

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Title: Monday, May 9, 1988 8:00 p.m.

Date: 1988/05/09

[The House resumed at 8 p.m.]

[Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair]

head: GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS
(Second Reading)

Bill 10

Interprovincial Lottery Amendment Act, 1988

[Adjourned debate May 9: Mr. Sigurdson]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Be seated, please.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please.

Hon. Member for Calgary-Mountain View.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to rise to speak against Bill 10 as it's written, brought before this Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, I was actually somewhat surprised when I saw that this was an amendment Act, the Interprovincial Lottery Amendment Act. So I thought, well, maybe I should go to the Interprovincial Lottery Act to see what's being amended. There, to my surprise, must be the shortest and briefest piece of legislation on the books of the province of Alberta. It consists entirely of one page made up of four clauses. So when I see that this particular Bill, Bill 10, to amend it runs an extensive two pages in length -- the amendment is twice as long as the actual Bill itself.

Now, what the existing Interprovincial Lottery Act does is basically give one of the ministers of the government the authority to enter into some agreements with other provinces to conduct lottery schemes, and he can then issue a licence to any individual or agent to conduct and manage that scheme within Alberta. Basically that is about all that's there. So when I hear that the minister, in introducing this Bill, says that he's doing nothing more than confirming what the practice has been in this province for the last 14 years or so, I ask myself: really, is that good enough? My conclusion has to be, Mr. Speaker, that it's not good enough. Simply because something's been done for 14 years doesn't make it right. To use that as a basis of defence for this particular amendment I think is simply avoiding the issues raised by the Auditor General.

What is it that the Auditor General has said about this particular problem? First of all, the Auditor General does not consider a four-clause page Act as being appropriate, giving the minister appropriate legislative authority to deal with the proceeds of lotteries in this province. It goes on to state -- and I agree with him, whether it's a legal opinion or not:

that the proceeds from these lotteries fall within the definition of "public money" that should be paid into the Province's General Revenue Fund.

My point is this, Mr. Speaker: what difference does it make whether the money is collected as part of your income taxes or

whether it comes to the provincial government through the sale of licence plates? It's still money that's accruing to the people of Alberta. If it comes to the province as a result of some lottery scheme, why should that be considered something different from those other two sources of revenue? It's still money that belongs to the public, and it should be treated in a similar fashion. That's the point. For the minister to stand up there and say that this amendment simply confirms what they've been doing all along doesn't make what they've been doing all along right. I would certainly hope that he would, before this goes much beyond the Committee of the Whole stage, consider making some amendments so that the money is dealt with and treated as we treat and deal with other public funds in this province.

The minister also said he wanted to "preserve the integrity" -- I think were the terms he used -- of these lottery funds. That is, the money comes to the province; he wants to make sure it's earmarked for specific things. Well, that's fine; there's nothing wrong in concept with that theory. But surely you can account for the dollars coming in, keep a total, and then however else you disburse it, through some vote in an estimate somewhere, you can account for it that way as well, so that the money coming in equals the money going out. You could easily set up some kind of a separate vote within one of the government departments somewhere. It could be the Department of Career Development and Employment, if that's the ministry given charge for this particular fund. There are lots of ways of dealing with it in a way that you preserve that integrity for the use of lottery dollars in areas that you want to use them for.

For that matter, why not set it up like the Heritage Savings Trust Fund? That's a separate fund that we deal with separately. What would stop this minister from introducing that kind of legislation so that the money that comes into the lottery fund under this particular Bill, Bill 10, could be dealt with as a separate estimate, perhaps again not as a separate vote but a separate estimate that's dealt with as part of the overall budget estimates of the province? I can't see how that would be any problem whatsoever. It's simply a matter of the way legislation is structured, and simply because the minister has brought it forward in this form doesn't mean that this is the only form that it needs to be brought forward in. There are lots of other ways of doing things to accomplish the same objectives.

Now, the minister went on to say that somehow being opposed to this Bill might be tantamount to being opposed to the groups or the organizations to which the money has gone. I don't know that that was his intention, but that certainly is not the case. There is a number of worthy organizations, and you know, the only time you can get a list that I can find is at the end of the public accounts for the previous fiscal year. Again, that's part of the problem. When approval is not requested, simply all we get is an accounting for how money was spent in the previous fiscal year.

It's interesting that the largest beneficiary of these funds happened to be the government of Canada. They got more money in 1986 and 1987 than any other of these organizations that were listed in the public accounts. Now, that may be part of the arrangement that was made with the changes to the Criminal Code -- I believe it was in 1984 and 1985 -- in which the government of Canada gave up any jurisdiction or involvement in lotteries anywhere in Canada in exchange for the provinces committing themselves to provide a certain amount of funds toward the Olympic Winter Games. That may be what that amount is earmarked for, but nevertheless I find it interesting that it should be

the government of Canada, which was not mentioned by the hon. minister in his opening remarks, being the one that gets the most lottery funds from the province of Alberta.

It's closely followed behind, however, by the Alberta Sport Council. Now, as all hon. members know, the Alberta Sport Council is set up as a funding body to various sports organizations. But I found it interesting that when you go to the Auditor General's report, for example, for the year ended March 31, 1987, this was the observation that the Auditor General made:

The Council is not exercising its right, nor meeting its responsibility, to determine whether the programs it funds are administered by sports associations in the manner required by the funding agreements.

Now, I wonder if the minister would still say that this organization is meeting all of its objectives that were set out for the organization, given that kind of statement by the Auditor General.

In fact, he concludes that the audit for this fiscal year confirmed that a program of review procedures has been implemented

However, the Auditor General regretted to say that the Council is unable to provide assurance that funding has been used as intended.

I found it also interesting -- just the same page of the Auditor General's report, when we find the observations on the Recreation, Parks and Wildlife Foundation:

The Foundation lacks satisfactory procedures for determining whether the grants it pays to organizations are used for the purposes intended.

Again, he makes the same conclusion about this foundation. They are unable to provide assurance that the funding provided is used as intended.

