about expenditures and plans of the government. I can't see any better reason to do something like that than this particular matter. If I were to dub this exercise this fall something, I wouldn't call it a filibuster. I would call it something different. I would call it the \$60 million closure. And I will tell you why, Mr. Speaker.

We peruse the annual budget each spring in the Legislature. This year the annual budget is in the vicinity of \$6.5 billion. Here's the documentation we get for that annual budget. First of all, for this year we get the 1981 Budget Address by the Hon. Lou Hyndman, the Provincial Treasurer. There are quite a few pages here. It looks like it goes to page 89 or 90; 90 pages chock-full of advice, charts, graphs, numbers, and tables, almost anything you could ask for. Backing that up are the Estimates of Expenditure 1980-81, Legislative Assembly Estimates, Government Estimates. Look at all the pages in this one — 421. Each page has a table with numbers representing the dollars the government is going to expend in this particular year. It goes by department; department after department for all the government. It goes by element and is broken down into salaries, manpower costs, supplies and services, grants, purchase of fixed assets, even payments to MLAs.

MR. SPEAKER: I hesitate to interrupt the hon. member, but it seems to me that the central idea of this amendment is an expression of regret for certain reasons given in the amendment. I'm having a little difficulty relating an intended expression of regret with the number of pages in the annual estimates.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Speaker, don't hesitate if you have any question about what I'm doing. Feel free to interject.

The connection simply is that I want to establish why I am expressing my regret about this. The point is this. When we consider the \$6.5 billion budget on an annual basis, the documentation we have before the fact is supported by the Budget Address which has 90 pages, documentation supported by the Estimates of Expenditures which has over 400 pages, Supplementary Information on the Element Details which has over 178 pages, and also Supplementary Information and Reconciliation of Historical Data which has over 300 pages. Before the government spends one cent, it must come to this Legislative Assembly and get approval to do so. That's one of the most fundamental bases of a parliamentary system. Whoever controls the purse, controls the throne. That was established a long, long time ago. This practice follows that custom.

However, we now have a situation where we have what is really an anomaly in democracies, the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. Before we in the Legislature can approve anything, we get the '81-82 estimates of the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund, Capital Projects Division. In it are 30 pages.

Mr. Speaker, I believe 22 items are described here which will be expenditures from the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. The Heritage Savings Trust Fund is \$8.5 billion and this is what we get in terms of prior information. On the other hand, the annual budget is less than the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund, and this is the documentation we get. The time we spend on it can be six to eight weeks. We go through it line by line, number by number. But we get to the heritage trust fund, which is even more, and this is all we get. It represents something

like only 12 per cent of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund.

In question period this afternoon questions were posed to the Premier about investments in tar sand plants and heavy oil plants. The question was: once these agreements are entered into, would they be brought back to the Legislature for ratification? In other words, when the Premier and the Alberta government enter into negotiations with these project developers, would they indicate to them that these projects and the commitment the government was making was contingent upon ratification before the Legislature? The answer was no.

Mr. Speaker, I regret those kinds of things because, for example, two years ago this government said it would commit \$7 billion to tar sand development, to heavy oil development. At that time, there wasn't even \$7 billion in the heritage fund, yet the government was making a one-shot commitment that would gobble up the entire Heritage Savings Trust Fund, which was larger than the annual budget, without any approval whatsoever from the Legislative Assembly.

In defence of that it's been said it would be difficult to get ratification from the Legislature because it could compromise the negotiations between the various parties. I don't believe that's true, Mr. Speaker. I look at private practice where Firms contemplating amalgamation, acquisitions, or mergers have to file certain documents with security exchange commissions before the fact. Even in the negotiations, when they sign agreements with one another, there's always a caveat that says "subject to approval by the shareholders".

Mr. Speaker, if there's an analogy here, it has to be that we in the Legislature are shareholders on behalf of the people of Alberta, especially in regard to the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. Commitments and undertakings by the Alberta government with that money should come before this Legislative Assembly. That's one of the reasons I would like to express my regret about this.

Another reason is that in my estimation the debate we have had on the estimates so far has not been a filibuster. It's been a reasonable examination and review of the government's plans, inasmuch as we are able to determine them beforehand. Inasmuch as they only apply to 12 per cent of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, that's not very much, but it's the best we can do here. What bothers me about this is that we've developed a great deal of new information about the heritage fund that we never had before, and I think that's important. Yet the government is now going to cut off that debate.

Even more important is that in not only reviewing the planned expenditures of the government for the coming year, we must also hold the government accountable for those expenditures made with the Heritage Savings Trust Fund in past years. We've dealt with the estimates of the Minister of Environment, the Minister of Transportation, the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care, and the Minister responsible for Workers' Health, Safety and Compensation.

But, Mr. Speaker, there is one big hole there. Two ministers have not yet appeared before the Legislature in regard to the estimates. In my opinion, they are the two who have to be held most accountable and responsible for the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. Those two have to stand before this Legislative Assembly and answer questions in regard to the handling of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. I don't believe that this closure motion gives them the opportunity. I'm sure each one of them would want to be here, to stand up and be held accountable, to stand up and have the opportunity to say, this is what we've done with the money and it's been worth while and beneficial. They should have the opportunity to say that. We in the opposition should have the opportunity to determine whether that is correct.

Mr. Speaker, in most instances I think the opposition would say to the government, yes, those programs have been beneficial. The Attorney General got up this afternoon and identified some of them. He said the opposition was being obstructionist in terms of reviewing those expenditures. Mr. Speaker, I can't argue with the merit of almost any of these programs we've been able to look at. Who can say that hospitals are not beneficial? I can't; I think they are. I think we need them. Who can say airport development isn't beneficial? I think it is. Who can say irrigation isn't beneficial? I think it is. I think most people in the Assembly agree that all these are beneficial. But that's not the issue by itself.

Right now the issue is the government's management of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. It has been exemplified by the loss, over the last three years, of \$60 million on the sale of marketable securities. Mr. Speaker, I've stood here other days and said, perhaps that \$60 million loss can be explained. Perhaps it could be said it was worth while to lose it here in order to gain more over there. That may in fact be the case, Mr. Speaker. The problem is that the two people responsible for that have not yet been in their place to satisfactorily demonstrate to this Legislature that in fact that was the case.

The two people I've been talking about are the Provincial Treasurer, who bears the ultimate accountability for the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. He said that before the watchdog committee, and I concur. I think he should be before the Legislature as well as that watchdog committee taking the same responsibility for that accountability.

The other individual who should be before the Legislative Assembly is the chairman of the investment committee of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. That person is the Premier of this province. The Premier of the province has gone other places to talk about the heritage fund and the beneficial programs. He's gone on television to say the same thing. But Mr. Speaker, I submit that this is another place, this is probably the first place, where the Premier and the Provincial Treasurer should be justifying the programs they wish us to approve and also standing

and accounting for the programs over the last years in the Heritage Savings Trust Fund.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment says that the Assembly formally expresses its deep regret, and I've indicated why I would express mine. It also goes on to say that this in an effort to speed the business of the Assembly. When these capital estimates were reviewed in years past, as much as I can remember, it didn't take more than a matter of hours. I don't think that's sufficient. I think more time is required to responsibly look at all those programs, line by line, number by number, just as we do with these things here. I think we could have gone through these capital estimates in a couple of weeks. But we've been dealing with them for seven weeks now. And do you know why, Mr. Speaker? It's not because the opposition has been obstinate. It's because the government has not answered the questions we have put to them. By this closure motion, this government is giving us five more days to review the Heritage Savings Trust Fund.

Mr. Speaker, I'm giving notice here that I'm giving this government five more days to answer the questions we've put to them. We've wasted enough time over seven weeks trying to get this government to respond to these questions, and it's their responsibility to do so. If not, it only raises another question that's prevalent not only here but trickling and filtering throughout the society of Alberta; that is, that this government will not stand up, address those questions, and answer them satisfactorily. The question is being asked: what do they have to hide?

It's not only incumbent upon these people to satisfy these people here, but they should ensure there is no element of doubt, not one iota of uncertainty in the minds of the people of Alberta, about what is happening with that money. It is in their best interests to make sure the people of this province are satisfied with what they're doing with it. It's in the best interests of the people of this province to have the confidence of the people of Canada, and to demonstrate to them that we are using this money in a responsible way.

The last part of this amendment deals with the inconvenience caused the members of the Assembly because Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition is exercising its legitimate right to freedom of speech. Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't know what the rush is that we have to invoke closure. These capital estimates do not come up until the fiscal year ending March 1983. There's no rush for these funds. There's no need to invoke closure.

Nevertheless, in the interim, the government has asked the Auditor General to address this matter in what is, in my judgment, a very peripheral manner and irrelevant to the central issue. That's why I have written a letter to the Auditor General requesting him to add some terms of reference to those contained in the Premier's terms of reference. They're not very substantial additions, Mr. Speaker. They just get to be a little more specific. They direct the Auditor General in a specific way so he's not wandering about the map and going to come back and say that overall, everything looks copacetic. Because overall it may be, but that doesn't negate the fact that there are incidents where everything is not copacetic.

The problem with that is we have to stop whatever those negative incidents are right now while this trust fund is only about \$10 billion. How can I say only \$10 billion? Mr. Speaker, I say only \$10 billion, because not long from now, in 20 years, that trust fund will be \$105 billion. If the government thinks we have problems today, if the public thinks it's scandalous that we have a \$60

million loss today, Lord help us in 20 years when that trust fund is \$105 billion, because the problems then will be beyond the imagination of any of us here. It's very important that we ensure that any problems there are today are corrected. That's the assurance we're trying to seek right now.

Mr. Speaker, I started out by saying that I had never imagined in my younger days that I would be a participant in a closure debate, or that I would be subject to it. I think it's extremely unfortunate that we've come to this point. From what I've been able to determine, Alberta has never had a situation like this. It has never had closure invoked. I've checked with whoever I could. I've looked at the records, had people look for them and we couldn't really find something that directed itself to closure in Alberta. Yet, I remember how in other places parliamentarians objected so vehemently at even the suggestion of closure, notwithstanding the fact of closure. And now we have it right before us.

Mr. Speaker, I believe members of this Assembly have a legitimate right to freedom of speech. I don't believe this closure motion serves that end. I especially don't believe that, when the main issue has yet to come before the Legislative Assembly, when the two main protagonists in this whole heritage debate have not stood accountable before the Assembly for their programs and answered for what they've done in the past. I believe there should be more time available for members of the opposition to examine those policies implemented and executed by the Provincial Treasurer and the Premier. It's unfortunate that we've had to go through all these other estimates to get to that point.

In speaking to this motion, Mr. Speaker, I express my regret at having participated in a Legislature where we're having closure. I've heard other members say that it's an historic event, and we're creating precedents in this province. I've heard it said in regard to other subjects while I've been here; the precedent we all set when we debated the motions about the constitution, the precedent we set when we had the energy crisis and, I guess, in my own small part, the precedent I set when I was the first to be kicked out of the party. I don't know that I'm the first to be on the other side of the floor, but as far as I can determine, I have the distinction of being the first to be kicked out of the party. Now I'm participating in the first closure debate, and I'll be the subject of the closure motion once the government implements it. I deeply regret that.

In regard to time management, I feel there has been none. I don't believe the government has responded to our major questions concerning the \$60 million loss. This Legislature could have adjourned around the Remembrance Day weekend if the government had answered those questions satisfactorily. Now I'm not going to sit here for five days and ask these people more questions. I'm putting the onus on them to respond to those questions we placed, Mr. Speaker. I'll give them five more days to answer those questions.

I'm not inconvenienced by being here, Mr. Speaker. I think it's my obligation and my duty to be here. I think it's my obligation and duty to be here until we have satisfactorily resolved all those things before us. I would like to move a subamendment to this amendment. I'd like to strike out the words "time management" and substitute the word "closure".

MRS. CRIPPS: Question.

DR. BUCK: Time for the hon. member to make a speech.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the Member for Drayton Valley, I was just allowing a minute for the copy of the subamendment to be distributed to her, so she could follow what we're doing.

MRS. CRIPPS: I know what you're doing.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Speaker, if I may address the subamendment please. It's a very simple, straightforward subamendment. Perhaps I could just read it into the record.

This Assembly formally expresses its deep regret at having to employ the above noted closure mechanisms in an effort to speed the business of the Assembly so that Members need not be too inconvenienced by the exercise by Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition of their legitimate right to freedom of speech.

Mr. Speaker, I say this is a simple subamendment to the amendment because — if I may use an analogy — if it walks like a duck, swims like a duck, and quacks like a duck, it's not a horse, it's not a turkey, it's a duck. Similarly the motion before the House cannot be described as time management, but should be more accurately described as closure. That's what this subamendment achieves. It is in fact closure.

Mr. Speaker, it's one thing to use euphemisms. We all do that in our daily life, and I would suspect we're subject to more than our share of euphemisms once we get into the Legislative Assembly. I've quite often been referred to by other members as the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo. Sometimes, by the inflection on the word "honorable" I'm not too sure exactly what they mean. In this case, I don't want there to be any doubt in anybody's mind about what we're doing here. It's fine to say "time management", Mr. Speaker. That's a concept being refined over and over again in private industry. There are courses people can take that are offered to businesses that will ensure time management is in place enabling the most efficient use of that available time. The objective, being efficient with the time available, is to ensure that whatever has been undertaken is achieved; that is, let's be efficient so that we can be effective.

Mr. Speaker, I think the opposition has been extremely efficient during this fall session in reviewing the capital estimates for the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. We have gone through each estimate as thoroughly as we are able to with the small numbers we have here. It may have seemed at times that the opposition members were dominating the time allowed to review these estimates. But it may be that that was only because the government members were not asking questions. Perhaps that's their approach or attitude. It's our responsibility to review these things, so we did.

Mr. Speaker, we found out some very interesting things about each estimate, which I will get into when I have more time to address them. But at this particular point, just let me say that the review this opposition has made this fall has been, in my opinion, the most efficient and most effective in the three years I have been here. As well, I think it has set a very high standard to follow for those of us who are here in the future, not only in heritage fund projects but in the estimates. I also think that providing the opposition is diligent in its pursuit of the government, diligent in insisting that like the annual estimates the heritage fund comes before the Legislative Assembly for

approval before rather than after the fact, changes will be made to the heritage fund in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I've looked at Standing Order 20 that deals with closure for the Legislative Assembly, and we've had an example this afternoon of closure being invoked; closure on closure. There's not much difference between the two. In fact, Mr. Speaker, they both seem the same to me. This is a closure motion. It's a cut and dried closure motion. It's unfortunate we've come to that point in time. If that's what it must be, then we must call it what it is. This is no case for an euphemism. This is no case where we should be using words other than those which accurately describe the situation. This is a case where there is undoubtedly room for differences of opinion, and perhaps in choosing euphemisms, differences of opinion will never be resolved. But the key issue here, Mr. Speaker, is not a matter of difference of opinion.

The key issue is a matter of difference of fact. It is a fact that \$60 million was lost on the sale of marketable securities. It doesn't matter how many opinions we have about that matter, whether they're just opinions, whether they're informed opinions, or whether they're expert opinions. There was a \$60 million . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I have to draw to the hon. member's attention that he has exceeded his allotted time.

MR. SINDLINGER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, in rising to participate in the subamendment, I certainly have a number of comments I wish to make a little later on, with respect to the amendment and the regret that I think all members of this Assembly should have with respect to this outrageous resolution before the House this evening.

Mr. Speaker, dealing with the subamendment, the question we have to address is whether we should — to use an expression I think you noted some days ago — be using plain English language; whether we are going to call something as it is. To suggest, as did the hon. Government House Leader the other day both inside and outside the House, that what we're looking at is time management, is nonsense. What we're looking at, Mr. Speaker, is closure. I think the people of Alberta have to recognize that this government is bringing in a closure resolution. The members of this House have to recognize when they vote, and be answerable to their constituents when they go back home, that they are dealing with a closure resolution, not time management, not a clever little euphemism that you might find in the Harvard business school vocabulary but, in plain simple English language, closure.

Mr. Speaker, in examining this issue, in my judgment we have to look at some of the arguments presented by the hon. Government House Leader today in his resolution today on closure. He cited other parliaments. He talked about the time set aside for the estimates in the Mother of Parliaments in Westminster. He talked about the time set aside for the estimates in the House of Commons and examined the precedents in other provinces. When I get into the more general discussion on the amendment, I'll deal with some of those issues.

Mr. Speaker, I would draw to your attention the observation made by the Rt. Hon. John George Diefenbaker, who probably forgot more about parliamentary procedure during his lifetime than those of us in this House will ever learn, both on the government and the opposition sides. He made the observation about the

Westminster precedent. He talks about closure. I want to cite page 4033 of the federal *Hansard*, May 17, 1956. He talks about the situation in Westminster. He says:

Some mention was made today of the fact that in Britain from time to time they apply closure. They have a means in the House of Commons in Britain of securing the facts from any government. They have the right at their disposal, at adjournment time, to move for the discussion of any matter in respect of which they have not received the information that they desire. If closure is brought into effect, it is brought into effect after consultation and determination as between the parties and the Speaker . . .

That's the late Mr. Diefenbaker's observation in 1956 about closure in Westminster, "between the parties and the Speaker". What kind of consultation did we have on this matter? Let me tell you. In a typical Alberta Conservative way, on a unilateral basis, we have the Government House Leader giving oral notice that he's ramming through this motion of closure, and then we euphemistically call it time management. Well, Mr. Speaker, as the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo has correctly pointed out, if it walks like a duck, swims like a duck, and quacks like a duck, let us call it a duck. In this case, if it looks like closure, if it's worded like closure, if it has the impact of closure — which is to snuff out legitimate free speech and debate in this House and impose a rigid timetable — then, Mr. Speaker, it must be called as it is. It's closure.

Mr. Speaker, if this government were serious about time management, they would have looked at other options. Indeed, if they were concerned about time management, they might have examined their own course of action over the last six or seven weeks. I recall when we began to study the estimates in more detail. At first, hon. members on the government side thought it was a big joke, and that this little opposition would run out of steam in a matter of three or four days. If hon. members recall, we had the ministers filibustering themselves. For the first time in the history of this Legislature, we had the hon. Minister of Energy and Natural Resources come into committee and read an entire contract into the record — well, almost an entire contract. He forgot to read the most relevant portions of the contract, but for over two hours he labored — and I might say in a very laborious way — through the details of a contract which was signed three years before, not even a current contract. We get all the government members so ready to bounce up on a point of order or a point of privilege. We're not dealing with the current year's estimate. Here we have a contract that had been signed some time ago read into the estimates, because we had a government that was so cocksure of itself that this little opposition would run out of steam, and wouldn't it be clever.

These are the time management boys, Mr. Speaker. Well, if they were so concerned about time management, perhaps they could have spent a little more time on those occasions answering questions, instead of doing their own filibuster. But then they find that, because the people of Alberta are asking legitimate questions, the hon. Leader of the Opposition and the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo are right. I know they're getting calls and letters from people all over the province. The calls I receive in my office are: what has this government got to hide on this issue? Why are they trying to close down the Legislature and boot the members out before we have an opportunity even to get the special report of the Auditor General? We had the Provincial Treasurer make the announcement the other day that the Auditor General is

going to be assigned to do a special report. But you know, if this government were serious about time management and about doing the public business in public, they would have recessed the House for four or five weeks, brought us back in the middle of January or whenever the Auditor General finishes his report, and then we could have studied the estimate and dealt with Bill 69 on the basis of the Auditor General's special report. Who's to say there will even be a spring session? The Premier could dissolve the Legislature and call an election. So there may not even be a spring session. Who's to say?

I'm saying to the members of this House, let's not try to kid the people of Alberta about time management. If they were concerned about using the time expeditiously, we wouldn't have had the little government mini-filibuster. It didn't amount to too much, I might say, but it lasted for a while, until irritation set in. If they were really concerned about time management, they would have recessed the House so we could have had full debate after the Auditor General's special select report on this matter of the marketable securities and the \$60 million, which is still unexplained. No, Mr. Speaker, they chose not to do that. Instead we have a motion introduced by the Government House Leader, with most of the government members quietly looking down — as well they should — during this debate. If I were a government member, I wouldn't want to go back and have to justify voting for this kind of motion to my constituents.

Mr. Speaker, let there be no doubt about what this kind of motion is. This is a closure motion. While I want to get into some detail a few minutes later about why I regret that we have come to this rather sad and sorry state in the affairs of this Legislature, that we have to introduce this kind of motion at all, let's at least be honest with the people of Alberta and call it what it is. There's absolutely no doubt at all that this is a motion of closure.

Some hon. members on the government side may say, oh, it's indelicate to talk about closure. We don't need to say that in the motion. We're not running a public relations firm here. This Legislature, believe it or not, is not the public relations adjunct of the Conservative Party. Sometimes I wonder if members realize that, but it isn't. This is a Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that closure is recognized, first of all in our *Standing Orders*, as the Member for Calgary Buffalo indicated. Standing Order 20, *Beauchesne*, Citation 334, and *Erskine May* deal with closure. Mr. Speaker, the point is that we have a government here which is invoking closure and muzzling free speech in the Legislature, but is using language and euphemisms which attempt to masquerade to the public what they are really doing. This subamendment clearly eliminates any doubt in the minds of the people of Alberta what the government is doing. I say to hon. members of this House that I'm sure there may be differences among the members of the opposition, but over the next weeks we would welcome the opportunity to debate this closure motion and the necessity for it anywhere in this province, in service clubs and community organizations, wherever people are prepared to debate. I would challenge government members. Beyond the dimensions of this House, I say to the people of Alberta that if they are interested, as I'm sure they are, in seeing debates being held . . . I recall a debate I had four or five years ago with the hon. Member for Taber-Warner in his constituency. I think that's a useful thing. I say to

members of the House and to Albertans that I welcome the opportunity — and I know other members of the opposition would — to debate with hon. members of the government side, riding by riding, what they are doing here tonight, tomorrow, or whenever this infamous motion finally comes to a vote.

No, Mr. Speaker, closure is closure. It's not necessary, it's regrettable, it's absolutely inexcusable, but that's another debate. I'll come to why I regret it in a moment. But at least, Mr. Speaker, at this point in time, the subamendment says very clearly that it is closure as opposed to time management. Let us recognize it as such and be accountable to our constituents and to the people of Alberta for whatever vote we cast on this motion.

DR. BUCK: Get the muzzles off.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the . . .

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to take part in the debate this evening. In your wisdom you have ruled that "puppet" is an unparliamentary term. But it seems that when the muzzles are on, we're not going to hear from the government members. It's very, very interesting that we have a government that tries to mislead not only this Legislature, but the people of this province by having the audacity to talk about time management.

The Tory hordes have finally met their match. They have finally decided that they cannot manipulate this Legislature as if it is a toy of their own. But most importantly, Mr. Speaker, while they're playing games with members on this side who are duly elected to represent their constituencies and also the views of about 40 per cent of the people of this province, they finally can't steam-roller and they just can't have it the way they always would like to have it. I find that very, very interesting. How the mighty have fallen, how the great Tory machine has ground to a halt, by five little opposition members. But behind those five little opposition members are at least 40 per cent of the electorate of this province, in many cases more opposition votes than government votes that brought the 73 into this Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, I feel very badly that we are upsetting the plans of my Tory colleagues across the way, the Cadillac Conservatives who may be wanting to go to Hawaii. Maybe some of the airplanes are waiting for them. So be it. They are charged with the responsibility of looking after the affairs of this province. We are charged with the responsibility of making sure they operate above board, making sure they are answerable to the people of this province, and they have the audacity to invoke closure because it is inconvenient for them, because they say we are wasting time. I will not recycle that part of the debate because it has been given by the hon. Leader of the Opposition and other members on this side, indicating we have been responsible in our duties in this Legislature, that we have given the government the opportunity to come clean, as it is, to tell the people of this province what happened with the \$60 million.

Mr. Speaker, I was at a meeting in my constituency last week on a matter to do with power. I'd like to give a very, very friendly word of caution to my arrogant Tory friends across the way. At that meeting, about 50 people . . .

MR. PURDY: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I think we had a ruling in the Legislature last week that the hon. member had to withdraw the word "arrogant". I'm not

sure, but I think that was from the Member for Edmonton Mill Woods.

DR. BUCK: If the shoe fits, wear it.

MR. PURDY: The member should withdraw it.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, arrogant means pompous. Arrogant means knowing all. If the government feels that's the way they are, the term is arrogant.

MR. SPEAKER: I invite the hon. member to consider whether he was elected to this Assembly to cast reflections on the personalities of other members in the House or to debate issues before the House. I assume a certain amount of sarcasm and edge may creep in in the ordinary course of debate. It might even happen when the Speaker is speaking. But I hope the hon. member would agree that, like the rest of us, he was elected to deal with the substantial matters which come before the House and not to reflect on the choices which other voters have made of the persons to represent them in the Assembly, because that's totally irrelevant. To describe one's colleagues as arrogant has absolutely nothing to do with the merits of the topic under debate.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, to me arrogance means when a large assembly, a large body . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I know what arrogance means.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, maybe some of the hon. members across the way don't understand that it . . .

MR. SPEAKER: There's a dictionary over there.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, when a government is so all powerful that it believes it cannot be questioned on any matter, when it believes it is above being questioned about the expenditure of the taxpayers' funds, when it believes it is above answering to this Assembly and to the people of this province, I don't know what other term to use. But if the hon. deputy speaker finds that not to his liking, I won't use it too many more times.

Mr. Speaker, why, in the first time in the history of this province, is a large majority trying to steam-roller a little opposition because the opposition is trying to do its job? We have not interfered with the process of passing legislation. We have responsibly questioned legislation. When a government, after weeks and weeks, does not supply this Legislature, this opposition, the people of this province, with information that should be available, when the Attorney General in his wisdom speaks to the Canadian Bar Association and says, there's no need for freedom of information in this province, I think it's time this government had a look at itself.

MR. CRAWFORD: Don't tell me you're listening to my speech, Walt.

DR. BUCK: No, I don't listen to the hon. minister's speeches. It was summarized in printed form, because no one understands the hon. minister's speeches. We couldn't even understand when the minister brought his motion in Friday for closure.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could rise on a point of order. I don't want to interrupt the hon.

member, but I wouldn't want the hon. member to feel constrained in his use of language. I see that Citation 320 of *Beauchesne*, page 110, deals with what is unparliamentary and what is not. Mr. Speaker, I refer you to the bottom part: "Since 1958, it has been ruled parliamentary to use the following expressions", and included in those following expressions is "arrogant ... *Debates*, May 19, 1970, p. 7087".

MR. SPEAKER: I'm aware of that citation. In fact, I just happen to have the book open at the same page. But I believe it has also been said by some fairly eminent speakers — I can't recall their names at the moment — that the question of what is parliamentary and what is not parliamentary is sometimes hard to define. It's hard to draw a line. There have been conflicting rulings on some of these words. There have been occasions when they're called unparliamentary, and some occasions when they're not. I suppose if you wanted to make a real comparison, you'd have to look at the context in some cases. However, whether it's parliamentary or unparliamentary, it's totally irrelevant to the matter under discussion to assess the motives or the characters of hon. members. So whether it's unparliamentary or not is really not of any great consequence. It's irrelevant.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, with great respect, I'd hardly suggest it's irrelevant. As one looks at the debates in other parliaments, on every closure motion without exception — and one could quote you chapter and verse the present hon. Leader of the Federal Opposition, Mr. Diefenbaker; Mr. Knowles, or for that matter Mr. King when he was Leader of the Opposition, or Westminster or other parliaments — there was never debate over the question of closure where the issue of the government's overall attitude has not been characterized as arrogant.

It is not a question of aiming that barb at an individual member, but quite a different thing in examining the overall position of a government. Mr. Speaker, I would say to members of this House and to you that on page 110 *Beauchesne* is quite clear. The context in which the hon. Member for Clover Bar was using the term "arrogant" was not aimed at an individual member at all, but was aimed at an attitude which has led the government to introduce a motion of closure in the same way that ...

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. We're getting nowhere with this. I didn't really start an argument or intend to start an argument on the question of whether it was parliamentary or unparliamentary. I'm saying it's irrelevant. My understanding was that it was applied to certain members of this Assembly. That is my concern. If it's applied to anybody other than members of the Assembly, then I'm not concerned. The fact of the matter is it's irrelevant.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, when we see a large, large majority indicating their displeasure with Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition, invoking closure, the action of that body is arrogant. I do not call any government member arrogant; I am calling the government arrogant.

In the many years I've been in this Assembly, I don't think I've ever seen the estimates as well combed and as well studied as they have been in this fall session.

MR. SPEAKER: While we're on the topic of relevance, might I just remind the hon. member that if I remember

correctly, we're debating a subamendment. It's really a matter of text or semantics as to whether we're going to use two words of one kind or two words of another kind. I think everyone knows that the purpose of an amendment is ordinarily to narrow the area of debate that focusses it. Hon. members know that when an amendment is being discussed, the rules of relevance are far stricter than when the main motion is being discussed. But when a subamendment is being discussed, then the rules of relevance are even more strict than that, because that further narrows the area which was set out in the amendment. Therefore, may I respectfully suggest to the hon. member that he confine his remarks to the choice of words, because all we're involved in here is that there is going to be one set of words or another. That's the topic.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Speaker, a point of order in regard to your ruling. I submit to you that there's more than a case of semantics here in using "closure" as opposed to "time management", because both those phrases, if we can call them that, are very broad ...

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. As the hon. member knows, I'm not at liberty to engage in debate with him with regard to what I've just said.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, in trying to establish that closure is being invoked, we must establish why the government has taken that route. The government has made the charge that Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition has been wasting time. Mr. Speaker, I am saying to you and to members of this Assembly that that is not so. In its arrogance and in its haste to have the session come to a close, the government is invoking closure. I feel that I am very relevant when I start discussing that we have never had the opportunity to examine the estimates in depth the way we have examined them this fall. That is why the burr is under the saddle. A rose is a rose is a rose, but a guillotine is a guillotine is a guillotine. The government is bringing the guillotine down, and I would like to know why.

Mr. Speaker, I am suggesting to you that the government has indicated they're trying to time-manage and that they're so concerned about more pressing responsibilities, that for the first time in the history of this province they wish to invoke closure. I humbly submit that it is very, very important that we on this side of the House have the opportunity to study the estimates in great detail. When we study those estimates in great detail, we may be saving the taxpayers of this province millions and millions of dollars. Had we studied Kananaskis in great detail, it might not have gone from \$40 million to \$210 million-odd, and the Health Sciences Centre from \$84 million to \$300 million plus. That's the responsibility of the members of this Assembly. This is why we are saying it is our responsibility to study in detail and not have closure and vote.

AN HON. MEMBER: Agreed.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, that's why I wanted to get into the amount of time being spent on the estimates.

It is so very interesting, Mr. Speaker, to look back at a smiling young man and the guideposts of the Progressive Conservative Party of Alberta: What Do We Stand For? I well remember sitting on that side of the House listening to the Leader of the Official Opposition on this side of the House talking about returning the action to the Legis-



lature. Very interesting; very sound. It sold well. It made him Premier. But now what happens? We say no, that was fine for a campaign promise, but now that we're here . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I remind the hon. member of the text of the subamendment. It simply says, strike out the words "time management" and substitute "closure".

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I [inaudible].

MR. SPEAKER: Well, sometimes I have difficulty seeing the point on the horizon, even with binoculars. But if it's closer than that, I welcome it.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, we believe what the quotation says about making public laws in public. We have had . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. What has that to do with the choice of terms here? I respect the hon. member if he's anti-semantic, but we're involved here in a semantic exercise. That's what the subamendment is.

DR. BUCK: Speaking to closure, Mr. Speaker, we are asking this Legislature to invoke closure. We are striking out "time management" and substituting "closure". What is the difference? The difference is that the first one is a fine Tory phrase for not wanting to call it like it is. The people of this province will not be misled. They will not be misled by the Tory term "time management" in the public good and other business. They are invoking closure. They're saying to members of this Assembly, you cannot speak any longer, because we have decreed that's the way it's going to be. We're talking about closure — brutal, hard, cold-blooded closure.

AN HON. MEMBER: Premeditated closure.

DR. BUCK: Premeditated, Mr. Speaker, by that side of the House. I could go on about the holidays, but we won't get into the holidays because we're speaking of closure. [interjections] The Tories will get their chance, Mr. Speaker. We hope. If they take the muzzles off. Maybe the Provincial Treasurer has gone to find out if he can or not, so we can hear from the Tory side why they are invoking closure.

Mr. Speaker, it's a sad day in the history of this province, a sad day for democracy, when a large, unfeeling majority tries to impose its views and its large majority, basically to stamp out dissent, to stamp out the opportunity to ask questions we feel should be answered. That is why it is closure. The government cannot hide behind any other terms.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question on the subamendment?

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I feel some things should be said with regard to this amendment. There is no question about the fact that this government wants to bring closure on the opposition and take away our right of freedom of speech. They talk about time management; how they can manage the time and control everything. Mr. Speaker, it's like the Premier who wants to put a pamphlet in all schools across the province. They want to

control the minds of the young people. That's only brain control. Here we have time control; it's just a little transfer of the same concept. They really want to take advantage of the young people of this province and convince them they should just follow through and vote for one kind of government. It's a kind of closure, I guess. Here we really have closure, though, at its worst in terms of what it's doing to us as members of this Legislature.

I have to say, Mr. Speaker, that what's going on in terms of this motion is closure. Therefore, it's very necessary that we substitute the word "closure" for time management. It's regrettable that I have to stand in my place and say that's what this government is doing. Members on that side of the House have stood in their places and condemned the concept. Maybe that's why they want to sneak closure in under the door in terms of time management. A couple of hon. members want to go home and take it easy because they don't care what goes on in parliament anyway. [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: That is definitely unparliamentary. The hon. member is personally attacking other members and saying they don't care what goes on in parliament. Even if it were true, it wouldn't be allowed to be said.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Speaker, to your point of order. I agree that was unparliamentary, and that member should not be saying things like that even if it is true.

MR. SPEAKER: May I express my extreme gratitude to the hon. member.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, with that reprimand, I withdraw.

As I was saying, members of this Legislature have stood in their places and condemned the concept of closure that has been brought into this Legislature by the motion which has been amended, and how there is a subamendment, which I'm speaking to.

I refer to *Hansard* of [October] 24, 1980. Through a question, Dr. C. Anderson indicates his concern about closure, and raises it in this Assembly.

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, could you advise the Assembly how the horrendous use of closure in the House of Commons last night affects the timing of the decisions arrived at yesterday at the meeting in Winnipeg?

Mr. Speaker, the government doesn't want to use that word "closure". They wanted to slip it in here and say "time management", a concept they were against. But we know the word that should be in this amendment — and that was an oversight on my part — is really "closure". Government members recognize the bad effects of closure.

Let's take the hon. House leader. How did he react to that question? How did he feel about closure, something that's happening in this House. The hon. House leader, Mr. Crawford, said:

One doesn't know whether or not to believe the most outrageous statements made, but the contemptible use of closure in Parliament yesterday may well be calculated to try to achieve a tentative legislative result prior to a decision by the courts.

He was going to try to take things away from the courts, condemning the use of closure at the same time.

On page 1217, October 24, 1980, hon. government members talk about closure again. This is Dr. Paproski.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question to the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The hon. leader has been in this House a fair number of years. It would seem to me that we have reached the stage where we use parliamentary language, and we don't refer to other members personally but by their constituency. [interjection] They're not here under their own names; they're here to represent constituencies.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I agree with you. I was quoting the name of the person from *Hansard*. That's the way we have it listed in *Hansard*. It isn't by constituency; it's by name, and I quoted as such. My apologies, Mr. Speaker, I won't let it happen again. Sometimes it might. There are times in the heat of debate that these things happen, but I won't do it intentionally.

The question from the hon. Member for Edmonton Kingsway:

Regarding the matter of federal closure of the debate on the constitution and the serious consequences of that, which undoubtedly increases the confrontation between the federal and provincial governments, and which should cause ...

He goes on to say other things, indicating a concern about closure. And here we have it, the real thing; not time management — closure in this House.

But the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs, Mr. Johnston, responded with regard to closure:

Mr. Speaker, I think last night all Canada experienced perhaps one of the most repugnant and reprehensible moves of parliamentary power I have seen in some time.

The most reprehensible use of power he has ever seen.

I think the use of the closure movement last night to gag the official opposition will go much beyond the precedents set in the pipeline debate and "the flag debate, two important uses of closure in our history. When it's used in such a fundamental way — to challenge the rights of all Canadians and all provinces to have a free expression of their views ...

And here it's the constitution.

Mr. Speaker, the same principles apply with regard to closure here. The government should be concerned about it. From the resolution, I know they want to call it time management but because of the concern we have, I think it should be called closure. The government should be ashamed of that. Let's call it as it is. If the government doesn't think it's closure, they can stand up and tell us.

Again, Mr. Speaker, backbenchers are sitting here waiting eagerly to tell us what they feel with regard to these amendments. Is it closure, or is it not? Do they really stand for closure, or do they not? Is it time management, or is it not. We don't know. When they speak one time, they're against closure. They talk about time management here, but when we look at the reality of the motion, it is closure. So we put it into the amendment. I certainly raise it for hon. members on that side of the House to react if they can. If not, we'll vote it in as closure.

[Mr. Speaker declared the motion lost. Several members rose calling for a division. The division bell was rung]

[Three minutes having elapsed, the House divided]

For the motion:

Buck	Notley	Speaker, R.
Mandeville	Sindlinger	

MR. SPEAKER: I'm just wondering about the Leader of the Opposition. It was my recollection that on a recorded vote, everyone in the Assembly must vote. I didn't see him stand on it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: He was first.

MR. SPEAKER: I apologize. I want you to know that if there was any implication about that against the Leader of the Opposition, I withdraw it right now.

Against the motion:

Adair	Gogo	Musgreave
Anderson, C.	Hiebert	Osterman
Anderson, D.	Hyland	Pahl
Batiuk	Hyndman	Paproski
Bogle	Johnston	Pengelly
Borstad	King	Purdy
Bradley	Knaak	Russell
Campbell	Kowalski	Shaben
Chichak	Koziak	Stevens
Clark	Kroeger	Stromberg
Cook	Kushner	Thompson
Cookson	LeMessurier	Topolnisky
Crawford	Lysons	Webber
Cripps	McCrae	Wolstenholme
Diachuk	Miller	Woo
Fjordbotten	Moore	

Totals:	Ayes - 5	Noes - 47
---------	----------	-----------

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to offer a few comments on the main amendment. Since we've had a debate on the subamendment, I like to recall members' attention to the amendment itself.

This Assembly formally expresses its deep regret at having to employ the above noted time management mechanisms in an effort to speed the business of the Assembly so that members need not be too inconvenienced by the exercise by Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition of their legitimate right to freedom of speech.

At the outset, I want to say that I am going to use the term "time management". In our system of government it's interesting that the supremacy of Parliament is based on the assumption that whatever Parliament decides is legal. It may not be sensible. It may not be reasonable. As a matter of fact, the dictum is that if Parliament decides the world is flat and water can run up hill, then the world is flat and water can run up hill. That's the theory of the supremacy of Parliament.

Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt in the minds of Albertans that what we're dealing with is closure; no question about that. But because we have voted down the amendment which says that it's closure by 48 to 5, I will refer to it in proper parliamentary fashion as time management, even though nobody in Alberta will see it as time management; even though you know that it quacks like a duck and swims like a duck and waddles like a duck, it's now a turkey. [laughter] I call it time management, Mr. Speaker, in deference to our parliamentary tradition, because we would not want to do anything that is unparliamentary in the course of this debate.

Dealing with the decision to bring in, to ram through this Legislature, a time management resolution totally inconsistent with freedom of speech, perhaps we might begin by looking at the question of freedom of speech itself. It seems to me that that's where we have to begin.

Citation 55 from *Beauchesne*:

The privilege of freedom of speech is both the least questioned and the most fundamental right of the Member of Parliament on the floor of the House and in committee. It is primarily guaranteed in the British Bill of Rights which declared "that the freedom of speech and debates or proceedings in Parliament ought not to be impeached or questioned in any court or place outside of Parliament".

Mr. Speaker, the privilege of freedom of speech is both the least questioned and the most fundamental right of a Member of Parliament. What the amendment says tonight is that this Assembly regrets the government's decision to invoke time management and deprive the members of the loyal opposition of their legitimate right to freedom of speech, that most fundamental right of Members of Parliament.

In addressing this question, Mr. Speaker, I suppose we have to examine a number of the arguments presented by the government in defence of this odious motion. The first, the proposal made not only inside the House, but more extensively on television outside the House . . . It's always interesting to watch government members. One almost senses a bit of envy because from time to time our little opposition find themselves on television. But government members are pretty good at getting on television too, even if we sometimes have to pay for it at public expense. But setting that aside for a moment, the argument has been made outside on television, carried widely in the province, that we have to ram this time management motion through the House, because the opposition is wasting time, because the opposition filibuster is delaying public business. Mr. Speaker, as members of this Assembly, we are not in a position to sit here and accept that kind of statement in a blind way. I say to hon. members on the government side, show members of this House, and through the members of this House, demonstrate to the people of Alberta what public business is now being delayed, what public business must now be dealt with.

Mr. Speaker, we have before us the estimates of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund capital works division, that small 12 per cent which the Legislature can allocate. We also have the appropriation Bill which allocates 30 per cent to the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. But none of this legislation has to be passed now. We are not dealing with estimates that begin until April 1, 1982. So I say to hon. members on the government side as they make that allegation outside the House, demonstrate what public business is being stopped at this stage, why it is necessary to bring in a time management resolution, as opposed to the suggestion made by several members inside the House and by people in various groups, from the working media to organizations outside the House, that say recess until we get the report of the Auditor General on the \$60 million loss. Hon. members have to be able to justify their action of bringing in this disguised form of closure. In order to do that, they have to demonstrate what Bills are being held up.

Mr. Speaker, when one looks at the great pipeline debate of 1956, and what a very odious example of trampling on the rights of Parliament that was, at least there was some thin relationship between the need to act and the action of the Liberal government of that time, which was so properly condemned by the Conservative and CCF opposition. The question was simply that in order to meet certain contractual obligations, a timetable had to be met. But we're not dealing with any timetable

at the present time. We're dealing solely with the convenience of members of this Assembly, not with any timetable that has to be met. No contracts have to be signed in the next two or three weeks or, if there are, we have not heard a single example cited. What's the rush? Why do we have to bring in this kind of motion? Well, Mr. Speaker, the members of the government have to be able to justify to their constituents. It's not simply good enough to say, as the hon. Government House Leader did the other day, that in the House of Commons they allow — what was it — 25 days, and 29 days in the British House of Commons. Those are agreements made as a result of interparty co-operation, discussion, and agreement.

I cited the example of Mr. Diefenbaker's observations about closure in the House of Commons relating to agreement among the parties and the Speaker. But we're not dealing with that sort of situation here, Mr. Speaker. We're not dealing with any urgency. We're not dealing with a Bill the government feels must be passed being held up. At this stage we're dealing with convenience, and convenience alone, for the government members of this Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, what do we mean when we talk about freedom of speech? Surely one of the most elementary aspects of freedom of speech in a Legislative Assembly is to properly examine the estimates. Our whole system of government is based on parliamentary control of the purse strings. I suppose there are really two principal sets, if you like, of underpinnings, or the foundation on which parliamentary government exists. One is the control of the purse strings I've just described; the other is that legislation must be duly presented to the House, properly debated in public, and passed through certain stages set out in our standing rules handed down over the ages to guarantee the public's right to know. These two fundamental underpinnings of the system require the right of members to be able to participate fully.

Mr. Speaker, we've been able to do that on the Bills. There has been good discussion on the Bills. As some hon. members have pointed out, we've even had useful discussion for the first time on third reading. . None of the Bills the government has set on their priority list has been held up. I ask hon. government members to name me one Bill that has been held up as a result of our thorough investigation of the estimates. Of course, nor has, with the exception of Bill 69, the appropriation Act. Bill 69 doesn't have to be passed until April 1, nor do the estimates. At least, they don't have to be passed in the next few days.

Mr. Speaker, the question then is, what has occurred during the fall session? As hon. members on this side of the House have pointed out, a detailed examination of the estimates has occurred. Some have called it a filibuster, but I really question whether that is an accurate description because, for the First time, members of this House or members of the Committee of Supply have obtained more information on the estimates.

Mr. Speaker, let me just cast members' minds back to the discussion we had in the select committee on the Heritage Savings Trust Fund a little over a year ago when we found out the government had mismanaged things on Kananaskis, how this little project announced at \$40 million, as a result of the shrewd business management of this government, blossomed to \$200 million. The case of the loaves and the fishes; no question about that; the multiplicity of dollars whenever we get into a Conservative government project. But when we began to examine

that in the heritage trust fund committee, the hon. minister and several of the government members quite properly said, where were members both on the government and the opposition side when this matter was discussed in the Heritage Trust Fund estimates? That was a valid point.

Mr. Speaker, as a result of the extensive investigation, analysis, and evaluation of the estimates this fall, members of the opposition have been doing the job which traditionally we are obliged to do: raise questions, insist on accountability, demand answers. Frankly, we've not made much progress on the \$60 million, but we'll get into that as we discuss this matter further during the night, or the morning, or however long this discussion takes place, and it could take some time.

Mr. Speaker, I'll come to that \$60 million, but I want to deal with the issue of the examination of the estimates, which is part of the time management resolution which will whisk away the right of Albertans to have these estimates properly examined. We had the discussion the other day with the hon. Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care. I thought it was a useful discussion. I don't always agree with the hon. Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care. The vast majority of my constituency and I disagree with at least one major decision of that particular minister. But I'll set that aside for a moment, because I don't want to spend time discussing the Berwyn hospital tonight. But I do say to the hon. minister and to members of this House that during the discussion of those estimates, we had a remarkable confession by the minister, a sign of humility by this minister who stood in the House and told us that he wasn't happy with the situation at the Walter C. MacKenzie health centre. Nor should he be. He wasn't happy with the bungling of the administration. I'm not suggesting anybody did anything dishonest, but there was absolutely no question that there was mismanagement. We had a minister who quite properly stood in his place in front of the Committee of Supply, coming back asking for more money, but admitting there had been serious mistakes.

I regret that, with all these government members here, more government members weren't participating, finding out that kind of information, and getting it on the record. But I give credit to the minister for laying out some of the problems, some of the amazing problems — change orders they discover in somebody's desk. They open up the desk and there they are. A desk full of change orders, authorizing public money without proper accounting, reporting, or anything else. I was amazed. I give the minister enormous credit that he could stand in the Committee of Supply with a straight face and make a report like that. A drawer full of change orders.