Now, the minister, also in his comments this afternoon in defence of this particular Bill, made reference to the Wild Rose Foundation. I've seen the list of all the organizations funded by the Wild Rose Foundation, and they are worthy organizations indeed. But the Auditor General has also made a reservation in his latest annual report that this foundation

establish procedures designed to ensure that grants paid comply with the restrictions imposed by the Wild Rose Foundation Act and related regulations.

Now, I find it interesting that three of the major organizations cited by the minister should all be found in the Auditor General's report with concerns expressed about the way they in turn are disbursing grants to other organizations. Then it's just a matter of interest to me as well, Mr. Speaker, that the third-largest proceeds from the lottery funds last year went to Edmonton Northlands, the fourth to Calgary Exhibition and Stampede. As I mentioned, Recreation, Parks and Wildlife Foundation is the fifth-largest recipient of lottery funds.

So I'd only say this, Mr. Speaker: there are some problems identified by the Auditor General which only underscore for me the importance that I place on accountability of this government's use of lottery funds. It has to start, in my view, right here in this legislative Chamber, where we require the minister to be accountable to the Legislature and the people of Alberta for the funds under the lottery fund. If the minister has an attitude that he shouldn't be accountable to the Legislature for these funds, is that not sending a subtle message out everywhere else in the province that perhaps others don't need to be accountable for the funding that they receive as well?

And if it applies to lottery funds, perhaps there are other expenditures such as the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, or others which this government's responsible for, where they can start to have a fairly cavalier attitude towards the spending of it, be-

cause after all, you know, accountability is not that important. If you can make an exception for one portion of public funding, public moneys, where do you draw the line? If you're not going to be accountable to the Legislature for lottery funds, what are all the other moneys that government receives that could fall into a similar category for which they shouldn't be accountable?

Well, the minister said something to the effect that this system has worked well in the past. I say, Mr. Speaker, that no system which does not require accountability for the spending of public money works well. If the minister believes that, then he still doesn't understand the basic concept of parliamentary democracy. He doesn't understand the important role that we play here in reviewing these documents, these public accounts, these estimate books that are put in front of us each year. Because it's public information at that point, and the government makes a commitment and seeks the approval of the Legislature for the use of those funds. That's an important concept, and you can't divide it and say that some money falls into that category and some doesn't. Either it all should or it all shouldn't. So the minister is simply saying that he doesn't believe that the proper role of this Legislature should apply to him and to the money he receives under this lottery fund. I think it's extremely regrettable not only for him and for this government but for the province as a whole.

There are a lot of other worthy organizations out there in the community, Mr. Speaker. The minister seemed to believe that not all the best ideas can be found in the Legislature, as if his ability to make decisions unencumbered by coming to the Legislature is the best possible way that these funds could be handled. Well, I'd feel better if I could have seen the proof of that, but the fact is that this government has never brought these funds to this Legislature to defend them. How do we know that all these organizations are better than a lot of other organizations out there in the province? I'd just like to have him come and defend that some day and say, "These are the reasons that we picked these priorities and not these other priorities." I'd just like to know how those decisions were arrived at.

For example, you know, I've learned in the last week or so -- I had a woman in Calgary call me who has a special need. She's discovered that she has a terminal form of cancer; it's a very rare form of cancer for which there's no treatment available in Alberta. But for her to go to the United States, where this particular kind of cancer has had a lot of success because somebody down there has been working to discover a cure -- she finds that she's not eligible for some of the funding arrangements to send people outside the province, because in the case of cancer treatments they're all considered experimental. Now, I'd like to know, for example: why isn't this an area of need that should be funded by lottery funds? Rather than have this woman stay in Alberta where she has a zero percent chance of getting the treatment that will help her in her need, she could go to another part of North America, in the U.S., where they are experiencing maybe a 30 or 40 percent success rate. Why are needs like that not being funded under lottery funds? Maybe there are good reasons for it, but this minister and this government have never come to the Legislature and defended those priorities.

There are others one could ask about. When I see this list from last year, I see that the Fort Macleod Provincial Historic Area Society received \$375,000. Well, good for Fort Macleod Provincial Historic Area Society. But how many other provincial historic societies are there in the province of Alberta? You know, if you want to go through the Auditor General's report, I found that there was a similar -- it seemed at least by the title --

organization called the Fort Dunvegan Historical Society. Now, I'd just be curious to know — maybe they never applied for lottery funds. But why is Fort Macleod able to get funding and another historical society not able to get funding? Does this mean that the member for Fort Macleod is a better lobbyist with this minister than the Member for Dunvegan?

Is that what this is all coming to, Mr. Speaker? Is it all depending on who gets to the minister first, who's the most effective lobbyist? I don't know. If that's the case, is there anything expected in return for giving an individual funding for an organization in their particular riding? Is there some sort of a reward system now that the minister has at his disposal? That has to be a concern, because as I read the Bill, it's not the Lieutenant Governor in Council who's responsible for making these decisions; it's the minister. It's not the Lieutenant Governor in Council who pays money from the fund; that is, the cabinet. It's the minister who pays money from the fund. It's not what the Lieutenant Governor in Council considers to be in the public interest; it's what the minister considers to be in the public interest.

Now, I don't know what the practice might be, but all I can look at and see is the legislation before us. What the legislation does is give one individual the total and sole authority so that we not only don't have accountability to the Legislature, but potentially we don't even have accountability to the cabinet. Now, the practice might be somewhat different than the Act states, but all we have in front of us this evening, Mr. Speaker, is the Act. What I read is what's here, that the minister is the one and only one who has the decision-making over these funds. Now, if that's not a concern to all members of the Legislature, then I would simply say to the members opposite: you're losing your sense of direction. If that's acceptable to you, you've lost, I believe, a big sense of direction as to what your purpose is as a member in this Assembly, and that is to use public funding, to review public funding to ensure all of us that money is being directed in the public interest.

That's what this whole Assembly is about, and if the minister's not aware of it, that's what the whole democratic process is about: to determine what is in the public interest, and for the government, the Lieutenant Governor in Council, to be responsible to this Assembly for those decisions which they've made and which we are here to hold them accountable to ensure that they have been made in the public interest. That's not the job of an individual minister, and it's not the responsibility and power that should be placed in the hands of an individual minister.

Because if our whole tradition as a parliamentary democracy means one thing, it is this: that we put checks and balances on government, and this is the only forum, the only Chamber, in which we can do that. Our friends to the south, the Americans, have a different system of checks and balances by separating the government, the legislative, into a number of different Chambers with a number of different powers. But all we have is this Chamber to protect the democratic rights and freedoms of this country and this province, and if we don't have the ability, the right, or the authority to review any spending, we don't have any opportunity for public tabling of estimates, no chance to debate, no chance to question, no requirement that the minister go through the process of cabinet and his caucus before those estimates are brought to this Chamber. There are a lot of checks and balances on the process in the system that get lost by using this short-circuit method. It's quite clearly wrong. It runs counter to the entire tradition that we represent in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker.

The minister can only go back 14 years; he said they've been doing this for 14 years. Well, we've had this Assembly, this Chamber, since 1905 and responsible government in this country a lot longer than that. And our tradition runs further back even than that, as you yourself probably know better than any other member in this Assembly. Fourteen years is simply not justification enough for this kind of amendment to this Bill, Mr. Speaker; it's simply not acceptable. I would ask the minister; I would ask every minister and every member in this Legislature here this evening on the government side of the House: before this becomes law, consider some amendments to ensure accountability to the Legislature. Because we're putting in place laws that last longer than individuals.

It may be that this minister will work closely with his cabinet colleagues, with his caucus. For all I know, he may make a special effort, notwithstanding what might be in this Bill, to make information public. I'm not holding my breath. I'm not going to count on it, but I'm just for the sake of argument assuming that he acts with those most noble of intentions. But he's not always going to be the minister responsible for these funds. We're putting in place a law in this province, and we're telling the people of this province about what is acceptable to the legislators in this Assembly, and if we're saying that it's okay to spend public money without any review of the Legislature, that's a pretty strong message that this government is sending out. And it's going to be in place for a lot longer than any one individual or incumbent.

We have to be concerned not only with the practice of individuals at the present time, but we also have to be considerate of those who come after us. Is this the sort of power we want to put into any one individual's hands, to potentially have access to a personal slush fund that can be doled out for political ends and purposes like some ward-heeling politician? Is that the kind of thing we want, given the whole tradition that we embody in this Assembly? Do we want to fly in the face of that tradition, Mr. Speaker? Is that what we're about? Because that's what's at stake in this piece of legislation, notwithstanding the comments of the minister that we shouldn't be concerned, that he will always act and his government will always act with the noblest of intentions.

Mr. Speaker, that's just simply not good enough. The wisdom of our democratic system is that we put checks on power. Lord Acton said, "Power tends to corrupt [and] absolute power corrupts absolutely." For that reason we don't allow an individual in our system to have power without accountability, power without responsibility, power without having to come to the Legislature for review. That is what this Assembly is about, and that's why this Bill, this piece of legislation, is not acceptable. I would ask the minister and the government to rethink this legislation before proceeding further.

I'd simply say in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, that from this action of government, from this message government sends out, flows a message to the rest of our province. I would ask if this government, in that the minister in charge of lotteries has traditionally not felt himself accountable to the Legislature — is that in some way reflective of perhaps a lack of attention to some of the things that the Auditor General has said, notwithstanding the good work that these organizations do on our behalf in every part of the province? They do do good work, but I'm concerned when I read that the Auditor General cannot give us assurances that money is being spent for the purposes intended. Perhaps those organizations feel, "If the minister's not accountable, perhaps we can be a bit slack as well and even be a little bit slow in

moving in the direction that we'd like to move to tighten up those funding guidelines." I don't know. But all I'm saying to you, Mr. Speaker, is that what we do in this Chamber sets the standard for the rest of the province. If we're saying that this Bill and this kind of legislation -- the power it gives to this minister - is acceptable, then it's very difficult for us to hold anyone else accountable.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. There's been a request from an hon. member that we revert to Introduction of Special Guests. Do hon. members concur?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Opposed?
Hon. Member for Wainwright,

head: INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS

MR. FISCHER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure to introduce to you and through you to the members of the Assembly, three ladies representing the Alberta Women in Support of Agriculture. They met with the agriculture caucus committee tonight, and I might add that we had a very informative and enjoyable meeting.

They are sitting in the members' gallery. Their names are Deen Hymas, from Standard; Leslie Willocks, from Blackie; and Donna Graham, from Vulcan. I'd like them to stand and receive the warm welcome of this Assembly.

head: GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS (Second Reading)

Bill 10 Interprovincial Lottery Amendment Act, 1988 (continued)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Edmonton-Strathcona.

MR. WRIGHT: I'm obliged, Mr. Speaker. The nub of this Bill is section 6. I've never heard such a flabby, ridiculous clause in the whole of my life. Let me read it to you in its full decadence:

The Minister may pay money from the Fund for purposes related to the support of initiatives related to recreation or culture...

Now, that's flabby enough on its own, and it continues

... or for any other purpose the Minister considers to be in the public interest

I see the minister is smiling. He should be ashamed of lending his name to such an ignorant Bill.

The Auditor General said that the legal opinion he obtained -- and not a very difficult legal opinion to come to -- is that the money should be paid into the public fund of the province because it is money raised from a certain government operation, just as one raises money from the sale of liquor in the province of Alberta, licences, and so on. There's absolute . . . [interjections] All right; then how about the money raised from pari-mutuel betting? Is that in the gift of the Solicitor General? Of course it's not. It is spent via the estimates, right? Where's the difference?

AN HON. MEMBER: No comparison, and you know it.

MR. WRIGHT: Whether there's a comparison or not, what I say stands on its own feet. What right has any minister to spend public money at his whim? That is what section 6 says. That's what it says.