This government, the group of people who in 1971 were running around the province with their little attache cases saying they were the business-like types; they would bring briskness and good business management to this government. Ten years down the road we're into a major project and, according to the estimates, it's now going to cost us \$500 million and some. It wasn't going to cost us that when the Premier made the announcement. We find a trail of mismanagement of public funds that came to light by a minister reporting properly, honestly, and straightforwardly to the Committee of Supply. Mr. Speaker, that's the sort of thing we need to know.

I was interested too in listening to the observations of the Minister responsible for Workers' Health, Safety and Compensation. Here again a good deal of honest examination took place in discussion of that hon. minister's estimates. We find that only about a quarter of the \$1

million allocated was actually spent. Some \$50,000 was allocated to a university professor to study farmers, which is very nice. But, as I said at the time, I think we need less study of farmers and more encouragement of farmers to take out workers' compensation. That's another kind of thing that came to light as a result of the exercise in this Committee of Supply of the freedom of speech which *Beauchesne* cites as our most fundamental though least mentioned freedom, why we're here and what is at stake in preserving our democratic system.

Mr. Speaker, I regret very much that tonight we're in a situation where we have to deal with this kind of amendment. I think it's regrettable in the extreme. As the Leader of the Opposition pointed out when this matter was first debated, there were other options. It would have been possible to have tabled the management letters. It would have been appropriate for the hon. Provincial Treasurer to have told the Assembly and advised the Committee of Supply just what system was being put in place to protect the public dollars.

I find it interesting that we're told we can't have this information in Alberta, whereas in two provinces, Quebec and P.E.I., it would be automatically made available. In Manitoba and Ontario the Public Accounts Committee could ask for and obtain that kind of information. In the case of Ontario, it might be due to the fact that for six years they had a minority government. But whether or not that is the reason is quite irrelevant. That kind of information can be made public. But in Alberta we're told we can't have it.

Mr. Speaker, in my judgment that is an infringement of the basic right of freedom of speech. Freedom of speech is not something which can be looked at in a total vacuum. Freedom of speech must also be based on having access to information. Not just wads and wads and wads of irrelevant documents, but relevant information. When members on both sides of the House — it's irrelevant which side it comes from — request relevant information, if the government is serious about its concern for freedom of speech, that kind of information should be made available. Without it, freedom of speech becomes at best just an idle phrase without the pith and substance.

Mr. Speaker, I want to deal with one other important element in this entire debate, one of the reasons that, quite frankly, I feel most strongly that our legitimate freedom of speech has been obstructed. We have to ask ourselves the reason for that. If we're going to deal with a resolution that has to be made available through the Votes and Proceedings, widely distributed throughout the province of Alberta — indeed, made available to some school children, and we wouldn't want to mislead school children, would we, Mr. Speaker — it seems to me that we have to use clear and plain language.

Why are we ramming this time management motion through the House? Is it because there is some contract, some obligation of a public nature that clearly must be met? Is there some time frame standing between now and the next few days? Have we, unbeknownst to members of the opposition, suddenly changed our financial year from April 1-March 31, and now it's January 1-December 31? Did we change that? Not that I know, Mr. Speaker. It seems to me the only reason we're doing it is because of the personal convenience of members.

Mr. Speaker, if that's the reason, hon. members have to say so and be accountable for it. You can't say one thing when in fact you're doing something else. You have to be accountable for the reasons you advance. I have not

been able to fathom, in listening to the hon. Government House Leader, both today or for that matter when he gave oral notice ... I should say listening to other members of the government, but the sad reflection of this entire debate is that not another single member of the government caucus has risen to defend the minister at this stage. The poor hon. Government House Leader. Gee whiz. That's not going to do things at all. If the Premier goes to Ottawa and we have a leadership race, I certainly hope there is a little more support than we've seen today from members of the caucus. I'm really, really sad.

It concerns me, Mr. Speaker, because I know the hon. Government House Leader, while trying to ram this time management resolution through the House, is one of the few Red Tories left on the front bench. I would encourage his prospects. But I don't think they're very good because none of the government members is there to support the minister. They're all holding their heads, downcast or, at best, laughing at the minister.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly wouldn't want to engage in any partisan comments. I'm sure hon. members would agree with that. But I do want to put forward a subamendment which will clarify for all hon. members what we're doing. I would like to move a subamendment which would add these words after the end of the amendment:

... and so that members with other business outside this House to attend to need be inconvenienced no further.

[Mr. Purdy in the Chair]

Mr. Speaker, the subamendment very clearly says that the reason we're ramming this through is not public business but the convenience of the members.

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

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, have the subamendments been distributed to all members?

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: I believe the pages are now distributing them.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, maybe it's only proper that the members get them in their hands before we decide if we call the motion or not. Otherwise, we could be accused of trying to speed up with undue haste the business of the Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, we are adding the subamendment so that members with other business outside this House to attend to need be inconvenienced no further. Staying in the narrow confines of that, we would not like to inconvenience the government if hon. members on the government side have other very pressing responsibilities. I realize they do have pressing responsibilities. They have to get out of here to tell the people of Alberta what happened to the \$60 million. If that's not pressing, Mr. Speaker, I don't know what is. My little friend, the little blue pig that the money being saved for the future goes into, and nothing comes out — the people to whom that money belongs would like to know from government backbenchers what is happening with their money. So maybe that's why there is due haste. This is why the government is going to invoke closure. Mr. Speaker, maybe they want to go out. They are in a very big hurry to get out to their people and tell them why they would

not stand up on public platforms last time and debate the issues. Maybe that's why they want to get out with such haste.

Is it because they wish to get out and indicate to the educators of this province why funding is being cut back? Maybe they want to go out and tell the doctors why they cannot have adequate funding. Mr. Speaker, maybe they want to tell that same story to the nurses. Or maybe they want to go out and tell the farmers that because of the badgering of the official opposition and members on the opposition side they finally found \$136 million to save the beef industry in this province. Maybe that's why they're in a hurry to get out.

AN HON. MEMBER: Don't forget about water diversion.

DR. BUCK: Water diversion. Maybe they want to really come clean. [laughter]

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would ask for order in the gallery.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I think the longer the people in the galleries — this building belongs to the people in galleries ...

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. Members of the Assembly have a right on the floor, but people in the gallery do not have a right to any outbursts.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I think that you are very, very narrowly defining what this building belongs to. Surely the citizens and taxpayers do not have to sit there like ...

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. Will the hon. member come back to the subamendment.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I'm speaking for the freedom of the people this building belongs to. Members in the galleries are not acting disrespectfully. They are here, and we are their servants. Let's never forget that. I think this government too often forgets whom they serve. When I go to public meetings I tell my constituents, never let me forget that I serve you. You are my bosses. This government has long forgotten that. If I were a taxpayer in this province I would also be laughing at the scene in this Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, maybe the government would like to get out of here so they could consult with the chancellor of the University of Alberta, a past Tory, past president, a man I'm sure is there to make sure the universities retain their independence. That's the only reason I can see why we would have that kind of appointment. But no one would ever accuse this government of that being a political appointment, because we know the universities have their autonomy. The Tories must protect that autonomy by putting one of their own in there.

Mr. Speaker, maybe we're so worried about what's happening to our booze in this province that we have to have someone very independent as chairman of that organization. Mr. Speaker, it's a good thing we have a lot of Crown corporations, because otherwise we'd run out of places to put our good Tory friends. Mr. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs, we have to get out of here so that we can get back and find more jobs for retired Tory cabinet ministers.

Mr. Speaker, there is no reason why we should be

invoking closure. We should be in this Assembly until the taxpayers' and the Assembly's business is legitimately completed. We have not heard one voice, not even one voice, from the Tory side. Mr. Speaker, I could not sit in this Assembly as a person elected by my constituency and prostitute myself by sitting in silence. [interjections] That is a parliamentary English term, unless you understand prostituting one's self is not doing what should be done. Mr. Speaker, I cannot believe that a government backbencher would sit here for two and one-half hours and not have the backbone to stand up and enter in the debate. I can understand why the Member for Calgary Buffalo left that caucus. Some people will speak their voice and conscience. It's too bad there was only one. Mr. Speaker, if we are inconveniencing members by not allowing them to do what they are elected to do, and that is the taxpayers' business, I feel sorry for my Tory colleagues across the way.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Speaker, I want to speak on this one. It really gives me a great deal of pleasure to hear the Member for Calgary Buffalo stand up and say it's his obligation and duty to be here. Last spring I kept track of how many hours some of the hon. members across the way spent in the House.

DR. BUCK: Does she have the Premier's for comparison?

MRS. CRIPPS: I'm glad to see ... [interjections] Sit down, Walter. Five and a half hours out of 19 for the First week.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. The Chair has some difficulty with what the Member for Drayton Valley is presenting. I think we have to stick to the subamendment to the amendment.

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, the amendment says exactly that.

... so that Members [who have] other business outside this House to attend to need [not] be inconvenienced ....

The Member for Calgary Buffalo says we want to be out of the House, we don't want to be inconvenienced. The Member for Clover Bar talks about vacations. The Member for Little Bow talked about us getting out of the House early. The Member for Spirit River-Fairview saved it till last. He said the government's doing it for convenience. I've got track of his time in the House, too. It's less than half.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, shame.

MRS. CRIPPS: I've got a little green chart here, Mr. Speaker. Very interesting. I've been ... [interjections] I didn't bring yours down. But quite frankly, I'm really pleased to see that members are finally thinking that it's their duty to be in the House. It's really a pleasant change.

I know some hon. members don't like to do committee work, which is behind the scenes and doesn't get the front pages, but that's got to be done. That's the backroom work.

While I'm at it, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table a little

cademus cademus. Do you notice how closely it resembles the Socred pig over there?

AN HON. MEMBER: Which one?

MRS. CRIPPS: I didn't say that.

In view of its color, I suppose you could say it's a twin. This thing is called cademus cademus. There's only one. It's hand crafted, so I'm sorry I can't table a copy for each member. If you take the more common name of that cademus cademus, I think you would find that's what we're being played for by the opposition by the allegations made about the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, allegations that the opposition knows are untrue.

I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, I know I'm off the amendment.

MRS. OSTERMAN: You're in good company, Shirley.

MRS. CRIPPS: That's right. In any case, I'd just like to say that I'm really pleased to see the opposition taking their responsibility to heart, and I hope that next year my records will show a lot better attendance than this year.

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I want to respond to some of the comments that have been thrown about — I think with a fair bit of licence — tonight. I won't identify the member from the opposite side who met me on the parking lot one night last summer during the spring session and said, where have you been all day, Dave? I said, I've been in the House; the House has been in session. Oh, he said, I just finished a good 18-hole round of golf. I wouldn't want to identify him. He knows who he is.

DR. BUCK: What was your score?

AN HON. MEMBER: What's his handicap, David?

MR. RUSSELL: In seriousness, Mr. Speaker, to sit here and listen to some of the things that have been said, I think it's time some of the other side be put forward. A lot of what has been said tonight has related to freedom of speech, that sacred right which we all guard and know is a very valuable right. It also carries with it a great deal of responsibility. I think all of us in this Assembly, as we accept legislative office, assume that with rights go responsibilities. We'll leave it up to the citizens of Alberta to decide whether or not freedom of speech has been used in a responsible manner.

As a matter of fact, I've watched with a great deal of interest the absences in the House immediately after question period for the last several weeks. On days when I was able to, I made my way to my office and had to fight my way through the media scrum, the histrionics and displays about the secrecy and lack of freedom of speech. It's really been quite a performance. I've watched this with patience and not said anything. Then I think of Thursday of last week. We came to that most sacred private members' day, the day when the government can't do business. It is given over to the private members, making sure that two days a week private members in this Assembly have the right to put their views on the floor and make their ideas known. Under the rules of our House it guarantees them the freedom of speech they hold so sacred. What happened last Thursday? There wasn't a single private member from the opposite side present.

AN HON. MEMBER: Where were they?

MR. RUSSELL: Where were they?

MR. NOTLEY: Where were they, he asks.

MR. RUSSELL: We had to revert to government business in order to keep the House going. [interjections]

MR. NOTLEY: They couldn't carry one motion.

MR. RUSSELL: It was quite interesting, Mr. Speaker; the little Shakespearean Thespian from the corner seat down there.

AN HON. MEMBER: How do you spell that?

MR. RUSSELL: I'll remember that day long after I leave politics. I had to go around this side of the Assembly because this committee room was being used, so I came down — the sight of the Leader of the Opposition and the Member for Spirit River-Fairview frantically rushing into the Assembly, where they should have been but they'd been so busy outside having news conferences they were missing what was going on.

AN HON. MEMBER: Too many things to do.

MR. RUSSELL: I said, it's too late, boys; it's all over. The look of dismay on those anxious little faces. I'll carry it with me for a long time.

I relate those two stories, Mr. Speaker, to say that there are two parts to freedom of speech. There is the right and there is the responsibility. When we work as a whole entity in here, opposition and government together making up the Legislative Assembly of Alberta, I think each side has its rights, but each side also has its responsibilities.

We've been accused of hiding information. Today, I'll express my frank disappointment at my appearance with the select committee on the heritage trust fund this spring. I came armed with a great deal of information and had quite a number of officials with me, following by several months a news conference that had been held by the MacKenzie Health Sciences board explaining what was going on over there, ready if necessary to spend several days to go through the accounts which is the duty of that select committee, to look at past funds spent. We had difficulty stretching the whole five programs over an hour that morning. So there wasn't that thirst for information. There was no hiding of information. We were all there ready to give whatever was asked. Quite frankly, I'm startled that nobody has taken the time to suggest a visit to the MacKenzie Health Sciences Centre to see for themselves not only what a magnificent building it is but also where a great deal of public funds have been invested, mostly wisely but some not so wisely.

Reference was made to the excellent questioning that has gone on. I don't think that statement should be left unchallenged. We had questions. One that comes to mind is: who are the present board members of the Alberta children's hospital — this from the member in whose constituency the hospital is, who I would expect would know them all by heart. Who are the members? That's public knowledge. They're appointed by order in council. Their names are well known. I could go on and on.

We've put up with several weeks of probing questions like that that are so directly related to this secret govern-

ment spending in this holy search for knowledge. It has been quite a performance. Now the final indignation is shown over the use of the term "time management". What else is it? There seems to be a feeling by members of the opposition that because they have nothing else to do, nobody else has anything to do either. Frankly, that's not the case. The business of government has to go on. The time that has been spent on these estimates, compared to years past, compared to the province's budget debate, compared to the House of Commons' federal budget debate, compared to any other government's budget debate, is there to be compared.

The notice of motion says there will be another five days available at the discretion of members to ask questions on whatever subject they choose. They can allocate the time and decide how to use those five days. But surely there is a very reasonable time between the time spent by the select committee in the spring and the Committee of Supply in the fall with what has been spent to now and what will be available to them. I believe any reasonable person reading the *Hansards* and looking at the time spent would say, enough's enough; anybody who wanted to know anything has had ample opportunity to ask their questions. So I believe it's unfair — and I know it's part of the tricks of debate — to stand in this House and suggest that because other members perhaps have other things to do and they apparently don't, this is somehow an infringement on their democratic rights.

In conclusion, the point I want to make is that all members in this House have equal rights. We each represent one constituency. I believe our time, our opinions, and our viewpoints, just because they come from the government side, are every bit as valid and valuable as those expressed by the members opposite.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, speaking to the sub-amendment before us. The purpose of the amendment is to say that if members have other things they want to do outside this House and that's the reason closure has been brought before us, then we should add that to the resolution and say, fine, if people want to do something else or leave, then pass this resolution. We'll quickly get the work of the House done, and they can go ahead and do that. The other day the hon. Member for Edmonton Whitemud — and I see the hon. member is still in the Legislature — raised the question of when the House was going to be over with and when a person could leave for a holiday or take on other responsibilities. The answer was very clear. If someone wishes to take on other responsibilities and leave this Legislature, one, they can resign or, two, they can pay \$100 a day.

The hon. Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care, leaving before I can respond to some of the things he has said ... [interjections] That's unfortunate, because I think there were some things the hon. minister should hear about the trade-off of the freedom of holidays for the freedom of speech going on at present — the freedom to do something else like take that winter holiday early to get out of this Legislature. That's what's happening, Mr. Speaker. That's the trade-off occurring right now. If that's what we're doing, we should support the amendment before us. I think this Legislature wants to endorse the truth and tell things as they are. That's what we try to do through the amendments we make to the motion brought forward by the House leader.

Mr. Speaker, we talk about business getting done in this Legislature, that there are other things the members can do, and that the rights of one member in this Legisla-

ture are no different from the rights of other members. The hon. Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care related that material to us. I agree with that. But the fact of the matter is that by the motion of closure before us, the government is saying they are through with the business, they have made decisions, everything is all right, and that there is no need of any further questions. At that point, they're saying that the rights of members in the opposition should be restricted and that freedom of speech should stop. Maybe the government can go back to caucus, a cabinet meeting, or some other place, and have a discussion, but that doesn't discuss the issue in public so public business is done in the public. There's no way it's done in that manner, Mr. Speaker.

The government has said — and I remember the Premier saying this when he stood in this position over here — that this Legislature should have a fall session so we could talk, debate, and ask questions about a large variety of issues. The Premier said to us that the Heritage Savings Trust Fund will be discussed in the fall Legislature so there will be time for all members to discuss the matter thoroughly, to check on accountability, and to ask the government questions. Well, how far did the Premier's promise go? To this point in time today, when the vote is taken on this motion of closure, the Premier's promise stops. He's saying: look, legislators, you've asked too many questions; we don't want to provide you with information; you can't have the information you want; you're asking too many questions; I'm supporting a motion of closure. The motion before us is the Premier's motion as much as anybody else's, and the Premier must take full responsibility for it. He has brought it forward in this Legislature and said, freedom of speech stops; I'm curtailing it. The people in this province have spoken enough and in a few days after next Friday, the Legislature will close. Mr. Speaker, I don't think we can accept that at this time. The Premier made a commitment. Usually he lives up to them. Here's one example where he hasn't: the curtailing of freedom of speech.

What else could we discuss in fall sessions, where we could have open and free speech? We could talk about special warrants. A year ago, this government was overspent by 11 per cent on special warrants, the largest overexpenditure in history. Special warrants could be talked about during the fall session of the Legislature. We could recommend special warrants, support the government in passing special warrants. But during the fall session, we don't even hear about them. The government passes them the day before the session starts or the day after, so we as members of the Legislature can't discuss special warrants in the fall session. Supplementary estimates: we could talk about more estimates funds, rather than special warrants. That would mean we would have budgeting done in this Legislative Assembly. Many kinds of business that could be done in this public arena are not.

Of those three, we have the opportunity to talk about one, the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. Now that government is invoking closure on us and saying: you can't ask any more questions; we have made a judgment that you have asked too many already. That judgment causes an inequity between the privileges of members on this side of the House and the privileges of members on the other side of the House, so the rights and responsibilities of members are certainly different in this Legislature, not because the Legislature was designed that way but because we have a government in this province that thinks they are the only ones in the administration of the

democratic process, the only ones to make decisions, and that opposition is no part of the government of Alberta. Mr. Speaker, that's wrong, historically and on precedent, and unacceptable.

More often than ever in the last 10 years, I've heard people across this province saying, I think we need a larger opposition to hold that government accountable. How can you do the job you're sent to do when you have to look over shoulders and watch 72 members, some 20 cabinet ministers making decisions on billions of dollars. Mr. Speaker, that's a most difficult task. But we were assigned by the people of Alberta to take on that responsibility. We have tried to achieve and carry out that responsibility in this fall session. That's why a motion of closure shouldn't be before us at the present time. In a sense, it's another reason we shouldn't be passing an amendment here that says that if the members really have other pressing business, they can leave this Legislature, close it down and go off to their holidays or whatever they want to do. That's really the wrong kind of directive to give a legislature.

But because of the circumstances prevailing in this Legislature at present, we know the attitude of government is that they want to get us out of here so they can do their own private thing by taking a holiday, going back to their medical practices, or whatever it may be. That's what they want to do. The people's business isn't of importance. It's way down the order in terms of priority. That only means that we might as well pass an amendment to the amended resolution and say, look, if that's the situation, if members of this Assembly want to go on a holiday, get the business of the House over with, let's give that as a reason in our motion. Let's admit the fact that we pass this motion which will enable members with other business outside this House to attend to that business and not be inconvenienced. I think that is considerate of us on this side of the House. That's understanding the way this government works, the way the back bench MLAs are giving support to cabinet.

Maybe the cabinet members have some pressing problems to deal with, but we're not sure they're really dealing with these problems at the present time. Maybe they want to. Let's give them the benefit of the doubt; maybe they have to — then stand up in this House and say they have some pressing business to attend to. To this time, not one cabinet minister has stood up and said: look, I'd like to have the Legislature close as soon as possible so I can deal with this important business — not one.

The Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care has risen in his place — and I give him full marks for having the courage to stand up and not be muzzled any longer like the rest of them in this House. And the Member for Drayton Valley — I certainly appreciate her remarks. It takes a bit of courage to stand up when the Whip has left the House, gone on to other responsibilities, and has left the message in this House: nobody gets up until I return. [interjections] What else can I assume? That's the observation I made. Nobody has stood up. Don't tell me you haven't anything to say about the loss of the freedom of speech. Don't tell me there isn't anybody here who hasn't something important to do that may be more important than staying in this House. If you have something more important, stand up and admit it. Then we'll understand closure, and maybe won't embarrass you by putting in this amendment we have placed before you.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. members across the way really feel all they have to do is sit in a complacent attitude . . .



DR. BUCK: Not arrogant. Don't use "arrogant".

MR. R. SPEAKER: . . . sit there, kind of let the time go by, and not worry about public responsibility. They have lots of money in the bank. There isn't an Albertan who has it. It just sits right in the old bank. There isn't a hole from the top to the bottom. I'll tell you, it takes magic to put the money in and save it. But they do, Mr. Speaker. That's the way they sit in this Legislature. If they're just going to sit and wait, I really don't know why they come. They say they need another 10 days of business. If there was urgency to get out of here, maybe they should have just invoked closure, closed everything down, and quit. Maybe it isn't that urgent, but nobody tells us where they stand. Why can't they get up and speak?

Why doesn't the hon. Member for Barrhead, with all his experience, stand up and speak. We haven't heard anything about his responsibilities in this Legislature, what he stands for, or what he wants to do. We haven't heard anything like that, Mr. Speaker. Here is his chance to say: look, I don't want to leave this Legislature; I want to defeat that resolution because I really don't want to be inconvenienced; I want to stand here and fight for freedom of speech so my rights are not eroded, so there is equality of rights between government members and members of the opposition. But he doesn't do that kind of thing. He sits back in the corner and takes the gaff or whatever you want to call it. And I can only assume he's under the thumb of the Whip.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. I understand the Member for Edmonton Whitemud is on a point of order. Would he please state the point of order.

MR. KNAAK: It's the rule of relevance, Mr. Speaker. As the Speaker before you pointed out, this being an amendment, it seems to me that the rules of greater relevance are applicable. In elaborating on my point of order, I might say that one challenge I have as a fairly new MLA is to find the relevance to my job in this Legislature of listening to the opposition. We sit here and sit here and listen to this playing or acting of the opposition.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. The Chair has some difficulty with what the Member for Edmonton Whitemud is getting at. The Leader of the Opposition is on the subamendment, and he very skilfully comes back to it every once in a while.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I can only compliment you for those wise observations. I followed the precedent of the hon. Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care, and was trying to use the same boundaries as the hon. minister in his learned debate.

Mr. Speaker, in concluding my remarks with regard to this, the amendment just puts things as they are. If hon. members in this House feel they have no other pressing business outside the Legislature and that the Legislature is most important to them, they should stand up and say: I want to stay here and fight, one, for the right to have freedom of speech; and two, to have a democratic process prevail in this Legislature — I really believe in that; that's why I came to the Legislature. Why can't hon. members stand up with a bit of idealism and talk about the basic principles and rules of the activity of this Legislature.

If they don't, if they sit quiet and don't say anything, I hope they will vote for this amendment because then the

amendment is applicable. We can only come to one conclusion: the members want to get out of this Legislature for other business more pressing to their personal needs, not the business of the Legislature. If they sit quietly and there's no response from the backbenchers or ministers on that side of the House, the people of Alberta can only assume that the Legislature is in a second position rather than number one.

[Mr. Appleby in the Chair]

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, I can't resist the opportunity to make a few remarks this evening. I'd like to begin by suggesting that each of us has a responsibility to the citizens of the province, which is exercised in other ways than attendance in this Assembly. Although attendance in this Assembly is very, very important, there are other forms of service. Having served as a minister of the Crown, the hon. Leader of the Opposition would be particularly aware of the expectations our citizens have for the provision of service in ways other than can be accommodated by debate in the Legislative Assembly.

It becomes a question of judgment as to what is the appropriate balance between the service that can be provided to citizens by attendance in this Assembly and service provided to citizens in a variety of other equally legitimate ways. Service to our constituents in dealing with the public service is important, perhaps not for large numbers of constituents but for individuals with a problem, it is an important consideration. Service to our constituents when they are organized in interest groups is an important consideration, usually accommodated through policy and administrative actions rather than through debate in the Legislative Assembly.

The question is asked whether it is convenient to be here or more convenient to be somewhere else. And the question is asked: whose convenience is important? Mr. Speaker, I enjoy being in the Legislative Assembly. I'm not sure that is shared by all my colleagues, but personally I enjoy being here. Nevertheless, my attendance here and the attendance of all my colleagues is at sacrifice of attention to the other legitimate expectations of all people in the province. It is a simple fact of life that while serving the people here, we cannot be serving the people in other equally important ways. That could be exemplified by all my colleagues in Executive Council and throughout the House — on both sides, in all parties, as well as the two independent members.

I'd like to cite only four examples in a five-day time span. Sittings of the House which required my attendance last Thursday and Friday meant that I was not able to be in Toronto to meet with my colleague ministers of Education and the hon. Secretary of State for Canada to discuss the extension of bilingualism in education agreement, student assistance program, and extended program financing. Clearly, I have an obligation to be in this House. Clearly, my presence in this House meant I could not fulfill an obligation to the people of Alberta to discuss bilingualism, student assistance, and extended program financing. The result of an unexpected extension of the fall sittings of the Legislature is that I have cancelled my regular meeting with the table officers of the Alberta School Trustees' Association, at which time they make their representations to the government about improvements that might be effected in education.

It is no inconvenience to me. I'm delighted to sit in this Assembly on Wednesday afternoon, and I will be in this Assembly on Wednesday afternoon. I will not be meeting

with the executive of the Alberta School Trustees' Association. The same is true of my meeting with the provincial executive council of the Alberta Teachers' Association. It is no inconvenience for me to sit in this Assembly. I will be sitting in this Assembly. I will not be meeting with the provincial executive council of the Alberta Teachers' Association. My colleagues — the Minister of Agriculture, the Minister of Social Services and Community Health, and the Minister of Labour — could cite similar examples.

I want to close with one other example. Three weeks ago, I attended the Public Accounts Committee of this Assembly. I attended because it is my responsibility as a minister to attend the committees of the Assembly when I am invited. I was invited, and I attended. Unfortunately, that was the day I would otherwise have been discussing a request for proposal with the social planning committee of cabinet for changes in the special education program of this province, an item which had been on the agenda of the social planning committee for three months, now deferred into late January or February. I attended the Public Accounts Committee at the expense of something which I considered to be important for those in need of special education in this province. I deferred to the judgment of my colleagues.

It is unfortunate that on the morning I appeared before the Public Accounts Committee no members of the opposition were present, except the chairman, for the duration of the meeting. [interjections] Mr. Speaker, I will sit in this Assembly for as many days as are required for the conduct of the business of the Assembly. For me personally, it will not be an inconvenience. But I invite the hon. members opposite to think about the teachers and school trustees of the province, and the parents of children in bilingual programs or the parents of handicapped children throughout the province. I invite them to consider whether there are not equally useful ways in which we might be spending our time.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, I have listened and listened. With respect to the hon. Leader of the Opposition, who has been here four times as long as I have, he obviously has spoken at great length about the history of this House, the Mother Parliament, and so on. The Minister of Education just touched on it. As hon. members of the opposition know, the so-called Lougheed government, they caucus and they caucus. That's true. We're all on a variety of committees.

It seems to me that in the history of parliamentary tradition, the rules established over many, many years make provision, as I understand it, for members of the opposition to question government on a very, very intimate basis in a system called the Standing Committee on Public Accounts. Reference was just made to it. Here is an opportunity where members of the opposition, with agreement from the committee, can have whomever in the House, including the Premier, in front of that committee on a Wednesday morning. I sincerely believe that it's an extremely useful committee, and one whereby the wishes and the will of the people of Alberta are looked after. I've never heard of a minister refusing to answer a question in that committee.

As some members know, although called by another name perhaps, I have a responsibility for dealing with about \$20 million and 400 people called AADAC. If that doesn't go right, I'm the guy who's up for jumps. I try to do a good job, yet I come from across the province on a Wednesday morning before that committee at 10:30. I

would just comment — and it's there for all to see — the members of that committee number some 32, with the Member for Clover Bar; the Member for Spirit River-Fairview, the people's choice; and the hon. Leader of the Opposition. I don't want to be critical of my colleagues in a personal way, but I have great difficulty understanding why I, along with other members of this House, have to stay on and on dealing with — and the Leader of the Opposition called it a filibuster, I never have — when there's very important business of the House to be conducted by the Standing Committee on Public Accounts. And where are they? Two consecutive meetings — and I'm quoting from the minutes — not one member of the opposition has been in attendance. What is any rational person in this province to think? If the members of the fourth or fifth estate had been around on Wednesday morning, you could be sure they'd been here. But they don't show up. Now what is an hon. member supposed to think? Are they or are they not concerned about the public business of this province? Frankly, I don't think they are.

DR. BUCK: Just give us the letters.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address this amendment please. Prior to getting right to it, I would like to respond to some of the remarks made by other members addressing this amendment. The first one would be to the Member for Banff-Cochrane. I've been here many years, and I've been here quite diligently over this year as well. I have yet to hear this member get up and speak on such important issues as these. Of all the members in this Assembly, Mr. Speaker, I have to say that this is one member whom I hold in the highest regard. Whereas, when some of the other members speak, I might turn off because I think they're just reiterating the party line. I would like to listen to this member because I value what he has to say, and I think he would give us a fair judgment on whatever it is he addresses. So I am anxiously awaiting that moment when that member does finally get up and speak.

DR. BUCK: You may have to stay here another 12 years.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Speaker, also in addressing comments made to this amendment by the Member for Drayton Valley, I'm surprised to see that she has taken such an interest in us. I suppose it's just her old school-marm days coming out when she has a chart there taking attendance of all the members. I'd just like to point out that over the session, if I can compare my attendance to anyone, I would compare it to the Premier's, and point out that I have been in this Assembly twice as much as the Premier has during the fall session.

Another point I would like to make to the Member for Drayton Valley is that we are now into the seventh week of review of the capital estimates. We're not here in the seventh week because the backbenchers for the government have been asking questions. I assure you, Mr. Speaker, they have not been asking any questions. The odd question that has been posed has been on a point of order. I remember the Member for Three Hills getting up on a point of order and saying that the subject matter was irrelevant. I was a little disappointed that the member had to actually read what she had said there. She can't even get up and speak to the subject. I wait for the time when that member, whose judgment I value, will get up and say what she thinks.

Mr. Speaker, the last seven weeks I have been in this Legislative Assembly diligently reviewing every last one of those capital estimates. Unfortunately, there was one day when I left to go the washroom. When I came back, this government had voted itself \$93 million. [interjections] Mr. Speaker, I will think twice next time before I go to the washroom, because Lord knows what they're going to do next.

One of the other speakers in regard to this amendment was the Minister for Hospitals and Medical Care. He made several comments; first of all, about appearing before the Alberta Heritage ...

[Dr. Buck left the Chamber]

AN HON. MEMBER: Where are you going, Walt?

MR. SINDLINGER: I hope he's not going to the washroom this time. It can be quite costly around here. Mr. Speaker, as the minister was addressing it, he said he was quite concerned about the quality of the questions asked by the members of the opposition. He said that he found relatively little merit in them. Mr. Speaker, I have Alberta *Hansard* in my hand for various dates: December 4, 1981, November 23, 1981, and December 2, 1981, all days when we were talking to the minister about his estimates on the W.C. MacKenzie health hospital and the southern Alberta children's hospital.

Some of the responses the minister made in regard to the questions being asked by the opposition were; for example, on December 4, in regard to a question on the Alberta children's hospital, Mr. Russell, the Minister for Hospitals and Medical Care, replied: "That's a very important issue." On November 23, when again replying to another question on the southern Alberta children's hospital, the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care said: "Well, that's a rather complex question with many parts." Mr. Speaker, on December 2, 1981, the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care replied again: "That's a difficult question to answer." So, Mr. Speaker, I put it to you that these are very important questions we've been asking the government, and they should be answered.

Yes, it's true that the session could have ended much sooner, as the Minister of Education has pointed out. I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that that is in fact true. But the problem has been that the opposition has not been getting satisfactory responses to the questions put to them. We could be out of here tomorrow, if this government would just undertake to answer those questions we have put to them — most important, the essential question, the documentation of that \$60 million loss. That doesn't take a lot of work to do. They could come up with that answer very quickly.

Mr. Speaker, addressing the motion now, adding the addendum to the other motion:

"and so that Members with other business outside this House to attend to need be inconvenienced no further."

First of all, in regard to what "other business outside this House": what about tonight? We don't have all the members here tonight. I don't know where they are, and I don't know what other business there is outside the House. But I do know, from observation tonight, except for those — in this instance, not too costly — washroom breaks from this side, that the opposition has been in here every minute of this debate listening to every word spoken and addressing every subject.

However, from observation these members have not all

been here tonight, nor, Mr. Speaker, have you been here all tonight. You were preceded by another Speaker, and that Speaker was preceded by another Speaker. Three of you have been sitting in that Chair, and members in this Legislative Assembly have been in and out as well, not just for short breaks. Obviously what is going on here is that the government, with its large number of members, is sitting in here in shifts, the idea being of course just to wait out the opposition. Well, Mr. Speaker, when they do that, I don't know how each individual member can have all the information available to them and make what can be a conscionable decision in their own minds, with all the information they need to do that.

More generally, Mr. Speaker, in regard to what other business there is outside this House, I have an interesting document here that purports to list the occupations of the members of the Legislative Assembly. Perhaps by looking at that, we can get an idea of what some of that other business outside the House might be. This document indicates there are 23 farmers in the Legislative Assembly. Almost 25 per cent of the members of the Legislative Assembly are farmers. Having grown up on a farm, and having listened to the Minister of Environment at one time when I first came here, I would say that's not too bad.

The first year I was here, the Minister of Environment was questioned about the justification for expenditures on irrigation. Now all the member was asking that minister was: why is this being undertaken? What are the costs and what are the benefits? If we expend this much money on irrigation, how many acres of land will become irrigable or developable? The minister didn't have that answer. Upon being pressed for the answer, he responded that, well, having known farmers all my life, I've never known one to make a bad decision. I might concur with that. Farmers are judicious, there's no question about that. But there's no way one can use that as a justification for an expenditure of multimillions of dollars. There has to be more justification than that in the Legislative Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, this also indicates there are 11 lawyers in the Legislative Assembly, or about 13 per cent. Now I would have thought there were more lawyers in this Legislative Assembly just from listening to the people who speak. But from time to time, I guess all of us as members of the Legislative Assembly are required to play lawyer when we start applying and interpreting the *Standing Orders*, *Beauchesne*, *Erskine May*, and others. We have 12 educators, six business managers, four doctors/dentists, five other professionals, five civil servants, and six who will not disclose what they do outside the House.

What business takes them outside the House when they should be here responsibly addressing the business of the House? Well, I won't go into that too extensively; in fact, I won't go into it at all, Mr. Speaker.

I'll just go on to the second part of this amendment. The first part was "other business outside the House". Let's just leave it that almost all the other members do have business outside this House, and it's not all personal business, Mr. Speaker. It's business they have to attend to in order to properly serve their constituents. The Minister of Education has pointed that out in a peripheral way, although his commitments were to government business. The business of all members here has to be to constituents, serving them in the most satisfactory way possible. Being an independent and not having government services to rely upon, I have to say that has become an onerous burden but one I've gladly undertaken and

fulfilled.

In regard to "inconvenienced": what is inconvenience? I guess it's inconvenient for the Minister of Environment when we scrupulously and diligently peruse his heritage trust fund estimates. I believe it's an inconvenience when we point out to the minister that for each of six years, that minister has taken twice as much from the heritage fund as he has required for his projects. Each year, and over those six years, that minister has failed to expend even 50 per cent of his total appropriation.

In justification, the minister has said, well, that's good, because we don't lose the money; we can just put it back in the pot, and it will still be there. I'd suggest it isn't good, because there is only so much in an annual budget. And if one minister is taking twice as much as he requires, that means another minister is getting less than required. It might be Social Services and Community Health. Maybe that's the area where people are crying out for more expenditures. But the minister can't get the money because the Minister of Environment has been taking out twice as much as he requires.

The next thing we found out with that minister is the Lesser Slave Lake development, an initial project cost of \$8.8 million and, could you believe it, after perusing that expenditure as well, the minister finally reveals that the project cost is not \$8.8 million, it's \$4.411 million. Again, he has double estimated his project. Mr. Speaker, I think it would be inconvenient for that minister to have members of the opposition discover something like that.

I remember when the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources was before the Legislative Assembly asking for \$54 million from the heritage fund this year, generally assigned for the Alberta Oil Sands Technology and Research Authority. One of the first questions posed to the minister was very simple and straightforward: Mr. Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, what is the \$54 million for? Because in the estimates of proposed investments for this year, it doesn't say what it's for. It just has the Department of Energy and Natural Resources, amount to be voted — pardon me, I've been saying 54 million — \$41 million. It says, 1981-82 estimates ... I've got the wrong year here. It's the subsequent year. This is the first year. The prior year was 41, and this year it's \$54 million — 1982-83. "Subprojects: no sub-project breakdown"; "Summary by Object of Expenditure": nothing for manpower, nothing for supplies and services, nothing for purchase of fixed assets; "Total Project": \$54 million.

Obviously, the first question is: what is the \$54 million for? I believe the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources was very inconvenienced when he had to stand up and say, I don't know. I think that would be an inconvenience if I were the minister and had to say, I want \$54 million, but I don't know what for.

Mr. Speaker, there's also the case of the Walter C. MacKenzie Health Sciences Centre. It's true, as the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care pointed out, that the heritage fund committee had the opportunity to question him on that when he appeared before it on August 28. The Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care said that when he did, the members on that committee had great difficulty in extending the time to find enough questions to ask him so that the full time allotted for him could be covered.

Well, Mr. Speaker, what happened was that some pretty specific questions were asked of the minister when he was before the committee. However, he did not have the information with him. Without that information, the committee members could not pursue the subject any

further. Subject to that meeting, the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care sent a memorandum to the chairman of that standing committee on September 4. In that memorandum, he gave costs associated with those five heritage fund projects under his authority. One of them was the southern Alberta children's hospital; the other was the W.C. MacKenzie hospital, the cardiac research centre in Calgary, cancer research, and heart research. Some pretty detailed costs were in that memorandum. Yet when the minister got back in this Legislative Assembly last week with the new appropriation for this hospital, he had the gall to say that he provided the information to the watchdog committee and the watchdog committee had the opportunity to question him on it.

Mr. Speaker, that has been a favorite ruse of all the ministers — I shouldn't say all, of most of the ministers — when they appear before the heritage fund committee. They walk in and throw a bundle of paper down before the members, and there is no opportunity for the members to look at that beforehand to determine what's in there and ask relevant questions. Yet, subsequent to that, the minister can always stand up and say, but I gave that information to the watchdog committee; why didn't you ask me questions then? How can you ask questions of the minister about information that you don't get until a week after? You can't do that. If I were a minister, I would be inconvenienced by something like that.

Isn't that exactly why we're here, Mr. Speaker, to review in depth and detail those expenditures of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. Over the last seven weeks, that's what we in the opposition have been doing. I do not recall what I would consider to be one frivolous question put by the opposition to the government. But I could cite for you several instances where members of the government responding to the questions gave very cavalier responses. For example, just last week the question was posed to the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care: what do you want to do with this \$91 million? The minister stood up and said, well, I want to build a hospital, and sat down. I don't think that's a satisfactory response. I think it's incumbent upon the government to bring more details forward.

One thing this exercise over the last seven weeks has demonstrated: there is a need for more accountability from this government. I'm looking forward to the opportunity when we can have the two who are most responsible and should be held most accountable for the heritage fund appear before the Legislative Assembly. I pointed out that that's the Provincial Treasurer and the Premier of the province, as chairman of the investment committee on the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. If anybody should be here defending this subject tonight, I believe it should be them.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know why this could be considered an inconvenience. It's true we have a responsibility to be here. As yet, I don't think any member of the government has demonstrated satisfactorily that there is indeed a reason for closure. What is the reason for closure? No one has really stated that yet. Why do we have to have closure on this subject? Why do we have to create this infamous day in Alberta's political history where we have closure invoked for the first time in this province? There's no need for that. I think the problem is simply inconvenience for the government.

Mr. Speaker, I think it would be very inconvenient for this House to be sitting when the Auditor General comes back with his report, as requested by the Premier last week. There's no reason why we can't stay here until we

get that report or why we cannot adjourn and come back to get that report when it's completed and discuss it. The government is putting that up as an answer to questions the opposition had posed. I don't think that's going to resolve the matter, nor satisfactorily answer the questions. I don't think it's appropriate for the government to say to us, you have five more days to ask us questions on these things.

I've said earlier — and I'll repeat it again today, tomorrow, and every day of the five days; and I'll count down from five, four, three, two, one — this government has five days to answer our questions; this government has four days to answer our questions; this government has three days to answer our questions, and we'll go on and on like that. Finally, if they don't deem to answer, as one of the members has said, there's only one place they could be held accountable, and that's at the polls. I think that's a good place that the government be held accountable. I think this day should be characterized as the heritage fund's \$60 million closure debate. When the government goes to the polls, I want to make sure there's somebody around who characterizes this government as a \$60 million loss government. There's no reason why it shouldn't be. There's one reason why it may not be, though. [interjections] If this government will come forth and document that \$60 million loss, there's no need for us to be here. There's a need for us to be here and persist until that loss is documented. Until it is, we have to keep persisting and persist we will.

The member from Lethbridge posed the rhetorical question, and I inferred from what he had said that the questioning and time spent on the estimates by the opposition somehow impeded or inhibited the conduct of normal business in the Legislature. Mr. Speaker, if he implied that or whether I inferred that is really irrelevant. But the point that has to be made is the review of the heritage fund estimates by this opposition over the last seven weeks has no way impeded or impaired the conduct of normal business of the Legislature. That has gone on as scheduled by the government. The only time that has been taken in the pursuit of its responsibilities by the opposition has been that time associated with the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund. That time has taken seven weeks. It was seven weeks well spent, because a great deal of information has been developed over them.

I can recall one day over that seven weeks when the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources got up and read from a contract between AOSTRA, Alberta Oil Sands Technology Research Authority, and the government, or Shell. That minister read for over two hours from the contract. He said there was valuable information in there, and he wanted to make sure all the members had it. Well, I concur; it was. We asked him if he could give us copies of it. But he said he had only one copy and would be needing it. Unfortunately, that minister didn't get finished; he didn't get through the whole thing. Given the new information we got from that, I'm eagerly awaiting the day when that minister will complete what he started in the first place, reading that contract.

Mr. Speaker, in regard to other business, there is no other business outside this House when we're dealing with the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. There is no other business when there's a question of this magnitude before us. There is no other business outside the House when we're holding the government responsible for mismanagement — I'll say mismanagement of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. There is no other business outside the House when we have to consider the fact that this herit-

age fund will be \$105 billion before too long. If we don't cure this mismanagement now, the problems we're going to have then are going to be 'homongous' compared to what we have now. I think the government ought to consider adjourning until we can get the Auditor General's report. Then we can determine whether or not there has been any substance for what has been said from either side of the Legislative Assembly. We're going to an independent adjudicator. There's nothing wrong with waiting for that decision to come down. Mr. Speaker, let me say this about that. [interjections]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? I believe all hon. members have a copy of the subamendment proposed by the Member for Spirit River-Fairview.

[Mr. Speaker declared the motion on the subamendment lost. Several members rose calling for a division. The division bell was rung]

[Three minutes having elapsed, the House divided]

For the motion:

Buck	Notley	Speaker, R.
Mandeville	Sindlinger	

Against the motion:

Adair	Diachuk	McCrimmon
Anderson, C.	Fjordbotten	Moore
Anderson, D.	Gogo	Musgreave
Batiuk	Hiebert	Osterman
Bogle	Hyland	Pahl
Borstad	Johnston	Pengelly
Bradley	King	Shaben
Campbell	Knaak	Stevens
Chambers	Koziak	Stromberg
Chichak	Kroeger	Thompson
Clark	Kushner	Topolnisky
Cook	LeMessurier	Trynchy
Cookson	Lysons	Webber
Crawford	Mack	Young
Cripps		

Totals:	Ayes - 5	Noes - 43
---------	----------	-----------

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I believe we as members of the Assembly take too much for granted. I'm sure people in the galleries, people in the province, and people up watching television don't really know what we're talking about. I'm sure there are people who do not know about rules of order, do not know parliamentary procedure. I think it's very, very important that we say to those people outside these four walls what the motion is and what the amendment is. Mr. Speaker, I'm going to be speaking on the amendment, but I think it's our responsibility as members in the Legislature, so that people know what the debate is all about ...

MR. SPEAKER: If that hasn't been made plain up until now, we're in some difficulty aren't we?

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, in all humility and modesty, I believe you have treated the matter too lightly. There are people out there who do not understand what the debate is about. I am going to take it upon myself to read it into

the record and indicate to those people outside, the people we serve, what the resolution is and what the amendment is. With the indulgence of the hon. Member for Edmonton Glengarry, the expert on so many matters, the motion we are debating this evening is Motion No. 16, the government motion proposed to the Assembly by the hon. House leader, the hon. Mr. Crawford:

16. Be it resolved that notwithstanding any provisions of the Standing Orders, the estimates of the Capital Projects Division of the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund and all appropriation Bills as herein defined, shall, unless earlier disposed of, be dealt with as follows:

- (1) In this resolution
  - (a) "Appropriation Bill" means
    - (i) Bill 69 — Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund Special Appropriation Act, 1982-83, and
    - (ii) any Bill introduced in the House to appropriate the funds covered by the Estimates;
  - (b) "Estimates" means the estimates and supplementary estimates of the Capital Projects Division of the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund that have been referred to the Committee of Supply during the 1981 fall sittings, and includes the resolutions before the Committee of Supply relating to them.
- (2) The Estimates shall be considered by the Committee of Supply on 5 separate sitting days after and including the day upon which this resolution is adopted and if, on the 5th day, the Committee has not voted upon all of the Estimates by the following time limit . . .

MR. CRAWFORD: Order.