You know, there was a revolution 300 years ago. The revolution was about the expenditure of public money; public money collected via the taxes should not be spent without the consent of Parliament. Whatever you say about Cromwell's revolution, that was what it established, and that was what was established later when the next king came in. That is what he conceded. That right was not obtained to permit a single minister to give it out on his whim. But we know it's not at whim, not at all. We know it's so that you people can bribe the electorate to be re-elected. That's what it is.

You know, you representatives, the representatives, Mr. Speaker, of the business interests -- this sorry lot that I'm looking at now -- when you peel the skin away enough layers, you get down to the irreducible minimum of naked greed. That's what you do.

AN HON. MEMBER: Dreamer.

MR. WRIGHT: "Dreamer," the minister says. But it's true. In the end you see that your idea of the expenditure of public money is to keep yourselves in power. You don't even go through the form of bringing it to the Legislature so that it can be voted on. That may be a bit of a farce in itself, you know -- electing a dictatorship for the term of the government -- but at least it goes through the form of democracy where we all can have a say. We cannot have a say except through the very indirect method of amending the Bill or something like that.

You know, it's not illegal to lie in itself. It's not illegal to cheat in itself. Prostitution is not illegal. Adultery is not illegal. That doesn't make it right. The Auditor General says that this is public money which should go to the public funds. You say, "Oh well, okay; we'll just make it legal." But it doesn't make it right, and the government should be ashamed of itself in having such an immoral and disgusting and atrocious section in this Bill, which is a nub of the Bill. It goes entirely against what we know to be parliamentary procedure. The baser part of me hopes to goodness you don't change it, and we can take it to the electorate next time and show you for what you are.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hon. Member for Edmonton-Kingsway.

MR. McEACHERN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to add my voice to that of my colleagues from Calgary-Mountain View and Edmonton-Strathcona, to tell the minister that this is one of the shoddiest pieces of legislation I have ever seen, and I don't see how he has the nerve to perpetuate that on the population of Alberta. How the minister thinks he can bypass the power of the purse that should reside with this Assembly and in some legal way say that it's perfectly okay to not ask this Assembly how the funds from lotteries or from any source of revenue of the government cannot be passed, I just do not understand. He certainly is looking for trouble, and the next election, as my colleague from Edmonton-Strathcona [said], will point out the kind of trouble he's in as a result

Mr. Speaker, the Auditor General has dealt with this many times, and my colleague from Calgary-Mountain View alluded to it, but I'm going to refer to it a little more specifically. It doesn't matter that he'd been doing this for 14 years, but this is

what the Auditor General says about what he's been doing for 14 years. This is on page 88 of the 1986-87 Auditor General's report:

The manner in which the proceeds of the major lotteries currently operating in Alberta are dealt with, the payments of administration costs and prize money therefrom, and the distribution of net profits earned from those lotteries, lack appropriate legislative authority.

Now, that's been going on for 14 years. So finally, after the Auditor General insists three years in a row and after he expresses a legal opinion about how shoddy the government has been handling these funds -- I'm sorry; the Auditor General didn't express the legal opinion; he ordered it this way:

A legal opinion obtained by the Audit Office indicates that the proceeds from these lotteries fall within the definition of "public money" that should be paid into the Province's General Revenue Fund. The Interprovincial Lottery Act makes no "special disposition" that would allow the proceeds to remain outside the General Revenue Fund, nor does it empower the Minister to do so through the licence.

Finally, the Auditor General, after adding to those arguments, makes his recommendation on page 89:

It is recommended that the Minister responsible for administering the Interprovincial Lottery Act:

- direct that the proceeds from the Province's lottery operations be paid into the General Revenue Fund as required by the Financial Administration Act, and that administration costs, prize monies and profit distributions be paid therefrom pursuant to the authority of appropriations of the Legislature;

Now, that's what should have been done. He does go on to say, and I disagree with him on this point

or

- seek an amendment to the Interprovincial Lottery Act to allow lottery proceeds to remain outside of the General Revenue Fund.

That is a scandalous recommendation by the Auditor General. There is no reason in the world that any minister of the Crown needs to spend money outside of the purview of this Legislature. All expenditures of the government should be brought before this Assembly and approved by this Assembly. We understand and know that the cabinet has the authority to push through whatever it wishes to push through, but they should at least do so and have the courtesy to do so in a parliamentary system in the Legislature, not outside the Legislature.

My colleague from Calgary-Mountain View mentioned that the government, having done it with the lottery money, are likely to be doing it elsewhere. We already know that they are and do. For example, a lot of the loan guarantees commit the tax dollars of this province, yet the government doesn't bring those before this Assembly and debate the terms on which those loan guarantees are made, so the government is already into casually handling the taxpayers' dollars as if somehow they have a God-given right to do them by themselves without the purview of this Legislature.

The long tradition of parliamentary democracy says that the power of the purse resides in this Legislature. Well, this government made another attempt to do something similar and, in fact, did so. A great part of the heritage trust fund is not settled in this Legislature as to where the moneys will be spent, how they will be moved around, what will be done with the heritage trust fund moneys and dollars. So the government already has established a sloppy procedure, Mr. Speaker. This is just one more instance where they're now trying to make it legal to have what can only be considered an immoral procedure.

This government tends to overuse orders in council, govern-

ment warrants, very unnecessarily. The government warrant to build the new Grant MacEwan facility was decided, supposedly, after the budget was set, so they announce it now. They are going to spend \$100 million of taxpayers' money that will not be properly accounted for for at least a year. There will be no proper debate of that; it will not be brought before this Assembly as an estimate in any way until a year from now. The government has a habit of doing that.

This government calls a fall sitting of the Legislature, a short fall sitting last year, and made no attempt to catch up on the number of orders in council that spent the taxpayers' money throughout the summer and through the spring and to ask this Assembly for approval for those expenditures. They wait around until it's far too late to have any meaningful debate on it. The money is already well spent.

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

It doesn't just stop at loan guarantees; we also do things like making commitments to Olympia & York to rent premises, again a call on taxpayers' dollars with no legislative approval. So, Mr. Speaker, what I'm saying here is that the government has got in the habit of spending a lot of taxpayers' dollars without the approval of this Legislature. This lottery fund -- to actually have the gall to bring in a Bill and say that they are going to somehow make it legal to go against parliamentary tradition is absolutely scandalous. I just do not understand why the minister thinks he should have that kind of power.

Another actually typical aspect of this government's procedures these days -- we noticed it particularly in the first year when they were rearranging a lot of the departments. Almost all of the Bills reordering the names of the departments and what their responsibilities would be had what my friend from Edmonton-Strathcona calls a Henry VIII clause, a clause saying that the minister shall make grants, and with no restrictions whatsoever on those grants, to the tune of -- supposedly bankrupt the taxpayers of this whole province if they wanted, with no guidelines, no sense of direction or purpose, just saying that this is what the minister can do. The only way this Bill limits the power of the minister is limited by the amount of money they're going to take in.

Now, since they already have half a dozen different lottery schemes, who's to say they won't develop a lot more lottery schemes and continue to tax the people of Alberta through lottery schemes? And they are a kind of a tax. What this government should realize is that raising funds by lottery schemes is a very shoddy and unfair way to tax the poor people of this province. What they have done is they have allowed the distribution of income in this province to get so bad, and there are so many people in this province that have no hope of ever having a decent life. I'm thinking of all the working poor -- the minimum wage is so low -- the people who are on welfare, the people who are on unemployment insurance: they have so little hope. What this government does is prey on them by offering lottery schemes so that they can hope to get out of this poverty.

Mr. Speaker, the Horatio Alger dream is dead in this province for 35 or 40 percent at least of the population -- in fact, probably 50 or 60 or 70 percent of the population -- because this government has run such policies as to make the distribution of income worse in the province. Then they decide to raise funds by lotteries and don't even have the courtesy to take those tax dollars -- because that's what they are in a sense; it's a tax on the poor, most of the people of this province that buy the tickets

on the lotteries. They don't even have the courtesy to bring that money before this Assembly and decide in a parliamentary, democratic way where that money should go. I do not understand how the minister can bring in a Bill in a sense legalizing the bypassing of this Legislature from having the control of the power of the purse that is inherent and is supposed to be inherent in a parliamentary system of democracy.

My colleague from Calgary-Mountain View made a number of remarks about where the funds go under this arrangement that we've had before. The minister, of course, will keep on doing whatever he wants to do. It seems he's not prepared to bring in any guidelines that would tell us where and how he's going to spend that money, who he's going to give it to, what organizations will get it. What it amounts to is that he's given himself full control to just ad hoc hand out the money to whomever he wants, whenever he wants. If he doesn't like the chairman of some particular organization, he can tell them to forget it; they're not going to get any this year. He can be totally capricious, and there will be no repercussions, because we in this Assembly won't find out until afterwards.

Mr. Speaker, it's incredible that the minister would think that he should be able to take the funds of the taxpayers of this province and just hand them out to whomever he wants, whenever he wants, on whatever schedule he wants or, for that matter, stick it in a bank and earn a little interest on it and not hand them out at all. There should be some rules; there should be some procedures; there should be some plan that we in this House can debate. There should be some organizations, some people to advise him, that we know who they are. Instead, what it really amounts to is that he's kept all the control to himself; he can hand them out ad hoc, on a political basis for all we know. "If you don't dance to my tune and tell your people to vote for me, you don't get any moneys this year." I mean, how do we know that isn't what he's going to do?

There is no reason in the world why we should trust this minister. He has stood up in this House so many times and told us how many jobs they've created. He's bragging about the number of jobs they create in this province. Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of poor people in this province, and they're being taxed by these lottery schemes. So, Mr. Speaker, this Bill is one of the most reprehensible Bills this government has ever brought in. It's legalizing something that is totally scandalous, totally wrong, and this government will regret it in the next election if they don't start changing and mending their ways and start looking after the public dollars, in this public place where they belong. This Legislature is where the power of the purse is supposed to reside, and I see no reason why any government should set it up in any other way. We should defeat this Bill. There isn't one person here that should really vote for this Bill.

MR. RUSSELL: Well, Mr. Speaker, to coin an overused phrase, I hadn't intended to speak in this debate until I heard some of the comments and words that were being thrown around, rather loosely, I think, and with overvivid imaginations at work. With respect to . . . [interjection] You'll get your turn to speak, hon. member.

MR. TAYLOR: I just said they were accurate.

MR. RUSSELL: Why don't you just listen when other people have the floor? [interjection]

MR. SPEAKER: Order, Westlock-Sturgeon, thank you very

much. The Chair will recognize you in due course.

MR. TAYLOR: A little heckling doesn't hurt.

MR. RUSSELL: I was quite surprised; I mean . . .

MR. SPEAKER: If it continues, it will hurt, hon. member, thank you. [interjections] Order please, Deputy Premier.

This is not a matter of estimates, hon. member. This is a matter of debate. In the course of second reading there's a slightly different procedure than takes place in question period.

Deputy Premier, please.

MR. RUSSELL: Well, I understand he doesn't understand good manners or courtesy, but I had hoped he would understand . . .

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Point of order, for the moment.

MR. TAYLOR: I'd like to make my point of order, Mr. Speaker. They may think there was a star in the east when this government was elected, but if he can't take a little . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order. Hon. member, what standing order or . . .

MR. TAYLOR: The rule I'm talking about is that I can make a comment when an inane statement is being made on the other side. If they can't take it, they shouldn't be in here.

MR. SPEAKER: It's a m a t t e r of the Chair bringing you to order, hon. member.

Deputy Premier, please.

MR. RUSSELL: Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't think any members in the House mind a little heckling. It's when some hon. member is standing trying to make his contribution to the debate when this nonstop braying from that corner of the House continues. He'll get his turn. All he has to do is wait and stand up and get the floor, and we'll listen to him.