DR. BUCK: What is your problem, Mr. House Leader?

MR. CRAWFORD: I have two points of order. Under Standing Order 19(b), if the hon. member is speaking to the amendment, he must confine his remarks to the subject of the amendment unless there's a substitute motion, which there is not. Under 22(d), the hon. Member for Clover Bar is again subject to being called to order for reading unnecessarily from a document. He knows that.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I have already indicated to the Assembly that we are servants of the people. I want the people outside this Assembly . . . Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure if the hon. Government House Leader was in when I commenced my address.

MR. CRAWFORD: I can't remember either.

DR. BUCK: I made it abundantly clear that I felt we in this Assembly take for granted that people outside understand what the debate is all about. Mr. Speaker, I've already indicated to this Legislature that this is why I'm reading it into the record. [interjections]

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

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Vermilion-Viking is trying to be heard on a point of order.

MR. LYSONS: When the hon. Member for Clover Bar is dealing with the motion, and he's talking about for the information of the people outside of the House, I thought we were to deal with things inside this House. If anyone

outside the House or inside the House wants to read that, they can read it. I think it is a waste of time to go over this when it's there, printed.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Surely we're still on the amendment, and that is that we express deep regret at having to employ the above-noted time management mechanisms. The hon. Member for Clover Bar is illustrating why this Assembly should have deep regret. The deep regret is with respect to the curtailing of the legitimate right of freedom of speech. The concern of people outside the Assembly is certainly relevant to that. After all, I would remind hon. members that the people outside the Assembly, the people of Alberta who elect us, are to whom we are ultimately accountable.

MR. SPEAKER: You should get together on this thing. My understanding is that we're now debating . . . As hon. members know, I was outside the Assembly for a while. For the edification of those who might suspect otherwise, I was working. I had my loudspeaker on and heard what was going on. I think there was some suggestion that I was taking it easy. [interjections] That's not very serious. In any case, just so I'm in the picture here, is this the amendment we're debating now?

MR. NOTLEY: We're dealing with the original amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: There's a collection of them here. Is this the one? "So that members with other business outside this House".

SOME HON. MEMBERS: We dealt with that.

MR. SPEAKER: We dealt with that one? Which one are we on now? Oh I see, we're back on the main amendment. Fair enough.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Have we finished hearing the point of order from the hon. Member for Vermilion-Viking? I didn't mean to cut him off.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, in carrying on with the motion, I will read the amendment so the people of this province know that what we're doing is bringing a closure Bill to this Assembly. I think it's very, very important that the people know exactly what the government has said in that closure Bill. And I carry on saying that:

10:00 p.m. if it be a Monday, Tuesday or Thursday,  
or

4:30 p.m. if it be a Wednesday, or

12:00 noon if it be a Friday,

the Chairman shall immediately interrupt the proceedings and shall forthwith put a single question proposing the approval of every resolution then necessary to complete consideration of the Estimates, which shall be decided without debate or amendment, and the Committee shall forthwith rise and report.

(3) A motion in the House

- (a) that the Speaker leave the Chair and the Committee of the Whole meet to consider an appropriation Bill, or
- (b) that the House receive a report of the Committee of Supply on the Estimates or a report of the Committee of the Whole on an appropri-

- tion Bill shall be decided without debate or amendment.
- (4) An appropriation Bill may be introduced in the House at any time after the receipt of the report of the Committee of Supply on the Estimates covered by the Bill, when the Order of the Day is Government business.
  - (5) An appropriation Bill may be read a second time, considered by the Committee of the Whole, reported therefrom to the House and the report received, on one sitting day.
  - (6) If an appropriation Bill is moved for second reading, and if, on that day, at the time limit defined by paragraph 2, all appropriation Bills have not yet been read a second time, the Speaker shall at that time interrupt the proceedings and put the question on second reading of every appropriation Bill then awaiting second reading, which shall be decided without debate or amendment.
  - (7) If, after all appropriation Bills have been given second reading, any appropriation Bill is before the Committee of the Whole for consideration, and if, on that day, half an hour after the time limit defined by paragraph 2, there remains any appropriation Bill not reported by the Committee, the Chairman shall at that time interrupt the proceedings and put . . . every question necessary to complete consideration of all appropriation Bills still before the Committee, which shall be decided without debate or amendment, and the Committee shall forthwith rise and report.
  - (8) If an appropriation Bill is moved for third reading, and if, on that day, at the time limit defined by paragraph 2, all appropriation Bills have not yet been read a third time, the Speaker shall at that time interrupt the proceedings and put the question on third reading of every appropriation Bill then awaiting third reading, which shall be decided without debate or amendment.

Mr. Speaker, my colleague the hon. Leader of the Opposition has moved an amendment by adding at the end of No. 16, Section (9):

This Assembly formally expresses its deep regret at having to employ the above noted time management mechanisms in an effort to speed the business of the Assembly so that Members need not be too inconvenienced by the exercise by Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition of their legitimate right to freedom of speech.

MR. SPEAKER: Just before the hon. member goes on, might I say that I question very much whether this reading that has just been done is in order. Obviously, the motion is a matter of public record. It's been on notice since last week sometime. This should be the last time we read the motion in this debate. I am required by Standing Order 22(d), as has been pointed out by the hon. Government House Leader, to form an opinion on this topic. My opinion is that it need not be read again.

MR. KING: On a point of order. It is probably not necessary that it be read again, but it is probably just as well it was read on this occasion, Mr. Speaker, I would like you to have reference to Annotation 423 in the fifth edition of *Beauchesne*, and I think you will be aware of other annotations in *Erskine May* dealing with the nature of motions and amendments to motions. I make the case to you that at least part of this amendment is out of order, probably all that part of it which follows the

phrase "time management mechanisms", because it is argumentative and contains unnecessary provisions. I think 423 would have the same application to the body of a resolution as does the annotation which prohibits the inclusion of therefore clauses.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The hon. Minister of Education certainly is entitled to his opinion, but a difference of opinion is just simply that. One can read this, and one can come to the conclusion that it may be argumentative. One could read it and come to the conclusion that it is not. However, I should point out that we have been debating it for the last four hours. It strikes me as rather unusual that the hon. Minister of Education, who has been sitting here for the last four hours, suddenly has this inspiration, at 12:05 on Tuesday, December 8. Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, when one reads the amendment literally, as it's worded, it's not argumentative. The question of whether hon. members may or may not think it is, is a subject of debate which is not a question of a point of order.

MR. KING: If I could, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member may be establishing a precedent, which may be repeated many times in the time we spend on this debate, by speaking twice to the same point of order. I must say, when I read the amendment the first time and several other times as well, I did have the feeling that it was out of order. I felt that possibly it was an occasion to exercise some latitude. Perhaps I went too far.

It's not a question of opinion at all whether the thing is out of order, because there is no question that the last part of the motion, "so that Members need not be too inconvenienced" et cetera, is a reason for passing the amendment. In other words, it's argument for passing the amendment. Our *Standing Orders* clearly rule out a preamble to an amendment, because all preambles are argument as well. This is simply a disguised preamble, because it's tacked on at the end instead of coming at the beginning. A horse is a horse, whether it comes before the cart or after it.

DR. BUCK: In speaking to the amendment, Mr. Speaker . . . Milt, will you wake up? I'm just trying to keep the hon. Member for Edmonton Mill Woods in the ball game here. I'd like to say that we are trying to disguise closure as time management. It was very interesting to listen to the hon. Minister of Education, for whom I have a great deal of respect. Once in a while he gets carried away with these rules of his, wishing to become the Stanley Knowles of the Alberta Legislature.

We're speaking of members' responsibilities. We as members of this Assembly are elected by our constituents, but we are here not only to represent the wishes and the wills of those constituents but to look after the interests of the entire province. I believe it is in *Beauchesne*, when the member in a riding in England said: after I am elected, then I cease [being] a member of my constituency; I am there to serve the whole. Mr. Speaker, we are here representing a constituency, but we are here to look after the interests of the people of the province. Closure, time management — if the government likes to give it that polite Tory turn. Closure is closure. It has never been done in this province before. But quite obviously, the government is going to use its large majority to pass this vote. I'm afraid it is going to be unfortunate, but none the

less rather historic.

I believe it's very interesting to look at what many, or some prominent Tories over the years, have considered their opinion of closure. In the federal *Hansard* of May 22, 1956, the Hon. George Drew said that closure is simply a bald threat to the opposition, that they are not going to be permitted to put their case before parliament and, above all, before the people of Canada, so that the opinion of the people of Canada can express itself.

Mr. Speaker, basically what we're doing is a bald threat to the opposition of this province, the people on this side of the Legislature who are trying to hold up that big steam-roller, trying to say to that big government . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: The hon. member is a bald threat.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, maybe my colleague right across the way who also saves a lot of money on shampoo the same as I do has something to say to the Government House Leader. Mr. Speaker, it's just an indication by the servant of the Crown, the minister of the Crown, that he takes this matter so lightly. If I were the instrument of bringing this action before the people of this province, I would not treat it frivolously, I would not joke about it. The Government House Leader will be the man going down in history as the architect of probably one of the poorest pieces of legislation the people of Alberta have ever seen. A dubious honor is going to be bestowed upon the hon. Government House Leader. May his political soul rest in peace after this legislation is brought in.

Mr. Speaker, we have tried to indicate to the government that we are not happy. We are not happy because we are not getting questions answered. What happened to the \$60 million? We are not happy with the Provincial Treasurer's explanation that management letters cannot be given to the committee, be it to the committee as a whole or to the legislative committee, the so-called watchdog committee which I suspect is many times a lap-dog committee, a dog without teeth, a dog who looks after questioning things after the fact, after the money has been spent. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult for even responsible Tories on the government side to feel they are really, really looking after the Heritage Savings Trust Fund.

Provision of information is power. We wish the government would show discretion in the exercise of that power. But when we see a large government, a large majority, that is when government should not exercise that power, when the opposition is small numerically, when the questions are out there, when the questions by the . . . [interjection] That's right, you may need a quorum.

AN HON. MEMBER: Don't leave.

DR. BUCK: Why, are we going to call a vote?

AN HON. MEMBER: Henry, stay.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I think the Minister of Transportation has been around the league long enough to know if he has to go to the bathroom or not. I don't think he has to listen to the Member for Edmonton Glengarry to find out if he can leave for a minute or two.

Mr. Speaker, one of the Conservative guideposts is: public business shall be done in public. There are very, very many interesting quotes when we're talking about closure, about what this government stands for, what this

Tory party stands for. One of the nine guideposts of the Conservative Party — and I think it's very interesting that we quote from the brochure, "What Do We Stand For?" At the bottom of the picture of the leader it says: our purpose is not merely a victory at the polls; we are concerned with the use we are going to make of the victory.

Mr. Speaker, I am afraid that the use this large government makes of that victory is to trample the rights of the opposition, to trample the rights of freedom of speech in this Legislature, and not to do public business in public. But I think it's very important that we know what the ninth guidepost of this government is. I think it's very important when we discuss what happened to the \$60 million. I think that'll be very relevant when we get to the end of that ninth guidepost. Listen to the ninth guidepost of the time the leader of the provincial Progressive Conservative Party, who is now the Premier of the province:

We believe that provincial government should always accept the necessity for sound financial responsibility . . .

Who can argue with that, Mr. Speaker? But the events that have taken place in this Legislature lay that to rest.

. . . of its affairs and the affairs the municipal authorities financially dependent upon it. This should obviously include a refusal to support radical and irresponsible monetary theories. But we do not believe that the necessity for financial responsibility should be an excuse for ultra-cautious fiscal policies.

Mr. Speaker, it goes on to say:

We believe in the concept of putting one's money and resources to work for improvement and development. We consider [and listen to this] unnecessary hoarding of surplus funds as a lack of progress.

Maybe that's why we lost the \$60 million. We were worried about having an excess "hoarding of surplus funds".

MR. NOTLEY: It's better to lose it than hoard it.

DR. BUCK: I guess that's right. It's better to lose \$60-odd million than to hoard it. But I say it would be better to put the \$60 million to work for the people of this province. There are hospitals, day care centres, there are many projects where that \$60 million could have been well expended. But the ninth goes on to say:

We further believe that provincial government has a constant responsibility to communicate to the public a clear picture of its total financial position, including all its operations as well as the combined obligations of the municipal authorities dependent upon it. Such communication should include a comparison with the other provinces.

Mr. Speaker, I think if other provinces lost \$60 million there would probably be the longest debate — if there were more than five members on this side of the Assembly — that this province has ever seen. I do not believe in large majorities. I didn't believe in them when we sat on that side of the House and the opposition was small on this side of the House. Large majorities do not make for good government. They do not make for responsible government. They do not make for responsive government.

Mr. Speaker, the government's response to the opposition's role of questioning the estimates, of finding out . . . As the former Leader of the Opposition, the present Premier of the province says, we will look under every



stone. I so well remember they were going to look under every stone. I wish they'd start looking under a few stones to find the \$60 million. That's why they're invoking closure. Because we've been turning the stones, we've been asking for their reports. Silence. Why?

I was almost tempted to use that word "arrogance" again, Mr. Speaker, but you could never accuse this government of being arrogant. I have heard people in this province say: you know, Dr. Buck, when you people were in government it took you 35 years to become as arrogant as this government has in 10 years. But one would never every accuse this government of being arrogant; overpowering, yes; Steam-rolling: you'd never want to accuse this government of that. You'd never want to accuse them of using the big hammer, or the big closure.

Mr. Speaker, I find the philosophy of this government, the philosophy of some of the members of this Assembly on the government's side, very interesting. I so well remember the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood saying: but we received a mandate in 1979; we can do just about anything we want to. That's not what the mandate was all about.

MRS. CHICHAK: That's not what the member said.

DR. BUCK: Maybe I paraphrased it a little, but that's what the member meant. [interjections]

They think that just because they get a large majority they can do anything they wish. The people out on the street are finding out that this government doesn't really care about the little people. This government doesn't really care when we question if funds are available. Maybe some of that \$60 million could have been used for people who are having genuine difficulty with mortgages, hon. Minister of Housing and Public Works. Maybe there are children who go to our educational systems who have very little lunch to take with them. Mr. Speaker, that's why we question and probe, probe and question. It is the charge of this government to look after the taxpayers' money. This government has not convinced this opposition that they are doing it prudently, that they are doing it in the open, that they are investing funds in the best interests of the people of this province.

We talk about the heritage fund to diversify the economy. Very interesting. We have heard that for many years. I heard that in 1967, when the now Premier was on this side of the House. Everything depends on natural resources in this province: I remember so well from this side of the House. Has that changed? I challenge the hon. Member for St. Paul to show me statistics that that has changed, because it has changed for the worse.

AN HON. MEMBER: Look at the economic growth.

DR. BUCK: Look at the economic growth. But our dependence on resource income has risen . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: Not in St. Paul.

DR. BUCK: Not in St. Paul.

MR. SPEAKER: Possibly the hon. member might assist the Chair by connecting the discussion of resource income with this resolution or this amendment.

DR. BUCK: Very simply, Mr. Speaker. Resource income comes from natural resources. That's pretty basic. Then 30 per cent of that goes into the heritage trust fund.

That's what we're discussing. I don't think that's too difficult to understand.

Mr. Speaker, we are speaking of closure, the limiting of debate. But the question we are asking and for which we have not received an answer from the government, is why. Why is it necessary? That case has not been made. It was a tradition in this Assembly that in estimates, ministers of the Crown would get up and tell us what is happening in their departments. I don't know what has happened with that practice. If some of those answers were given in estimates, maybe this discussion would not be taking place this evening, maybe Big Brother government would not have to bring down closure, because we are asking straightforward questions. Ministers of the Crown are responsible to give this Assembly answers to those questions. That's what the debate is all about.

I find it rather appalling that when members on this side of the House question the government, when we have another point of view, it's either unpatriotic, un-Albertan, or it's: you shouldn't ask questions because we've got everything under control; you can trust this government. Mr. Speaker, the people outside on the streets, and in the towns, villages, and cities in this province, have always suspected this government. They voted for them, but they've always had that uneasy feeling that maybe they made a mistake in 1971. They have always had that uneasy feeling that this government is too powerful, that maybe it doesn't answer to the electorate, that maybe there is something they're trying to hide.

The people of this province at the municipal level could use that \$60 million, because many members of councils are afraid of their own provincial government. They're afraid that if they express a different point of view, the old tap line will be shut off.

MR. SPEAKER: May I respectfully ask the hon. member's assistance again in connecting the fears, timidities, or whatever of municipal officials with this resolution that's under debate.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, it's the \$60 million we're having the problem with.

MR. SPEAKER: Does that strike fear into anybody?

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I guess if you were the mayor of a municipality that's running a deficit budget, or if you were the mayor of a small town which is going bankrupt, you would be asking questions. Ask the hon. Member for Drayton Valley to name one.

MRS. CRIPPS: I'm working on them.

DR. BUCK: The bankruptcy or getting funds?

Mr. Speaker, the closure that we are asked to vote upon is not the sign of a benevolent government. It is not the sign of a government that wants things being done out in the open. It is the sign of a government that is going to display its power, its numerical advantage, and let the chips fall where they may. The voter has a long memory. I'd like to remind my government colleagues across the way that so many of the speeches and so many of the actions that have been taking place in this Legislature this session are duplicates of the ones I heard from the government side in 1971. When a government invokes closure, the government is saying to the people of this province, we know better than the Legislature what is good for you. They are saying that what is good for

General Bullmoose is good for everybody. I don't think the government has that much knowledge. I think that the parliamentary procedures, the parliamentary system and the democratic system, are much more important and must be protected more than we protect a minister or a department, even though they are investing our funds, making some money, but in some instances losing some money.

Mr. Speaker, I find it beyond belief that a legislative committee struck by this Assembly would not know who is investing our funds. No business operation, no corporation, nobody in their right mind can accept that. Nobody can accept that. Public business must be done in public. The funds that we spend and expend are held in trust. It is our responsibility to spend them responsibly, prudently, and above any suspicion.

Mr. Speaker, this is a sad day in the history of the Legislature in this province. I would like to move an amendment or subamendment to the amendment. The amendment to Section 16 strikes out the words "in an effort to speed the business of the Assembly" ... Mr. Speaker, I've used all my time. Do I have time to speak on the ...

MR. SPEAKER: As the hon. member knows, *Standing Orders* provides that a member moving an amendment is entitled to speak in the same speech to both the amendment and the main motion. That rule is paralleled in regard to amendments and subamendments. In other words, a member moving a subamendment has the right to speak in the same speech to both the subamendment and the amendment. But just saving a subamendment to the end of a speech doesn't give you another 30 minutes.

DR. BUCK: That's fine, Mr. Speaker. I'll save it for later in the morning.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question on the subamendment?

MR. R. SPEAKER: In speaking to the subamendment moved by my colleague, I feel that some relevant remarks should be made at this time. As I investigate it, the subamendment says: "in an effort to speed the business of the Assembly". With regard to our earlier concern with the amendment I moved in this Legislature, I suppose there was potentially an argumentative area in the resolution. That could be one of the reasons removing this section would improve the amendment I raised in the Legislature about four hours ago, 8:30. I think it would improve the resolution, Mr. Speaker. I certainly would support it on that basis. Removing that section leaves the former amendment I moved to read as follows:

This Assembly formally expresses its deep regret at having to employ the above noted time management mechanisms so that members need not be too inconvenienced by the exercise of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition of their legitimate right to freedom of speech.

Mr. Speaker, leaving the resolution in that form certainly says that members on this side of the House have been very responsible in their actions since the beginning of the legislative session in October.

Earlier this evening I read into the record a number of statistics indicating the many Bills passed in this Legislature. We have had 22 government and non-government motions discussed, 18 government Bills, and 5 private Bills. Five government Bills, 11 public Bills, and 26 public

Bills other than government Bills are awaiting second reading, and there are 21 notices on the Order Paper for other Bills to come before the Legislature. In terms of a fall session, I think we have done a lot of business. We have expedited business from this side of the House. We have not asked the government to hold up any business that urgently required the attendance of the members of this Legislature. I think that speaks well for the members and the process, even though we had concern with regard to the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, a trust fund of some \$8.5 billion. Mr. Speaker, we can indicate our deep regret at the government's action to use time management or closure, as we have indicated. They think that debate in this House should cease within a short period of time and that the freedom of speech, the rights of the members, cannot be protected.

For a moment or two, I'd like to recall the words of the Premier of this Legislative Assembly when he was Leader of the Opposition on this side of the Legislature, words that the Premier set out as his goals and responsibilities in the years 1968 to 1971. I find some of those quotes very, very interesting in that the Premier, during that period of time, supported the fact that we should have freedom of speech, that the Legislature should take responsibility. If they were going to be paid more, members of the Legislature should work harder and spend more time on their legislative responsibilities.

Some of the things the opposition leader at that time raised in the Legislature would be of interest to us here this evening, Mr. Speaker. One of the first things Mr. Lougheed said at that time with regard to freedom of speech in the Legislature and the openness of the Legislature is in the *Journal*, February 20, 1968, page 25. He said that he wanted to take the lid off this enormous bureaucracy in Alberta. One of the ways of doing just that is to ask questions, review the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, and have a massive amount of freedom of speech and the right to ask questions in this Legislature to put the government to the test in terms of accountability. But that was forgotten by the Premier. I guess we don't want to take the lid off the bureaucracy in this province anymore.

What else did the Premier say that was very interesting about the subject of freedom of speech and the openness of the Legislature? We look at the *Journal* for March 5, 1968, page 17: a very interesting quote by the Premier of this province when he was Leader of the Opposition. I think the guideline he set out in these remarks applies to the opposition at this point in time. We follow the same guideline. What was that guideline? He said, we will look under every rock. How do you like that? I remember when he said that. Oh man, he strutted around here and danced and pranced, and goodness — going to look under every rock. He didn't say anything about the time management that's in this amendment. In no way did he talk about time management. When you look under every rock, it takes a lot of time. The Premier of this province said that on March 5, 1968. Here we are, a few years later, this government has already forgotten one of the basic ground rules. They're bringing in closure because the opposition, the members on this side of the House, want to look under that rock sitting on top of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. We want to find out what's going on, where that big basket of money is, and see what the traders are doing as they carry it around and make money from one day to another.

Mr. Speaker, you can't manage time when you have that. You have to have open time, free time. You have to

take a lot of time. As I've learned over the many years I've been in this Legislature, the democratic process is a slow and positive process that needs patience, tolerance, and understanding. It's not a process that requires an insular attitude or a bit of complacency or — the term was a sort of arrogant attitude. [interjections] We want to be careful of that term now, but generally I say that about the government. Not to point at any one member, but I think we can characterize the group in those kinds of terms.

Let's talk about something else he was saying that relates to how the Premier didn't want time management. He wanted the people to stick in this Legislature and take on the responsibility. Here is it, right here. March 4, 1969, this is a speech transcript. At that time we didn't have a *Hansard* in this Legislature, but we had a speech transcript. It's on page 17. I should get into form so I can do it the same way. I remember that the chair was back and he was doing a little prancing around. The Premier said: "Now I think if there is anything that we don't need in this Legislative forum it is complacency." How do you like that? He said that back in 1969. Mr. Speaker, here we have a government that wants to bring on closure and cut down the debate, a government that doesn't want to have tolerance, patience, and understanding about the concerns of Albertans. They want to sit in complacency, bring in closure, and put in time management. As members of the opposition, we certainly don't want to inconvenience any members. They want to stay in a sort of complacent attitude and do other things. That's all fine and good.

What else, Mr. Speaker? Here's a great quote I thought was equally applicable to our circumstances here this evening. It was in the *Journal* for February 20, 1968, page 25. The *Journal* was a great supporter of the Premier in those days, and I think they follow the same pattern at the present time. It's very descriptive of what the Leader of the Opposition at that time was doing: "He wheeled into his plea that parliamentary democracy be restored in Alberta." Well, here we are today, eroding the cornerstones of democracy by bringing in this closure motion, so that the members of the government can conveniently do whatever they have to do. The article goes on to say: "Mr. Loughheed said circumstances in the province over many years has led to an eroding of the power of the Legislature." Then he goes on to give the reasons for the eroding. Well, Mr. Speaker, after 13 years, the very man who was going to lead this Legislative Assembly into a solid foundation that would uphold all the democratic principles is leading this government with a motion of closure to cut out freedom of speech and bring in time management:

so that Members need not be too inconvenienced by the exercise by Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition of their legitimate right to freedom of speech.

Mr. Speaker, that's basically what's happening here today. Here the man who was going to give all the freedoms to Albertans, build the democracy we all could be proud of, is deteriorating the democracy at present. That's very unfortunate.

I think the amendment here and the subamendment introduced by my hon. colleague to take out the section that says, "in an effort to speed the business of the Assembly", certainly should be withdrawn. I think that's a good part to withdraw, because maybe it isn't applicable to the situation in this Legislative Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, maybe the government really doesn't want to speed the business of the Assembly. Maybe the

speed, whether slow or fast, really isn't relevant, so we withdraw that part of it. I support that move of my hon. colleague. It's more important that we bring in this time management so that the members of this Assembly on the government side won't be inconvenienced. That's the real point of it all.

I guess the Premier of this province, who made these great statements a few years ago to Albertans so he could get elected, really just said them, and they were nothing but words. The only way a man proves his worth is to prove it by his actions. Here in this Legislative Assembly, the leader of this province is allowing democracy to erode, the freedom of speech to erode, and complacency in government to set in. He is not allowing the opposition — which he said at that time was 'most important' — to look under every rock or to get answers about all questions. The Premier of this province, guided by the hon. Minister of Education as one of the greatest executive assistants of that time to the Leader of the Opposition — well, he was the only one. He guided the Leader of the Opposition to being Premier, guided an Albertan to being Prime Minister of this country.

DR. BUCK: That's power, David.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that man supported that very statement that they will look under every rock and allow the opposition to do it. We want to do it today, and they're bringing in closure for the convenience of the government members.

I think we should remove that part of that amendment I presented to the Legislature. I think the speed of the business, or maybe even the business of the House, is of no concern to the members on the government side. If they are concerned about speeding up the business or doing business, they should talk about it in this Legislature. But at the present time, we've seen no indication of that. So we'll withdraw that, take it out, because maybe it isn't too meaningful in this Legislature as it is.

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, in spite of the arguments advanced by my hon. colleague the Leader of the Opposition, and in the interests of the fullest possible opportunities for debate, I'd like to advise that the government will accept the subamendment proposed by the hon. Member for Clover Bar.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. NOTLEY: I'm delighted to learn this information.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. NOTLEY: Mind you, I'm sure all members want to debate the thing fully, and we'll do just exactly that. [interjections] The hon. Minister of Education got up and gave us the benefit of what wisdom he has and tells us he's going to support it. I welcome that. However, that doesn't alter the fact that other members may wish to contribute observations to this debate. Of course, I would welcome government members. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, now that the hon. Minister of Education has given the thumbs-up sign, perhaps we may see a little action from government benches on this matter. Maybe we'll get some debate from government members, now that they have been given permission to proceed.

Mr. Speaker, I want to deal with this particular subamendment, because the subamendment seems to me

to make the observation very clearly ... [interjections] I beg your pardon? I'm for it. Yes, we're all for it. [interjections] Don't worry. We have lots of time. No one is in a rush. I have all evening, morning, and however long the government members want to sit here. Don't worry about it, friends. Just sit and bask in the information you're about to receive.

I say to the hon. members opposite that one of the reasons I support this particular subamendment — I just want to read it very carefully — to delete "to employ the above noted time management mechanisms", then "in an effort to speed [up] the business of the Assembly", is that I think when one reads the subamendment literally, the point is made that the business of the House has been carried on expeditiously. That is an important point to make, Mr. Speaker, because during the fall session of this Legislative Assembly, we have certain obligations. One of those obligations is to deal extensively with the Heritage Savings Trust Fund in terms of both the capital estimates and the appropriation Act.

The Leader of the Opposition made observations with respect to the hon. Premier who, when Leader of the Opposition, was looking under rocks for information. I'd like to quote the hon. Premier, too. Perhaps this is his day. On April 23, 1976, the hon. Premier had quite a bit to say about the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, Mr. Speaker. One of the things the hon. Premier said to this Assembly on that important occasion was transmitted far and wide to all the people of the province. Of course, when the time came to ride in on the hon. Premier's coat tail in 1979, our eager friends across the way were quick to tell Albertans what the hon. Premier said. One of the observations he made was to deal at some length with our legislative responsibilities in terms of handling this Heritage Savings Trust Fund. For example, on page 832 of *Hansard*, the Premier points out: "Mr. Speaker, the major change I set forth in Bill 35, as compared to Bill 74 ..." Hon. members may recall that a Bill introduced in the fall of 1975 really was a sham. There was absolutely no legislative control at all. So there were certain changes between the Bill 74 the Premier refers to and Bill 35.

MR. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member seriously saying that the Bill passed through the Assembly was a sham?

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, with great respect to you, no that's certainly not true. I suggest, with great respect, that you did not listen quite carefully enough. [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: I listened carefully, but perhaps I didn't hear.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, that's true. You didn't hear. What I said was a Bill was introduced and, as a matter of fact, that Bill was not passed. That's precisely what I said. If you'll just permit me to quote directly from the Premier, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure you would not want me to misquote the Premier, so I will quote him directly.

MR. SPEAKER: Might I say that I would be equally distressed if somebody misquoted the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that would be true.

... the major change I set forth in Bill 35, as

compared to Bill 74 that was presented in the fall session of the House ...

Mr. Speaker, that was a Bill that I maintain was in fact a sham when it came to the legislative control, but it was not passed by this House. It was presented to the House, it was held over, then we had Bill 35. Now this is the Bill the Premier is referring to. It was presented in the fall session of the House, and it:

... was to establish a special act of this Legislature each year to authorize in advance 30 per cent of the non-renewable resource revenue. So if this legislation is passed in Bill 35, from then on no additional money will move into the fund without the special act of this Legislative Assembly.

If the Legislature is not satisfied with the investment committee's management of the fund, it can refuse to authorize passage of that special act. Without the slightest doubt in my mind. Mr. Speaker, or in the minds ...

MR. SPEAKER: I very much regret interrupting the hon. member again, but as I mentioned a couple of hours ago, the purpose of an amendment is ordinarily to narrow the area of debate. As hon. members know, *Standing Orders* provide that relevance in a debate on an amendment must be stricter than the debate on the motion. Of course, once you get into a subamendment, which we are into now, the strictness of relevance becomes even greater for the simple reason that the subamendment — and it's very evident from this one — restricts even further the topic under debate.

Now, as I understand it, the narrow point we're on at the moment is whether or not these words in this subamendment should be expunged from the amendment. Frankly, I have some difficulty in connecting what the hon. member is saying — and that difficulty has been increasing, and perhaps he can get me out of it somehow — with the desirability or lack of desirability of removing from the amendment the words "in an effort to speed the business of the Assembly". I really haven't heard very much about the speed of the business of the Assembly in the last while.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I was coming to that very point. Have patience. I just want to complete this quote, because I'm sure we wouldn't want to misquote the Premier.

Without the slightest doubt in my mind, Mr. Speaker, or in the minds of objective thinkers in this province, the Legislature controls the tap. It turns it on or turns it off. The Legislature clearly controls the purse strings of this fund.

Mr. Speaker, directly relating that to the amendment, what we have to address in the amendment is whether or not there needs to be any alteration whatsoever with respect to the speed of business of this Assembly. Anything that relates to that matter during the fall session is strictly relevant, in the narrowest sense, to the discussion of the amendment. I submit to members of the Assembly that during the fall sittings of the Legislature, the discussion that has occurred on both Bill 69 and the estimates of the capital works division of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund was appropriate. Because the time was appropriate, there is no need to have this particular provision in the resolution. Therefore, I support the amendment.

Mr. Speaker, let me just explain to members of the House — and to you, sir, because I'm sure you would

want the edification — why I believe that the time taken this fall was reasonable, adequate, and not unreasonable. In addressing that question, I think one has to look at the importance of the task one has to address as members of this Assembly. The importance, as I think the hon. Premier noted quite properly in 1976, is that we turn the tap on, we turn the tap off. It is the decision of this Legislature whether or not an appropriation Bill is passed to authorize 30 per cent, in this case something over \$2 billion. Before we can make that decision, Mr. Speaker, we must be satisfied, as the Premier pointed out ...

MR. SPEAKER: With great respect to the hon. member, he is now lapsing back off the point. He got back onto the point. I really must say that these remarks are not relevant to this narrow question as to whether or not the amendment should contain these nine or 10 words that are to be taken out. That is what's before the Assembly, whether or not these words should remain in the amendment or should be taken out. Now, perhaps we could get to the point.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, the very point is ...

MRS. CRIPPS: On a point of order. With all due respect, I don't believe the Premier was speaking on this subamendment.

MR. NOTLEY: With great respect to the hon. Member for Drayton Valley, I will send her the *Hansard*. As a schoolmarm, I certainly wouldn't want her to be as unaware of what has gone on in this Legislature as she seems to be. [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: I don't think there's any call for referring to anybody as a schoolmarm in the Assembly.

MR. NOTLEY: I beg your pardon?

MR. SPEAKER: I don't think there's any call for referring to any one of either sex in this Assembly as being a schoolmarm.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would certainly not want to offend the hon. member. I certainly wouldn't think of doing that.

Mr. Speaker, let me go on to deal with the particular amendment. I want to deal with this directly because, with great respect, the time frame we have before us is very relevant to whether or not we can do our job properly. The point I was attempting to make is that we in fact were doing our job as members of this Assembly in assessing the estimates and in considering the appropriation Bill, and that there was in fact no need to have any amendment "in an effort to speed the business of the Assembly". Why? Because the business of the Assembly was proceeding at a satisfactory pace. Why was it proceeding at a satisfactory pace? Because there were certain clear obligations that we had to undertake.

Mr. Speaker, one of those obligations is the consideration of the appropriation of 30 per cent. That's not an appropriation that just come in here and pass willy-nilly. That's an appropriation that is the heart of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund and requires a good deal of consideration, not the kind of consideration where we come in here one day and pass it the next. So there's no doubt at all in my mind that the "in an effort to speed the business of the Assembly" is not necessary. It implies that the

House was not carrying out its work expeditiously. In fact, it's my submission that quite the contrary, it was carrying out its work in an expeditious fashion. That includes not just the appropriation Bill that I referred to but also covers the question of the estimates.

I know one could say, as did the hon. Government House Leader, that in the House of Commons. I believe he mentioned the figure 23 days; in the House of Commons in Great Britain, 29 days. But that is irrelevant, because those are agreed to times as a consequence of discussion among the parties. The issue here is: what is judicious time in this Legislative Assembly to deal with the estimates? I would say that the discussion that took place this fall was reasonable, that we were obtaining information that was useful to all members of the House and to the people of Alberta. So there's absolutely no need to alter or, in fact, qualify this amendment by having the phrase "in an effort to speed the business of the Assembly".

I just want to make one further observation on the subamendment before the House. The implication is that we must now speed things up a bit. The hon. Leader of the Opposition talks about the time management and that somehow if we have these five additional days that's going to be fair and reasonable. No, Mr. Speaker, it isn't. It's not going to be fair and reasonable to meet the criteria the hon. Premier set out; that government members campaigned on; and that became the centrepiece, if you like, of the Conservative platform in the last election campaign: that we had a Heritage Savings Trust Fund here, and there was legislative accountability, most of it — 88 per cent — after the fact, but on the 12 per cent before where we have an opportunity to consider on a prior basis the investment of money. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, and to members of the House, that before you can pass the kind of closure motion we have before the House, and before members can vote down either the subamendment or, after the subamendment, the amendment itself, they have to be able to demonstrate why the business of the Assembly should in fact be speeded up.

Mr. Speaker, I welcome the fact — perhaps it's because it's 1 o'clock in the morning — that we have the concurrence of the Minister of Education on this matter. Now that the government has indicated they're going to support this subamendment, which I think has a good deal of merit. It clears up the resolution, no question about that; simplifies the resolution so it's more easily understood by people in the province. Now that we have the commitment to support the subamendment, I hope that when it's passed we will have government members joyously rising to support the amendment. It seems to me that that would open a new sense of fraternity in the House and do more than almost anything else to restore public confidence in this government's commitment to open government although, frankly, that's going to take a lot of doing, considering the way they're trampling over free speech and the rights of Albertans on this entire issue.

I welcome the observations and commitment of the Minister of Education on this matter and look forward to a similar change of heart in terms of the amendment itself. If we can do that, perhaps we'll be on our way and have a successful conclusion to an excellent early-morning debate.

MR. COOK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make a couple of quick points and, as well, refer to *Beauchesne*. On the first page, it talks about the principles of parliamentary procedure and law. It states that the principles that are

the foundation of our parliamentary procedure are to protect the minority and restrain the majority. And we have that, Mr. Speaker. But it's also "to secure the transaction of public business in an orderly" way. I think that is what the government is attempting to do: provide that the public's business will be done in an orderly manner. We have provided ample opportunity for the minority in this Assembly to express themselves. Frankly, at this point, I think that hon. members in the opposition are trying to provide a form of entertainment for the gallery. I am somewhat . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I realize that on and off since yesterday, remarks have been made on both sides of the House, I think, with regard to the motives of other members, their characters, their courage or lack of it, and a few other things like that. With great respect, I repeat what I said yesterday: that's really not relevant. Members are assessed by their constituents, they're sent here by their constituents, and there's no need for them to be assessed further in this Assembly. We're here to assess ideas, plans, proposals, motions, amendments, subamendments, and that sort of thing. So again, may I respectfully ask that the debate relate to the topic and not to the personalities of the members.

MR. COOK: Mr. Speaker, I certainly wouldn't want to suggest that the hon. members are playing to the gallery. But I would like to suggest that the motion in front of us is really somewhat irrelevant to the question at hand. As hon. members in the opposition have pointed out, the business in the Assembly has largely been conducted, save for the appropriation Bill . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The member said "motion". Is he referring to the motion or the subamendment?

MR. COOK: The subamendment, Mr. Speaker. The question before the House right now.

For that, we have had another demonstration of an attempt to simply run out the clock. I suppose that's a legitimate tactic, but it doesn't reflect on the subamendment. We're willing to stay here until 2, 3, or 4 o'clock. It doesn't matter. I'm sure hon. members on both sides are committed to the concept that we should be giving a full airing of this matter, the estimates before the House, the appropriations Bill. The motion before us provides for more than ample time for debate on both the motion the hon. Government House Leader has proposed and the appropriations. Since the business of the Assembly has largely been concluded except for those two points, and since this subamendment proposes to take that reference out, I think we should simply proceed with the debate and the question and get on with the business of the House. Question.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Speaker, may I address that point of order, please.

MR. SPEAKER: I didn't regard that as a point of order. With respect to the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo. I thought it was just a debate on the subamendment. I'm not aware that any point of order was raised.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Nobody is too sure what he said.

MR. SINDLINGER: I thought he had risen on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Everything in *Beauchesne* doesn't relate to points of order.

MR. SINDLINGER: If you don't mind then. Mr. Speaker, I'll save this until the next time that member rises and do it then.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I'm delighted to be able to join in this leisurely debate on the subamendment which obviously has the total approbation and support of all members of the Assembly, or appears to have. So I think it's fitting that we should take our time with such a subamendment and consider exactly what the matter before the House is. I think my hon. colleague and I have struck on the same refreshing excerpt in the introduction to *Beauchesne*. Since he did not complete the whole portion of it, perhaps I may do that:

To protect a minority and restrain the improvidence of tyranny of a majority; to secure the transaction of public business in an orderly manner: to enable every Member to express his opinions within limits necessary to preserve decorum and prevent an unnecessary waste of time;

And as an aside, I might say that that perhaps ought to have a special meaning for us this evening — or this morning, at this hour.

to give abundant opportunity for the consideration of every measure, and to prevent any legislative action being taken upon sudden impulse.

As I understand it, that it a quick synopsis of the summary of principles of parliamentary law.

To the question of "in an effort to speed the business of the Assembly" and whether it's significant to the subamendment, I'd simply make these points. Under our existing rules, it is possible to have a tyranny of one if we're going to talk about tyranny in terms of the business of the House. All members well know that in the stage of committee study, as we now proceed, it is virtually a requirement that there be a consensus of satisfaction on any point. Under our rules, that's the way the situation stands. A member can rise in his place and ask questions without end, really without end. I think we have to ask ourselves, can that system be abused? Does it lead to the conduct of public business as it should be conducted? We can have different points of view about that. But the fact of the matter is that in all other assemblies in Canada, apparently, where it has been identified that an individual MLA can interfere in this manner, certain additional rules have been put in place to protect the public interest. I see that to protect the public interest and to carry through the work expeditiously. That is in fact the main motion before us, and I think it's irrelevant whether we do or do not have this subamendment.

The fact of the matter is that I believe the time spent by this Legislature this year on the estimates before us exceed or will shortly exceed four times that which normally has been required by this same Legislature, approximating the full amount of time the Parliament of Canada spends on a much larger expenditure. I draw that to the hon. member's attention and to any others' attention. So we're not talking about whether hon. members have the ability to have freedom of speech.

Every member in this Assembly well knows that on Thursday and Tuesday afternoon there is an opportunity to bring a motion before the House if the hon. member so wishes. There is an opportunity in question period to ask questions. We're not talking about freedom of speech in any respect, in any way at all. If we're on point, we're

talking about a system which gets the work of the Legislature completed in an orderly way. I think time scheduling is a perfectly appropriate . . . [interjections] I'm calling it time scheduling because that's really what it is. The hon. members have spoken on a number of matters, even once in while referring to a big majority and a small minority.

MR. SPEAKER: I don't know whether this will distress anyone, but I feel slightly offended about being left out of all this. I'm wondering if I should take my position at the table there, so that I may chair these exchanges going back and forth. Possibly we could get back to orderly debate.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, the point I wanted to make in concluding is simply that we have to have some regard to the business of the Assembly and the appropriate scheduling of the business of the Assembly. That's why we're sitting here this early morning. We're not talking about the right of free speech. We have lots of that, and we've heard lots of that.

We're not talking about protection of the democratic system in the sense the hon. Member for Clover Bar used the expression earlier this evening, because we will, not have a democratic system unless we have some fair rules that allow us to schedule the business of the democracy. As I've already pointed out, compared to all other legislatures, the Mother of Parliaments, and the Parliament of Canada, there is a gap in the rules of this Assembly which the hon. members well know, which allows the democratic system to get side-tracked and, if it were permitted to go on, to be destroyed. The business of the democracy simply could not get done, nor the citizens in the democracy. That's the point, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate this opportunity to address it.

MR. KNAAK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few comments on this subamendment as well. I think it would be instructive to relate to the beginning of the fall session, when the opposition quite boldly stated that they would commence a filibuster on the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. Part way through, several weeks ago, the statement was made that if they received certain documentation which the government felt was against an Act of the Legislature to produce, they would cease their filibuster. I would just like to read the definition of a filibuster: obstruction, in Legislative Assembly, especially by prolonged speaking. The filibuster is intended and known to be an obstruction to the normal legislative process.

The point I wish to make with respect to the subamendment where we relate to an effort to speed up the business of the Assembly is that the opposition quite clearly stated that if certain documentation was forwarded, which the government felt it could not forward under the laws of the province, they would get on with the business. Tonight we hear that all of a sudden they have some more rocks to look under. What happened to the process between when the statement was made that they would cease their filibuster, their obstruction, if the documents were forwarded, and tonight?

We're hearing a lot about freedom of speech. What does freedom of speech mean? Does it mean that a group of people can stand in the middle of Jasper Avenue, obstruct traffic, and just talk? Does it mean that we can talk about anything you want when we're addressing a point? Does it mean that the elected government of this province can be frustrated indefinitely from carrying on

the functions of government? Of course it doesn't. There's always a balance. Freedom of speech doesn't mean you can speak whenever you want, about any subject you want, any place you want. That's the position the opposition has taken in this House. There's a balance between freedom of speech and responsibility in this House. We've all been elected to represent our constituents and to make our points of view known.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. We're talking about a subamendment here. A general philosophical discourse on freedom of speech is very interesting, but it must be related to "in an effort to speed the business of the Assembly". [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Quite candidly, I find the point of order raised by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview to be just exactly right. We're talking about whether to take out the words "in an effort to speed the business of the Assembly". Although I realize the hon. minister got into the area of free speech once in a while, I was listening fairly closely. He just got a little bit off the point, then came back to it. It seems to me that we're making a wider excursion away from the point now. Perhaps we could get back to it.

MR. KNAAK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Talk about calling the kettle black.

The point I was trying to make — and I was directly on point, Mr. Speaker. I too would ask for a little bit of patience to bring the argument back around. If we permit the argument of freedom of speech to be unconfined to the rules of this House, there's no way the government can legitimately do its business. When we talk about "in an effort to speed up the business of the Assembly", I for one feel that the general approach taken by the opposition, by their own admission a filibuster, an obstruction, was really intended [interjection] to force us into the position of forcing . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Will the hon. member resume his seat for a moment until we hear about the point of order.

MR. R. SPEAKER: My point of order, Mr. Speaker, refers to page 112 of the rules of debate, Chapter 7 of *Beauchesne*, the fifth edition. On page 112, the word "filibuster" is a word that is not accepted as parliamentary. You will note there the word "FILIBUSTER", *Debates*, January 18, 1958, page 3364. The reference is made and makes it unacceptable. I'd like the hon. Speaker to call that to the attention of the hon. member.

MR. KING: I would invite the hon. Leader of the Opposition to consider which list he is reading. If he looks at 110, he will find that since 1958, it has been ruled parliamentary to use the following expressions — and there follows the word "filibuster". He's had this problem from time to time.

MR. SPEAKER: There's an additional difficulty. If an hon. member says, "I am filibustering", and some other hon. member agrees with him and uses the same word, I think we have a little difficulty having a complaint raised on it.

MR. KNAAK: Mr. Speaker, I see that the Leader of the Opposition, having started his filibuster, is now trying to

say that his freedom of speech is being impeded. What's being impeded is his obstruction.

Thank you.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, if I could just make a few comments on this amendment. What has attracted me on the amendment are the words "speed the business of the Assembly". That has attracted me.

Mr. Speaker, in the fall session I certainly have had a concern with the operations of the House and the way the House has been performing, and, as a result, not being able to get this information. I know that all members of this Legislature consider themselves as directors of a big business; that is, government. I'm one who is going to continue to, to consider myself as a director of the business in this province. As far as expediting the business in this House, I've always preached it in my constituency, and I still want to preach it in the House. I do when I go home to my constituency. On many occasions I have said that the government is doing a good job in many areas. I mean that, and they have done.

But I still have to say, as I've been going home the last few weeks and taking some polls, I have some concern in my constituency about speeding up the work in this House, but also getting some information so we can speed up the information in the House. As I've said, I've tried not to play politics in my constituency. Maybe sometimes I do, Mr. Speaker, when we have a campaign or something like that. I might say, what do you gentlemen think? Should we send money to the other provinces, or should we spend it on twinning Highway 1? I make some little comments like that sometimes.

DR. BUCK: You've got a mile of road in 12 years, Fred. What are you complaining about?

MR. MANDEVILLE: Those are some of the areas where I do play some politics, and that's in the campaign. But in the 14 years I've been a member of this Legislature, I've tried to be responsible, Mr. Speaker. I've tried to keep my comments down, but I like to express the views of my constituents. And that's what I have to say right at the present time: the views of my constituents.

I took a poll when I was home on the weekend and, as I said, they were concerned about the procedure of the House at the fall session. They were also concerned mostly about the loss of the \$60 million. That was the concern I had. Many people I talked to were very concerned as far as the closure is concerned. When I was home on the weekend, very few people knew about the closure. But everyone I talked to knew about the \$60 million.

I have to say, Mr. Speaker, it's regrettable that we got involved in this. So we've held up the procedure of the House as long as we have in the fall session, because we're losing more money on top of the \$60 million as a result of holding up the House. I have to agree that when one loses money on the stock market, you don't go around bragging about it. I know I lose money on the stock market, and I don't tell anybody about my losses. I brag about my wins. We have one particular cattle company, and we play the cattle commodity market on them. Three of us are partners in the cattle commodity market and I run the commodity market on that. I had some pretty severe losses, but I have to tell all my partners about it. I have to tell each partner how much I lost, how I was playing the market — playing it up, playing it down, or whatever. I had to give them all the information as partners. I think that's what we want in

the Legislature and what my constituents in Bow Valley want. They want to know how we lost it. And the main thing they want to know is: are we going to do it again?

Hopefully, we don't go to spring session and waste time discussing issues such as this. I hope we won't be involved in an issue such as playing the stock market. It's a dangerous area to get involved in as far as governments are concerned. When I took the poll, most people I talked to said that that isn't the purpose of governments; the purpose of governments is to provide roads, education, health, and not to get involved in the stock market.

Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to make a few remarks. I thought this was an opportune time. I enjoyed that "speed" in this amendment, and I wanted to give you the reasons I'm opposing this motion.

Thank you.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make a few very brief comments about this subamendment. I'll divide those brief comments into three categories. The first deals with comments made by the Minister of Labour and the Member for Edmonton Glengarry, both of whom referred to *Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms*, fifth edition. They began by referring to the principles of parliamentary law. I felt they went over it quite quickly, and there's just one line I would like to refer to. When it talks about the principles of English parliamentary law; that is: "to protect the minority and restrain the improvidence or tyranny of the majority".

It seems to me they went over that quite quickly, and I wonder if one could make a case for either one or the other; that is, to protect the minority or to restrain the improvidence or tyranny of the majority. Standing here, it's certainly not difficult to determine which is the majority and which is the minority.

One of the bases of our democracy is that majority rules but with appropriate respect for the minority. In this case, we have before us the ultimate weapon of parliamentary debate; that is, closure. I think the Minister of Labour tried to make the case for closure when he made his comments. However, I would submit that we haven't had adequate time to review the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. We have not yet had the Provincial Treasurer come before us and defend his proposals. We have not yet had the chairman of the investment committee of the heritage fund, the Premier, come before us and be accountable for those things which have gone on with the heritage fund, specifically the \$60 million loss.

One might say that closure doesn't protect the minority. Closure may be categorized as improvidence or tyranny of the majority, and that's where I might put that. I might also say, with regard to what's happening tonight, where we have the majority working in shifts in an effort to wear down the minority, it...

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I wonder if the hon. member would like to follow the example of the two preceding speakers and assist the Chair by occasionally relating his remarks to this subamendment.

MR. SINDLINGER: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I suppose the improvidence or tyranny of a majority might in fact speed up the business of the Assembly, but I don't really believe that is respect for the minority.

Having just addressed that, I'll put this down. I might make one other comment about the references by the Minister of Labour with regard to gaps in legislation in this province. I submit there is one major gap; that is,



freedom of information, the right of access to information. If the heritage fund committee had the right of access, if it had more information about the management of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, we would not be here today. The reason we are here today, among others, is simply that through accident the Heritage Savings Trust Fund watchdog committee found out that it is not getting all the information on the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, Mr. Speaker. The management letter I just referred to was tabled in the Legislative Assembly. I just wanted to make those two comments about that.

The second comment is in regard to the original debates on the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. I think we can learn a lot by going back to those when we talk about this amendment to speed the business of the Assembly. That question was brought up in original debates, more or less, on April 23 and 26, 1976, when there were the original debates on the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. One of the members at the time said there was a real concern in the minds of Albertans that the Legislative Assembly would become nothing more than a rubber stamp for the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, that things would be railroaded through here so quickly that there wouldn't be adequate review of what had happened to the fund and what was going to happen to it. The term "rubber stamping" was used. That's what we're talking about today.

The member went on to talk about the difficulty that posed when we had such a unique problem with the heritage fund. The member noted that a surplus of this sort was extraordinary in western democracy and that governments weren't really set up to handle these kinds of things. Governments were set up to provide those services that the citizens demanded, and then collect sufficient revenues to ensure that those demands for services were met. Governments weren't set up to tax away revenues so there would be a surplus. The structure for something like that isn't there. The structure there is simply to meet demands for services. So what would happen when the government accumulated these surpluses was that there would not be a structure in place to adequately handle those things.

MR. SPEAKER: Could the hon. member assist me in saying how that relates to speeding the business of the Assembly and whether or not those words should be removed?

MR. SINDLINGER: Yes I can, Mr. Speaker. I am going to come back to it, I hope not in a circumlocutory . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Soon?

MR. SINDLINGER: Fairly soon, I hope. The point is that with the rubber stamping and these unique circumstances, there would be a problem with the way we were handling the fund. He went on to say that this was the first time anything like this had happened in the British Commonwealth.

All these concerns raised by this member were consolidated into one summary statement, that there would be a problem if these things were rubber-stamped and railroaded through the Legislative Assembly; that is, speeding up the business of the Assembly just for expediency. That concern was addressed at that time by the Premier, and in most instances quite thoroughly. The Premier indicated that we would not have to be worried about this thing rubber-stamped and speeded through the Legislative Assembly, because there were legislative controls and

checks. He pointed out a couple of them. The first one I quote from *Alberta Hansard*, April 23, 1976, page 832. The Premier said:

The first is the act each year with regard to the capital projects division that I've already mentioned. That's all he addressed in that particular case. That is this one here, the 1982-83 estimates of proposed investments. The Premier said we would not have to worry about the heritage fund being speeded through the Legislative Assembly, because each year we could come here and address the capital project estimates. But here we find that we don't have to worry about speeding them through the Legislative Assembly. We just have to blink and we have closure and don't even know where it has gone; it has gone already. So the very first instance where the Premier says there will be legislative control on rubber-stamping expenditures of the heritage fund is meaningless, because we're about to invoke closure on those estimates.

Mr. Speaker, the other way the Premier indicated we could have legislative control of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund was through the introduction of a special Bill. Again, I quote:

... a special act of this Legislature each year to authorize in advance 30 per cent of the non-renewable resource revenue.

Mr. Speaker, that special Act is the subject of closure.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I must respectfully say to the hon. member that he is not being relevant to the subamendment. I have great difficulty in finding any substance in his remarks which relates to whether or not these words should be taken out of the amendment. I assume that some debate I might hear on this topic might say that these words are good to leave in the amendment for this reason, or they should be taken out for that reason. But I'm not hearing that kind of thing. It seems to me the rules of relevance apply regardless of the hour of the day or night.

MR. SINDLINGER: I agree, Mr. Speaker. We should make every effort to ensure we are being relevant in this material as well. I could preface everything I'm saying by saying that in an effort to speed the business of the Assembly, we should or should not have these things here. To get back to your point, I support the subamendment. We should delete those words, "in an effort to speed the business of the Assembly". I don't believe that the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund should be speeded through the Legislative Assembly. That was the concern of the member in the first instance. He didn't feel that these things should be speeded through the Legislative Assembly. They should not be rubber-stamped. In response to that, the Premier said don't worry folks, we won't do that for two reasons: one, you can come in here and debate these capital estimates every year; and two, you can debate Bill 69, or the appropriation of 30 per cent every year. Well, we've had a shot at this; I have to admit that. But we haven't got anywhere even close to talking about Bill 69. That has to be the whole essence of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, for two reasons. First of all, that's where all the money comes into the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. Secondly, that is the revenue for all these projects undertaken here. That's a very vast area, and I think it warrants scrutiny by the Legislative Assembly. So I have to wonder about those two things.

The conclusion by the member was simply that that wasn't good enough. Those weren't the Premier's words. I know the Premier uses those words quite often, that that

wasn't good enough. The member said that that was not good enough. I think the years have proven him to be correct.

MR. SPEAKER: Does this relate to whether or not these words should stay in this motion? I'm sorry. When hon. members propose a subamendment, they give me a one-track mind.

MR. SINDLINGER: I can understand that, Mr. Speaker. I think they do relate, otherwise I wouldn't be wasting your time bringing them up right now. [interjections]

Let me put it this way and simply conclude on that point, which was the second of my three. The member who said that that wasn't good enough also said ...

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Please let's get to the subamendment if the hon. member wishes to continue speaking. If he wants to discuss the main amendment or the main motion, I'm sure there will be ample time for that between now and half past 2 tomorrow — or today.

MR. SINDLINGER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll see if I can't get back on the topic. I actually thought I was. I was talking about speeding things through the Assembly. One is talking about rubber-stamping, the other says we won't rubber-stamp.

MR. SPEAKER: The speeding *per se* isn't to the point. The question is whether the reference to it should stay in the amendment. That is the point it is my responsibility to see discussed until we get to a vote.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Speaker, if I can refer directly to the subamendment, it talks about speeding the business of the Legislative Assembly. I'm trying to say that I don't think it's a good idea to speed the business of the Legislative Assembly just for political expediency, or any other particular reason. There has to be a specific reason. If you speed the business of the Legislative Assembly, we're going to have a situation where we can apply that old adage that haste makes waste. This might be a very good example of that. There are ample precedents for things like that as well. The Alberta waterways railroad development in this province, when the Alberta government ...

MR. KNAAK: This is not relevant to the point. I've been called on a point of order on the same kind of discretion. In talking about railways, he is not on the point of the discussion.

MR. SPEAKER: With great respect to the hon. member, it seemed to me we were getting relevant. [laughter] The hon. member said he didn't want these words in the amendment because he didn't believe in speeding the business of the Assembly. He is saying that speeding the business of the Assembly is not a good idea, and he is giving an example of it. I can't quarrel with that, and don't even want to.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Speaker, if I might capsulize for the Member for Edmonton Whitemud so we might all get back on the point of order, I was saying that I don't believe this subamendment, speeding the business of the Legislative Assembly, should be in there because it leads to situations that might be categorized as haste makes waste. I used an example that occurred in the Alberta

Legislature in the early years of railway development, when all governments felt that the best thing they could do for economic development was to construct a railroad. Railroads were built all across this country by any number of different companies and different governments. In this case, it was the Alberta waterways railroad. There wasn't ample time for debate and scrutiny. If more time had been taken, even just to let some time elapse, new information would have come forward that would have slowed down that decision and saved a lot of money for the provincial government of the time. As it turned out, however, at that time there was something called "time management" — even in those days, 1909. They stopped the debate in a different way but not too dissimilar to what is happening today. If the government had allowed further scrutiny to go on, they probably could have benefited from that and saved themselves a great deal of money and effort in the future.

This subamendment strikes out the words "in an effort to speed the business of the Assembly." I have looked at that in regard to the amendment and wondered why those words were in there when we first looked at it. I don't think there is any need to speed the business of the Assembly. I think it would be prudent to take all the time and caution that is required to deal adequately with any subject that comes before the Assembly. The government shouldn't be in any rush to go anyplace. What we found in regard to the \$60 million is another example where haste makes waste.

There was no need to incur that \$60 million loss, notwithstanding what people say, that all the dealers in bonds throughout North America were taking a beating because interest rates were rising. That's true. Bond values dropped as interest rates rose. However, there was no need for this government to sell those bonds which resulted in a \$60 million loss. They were all short-term securities that came due within 120 days on the average, according to the annual report. There is no reason the government could not have hung on to those bonds for a few more days so that when they matured, they would have got the full value of the bonds, plus the interest rate. The problem was that the government, in its haste, in its attempt to speed things up, did not do the proper cash flow forecasting. They found themselves in difficulty when they started transferring funds, especially for large projects like the municipal debt reduction plan. They found they were cash short. Without sitting down to think about what they were doing, they sold those short-term bonds and incurred the loss. That was the problem: too much speed and haste. And there's the waste. I wonder why the member put that phrase in there in the first place. I don't think he wants to have the business of the Assembly speeded through. I don't think he wants it any more than that member in 1976 who didn't want things sped through and rubber-stamped.

I support this, and I'm glad to see there is so much unanimity on this particular project. It was mentioned earlier that perhaps this is an indication of the co-operation that is yet to come from the government members as we further deliberate the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. Certainly, I look forward to that feeling of co-operation and cordiality that is associated with it.

MR. SPEAKER: Having heard the motion for amending the amendment by subamendment, by striking out the words "in an effort to speed the business of the Assembly", would the members in favor of the subamendment please say aye.

[Motion on the subamendment carried]

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question on the amendment?

[Mr. Speaker declared the motion on the amendment lost. Several members rose calling for a division. The division bell was rung]

[Three minutes having elapsed, the House divided]

For the motion:

Buck	Notley	Speaker, R.
Mandeville	Sindlinger	

Against the motion:

Anderson, C.	Cookson	LeMessurier
Anderson, D.	Cripps	Lysons
Appleby	Fjordbotten	Mack
Batiuk	Gogo	McCrimmon
Bogle	Hiebert	Musgreave
Borstad	Hyland	Pahl
Bradley	Johnston	Stevens
Carter	King	Thompson
Chambers	Knaak	Topolnisky
Chichak	Kroeger	Webber
Clark	Kushner	Young
Cook		

Totals:	Ayes - 5	Noes - 34
---------	----------	-----------

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity this morning to participate briefly in Motion No. 16 on the Order Paper. I might say that the only good thing about the defeat of the amendment is that in a parliamentary way we are now able to call a spade a spade and to deal with closure as closure. Now that government members have defeated the amendment, there is now no longer any reference to time management. All that debate is by the board. We can now deal with the issue of closure, pure and simple.

[Mr. Appleby in the Chair]

Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by offering a few observations on the introductory remarks of the Government House Leader. The Government House Leader made reference to other legislatures. He made reference to the government of Manitoba. Let me just say to the hon. government members of this House that they might well remember that several years after those changes were made, the government of Manitoba at the time was defeated. And perhaps it should have been if those kind of changes were made in the rules of the House.

The hon. Government House Leader was somewhat inaccurate, though, in terms of the Saskatchewan situation. After listening carefully to his remarks, I contacted the government of Saskatchewan. There are no limits on the Saskatchewan estimates debate, as a matter of fact, nor any limit on the Saskatchewan heritage trust fund debate. I think that should be made clear for the record. If closure is introduced under the terms of the Saskatchewan standing rules, it must be done on a clause by clause basis. Of course, Mr. Speaker, what we see today is the granddaddy approach to them all. In one whack, we're going to be ramming through the estimates as well as the appropriation Bills, as well as Bill 69, all in one nice, massive closure move, not clause by clause.

Since the hon. Government House Leader spent some time talking about the political marriage, and I think he even made some almost indelicate comments about marriage bed, et cetera, I think it might be useful to observe what did occur in our neighboring province of Saskatchewan in 1976 and 1977, when two members initiated a filibuster and hon. members in this House were very enthusiastic about it. I even remember observations of great enthusiasm made about Mr. Collver, who at that time was leader of the Conservative party and who was to be the Premier of Saskatchewan. Of course, Mr. Collver is no longer the leader of the Conservative party. He is now the head of the Unionist party. He wants to join Canada to the United States. The kissing cousins of the Tories in the Legislature are very intriguing people, talking about marriage bed or the family relationship. But what is interesting is that the little Unionist party in Saskatchewan decided it would undertake a filibuster. The proceedings of the Saskatchewan Legislature went on day after day after day, but no closure motion was introduced. The government just sat it out, as well it should.

One option this government clearly had was to sit it out. Another even better option presented was to have recessed the Legislature for four or five weeks until we had the report of the Auditor General. Then on the basis of the Auditor General's report, Mr. Speaker, we might have been able to assess one of the principal questions that has been at the centre of this entire issue this fall, and that is the loss of the \$60 million. The government has commissioned the Auditor General to undertake this report to determine whether or not there was any collusion or fraud, to determine what happened to the \$60 million. It seems to me that if you're going to have a special report by the Auditor General, the only sensible thing to do is to recess the Legislature so that the entire Assembly will have the benefit of the special report in determining whether or not we should allocate any more funds to the Heritage Savings Trust Fund.

I refer hon. members of this Assembly to the Premier's statement of 1976 that both the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo and I quoted from, that one of our responsibilities in turning the tap on or turning the tap off is to satisfy ourselves that the management of the fund is up to snuff. Mr. Speaker, it's pretty clear that as of this leaked document from the Auditor General — and isn't it a pity that we have to get documents in this fashion. The leaked document says:

There is considerable for scope for collusion between an investment trader employed by the Treasury Department and someone in one of the brokerage houses, which could result in fraud.

You then look at the Premier's 1976 statement, and one of our responsibilities is to satisfy ourselves that the fund is being properly managed.

How hon. members of the Legislature can vote in favor of a closure motion when we still aren't satisfied that this matter has been dealt with ... The hon. Provincial Treasurer has said that everything is fine, we've fixed it up; we're not going to tell you how we fixed it up, just trust us, have confidence in us; we'll look after it, don't worry about it; go back to your constituencies; everything is going to be hunky-dory. Mr. Speaker, that's not what the Auditor General said in this memo, not a memo which was presented to the select committee on the heritage trust fund, not a memo which the Provincial Treasurer brought before the Assembly in a forward way, but a memo that was somehow leaked to one of the members

of the opposition.

Mr. Speaker, it is really regrettable that the government has not come forward with this information. Frankly, until that information is properly presented in this House, I don't see how any hon. member, if they pay any heed whatsoever to the comments the Premier made in 1976, could bang their desks, as did the members who were here in 1976 when the Premier made those comments, then turn around and say, we're not going to worry about this in 1981; we're going to pass this motion of closure even though we have no way at all of knowing for sure what is going to be in that special report of the Auditor General. I say to the members of this Assembly that it is going to be a long time before Tory members in this House can justify to the people of Alberta why we need to invoke closure in December 1981 when the report of the Auditor General will not be all that long, certainly before April 1. We could in fact have been recessed and called back to do our business in light of the kind of information that will be coming forward from the Auditor General.

Because of some of the observations made both inside and outside the House about lack of confidence in the Auditor General, or at least those kinds of allegations, may I say that I for one have a great deal of confidence in the Auditor General. I'm convinced that given the mandate to undertake this review, Mr. Rogers will do it thoroughly. It is certainly not doing Mr. Rogers any favor to boot the members of the Legislature out of the Legislature before we have the benefit of his special report.

Mr. Speaker, I want to deal more specifically with the motion before us this morning; that is, this motion of closure. There's no doubt that it's a closure motion. When one looks at Citation 334 on page 117 of *Beauchesne*:

Closure is a method of procedure which brings debate to a conclusion and enables the House to secure a decision upon a subject under discussion.

So let's set aside all this nonsense about time management. I notice that even the hon. Minister of Labour talked about time management in his comments a few moments ago. Well, this really isn't time management, Mr. Speaker. It's out and out closure. Closure can only be justified in the most rare occurrences.

What kind of justification have we had in presenting the case for closure? The suggestion has been made by some that there has been an interminable delay in the proceedings of this Legislature. I say to hon. members who advance that theory, such comments are absolute nonsense. We have gone through a host of Bills which have been given Royal Assent. We are now dealing only with estimates and an appropriation Bill that relate specifically to the heritage trust fund for the year beginning April 1, 1982. There should be no doubt in anyone's mind, and certainly no doubt among the people of Alberta, that really for the first time, certainly in my review of the history of closure in Canada, we have closure for convenience, not closure because we are faced with some kind of immediate time frame.

I thought Mr. Trudeau was totally wrong last year when he used closure to ram his constitution motion through the House of Commons. But at least there might be some kind of albeit hazy idea of meeting a time frame to meet the objective he thought he had with Mrs. Thatcher in terms of the agenda of the British Parliament. I don't accept that, but at least there was some thinly disguised relationship that made some sense.

Again, in the case of the pipeline debate in 1956, I think the members of the opposition, both the Conservative and CCF members who opposed it very vigorously at the time, were right. But at least in 1956 there was a time-frame element that had to be taken into consideration. If the pipeline was going to go ahead, contracts had to be signed. There was a time frame that had to be met in the House of Commons of the day. While the Liberal government could be faulted for being all too leisurely in the pace at which they introduced the Bill in 1956, at least they had some time frame they had to meet.

Mr. Speaker, what time frame do we have to meet here? What is the rush? What is the urgency? You see, if we're going to bring in closure and curtail people's freedom of speech, there has to be a good reason. And remember, the freedom of speech all Albertans have stands or falls on the freedom of speech we possess in this Legislative Assembly. It isn't a good reason to say there are 25 days in Ottawa and 29 days in the British House of Commons. As Mr. Diefenbaker pointed out very well in 1956, there can be closure but it comes as a result of agreement. We all know what happened in the allocation of time in the House of Commons. Horse-trading in the rules took place. To quote a fairly well-known Albertan of recent date: you win some and you lose some. So there was that kind of trade-off.

We're not talking about a trade-off here. We're talking about unilateral action by this government, with its huge majority, to ram through a closure motion. For what? To meet the convenience of members, not because we have contracts that have to be met; at least, I haven't heard any. If there are, the government members have had all sorts of opportunity to raise those points. But I don't know of a single contract where we have to allocate this money in the next five days in order to meet it. We're talking about a budgetary year that begins on April 1, so we have lots of time to deal with this matter properly and expeditiously. If we were looking at the Legislature still debating this matter on March 25, then I think hon. members on the government side might be able to make the case for closure to their constituents and to Albertans. But on December 8, almost four months before the end of the fiscal year, we're in such a rush that we have to set aside the free speech upon the very foundation of which our system of parliamentary government rests? No, Mr. Speaker, I have not yet heard a single government member advance a legitimate reason why we have to put the free speech of members of this Assembly in cold storage in order to meet some kind of convenient timetable for government members in this Legislature.

The hon. Minister of Education talked about the responsibilities he has as a government minister. Of course. But he carries on those responsibilities when the Legislature meets. He doesn't just exercise those responsibilities when the Legislature is out of session. That's nonsense. Members of the opposition have responsibilities too. As the five opposition members; we have a call all over the province, but our first call is to be Members of the Legislative Assembly. We have to fit in our other responsibilities with those obligations as Members of the Legislative Assembly. So do members of the cabinet.

The federal House of Commons now meets nine or 10 months a year. We don't have federal ministers, even in a federal Liberal government . . . As I look at *Hansard* question period from time to time, I'm told that some hon. members have even suggested that the Ottawa government is an arrogant government. Imagine hon. members of the Legislature saying that the federal government

is arrogant. I'm surprised they would use that kind of term. I thought that was unparliamentary. Nevertheless, they say it's an arrogant government.

Mr. Speaker, even that government doesn't have ministers say: wrap up Parliament; we'll only sit four or five months of the year because somehow we have these public responsibilities. You bet cabinet ministers have public responsibilities. But those public responsibilities, those administrative responsibilities, all the responsibilities of being a minister of the Crown are just as much there when the House is in session as when it isn't. It goes with the turf. With great respect, Mr. Speaker, I don't believe a person should be in the cabinet if they're not able to handle it. It has to be part of the responsibility that goes with the job.

Mr. Speaker, one could quote many comments from past Hansards. There's one I want to deal with because I believe that more than anything else, this observation by the Rt. Hon. Mr. Diefenbaker — who I think all members of the House will recognize as one of the genuinely great parliamentarians in Canadian history — during the 1956 pipeline debate ought to be considered very carefully by members of the Legislative Assembly of the province of Alberta. It's very brief, and I'll take the liberty of quoting it. I'm sure all hon. members would like to hear it.

I never believed that this thing would take place, with a man like the present Prime Minister in this position. I have always said, "after all, while one may disagree with him, he will endeavor at all times to uphold the sacredness of parliament." I ask him even not to make, or at least endeavor to make, and restore it as a temple of freedom instead of a place of majority repression.

A "temple of freedom instead of a place of majority repression."

Mr. Speaker, majorities can do some pretty strange things. I think the Liberal Party found that out, to their sadness, a year later, in 1957. The Liberals were so arrogant in 1956. When Mr. Diefenbaker made this remark about a temple of freedom instead of a place of majority repression, all kinds of Liberal government backbenchers laughed. They thought that was a big joke. They didn't think it was a joke a year later when one after another went down in electoral defeat. One of the principal reasons was that Canadians recognized that our system is based upon parliament being a temple of freedom and not a place of majority repression.

Members in this House have to realize that too. Yes, in the last election 57 per cent of the people voted for the governing party, but 43 per cent voted for other parties. Members well know that a relatively modest shift of votes can make the difference between winning and losing, and that the public mind can change. And properly so in a democratic society. It can change as it relates to all of us. It seems to me that when one looks at the history of the use of closure, there is no better way to earn the enmity of Canadian votes, if the example of 1956 is anything to go by, than to ram through an unnecessary closure motion.

Mr. Speaker, as I look over some of the observations made in this debate so far, I genuinely regret that it is necessary for us to have to debate this kind of motion until the wee hours of the morning. It would be so much better if the kind of reasonable information we requested had been made available. After all, this kind of information is made available in other provinces. It doesn't wreck their management control systems. There were lots of

opportunities for the government to honor what was a reasonable request on the part of the opposition.

Setting that aside for a moment, I would say to members of the Legislature that over the last seven weeks, there has been the kind of discussion on the estimates of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund that does honor to this Legislative Assembly. Of course you can look over the estimates, and perhaps not every question is the kind that one would want printed forever on the pages of *Hansard* and circled as part of one's biography as one of the high points in a person's career in this House. I'm sure that would be true of the answers just as it is true of the questions. But when one looks over the answers — and the Member for Calgary Buffalo was quite correct in pointing out that when one reads *Hansard*, the very minister who raised some concern about the quality of the questions prefaces every second comment with, well, that's a good question, or that's a difficult question, or that's a complicated question. One wonders what suddenly changed that hon. minister's mind between the study of his estimates and his contribution to the debate this evening.

The point that has to be made, and I think it's extremely vital, is that this fall there has been a thorough examination of the those estimates. And there is nothing wrong with that; indeed, there is a lot that is good with that. That's consistent with the promise the Premier made in 1976 when this Heritage Savings Trust Fund was first debated in the Legislative Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, I want to move from there to deal with one aspect that I think needs to be given a good deal more attention than it has; that is, Bill 69, which is also part of this closure motion. That's the Bill that appropriates 30 per cent of the natural resource revenue to the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. As the hon. Premier pointed out in 1976, in many ways it is perhaps the most important part of the process. Oh yes, we can deal with the estimates of the capital works division, but that's only 12 per cent of the existing Heritage Savings Trust Fund. So 88 per cent of that money is still allocated by cabinet. But the one area beyond any shadow of a doubt where the Legislature, if you like, has supremacy is in the appropriation of that 30 per cent, the turning on or off of the tap, to use the expression adopted by the Premier in 1976.

Mr. Speaker, what have we seen this fall? We've seen a relatively brief discussion on second reading of the appropriation Bill. That's as it should be. The rules of the Legislature apply in a very strict way: no member has an opportunity to speak more than half an hour. Second reading occurred as in the normal course of events. As we all know, the real opportunity to deal effectively, if you like, with the meat of the appropriation Bill is in committee study of that Bill, where we are then able to put questions to the Provincial Treasurer and, I would say, beyond the Provincial Treasurer to the chairman of the investment committee himself. After all, if this government is asking for another 30 per cent it has to be able to satisfy all members on both the government and opposition side that its management of the fund has been satisfactory.

While I welcome the opportunity to study the estimates of the minister in charge of workers' health and safety, and while I think that much of the information we received from the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care was useful, and the Minister of Environment gave us a good deal of helpful information on the Lesser Slave Lake drainage project that I'm sure will be welcomed by

the people along Lesser Slave Lake, and other ministers who participated in the discussions on airports, the Advanced Education heritage trust fund: all very, very helpful and useful. None of us needs be ashamed of it; indeed, collectively as a Legislature we should be proud that we're taking the time to study those estimates properly. But, Mr. Speaker, important though those estimates may be, they represent only 12 per cent of the fund. The real question on how this government has handled the total Heritage Savings Trust Fund awaits the thorough examination of Bill No. 69 with the Provincial Treasurer and the Premier. In my judgment, no alternative to that kind of thorough examination really exists.

As a consequence, it is my intention to move an amendment. I'll read the amendment for all hon. members before it's distributed. It is that the motion be amended by:

- (1) In Section (2), by
  - (a) striking the words "the Estimates" and substituting for them the words "Bill 69 — Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund Special Appropriation Act, 1982-83"; and,
  - (b) striking the words "the Committee of Supply" and substituting for them the words "the Committee of the Whole".
- (2) By striking Section (5).
- (3) By striking Section (7).

I have copies for all hon. members of the Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, in addressing the question of the amendment that is before the ...

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Perhaps the hon. member would wait until we distribute these.

MR. NOTLEY: I'd be glad to do that if the hon. Speaker will stop the clock. [The amendment was distributed]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Does the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview wish to proceed now?

MR. NOTLEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think all hon. members have copies of the amendment.

The amendment places the emphasis where I think it has to be: on committee discussion of Bill 69. While I think it's useful that we have the time to discuss the remaining estimates, this amendment very clearly sets out a priority for the trust fund appropriation Bill itself. I believe this House would be completely derelict in its duties if we didn't have the opportunity to have the Provincial Treasurer and the chairman of the investment committee before the Legislature, to ask them in the very clearest way possible to explain everything relevant in this memo of February 20, 1981, with respect to the documentation for significant investment losses. It's just not possible for us to be cavalier about this loss of \$60 million. It isn't reasonable for us to speak about it generally in this kind of debate when we should have an opportunity to examine it in detail with the Provincial Treasurer and the chairman of the investment committee. Ultimately, it is the Premier and the Provincial Treasurer who must bear the major responsibility for this Heritage Savings Trust Fund. While it's useful to carry on a little more — and I would probably enjoy carrying on a further discussion with the Minister of Environment on Lesser Slave Lake; I found it very useful — it is not as important as having the Premier and the Provincial Treasurer before this committee to answer in a detailed way, chapter and verse, what

went wrong.

We have a government here ... Yes, I'll close in the remaining two minutes. We have a government here which is very, very pleased. It takes every opportunity to pat itself on the back for the good things. We even had the Premier himself make the announcement on the \$130 million we're going to allocate to cattle producers, largely as a result of the huge meetings throughout the province and the efforts of the opposition in this House, among other things. [interjections] We had the Premier give us the good news, but where is he when he comes to the bad news?

DR. BUCK: The polls will tell him what is happening in the rural areas.

MR. NOTLEY: Yes, the polls will tell him what is happening in the rural areas. There's no doubt about that. Maybe the ultimate poll will tell him what's happening in not only the rural areas but the urban areas too. He may find out, just as did Prime Minister St. Laurent in 1957, that if you bring in closure you court political disaster.

In discussing and opening the debate on this amendment, the point I want to close on is that while the estimates are important, the fundamental issue over the next few days is Bill 69: the appropriation of 30 per cent, the management of the fund, the accountability of the fund, the accountability of the Provincial Treasurer and, most important of all, the accountability of the Premier. That's why the amendment is before the House at this time.

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, I move that the question be now put.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I think some remarks certainly can be made with regard to the amendment before us. I don't see the urgency of the government bringing about this rush for closure. In their responsibilities in this Legislative Assembly, I think the government should take time to meditate on and understand a number of things to a greater degree.

The amendment before us says very clearly that possibly a priority should be placed on the business that remains before this Legislative Assembly. Bill 69 certainly has great importance, in that 30 per cent of the natural resource revenue that is made available to this province should go into the Heritage Savings Trust Fund — 30 per cent, which in this coming year will most likely be some \$2 billion. That's a lot of money. As we read the motion placed before us by the Government House Leader, we noted that the amount of time for debate on Bill 69 was rather limited. We also noted that more time would be allocated to the supply estimates, in our understanding. That's placing a priority on those two items, so certainly both are important. But in terms of the most important item, I think Bill 69 is of utmost importance. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, this type of amendment would place a greater priority on Bill 69 and would be a matter of the most urgent debate.

Bill 69 talks about the whole cross section of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. The supply estimates before us talk about 12 per cent of the total Heritage Savings Trust Fund. I don't think it's fair. If we place the emphasis on the 12 per cent factor and not on the 100 per cent, which is Bill 69, we're not taking on our responsibilities. If we in the opposition must accept the fact that this

government is going to bring about closure and stop debate, restrict the amount of speaking time we have in this Legislature, then our only alternative is to look at the matter on a priority basis. On that basis, we certainly feel that Bill 69 should have greater consideration.

If the Premier were sitting in his place this evening and taking on his responsibility as a legislator in this province, I think even he would agree with that specific matter. I refer to some of the 1969 quotes of the Premier which would certainly support this point of view. On February 12, 1969, on page 41 of the *Journal*, the Premier made the following statement:

Many things that are now decided by cabinet orders, he said, should be dealt with by the legislature, particularly decisions involving large amounts of money.

Mr. Speaker, I think that sets the ground rules for the debate before us. The allocation from the Heritage Savings Trust Fund through Bill 69 will be some \$2 billion. That's a large sum of money. The supply estimates involve just over \$400 million. That's a lot of money, but it isn't as much as \$2 billion. So in terms of those two expenditures and our responsibility in this Legislature, we must prioritize — that's a great word that we've heard in this Legislature many times by the Leader of the Opposition prior to 1971, as he stood in his place in this Legislature and talked about the priorities in this province: what is most important and what is least important. We always heard the word "priority" but we were never able to discover the most important and least important things to this government. We still don't. It's a government that has at its fingertips and has access to billions of dollars; on a per capita basis, more than any other government in Canada at present. This government doesn't set priorities because of that very fact.

Here before us are two main items of business: Bill 69 and the supply estimates. We have large sums of money. The Premier himself said that matters like this should be dealt with by the Legislature. As I quoted in earlier statements, the Premier said we're going to look under every rock; we're going to have free debate and access to all kinds of information. The Premier should be here in his place to defend the right of the opposition to have access to information, to be able to discuss all subjects, particularly those decisions involving large sums of money that are very, very significant. Those items should be discussed at length in the Legislature, scrutinized in terms of questions, in terms of cabinet ministers presenting information to this Assembly, by debate and points of view being presented, until we reach a final decision with regard to any matter at hand.

Mr. Speaker, that's not happening. At the present time we have closure before us, limitation of debate. In that limitation of debate, the government is even reversing the items of importance. Bill 69 is secondary as far as the government is concerned. We raised the question: why does the government take that kind of approach? I can only assume, as I assumed earlier in this debate, some six and a half hours ago, that there must be something the government is trying to cover up, that the government must be hiding something — first of all, that they want to bring in closure; secondly, that they want to put the most important matter, Bill 69, which is directly the responsibility of the Provincial Treasurer, as a lower item of priority, an item to receive less time in debate in this Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, that's not good enough. That's unacceptable to us as members of this Legislature. If we wish to

do the best job we can in terms of the rigid framework established by the government ...

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, there is a stranger in the House. I believe only members of the Assembly who are elected by constituents can be in the Assembly.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I'm not aware of who is being signified. As far as I can see, there are just elected members and the officers of the Assembly.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I believe that only an elected member can be in his seat; otherwise he would have to be someplace other than in a member's seat.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I'm sure all hon. members are aware of the fact that at the present time we have no pages in the House, and we do have to have messages carried around by some means. That has been going on all evening since the pages were dismissed. I don't see anybody in here but officers of the Assembly, and that's the means we're using to carry messages.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to draw that to your attention so you are aware. [interjections]

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, the motion of closure and the amendment before us are not satisfactory. In terms of compromise and some kind of acceptability, we have to look at that situation.

What else has the present Premier of this province had to say about the democratic process and freedom of information and free speech in this Legislature? On February 18, 1969, when the Premier was in his prime and Leader of the Opposition, he made many statements which were significant and important to the public of Alberta when he set out his objectives as a leader in this province. Along with some of the others I've quoted, I'd like to quote this one:

Opposition leader Peter Lougheed warned the Legislature Monday that it must modernize its procedures and become more public relations conscious or invite "peril".

He questioned whether the Legislature is a "meaningful institution" to most Albertans and called for less-strict party discipline, fewer closed-door decisions ...

Just listen to that.

... and more opportunity for the public to view the Legislature's actions.

... the Tory leader said these measures could bring about "a return to representative democracy" in the province of Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, those are unbelievable statements in light of the situation we have faced in the debate on this motion of closure. Here was a Premier who set out his goals in 1969 that said we must have an open Legislature, fewer closed-door decisions, and more opportunity for the public to view legislative actions. That Premier really isn't too concerned about that any more. He isn't even in his place for a most important debate, a debate that talks about the change of rules. The Minister of Labour stood in his place this evening and said very clearly that because this government didn't have a way to shut off the opposition, they're going to put it into the rule book so that next time there are definite rules in the rule book that will cut the opposition off when we study the supply vote.

Mr. Speaker, it's going to be interesting when we meet

in committee and discuss that very rule the hon. Minister of Labour suggested this evening, if that's the process and procedure this government will take. When they find they can't handle the opposition by debate, by facing the issues before them, by providing public information — that's a government that will not last long in this province. That is something we just can't stand for because they find they can't control the House because of democratic rules of debate that allow for members to speak up and to speak for their constituents. When they wish to change the rules to deny us that kind of privilege, that will be a most unfortunate situation. But that's what I heard earlier this evening from the hon. Minister of Labour, that the rules did not fit this situation we as members of the opposition have created. It is unfortunate that the minister took that approach, to say that kind of thing in the Legislature this morning.

What else can we say about the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, the importance of Bill 69 and of the amendment before us? As well, the Premier made other statements.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, a point of order. I wonder if I could have a ruling from the Chair for my information in that the amendment to Motion 16 being discussed is incorrectly dated. Could you advise me whether it's appropriate to discuss the amendment?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I think my ruling would have to be that the amendment could be proposed and, if the Assembly agreed, the date change would have to be made. Does the Assembly agree to a date change?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I believe the date change is agreed to.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I think we can again have faith in the democratic institution. There's been common sense and understanding. What we want in this whole debate is common sense, understanding, information, and a give and take between the government and the opposition. To this point in time, all we've had is take by the government; take the information and hide the information. Don't give it to the opposition; don't give it to the public. We try and try. Here it is 2:45 in the morning, and we're still trying to obtain some information with regard to the \$60 million loss. The Provincial Treasurer didn't care about it. He feels the public of Alberta doesn't need that information.

MR. NOTLEY: He's not even here.

MR. R. SPEAKER: He went to bed at 10 o'clock last night.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: As the hon. Speaker pointed out earlier, when we get into amendments we're in the area of more strictness as it applies to the motion itself. I think the matter of relevance is very important at this stage.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, the intent of the amendment before us is to put a priority on Bill 69 so when we are faced with this closure motion and only have a few days to debate the estimates for the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, we set a priority on Bill 69. I agree with that. If we can't defeat the motion of closure, that is

the motion we have to accept. To have limited debate is not the best option, even on Bill 69. We should still have a debate that could lay all the questions before us. That's the point I was making earlier. The Provincial Treasurer should be here presenting us with all the information we want, and we could all go home at this time. But this government wants to do two things: one, prevent us from having information; and, two, limit the debate on two very important estimates. That's not acceptable at all.

I think the amendment before us should certainly be supported. It's most important as a compromise amendment. Even adding to that amendment, I think there certainly need to be other improvements to the motion before us. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to add a subamendment to that amendment so we can discuss the matter more thoroughly and, as well, give more flexibility in debating in the tight stricture that's going to be placed on us by the closure motion, which I'm sure this government will force on us either this morning or this afternoon, whatever the case may be.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move the following subamendment. In accordance with your earlier ruling, I'm now going to change the date to December 8, 1981. Other copies of my amendment will be dated December 7, but I'd like to note that the original, with my signature, has on it December 8, 1981. My amendment reads as follows:

By deleting part (2) of the proposed amendment and substituting as follows:

(2) By adding at the end of Section (5) the words "with the unanimous consent of the Assembly."

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Perhaps we could hold the time for the hon. Leader of the Opposition while we distribute these. Perhaps somebody on this side would assist the Sergeant-at-Arms.

In the meantime, I might point out that when we look at it, and thinking it over, the date on the document itself is not significant. The amendment has been stated and read, and that's the way it is presented. Actually, it would not be a matter of concern if it were not dated at all.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my amendment would make Section 5 read as follows:

An appropriation Bill may be read a second time, considered by the Committee of the Whole, reported therefrom to the House, and the report received, on one sitting day, with the unanimous consent of the Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, that amendment protects the rights of members in this Legislature: the right to have time to do a thorough study of the business before us. I find that the way the present ...

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I regret to interrupt the hon. Leader of the Opposition. I have some difficulty with the subamendment. The amendment says, "By striking Section (5)". The subamendment is adding to Section 5 which, to my way of thinking, has already disappeared.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I believe the subamendment would delete Section 2, which strikes out Subsection 5 as worded in the original motion, and substitutes "with the unanimous consent of the Assembly". So we'd take one part of the amendment I proposed, strike out Section 2, and insert "with the unanimous consent ...".

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I understand now. I'm sorry for the interruption.



MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, the intent of my subamendment, "with the unanimous consent of the Assembly", is to make it possible that there is protection in the Legislature, that full study of the Bill takes place so we don't rush the business of the Assembly, so all members get a chance to raise some of the questions that are very, very necessary, so we can ask the Provincial Treasurer questions. What evidence can be given to document the \$60 million loss? What kinds of management procedures are in place? Can the hon. Provincial Treasurer present management letters to this Legislative Assembly so we can study them? All those questions could be asked. But the fact that under this subamendment we require unanimous consent of the Assembly gives each member the right to dissent, the right to say that this is not the time to move on to the next study of the Bill, as the case may be.

Mr. Speaker, I think that's quite fair. If the House is able to receive unanimous consent, no members want to study the Bill any further. At that time, when we get unanimous consent, all is agreeable in the Legislative Assembly. No member's rights have been taken away. There has been total freedom of speech, and we have done the best job we can in studying the appropriation Bill. That seems like a reasonable subamendment at this time, and I certainly think it should be acceptable to this Legislature.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few comments about this subamendment. Before I do, I'd like to say that I wish the government had attacked the estimates with as much gusto as they're attacking us this evening. Several nights when we were looking at various estimates, I wished we had had more time rather than shutting down shop at 10 or 10:30. [interjections] I was here on the estimates more than anybody else in this Legislative Assembly. It hasn't been the 72 government members keeping us here for the estimates; it's been the five opposition members. I think the government members ought to remember that.

Mr. Speaker, this particular amendment is quite technical and, I guess, a little complicated. But then the initial motion is a little complicated. It has eight different sections, and subsections to that. When you start amending that motion and then have a subamendment, there is likely to be some confusion about what particular section we're dealing with.

If we dig through all that, I think it becomes quite clear that it is a simple amendment and is founded on a very simple principle. The Member for Spirit River-Fairview has quite rightly pointed out that it is compatible with the original amendment in that rather than being deleted in the amendment, Section 5 is left in place, and the words "with the unanimous consent of the Assembly" are applied.

Mr. Speaker, what does this unanimous consent imply? What does it mean to the Legislative Assembly? Many times we have used unanimous consent to exercise the will of the Legislative Assembly. More often than not, it's been that way in order to protect the minority rights within the Legislative Assembly. There's no question that the majority rules. But there's a clear distinction between majority rule and unanimity. We found that out in the constitutional talks over the last year. In this particular case, unanimous consent is there for a particular reason, because there has to be some protection for the rights of the minority.

That statement is implicit in the principles of parlia-

mentary procedure in *Beauchesne*. Reference was made to that earlier. One basic principle is

To protect a minority and restrain the improvidence or tyranny of a majority . . .

That's on page 3 of *Beauchesne*. So in our rules and *Standing Orders*, we have unanimous consent in order to protect the minority from what may at times be considered an improvident majority, apropos *Beauchesne*.

There is also need to consider this subamendment quite thoroughly, Mr. Speaker, because we must bear in mind that in moving closure, we are setting in this Legislature a precedent that will be here for the next 500 years or forever, which is a long time. From day to day we are in the habit of quoting instances and incidences from years before, those things which have come before us in the Legislative Assembly. When decisions are made by the Speaker or the Legislative Assembly, they establish long-standing precedents which determine the behavior and actions of the Legislative Assembly. In effect, they define what we can and cannot do in a democratic society.

Therefore, a great deal of consideration should be given to this subamendment. If on one hand we are to establish the bludgeon of closure, we must try on the other hand to ensure there is a check or counterbalance. I would submit that the implementation of a subamendment of this nature would provide that counterbalance, that check to the bludgeon of closure, by ensuring that if there is some dissenting voice from a minority and if that minority feels its rights are being compromised or its privacy being trespassed upon, it can dissent from that unanimity and ensure those minority rights are protected. Therefore, I think we ought to bear in mind and at least consider the experiences of other jurisdictions in regard to closure. From time to time we have made reference to that last evening and earlier this morning.

What happens in other jurisdictions? I think the Minister of Labour referred to it at considerable length and pointed out that other jurisdictions have some sort of closure mechanism, although I believe the minister referred to it as "time management". I suppose that is the procedure or terminology that should be used here tonight. Earlier on, in regard to an amendment, we debated the use of the word "closure" as opposed to time management. We also had the analogy drawn about a duck. If the duck quacks, swims, and flies, it's a duck and not a horse. I think that still applies in this case. But the Minister of Labour made the point that other jurisdictions have closure provisions to ensure that there may be orderly conduct of business in the Legislative Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, I would concur in such a sentiment; that is, to ensure there is orderly conduct of business within the Legislative Assembly. But I submit that it is also incumbent upon the Assembly to ensure that business is not only done expediently but is done thoroughly as well. In this particular instance, I do not believe thoroughness has been served. I do not believe the estimates have been thoroughly reviewed. We have looked at some, but I think eight votes have still not come before the Legislative Assembly. [Mr. Speaker in the chair]

In this case, I think two items are going to be subject to closure. One is the estimates; the other is Bill 69, which takes 30 per cent of the natural resource revenue and puts it into the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. If one has more serious implications than the other, I would say that closure invoked on Bill 69 is much more serious and grave in its consequences than just the estimates. Therefore, I think there should be unanimous consent in regard to closure on that particular item. I believe there should

be unanimous consent on any item before closure is invoked, to ensure that those minority rights in the Legislative Assembly are protected.