But to continue with the debate, I was a little surprised at the looseness with which some recent speakers use the terms "immoral," "shoddy," "scandalous," you know, and went on and on. After all, we're talking about voluntary proceeds contributed by all the citizens of Alberta and other provinces when they're visiting here, when they voluntarily buy lottery tickets at the corner drug store. To somehow equate this with legislatively raised public funds and therefore apply the same rules of accountability to that is absolutely ludicrous. Even the comparison made with betting at the horse races doesn't hold up, because those races are held at licences given under the auspices of the Legislature through legislative authority, taxed at rates set by the . . .

MR. TAYLOR: You're talking about distributing the loot.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. member; that's enough. Deputy Premier.

MR. TAYLOR: He doesn't think that I have a question . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. member. The Chair will hear

you again in due course, with the proper citations. Thank you.
Deputy Premier.

MR. TAYLOR: I think you've got more to do than protect him.

MR. RUSSELL: He really would get his chance if he'd only sit still and shut up. [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, hon. member. The Chair can bring the Deputy Premier to attention for that kind of statement as well, and will do it.

The Chair really doesn't need Westlock-Sturgeon to defend it, thank you very much. [interjection]

Deputy Premier, that really isn't a phrase that we really ought to use, thank you. I'm sure you'll withdraw it and then continue with your remarks.

MR. RUSSELL: Well, I'll withdraw, Mr. Speaker, certainly. I just hope the hon. member gets the message, though. He will get his turn.

MR. TAYLOR: What? At the fund?

MR. SPEAKER: If he keeps it up, he will not get his turn this evening.

MR. RUSSELL: But the point I'm making, Mr. Speaker, is the outrage and the lather that the opposition work themselves into at the disposition under public audit of these funds, which are voluntarily contributed and are no way government funds. The outrage they express at the fact that these funds are going to be passed on to established public foundations, governed by boards of appointed citizens of Alberta, reported by independent audit, and laid before this Legislature in annual reports astounds me. And they use the word "immoral" that we're doing that.

The immorality of public spending lies with that group across the Chamber, because day after day we sit in here and listen to them say, "Do this," and "Do that," with no accountability as to how the bills are going to be paid but spend, spend, spend. It's no wonder the last ND government in Canada got turfed out because of those kinds of practices. Canadian citizens are fed up with the spending practices and the debt collections of those two parties across the Chamber, and they know it and they ought to be ashamed of themselves. It's not a laughing matter, but ordinarily we ignore the things like that, because we're used to it. Just spend, spend, spend. Universal everything for everybody.

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

MR. SPEAKER: What is the point of order and the citation?

MR. FOX: [Inaudible] I understand is what's up for discussion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair appreciates the advice from Vegreville, but the Chair has also been listening to some of the other debate that has been going on in most of the last hour, and the principle of relevance has been disappearing a fair amount. It is indeed a good point, that indeed one should be brought back to the principle of the Bill, and I'm certain the Deputy Premier will take that under consideration. So will future speakers to the discussion.

MR. RUSSELL: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'll conclude simply by saying that I wasn't going to enter the debate. I listened to the words that were thrown out here by the Member for Edmonton-Strathcona, by his colleague in the back row there. The words were "immoral," "shoddy," "scandalous," and I simply had to reply that those kinds of practices certainly don't belong here. They are there by practice on that side.

This is a good Bill. It's doing lots of things that government funds under careful management cannot cover. These funds by the voluntary sale and purchase by citizens throughout Alberta are providing lots of amenities for the fields of culture, recreation, sports, and a variety of supplementary social services not covered by government. The Bill outlines the responsibility and the methods by which that can be done. It's a good Bill.

I would not have debated until the opposition members really did get carried away, and I wasn't prepared to see our government labeled with those kinds of words for bringing in this Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair recognized in the following sequence: Calgary-Forest Lawn, followed by Edmonton-Glenarry, followed by Westlock-Sturgeon, followed by Vegreville.

MR. PASHAK: Mr. Speaker, I have some general concerns about the Bill itself before it is amended, and then I have some specific concerns about one of the amendments, section 6 in particular. With respect to the Bill itself. . .

MR. SPEAKER: The principle of the Bill, thank you.

MR. PASHAK: The principle of Bill 10. . . [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Calgary-Forest Lawn, please.

MR. PASHAK: Well, I just. . . [interjections]. Thanks for all the advice I'm getting from everybody. I really do genuinely appreciate that.

With respect to the Bill itself, Mr. Speaker, I think it's really unfortunate that we've developed this whole tradition in Canada now of raising funds for important social purposes, whether they be cultural, recreational, or health purposes, through forms of gambling. I think if you really wanted to look at the historical record of the collapse of civilization, you'd soon find that that is something that usually accompanies the total collapse of civilizations, historically speaking. It'd be much better if we could recognize these needs and we could raise taxes in the usual and regular ways for the purpose of providing for the needs of our citizens in terms, as I say, of recreation purposes, health purposes, or whatever.

Now, I recognize that we've institutionalized gambling in our society, and we've institutionalized raising revenues for provincial purposes from gambling. I think it'd be very difficult to put that particular genie back in the bottle that's with it, so we have to regulate the use of gambling funds in the most appropriate way possible, and we have to make sure that they're used in the best interests of our citizens, and we have to make sure they don't contradict long-standing parliamentary principles that have evolved over time, ever since the formation of the whole British parliamentary tradition.

I'd just like to say that the deputy leader in his remarks mentioned something to the effect — and I hope I heard him correctly — that these are not public funds in the sense that tax dollars are public funds; they're raised through some kind of volun-

tary choice on the part of individuals. Well, I disagree with that most strongly, because those funds do come into provincial coffers, and many experts who look at this question would argue that this, indeed, is a form of indirect taxation. And it's a particularly important form of indirect taxation, because all of the studies show that this tax hits those who have lower incomes harder than it hits people with higher incomes. People with lower incomes are more desperate to try to achieve some kind of measure of economic well-being and success in life. They find themselves blocked by existing institutional structures. So one of the things they do, and you just have to go to a corner grocery store on any Saturday night before 6 o'clock: they line up in long numbers, particularly if the lottery wasn't won on the previous night, to buy lottery tickets. Very low income families will often squander the last \$5, \$10, and sometimes \$20 of their available income to buy lottery tickets. I think this is a preposterous situation, particularly in a country that, generally speaking, is as affluent as Canada is.