Nevertheless, reference has been made to other jurisdictions and the need for closure to ensure the orderly conduct of business, to ensure it is completed in a timely fashion. I would submit that there is no urgency to the passing of the estimates, that would require them to be passed prior to the receipt of the Auditor General's report on the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. These estimates are not required until the fiscal year ending 1983. So I don't believe there is an urgent need for closure on the estimates.

Of course, other jurisdictions do have closure. However, I'm not too sure how often it is invoked. Perhaps there, as here, it would be invoked as the ultimate last resort. It's difficult to tell what the jurisdictions have from one province to another. From the debate tonight, I understand that only three other provinces do not have closure. But there is a difference of opinion in regard to how it is implemented, what mechanism triggers the invoking of closure. It seems it's a matter of degree. However, I submit that in this particular instance, the degree is quite severe, bearing in mind that we haven't even looked at seven of the estimates, and that we haven't even been able to debate Bill 69 with the Provincial Treasurer.

Mr. Speaker, it's worth while to note that there are parliamentary jurisdictions where closure originates from the Speaker. But from my understanding, closure has never been invoked by a Speaker because it's a very devastating tool. If that is the caution with which the Speaker handles closure when he has the authority to invoke it, I think we ought to bear in mind that it is a mechanism that should seldom be used and only as a last resort. All kinds of alternatives could be pursued in this particular case rather than invoking closure.

The reason closure has been given to speakers in other jurisdictions is that it is obviously a very self-serving tool of governments. There is no better example than this particular case of closure. Without a doubt, it is a self-serving tool of government. So in other jurisdictions where the Speaker has the authority, the Speaker has never really invoked that closure. In instances where it has been deemed desirable to do so, the authority has been delegated. But it has not been delegated to a government or opposition member; it has been delegated to an independent authority that can assess the circumstances in that particular case and rule accordingly.

Mr. Speaker, if I had my 'druthers' I would prefer that the power to invoke closure rested in the hands of the Speaker of this Legislative Assembly rather than the government. I'm very concerned about the consequences of this move to invoke closure. First of all, it does not say very much for all of us as legislators. Casting aside our various political affiliations and our positions in the Legislature, and bearing in mind that we're here to serve the public and do public business in public, it indicates that we in the opposition and those in the government have failed. That we could not resolve this in debate and discussion indicates a failure on the part of us all. With a little more patience, I believe we would have been able to resolve these matters satisfactorily, not only for the government and us but for those people outside the Legislature who watch us and expect us to act responsibly and in accordance with their best interests.

Aside from the fact that I think closure indicates a failure on the part of all of us as legislators, Mr. Speaker,

the second concern I have is that it sets a precedent. Once we get away with closure, it's going to be that much easier the next time; the time after that, it will be easier again. When closure is such a self-serving tool and is in the hands of the government alone, I don't think it would be in the long-run interest of the Legislature or the people the Legislature is intended to serve.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I think that if we must have closure on this, if this Bill must be adopted by the Legislative Assembly — and I truly wish it would not have to be that way — and if closure is to take away the rights of the minority to speak on these matters, there must be some other element of protection. There must be some other way, as *Beauchesne* puts it, that the minority will not be subject to the "improvidence or tyranny" of the majority. Those are *Beauchesne's* words. They're not mine; I didn't write them. They're one of the principles of parliamentary practice.

If that is to be the case, we must have some alternate means of protection. The precedent is well established for this particular subamendment: that is, unanimous consent. Mr. Speaker, I believe that by putting this subamendment back into the amendment and leaving Section 5 in, the unanimous consent can protect the rights of the minority in this particular instance. And I think we should give consideration to that, not only because it's been well established in our legislative practice but because it's become necessary by invoking closure.

Mr. Speaker, I would therefore urge all members of the Legislative Assembly to support this motion to give more credence to, to re-establish and reaffirm, the principle we already know well: in this Legislature we have majority rule. That's the way the system is set up, and that's the way it works. However, concurrent with that majority rule in this Legislature and in any parliament is a respect for minority rights. By the invocation of closure there has not been respect for minority rights. In all instances that I am aware of in the past, that have occurred in my lifetime, and that I have followed, the opprobrium associated with closure has been extreme. When members of a parliament will leave their seats and assault the Speaker's Chair and weigh invective against the Speaker because of closure, that indicates to me the traumatic impact of closure.

We should do everything at all costs to avoid that happening in this Legislative Assembly. We would do a great disservice not just by stopping it at this particular place, but I think we do a great disservice to all those who follow us after this particular case because the legacy, the responsibility for this will be on their shoulders time and time again. This type of thing will weigh over them. They'll be thinking: if we do this, what happens. If this bludgeon, this cudgel, is held over their heads, it is going to inhibit the ability of members to perform their function in a free and open fashion. I don't believe that should be allowed to happen in the Legislative Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, I've spoken at length about this, and I don't want to take up too much more time on this particular subamendment because obviously we have to get back to the amendment. And I have several other things I would like to say about that. So I would just say to Members of the Legislative Assembly that they should give serious consideration to ensuring there is some provision to protect minority rights if they must go through with closure. If they must bring that club down on this debate, there must be some other method to ensure that concurrent with majority rule in the Legislative Assem-

bly, there is a provision to respect and protect the rights of the minority.

MR. KING: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I regret that I was not in the House when the subamendment was put; I returned to the House while the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo was speaking. But it would be my contention that the subamendment and the amendment itself are out of order. I would have reference to Annotation 436(2) on page 155 of *Beauchesne*.

An amendment which would produce the same result as if the original motion were simply [negated] is out of order.

I believe that is the effect of subsections 2 and 3 of the amendment put by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview. Subsequently, I have reference to Annotation 424(5) on page 153.

Any irregularity of any [part] of a motion shall render the whole motion irregular.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, just briefly responding to the point of order raised by the hon. Government House Leader, I would say to members of the Assembly that in my view the amendment I proposed does not at all render the main motion inoperative. However, it does shift the focus from the estimates to Bill 69. It seems to me that that surely must be in order in terms of an amendment. If the hon. Government House Leader does not agree with the amendment, of course, he is at liberty to say so in the debate. Members who don't agree may vote against the amendment. But that is the purpose of the amendment.

As I see the subamendment — we already went through this point of order. I don't know how many points of order we can have on a point of order, but we went through this before, while you were out, sir. The subamendment would simply strike out Section 2 of the amendment I proposed and add to the existing section "with the unanimous consent of the Assembly". I should just point out for your information, Mr. Speaker, that while you were not in the Chair we had a debate on the relevance of the subamendment.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Speaker, speaking to the point of order, I would agree with the second part of the citation of the Minister of Education from *Beauchesne*, 424(5):

Any irregularity of any portion of a motion shall render the whole motion irregular.

That seems to stand on its own.

However, in regard to Citation 436(2) which says:

An amendment which would produce the same result as if the original motion were simply negated is out of order.

As the Member for Spirit River-Fairview has pointed out, Mr. Speaker, we initially dealt with the matter of relevancy prior to your resuming the Chair. I would also reiterate, sir, that the amendment would not produce the same result as the original motion. They are two distinct items.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, speaking to the point of order, specifically my subamendment and relating to 424(5), irregularity "shall render the whole motion irregular", I would say that the addition I have made to the resolution — "with unanimous consent of the Assembly" — doesn't make it irregular. It adds to the format of the resolution whereby, first, it was very definite that first reading, second reading, Committee of the Whole, and

potentially third reading could all happen on one day, without the unanimous consent of the Assembly; it was on majority vote. My amendment placed in there the parameter "with the unanimous consent of the Assembly", which certainly changes the format in one sense but doesn't make it irregular.

MR. SPEAKER: I must confess to having some difficulty here. As I see it, first of all, we have an amendment moved by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, and the part of it that is relevant to the subamendment is Section 2, which in its original form provides for striking out Section 5 of the main motion. If we're agreed that far, the next step is the subamendment. That says that we should add at the end of Section 5 "with the unanimous consent of the Assembly".

It seems to me that that subamendment may be a bit previous. How can we add words to Section 5 when we haven't yet decided whether or not we're going to strike it out? That's not a ruling; that's just a question, a bit of puzzlement I have here. I noticed the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo was making a point with regard to what the motion meant with the amendment, and what it would mean without the amendment. Perhaps we could come back to that in a moment.

In the meantime, my difficulty is that we have an amendment which says to strike out Section 5. Then, without having decided that point, we come along with a subamendment that's going to add words to Section 5. I don't know how that can be done.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I wonder if I could, while both you and the Minister of Education were not out — first of all, I would say that it does seem to me in terms of your ruling . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I haven't made a ruling. I'm asking a question.

MR. NOTLEY: I know that, Mr. Speaker. In terms of the discussion of the point of order, I should advise you, sir, that this matter was raised. It was my understanding that the occupant of the Chair at the time made a ruling on it. Unless I am mistaken, that would seem to apply to whoever is in the Chair. It seems to me that because there may be a different occupant of the Chair — you must be bound by whoever was in the Chair. This very point was raised; I forget which hon. member raised it. I should just point out that it specifically was discussed. I would just advise . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Might I just interrupt the hon. member for a moment. Perhaps I could be told what the ruling was. Was there a ruling that you could go ahead and amend a clause that you had not yet decided to keep?

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, the matter was raised on a point of order. After the matter was explained, the Speaker indicated that the debate could proceed. I don't think there was a formal ruling as such.

MR. SPEAKER: I should think I could be bound on this only by a formal ruling. We now have a point of order raised on the subamendment. Of course, that means we have to relate it to the amendment and possibly back to the main motion. I invite the assistance of any hon. member who can tell me how we can debate a subamen-

dment to add words to a provision we haven't yet decided to keep.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, very quickly on the point of order, Part 2 of the amendment of the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview strikes out Section 5 of the original motion. The subamendment added by me indicates: delete Part 2 of the amendment, the part that strikes out Section 5; in other words, reinstate Section 5 into the main motion. After I have reinstated it, I bring in my amendment by adding to the section I reinstated: "with the unanimous consent of the Assembly". That was the understanding I had when we proceeded with the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: Subject to what other hon. members may say, that seems to make sense to me.

MR. NOTLEY: Let's go ahead.

MR. SPEAKER: I don't know who had the floor on the subamendment.

MR. KING: I'm a little confused, Mr. Speaker. When I rose, my concern was not about the appropriateness of the subamendment. It seems to me to be directly related to the amendment in the way described by the hon. Leader of the Opposition. My concern, however, is my earlier argument that I believe the amendment itself is out of order. That was never ruled on or commented on by the other hon. gentleman who occupied the Chair. His ruling was on the relevance of the subamendment, not the amendment itself.

I am making the point of order to you, Mr. Speaker, and ask your interpretation subject to Annotation 424, that the Speaker has the unquestioned authority to modify motions with respect to form or indeed to refuse to allow them before the House if he considers them to be out of order.

MR. SPEAKER: My understanding is that that happens before they reach the Order Paper, when motions are on notice. It seems to me that the Speaker's power — surely he can say that a motion is out of order, but I'd be very reluctant to exercise, in a way, the function of the House by amending a motion. It seems to me that once a motion has come to the floor of the House, the only choices open to the Chair are either to recognize it as being in order or to say it's not in order. As the hon. member cited a moment ago, if part of it's not in order, then all of it's not in order.

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, I'm only asking if you would give a judgment as to whether you consider this amendment to be in order. On the basis of annotations 436 and 424, I have submitted that it is out of order but, of course, I rely on your ruling in that matter. I have simply argued that because, in my view, part of it is out of order, all of it is out of order. I await your ruling in that regard.

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if the hon. member would just assist the Chair by going over that again. What is out of order in this amendment?

MR. KING: I have reference to Annotation 436(2) on page 155.

An amendment which would produce the same result as if the original motion were simply negated

is out of order.

Then I have reference to 415, which says that a motion may be voted on in parts. That opportunity existing with respect to motions, it exists with respect to amendments as well. If that is the case, then I argue that to adopt Part 2 of the amendment, which has the effect of striking Section 5, is to have the same effect as to negative Section 5 of the resolution. To adopt Part 3 of the amendment, which strikes Section 7, has the same effect as negating Section 7 of the resolution, which could be done if the resolution were voted on in parts. On that basis, I would argue that parts 2 and 3 of the amendment are out of order and, if that is correct, then 424(5) has effect.

MR. SPEAKER: As I understand it, the hon. minister is saying that Section 2 of the amendment, which provides for striking out Section 5, is out of order because the same result could be achieved by simply voting against Section 5. He is saying that Section 3 of the amendment is out of order since it provides for striking out Section 7, and the same result could be achieved by voting against Section 7.

It would seem to me that a difficulty with the point of order raised by the hon. minister is that that presupposes that the Chair is going to exercise its discretion of dividing the motion into parts and having it voted on separately. I rather doubt that I'm going to do that, especially when we have a notice of closure under it.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, to the point of order. Surely for the hon. Acting Government House Leader even to suggest that we're going to be dealing with it in parts at this stage is quite questionable. It would seem to me that if that were the intention, the motion would have been introduced on the basis of dealing with it part by part; then amendments could have been placed part by part. At this stage of the game, at 3:25 in the morning, to raise a point of order on that basis on what is a legitimate amendment, I say with great respect, Mr. Speaker, is wasting the Legislature's time.

MR. SPEAKER: It seems to me that any discretion I might have had with regard to dividing the motion so that the point of order might have been given effect has passed. I suppose it's in the hands of the House. If somebody wants to move an amendment — in fact it's already been done, taking out two parts; that's one way of dividing it, although it won't divide it for consideration because the two parts taken out will have been discarded if the amendment carries.

MR. LYSONS: Mr. Speaker, relative to the question asked by the Member for Spirit River-Fairview, what difference does the time make? We didn't set the time. He said in relationship to the time. I'd like that clarified.

MR. SPEAKER: If I may say, with respect, to the hon. Member for Vermilion-Viking, I think the reference to time is that the clock has made a considerable amount of progress since 8 o'clock.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Speaker, could I add a few more comments about unanimous consent of the Assembly? On very many occasions through the last three years I've been here, we have considered things, courses, or directions for the Assembly to take only after seeking and attaining unanimous consent of the Assembly. So there is ample precedent for something like this; that is, getting

unanimous consent of the Assembly.

The reason it becomes so important in this case, Mr. Speaker, is that we're invoking something here which has never been invoked before in the history of this province; that is, closure. If Members of the Legislative Assembly ever had one weapon or one thing they could do in this Assembly — that is the ability to get up and debate — that is being taken away from them. The ability to get up and debate is being taken from the members by invoking closure.

There are items in the estimates that have not yet been debated. There are — I can't recall off hand; I guess I should look. I recall there are 24 votes, and we have not covered the 24 yet. We still have another eight to go. Not only that, Mr. Speaker, we have not yet had the opportunity to debate or discuss Bill 69, where 30 per cent of the revenues the province receives from natural gas, crude oil, coal, and sulphur is transferred from general revenue into the heritage fund. In my judgment, sir, that is a very important omission because Bill 69 is really an umbrella Bill.

When we talk about the various estimates and the various capital expenditures for irrigation, airports, or hospitals, those are very specific allocations of funds. When they were before the committee, the debate centred specifically on those items. When airports were before the committee, we talked about airports; we did not talk about hospitals. But in that instance they were distinct and discrete entities. When you look at the two under Bill 69, there is an interrelationship between them, not in their functional purposes but simply in the allocation or budgeting of funds. When we look at Bill 69, there becomes a question of prioritizing expenditures. That is, when we have the money coming into the heritage fund, just what is the allocation process? How much of that money should be going to hospitals, and how much to airports? That's where the interrelation comes in. That's a very important subject matter that this Legislative Assembly should debate and discuss prior to giving approval to the transfer of that 30 per cent of funds.

Mr. Speaker, from time to time I have heard it said in the Legislative Assembly that perhaps it ought not to be 30 per cent. Some of those among us have the opinion that it should be more than 30 per cent. As well, some have felt that it should be less than 30 per cent. So it's a very important question that should be debated.

MRS. CHICHAK: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I hesitate to interrupt the hon. member, but it was my impression that when he spoke just prior to the point of order being raised by the hon. minister, he had concluded his remarks and his debate at that time. I'm just asking for a clarification. That was the impression, and it was my understanding then that the hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest had risen to commence his remarks. Could we have a clarification?

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Speaker, the Member for Edmonton Norwood has asked for clarification in regard to whether or not I had discontinued my remarks at the time. I would like to point out that I have some more comments to make about this particular thing. I await eagerly the comments from the Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest. I will try to be very brief and succinct in the remaining ...

MR. SPEAKER: But is that on the point? The question is: had he stopped? It may well be that he has more to say

when he stops. I understood that he was interrupted to deal with a point of order which was raised ...

AN HON. MEMBER: Sure he was.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, let's find out.

MR. BRADLEY: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I rose to speak after the hon. member had sat down, but the hon. Member for Edmonton Kingsway then rose on a point of order and superseded my right to speak on the subamendment.

MR. SPEAKER: In that event, I would have to say that the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo has used up this turn.

MR. SINDLINGER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thank the Member for Edmonton Norwood for bringing that to our attention. It seems that the hour and the importance of the subject caused me to forget exactly where I had left off.

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, my passion to participate in this particular debate has probably diminished with the hours that it has continued. But I felt it necessary to speak on the subamendment because of some of the remarks which have been made and some of the quotations from *Beauchesne* which have been made in reference to the principles of parliamentary law. Since there were some references under Annotation 1 and the principles of parliamentary law which the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo referred to, I thought I just might continue where he left off, to put in the public record some of the other principles of parliamentary law under which we operate. If I may quote from *Beauchesne*, Annotation 1:

The principles that lie at the basis of English parliamentary law, have always been kept steadily in view by the Canadian Parliament; these are: To protect a minority and restrain the improvidence or tyranny of a majority;

That's as much of the quotation which the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo quoted. But then it goes on to say:

to secure the transaction of public business in an orderly manner; to enable every Member to express his opinions within limits necessary to preserve decorum and prevent an unnecessary waste of time;

I think we're here today discussing with regard to this motion before us a scheduling of time, limits within limits. That's what we're discussing.

... to give abundant opportunity for the consideration of every measure.

And I would submit that 17 days discussing estimates, plus six, is abundant opportunity for consideration of the measures.

... and to prevent any legislative action being taken upon sudden impulse.

Now, this isn't impulsive legislation that we're proceeding on. It's an additional five days in the estimates. These are principles of parliamentary law. I just wanted to point out to the Assembly that there were other principles in the annotation which the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo quoted, other than the ones that he had. There are plenty of them.

He also went on to suggest in his remarks that there had been no discussion on Bill 69. In fact, there has been discussion on Bill 69. Second reading was on Friday, November 13. A number of members participated in that

debate. On Thursday, November 19, in this Assembly, it was debated in Committee of the Whole. So there has been consideration of Bill 69 to date. In fact, the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview spoke in Committee of the Whole, and the hon. Member for Little Bow, and the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo. So in fact there has been some discussion in this Assembly with regard to Bill 69. I suppose, perhaps, the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo forgot that he participated in the debate on that day.

With regard to the question of scheduling of time which is really before us, there are a number of precedents. If I could quote from the *Standing Orders* of the House of Commons, they have limits with regard to debate on the throne speech. That's Standing Order 38(1), under the Address in Reply to His Excellency's Speech:

The proceedings on the order of the day for resuming debate on the motion for an Address in Reply to His Excellency's Speech and on any amendments proposed thereto shall not exceed eight sitting days.

That's the amount of time allowed in the House of Commons in this country with regard to the debate on the Speech from the Throne. So, is that closure or is that scheduling of time? I suggest that it's scheduling of the orderly business of the House.

We go on to the estimates which the hon. House leader earlier alluded to. The estimates of supply in the House of Commons are again under a standing order of the House of Commons, Standing Order 58(5). It refers to the fact that 25 days would be allotted to consideration of the estimates of the House of Commons in supply, 25 days for dollars to be appropriated, which equal 15,000 per cent greater than the amounts which we are talking about here. For 150 times more dollars with regard to the federal budget of this country, 25 days are allotted by the *Standing Orders* of the House of Commons.

Again, is that closure or is that scheduling the time of the Assembly to conduct its business in an orderly way? What is fair and reasonable? We're suggesting 17 days so far in the estimates and another six. That's 23. I suggest that's fair and reasonable when you look at the comparison in the House of Commons.

Further to this matter, I look at what the practice is in the British House, and refer to *Erskine May*, page 285, under Supply:

Under the terms of S. O. No. 18, twenty-nine days are allotted to the business of Supply in each session. In the Mother of Parliaments they have a time scheduling motion in their *Standing Orders* which gives them 29 days. I don't know how many billions of pounds the budget of the United Kingdom is, but it's certainly at least equal to the budget of Canada, if not greater, and is inestimably greater than the \$400 million we're discussing here under supply.

I just wanted to bring that to the attention of the hon. members with regard to this debate, and correct some of the impressions created by other members earlier in this debate.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, it's amazing, when you're facing the guillotine, how you feel that this may be your last chance to speak. You never know. So I would like to say a word or two on the subamendment before us.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that when we're looking at closure, a large government, and a small opposition, the government is achieving its purpose. They are grinding us down, Mr. Speaker. They are wearing us down. If this is the way the government wants to run its operation, that's fine.

The people of the province will judge them. It may not be this election, but it'll be the one after.

To speak to the point, I was appalled to hear the Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest say that this was premeditated. It wasn't just something they thought of on the spur of the moment. Is the member saying to this Assembly that the government has always been planning that if they do not like the way the opposition questions and shows its responsibility by checking the estimates and Bill 69, the appropriations Bill, which has not been as fully discussed as it should be, Mr. Speaker to the hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest, when billions of dollars, at least \$2 billion, will be put into the Heritage Savings Trust Fund — should that not be questioned? Should that percentage not be increased or lowered? That's what the legislative process is all about.

Now the government, in its bigness and its lack of wisdom, is going to bring closure. The member says the guillotine has been premeditated. I hear rumblings in the back from my friend who should be sitting way back in the corner in his seat. But that's okay, it feels a little lonesome way back there in the corner, because your other Tory friends have all gone home to bed.

MR. NOTLEY: They're on the shift that can sleep tonight.

DR. BUCK: Mind you, I realize that when you shift boys, bring some in and haul some out ... I see the Minister of Transportation has finally given up. It was his night to be in the barrel. The whip said you had to be there, hon. Minister of Transportation. It's your turn to be here. So if you're told to be there, be there. That's the way this government runs. If you question you get kicked out, right, Sindlinger?

Mr. Speaker, in this Assembly this coming evening, at 8 o'clock, I presume, a vote is to be taken. Then this large government is going to really put that little opposition in its place. They are going to show the opposition and the people of this province how you run things. Mr. Speaker, that has some perils.

[Mr. Kroeger entered the House]

MR. NOTLEY: Here's Henry. [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if I really am building up my expectations to an unreasonable extent if I ask that we get back to the subamendment.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, when we are asking that unanimous consent be given, if we're going to go through the stages of the Bill without discussion, then we are saying that there should be unanimous consent. If the issue is so pressing, if it means that we have to pay the wages of the civil service in this province or something has to be done, I am sure that opposition members are not unreasonable people. We are elected to this Assembly to do the business of the province. But this government has not indicated to us why they need this power. If they needed the power, we would grant unanimous consent.

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, oh.

DR. BUCK: Don't moan and groan. If that power were required, it would be granted. It's that simple. But when we are being cut off at the pass, as the old western says, at the Alamo, then we will not allow it. It doesn't matter

how large the numbers are; it doesn't matter how many hours it will take. They are not going to steam-roller over us. Mr. Speaker, it may take some more coffee. But there aren't enough of them over there to run over us.

MR. NOTLEY: They look pretty bleary-eyed too, Walt.

DR. BUCK: Fine, be my guest. We're going to call in the fire department because they know how to work shift. Maybe the fire department could do a good job of dousing this closure motion. When we were looking at unanimous consent to have ...

MR. NOTLEY: They still remember the two-by-four, Walt.

DR. BUCK: Oh yes, we well remember the two-by-four, and how you have to hit the firemen between the horns with a two-by-four to get their attention. Mr. Speaker, that will go down in the history of *Hansard* as one of the most infamous statements we've heard.

Mr. Speaker, we are trying to separate Bill 69 from the heritage trust supply, because we feel that the two issues are sufficiently important that they should be divided.

In two more minutes, a record will be set in this legislative chamber for the amount of time spent in the morning in doing the taxpayers' business. But, Mr. Speaker, more earth-shaking than that will be what will happen when the government invokes closure. At that time, are we going to run this province and Legislature entirely at the whim of the government? Is the parliamentary process not going to function in this province? When we're asking for unanimous consent, can we decide now, at a whim, that maybe 27 days have been too long? Maybe next year we'll have a lot of people who want to go someplace, or there's a lot of business to be transacted. Maybe next year it's going to be 20 days, and the year after that, 15 days, and then after that, one day.

Mr. Speaker, what we are trying to protect in this Assembly is the right of people to stand in their places, to ask questions, to debate without fear of that guillotine coming down. I have been in this Assembly the same number of years as the members of the government who were over on this side in 1967. We've had the same number of years of experience. We are only behind the hon. Leader of the Opposition in years of service. We have not seen the reason for closure in this Assembly until now.

MR. SPEAKER: There seems to be a most discouraging lack of attempts to assist the Chair in getting back to this subamendment. It would seem to me that the substance of the subamendment is whether something should be done with unanimous consent or by majority vote. Those are the two alternatives. I don't recall hearing much about that.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, when we are going to move through more than one stage of a Bill, we are saying that we require unanimous consent. We do not feel that if that unanimous consent is not given, it can be overridden by a large majority. The subamendment says that if the unanimous consent is required for a Bill of great importance, it would most likely be given. But it is not good enough that if the rights of members are going to be overridden, a large majority could do that. So what we are trying to say here is that unanimous consent would be given when it is required. This is the stand that I would like to take on the

debate. I feel that if we are responsible, that is the only course of action to be taken.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a comment or two to the subamendment before the House this evening. It's only appropriate in dealing with the subamendment that I respond to the comments made by the hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest, whose comments, incidentally, were out of order, unless one looks at the context of unanimous consent. So, while he didn't say that and he wasn't called to order, I assume that that goes without saying, because I assume he wasn't out of order.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest went on for some time to talk about the time allocated in other jurisdictions. He mentioned the House of Commons and 25 days. He quoted for some time from *Erskine May* with respect to 29 days in the British House of Commons.

MR. SPEAKER: I have to agree with the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview that I was not sufficiently diligent with regard to relevance. I also have to agree with him that, those things having been said, he's entitled to deal with them.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, dealing with the observations made, then, by the hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest, what he did not point out, and I think it needs to be said in discussing this entire issue, is: yes, 25 days are set aside for estimates in the House of Commons; yes, those estimates constitute 150 times greater magnitude — I think that was the figure the hon. member used — than the \$400 million in the estimates. I might also add, though, that this closure motion deals with the 30 per cent appropriation too, so it's a much larger figure than \$400 million. But let's just take that for the sake of following through on the hon. member's argument.

What the member did not point out, however, is that the time set aside is as a result of agreement. We have agreement in our *Standing Orders*. There is a time set aside for the Speech from the Throne. Now, how did that happen, Mr. Speaker? It happened because the *Standing Orders* were submitted to the Legislature. As a matter of fact, I recall that in 1973 that particular section was carried unanimously. There was no dissent on the amount of time allocated for the consideration of her Majesty's Speech from the Throne. Now, why did that occur? Because there was interparty co-operation. As a matter of fact, as I recollect — and I could be wrong — there was even a standing committee representing both sides of the House that reviewed the rules of order and produced the rules of order which we have today.

Mr. Speaker, it is quite another thing to say that, because we have eight days in the House of Commons for the Speech from the Throne and 25 days for the budget — it came as a result of interparty negotiation. We have a schedule of time set out in our own *Standing Orders*. It came as a result of a committee representing both sides of the House. That is one thing. That is a perfectly proper course. But it is a totally different thing to come in here and one side of the House unilaterally say, this is what the rules will be.

Similarly, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the 29 days in Great Britain that the hon. member from Pincher Creek cited, well, I just make reference to the point that Mr. Diefenbaker made in 1956. Yes, there are time frame obligations in the *Standing Orders*, but how did they

develop? According to Mr. Diefenbaker, as a result of negotiations between the speakers and the parties in the British House of Commons.

Mr. Speaker, that really gets back to the basic point of the subamendment. You see, the issue is that if there is unanimous consent, we can do almost anything. We can set aside any rule of the Legislature with unanimous consent. As a matter of fact, as the hon. Minister of Education well knows, because of the regrettable absence of opposition members on an opposition day, Thursday last, there was unanimous consent. We got into government business on an opposition day. So we can set aside the rules.

So let's not suggest that this proposition of the requirement of unanimous consent is any serious imposition on the part of the government. I say to members of the House that in my 10 years' experience — I don't have the experience of some members of the House over the years, but 10 years is some time — how many times when a request was made for unanimous consent has it been denied? How many times? Of the host of occasions when the Government House Leader comes in and asks for unanimous consent, or when members on this side ask for unanimous consent, how many times is it denied? Very seldom, but the rules are there.

The predecessor of the present Speaker, the hon. Member for Calgary Millican at that time, Mr. Dixon, made the point and properly so. He said that majorities protect the government; the rules protect the minorities. One of the rules that protects the minority is the unanimous consent concept. Perhaps that minority may just be one member, but that unanimous consent, on occasion, is important to protect that individual member's rights.

Frankly, I think the subamendment improves the amendment I advanced, because it allows more flexibility. It allows the government to make a reasonable case. The hon. Minister of Education is Acting Government House Leader tonight; if he's in charge tonight, or when the appropriation Bill goes through, and if he's able to make a reasonable case that in one sitting day the Bill be read a second time, considered by Committee of the Whole, reported therefrom to the House, and the report received, with the unanimous consent, well, Mr. Speaker, he may get it. I'm not suggesting that he will, but he may. Certainly, if we go on the basis of the record of this House, when reasonable requests have been made, normally they have found a generous response on the part of members willing to grant unanimous consent.

The subamendment allows the government a little more latitude than the original amendment which I proposed. In my judgment, however, it still protects the minority. Because if even one member feels that more time should be available — and although not usually exercised, none the less that's certainly the kind of right which should exist for members of the Legislature — then that individual member can say, no, you don't have my unanimous consent.

Mr. Speaker, I say to all hon. members in this Legislature that this particular subamendment has to be examined in light of the record of this Assembly. No member can deny that. This particular subamendment and all the government debate that has proceeded about time management and what happens in other jurisdictions has to be examined in the light not of closure but of concurrence and agreement. When there is concurrence and agreement, then the Legislature can move in a particular direction, and properly so, because that's consistent with our rules.

But when there isn't, when one member says no, I'm not sure that I want to say yes, you can put this appropriation Bill in a single day; I'm not sure that I'm satisfied that the government has properly accounted for the \$60 million they lost; I'm not sure that the Premier and the Provincial Treasurer have told us enough to convince me that there is proper management of this heritage trust fund: if there is one member who feels that way, then yes, under the provisions of this amendment, it would take long. But, Mr. Speaker, if the government is able to come forward with the kind of information which has been requested by members of the opposition, not unreasonable information, and is able to make a convincing case, well, I just simply say, let the precedents of the House, let the record of the House, let *Hansard* of this House over the last 10 years, which shows the countless requests for unanimous consent, let that speak for itself.

I say quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, that under the circumstances, the subamendment should be supported by members on both sides of the Assembly. It should be supported first of all by the government members because it allows more flexibility. It should be supported by opposition members because, while it still allows the option of proceeding with an appropriation Bill in one day, it nevertheless underscores the sacred right of unanimous consent and the ability of one member, if that member is not convinced of the correctness of an approach, to be able to stand in his or her place and say, I deny unanimous consent. Under those circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the subamendment to the amendment, and would urge all members to endorse the subamendment.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question on the subamendment, which proposes to delete Part 2 of the proposed amendment and substitute a new Part 2, which would add to Section 5 of the original motion "with the unanimous consent of the Assembly"?

[Mr. Speaker declared the motion on the subamendment lost. Several members rose calling for a division. The division bell was rung]

[Three minutes having elapsed, the House divided]

For the motion:

Buck	Notley	Speaker, R.
Mandeville	Sindlinger	

Against the motion:

Anderson, C.	Cookson	Lysons
Anderson, D.	Cripps	Mack
Appleby	Fjordbotten	McCrimmon
Batiuk	Gogo	Musgreave
Bogle	Hiebert	Pahl
Borstad	Hyland	Stevens
Bradley	King	Thompson
Carter	Knaak	Topolnisky
Chambers	Kroeger	Webber
Chichak	Kushner	Young
Cook	LeMessurier	

Totals:	Ayes - 5	Noes - 32
---------	----------	-----------

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in the debate on the amendment, when we're looking at Bill 69, the transfer of funds into the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund, I find it rather unusual that the Provincial



Treasurer, who is responsible for the funds that come in from natural resource revenue, would not be here this evening. I find it rather peculiar that the government would take this matter so lightly that the Provincial Treasurer would not have made sure that he would be here to find out what we're talking about.

Mr. Speaker, when we're looking at the transfer of funds, 30 per cent of natural resource revenue, total in the vicinity of \$2 billion, we well remember in this province when we tied natural resource revenue to funds that would be available to cities. I so well remember when some of the members of the AUMA were looking at marching on the Legislature, because at that time the funding was running dry. The kettle was getting a little low on funding. Therefore, the government at that time looked at lowering those funds.

[Mr. Appleby in the Chair]

MR. YOUNG: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps before the funding runs totally dry, and the hon. Member for Clover Bar runs totally dry, he can make relevant his observations to the amendment before us.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, we are looking at the transfer of funds. We are looking at Bill 69. We're going to be transferring funds into the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund. Some of those funds could be used in municipalities. As a matter of fact, the party that I represent has said that there should be a direct sharing of revenue from natural resources. So that's what we're talking about, hon. Minister of Labour. Maybe the hon. Minister of Labour has forgotten what local autonomy and revenue sharing mean, because I know that they never want to give up the power of the purse strings. They want to have the strings attached to the funds that go out to the cities, towns, and villages of this province, because they know that they can have the municipalities and cities come with hat in hand begging for funds. They like that power. If they ever really believed in local autonomy, then they would say to the municipalities, here's your share of natural resource revenue.

The appropriation Bill that we would like separated from this closure motion . . . Do you people have a problem over there? [interjections] Mr. Speaker, the Tory members can make their own speeches if they wish to. We've been waiting all night, for eight hours, for the Tories. I challenge the hon. associate minister of whatever he's associated with to get up and tell us what his stand is on the closure that he's going to be responsible for. We're waiting with bated breath.

AN HON. MEMBER: Sit down.

DR. BUCK: You should be so lucky, Mr. Knaak.

Mr. Speaker, we are looking at the transferring of funds. The next thing we're going to be told in this Legislature when we're looking at the transfer of natural resource funds is that this government invented oil. They've already told us that they started the Israeli air war over in the Middle East to make the price of oil go from \$3.25 a barrel to what it is now. The next thing the Minister of Labour is going to tell me is that that's not relevant, the price of oil going from \$3.25 a barrel to \$14, \$17, and up. Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that if the Minister of Labour did a little more homework on the items in his department, instead of heckling when I'm trying to make a speech at 4 o'clock in the morning, we'd have a little

less labor unrest in this province.

Mr. Speaker, it is a sad day, when we are looking at the fact that we're going to be transferring funds through Bill 69 to the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, that the Provincial Treasurer is not here, and that we have not had the opportunity to question the Provincial Treasurer fully.

MR. LYSONS: There wasn't one of you fellows here the other day.

DR. BUCK: Every day, every day. Well, the Provincial Treasurer was away. He had a legitimate reason for being away. We were looking at cost sharing, so the minister had to be away. Now, I'd like to know who the Deputy Provincial Treasurer was at that time. But we get the old runaround: we'll pass the question on down the line.

Mr. Speaker, but we wish to have more time to debate Bill 69. That's what this exercise is all about. I'm sure the Minister of Labour can understand that as being relevant. I'm sure the Minister responsible for Personnel Administration finds that relevant. He doesn't even have to write that speech. No one has to write one like that for him. We've been awaiting, as the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo said, a man we respect, the Minister responsible for Personnel Administration. Let's hear his views. It's quite amazing how you can pick up 60 grand a year for being a minister, and then you never tell anybody what you do for a living. It's quite amazing.

What we're talking about is that with Bill 69 there should be time. Should the percentage be 30, 35, or 25 per cent? I think the people in this province, to whom the funds belong . . . It's not Tory money, even though the Tories like to think it is. Maybe we should have a sitting of the Committee of the Whole. Has anyone ever asked anybody in this province what percentage of natural revenue goes into the Heritage Savings Trust Fund? It's a common practice of this government. We have not had a sitting of the Legislature in the whole and opened it up to the people of this province. We had that debate on the Bighorn dam. We pressed this government. We were forced, the hon. member says. But there are many times, if we really wanted the action in this Legislature, that we could have asked the people of this province to ask their own government, open it up, about Bill 69. What percentage of revenue should come from natural resource revenue into the Heritage Savings Trust Fund? That opportunity should have been afforded the citizens of this province.

I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that the fact that we are taking funding from resource revenue and putting it into the heritage fund — what do we tell the cities that have to provide the infrastructure as the megaprojects will be coming on stream? How do we tell them, go ahead and enlarge your water treatment plants, your LRT, but don't come to us for money, because we're putting 30 per cent into the Heritage Savings Trust Fund? Are we going to tell them, as the Minister of Municipal Affairs said, we haven't got any more money; you'll have to raise a gasoline tax? Raise a gasoline tax: what a way to shirk your responsibility. Let the people at the local level take the flak. We can be the good guys here. We've got all that money coming in; then we can hand it out. The people come there with hat in hand, and just before the election — we happened to find \$1 billion the last time. Good move, good move. My lame-duck friend from Calgary doesn't have to be waving his speech around. He can give his own speech. [interjections]

Mr. Speaker, it's fine for the government to laugh and snicker. They can do it with their large majority. They can wear us down and grind us into the dirt, but we cannot get away from the fact that Bill 69 has not had sufficient input from members of this Assembly. The Provincial Treasurer has not given us all the answers that we require. That's what the debate is all about. They don't have to shake leaves of relevance at me. The people out there will tell the government members what relevancy is all about. It's their money, and we're asking that money to be transferred from natural resource development into the Heritage Savings Trust Fund.

Mr. Speaker, it behooves the government to look at what we're doing with that fund, to look at how much money we're putting into that fund. The members of this Assembly this morning are all charged with that same responsibility, to answer and explain to the taxpayer, and to do it through the medium of this Assembly. I know that that gets in the road of the government at times.

When you're running this province on a straight business principle of debits and credits, somehow we seem to lose that personal touch about what people would like done with their money, how much money people need, and how much people-program fundings need, that may be going into the fund. Mr. Speaker, it's just not good enough that we give Bill 69 a light going-over, just a little brush-off. The hon. Leader of the Opposition says two days out of five. They feel that they're really being responsible to the electorate and the taxpayer of this province.

It's very interesting to have a look at the projections, as the price of oil escalates, of the funding that's going to be going into the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. We've heard the government say that under our program, where we're investing in Alberta through roads, telephones, and some of these other projects, we'd be blowing the fund. We're not; we're investing the fund.

I'd like to know from the hon. Member for St. Paul just how many new roads have been built in that area. It's not impressive, hon. Member for St. Paul. The day of reckoning may not be too far away.

AN HON. MEMBER: Come out and look.

MR. NOTLEY: We'd wreck our car to go out there.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I do wish to say, as an aside, when we're looking at the expenditure funds, that the Member for St. Paul did do something. They did put a little bit of cement down at Long Lake so you could dock your boat. I will compliment the member on that. That was a major achievement. I'm proud of that. But he could also do something about the airport in St. Paul. They could help out a little bit there, instead of shipping it out another 10 miles.

Mr. Speaker, when we're looking at the moving of large amounts of money, the debate could go on for literally weeks. Who said that would be great? I guess it would be great if you listen to the people. But this government doesn't like doing that, because they may hear a few unpleasant things. When you have a large government like that, nobody wants to hear anything unpleasant. They go to these friendly little meetings and pat each other on the back and tell each other what great fellows they are. Nobody wants to really hear anything unpleasant. So we have these friendly little government and party get-togethers, clap each other on the back, and say, we're going to put 30 per cent in the fund, that

should do them. Mr. Speaker, you can only buy the taxpayer's vote with the taxpayer's money for so long. Then the old barnyard saying is that the chickens start coming home to roost.

Mr. Speaker, when we're looking at the transferring of funding, I feel that the suggestions that have been made on the future of the fund and on the amount of the fund — that the legislative committee charged with looking after the fund is an exercise in frustration. It is an exercise in frustration because of the many weeks that we've been trying to get a window into the 30 per cent of the funding that goes in through Bill 69. We're trying to get a window into that fund, to find out what's going on.

Mr. Speaker, the government chooses to take the other route, to say no, don't worry about what's going on. We know best what is good for you. Close the doors, do it in caucus. I have to chuckle when I hear that everything goes on in caucus. You don't have to be a very brilliant mathematician, when we're talking about how much money we're going to put in the fund, when you ask how much input the caucus has. All you have to do is divide a one- or two-hour meeting by 72 members. When I say to the members of the back bench that this may not be your month to ask your 30-second question, then I know how much goes on in caucus. [interjections] I do know something, hon. Member for Calgary Millican, or Calgary Currie. Somebody misled me there. I've been misled by better people than that. Anyway, I wish to say, Mr. Speaker to the hon. Member for Calgary Millican, that I feel badly that he lost his nomination. But I guess he's learning that the knives are always sharpened. When you're a member of the Conservative Party, there's always somebody sharpening the knife to gently slide it between ...

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Perhaps the hon. Member for Clover Bar would take a look at the amendment and properly confine his remarks to the pertinent sections that are being discussed.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I was going to say that it's unfortunate the hon. Member for Calgary Millican will not be here in the future to help us move funds through Bill 69 — or whatever number that will be — into the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. But I sincerely say that when we're looking at moving funds through Bill 69 into the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, a man of the calibre of the hon. Member for Calgary Millican will be missed. I say that in all sincerity. I know that's just a little beside the point, but the hon. member has done a good job, and he continued to do a good job when we were looking at funding under Bill 69.

Just in case the hon. government members feel that they would like to get in on the debate, I would like to move a subamendment. [interjections] I'll just say there are cookies and coffee for the government members back there, because they need a little bit of strengthening. I've always said that it takes at least 10 Tories to be the equivalent of one opposition member. They're feeding them in the back there, Mr. Speaker.

The subamendment I'd like to bring is that:

By deleting part (2) and substituting as follows:

(2) By inserting in Section (5) after the words "appropriation Bill" the words "with the exception of Bill 69."

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Perhaps we could have a little recess while we distribute those copies, and then the

hon. member could continue his remarks.

Perhaps the hon. Member for Clover Bar might continue with his remarks regarding the well-worn, in-and-out Section 5.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I think that just for the elucidation of the hon. members opposite, we're looking at inserting after the words "appropriation Bill", the words "with the exception of Bill 69". Mr. Speaker, the hon. members opposite...

MR. LYSONS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. This amendment is dated December 7. I think it's December 8, if the hon. member would like to bring that into the record.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Perhaps the hon. Member for Vermilion-Viking was not here when we had an earlier discussion regarding that little item, but the date that's on the amendment as presented is not significant. The subamendment has been read, presented to the Assembly, and the date really is not very significant.

MR. LYSONS: On the same point of order, Mr. Speaker. I was here. This is a different amendment, and I thought that should be brought to your attention.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Yes, but the same remarks from the Chair would be made, though. As far as the date is concerned, it actually would not have to be on there at all.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I guess the legal term when you get a summons for speeding or anything says "on or about". So I guess that would apply. That seems to be a legal term that lawyers seem to like, on or about.

AN HON. MEMBER: Not that any members in the opposition would ever get a speeding ticket.

DR. BUCK: I don't know if December 7, Pearl Harbor day, has any significance.

Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the subamendment, the reason we would like Bill 69 taken out is because we believe that it should be treated differently. We believe it's a Bill of very, very major significance. That's why we've moved that subamendment. Bill 69 is one that really can affect the future of this province. It is a fund that can provide us with the so-called diversification we were looking for. It can provide funding for research in agriculture, research in many other fields; protect the economy, protect the environment. It has many, many ramifications. It's a Bill that must receive special attention.

Mr. Speaker, we have looked and we have voted on irrigation projects, excellent programs. The day may come when we may be turning the rivers from north to south. Will that be coming under the auspices of the funds that come in through Bill 69? We may not only change the entire geography, topography, and crop potential of the southern part of the province. We may also, at the same time... [interjections]

MR. LYSONS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I thought we were talking about the amendment. The hon. Member for Clover Bar clearly is way out on a wild bat on this one.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, on that point of order, the hon. Member for Clover Bar certainly has the right, in the course of debate, to outline reasons to this Assembly that Bill 69 should be treated separately from any other appropriation Bills that come out of the discussion of heritage trust fund. I think the point he was making was that Bill 69, because of its importance, is sufficiently vital to the future of the province that it should be considered separately. [interjections]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Regarding the point of order: a long time ago, several hours ago, I think the Speaker made it very clear that when you get to the subamendment stage, you should be very strict about speaking to the actual point that is presented in the subamendment. However, when the Deputy Chairman of Committees was in the Chair, he did mention, I believe, how the hon. Leader of the Opposition was very skilfully returning to the subject at hand from time to time. In the matter of relevancy, I would have to acknowledge that this is still being done, though perhaps it's being stretched a little further between returns to the actual subamendment from time to time. So I would ask the hon. member if he could keep his comments regarding the subamendment a little closer together.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I thought I was staying in a very narrow area, as a matter of fact.

Mr. Speaker, when we are looking at the transferring of massive funds, when we put them into the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, \$2 billion, the programs that can be funded out of that are enormous. So how can we narrow what the funding is going to be used for under the auspices of Bill 69? It opens up the whole Pandora of programs that could be funded from this.

I can't understand why the Member for Vermilion-Viking would be having trouble with that. Through the Heritage Savings Trust Fund they may even build something in Vermilion. Thank goodness, the dam washed out. We got a provincial park in there. [interjections] Mr. Speaker, are we actually going to have a government backbencher make a speech? [interjections]

DR. BUCK: We have only front benchers in the opposition, Mr. Speaker. We don't have any backbenchers. [interjections]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Perhaps the hon. Member for Vermilion-Viking would withhold his comments until he has an opportunity to speak, if he wishes to do so.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I like the hon. Member for Vermilion-Viking. He's a fine fellow. It's too bad he's going to retire after the next election, willingly or unwillingly. But that's the way it goes.

Mr. Speaker, in a Bill as important as Bill 69, we feel it should not be in with other Bills of less import, because we feel the taxpayers' money, money we are going to be putting into a fund for the future, is much too important to be handled in a light manner. Mr. Speaker... [interjections] At 4:35 in the morning, I guess a person can be allowed — his lip gets a little dry. [interjection] Never mind the breathalyzer. Maybe you've been sneaking out. We've been in the House doing our job. [laughter]

Mr. Speaker, it is a very important Bill that requires the consideration, close study, and close scrutiny of the members of this Assembly, the members of the committee.

Mr. Speaker, because my time is up, I would just like to say that I am sure that members who are diligent in their duties would support this Bill.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make a few comments about this subamendment. I was a little hesitant to get to my feet, because I had the idea that the Member for Vermilion-Viking wanted to say something, but I guess that's not the case. So I will get into the subamendment.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very important subamendment because it recognizes the central importance of Bill 69. We would not have the estimates, we would not have anything, if we did not have Bill 69 and what it represents. I have been corrected in some earlier remarks I made with regard to the amount of time we'd already spent on Bill 69. Bill 69 has gone through first reading and second reading as well, and some members did speak to it then. I don't think I acknowledged that when I was speaking earlier. As well, Bill 69 went into the Committee of the Whole, and some members did address it there as well. However, it was a very truncated debate at that time as we did run out of time, to go into it in any detail. It takes up only 20 pages in *Hansard*. If one looks at the amount of money in the fund now, roughly \$10 billion, that's almost \$500 million per page. I would suggest that's not enough attention for Bill 69. Surely money of that order of magnitude requires more review and scrutiny than just 21 pages.

First of all, the issue of closure itself and, secondly, the issue of where the closure falls most heavily, have been matters of contention all evening. Obviously, it falls most heavily on Bill 69, because we have yet to have the Provincial Treasurer and the chairman of the investment committee before the Legislative Assembly so they can answer detailed questions about the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. We look forward to that opportunity.

That doesn't hold entirely to all the votes in the estimates, of course, because we have gone through several of them in considerable detail. I'm sure it will not take that much time to go through the other votes in the estimates either. I say that because essentially they are projects that were initiated some years ago, and they're just continuations of those projects. So the principles have been discussed quite thoroughly several years over. The one aspect that remains to be discussed in regard to those expenditures, however, is the disposition or placement of them. That is, the Assembly has to be assured that those funds appropriated for a specific purpose in fact were used for that specific purpose. We have found in some instances that the funds so appropriated were not appropriately placed.

There is a very generic issue in regard to Bill 69, because Bill 69 epitomizes the government's policy with regard to economic development in the province. It can be said, of course, that there are many purposes for the fund. Those purposes, or if I might call them objectives, are set out in Section 6, I believe, of The Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund Act and in the preamble to the Act, which states in general terms that we cannot expect to receive revenue forever from oil and gas because those are finite resources and cannot be developed forever. Therefore, it would be prudent to take some of those resources and save them for that day when the oil and gas run out.

There are several sections to the Act. First of all the capital projects division. The purpose of that division, it is said in the Act, is to provide long-term social and economic benefits to the province. Certainly, it's always

difficult to identify specifically what social benefits are because that is not a precise science. It's a very subjective area. However, in terms of long-term economic benefits for the province, that is an area which can be more precisely defined. Of course, it can't be exactly pinpointed, but specific directions can be identified and pursued. Presumably those long-term economic benefits would be such as to diversify the economy. That has been stated many times by the government, and the government has indicated that the Heritage Savings Trust Fund would be a very good tool to achieve that end.

Another division of the fund, which indicates that economic diversification or economic policy of the government is inherent in the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, is the Alberta investment division. The criteria for investments in that area are those investments that would tend to strengthen or diversify the economy. So there again, we have a stated, explicit intention that the fund be used to develop the economy, first of all to strengthen the economy. Certainly the fund has been used in those areas; for example, the Alberta Energy Company, Syncrude, the investment in Luscar Ltd., and perhaps even, in an oblique way, the investment in the debentures of Calgary Power, now TransAlta Utilities, I believe. Nevertheless, the fund has been used for that purpose: to strengthen those resources which we now have in place.

The other aspect of that investment division, though, to diversify the economy, is questionable. It has been in the Heritage Savings Trust Fund Act since initiation of the Act, but it has been difficult to actually diversify the economy. There are more things dictating economic development or growth than simply money. If we do not have those strategic economic advantages or comparative economic advantages in this province, it doesn't matter how much money we throw at the problem; it won't be solved. Therefore, there's a problem with regard to economic diversification.

Mr. Speaker, I am bringing this up because this amendment strikes directly at the intent of Bill 69. Bill 69, as it's called this year, deals with the transfer of funds from general revenue into the heritage fund. It's not enough just to say, we have this revenue, which will be in excess of the general revenue requirements of the province; therefore, let's put it in a big bucket called the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund. That might be done if the heritage trust fund could be said to be completely distinct and separate from the government programs and policies. However, as I've just demonstrated, that is not in fact the case. Having objectives and purposes such as to strengthen and diversify the economy and to provide long-term economic benefits indicates that the trust fund is in fact an instrument of government policy. Therefore, consideration has to be given to exactly what that government policy is.

Mr. Speaker, the first obvious question that arises from something like that is: precisely what is the government's long-term plan for economic diversification in this province? After having set that out, one can then say, this is the role the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund will play in that long-term economic development. This question was brought up in the watchdog committee the first year I was there, and it was put to the Provincial Treasurer.

MR. COOK: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, can I ask the member how this is relevant to the amendment? Could the hon. member explain how this point is relevant?

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Speaker, I welcome that question from the Member for Edmonton Glengarry. I will attempt to explain to him the relevancy of Bill 69 and the role it plays in appropriating funds for supplementing the government's program for economic development and for strengthening and diversifying the economy of the province.

Mr. Speaker, I think I got to the point where I had said it would be desirable to have a very distinct and separate heritage fund apart from government policies and programs. However, that is not the case. Since the two are so inextricably intertwined, it behooves us to determine what the purpose of that fund will be in the long term. What is the long-term plan for the Heritage Savings Trust Fund? That was the question put to the Provincial Treasurer three years ago before the Heritage Savings Trust Fund watchdog committee. What is the long-term program . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It would appear to the Chair that the types of questions the member is presenting at the moment, also some of the remarks he is making, would more properly be brought forth in committee study of Bill 69 when it's presented. Perhaps the hon. member could confine his remarks to the actual sub-amendment under discussion.

MR. SINDLINGER: I will, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would just like to reiterate the remark you have made, and that is that it would be appropriate to bring these things up in Committee of the Whole when Bill 69 is considered. Unfortunately, we have before us a motion of closure, which will make it very difficult to do that. That's why we have been objecting to this motion of closure so strenuously this evening. Aside from the fact that it's an impingement on the freedom of speech in this Legislative Assembly, it also impedes, impairs, and makes impossible the ability of the members to discuss Bill 69 in Committee of the Whole. The closure motion gives us only five days. By inserting in Section 5 the words 'with the exception of Bill 69' after the words 'appropriation Bill', the amendment extends the period of discussion and debate so that there will be an assurance that Bill 69 can be appropriately and thoroughly discussed and debated before transfer of funds can occur.

That is a very important subject, Mr. Speaker, and it's not one we should treat lightly. A quick calculation in terms of dollars and cents: if the Alberta share of the resource revenue over the next 65 years will be \$64 billion, and we take 30 per cent of that, that's \$19.2 billion, and put it in the fund — and there's roughly \$10 billion in there now — that's \$30 billion. So on an annual basis, when we talk about transferring funds from general revenue into the Heritage Savings Trust Fund through Bill 69, we're talking about almost \$4 billion to \$5 billion a year.

If we're talking about \$4 billion or \$5 billion, we ought to have some time in this Legislative Assembly to talk about that. We ought to be able to discuss it and debate it. The way this closure motion reads now, we're not going to do that. I don't think that's fair. I don't think it's right. I can't make any appeal other than to the sense of fairness of the members here, that the opportunity be provided for us to discuss Bill 69 completely, thoroughly, and unrestrained. I think it would be in the best interests of government members too, to ensure that we had that opportunity, so that it couldn't be said anywhere at any time by anyone that we were denied the opportunity to

assess the performance of the government in its handling of those funds over the last six years, and to review and approve the plans of the government over the next year, and the next few years as well if that's the case. It's one thing to go ahead with something like this and just rubber stamp it and push it through. It's another to ensure that the democratic process is served so that we all can look at that transfer of funds.

Mr. Speaker, if there was ever an umbrella type of legislation for anything in this Assembly, Bill 69 has to be it. Through Bill 69 and the transfer of those funds, the government has immense opportunity to implement anything it wants to. The heritage fund now exceeds the annual budget. The annual budget for this year was \$6.5 billion. The heritage fund is around \$10 billion now. We have to consider Bill 69 thoroughly. We have to ensure that all those programs that come through Bill 69 — the member referred to them as well in introducing the subamendment: the irrigation projects, Lesser Slave Lake development, the Alberta Oil Sands Technology and Research Authority, enhanced oil recovery, W. C. MacKenzie Health Sciences Centre, and Alberta children's provincial hospital. All those things emanate and are derived from Bill 69. They are all derivatives of Bill 69. If it were not for Bill 69, there would not be a Walter C. MacKenzie Health Sciences Centre nor a southern Alberta children's centre. There would not be any of these things. There would not be investments in bonds or equities, or foreign investments overseas.

When we discuss Bill 69, we're not just talking about a simple transfer of 30 per cent from the General Revenue Fund; we're talking about the real heart and meat of this government's efforts to strengthen and diversify the Alberta economy. We're talking about the real heart and meat of the government's attempts to provide long-term economic [and] social benefits. There really isn't one program this government is undertaking that doesn't meet those goals, or at least attempt to do so. It's therefore very incumbent upon us to discuss Bill 69 in terms of the derivatives, and not just the simple transfer. If we were to discuss just the simple transfer, I don't know that there would be much to discuss. What is there to discuss other than just the mechanics of doing that? I don't think that's what we should be doing.

Mr. Speaker, when the Provincial Treasurer appeared before the watchdog committee, he was asked some pretty specific and detailed questions about these matters. He made two responses. One was that these questions could be asked in detail in Committee of the Whole. He could not provide the information before the watchdog committee, but, he assured us, don't worry, you can get answers to these questions when Bill 69 is in Committee of the Whole. If we don't amend this closure motion, we're not going to have that opportunity.

MR. LYSONS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Again I have to bring to you, sir, that the amendment is dealing with a very, very simple sentence and not travelling all over Alberta and western Canada, and all over resource income.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Speaker, that's a very good point, and one I will now direct my attention to and deal with decisively and conclusively, I hope, because the same point was raised by the Member for Three Hills a few weeks ago. It's with regard to Bill 69 and what it entails.

Bill 69 does not just entail the transfer of funds. It entails all those things for which the funds are intended.

It's just a generic matter, and we have to direct our attention to the derivatives. All those derivatives, Mr. Speaker, for the Member for Vermilion-Viking and the Member for Three Hills, are contained in this annual report. It doesn't talk about simply a bookkeeping transaction that takes money from one place and puts it into another. Bill 69 is so important because it deals with all those purposes and uses outlined, just outlined, in this annual report. It is all-inclusive. If we do not go through with amendments such as this to exclude Bill 69 from that short debating period, and allow Bill 69 to be bunched in with the estimates — Bill 69, which entails billions of dollars, to be bunched in with estimates, which comprise only about 12 per cent of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund — then we're not doing this correctly.

We have to look at all aspects of the allocation of those funds. We can do that by starting to look at this. We can do that, sir, only if we have the time to do it. This closure motion gives us time to look at some of the capital estimates, which comprise only about 12 per cent of the fund. Mr. Speaker, I'm going to be watching very carefully when we get to those capital estimates again, because we've been debating, discussing, and reviewing those capital estimates for the last seven weeks, and that debate, discussion, and review has come entirely from opposition members. I have not heard more than a few questions from government members with regard to those estimates. When we get to those estimates after going through this closure debate, I thoroughly expect, from some of the comments that have been made here today and tonight, that some government backbenchers are going to get up and ask some questions about those capital estimates. If they do not, I'm going to wonder what their purpose was in being here tonight, because I know what mine is. Mine is to grill this government, to ensure beyond any element of doubt that these funds, appropriated under Bill 69 and the Bill 69s before them, have been allocated for the purpose for which they're appropriated and that there is no mismanagement whatsoever.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot overemphasize the importance of this Bill. I started out a few minutes ago by saying that when the Provincial Treasurer was before the committee addressing Bill 69, and he could not respond to all queries and said we could get the answers in Committee of the Whole, he also said something else. He said that in the final analysis, there is only one person who is accountable for the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, and that is me as the Provincial Treasurer. Mr. Speaker, I think that's right. But we have not yet had that moment of accountability. We have not yet had that minister before the committee to answer those questions which were put to him before the heritage fund committee. In addition, we have not yet had him here to be held accountable, as he himself has said he is. Mr. Speaker, I believe we need that time. That's why we have to have this amendment, so that there will be more time for Bill 69; so that the Provincial Treasurer can answer those questions, as he undertook to do; and so that the Provincial Treasurer can be held accountable, as he wished to be, so there's no question of accountability or nonaccountability.

Mr. Speaker, when that minister introduced Bill 69 in this Legislature this fall, he also had some other things to say. He talked about a couple of families: the Smiths, Jones, Greens, and some others. I have a little letter here too. This one was to Ann Landers. It says: Hi. My name is Sam Smith. I have \$50,000 saved and would like to invest it so that I can take care of my parents in their old

age. I would like to develop trust in my bank manager ... [interjections] ... but he feels he has an option not to tell me how he's going to go about it. [interjections]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I believe the hon. Member for Vermilion-Viking has another point of order.

MR. LYSONS: Surely we're beyond Ann Landers when we get to this place. If the hon. member has something to say, why doesn't he say it without going into the soap opera bit.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I believe the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo may be leading up to some point that he wants to show.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Speaker, I am rapidly drawing to a close on this particular subamendment. I find it very helpful to draw on simple analogies like this, just as the Provincial Treasurer has, in order that all members in this Legislative Assembly clearly understand what is going on. I think these simple analogies should serve that purpose for the Member for Vermilion-Viking.

The letter is simply this: Hi. My name is Sam Smith. I have \$50,000 saved and would like to invest it so I can take care of my parents in their old age. I would like to develop trust in my bank manager, but he feels he has an option not to tell me how he is going to go about it. Not only that, he doesn't even want to tell me. Do you think I can trust him, Ann Landers? That's where we're at with the Heritage Savings Trust Fund right now.

AN HON. MEMBER: What did Ann respond?

MR. SINDLINGER: I've been here for three years now, and I've enjoyed the remarks of many members of the Legislative Assembly. I'm sure some of those remarks are just waiting to come bubbling to the surface. However, for some reason or other, the members haven't been able to get up and express them. I'm looking forward to hearing from two members this morning. They've been trying so hard to get into the debate. I've been talking, and they keep yelling in the background. I think it's going to be very enlightening to hear the Member for St. Paul finally say something, and a complimentary remark by the Member for Vermilion-Viking. Won't that be exciting for us?

DR. BUCK: Oh, yes. Great.

MR. LYSONS: Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure to get the little green light so I can start rebutting some of the remarks on this subamendment by the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo. The name Calgary Buffalo is so suitable. Buffalo always means something to me. I remember my mother talking about how they heated their fires when they came in a covered wagon from the United States.

Mr. Speaker, the amendment says:

By inserting in Section (5) after the words "appropriation Bill" the words "with the exception of Bill 69".

Bill 69 is one of the most fundamental things. It is the fundamental base of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. If the hon. Member for Clover Bar, who proposed the amendment, had really read what this subamendment would do to the Bill, surely he wouldn't have brought in the subamendment. I won't deal that much with the hon. Member for Clover Bar, because he was complaining

about being tired and sleepy. He's really not a night person; he's an early morning person.

DR. BUCK: I'm ready now, Tom.

MR. LYSONS: You're ready now. It must be your time. He's a farmer, and I understand a good farmer — strawberries and trees. He can't grow hair, he says, but he can sure grow trees.

I really got a charge out of the Member for Calgary Buffalo. He says the oil and gas is going to run out. Anybody who has had any experience with oil and gas knows it's never going to run . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I'm afraid we're getting into the area of relevancy once again. Maybe the member could confine himself to the subamendment.

MR. LYSONS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate your interruption.

MR. SINDLINGER: On your ruling, please, Mr. Speaker. I think the member is coming around to an essential point. He was very courteous to allow me to go on. We would really like to hear what he has to say about this.

MR. LYSONS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo, for the interjection. I was hoping I would have something near the same latitude he has had.

Anyone who knows anything about oil and gas knows that it's not going to run out immediately. The gas keeps bubbling away in Calgary Buffalo. The member talks about the amendment, the relevance of the amendment, and that the Heritage Savings Trust Fund is a bucket of money. The man tells us he's an economist. There's no such thing as a bucket of money, and there's no such thing as an umbrella in Bill 69. It's a simple little Bill that says that 30 per cent of the non-renewable resource revenue will go into a special fund. I know the hon. member isn't knocking that. Then what has he been knocking for 20 minutes or a half hour?

There's enough oil, gas, coal, and energy in this province to last us to the next ice age, depending on how we use it. We all know that. I'm just appalled that someone can take the time in this House and use the amendment the hon. Member for Clover Bar has brought in to destroy, or attempt to destroy, the very things that most of us have come here to work for. I've always felt, when I met someone who had some money, that he or she was something to look at, that they had done something. I have never really felt I could look up to someone who was really, really poor, that the man, business, and government that cannot and will not save money cannot or will not do anything else worth while.

Mr. Speaker, in all honesty, I feel offended this morning by hearing some of the statements that were made. We want to get on with the business of the province . . . [interjections] Chick, chick, chick — we used to get the old hens coming up to the feed trough with that same little trick.

MR. COOK: Mr. Speaker, I am reluctantly obliged to ask the hon. member to come to the point. I'm having some difficulty understanding what he is saying and how it relates to the subamendment before us.

AN HON. MEMBER: He's coming to it.

MR. LYSONS: Mr. Speaker, I have to relate to the hon. member from north Edmonton that really what we want to do is get on with the business of the House. The hon. opposition — and God bless them; we need an opposition once in a while. I'm married, and I got lots of opposition. [interjection] Would you repeat that please? My wife nags too, and I enjoy it. I wouldn't know what to do if she didn't. In fact, I encourage it.

I don't know what this filibuster is all about. It's an American tradition. It has no place in the British system, that I know of, and I'm British — American too, but I'm British. We're dealing in a British system.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to see the Members of this Assembly defeat this amendment in all possible haste. Thank you.

MR. KNACK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address the subamendment as well, if I may. I enjoyed the comments from the opposition members. I found it very instructive. I want to raise a few points with respect to the deletion of Bill 69.

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

Bill 69 is not the foundation of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. The Heritage Savings Trust Fund Act passed by this Legislature is the foundation of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, and it was supported and passed by everyone here, if my information is correct. All Bill 69 does is increase the size of the Trust Fund. It doesn't create or establish it. Each year the Legislature decides whether it should be 30 per cent, 20 per cent, 10 per cent, or some other percentage. That's a very important consideration, of course, and it should be debated. But that debate doesn't include all the aspects of what should be done once the money is transposed into the Trust Fund. That should be done through amendments to the Heritage Savings Trust Fund Act or, alternately, under the capital projects division under the appropriations.

One matter I find very curious, being a member of the watchdog committee also, is that not one member of the opposition — not the Member for Spirit River-Fairview, nor the leader of the official opposition, nor the Member for Calgary Buffalo — addressed the question of 30 per cent, 20 per cent, or any percentage at all, in the recommendations that can be made from the Heritage Savings Trust Fund.

MR. COOK: Shame, shame. Negligence.

MR. KNAK: We have a very interesting speech about the importance of the matter from the Member for Calgary Buffalo. He made about — I forget; there were so many — 20 recommendations at least. But not one of them related to the percentage, or a change in the percentage, that should be transferred to the Trust Fund. The Member for Spirit River-Fairview had about 28, plus a book with 117 more, and not one of those included any discussion with respect to the percentage that should be transferred to the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. It would have been very appropriate at that time to discuss it. Absolutely no time limitation whatsoever was imposed on that committee, in terms of dealing with those matters.

The final matter I have to come back to, and I've said it once before. We have the very indignant-sounding tone of the Member for Calgary Buffalo, who's learning to be

a bit of a speaker in this House as well. I see he's learning from the Leader of the Official Opposition. But he too has made the point that if government documents, that the government feels are against the law to hand over, had been handed over, the filibuster would stop. I've already said what "filibuster" means. It means an obstruction. That's how a filibuster is defined. It's defined as an obstruction by excessive speaking, by the excessive use of time in the House. All members of the opposition have said that if those documents are handed over, the filibuster would stop. Since the government is not handing over the documents, they're continuing to filibuster. They can disguise it and say it's not a filibuster any more. All of a sudden it's transformed into freedom of speech. But let's call it what it is. It's a filibuster and will continue to be a filibuster.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Speaker, I have a point of order, but I didn't want to interject and interrupt the member while he was speaking. I thought I could retain it until he completed.

It's with regard to comments first by the Member for Vermilion-Viking and then by the Member for Edmonton Whitemud. There seems to be a grave incongruity between what the Member for Vermilion-Viking has said and what is written. I might point out that the . . .

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

MR. SINDLINGER: I'm on a point of order.

MR. COOK: Mr. Speaker [inaudible] a member's remarks in one point or in another are the subject of a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: I haven't heard what the point of order is, and it's difficult to have a point of order on a point of order on a point of order. That only happens with fleas.

MR. SINDLINGER: First of all, with regard to what I consider to be a grave incongruity between what is written and what was said, the preamble to The Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Act specifically says: "WHEREAS there is a limited supply of non-renewable resources. . . ." On the other hand, I've sat here and listened to the Member for Vermilion-Viking say, first of all, that we're not going to run out of oil and gas, and secondly, that there's enough oil and gas; we all know that. Obviously those two statements are incompatible. I thought we should afford the Member for Vermilion-Viking the opportunity to reconcile them.

Mr. Speaker, the second point of order, with regard to the comments by the Member for Edmonton Whitemud, is that he said that the Member for Calgary Buffalo has said "filibuster". I'd like to point out that at no time have I ever said we were engaged in a filibuster in the Legislative Assembly.

MR. COOK: Mr. Speaker, I enjoyed the second addition to the debate, and not the point of order the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo contributed.

I want to make a couple of quick points. One is that Bill 69 is relatively simple and quite short. If the opposition members really want to get into the debate on Bill 69, they have only to cease their filibuster on the amendments and subamendments that we have before us this evening, and there would be plenty of time for Bill 69 under the time allocation [motion] before us. I suggest to

hon. members in the opposition parties — the Leader of the Official Opposition, the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, his side-kicks from the Social Credit Party, and the independent — that perhaps if they were to speed up the discussion in this area, they would have ample opportunity to discuss a relatively simple straightforward Bill, Bill 69. I encourage them to do that.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make a few comments on this particular amendment as it relates to Bill 69. If I didn't make a few comments, I'd be neglect in my duty in serving the constituency of Bow Valley. If we were debating this in the spring of the year, my farmers down there would be getting up, getting their irrigating boots on, and getting ready to irrigate, while we're trying to locate some money or settle some dust in the Legislature.

We dealt with the Department of Environment. I didn't have the opportunity to discuss some of the situations I have. And I didn't have the opportunity to discuss this, realizing Bill 69 deals with transferring money into the heritage trust fund for capital investment. We took a good tour around Slave Lake and dealt with that. My concern is that if I don't get up on Bill 69 at the present time, we might not have the opportunity to discuss the issues I have in my constituency.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, on the diversion of trust funds into Bill 69, I want to make it very clear that when we were talking water diversion in the Legislature, I am one member of the Legislature . . .

MR. COOK: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. When we're discussing a subamendment, the debate should be on that narrow point: whether or not Bill 69 should or should not be considered in the discussion before us; not on the merits of Bill 69, but simply on whether Bill 69 should be included in the provisions of the time allocation Bill or whether it requires unanimous consent. That is the question before us, not the merits of your water programs in southern Alberta that might be funded through Bill 69.

MR. SPEAKER: With respect to the hon. member, it would seem to me that in deciding whether you're going to include Bill 69, it's relevant to consider what Bill 69 is about and whether or not it's worth including. It seems to me that means going into the merits.

MR. COOK: Mr. Speaker, it's a very small Bill. It simply says 30 per cent. The only real question is 30, 20, 10, or none.

MR. SPEAKER: But 30 per cent of what?

MR. COOK: Resource revenue, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NOTLEY: Of \$8 billion.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, as I indicated when I started my remarks, I feel that Bill 69 is very important. As I said, I want to discuss some of the merits of Bill 69, as far as another resource is concerned. I think that if we do that at this time, when we don't have our non-renewable resources putting money into the heritage trust fund maybe we should be getting into water resource development so we will be able to get some money to put into the capital investment program, or the 30 per cent of whatever amount we're going to be putting into the in-



vestment fund of the heritage trust fund.

On the water diversion, Mr. Speaker, I for one member in this Legislature don't disagree that some time down the line we shouldn't be taking money out of the heritage trust fund and using it for water diversion in this province. However, at the present time, I think we've got to look at the water basins we have in southern Alberta before we start a diversion project. I'm sure the hon. Minister of Environment agrees with me on that point. We've got to develop the water basins we have in southern Alberta. One basin I was concerned about is the Bow River basin, a basin we should possibly be looking at spending some of our heritage trust fund money on. I know we've had many studies on the Eyremore dam. At one time, I think we could have put in a dam for \$2 million that would store 1 million acre feet of water. Today, I think we're looking at possibly \$300 million to put the dam in. As we keep going down the line, it's going to cost more and more all the time to put storage on the Bow River.

At the present time, we're spending heritage trust fund money on storage of water within the Eastern Irrigation District, and I know the irrigation district is very sympathetic with where the money is being spent. I think we should be storing the water on the river basins and leave that good farmland that we're taking up acres and acres of in water storage for irrigation. I'd like to say to the hon. Minister of Environment, if we get through estimates and get them on the road, that I'm hopeful the minister will take a good look at many requests he has from the Eastern Irrigation District to help develop the Bow River basin. If we put the Eyremore dam in, we could use it for tourism and for a bridge — the minister of highways wouldn't have to use his appropriation from the heritage trust fund. We could use it for generating electricity.

I think we've got to start taking a very serious look at developing this resource that's either flowing into Hudson Bay or the Gulf of Mexico. It's a resource. I don't know whether you'd call it renewable, but we're losing our water. What's happening at the present time is that we're on the water agreement between the three prairie provinces, as are many of our river basins, to supply 50 per cent of our water to Saskatchewan and Manitoba. The day is going to come when they're going to say, day by day, we've got to have that much water through the Bow River, the Oldman, or whatever river basin they're concerned with for getting water.

When we're talking about Bill 69, transferring money to the heritage trust fund, we better take a strong look at investing this money in water resource development. If we're going to start approving money for developing hydro in Quebec . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I hesitate to interrupt the hon. member, but I have a difficulty here. Section 5 of the motion says:

An appropriation Bill may be read a second time, considered by the Committee of the Whole, reported therefrom to the House and the report received, on one sitting day.

I believe we have also referred to Section 5 in the main amendment, that we're still on. Now we are accepting Bill 69, apparently from the operation of Section 5, and that would purport to say that it can be reported out of Committee of the Whole and go to third reading on the same day. It's already in Committee of the Whole, and there's nothing exceptional about taking it out of there

and into third reading on the same day. I just can't see how this motion will have any effect at all on our proceedings for this subamendment.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure I'm going to have an opportunity to conclude my remarks before we deal with estimates for the Department of Environment.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I gather you haven't made a ruling at this stage. You're . . .

MR. SPEAKER: No, I'm just airing a difficulty. We're still on the second amendment, as I understand it, but we're on a further subamendment. Now the second amendment, in paragraph 2, says to strike out Section 5, and the subamendment says to insert [in] Section 5.

MR. NOTLEY: No, delete Part 2.

MR. SPEAKER: Right, okay. Sorry, I wasn't here when that happened.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I think the subamendment is in order. I'd like to address a few comments to the subamendment before us. Basically the subamendment proposed by the hon. Member for Clover Bar attempts to moderate, to qualify the impact of this closure motion. I think we might as well lay the cards on the table. That's what we're attempting to do here. I don't think there's much doubt as I observe the proceedings of last night and this morning, that it may well be that this motion, euphemistically called time accounting, will be passed even though we all know it's closure.

Mr. Speaker, I suppose my feelings on what will probably happen — and one of the reasons I support the subamendment so strongly was rather well put by the former Prime Minister, again in the pipeline debate. He made the point, and I just want to quote it very briefly, because I think it is relevant:

I ask the Prime Minister, through you, not believing at this time that there is any prospect of any change in his view, nor am I any more hopeful than if a seed were dropped on a glacier that it would become productive, but I do make this appeal on the basis of all the authority of British tradition.

Mr. Speaker, I'm not any more hopeful than the late Mr. Diefenbaker was in 1956 that we're going to be able to convince this government to drop this motion of closure, not any more hopeful at all. But the reason I support the subamendment is that at the very least, we should try to minimize the devastating impact this motion is going to have on freedom of speech in the Assembly.

Why should we look at Bill 69 in a different way from the estimates, from the appropriation Bill that will deal with the estimates? Why should we set it aside? Why should it be given special consideration? Well, Mr. Speaker, the reason is quite simple and straightforward: as the hon. Member for Vermilion-Viking said, and I think the hon. member was correct, the fundamental basis of the heritage trust fund is the money allocated on an annual basis by the Legislature. The Bill this year says 30 per cent. It's not written. It's not the law of the Medes and the Persians that it be 30 per cent. It could be 40 per cent, 20 per cent, whatever figure the Legislature decides.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when one looks back over the discussions in 1976, it was clear that there were four items of legislative control identified by the Premier in intro-

ducing the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. One was the capital estimates, that are affected by the closure motion. Another was the select committee, that members have made reference to in this particular debate. A third was the opportunity any member has to introduce a resolution. Any member can introduce a resolution, and if that resolution directs the investment committee to do something, the investment committee must follow the direction.

But the fourth — I think that's the issue at hand at the moment — is the most important; that is, the appropriation Bill that allocates the 30 per cent to the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. It seems to me that the Premier made that point very clearly when he spoke on April 23, 1976. He made the point that legislative accountability is inextricably bound up in the way this Legislature handles the 30 per cent or whatever the appropriation Bill allocates from the resource revenue of the province to the Heritage Savings Trust Fund.

I don't think there can be any doubt that Bill 69 is not only the most important part of the legislative accountability aspect, but it also just happens to be a Bill of such fundamental importance to the province that it has to be exempted from the more narrow, and, if I could use the expression — well, I won't use it, because I don't want to be impolite at this time in the morning — application of this closure motion that the government is attempting to force through the Legislative Assembly.

Some members have suggested it's not a major matter. The hon. Member for Edmonton Glengarry got up and waved the Bill around, said it was only several pages, 30 per cent, what are we making all the fuss about, failing to point out, of course, that that's 30 per cent of what will be something over \$8 billion of revenue this year. The hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo quite properly pointed out that as a consequence of the energy agreement, between now and 1986, if the figures ... Heaven knows, it took long enough to get common figures between federal and provincial authorities. We spent well over a year battling to get common figures. We now have them, and over the next five years, there is going to be \$64 billion ...

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I have not been able to overcome my difficulty. In its second part, the main amendment says: strike out Section 5 of the motion. The subamendment says, no, don't strike it out, but add to it "with the exception of Bill 69". Okay? So we go back to the main amendment. This is what we're proposing: we're proposing to make it say that on one sitting day an appropriation Bill, with the exception of Bill 69, may be read a second time, considered by the Committee of the Whole, reported therefrom to the House, and the report received. Well, in my respectful opinion, the amendment is meaningless. Bill 69 has already been read a second time, therefore the motion can't operate on it. It doesn't change a thing in regard to Bill 69, which can already be reported from committee and read on third reading without any special leave or any resort to the rule about a Bill going through more than one stage on the same day, because this can be done now. It would appear to me that insofar as Bill 69 is concerned, the amendment has no effect.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order. I think if we put this interpretation, it could have some effect. There are three possible appropriation Bills. Bill 69 is one of those. The reason that amendment could be

there is that the other two Bills that will come before the Legislature would come under this rule whereby they were:

read a second time, considered by the Committee of the Whole, reported therefrom to the House and the report received, on one sitting day.

If we insert "with the exception of Bill 69", that means that Bill 69 does not go through this process, which is in agreement with what you have said, Mr. Speaker. Bill 69 is in Committee of the Whole. From Committee of the Whole, it can move into third reading. We just except it from this rule, indicating it's unnecessary for us to have this kind of rule with ...

MR. SPEAKER: The amendment has no effect whatsoever on Bill 69, so far as I can see, and consequently is completely without purpose.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, with great respect, as I read the initial amendment, we strike out "The Estimates" and insert "Bill 69". We are now saying that Bill 69 shall be considered by the Committee of Supply — not "may" but "shall" — because we must look at ...

MR. SPEAKER: Striking out "The Estimates", you say?

MR. NOTLEY: That's correct.

MR. SPEAKER: Where are we striking that out?

MR. NOTLEY: In Section 2. You strike out "the estimates", and we're now talking about Bill 69. If you follow through with me, Mr. Speaker, "Bill 69 shall be considered by the", and then we strike out "Committee of Supply" and substitute "Committee of the Whole". Keep in mind that the original amendment was designed to emphasize the importance of (a) in this resolution — because both (a) and (b) are recognized — which is Bill 69. We're saying Bill 69 is more important than (b).

You then go to Section 2: Bill 69 "shall", not "may". That being the case, Mr. Speaker, when you follow the changes made in the original amendment, which we've been debating now for over three and a half hours, Section 5 must in fact be struck out to be relevant at all, because we say "shall" and we're talking about "may". So there's no question that there must be an exception for Bill 69 in subsection 5 for the amendment in fact to stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Now, let's go over this thing on all fours. I have before me an original amendment, apparently moved by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview. It has three parts. The second part says: "By striking out Section (5)." Are we together this far? Okay? Then we come to a subamendment which says, no, don't strike out Section 5, but change it by inserting in it, after the words "appropriation Bill", the words "with the exception of Bill 69". As I read it, Bill 69 is in effect already accepted, because it has passed the stage referred to; namely, being read a second time, which is referred to in Section 5 as it stands. Consequently, I'm confirmed in my opinion that the subamendment is out of order.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The amendment says Bill 69, and it says it in the context of the rest of the sentence: "Bill 69 shall" — not "may" — "be considered by Committee of ..."

MR. SPEAKER: Where do we get this "shall"?

MR. NOTLEY: The very word in Section 2 of resolution 16. Section 1 in the resolution says that appropriation Bill means (a) Bill 69 and (b) estimates. The original amendment deals with Section 2, so we strike out the words — because keep in mind that the purpose of the original amendment was to focus the importance on Bill 69. This is the amendment we've been debating now for the last three and a half hours.

MR. SPEAKER: With great respect to the hon. member, I don't follow. This original amendment has three parts. The first part refers to Section 2.

MR. NOTLEY: Exactly.

MR. SPEAKER: Right. The second part doesn't refer to Section 2 at all. It refers to Section 5, and the subamendment relates only to that. Well then, what difference does it make whether it says "shall" or "may" in Section 2?

MR. NOTLEY: If I could finish my point of order, I'll have an opportunity to explain. "Bill 69", as the original amendment reads, replaces "The Estimates", and "Committee of Supply" is replaced by "Committee of the Whole".

MR. SPEAKER: Where does that happen?

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, if you look at subsection (b) of the amendment, you will see: striking the words "the Committee of Supply" and substituting for them the words "the Committee of the Whole". That's fairly straightforward.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, but that's in Section 1 of the amendment, and this subamendment relates to Section 2.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry. If you look at the first section of the amendment, the first section deals with Section 2 of the resolution. That's what we're looking at. You then look at Section 2 of the resolution. What happens is that we strike out the words "The Estimates" and insert "Bill 69"; we strike out the words "Committee of Supply", and we substitute "Committee of the Whole". That's the amendment.

The key thing in that amendment is that the rest of the wording is there, which includes "shall" and, most important of all, includes "on 5 separate sitting days". So the amendment says that Bill 69 shall be considered by the Committee of the Whole on five separate sitting days. That being the case, Mr. Speaker, there must be an exception on Section 5, because we can't include Bill 69 on anything other than an accepted basis. We're saying in the original amendment that it will be based on five separate sitting days, and Section 5 deals with one sitting day. That being the case, there's absolutely no doubt that the subamendment is in order. Indeed, unless the subamendment stands, the entire amendment isn't in order.

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, if I may, I think the explanation is made longer and more cumbersome by the desperate desire not to deal directly with its implications. The effect of the amendment, as I understand Section 1, it would be a resolution of the Assembly to recommit Bill 69 to committee consideration. It's a subtlety that ap-

parently some members hoped would get past the Assembly. As I interpret part one of the amendment, if adopted, it would have had the effect of recommitting Bill 69 to committee stage, at which point the explanation of the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview is then absolutely correct and appropriate. I believe, the amendment is in order. The subamendment is in order. The necessity for the convoluted explanation arises from the desire not to say simply that the effect of it is to recommit the Bill to committee stage.

MR. SPEAKER: May I ask this further question: can the Bill be ordered to be recommitment to committee stage without express words saying so?

MR. NOTLEY: On a point of order . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Possibly the hon. Minister of Education can educate me further.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Speaker, if I may, please, on a point of order. The words that caught my mind were "recommitted to committee stage". In order for it to be recommitment to committee stage, I think it would have had to have passed out of committee stage. It has not yet passed out of committee stage. In fact, it is still there.

MR. NOTLEY: Further to that, Mr. Speaker, it says "shall be considered". We have the estimates before Committee of Supply. Nobody seemed worried about that:

The Estimates shall be considered by the Committee of Supply.

We have Bill 69 before Committee of the Whole:

... shall be considered by the Committee of the Whole on 5 separate days . . .

It doesn't have to be recommitment. It's there, it "shall be considered". It is just refocussing the emphasis in this five days, from estimates to Bill 69.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the hon. members for their assistance.

MR. NOTLEY: Now, Mr. Speaker, perhaps we can proceed with the debate on the subamendment. We have a few more observations to make on the subamendment; at least I have a few more observations to make on the subamendment.

Mr. Speaker, the question I was raising before the concern you expressed stopped the proceedings was the issue of importance. Should we in fact be singling out Bill 69? Should we look at it in a different way than the appropriation Bill that will have to be passed to bring the estimates before the House? Should we look at it as a special case? I just made reference to the observations, I believe, of the hon. Member for Edmonton Glengarry, that he really didn't think it too important a matter. He picked up the Bill and pointed out that it's just a couple of pages: a couple of pages, 30 per cent.

Well, the point that has to be borne in mind, Mr. Speaker, is that that's 30 per cent of well over \$8 billion expected revenue this year. Over the next period of five years, under the terms of the energy agreement, we're looking at 30 per cent of \$64 billion.

Mr. Speaker, the 30 per cent concept — whether it's 30 per cent this year or 40 per cent next year or 20 per cent next year — is not relevant. What is relevant is that I suspect we are talking about probably the largest appro-

priation Bill of its kind, certainly of its kind in any provincial legislature in the country. I stand to be corrected in that if I'm wrong. But certainly it's a massive appropriation of funds: well over \$2 billion in 1982 and, over the next period of 5 years, almost \$20 billion, if the figures worked out after much negotiation between federal and provincial officials are correct. I'm not sure whether they're correct. The hon. Member for Vermilion-Viking tells us that perhaps things are a little rosier. He tells us we have enough oil and gas to last until the next ice age. I'm encouraged to hear that. It's certainly information that, to my understanding, is not currently in vogue in the oil industry in Calgary. But perhaps the hon. member knows something the ERCB doesn't know. I certainly welcome that information. But, whether we have enough oil and gas to last until the next ice age or whether we have to be a little more pessimistic in our outlook, the fact of the matter is that vast amounts of money will have to be allocated.

Mr. Speaker, another reason why Bill 69 is so important is that the entire framework of legislative accountability rests upon the sort of discussion that takes place when Bill 69 comes before the Committee of the Whole. This is the opportunity we have, Mr. Speaker, as members of the Assembly, both on the government side and the opposition side, to hold the Provincial Treasurer directly accountable. It's important that we have an opportunity to review the estimates of all the other hon. ministers. That's true. But if we have to make a choice, to go back to Diefenbaker's statement, if the chance of any change is about as hopeful as a seed being dropped on a glacier becoming productive, if we have to make that choice, then I say as a member of this House, let's have the time focussed on Bill 69. Let's have the time so that we can deal with the big fish, if I can use that term, rather than the little fish in the cabinet. Let's have the time so that we can have not only the Provincial Treasurer here but so we can ask the chairman of the investment committee himself, the Premier of the province, to come before this Committee of the Whole and answer questions.

We have a lot of pretty fundamental issues, not only the issue of water diversion that the hon. Member for Bow Valley raised, or some of the other items that have been raised by other members during this debate. One can talk about the potential industrial strategy. Because if there is any industrial strategy for this province, it has to surround the debate on Bill 69. But I'm not going into whether we should have an industrial strategy or not. Obviously I think we should, and I don't think this government has one. But that's the kind of thing that is relevant in a discussion of Bill 69.

It's pretty hard to discuss whether we have an industrial strategy when you're reviewing the estimates of the minister in charge of workers' health and safety; we have to talk about workers' health and safety. When we come to the Lesser Slave Lake drainage program, we have to talk about the Lesser Slave Lake drainage program. You can only bend the rules of relevancy so far.

But we're interested in finding out from this government if they have any idea where they're going, what they're going to do with all this money, whether they're going to plan to develop and diversify the economy of the province. We need to have the examination in the Committee of the Whole, with the Provincial Treasurer and the Premier, to discuss the appropriation of funds. That's the only way we can satisfy ourselves that we know where this government is going.

Pray tell, Mr. Speaker, where we are going to be able to get any information on what happened to the lost \$60 million if it isn't in a discussion of Bill 69? Are we going to get that by going down the list of estimates? Not very likely. In discussing the Walter C. MacKenzie hospital in Edmonton, we can't ask the hon. Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care what happened to the \$60 million because that's not his department. He can rightly say, I'll accept the buck when it comes to the mismanagement of that hospital, but the \$60 million we lost in financial transactions is not my responsibility. And I'd have to agree with him. That isn't his responsibility, any more than it's the responsibility of the Minister of Environment, the Minister of Agriculture, or the Minister of Transportation.

Mr. Speaker, if we're going to have an opportunity to find out what happened to that money, we have to have the Provincial Treasurer in front of us, and we have to have an opportunity to call the Premier. That's where the only chance exists for the concerns that have been expressed this fall, concerns that exist out there in the province of Alberta. That's where the opportunity comes for full accountability by the people who are basically in charge of the direction of this trust fund. While the discussion of the estimates is interesting and useful, they are not as important, they are not as crucial to the issue of legislative accountability and control, as is the examination of Bill 69. That is the reason hon. members of the House who don't like closure in the first place — and I think in our gentle way we've made the view reasonably well known, that we don't like the resolution, that we're opposed to the resolution. But because we are opposed to the resolution, we want to minimize the damage. Surely we want to minimize the damage to the most important issue before the House, and that most important issue is Bill 69.

Mr. Speaker, I say to members of this Assembly that I hope, quite frankly, that if this motion is rammed through the Legislative Assembly, the Premier and the Provincial Treasurer will be in their places when we examine Bill 69 in Committee of the Whole; not just the Provincial Treasurer, but the Premier as well, as chairman of the investment committee. Because if we have any questions — whether the hon. Member for Bow Valley wants to talk about the impact of water diversion on the future of the province, and he mentioned the impact on his constituents; it has enormous impact on the entire future of Alberta — that's the place where they can be discussed.

The Premier wants 30 per cent of the resource revenue going into this trust fund. We have a right to be able to ask questions about what plans there are on water diversion. What is the government's strategy? We have a right to ask whether there's a government strategy on economic development and diversification in this province. We have a right to find out from this government what happened to the \$60 million. We have a right, and we have an obligation to find out, because we don't know.

We have the Auditor General saying there isn't enough information to know for sure; there's no evidence of fraud and collusion. I have no reason to doubt that statement. But the point is: we don't know because adequate records weren't kept. Who's responsibility is that? We've got to be able to go to the ministers who are responsible, Mr. Speaker. That's the Provincial Treasurer and the Premier. We've got to be able to zero in on where the responsibility rests.

If we have to look at this euphemism of time manage-

ment, and we have to sort of decide, okay now, we're in this cramped period of time because of the desire for the convenience of government members — not for any necessary public business that has to be dealt with, not because any contract has to be met, not because any emergency faces us squarely that we have to deal with; only because of this convenience have we got this time management scheme.

Mr. Speaker, let me tell you that if we are going to have to deal with the muzzling of the Legislative Assembly and the curtailing of freedom of speech, if we must face that ugly reality, then let us mitigate its impact as much as possible on the most important issue before the Assembly or before the Committee of the Whole. That clearly is Bill 69. The hon. Member for Clover Bar has hit the nail on the head. None of us likes it; none of us likes to have to make this choice, but we have to face the grim reality of a legislative majority, the tyranny of a majority. We have to face that fact, and we then have to make choices. The hon. Member for Clover Bar is suggesting that the choice we make is that we exempt Bill 69.

Mr. Speaker, because of that point, I strongly support the subamendment and urge hon. members on both sides of the House to support it. But I would certainly welcome — especially in view of the comments that are on record in *Hansard* by the Premier when he introduced the heritage trust fund Act. The hon. Member for Edmonton Whitemud talked about the foundation. As a matter of fact, there's a little bit of an argument between the Member for Vermilion-Viking and the hon. Member for Edmonton-Whitemud. The Member for Vermilion-Viking said that the 30 per cent Bill was the fundamental base of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. The hon. Member for Edmonton Whitemud said, no, that's not true; there is a heritage trust fund Act, and all Bill 69 does is increase the size of the trust fund. I'm not quite sure who is speaking for the government. Although, listening to the hon. Member for Vermilion-Viking and not hearing any government members arguing to the contrary — with the exception of the question of the designation of what is the most important element of the trust fund — I can only assume that the arguments presented by the hon. Member for Vermilion-Viking sum up the position of the government on this issue, and that all the hon. members of the House are prepared to stand behind everything the hon. Member for Vermilion-Viking said. I think that that's certainly going to be very interesting.