ANHON. MEMBER: Do you ever buy any?

MR. PASHAK: Now, the member to my left is asking me if I've ever bought lottery tickets. Sure. I'm not trying to present myself as someone who's holier than thou. I like to go to the racetrack. When I was younger, I didn't mind playing a little poker or whatever, and I occasionally do buy lottery tickets.

But I think that brings into question the very real role of governments and educational systems within society. It's up to governments to try and provide some leadership by establishing principles and making it easier for people not to be seduced rather than to be seduced by these terribly alluring appeals. Gambling can be an extremely alluring appeal, because people gamble only because they think they're going to win.

That's not my only concern with this particular measure, Mr. Speaker. I also have concern with the principle again that the minister should have so much power and authority to allocate these funds as he sees fit. That particular section of the Bill does say:

The Minister may pay money from the Fund for purposes related to the support of initiatives related to recreation or culture . . .

Which, as the Member for Edmonton-Strathcona pointed out, is pretty open-ended just in those terms. But then the measure goes on to say:

. . . or for any other purpose the Minister considers to be in the public interest.

And it's not clear, it's not defined as to what that "public" purpose is, so it's very easy to interpret this Act as giving the minister the total power to use the money not just for purposes that are in the public interest but for any other purpose, including political patronage if he so chooses. I'm not saying that the minister will use those funds for that purpose, but the opportunity, the window, is certainly there for him to do that.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that that opportunity flies in the face of everything English-speaking people have fought for over the centuries, the whole sense of what Parliaments are about. The English-speaking tradition does not come from the pursuit of freedom of speech; it has come from the desire on the part of common people to control the spending power and the revenue-gathering power of rulers and monarchs. I could just quote from Paul Einzig, *The Control of the Purse: Progress and Decline of Parliament's Financial Control*, in which he says that:

The control of public expenditure and taxation is at the heart of our system of representative parliamentary democracy. Parlia-

ments in most other countries originated as a culmination of movements aiming at political freedom -- freedom of speech, freedom of the press, independent administration of justice, freedom of religious worship, freedom from alien domination.

MR. SPEAKER: Okay, let's come back to the Bill, please. Could we have the freedom to deal with the Bill.

MR. PASHAK: With respect to freedom to deal with the Bill, Mr. Speaker, I'm just trying to point out, and I'll try to paraphrase instead of quoting directly, that it was important that an Englishman back in the early days of the development of our parliamentary control -- that expenditures could not take place without his consent. So all I'm trying to argue is that whenever moneys are spent that are raised by or through provincial means, it's absolutely essential that this Assembly in some measure, as we do with the estimates, determines exactly how those funds should be directed, and everybody has an opportunity to have a say and provide some direction and is able to criticize the government's proposals with respect to that spending. Then when that is done, the general public is in a position to have more knowledge about government spending policies, and they themselves can decide whether or not they support what it is the governments are doing. They have at least an opportunity every four years or thereabouts to look at the government record and decide whether they want that particular government to represent them.

I could go through a whole history of important steps that have taken place in the evolution of that parliamentary control. But at this point I think I've fairly made my case that it really is absolutely essential that the minister does not have this discretion to spend this money for whatever purpose he deems reasonable but rather that that purpose get firmly lodged in this Assembly itself.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.
Edmonton-Glengarry.

MR. YOUNIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I won't overuse that phrase. It was my intention right from the beginning to speak on this Bill. A previous speaker referred in most critical terms to some words used to describe this Bill. I will discuss the principle of the Bill, although it's difficult to discuss something that doesn't exist, because there are no principles of a positive nature behind this Bill.

A previous speaker took exception to the words "immoral," "shoddy," and "scandalous." I would judge that in fact those were somewhat gentle and kind descriptions of the Bill, and I might opt for words such as "disgusting" or "repugnant" or "contrary to any principle of parliamentary democracy" in describing the Bill. I think the Bill is based on the principle that a single minister of a government representing only one party of four in this room has the power to decide how to spend some fairly large quantities of money without those expenditures, the nature of them, the motives behind them, the purposes of them, being debated before the fact.

Now, it seems to me the whole purpose of having an election in the first place, the whole purpose of spending taxpayers' money to run this building, is so we can discuss these kinds of things before the decisions are finalized. The government may want to say, "Well, with our majority that's a farce, and we really do whatever we want anyway." I would challenge them to

publicly admit it. In fact, I would point out the principle of this Bill is a public admission that the governing party sees no value in the purposes this place is supposed to stand for; they see no value in public debate by the elected representatives before expenditures are authorized.

Now, if I can compare it to just two expenditures in this minister's estimates which have been debated in the Legislature, I want to use them by way of illustration of how important the principle is. Within the minister's office there was an expenditure increase of 9.9 percent, which came to \$18,000. For \$18,000 he had to come before this Legislature, bear the brunt of opposition discussion, and answer why he needed \$18,000 extra in his office. That is valuable, because we believe in the principle of debating the expenditures of government. Now we've got a Bill here that says for millions of dollars the minister can be the sole judge and jury of whether or not it is in the best interests of society to make the expenditure. From a minister's point of view, it may be his friends who want to do business for us in another country, so we'll expend it that way; it may be relatives who own a large corporation, and they will be the recipients of largess from his fund. There will be no debate before the fact. There will be no chance to alert the public to the nature of the expenditure. There will be no chance to have a vote in this Legislature on whether or not the expenditure is reasonable and just and in the best interests of the public.