If they don't, perhaps they might enlighten us, because we wouldn't want to misrepresent them. But in the absence of any statements to the contrary in the debate, one can only presume that the new Whip, if you like, the new strategist, the new rules expert for the government is the hon. Member for Vermilion-Viking. That's fair enough. I certainly welcome his summary as the explanation of the government's case on this amendment.

Mr. Speaker, in concluding my remarks on the subamendment, I just say to members of the Assembly that we have to deal with a difficult choice: a choice not of our own making, a choice that none of us on this side of the House would choose, but a choice that we have to frankly face. That being the case, I would like to see Bill 69 exempted from the more odious features of this closure motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Having heard the . . .

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I certainly feel that . . .

MR. SPEAKER: It would appear that as time goes on, the alacrity with which members get to their feet becomes less and less. In some parliaments, once the Speaker is on his feet to call a question, it's too late to get up.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I certainly understand your support for freedom of speech and the rights of the members of this Legislature to be able to put forward their point of view. There's no way I think you would stand in the road of that kind of activity in this Legislature.

I thought that at this hour of the morning, at 6:05, it would be very relevant and very fitting at this time if I referred to a quote that I've kept since 8 o'clock last night for the Legislative Assembly this morning, for this subamendment before us. I feel that the quote is very fitting. It's a quote from John Milton. Many of us who have gone to university know that in one of our first university courses, English literature, John Milton had some great things to say. I'd like to read one of his quotes that I thought was very applicable to the subamendment before us and the activity we have been discussing:

. . . the knowledge of vice is necessary to virtue and the scrutiny of error to the confirmation of truth.

Mr. Speaker, that's what it's all about here at this time: "the scrutiny of error to the confirmation of truth". In the subamendment before us, we are saying that we must give every opportunity for members of the Legislature to have priority discussion, to have ample time in discussion, even within the limits of the closure being applied to us in this Legislature, even within five days. We must have every opportunity to discuss the most important item on the agenda, and that's Bill 69, the life line to the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, to the Act that is put in place, that in turn allows for the investment of moneys, resource revenue, into the various programs in this province of Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, that's the purpose of Bill 69. On that basis, we have to discuss it with every opportunity so that we can give it the best discussion possible. If the government and the Legislature accept the subamendment before us, that excepts Bill 69, that allows it to go through a more normal process in those nine days, it gives members more opportunity to talk about the various items on which the 30 per cent of moneys can be distributed, that will be distributed by government, by members of this Legislature. For example, the government will want to distribute some 8 per cent of the money on the Canadian investment fund; to look at investments in other provinces; add to the investments that have been made, possibly add to more of the investments in terms of Hydro-Quebec so that there'll be a sum near \$200 million in this coming year to Quebec; add to the moneys already in the province of Manitoba, some \$185 million at 13.75 per cent; the investments in New Brunswick, Newfoundland, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island.

All these items must receive the priority attention of the members of this Legislature. The best forum on which these matters can be discussed is Bill 69, and with ample opportunity, so that during those five days we have Bill 69 before us at every convenient moment. This subamendment will allow for that to happen, will facilitate that kind of discussion.

What about the other part of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, the capital projects division? Certainly the 12 per cent of revenue spent on the capital projects division can be studied in the estimate study in terms of supply. Certainly we can look at each of these topics with regard

to the new rail hopper cars, the Alberta Children's Provincial General hospital, medical research, applied cancer research, heart research, Southern Alberta Cancer Centre, the Walter C. MacKenzie health centre, irrigation rehabilitation, irrigation headworks, AOSTRA, learning projects, library development, Farming for the Future, grazing reserves, reforestation nursery, Kananaskis, land reclamation, airport terminals, Lesser Slave Lake, and Edmonton and Calgary parks.

Mr. Speaker, every one of those projects is good. They can be discussed under the supply estimates. But that's only 12 per cent of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, \$400 million in the year 1982-83. We need to discuss the large amount of money in the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. All the projects — in the Canada division, the Alberta division, those funds invested in various ways in bonds, as we have discussed in this Legislature — must receive the attention of this Legislature.

I think some very important items under the Alberta investment division could only be discussed if we keep Bill 69 before us in this Legislature as a priority topic; for example, the investments in provincial corporations such as the Alberta Home Mortgage Corporation. Not too long ago I believe, the hon. minister announced to the municipalities an extra \$200 million for homebuilding in this province, an excellent program. If we stick to supply estimates, we can't discuss that, Mr. Speaker. If we go to Bill 69 and give it the priority it deserves, we can discuss that kind of item in this Legislative Assembly — the Alberta Housing Corporation, Alberta Government Telephones, Alberta Municipal Financing Corporation, Agricultural Development Corporation, Alberta Opportunity Company, and certainly there are other investments such as the Alberta Energy Company and Syncrude, corporate debt investments.

Mr. Speaker, those are the areas we can explore by placing Bill 69 in a priority position and in a position where it can receive the more normal attention of the members of this Legislative Assembly. I think that's the responsible thing to do. The way the original motion is formed, that has received discussion by us in this Legislature, that kind of process cannot happen. I think that leads to irresponsibility. It leads to a position in this Legislature where only 12 per cent of the funds received the majority of discussion, with 88 per cent taking second place. Mr. Speaker, that's not good enough. As members of the Legislature, we must look at how all the funds are allocated. We must ask all the questions because that is our responsibility.

The fourth area that has caught our attention on this side of the Legislature is with regard to the deposits and marketable securities, the investment environment of this province, the portfolios, the deposit and money market securities, and the bonds. We can only reiterate that our concern started in this Legislature when the Auditor General said there was a possibility of collusion, fraud. Those are very dangerous words when you're talking about public funds and the allocation of public funds, when people in investment houses are investing millions of dollars on behalf of Albertans and we as Albertans do not know what accountability is in place.

Mr. Speaker, the only way we can discuss those kinds of things is to have Bill 69 before us in a priority position, in a position where we can have continuous discussion and press the person who is most responsible for this Heritage Savings Trust Fund. As we all recognize, that person is the Provincial Treasurer, who is directly responsible to the Premier of this province. They are the

decision-makers. They are the persons who make the decision on 88 per cent of the fund. Over \$6 billion is in the hands of those two individuals, Mr. Speaker.

With all humbleness and modesty, I'm sure it is those two individuals who influence other members of cabinet in how the Heritage Savings Trust Fund is being invested in this province. The Provincial Treasurer talks about how we should handle the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. The Provincial Treasurer commends and says that it's great that the committee of the Legislative Assembly "conducts an annual in-depth review of the activities of the Heritage Fund". We found that we were unable to follow through with an in-depth review of the heritage fund in our committee. We couldn't get the necessary information. We couldn't find out why the \$60 million was lost. The traders' notes couldn't be documented or produced for us. Management procedures we asked about couldn't be revealed. Management letters were kept in privacy and behind closed doors.

Mr. Speaker, we wouldn't even have found out about mismanagement going on, about the things being hidden, if a document hadn't been leaked to us on this side of the Legislature. The Provincial Treasurer is very open in his report, and wants full discussion about Bill 69 and the allocations to the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. He even admits this at the end of his report when he says:

I look forward to a continuing flow of useful suggestions from the Committee as it fulfills its important mandate.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think that committee was very effective because they couldn't get the information to make the recommendations and decisions that were necessary. That's the kind of thing we face at the present time. We're here this early Tuesday morning, pressing the government, saying we need more information. At the same time, we're making amendments that are trying to make provisions in the closure motion to allow us the greatest capability to take on our responsibility here in this Legislature. But the government doesn't care. They're going to sit here and wait us out.

When we leave this Legislature, what's going to happen? All that information we want will still be behind closed doors, not available to the public of Alberta; decision-making will be in the same place as before. The government will sit in its insular position and Albertans will suffer. Because what really happens, Mr. Speaker, is that when a government takes that kind of position at this time in their administration, that attitude continues into the next government with the next minister who takes over. They say, this is precedent. The opposition doesn't require very much information about the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. You can limit discussion. Once we pass this closure motion, there will be precedent in Alberta for the use of closure, which is most unfortunate.

We know this closure motion will push us out of this Legislature. The only bargaining tool we have is to try to amend that closure motion to enable us to have a greater amount of discussion in this Legislature. We know that discussion isn't going to lead to getting the documents we want. We're pretty well convinced of that. We've had seven weeks when we've tried to get something out of this government, when the government has never prepared themselves in good argument, debate, as to why they can't do it.

I've presented a legal argument, a legal opinion, to the Provincial Treasurer that indicated there was no reason the Provincial Treasurer could not table the management documents and any other documents. The only reason I

could come to was that the government was hiding something, keeping something behind closed doors, not doing public business in public; saying, it doesn't matter, we're looking after things. But, Mr. Speaker, with that kind of attitude, with the huge sums of money we have in this province, somewhere temptation will corrupt the system. Somewhere that type of attitude will be the downfall of this government.

That will be the sign and someday it will happen. It's going to happen. All we in the opposition have to do is wait. It's been 10 years. Maybe the seed is already planted somewhere in one of those departments. Maybe it will happen in the next two, three years; maybe before the next election. There are too many dollars, and too many things done behind closed doors and not in public so that there is a control device that makes elected persons responsible in their job and answerable to the public. But under the present circumstances — where all things are done behind closed doors, where it's possibly easy to make deals and arrangements — there could be the fraud and collusion the Auditor General talks about. It can happen.

It isn't going to hurt us on this side of the Legislature. The only people who are going to be really hurt are the people of Alberta because they are the ones who lose under those circumstances. It doesn't matter if a government's replaced and 24 cabinet ministers go back to private life; 24 other people will move in. But under conditions such as that where there may be losses — here \$60 million of the taxpayers' money lost, not documented, bad management procedures in place. This government just brushes it by and says, well, we lost that one; we win some, we lose some. We lose it, so what? Who cares? We don't have to document it. We don't have to tell anybody about it. We'll tell them about all our wins, it'll kind of push the picture over where it looks good. But as I said a number of hours ago, you could paint the nice picture on this side but there's still the black picture over here, the black day when this government could not reveal information to support their position that they were responsible in losing \$60 million.

Mr. Speaker, that is the way it is. Our only recourse is to try to focus on Bill 69 in a five-day period to raise the problems of the cross-section of investments, raise the concerns with regard to the cross-section of investments by the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, the Provincial Treasurer, and the Premier. That's the only chance we have to hold the government accountable to a small degree, a very minor degree. But I know the government will say, we have five days, we'll last them out. Let them ask the questions, we'll ignore them. We won't answer them, because we really don't have to.

In introducing this debate on the motion of closure, the hon. House leader didn't have the courtesy to list a number of valid reasons why it was urgent to put in a motion of closure. They were not listed before us. The House leader said, here's the motion, we're going to do it; we're going to close you out, in five days you're gone and we're rid of you. That's about what was said.

Mr. Speaker, that isn't the way the democratic process should proceed. That's usually the way the answers are in the House as well. We've asked 101 times for documents from the Provincial Treasurer. He gave no understanding why those documents couldn't be presented in the Legislature. Asked if he could give a legal opinion . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I know this is wide open, and we're certainly indulging in a great deal of unneces-

sary repetition. We're going over arguments that were made yesterday. As far as the question period is concerned, hon. members well know that there's no comment on a minister's answer, whether he answers or not. It's not a point of privilege. So let's get back to the subamendment.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I was on the subamendment. I did lead from a point about three or four minutes ago indicating that the subamendment allows for discussion, specifically on Bill 69, with a greater amount of latitude. Through that discussion we hope to get a number of answers out of government that they haven't given us yet. That was the point I was making about the Provincial Treasurer, Mr. Speaker.

The Provincial Treasurer has had ample opportunity to point out, first of all, legal reasons why the hon. Provincial Treasurer couldn't table the documents; secondly, some good political reasons; and thirdly, maybe even some good management reasons why those documents could not be tabled in this Legislature. That courtesy was not extended to us. So by this amendment to the resolution, we hope we can place Bill 69 at the top of the list, ask those kinds of questions, and press the Provincial Treasurer into giving us more factual and well thought out answers.

I think that's a fair position, Mr. Speaker. I think it's fair that we insert this subamendment at this point to protect the little freedom of speech we have left in this Legislature. I think that's the least this government could do: allow us to choose the item we can discuss in those five days, give it the priority required, and give us some time on this side of the House so we can hold the Provincial Treasurer accountable for his actions, not only in the future but those actions in the past three years.

MRS. CHICHAK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to participate in the debate through last night and this morning to clarify some statements by the hon. Leader of the Opposition in regard to opportunities that the opposition or any member in this House may have or has had to question and have a thorough, in-depth review into the spending or investment of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund and Bill 69, and the subamendment before us indicating that it's necessary to have Bill 69 in order to seek out in-depth information with respect to the total areas of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund.

Mr. Speaker, it disturbs me greatly when the hon. Leader of the Opposition — having been a member of this Legislature for many years and very well aware of the need to present to citizens an accurate picture of the ability, duty, and role of the hon. member in determining that the government has prudently exercised all aspects of its responsibility in the utilization and investment of funds on behalf of Albertans — repeatedly indicates that he is not given the opportunity to have freedom of speech, to ask probing questions, and do in-depth analysis of the government's performance. If we review briefly the availability of procedure that has not been curtailed, altered, I think the opportunity has been there. Perhaps the hon. Leader of the Opposition may not have taken advantage of that opportunity. That may be a matter he has to answer for. But to say that it is necessary to bring Bill 69 into focus as the necessary point through which the hon. leader can achieve the goal and the responsibility he feels he is here to achieve is somewhat of an inaccuracy.

If we look at the documentation we have — and I don't

need to go back very far. If we very simply review some of the mechanisms in place when we started the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund, the various components the legislation for this fund provides with respect to the capital projects division, the Canada investment division, the Alberta investment division, the energy investment division, the commercial investment division, deposits, and marketable securities: all those mechanisms are provided under the legislation.

However, the availability of the opportunity to inquire to examine the performance of the government with respect to each of these areas is twofold: one, before the fact; two, after the fact, in order to make a further determination whether the allocation of additional funding is to be considered and granted. This year we have proposed estimates for programs for the following year, the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund capital projects division for 1982-83 estimates.

We had the same opportunity last year to look at estimates proposed for 1981-82, to examine what was being proposed and whether those were worth-while, legitimate directions that the government ought to take, and to have approval to carry on with. Then what happens following the approval of those proposed estimates? If we look back, in 1980 we had the opportunity to examine the proposed 1981-82 estimates. This year, we had the opportunity to examine how the approval and responsibility that was granted to Executive Council and to the government in 1980 was carried out.

[Mr. Appleby in the Chair]

What opportunity is there to have that examined? The procedure followed is a matter that hon. members know very well. The examination after the fact is carried out through the legislative committee on the Alberta heritage trust fund that looks at what took place.

Now if hon. members were not present at those particular sittings and didn't afford themselves the opportunity or the time and the in-depth review of what had gone over the past year, that is something they themselves have to answer for. Surely they can't say that due to their absence and lack of inquiry they have not obtained all the information they now wish they had. That is not something they can lay on the rest of the members of this Assembly. We all have our responsibilities, and we all have to answer to our electorate. We all have to communicate with our electorate.

I take nothing away from the hon. members in the opposition that they are communicating with their electorate. However, they cannot come in this House and make claim that they are not being allowed or permitted the opportunity to ask the questions, to probe, because that is not an accurate statement. If they have not taken that opportunity that is theirs, surely it cannot be an accurate statement that they're not allowed the freedom of speech to ask those questions.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition made the statement that he has not been given the opportunity to ask about the \$60 million loss. I think the hon. Provincial Treasurer has indicated the investment, the divestment, and the reinvestment, and that ultimately in that overall picture there was in fact a gain, not a loss. Maybe the hon. Leader of the Opposition and the members didn't like the answer they received. But that is not to say they were not given information or the answer.

Further, I think the hon. Premier and the hon. Provincial Treasurer informed this House that the hon. Premier

had sent a letter to the Auditor General to ensure the members of the House, to ensure all Albertans, that if there was any action on the part of anyone under the direction of the government, the minister, the Provincial Treasurer, or anyone who has been elected, if there was any misappropriation, inappropriate action, or consideration that would have led to deliberately defrauding or creating a loss for Albertans, the Auditor General is to make his investigation and inquiry and report to the Legislature, to the public. I think the hon. Premier and the hon. Provincial Treasurer have gone as far as anybody, any government, any Legislature can go in trying to ensure, not only to the opposition but to all members and to the people of Alberta, that everything that took place was appropriate and was done with the best judgment in mind.

For the hon. Leader of the Opposition to claim that there isn't opportunity — there's opportunity for further debate before the fact and after the fact. As any member in this House knows, every member has been given that opportunity. I don't need to recite again the number of days that have taken place. Just to be sure the record indicates accurately that the opportunities are there — whether or not the members take them, they have to answer for themselves.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

[Mr. Deputy Speaker declared the motion on the sub-amendment lost. Several members rose calling for a division. The division bell was rung]

[Three minutes having elapsed, the House divided]

For the motion:

Buck	Notley	Speaker. R.
Mandeville	Sindlinger	

Against the motion:

Anderson, C.	Cook	Lysons
Anderson, D.	Cookson	McCrimmon
Batiuk	Cripps	Moore
Bogle	Gogo	Musgreave
Borstad	Hiebert	Pahl
Bradley	Hyland	Pengelly
Campbell	King	Stevens
Chambers	Kroeger	Thompson
Chichak	LeMessurier	Webber

Totals:	Ayes - 5	Noes - 27
---------	----------	-----------

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Speaker, with results being as close as they are, it gives one added encouragement to get up and continue to address the subject. I suspect that by this time next week, we might down to about 6 to 5, 5 to 4, or something like that.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make a few very, very brief comments in regard to the amendment proposed by the Member for Spirit River-Fairview. In my judgment, that amendment places or emphasizes and gives the importance to Bill 69 that it so rightly deserves.

We are faced with the invocation of closure. Closure is not a palatable thing under any circumstances, in any place. Nevertheless, being faced with the invocation of closure, I think the amendments that have been proposed through the course of this morning demonstrate that the



opposition is making every effort possible to seek the next best alternative. If we must live with closure, if that is to be the decision of this government — and obviously that is — then how can we somehow ameliorate the adverse impact of closure.

This amendment ensures that ample time is given for consideration of Bill 69. It ensures that the Provincial Treasurer can appear before the Legislature and the Committee of the Whole and do those things which he said he would do when he appeared before the watchdog committee. He said he would give detailed responses to questions which were posed to him when he appeared as a witness. The Provincial Treasurer also indicated at that time that it was he, and he alone, who would be held accountable in a democratic system for the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. Mr. Speaker, I don't believe we should take that opportunity from the Provincial Treasurer to fulfil his obligation and appear before the legislative Committee of the Whole and deal with Bill 69.

[Mr. Purdy in the Chair]

Mr. Speaker, Bill 69 is extremely important when the Heritage Savings Trust Fund is considered. It is true that the initial fount for the Heritage Savings Trust Fund was the legislation which in fact established the trust fund. However, the lifeblood of that fund is now Bill 69. Without Bill 69, there would not be a transfusion of new funds into the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. So whenever Bill 69 comes up, it's a very important checkpoint for the Legislative Assembly.

Two essential questions should be asked in regard to Bill 69. One is, what have you done with the money that has been appropriated on an annual basis under other Acts? And two, what will you be doing with the money that will go into the Heritage Savings Trust Fund as a result of proclamation of Bill 69?

Beginning with the first question, what has been done with the money that has been appropriated in other years, the select standing committee of the Legislature posed that question to the various ministers who appeared as witnesses. That question has also been posed to those ministers who appeared before the Committee of [Supply] in support of their estimates for 1982-83. When the members of the Legislature — I should make that more precise and say when the members of the opposition questioned the ministers in regard to their appropriations for 1982-83, they invariably did so by preambing what they had to say by saying that, for the most part, these were good programs and projects; it was difficult to argue with the value or merit of any of these because in fact they have merit, value, and undoubtedly they will provide benefits for all Albertans. Unquestionably they also meet the criteria of this investment division of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, and that is to provide long-term social, economic benefits for the people of Alberta. Sometimes perhaps it's difficult to see precisely what those long-term social and economic benefits would be. Nevertheless, common sense predominates in an issue such as that. For example, the first one, Advanced Education and Manpower, was the culmination of the three-year program, and there was only an additional \$288,000 to be expended out of a total project cost of \$9 million. I recall, Mr. Speaker, when members of the opposition addressed that, several said that this was such a good program, why did we spend only \$9 million and why don't we give consideration to extending it into the future? The same could be said for Agriculture, Farming

for the Future. My only question about that was one that had been raised by several members of the legislative committee over the three years I've been there: how would it be possible to ensure that those projects which were funded by heritage funds receive that recognition?

Over the years, recommendations have been made that, for example, a logo be developed for the heritage fund, and that has been done. However, I was in Lacombe over the summer and visited the Lacombe research station. The people gave me a tour of the facilities, and they were quite proud of the projects they were undertaking at the time. I asked them about the funding for it, and they explained it to me. They also gave me some brochures which described the programs. I was very surprised to see that one of them was one of our Farming for the Future projects from the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. What surprised me even more was that throughout the four pages of that single-spaced brochure, 8.5 by 11 paper, there was not one mention of the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund. In fact, the brochure gave all appearances of its being a 100 per cent federally funded project. I know that is not the case. I know it was fifty-fifty project, 50 per cent by the federal government and 50 per cent by the Alberta government through the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund. Nevertheless, on Agriculture there weren't many other comments except to say they're good programs and there's hope that they be continued.

The next program we came to in this particular year was the Alberta Oil Sands Technology and Research Authority. Two questions were raised there, Mr. Speaker. One was in regard to the total cost of the project. When the project was first initiated, it was said with a great deal of fanfare that this would be an energy project breakthrough and that \$100 million would be allocated for that. It was in fact a ceiling that was incorporated within the legislation for the Alberta Oil Sands Technology and Research Authority. It wasn't put in there just to take up space, Mr. Speaker. There was a particular reason: it was for management control purposes. It did two things. First it said to the manager, when you make your daily operating decisions, you must bear in mind that you don't have an unlimited source of funds. Those day to day decisions would have to be compatible with the long-term objective: the development of new heavy oil and tar sand development techniques that would hopefully lead to innovation and implementation in the future.

The problem was that the \$100 million was set up as a finite guideline. It was expected that after the term of the project, which was initially announced at five years, we could come back to the Legislative Assembly and ask the first of the two questions that I have posed in regard to Bill 69: what have you done with the money you had last year and over the last five years? That's why the \$100 million was there. It was intended to be a measurement of effectiveness or efficiency; that is, if the research authority could attain its goals by using the \$100 million, or less, it would have been effective in attaining its goal; secondly, in attaining the goal by using the allocated budget or less, it would have been very efficient. On the other hand, if it had or had not attained its goal yet expended more than \$100 million, there would be a question of accountability. That's how financial managers or managers of any operation are held accountable. Then we could come back to this Legislative Assembly and say, this project was established with \$100 million funding, what have you done with the \$100 million and what have you achieved?

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, somewhere along the line

the rules of the game were changed, and an amendment was made to the Alberta Oil Sands Technology and Research Authority so that the \$100 million which was initially set aside for it was not even touched. I believe something like \$3,567,000 was expended out of that \$100 million. The question arises, where did they get the other money? It came from the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. There was an end run around that parameter or guideline of \$100 million so that to date, I believe somewhere in the order of magnitude of \$220 million has already been expended on AOSTRA, which is far in excess of the \$100 million initial guideline.

What further complicated that matter, Mr. Speaker, was the fact that the minister was asking for an additional \$54 million, which would take it up to around \$275 million. Upon further review and scrutiny of this particular estimate, it was revealed that this was just interim financing. The projects that would be undertaken with the money had a lifetime expectancy that went not only beyond this year's appropriation and beyond the initial five-year project period, but beyond the next five years as well, into the 11th and 12th year. The Assembly wasn't being asked just to approve an expenditure of \$54 million. It was being asked to commit to projects that would have a life-term expectancy going beyond the next five years and into the next five as well.

Mr. Speaker, given the magnitude of those projects and the nature of them — it's not really practical once they have been undertaken to stop in midstream and say, hold it, we'd better review this and decide whether we want to go further or not. There is such a large initial capital outlay for these things that once that outlay has been made, it is only prudent to continue the project into the future.

Now that was a matter that concerned the Auditor General. The Auditor General has expressed that concern in his annual report to the Legislative Assembly. He said that when we get into the Legislative Assembly and consider these estimates of proposed investments each year, we should be asking detailed questions of the ministers who are seeking the funds, in terms of the total project cost. What was the initial project cost? What changes in scope, design, or direction were there? What were the cost changes due to that? What is the expected total cost to completion? Things of that nature.

The Provincial Treasurer responded to that recommendation, Mr. Speaker, and said that that isn't really in the line of tradition and custom in the Legislative Assembly. The Auditor General had said that that type of information should be contained within these annual estimates. The Provincial Treasurer, in a written response, said that traditionally and by custom, we normally don't include that type of information; however, if any members would like to get it, they can do so easily when the estimates come to Committee of Supply. Then the questions can be posed to the ministers, and such details as those sought by the members and those recommended by the Auditor General could be provided at the time. Naturally, when the opportunity arose to discuss those estimates before the Legislative Assembly, we did so with a great deal of vigor over the last seven weeks. I must say that that effort has provided a wealth of information about the Heritage Savings Trust Fund that I don't believe was there beforehand.

In regard to some of the others, we haven't finished all of Energy and Natural Resources. Out of the 24 here, we've covered only 11. We have quite a few more to go. We did cover Environment — Capital City Recreation

Park, Fish Creek Provincial Park, irrigation headworks, and main irrigation. Then we got into land reclamation. That was very interesting when we addressed to the minister that first question relative to Bill 69: what have you done with the money you got in previous years? We found that over those six years, the minister had consistently overestimated his funding requirements. Over those six years, the minister was not even able to spend 50 per cent of those total funding requirements. In defence of that, the minister said that was prudent budgeting. Mr. Speaker, when looked at in its entirety that is not prudent budgeting. Although it may be prudent budgeting for that particular minister, it's not prudent budgeting for the government as a whole. We must bear in mind that there are a limited amount of dollars each year. Quite naturally, each department competes for a share of those dollars. When one department consistently takes twice the money it needs, there is less money for someone else in another department. That's not prudent total budgeting.

We went on from land reclamation, where we had gone through that discussion, to the Lesser Slave Lake outlet. It was pointed out by the minister that here was another excellent example of prudence within the department. He substantiated that by saying that this particular project was initially thought to cost \$8.8 million. However, after having talked to advisory committees and having had the initial development stages, having got past the exploratory and preliminary stages, the minister said that it now cost only \$4.411 million. Again, the department had overestimated its requirements twofold.

What concerned me even more, when we queried the minister at great length about the estimates for this particular project, asking for different documentation supporting the decision to undertake the project, was that the minister substantiated the decision to undertake the project by referring to a document. But he would not tell us who authored the document or what the data on the document was. It struck me as rather strange. If the minister was willing to substantiate or support his estimates by referring to a document and quoting it extensively in the Legislative Assembly, he should also identify that particular document for the Members of the Legislative Assembly.

We then went on to Workers' Health, Safety and Compensation. The amount to be voted there was \$1 million. I think most members felt that was a good expenditure, although there were some questions about the details of those expenditures. We got into great discussion about one in particular, research on farming. I believe there was an initial expenditure of \$8,474 on the first phase. The second phase was about \$45,363. The total funds were going to one professor, Dr. Harrell, to undertake a survey that would identify the cause of accidents on the farm. The question put to the minister, left unresolved at the time because we adjourned, was how a doctor whose annual remuneration at a university was probably in that range could undertake two simultaneous obligations. We still haven't gotten the answer on that one.

Mr. Speaker, I think the next estimate example really demonstrates the value of asking those two simple questions: what have you done with the money you got last time and what will you do with the money you're going to get this time? In regard to what have you done with the money you got last time, we had a very interesting dialogue, if I may say so, with the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care about the Walter C. MacKenzie Health Sciences Centre. Two years ago, when the Minister of

Hospitals and Medical Care appeared before the legislative watchdog committee, he was asked what systems were in place to ensure there were adequate accounting and management control procedures. The minister didn't adequately respond to that question. It led one member to say: Mr. Minister, I believe you would probably agree that, if we borrowed a term from medicine, that it would be better to have preventive measures rather than remedial measures.

Mr. Speaker, we all wish the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care had given more attention to preventive measures rather than remedial. What we had last week with the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care before us was an admission that something "horrible had gone wrong". The cost of that centre had skyrocketed for many reasons. One reason was inflation, and we all have to deal with inflation. It skyrocketed because of changes in scope. But, Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding those two very understandable changes in total cost, the third one was most disconcerting. The third reason for those skyrocketing costs was the fact that there were inadequate control procedures. Things were happening there that should not have been happening. Things were built up and demolished. Changes in scope, changes in construction, and new designs were not approved in a proper manner. The project manager was taking ...

MR. COOK: Mr. Speaker, could I rise on a point of order? I realize that it's after 7 in the morning. Maybe it's the hour, but I'm having some difficulty connecting what the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo is saying to the amendment moved by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview. I'd appreciate some help in trying to connect these remarks with this amendment. Frankly, I'm baffled.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to thank the Member for Edmonton Glengarry for his diligence in ensuring that this morning we do adhere to the topic. Although I thought I was specifically on it, I will retrace my thoughts and ensure that I don't stray again.

Mr. Speaker, the amendment we're talking about re-emphasizes the importance of Bill 69. It identifies the fact that Bill 69 should predominate over the estimates. I'm not saying the estimates are not important, because they are important. If I can continue with what I'm saying, I will demonstrate why they are important. Nevertheless, we would not have the estimates unless there were Bill 69s. We must first deal with Bill 69 before we can even get to these estimates.

In regard to the Walter C. MacKenzie Health Sciences Centre, the minister was forthright in standing up in this Legislative Assembly and saying that things didn't work out the way we wanted them to. Sometimes that happens in life. Even playing basketball, I can remember ...

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Does the hon. Member for Edmonton Glengarry have a point of order?

MR. COOK: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I'm still having difficulty connecting Bill 69 with the Walter C. MacKenzie hospital. Bill 69 provides for 30 per cent of natural resources revenue to be transferred to the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. I suppose we could talk about whether it's 20 per cent, 30 per cent, 40 per cent, or no per cent. I think that would be relevant. Mr. Speaker, perhaps it's just the hour of the morning, but I don't understand how one can connect the Walter C. MacKenzie hospital to Bill 69. I'm at a loss.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Speaker, I do want to ensure that there is communication between the Members of the Legislative Assembly, and especially between me and the Member for Edmonton Glengarry. Let me try one more time. There would not be a Walter C. MacKenzie Health Sciences Centre, an irrigation project, library projects, grain hopper cars, or anything, unless there first was a Bill 69 where we could get the money for those things.

MR. COOK: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. That may all be true. Using that same interesting logic, if there were no sunshine there would be no water, ground, warmth, or agriculture. We could discuss all sorts of wonderful things with a right-to-sunlight Bill. I don't see a direct connection between Bill 69 and the Walter C. MacKenzie hospital. Again, Mr. Speaker, we're on an amendment. The amendment requires us to have a very narrow focus; that is my point. Since we're on a very narrow amendment, the rules of relevancy are even more strict, as the Speaker has pointed out several times this morning. Surely we could be a little more careful in our debate, talk about Bill 69 and its importance, and that's all.

MR. NOTLEY: On the point of order. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the question that really has to be addressed is the degree of importance Bill 69 has vis-a-vis the estimates. As I understand the point the Member for Calgary Buffalo made, while the estimates are very important because they are fundamental to the lifeline of the fund, Bill 69 is more important. That being the case, it's not possible to address the amendment and ignore the estimates. The discussion of the estimates must be in light of whether they are more or less important. Some hon. members might suggest that the estimates are more important. I think those of us on this side of the House are suggesting Bill 69 is more important. That's a reasonable difference of opinion and properly part of the debate. But certainly it's not possible to properly debate the amendment before the House unless one also analyses the estimates in the context of whether they or Bill 69 are the most important.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: By looking at the estimate, only coming into the Assembly about a half hour ago, and viewing it last night and on television this morning, the debate has been far-ranging. I would ask the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo to continue.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Speaker, thank you for allowing me to continue on what I consider to be an extremely important matter. I think an extremely important principle has just been established. Without the Bill 69s, we would not have the capital estimates. That's why Bill 69 is so very important. That's why we are moving these specific amendments. If we have to have closure, if we have to live with that, let's prioritize the time we have left. If the guillotine falls in five days, the more important thing has to be Bill 69 rather than the estimates. Mr. Speaker, inherent in Bill 69 is ultimate accountability for the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, through the appearance of the Provincial Treasurer, who has quite pointedly stated that in the final analysis it is he who is accountable for all aspects of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund — not just the transfer of funds, but all aspects: this project, that project, and all the projects together. Therefore, we have to spend more time on that, and to do that we have to have the Provincial Treasurer before us.

Mr. Speaker, I want to address some other items in

capital estimates, but before I do I would like to address a couple of things brought up by another member. Again, it is in the vein of the initial question: what have you done with the money? If you, the government, are here before us today asking for more money, the first and most obvious question is what have you done with the money you got last time? There has been considerable discussion, and obviously a difference of opinion, about what has happened to \$60 million of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. It has been pointed out by some members, quite rightly, that the loss isn't of the type that falls through cracks in the floor and somehow was swept out with the dust. In this case, the loss is very specific. It is stated quite precisely in the annual report that there was a net loss on marketable securities. It's been pointed out that the net loss was incurred to gain more over here. That may be the case, but it has yet to be sufficiently documented to indicate that.

Mr. Speaker, in concluding my comments on this amendment, I would like to move a subamendment. The subamendment reads as follows:

By inserting in Section (8) after the words "all appropriation Bills" the words "with the sole exception of Bill 69", and by inserting after the words "every appropriation Bill" the words "with the sole exception of Bill 69".

Mr. Speaker, I would like to distribute this amendment to members, perhaps allow a moment for them to receive it, and then continue discussing the amendment.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: The time for the hon. member's has now elapsed. In fact, I gave the hon. member a couple of minutes extra because of the two points of order raised during the debate.

MR. SINDLINGER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, it's quite amazing that the government members would call the question before they've even seen the subamendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: We've heard it.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, if the government members are genuinely interested in carrying on the debate, I'm sure they would like to read the amendment, digest it, and then enter the debate.

MR. COOK: Read it for us, Walt.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, for the hon. Member for Edmonton Glengarry, who has a little difficulty understanding, I will read the subamendment.

MR. COOK: Thank you.

DR. BUCK:

By inserting in Section (8) after the words "all appropriation Bills" the words "with the sole exception of Bill 69", and by inserting after the words "every appropriation Bill" the words "with the sole exception of Bill 69".

Furthermore, for the hon. Member for Edmonton Glengarry especially, what does the subamendment mean? The subamendment is an addition to the amendment ensuring that if third reading stage is reached, the

time limit set out in Section 2 will not apply to Bill 69 nor, as a result of this amendment, will the Speaker be permitted to put the question with regard to Bill 69. Mr. Speaker, we are concerned and trying the best we can to give the government the opportunity to get out of this situation gracefully. There's the old Japanese saying that if you've defeated your enemy, let him lose face graciously. We know that this government, with this large membership, with the double shifting — and in the case of the Speaker, triple shifting. One Speaker has a little sleep, then we bring in the Deputy Speaker, and the deputy, deputy . . .

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Will the hon. member please come back to the subamendment.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, we're speaking about double and triple shifting.

In looking at the importance of Bill 69, many, many projects have been funded because we have moved funds from natural resource revenue to the Heritage Savings Trust Fund — many, many useful projects the people of this province are proud of. I am proud. Mr. Speaker, I stand at rigid attention when the blue and yellow hopper cars go by. I know it has benefited the farmers of this province and the western provinces. We now have hopper cars from our neighboring province to the east. We have the blue and yellow hopper cars here. These are good projects, funded by the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. This is why we feel it's so important Bill 69 receive a higher priority than just being thrown in . . . Mr. Speaker, I retract that.

We consider Bill 69, the transfer of funds to the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, to be very, very important. There is more money, and all these great projects before us will be funded by a transfer of those funds. When we look at the Alberta Children's Provincial General hospital, it's very interesting that instead of calling it the southern children's hospital, because they well know we need a northern children's hospital, the government in its sly wisdom feels it can probably get by with building just one. Mr. Speaker, it is a shame that a province as rich as this, a province with billions in the heritage fund, has to have benefit nights to raise funds to try to get the northern Alberta children's hospital off the ground. Next, we'll be selling raffle and bingo tickets. The Heritage Savings Trust Fund should be used for a northern Alberta children's hospital. That representation has been made to you, sir, to me, and to all members of the Assembly.

I keep telling the people working so hard and diligently: keep at it, keep it up. We're not that far away from an election. That will be a great time for the Premier to announce a northern Alberta children's hospital. It's more appropriate to announce that just before an election. I don't particularly care when that announcement comes, as long as it does come. One thing about this government, if they haven't thought of something first, they want to make it appear as if they really did think of it. I don't care who gets the credit. The people of northern Alberta are entitled to a children's hospital. I see my learned friend from Banff-Cochrane is waving his arms around again about relevancy. Mr. Speaker, I can't think of anything more relevant than a northern Alberta children's hospital funded by the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, with Bill 69 the vehicle to transfer those funds into the Heritage Savings Trust Fund so we can build a northern Alberta children's hospital.

Mr. Speaker, the people in this province are finding

out how you get some money out of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. You badger and you lobby, and you lobby and you badger. This government seems to understand pressure. When we need research funds, you have to keep after the government. Instead of the government providing leadership, they seem to be good followers — better good followers than nothing happening at all.

A project I find very intriguing and deserving of our support is the Farming for the Future program. I guess it should come out of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. I find that farmers are great philosophers. When they're on the tractor going up and down the field, they have time to do some deep thinking. Sometimes we politicians could take a few lessons from farmers and do some deep thinking. In the Farming for the Future program, a farmer said to me at a political rally — I was quite flattered because he said "young man" to me — you know, they talk about this Heritage Savings Trust Fund being funds to ensure the future, but I'm just a hard working man of the soil; I may not be too well educated formally, but I think I'm capable of doing some thinking: if you politicians invest money in the education of our young people, the future will look after itself. Now I think that's quite profound, Mr. Speaker. When we invest funds in Farming for the Future, we are planning ahead, and I compliment the government on this.

The grazing reserves development is the same thing. The reforestation and nursery programs are excellent. In this province, the former government and this present government have been derelict in cutting more timber than we replanted. Mr. Speaker, I think we all have to take responsibility for that. I compliment the government and the funding for our tree nurseries. When we were in Europe, every tree that's cut in Germany must be replaced — I don't know if it's a statute. An excellent program. In this country, we could learn something from that.

At the same time that we are so proud of some of these programs, I'm not so proud. Because the heritage fund is so large, we seem to feel that we have to be poor custodians of how funds are expended. The Kananaskis project is a good program and concept. But surely when we go from \$40-odd million to \$210 million, from \$80-odd million to \$300-odd million at the Walter MacKenzie health centre, people must wonder about our credibility, if we can manage. It's quite obvious that this government can spend, but can it manage?

It's interesting how immune the taxpayers of this province become to cost overruns. At the convention centre in Edmonton, they're ready to lynch the mayor and the council because they have cost overruns. But if the provincial government overruns from \$40 million to \$210 million, that's the way governments do business. Throw some more money in the pot. If we overrun the health sciences, throw some more money in the pot. Why worry? That's the way the government does business. Why should the city aldermen be chastised? Now in fairness and in complimenting that august body, they are putting very, very tough cost controls in place to make sure that the taxpayers' money is being well spent.

Mr. Speaker, I think we could learn something from that. The Capital City Park project in Edmonton and Fish Creek in Calgary overran only about \$10 million, especially in Edmonton. Again, it was interesting that this project was announced just before a provincial election. It got a lot of Tories elected in Edmonton. There was no cost/benefit analysis done at that time. An announcement

was made and the government said, we think it will cost about so and so.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. The Chair has some difficulty with hon. member's debate when we are debating a subamendment regarding the appropriation Bill, especially after the hon. member's lecture on what a subamendment was.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, we're talking about transferring funds. I'm comparing what has been done in the past to what we are voting to do in the future. The point I am trying to make is that we are responsible for close monitoring to make sure that when public funds are expended, they are not wasted. Basically it's that simple. There are many good programs. We, as guardians of the taxpayers' money, are responsible to make sure that the programs we put in place are good programs.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it was an education to all of us when we took the Minister of Environment through his many hoops as to what was going on in the Slave Lake area. There are many benefits, as there also were many benefits in the Paddle Lake project.

We are talking about Bill 69 in this vote. We want it to retain a special priority if other sections of the estimates and other Bills are passed. Bill 69 is the mechanism by which we fund these excellent programs. It is the mechanism we've heard so much about in the development of the petrochemical industry and the diversification of the economy. All these programs are dependent upon the movement of funds through this mechanism into the Heritage Savings Trust Fund.

Mr. Speaker, I feel there are areas — lending funds to other provinces, as we have done from the Heritage Savings Trust Fund — where we have to have a close look at what we are doing to our own people, the people to whom the funds belong. When a young businessman has to go through many hoops to the lender of last resort, the Alberta Opportunity Company, funded from the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, I wonder how much cynicism that young businessman has when he has to wait for 18 months to get a "no" answer. By a "no" answer I mean not any kind of answer. That young businessman becomes very, very disillusioned when he says: who does that money belong to? Does that belong to me? Does that belong to my children? Is it going to benefit me because it hasn't benefited my mother or her mother?

When is the future going to begin for the Heritage Savings Trust Fund? That young businessman looks in amazement when we lend funds to Hydro-Quebec at 15 per cent. He borrows higher. We lend it to other provinces; the farmer borrows higher. The farmer has to have loans guaranteed by the government at 20, 21, 22 per cent. When we give funds to the Alberta Housing Corporation, in fairness to the Minister of Housing and Public Works, there are good programs and good use of the taxpayers' dollars. At the same time, maybe Albertans deserve a better break than they are getting.

It will be interesting to see what we do with the funds we transfer by means of Bill 69 from participation in Syncrude and some of the megaprojects. It will be interesting to see the government's long-term philosophy as to what we're going to do with those funds as they relate to the megaprojects. Mr. Speaker, when we look at the megaprojects, the federal government and the provincial government have to take almost equal blame for what has happened to the economy of this province and this country. It's not good enough to hide behind the fact that it is

only a one-sided story.

As a responsible opposition, we'll be looking forward to what happens to participation in the megaprojects in this province. The megaprojects have the possibility of being funded from the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. When we look at the extension of funding in the energy investment division, it would be interesting to know who it is and how they decide who is going to get the funding out of this. That would make for a very interesting thesis study for some graduate student at the university. I think that young man or woman would have a very interesting time trying to come up with a solution of who gets the money out of that fund and who doesn't. It will also be more interesting in the future to see who gets the money from the energy investment division of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund and who doesn't.

Mr. Speaker, in this province we worry so much that when the oil wells go dry, we're going to go broke. I don't believe that this province is going to go broke when the oil wells go dry. I don't think they're going to go dry for a long time. Secondly, coal will become king. This province has vast reserves of coal. I think it's a trial balloon when this government says to the people, trust us; we will look after you when the wells go dry. Mr. Speaker, the well may go dry, but the coal will not run out, and natural gas will be here for many, many years. But it was a good election ploy; it worked. It said, you need strong leadership because we have the dollars in the Heritage Savings Trust Fund to diversify the economy. We're still waiting for that diversity.

When we're looking at funding, an area that concerns me is getting back once more to the responsibility factor. As I stated several times before, last evening and this morning, we are guardians. We have a sacred trust to look after these funds transferred by Bill 69 into the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. I still well remember the former Premier of this province, Senator Ernest Manning, saying that you members of this caucus and this Legislature must remember that is not your money. You can do whatever you wish with your personal money, but that is a sacred trust. You must look after that much more understandingly and diligently than if it were your own money. We must remember that, Mr. Speaker, when we are in this Assembly. It is not our money; it is in trust to us.

Mr. Speaker, there are programs, and there will be programs in the future. We will not be getting an opportunity to peruse the capital works division of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund in any greater length, because it seems the guillotine is going to be coming down. I make a final plea that Bill 69 would give the government the opportunity to gracefully terminate this debate this morning. All they have to do are two things, Mr. Speaker. First of all, afford this Assembly — not the opposition, but this Assembly — further debate on Bill 69. Secondly, have the Provincial Treasurer stand in his place and indicate what happened to the \$60 million. That will satisfy the Assembly, but most importantly it will satisfy the people in this province who are asking us why and where. The government has the opportunity to allow this debate to come to a merciful end with grace and dignity.

They can grind us and grind us, and they know they will win. Five members have only so much stamina. They have double-shifted us. They have triple-shifted us. They have tried to make us bend. [interjections]

MR. COOK: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I've been here since 2:30, and I'm no more shifty than he is.

DR. BUCK: If the member is here, I didn't notice him.

Seriously, Mr. Speaker, the government can grind us down; then: is no doubt about that. But they are not going to mislead the people of this province. We have made our case. The attitudes are out there. People know and want answers. So, Mr. Speaker, the ball is in the court of the government.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, at an early hour like this, with newly shaved faces, I'd think they would come back with enthusiasm and gusto for the right to preserve the freedom of speech. I am referring to those who left and came back. The hon. Minister of Culture has been with us all evening. I appreciate that very much. That stamina and determination shows the leadership and courage of the women of this province. Mr. Speaker, that says a lot.

Mr. Speaker, where are we this morning at 7:45, Tuesday, December 8. I think some good lessons have been learned over this evening. There are subjects which should be put on the agenda of this Legislature and have the focus of attention of every member. The subamendment before us talks about giving Bill 69 the opportunity to be discussed by the members of this Legislature, not pushed through the Legislature quickly, that the Speaker will not be permitted to put the question with regard to the Bill as a result of this amendment. In other words, we get a lot more time to discuss the state of affairs with regard to Bill 69, and indirectly all the programs to which that Bill will contribute. That's one of the things; we have focused on an important subject.

The second thing I believe we have done over this last evening is focus on the subject of freedom of speech and how the initial motion presented to this Legislature will erode that freedom of speech. I think we have made the case well, Mr. Speaker, and have said it over and over again. The passage of that closure motion will certainly erode that right in this Legislature. What else have we learned? I think the third thing we have learned and tried to relate to the government on that side of the House is that their Premier, ministers in this government, made commitments to have a proper and historic democratic process in this Legislature.

The Premier of this province, when sitting as the Leader of the Opposition, very clearly said to this Legislature on February 16, 1968, that the Legislature has supremacy over the government. That statement should have set the ground rules for his leadership in this province over the past 13 years. That's very simple, Mr. Speaker.

[Mr. Crawford entered the Chamber]

MR. NOTLEY: Here he is. You look rested. Neil.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Another clean shaven face ready to stand and defend the rights of individuals in this province, the right of freedom of speech, where we left off last night. It's great to see the hon. House leader here to place some real arguments before this Legislature as to why we can discuss Bill 69 as the first priority item on the agenda, why there may or may not be a need for closure, also to tell us how the government is following through on that basic principle that the leader of the Conservative party set for this government and that party in 1968 — that the Legislature has supremacy over government. If that is true, Mr. Speaker, this subamendment we have before us at this point in time should be accepted without question.

The members of this Legislature should say, yes, let's give all the time we can to the study of Bill 69. Let's also reconsider this motion of closure and eliminate it from the agenda of this Legislature. Let's go back to the rights of the members of the Legislature, back to good, concrete, old-fashioned freedom of speech that has been honored and has endured over many years in the parliaments of the Commonwealth.

But, Mr. Speaker, that doesn't seem like the direction we're going. Even when we fight, argue, and place our case for that type of objective so well in this Legislature to a government that was led by someone who really believed, before 1971, that the Legislature should have supremacy over the government, that we wouldn't have a government by cabinet rule that believed in passing orders in councils or special warrants when the Legislature is not sitting — if the Premier really believed in what he said in 1968, we wouldn't have the big flood of orders in councils and Lieutenant-Governor directives that prevail in this province.

As a matter of interest, I did a bit of summary on legislation this government has introduced since the spring of 1977. I was looking for the erosion of the power of the Legislature. The Legislature was second-rated, and it was really a government by cabinet that was taking supremacy over the responsibilities of members of this Legislature. Mr. Speaker, this motion of closure is the best example: the resistance of this government to face the biggest question at hand today, Bill 69, and answer all the questions that can be asked about it, and to produce documents that support the actions carried out through this lifeblood Bill. This government will not do that. They believe in a different principle. A principle that says the Premier and the cabinet have supremacy over the Legislature. It's not the Legislature that has supremacy over the government, as it started out in 1968. They have done a reversal, Mr. Speaker, a total reversal over a period of 13 years. It's like the Liberals and the Conservatives in Canada. Now the Liberals are more conservative than the Conservatives in some instances. The role change is very interesting.

The point I want to make here is that this government has violated a very basic principle it started with, that the Legislature has supremacy over the government, not the cabinet and their ministers having supremacy over the Legislature. Let me cite some examples where that erosion can be seen in some of the legislation passed in this province. I relate that to the subamendment on the basis that the passing of this subamendment would demonstrate the principle that this government really believes the Legislature has supremacy over the government. When I look at the actions of this government, that principle is not supported. They can only start to rehabilitate and reinstate themselves by supporting such actions as are in this subamendment. This subamendment would show that this government really believes the Legislature has supremacy over the government in the province of Alberta.

What are some of those examples on topics relative to the subamendment, Mr. Speaker? I chose four Bills in the spring of 1977. Bill 1, The Alberta Historical Resources Amendment Act, permits the Lieutenant-Governor to make regulations concerning the Alberta Historical Resources Foundation — laws by cabinet. Bill 13, The Forests Amendment Act — more powers to the Lieutenant Governor in Council and the minister to make regulations respecting land use. Bill 18, The Social Development Amendment Act, permits the Lieutenant Gov-

ernor in Council to make changes in rates for family allowances. Bill 28, The Alberta Uniform Building Standards Amendment Act, extends subjects in respect of which the Lieutenant-Governor may make regulations, in some cases taking control from municipal governments.

In the fall of 1977, Bill 15, The Planning Act, gives power to the Lieutenant-Governor to establish commissions and jurisdictions. Other powers were given to the minister and to the cabinet. Many powers were taken away from local government and put in the hands of cabinet and the ministers. Bill 51, The Wildlife Amendment Act — greater powers to the Lieutenant Governor in Council dealing with the purchase and disposition of land for wildlife purposes. Bill 63, The Financial Administration Act — responsibility for pre-audits, accounting and financial reporting. There was a growth of special warrants, Mr. Speaker, which is a significant change in responsibility to the Legislature in terms of budgeting. Bill 66, The Department of Hospitals and Medical Care Act, transferred responsibility for the administration of health care from two hospital commissions to the direct control of a single government department. More control by government, Mr. Speaker. Bill 73, The Motor Transport Act, increased the power of the minister to establish regulations.

Bill 74, The Environment Conservation Amendment Act, weakened the impact of the independent board — closer ties to cabinet. Bill 81, The Department of the Environment Amendment Act — more power to the department to acquire land by expropriation. That's a very serious power, Mr. Speaker. It also makes it easier for the department to control land use adjacent to or within RDAs. Bill 88, The Social Care Facilities Licensing Act — more power to the department to shut down social care facilities. Bill 91, The Alberta Housing Amendment Act, more power to the Alberta Housing Corporation to initiate subdivisions and get government involved in development. Bill 95, The Glenbow-Alberta Institute Amendment Act, increases government representation on the board to gain a majority control.

Mr. Speaker, each step shows that the government was extending its control into various areas, wanting cabinet control over activities of the Legislature. In the spring of 1978, Bill 16, The Cultural Development Amendment Act, gave power to the minister to buy and sell works of art; maybe that's all right. Bill 25, The Utilities and Telephones Statutes Amendment Act, forces REAs to conform to standardized government regulations. Bill 37, The Corrections Amendment Act, allows the chief executive officer full power to transfer inmates to a mental facility, increases the regulatory power of the Lieutenant Governor in Council. Bill 38, The Municipal Government Amendment Act, allows the Lieutenant-Governor in Council to vary, as well as approve or reject, local authority board recommendations regarding annexations. In Bill 39, The Mines and Minerals Amendment Act, the minister's powers of delegation are broadened for establishing or cancelling agreements. Bill 40, The Ombudsman Amendment Act, allows the cabinet to suspend the Ombudsman, although control of the office of the Ombudsman has supposedly moved from the cabinet to the select committee on the offices of the Auditor General and Ombudsman. I hope that's true.

In the fall of 1978, Bill 61, The Students Finance Amendment Act, allows the Lieutenant Governor in Council to make regulations regarding rules for the appeal board. Bill 66, The Fuel Oil Administration Amendment Act, allows the Lieutenant-Governor to

make regulations designating specific operations as farming operations. Bill 70, The Social Care Facilities Licensing Amendment Act — greater powers to the minister to shut down social care facilities.

We can go on in the spring and fall of 1979 and see a long list of Acts the very same way. Bill 66, The Planning Amendment Act, authorizes the Lieutenant-Governor to make regulations concerning utilities and allows planning commissions to acquire land. Bill 67, Bill 55 . . . In the spring of 1980, Bill 41, The Alberta Corporate Income Tax Act — administration of income tax from Revenue Canada to the Provincial Treasurer. We haven't heard much about that Bill, so we don't know how that's affecting Albertans at this point in time. The Individual's Rights Protection Amendment Act, Bill 13, Bill 38, Bill 23, Bill 49: all Acts that increase the power of the Lieutenant Governor in Council. Fall of 1980, Bill 80, The Employment Standards Act, Bill 94, Bill 84, Bills 79, 75, 86, and 73 all increase the power of the cabinet of this government. In the spring of 1981, we had a number of Acts that do exactly the same kind of thing. I listed some 12 Acts that give greater power to the Lieutenant Governor in Council.

What's the point? The point is that there has been a basic violation by this government of a principle they established in 1968, that the Legislature has supremacy over government. When we look at special warrants, new legislation, orders in council through the Lieutenant-Governor, this closure motion, the fact that if we do not get this subamendment through that gives greater capability of discussing Bill 69, we have a continuous erosion of the rights of the members of this Legislature: freedom of speech, the right to hold the government accountable. That's what our objective is. We have debated for a number of hours over the night to try to show this government that closure is wrong in principle and unacceptable in Alberta. But this government says it's going to sit here and wait and be callous. As far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, we are on the offensive. We have put this government in a position where they must be accountable. They are working on our terms, not us in the opposition working on the terms of government, as they have always wanted to have it for the last 10 years. The government must answer in this Legislature. We have carried on this debate to show that this government must answer to the opposition. In turn, they will have to answer to the people of Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, it's our intention to try in every way we can to hold this government accountable. That responsibility must be taken at this time. This government has had its own way of doing things any way they want for 10 years. It is going to be a little difficult for them to change their position not to take a position of accountability. They don't know how to handle it. The only way they've been able to handle it so far is to come back with strong-arm tactics. A closure measure to try and push us down into the dirt.

Mr. Speaker, I think we're pushing back and holding our ground. There's going to be a little dirt taking and eating on the other side of the House. People in Alberta know we have spent the night in this Legislature. At this point in time, we have spent a full 12 hours in debate to fight for the right of freedom of speech and our rights as members in this Legislature, to stop this government that's trying to push a closure motion on us. We believe there is a time to have a government that is responsible for its actions, and that time is now. If it can't be answerable, I think it's time the people made another

choice. That's what democracy and representative government are all about: people in government who represent the population as a whole, respond and listen to them, and take direction from the people of the province.

When you get a group of individuals who feel they have the answers before the people of Alberta have the answers, the whole representative concept of democracy has broken down. Certainly, here in this Legislature in Alberta, we are going to lose a right and an opportunity because of a closure motion. That is only the beginning of the types of tactics this government will use. Earlier in the evening, a minister said we have a loophole in our rules that allowed us as a government to get into a situation where this little opposition could hold us at bay for hours.

Mr. Speaker, there's no loophole in the House rules. What there are in the House rules are the rights of members to freedom of speech, to have the opportunity to speak at length in this Legislature and express their points of view without any interference from anybody. The government is going to plug that loophole. They have a majority on the committee that revises the rules and changes them. As soon as that committee can be called and a recommendation can go to that committee, I'm sure we're going to have changes. Whenever we study supply in the future, there will be limitations and hard-line rules so all of a sudden the House leader can stand up and say, okay boys, you've had a nice little conversation, you've asked nice questions; it's all over, go home; we'll look after the basketful of Heritage Savings Trust Fund money; we'll look after it, spend or invest it; we won't ask traders to document anything; everything is great and fine and accountable.

Mr. Speaker, hopefully that kind of situation won't arise in Alberta. If it's up to us as members in this Legislature, we're going to stand up and fight for this right. We're going to press the government for questions and answers and hold them accountable. That's our responsibility. I think the beginning is for this Legislature to accept this amendment so we can press the Provincial Treasurer in terms of Bill 69, so he will come to this House with some answers and not take the responsibility he has as Provincial Treasurer in this House glibly and lightly.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I certainly welcome the opportunity to participate in the subamendment before the House. The subamendment strengthens the question of how one deals with Bill 69. It's not quite as strong as the amendment voted down before, but at least it deals with the question of the third reading stage. Before the Speaker is permitted to put the question, there will be adequate debate in third reading of Bill 69.

Mr. Speaker, I must confess that it really amazes me to listen to some of the hon. government members. Unfortunately, we haven't heard a lot from the government benches. I think it's rather scandalous that in this major debate, perhaps one of the most important debates in the history of the Alberta Legislature, so few members of the government have actually participated. They sat here all night, but basically one would expect they'd be rising to their feet if they're so proud of this motion they're going to ram through the Legislature.

It would seem to me they would want to have their name clearly marked in *Hansard* so their constituents can judge them and assess whether they agree with their members. But for the most part we have this sort of silent core who have sat with us during the evening but really



haven't participated in the debate in any significant way. I want to say that there are some exceptions, and we certainly welcome those exceptions.

For example, I welcomed the comments from the hon. Member for Vermilion-Viking. I didn't agree with his comments, but at least they were comments on this issue. I welcomed the comments the hon. Member for Calgary Glengarry made. I didn't agree with those comments, but at least they were comments, and his constituents know where he stands, just as the firefighters knew where he stood two years ago when he talked about the two-by-four. They knew where he stood, Mr. Speaker, and we appreciate that. I think it's important to talk in plain, simple language so our constituents know where we stand. Mr. Speaker, I must apologize. I forgot the hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest. He stood in his place and gave us quite a little lecture on British parliamentary history which I found very interesting; not relevant to the debate, but very interesting. At least we know that the hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest is interested in the subject, and I welcome his participation.

We had an excellent dissertation by the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood. As a matter of fact, I found her words very thoughtful. I think more government members should have been here to listen to the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood, because she took a good deal of time to outline in a very deliberate way her views on the subamendment at that particular occasion, and properly so. She was representing her constituents. While I didn't agree with her position, at least where she stands is on the record. We have so many members we still haven't heard anything from. It amazes me; it really does.

One would get the impression, listening to those few members who have spoken, that somehow this nasty little opposition is beating up on the poor, poor government, that the five here are just an awful bunch — we're stopping the process of government business; we're strangling the operation of government. One would think we aren't able to pay our civil servants or meet our obligations to other Canadians. It's just an awful situation, because we have these five members on the opposition who want to insist public business be done in public that we deal with Bill 69, and that that Bill be given the priority it should and not shuffled out of here as quickly as possible.

Mr. Speaker, there is little doubt that Albertans listening to this debate — and I gather some have — and Albertans reading about this debate when they get their *Hansard* and their newspapers, will wonder why this government is so insistent on ramming closure through. They're not prepared even to consider an amendment which gives some degree of latitude in the area of the importance of Bill 69. Mr. Speaker, that's really what is at stake at the moment.

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

What is the issue dealing with Bill 69? This motion that is going to gag — I use the expression "gag" deliberately, because the Rt. Hon. Joe Clark, the leader of the hon. members federally in the House of Commons, over and over again used the term, gag the opposition, and properly so. I'm glad to see the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs is now in his place, because he was very firm and very eloquent last fall about the gagging of the opposition in the House of Commons. He was correct on that. But everything he said last fall, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the constitutional debate in the

House of Commons could be said equally today if that hon. minister and other members of this House vote against an amendment which is at least going to mitigate the impact of this closure motion on the discussion of Bill 69.

Really, Mr. Speaker, that's what we're saying here. We're saying that when this Bill comes to third reading, when we get our final opportunity to address the concerns of our constituents, the gag won't be applied. The Speaker won't be able to say, yes, you passed a motion; therefore the time is up; bango, that's it. We're going to have the full opportunity to address Bill 69 properly on third reading.

Mr. Speaker, while that will involve the time limit, the rules with respect to third reading will apply. We will be able to raise some of the questions that need to be raised and answered. Two fundamental questions, I think, are relevant: what happened to the money last year, and what do you propose to do with the money this year? What happened to the \$60 million? What happened, Mr. Speaker? Do we know? No, hon. members of this House don't know. We've been given some answers in the House by the hon. Provincial Treasurer, but totally unsatisfactory, not backed up by any documentary evidence, just simply an assertion that everything is fine and hunky-dory. Don't worry about it. Trust me. Trust me, don't ask any questions. Beyond that everything is fine. If we try to get any more information, the hon. Provincial Treasurer tells us that if he gives us the information we've requested, somehow it's like giving away, if not the keys to the safe of the main treasury branch in Edmonton, at least opening the door to a real raid on that treasury branch safe.

Well, that kind of argument may be interesting in debate and may even satisfy some of the members of this Legislature, but it doesn't satisfy Albertans who have a right to know what's happening to their money, including the \$60 million that still has not been properly accounted for and explained by the Provincial Treasurer. When other provinces can make this information available, I say to you, Mr. Speaker, and I say to the Provincial Treasurer, to the Premier, and to the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs that if this information can be made available in other provinces, what is the insurmountable difficulty in Alberta? Why is it necessary that we do this business behind closed doors in Alberta when other provinces can have a more forthright accounting and assessment of the public's money in the Legislative Assembly, where it should be assessed in the first place?

Mr. Speaker, I don't know why this government is in such a rush to get us out of here, why they aren't prepared to look, at least, at the modification we propose in this subamendment so we can properly deal with Bill 69. Perhaps it's because they have a whole series of special warrants they're about ready to pass in cabinet, so as soon as they boot us out of the Legislature, they can ram through the special warrants on top of an appropriation Bill, 30 per cent without proper assessment and discussion in this Legislature. Perhaps that's the reason, I don't know. But we haven't heard any reason advanced yet by the Government House Leader, the Provincial Treasurer, or any other front bench members as to what the rush is, why it's necessary that we include Bill 69 in this closure motion and, even if we're prepared to do that, why we insist on applying the closure to every aspect of Bill 69. You know, Mr. Speaker, the government really has to be able to tell this Legislature why. Why?

It's interesting to note, Mr. Speaker — perhaps you'll permit me to quote you — that you said on November 26:

Free speech is part of the system. A person's good name is part of the system. Fairness to all members of the Assembly is part of the system. To play poker with information so that you can play one of the cards before anybody else gets a chance to know what's in it is not part of the fairness of the system.

Those are apt words, and they now become part of the precedents of this House, as a result of the decisions made by the Legislature.

But you know, Mr. Speaker, the observation you make goes beyond the narrow confines of the debate in which you made that statement, because information and access to information is part of the system. If members of this House are going to be able to make an intelligent assessment on Bill 69, we have to have information, because information, as you properly say, is

one of the cards before anybody else gets a chance to know ... is not part of the fairness of the system.

We're all hon. members of this Assembly. We have a right to information. That right to information directly involves what happened to the \$60 million over the three-year period that is the focus of much of the debate — not all of it, but much of the debate on this matter. That's why Bill 69 must be given the precedence that the subamendment affords it. As much as possible, it must be removed from the ironclad guarantee of minimum debate which this closure resolution demands.

Well, Mr. Speaker, if free speech is part of the system and

To play poker with information so that you can play one of the cards before anybody else gets a chance to know what's in it is not part of the fairness of the system.

It's not part of the fairness at all. It's not part of the fairness for the Provincial Treasurer to have that information. The Provincial Treasurer can make that information available in other provinces. It doesn't disrupt the management system. Mr. Speaker, the Provincial Treasurer could make that information available to all members of the Assembly, both government and opposition members, because we are all equally accountable for the management of the heritage fund, because we are ultimately answerable to our constituents and collectively answerable to the people of Alberta.

The Provincial Treasurer and our system of cabinet government — and I want to make one or two observations on that issue as well — is that the cabinet is responsible and answerable to the Legislature. So while the Provincial Treasurer can say, I accept full responsibility, that responsibility is shared with all elected members because ultimately we are the ones accountable. It isn't good enough for us to simply accept, yes, everything is fine. Don't worry about it. It's okay. Trust me. We must be able to account to our own constituents as to why we have either accepted that position or sought the kind of information we need to know in our minds that that money has been properly invested.

After all, Mr. Speaker, what in heaven's name was the point of the debate five years ago? I don't want to rehash that debate, because I've already cited it. But I think the hon. Premier's point was valid when he made it some time ago; that is, the appropriation Bill is a tap that is turned on or turned off. It is the ultimate role for legislative accountability. It is the one mechanism, if you like, that most clearly denotes the control of the Legislature

over the cabinet and ultimately over the heritage trust fund. Mr. Speaker, if that's the case, in my judgment it's absolutely necessary that Bill 69, as this subamendment suggests, has to be treated somewhat differently than the estimates.

I don't like the fact that this government is going to cut off debate on the estimates. I think we could well spend more time on the estimates. As I said before, I think it would be in everybody's interest if we recessed this matter until the Auditor General has completed his report on the securities loss of \$60 million. I think that would be in everybody's interest. We could have a thoughtful discussion on Bill 69 and an equally thoughtful discussion on the estimates. But, Mr. Speaker, that's not our choice, because the government has decided unilaterally, not as a result of discussion with the other parties or other members in the House, but quite unilaterally, on its own, that it's going to bring in this closure motion. Now we have to face that fact. We don't like to face that fact, but we don't have any choice, because ultimately there are 73 on the government side and five on the opposition side. So that when the numbers are counted — we can do our own arithmetic, Mr. Speaker.

So we have to ask ourselves where we can modify the impact of that closure, so that in properly addressing the issue, we can focus on the most important aspects. I suppose, Mr. Speaker, to use a government euphemism, we on this side of the House have to undertake a little bit of our own time management. Because if we're going to have the gag applied, if we're going to have this kind of closure brought in, and there is only a limited amount of time, we are saying in this subamendment, let us focus on Bill 69, because that is the most important aspect. However important the other elements of the estimates may be, they are not as important, the \$400 million is not as important as the 30 per cent, which this year will amount to something over \$2 billion allotted to the Heritage Savings Trust Fund.

Really, what is at stake? The hon. Leader of the Opposition raised this point in his remarks. He raised the issue of the supremacy of the Legislature because, in my view, Mr. Speaker, we cannot operate on any other assumption than the supremacy of the Legislature if we are to model the activities in this Assembly on the Parliament of Canada, which is modelled on the Mother Parliament in Westminster.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, when the amendment on closure, the first amendment the opposition put, was defeated, I had to refer to the issue of time management. I didn't want to, because I thought that was a silly euphemism. But, you know, the supremacy of Parliament is very clear. In theory, the supremacy of Parliament is that whatever Parliament decides is correct. If Parliament decides this is Friday rather than Tuesday, or if the Legislature decides this is Monday, or the Parliament decides that water can run uphill, the world is flat, or the moon is made of green cheese, legally that is true. That is the dictum of parliamentary supremacy.

Now, Mr. Speaker, how do you guard parliamentary supremacy? Well, it's not easily done, because throughout the history of our system, there have been efforts — especially with the growth of more powerful governments in the last few years, the power and influence of the executive, of the cabinet, have assumed a much greater importance than would have been the case in years past. We see that in this province with the massive use of special warrants instead of supplementary estimates. It would be far preferable if we had supplementary

estimates.

But, Mr. Speaker, the point I'm making is that we cannot insist on a principle in a vacuum. The principle is the supremacy of the Legislature, but that principle cannot be allowed to languish for want of proper discussion. That proper discussion can't be in an abstract and theoretical sense. It has to be on issues vital to the operation of government in the province of Alberta. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, what issue is more vital than the allocation of 30 per cent of our natural resource revenue to the Heritage Savings Trust Fund? What single move by the government of Alberta is more important than an appropriation of more than \$2 billion? Mr. Speaker, it's just not possible to talk in terms of legislative supremacy unless we are prepared to defend with every bit of vigor we can command and insist that a Bill like Bill 69 be given the precedence it clearly requires. If that means that we as members of the Legislature have to say reluctantly that because of this closure motion — a motion inconsistent with democratic tradition, a motion that gags free speech in the Legislature, a motion that, in my judgment, cannot be defended because there is no reason other than convenience for bringing it in — if we have to make that absolutely impossible decision, then we're saying that the choice must be to focus on Bill 69 not only in committee stage, because that was an amendment we debated, but on third reading, so that we have an opportunity . . .

The hon. Member for Bow Valley raised some points, and I don't agree with his views, as one would expect, because he lives in the south, in an area which would be the beneficiary of water, and I live in the north; and I'm not entirely sure I want to see us get into massive water diversion. But that's not the point. Whether we agree or not is irrelevant. Mr. Speaker, what is relevant is that an issue as important as water diversion be debated in the context of this 30 per cent, that if any of that money is going to be used for water diversion, it be part of the discussion of Bill 69.

Mr. Speaker, I would frankly doubt that are many decisions of much importance will be made in this province in the next few years that don't relate to the allocation of money into the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. Today in question period, the hon. Leader of the Opposition raised questions to the Premier about what kind of investment is being contemplated in the megaprojects, Alsands and the heavy oil projects. The Premier indicated he wasn't sure, but certainly indicated that there had been at least some preliminary discussion. No doubt down the road there will be some kind of investment. But surely, Mr. Speaker, that's why Bill 69 is so important, because if that investment involves the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, as it undoubtedly will, members of the House surely have to have a right to advance a proposition one way or the other as to whether or not that's a good move.

Mr. Speaker, before this government can satisfy members of the House that it has done a good job, and I make the point, directly relating it to the Premier's comments of April 23, 1976:

If the Legislature is not satisfied with the investment committee's management of the fund, it can refuse to authorize passage of that special Act.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we have to look at what has been done, not just the \$60 million. One of the things we have to examine in terms of how this government has handled, and managed the Heritage Savings Trust fund is the Syncrude equity. When the matter was first raised last May, we had a dour Provincial Treasurer saying, oh, no, there was no way we should have converted. Yet the

arithmetic . . . As a matter of fact, I would welcome the opportunity in committee stage to get into that discussion all over again, to go through it chapter and verse. But we finally had an eleventh-hour conversion, Mr. Speaker, and the conversion resulted in the conversion of these debt instruments at fire-sale interest rates. Imagine interest rates in this day and age of 8.666 per cent to one of the largest oil companies in the world. Nevertheless, the fact of the matter is that's the kind of accountability that can only be discussed when we examine Bill 69. We can't discuss that when we examine other aspects of the estimates, Mr. Speaker. Bill 69 is the crux of the issue.

So I say frankly to hon. members on both sides of the House, the subamendment before the House today is not one I would prefer. I would be much happier had the amendment several hours ago been passed, but it was rejected. So in an effort to salvage what one can from a rapidly diminishing position . . . Because this government, instead of being willing to show any flexibility at all to maintain at least some vestige of free speech, certainly seems to be prepared to slam the door shut on whatever effort is made to qualify the application of closure to the operation of the heritage trust fund and, in particular, to Bill 69, the special appropriation Act.

So, Mr. Speaker, I suppose it's a fall-back position. I regret that. I don't think it's an enviable position to be in at 8:30 in the morning, that we have to talk about a fall-back position in terms of freedom of speech, that the rights of all Albertans as represented by the rights of the members of the Legislature to speak out freely on the issues of the day are going to be so badly trampled by this government with its big majority.

Nevertheless, the fact remains that at least this is something. Something is better than nothing. At least if this amendment were passed, on third reading we would be able to properly debate Bill 69. We'd be able to bring to the floor of this House the views of our constituents on the many issues discussed over the evening and throughout the morning hours, and properly so. We wouldn't have the opportunity to grill the Provincial Treasurer and the Premier in the way I think they need to be grilled, but at least in the final stage of the legislative process, we would not have the axe falling before we had an opportunity to ventilate the views of the people of Alberta on this issue.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, one other very important aspect of Bill 69: I find it interesting that hon. members on the government side are very critical of the opposition. They say, fine, it's okay to oppose, but what do you propose? Well, Mr. Speaker, Bill 69 is made to order for that. Bill 69 is the one opportunity we have to propose. As a matter of fact, if this whole matter wasn't going to be swept away by closure, it certainly was my intention to have tabled and discussed in some detail the recommendations of the New Democratic Party policy committee on an Alberta development fund, a rather significant set of proposals that would deal with how this 30 per cent should be managed. The government may like it; they may not. That's too bad. If I'm a member of the Legislature, it's an opportunity to discuss some positive proposals. I know that other members of the House would want to make positive proposals too.

So if this government, which is always saying, where is the proposal instead of opposing, is really interested in that, don't gag us on Bill 69. Don't tie the rope around our necks, or guillotine us, whatever it is you're going to do with this closure motion. Let us have maximum opportunity on Bill 69 or at least, as the subamendment

says, in the last stages of it. We're going to ram the rest of it through. At least, let's show a little bit of class just before Royal Assent, that we can bring back a little bit of freedom of speech. What's wrong with that, Mr. Speaker? It seems to me that would be a small olive branch indeed, but an olive branch to the opposition, an olive branch to those people concerned about freedom of speech, and to those Albertans who, through us, are concerned about an arrogant government trampling on freedom of speech.

So, Mr. Speaker, while the subamendment we're dealing with today is only a modest qualification of the gag that faces members of the House, because it is a small step in the right direction it is my intention to support it.

[Mr. Speaker declared the motion on the subamendment lost. Several members rose calling for a division. The division bell was rung]

[Three minutes having elapsed, the House divided]

For the motion:

Buck	Notley	Speaker, R.
Mandeville	Sindlinger	

Against the motion:

Adair	Hiebert	Musgreave
Anderson, C.	Hyland	Osterman
Bradley	Hyndman	Pahl
Campbell	Johnston	Paproski
Carter	King	Pengelly
Clark	Kowalski	Purdy
Cook	Koziak	Russell
Crawford	LeMessurier	Shaben
Cripps	McCrae	Stevens
Diachuk	Miller	Thompson
Gogo	Moore	Trynchy

Totals:	Ayes - 5	Noes - 33
---------	----------	-----------

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to address a few short remarks to the motion before us this morning. I'm very pleased to see the mover of the motion in his seat this morning, bright-eyed and bushy-tailed. I'm a little surprised that he wasn't here.

MR. SPEAKER: Would the hon. member kindly resume his seat until I hear about the point of order.

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, I believe we have voted on the subamendment. We have not voted on the amendment proposed by Mr. Notley. The hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo has spoken to the amendment proposed by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview.

[Mr. Speaker declared the motion on the amendment lost. Several members rose calling for a division. The division bell was rung]

[Three minutes having elapsed, the House divided]

For the motion:

Buck	Notley	Speaker, R.
Mandeville	Sindlinger	

Against the motion:

Adair	Hyland	Pahl
Anderson, C.	Hyndman	Paproski

Bradley	Johnston	Pengelly
Campbell	King	Purdy
Carter	Kowalski	Russell
Clark	Koziak	Shaben
Cook	LeMessurier	Stevens
Crawford	McCrae	Stewart
Cripps	Miller	Thompson
Diachuk	Moore	Topolnisky
Gogo	Musgreave	Trynchy
Hiebert	Osterman	Webber

Totals:	Ayes - 5	Noes - 36
---------	----------	-----------

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address some comments to Motion 16, please. This motion is essentially closure, and it's a very important motion. We've been here since 8 o'clock last night debating that motion. We, the members on this side, have been putting forth arguments why there should not be closure in the Legislative Assembly. After having argued that point for many hours, Mr. Speaker, we proposed amendments and subamendments. If we have to live with closure, if it's inevitable that the government invokes closure on this debate, we have tried to devise ways that would be less onerous on the opposition. We've come up with amendments that would allow further debate on Bill 69, as opposed to the estimates. Mr. Speaker, we've said it's not that the estimates aren't important, because they are important. But given the short time period we would have left to debate this issue, five days, it was felt that we should prioritize our efforts and direct our attention to the central issue here, Bill 69.

We said that Bill 69 was a central issue because without Bill 69, without the transference of the funds from the general revenue source to the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, there could not be any capital estimates. There could not be a Walter C. MacKenzie Health Sciences Centre. There could not be irrigation projects. There could not be library projects. There could not be tank cars. So although the estimates are indeed important, we could not have those capital expenditures unless we first had those transfers of funds from the general revenue source.

Mr. Speaker, the interesting thing about the proceedings this evening is that whereas the members of the opposition have addressed the motion, whereas the members of the opposition have addressed the amendments, whereas the members of the opposition have addressed the subamendments, arguing against closure and putting forth suggestions as to the resolution of this impasse between the opposition and the government, we have yet to hear from more than one government member supporting closure. On occasion, a member of the government has gotten up to argue a specific point or to add some information to clarify some things misunderstood. But throughout the course of this debate, only one member has gotten up and unequivocally supported closure, the member who moved the motion in the first place.

That was some time ago, Mr. Speaker. It may be well to go back and look at the remarks the mover of the motion made at that particular time. At first, the mover referred to certain statements that had been made by the opposition and, in his words, deemed them to be "foolish indeed". The statements he was referring to were in regard to freedom of speech. He felt that the opposition members were using that term freedom of speech too cavalierly and with reckless abandon. Mr. Speaker, when

allegations are made in regard to freedom of speech, they should not be treated lightly, nor should those who use them do so without thinking about the import and impact of those statements. Freedom of speech is a very serious matter indeed. I cannot adhere to those words the mover of the [motion] has used in regard to them, categorizing them as being "foolish indeed". The mover went on to discuss various aspects of free speech, the Mother of Parliament, et cetera, and again indicated that what the opposition had put forth was foolish and lacked merit.

Mr. Speaker, the mover went on to say that what is involved is whether certain estimates are passed. That was what was involved here. To a certain degree, that is true. We do have some capital estimates before us. Those the mover singled out dealt with libraries, reforestation, land reclamation, urban parks, research, food products, agriculture, oil sands research, health and safety, et cetera. Obviously, Mr. Speaker, the mover of the motion was referring to the 1982-83 estimates of proposed investments, in which there are 24 votes to be considered by the Legislative Assembly. To this date, 11 have been debated and discussed in the Legislative Assembly, and they have been passed.

Mr. Speaker, for the last seven weeks all these votes have undergone a very thorough scrutiny by the members of the opposition.

The members of the opposition have been carrying out their responsibility in regard to the Legislative Assembly and, to the utmost of their ability, have been asking those reasonable and responsible questions which should be put to the government. Those questions put to the government in regard to these estimates were always prefaced by the statement that in general, each of these specific projects have merit and value in their own right. Not one opposition member got up and said, the Walter C. MacKenzie Health Sciences Centre should not proceed. Not one member of the opposition got up and said, the southern Alberta children's hospital is not a good idea. Not one member got up who said that research in regard to the Alberta Oil Sands Technology and Research Authority was not a good idea. Generally the members of the opposition, when posing those reasonable, responsible questions to the members of the Legislative Assembly said that these were indeed good projects.

Nevertheless, it was incumbent upon us in the opposition to ask questions dealing with the management and accountability of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. Lo and behold, as we went through these estimates, we found that indeed there were some things for which the government should be held accountable. The most glaring might be said to be the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care, when we talked about the Walter C. MacKenzie Health Sciences Centre. It was noted that there definitely were problems. The minister acknowledged that, and it's to his credit that he did so. I think it's to the credit of the opposition that they raised the issue in the first place. The minister took great pains — and rightly so — to assure the Legislative Assembly that things had been changed and management control systems, checks, were put in place so there wouldn't be a recurrence of that incident. Mr. Speaker, that was a satisfactory reassurance we got from the minister. We seek nothing more than that when we question these estimates.

The mover of the motion went on to say that the real issue is the amount of time for estimates. He said that one can't say that doesn't matter. Certainly it matters, Mr. Speaker, and I concur with him in that regard. However, in supporting that point, the mover went on to say: "look

... at the size of the estimates in the House of Commons." In comparison, those estimates are 150 times larger than the estimates here. He went on to say that the House of Commons allows 25 days. He notes that here we will have provided 23 days, with an additional five under closure.

Mr. Speaker, it may very well be that the estimates in the House of Commons are 150 times the estimates here. But I think a better comparison would be one which is more relevant to the responsibility we have here; that is, a comparison of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund to the estimates of the Alberta Legislature. The Alberta estimates are contained in these volumes. For this year, they amount to \$6.5 billion. There is an extensive amount of documentation supporting those expenditures, pages and pages of it. Yet when we are considering the estimates for the heritage fund in the Legislative Assembly, we deal with this booklet — a booklet, not a book — that has only approximately 12 per cent of the funds in the Heritage Savings Trust Fund.

The most fundamental tenet of democracy is simply that whoever controls the purse controls the throne. That is why each year, prior to any cent being expended from the annual budget, they come before the Legislative Assembly for approval. We scrutinize them very thoroughly for anywhere from six to eight weeks. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the opposite is true for the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. There is ex post facto approval — after the fact.

The same thing was exemplified yesterday in question period in regard to provincial participation through the Heritage Savings Trust Fund and heavy oil/oil sands development. The Premier was asked if that participation would be brought before the Legislative Assembly, at least for ratification, and if those deals would be made contingent upon ratification of the Legislative Assembly. In my opinion, the Premier's response was characteristic of the attitude taken by the Premier and the government in 1975-76, when the heritage fund Act was debated in the Legislative Assembly. The response was simply no, we have a responsibility to make these investments; we will be held accountable at the polls. Mr. Speaker, I don't think that is good enough, and I think other people would agree with that.

In moving this motion, Mr. Speaker, the mover said there was only one reason — one reason that I could catch — for having closure; that is, because of a comparison to the estimates in the House of Commons, where it was said that they were 150 times the estimates we're looking at here. That's not a relevant reason for invoking closure. That's not a relevant reason for invoking the ultimate despicable, in some cases, closure in the Legislative Assembly. Even if it were justified in this case, which it's not, think of the precedent it will set. Think how much easier it will be next time for government to invoke closure. Perhaps the issue won't be as serious as this particular one, but the threat of it will hang over the heads of those in the Legislative Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, we have spent a great deal of time, about 13 hours, arguing why there should not be closure in this Legislative Assembly. On the other hand; argument has been put forth only by the Attorney General — I don't know if it even amounted to 15 minutes — on why there should be closure. I would like to hear some other member of the government get up and justify why we have to have closure in this particular case. There is no need for closure. There is a need for full disclosure, not closure. That full disclosure has to be in regard to all

aspects of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund.

Mr. Speaker, I think it might be wise to reflect a little on what has gotten us to this particular point. In my judgment, there have been many good arguments presented over the course of this debate. I recall a couple of comments made. One was that no single living person in this province invented the oil. The oil was there when all of us weren't here. The other point was that the value of that oil is not due to any single person in this province. The point was made that the market value of oil today has much more to do with international market conditions, the demand for crude oil, and the concurrent constrained supply of crude oil. Those factors give the crude oil in this province its value. One might say that the establishment of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund was due more to fortuitous circumstances than to the pioneering, entrepreneurial spirit of any one particular Albertan.

Mr. Speaker, I read that the idea for the Heritage Savings Trust Fund didn't even originate in Alberta. It originated in eastern Canada with those most despised of eastern Canadian politicians, Pierre Trudeau and John Turner. That's where I read it came from. Then there was a great deal of debate in 1975-76 about how the government could be held accountable for the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, especially in view of the fact that these were unique circumstances, that nowhere in the western democracies was there a government that had or would have surpluses of the order or magnitude of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. In those initial days, Mr. Speaker, no one had the foresight to imagine how large the trust fund would grow. There were some estimates, grossly incorrect, of something that would reach the order or magnitude of \$400 million or \$500 million. Those were the earlier days. Now, relatively speaking, \$400 million or \$500 million is not that large to the potential for the trust fund.

The problem posed when the trust fund was being debated was how the government could cope with those surplus funds. It was pointed out that governments were not set up to make money but to serve the needs of the citizens, to identify what those needs and demands were, then to set out and collect sufficient revenues simply to meet those needs and demands. Governments traditionally don't go out and overtax people and accumulate surpluses, since their main objective is to meet those needs and demands. That concern was expressed several times in debate, Mr. Speaker. There were some members who had a great deal of reservation about the Heritage Savings Trust Fund.

However, the Premier responded at the time and said there was no need to worry because there were several ways the government could be held accountable to the Legislature. One was through the consideration of estimates. Each year the government would have to come before the Legislature for consideration of these estimates. Mr. Speaker, in a way that's true. The government does come to the Legislature before the fact, in the case of estimates, and that's a good beginning. But that can only be considered a beginning, because these capital estimates amount to only about 12 per cent of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. That other 88 per cent still does not come before the Legislature before the fact; it comes after. Mr. Speaker, in addition to that shortfall, there is also a problem. Even the consideration of these estimates is being curtailed by this motion of closure, notwithstanding the fact that in the establishment of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, it was pointed out by the Premier of this province that this would in fact be one of the ways

the government could be held accountable.

Mr. Speaker, the second way the Premier said the government could be held accountable for the Heritage Savings Trust Fund was through consideration of an annual appropriations Bill, whereby each year the government would come to the Legislature and say, this year we want to have X per cent of non-renewable resource revenues transferred to the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. It has turned out that that X per cent has been 30 per cent over the years. If there is any way that the government could be held accountable overall for the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, I suggest that would be it.

The Provincial Treasurer said before the watchdog committee that in the final analysis for all aspects of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, he is the one who is held accountable in a democratic system. Mr. Speaker, I would agree with that, but the only way that minister can be held accountable for all aspects of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund is if he appears before the Legislative Assembly and does two things. One is to stand accountable for the disposition of those funds in prior years; that is, respond to the question, what did you do with the money you got beforehand? Two is to support his plans for the future; that is, what's the purpose of this money in the future? Again, Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate, sad, and distressing to say that we're not going to have the opportunity to pose questions to the minister in detail the way we would like to, because of this closure motion. One thing the Provincial Treasurer did say when he was before the watchdog committee in response to some pretty detailed questions put to him, although he did not have the information at hand to respond to them, was that he would be appearing in the Legislature before the Committee of the Whole. At that time, those questions could again be put to him, and he would respond to them. Mr. Speaker, we're not going to have the opportunity to do that thoroughly because of this motion for closure.

We've had the Heritage Savings Trust Fund for six years. Over the last summer, we've been looking at the fifth annual report of the heritage fund. In doing so, many members remarked that this was a milestone or bench mark, where we should stop and take account of the heritage fund over all the five years. Rather than having just a snapshot picture of what had happened and was happening with the fund, we could look at different years, compare them, and establish, identify, assess, and evaluate trends in regard to the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. I think it's important to look at those past five years, because it might help us identify what is going to happen to it over the next five and 10 years.

One of the most fundamental, cogent questions that has to be put to this government in regard to the Heritage Savings Trust Fund is what exactly is the long-range plan for it. I say it's a very cogent question because it is relative to all that this provincial government does. It is the main instrument or tool this provincial government has to achieve those goals it has set for itself. They're not inherent; they're not implicit. They're very explicit and very specifically defined in the heritage fund Act. It sets out guidelines for investments in the capital projects division. It very explicitly specifies that the investments in that division have to have long-term social and economic benefits.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot look at long-term economic benefits in isolation or on a one-year basis. They have to have long-term guidelines to ensure that those decisions made today for the short term are compatible with the long-term objectives; similarly for the Alberta investment

division, where the criterion is to strengthen and diversify the economy of Alberta. Again, it's conceivable that decisions would be made on a daily or annual basis that may not be compatible with long-term objectives. The only way there can be assurance that there would be that compatibility in the long run is if there were a long-term plan. I have not yet seen a long-range plan put forward for the heritage fund and for economic diversification and development.

It is true that over the last five or 10 years in general, we have strengthened our economy in certain ways. The strengthening has occurred in areas where we are strong to begin with, where we have comparative economic advantages. There is nothing wrong with that. We should work on our strengths, not neglect our weaknesses. But the greatest advantages for us will be in working on our strengths.

Mr. Speaker, the key word I have used is accountability. Accountability extends over a long period of time. When going through the estimates we find things that aren't quite right, quite proper, or what could be said to be management at less than a desirable level. Certainly on the heritage fund committee this year, we found that things were not at the level of desirability we would expect in regard to the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. The management letter we received from the Auditor General identified some very serious problems with the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. That's not the problem, I would think; that's the symptom. The problems are underlying that. What we need to have is ironclad reassurance that those problems the Auditor General has identified have been rectified. That's not forthcoming.

Mr. Speaker, what this closure motion does is purport to give the opposition five days to continue questioning the estimates, to continue questioning the minister in regard to Bill 69. I don't look at it in those terms. The way I look at it is that it's the government that has five days to respond to those questions we have responsibly and reasonably put to them. I'll stand here every day and count down the days: five, four, three, two, one, zero. Then we will invoke closure on them. We will have given them the opportunity to respond to these questions. If they haven't responded to them at that time, then it's they who face the consequences, not us.

The central issue that has come out of the Auditor General's report, the management letter that has been the cause of a great deal of misunderstanding, has been statements by the Auditor General in regard to the net loss on the sale of marketable securities. In over three years, that net loss on securities has amounted to \$60,282,000. In regard to that, Mr. Speaker, the Auditor General said that it was not possible to identify the precise reason for those sales. In general, he said that was the case because inadequate records had been kept. It has been said in defence of the government that from time to time, it makes practical, good common sense to take a small loss in one area in order to realize a large gain in another.

When it has been pointed out that there has been a \$60 million loss in these particular areas, the rebuttal has been yes, but overall the fund made a lot of money. We are not talking about a normal fund. We're not talking about investments clubs. We are talking about public funds, and there's no reason whatsoever that a government should put itself in a position where it is taking risk that could result in loss through uncertainty. In investing public funds, the greatest of prudence should be exercised. I submit that in this case, it was not. I submit that

that \$60 million loss need not have been incurred. As much as I can determine, that loss was incurred on the sale of short-term bonds which over the last two years, if I recollect rightly, have had an average maturity date of 120, 144 days. If those instruments had such a short maturity date, I cannot see why there would be such a rush to cash them in or to sell them. They could have been held for a few more days, not more than 120 days — not even 120 days, because if it was 120 days it would mean they would be bought and sold on the same day. Surely they could have been held for that period when they would mature on an average basis.

Why, then, were they cashed in? I don't know. I've had questions on the Order Paper. I've asked questions of the minister. Why were those bonds sold and what was acquired from the proceeds of the sale? In reply, it has been said that to reveal that information would expose the investment strategy of the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund. I don't think that would be the case. Every year for the last four we have seen the Provincial Treasurer provide to the heritage committee a one-day window, he calls it, on investments. For that day, selected at random by the Provincial Treasurer, he provides a list of the instruments held by the government, a list not only of names but the acquisition date, coupon rate, maturity day, and things of that nature. Mr. Speaker, by revealing those holdings on that one day, the minister did not compromise the integrity of the investment strategy of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. Indeed, I have seen that each year after that information was provided, the Heritage Savings Trust Fund was still there. Nobody had raped and plundered it. It was still there. But the difference between what I'm asking for and what was provided is that what was provided did not incur a loss. What I'm asking for incurred a loss.

Mr. Speaker, I have some more things I would like to say on that. But as my time is almost up, I'm going to conclude. Perhaps on another occasion, I will be able to begin where I have left off. At this point, I would like to move an amendment to the motion. I will distribute it to members, then address it.

MR. SPEAKER: Since we haven't any pages, possibly we could just pause for a minute while this amendment is distributed. I hope we haven't run out of copies without being able to provide one to the Chair.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I think I heard the hon. member say he was going to proceed.

MR. SPEAKER: If the hon. minister is referring to this, I'm not sure it has been moved as yet. I don't think it's before the House except physically.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Speaker, I thought I implied that. If I may speak the proper words, I move this motion standing in my name.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion is to add paragraph (9) to Motion No. 16. It reads:

As this motion effectively suspends the democratic rules of procedure of this Assembly as set out in the Standing Orders, this motion may not be taken as being precedential in any way.

Perhaps I should say "precedential" just so we don't get any republican ideas into the debate.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, I don't think the fact that the hon. member has moved an amendment extends his speaking time beyond 30 minutes. I think the 30 minutes have elapsed,

MR. SPEAKER: I think that's recognized.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Speaker, I certainly wouldn't want to go beyond 30 minutes and take up the time of any hon. member who would like to address the motion. Recognizing that my time has expired, I thank you for allowing me to introduce the motion.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I move the House now adjourn until this afternoon at 2:30.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

[The House adjourned at 9:24 a.m. on December 8, 1981]