To give another example from the minister's expenditures, it was a \$19,000 decrease in the hire-a-student budget line. Now, we had the right to come in here and ask the minister if he wasn't in fact taking money from hire-a-student to enhance the running of his office, and he had to be willing to justify that no, it wasn't that and there were good reasons for what he was doing. Again, it's the value of the principle.

I think a government that had principles would not have brought this Bill before us. So what we have is written proof that I'll be glad to take to the voters, if this government has the arrogance to pass this and illustrate those principles, that in fact they have no concern for what the electors did in setting up this government, that they have no concern to allow all of the elected representatives to discuss multimillion dollar expenditures. The one minister will be able to say, for whatever reason he may have, "This is the way it will be." Or if we even assume that that minister -- because he is, after all, in that position only due to the good graces of the Premier and the Executive Council that he is part of -- will discuss it there, the principle of this Bill is that those expenditures should be discussed by Executive Council only and then announced in a news release, at which point the opposition, whose job it is and whose role it is to discuss publicly those expenditures, will never have the opportunity to discuss them in the Legislature.

One can argue that the entire principle of this Bill is to allow a very large fund of money to be spent in ways that Executive Council sees as politically expedient and circumvent the role of parliamentary democracy with an opposition and a governing party. If that is what this government stands for, then I would challenge them to say so publicly. I would challenge any speaker from the government side who wants to get up to say: "We don't believe there is value in debating expenditures in the Legislature. We don't believe it's necessary for the interests of the people of Alberta to be protected by that open two-sided or three-sided or four-sided discussion." Because we certainly aren't going to see Executive Council come out with a public debate of the value of the expenditure. We can certainly see, if the past history of this province is any example, that an awful lot

of those expenditures around election time will be designed to woo voters and will be decided by Executive Council according to what their election planning strategy committee tells them are the best places to put a few bucks to bring the maximum number of voters back into the fold, because an awful lot of them have left in either embarrassment or disgust over the last election.

Now, if that is why we're passing this Bill, then I would challenge members to get up and say, "We see value in turning this lottery fund into an election slush fund for the governing party where there'll be no public debate." That is obviously the overriding principle behind the Bill. If the principles I've been describing are it, then I would challenge members to have the courage to get up in this Legislature and explain those principles and justify them. I don't believe it can be done, and I believe every member of this Legislature has a responsibility to the voters, if they believe there's any purpose in parliamentary democracy, to oppose this and vote against it.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.
Westlock-Sturgeon.

MR. TAYLOR: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Unfortunately, the Deputy Premier is not capable of answering my remarks. I looked forward to getting into a battle of wits with him, even though he was unarmed.

To go on a bit, he mentioned he was taken aback, Mr. Speaker, on the principle that was attacked, that this Bill was "immoral," "shoddy," and "scandalous." I think possibly the Deputy Premier did have a fact here. "Immoral" means that you have the ability to tell the difference between right and wrong. In this case, I think it would be better to call it "amoral." They don't seem to have any concept that by passing this Bill they're flying in the face of what parliamentary history and the whole process of self-determination has come to through the years. It's just absolutely amazing that they think of passing a Bill where one minister not even responsible to the cabinet has the right to make these decisions.

He balked at a mention that it was shoddy. I think probably that was a fairly good criticism. I have a tendency to think of it more as decrepit. "Decrepit" is a word that applies to anything that's decaying or falling apart at the seams or has been around too long, Mr. Speaker. All of those fit very closely to the judgment of people that would put forward a Bill such as this. "Scandalous" also. I can understand being bothered at that. I think more like "licentious" would be a better word, Mr. Speaker, or "arrogant," taking on abilities to themselves as if their moral values take precedence over any thought of history or any thought of the public good.

I was particularly concerned when the Deputy Premier, and to think that thinking like that is loose on the front bench, mentioned they were not government funds -- I'd have to read *Hansard* to really believe that -- because somehow or another they were collected voluntarily, that someone went out and bet. Well, I think liquor taxes are collected voluntarily, even occasionally by a Premier that crosses a picket line or whatever it is. I'm sure nobody forces anyone to go and buy liquor taxes, and yet we wouldn't think for a minute of leaving the Solicitor General, or whoever is in charge of the liquor board, the sole and exclusive authority to disburse funds from liquor taxes. I'll admit the Solicitor General has used the argument occasionally that it was all right to give back horse racing funds because they went to people that bet on horses. I look forward to that, be-

cause my Great Uncle Louis always bet for years that since he contributed more through his drinking to taxes than anyone else did in society, he should get some of those taxes back. Now, after all these years, the Solicitor General apparently is adopting a philosophy such as that, and the government is going forward and putting into rules a philosophy of taking taxes out of the lottery to go back.

But maybe what bothers me about this Bill most of all is the statement that they do well with it, that they're going to do good. Well, being a man of the cloth, Mr. Speaker, you know you've been taught many times that the end never justifies the means. Yet we have a group over here that flies in the face of over 2,000 years of philosophy that says the end can't justify the means. They get up and say: "Well, we're doing good things. We gave some money to the Little Orphan Annie club over here. We gave some to another club building something in Edmonton. We're going to give some money here. As a matter of fact, we may even give some money to people the Liberals recommend should get money." But all those wonderful virtues are not enough reason to therefore say they can unilaterally go ahead with giving the funds.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bad Bill, and I am torn between the disgust at seeing it presented in the House and the glee that I will be able to go out and rub their collective noses in it in the next election.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Vegreville.

MR. FOX: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to speak briefly to the principle, or lack thereof, of this Bill. In case it's escaped the attention of government members, we in the opposition are concerned about this Bill and we're going to oppose it at every step of the way unless we can see there is some willingness on the part of the government to acknowledge its deficiencies and try and remedy same.

It was interesting to me to hear the Deputy Premier leap to his feet and become perhaps the only member of the government, other than the minister himself, to defend this offensive piece of legislation. He was saying: how could the opposition possibly object to something like the Interprovincial Lottery Act that gives funds to a series of incorporated, regularly funded volunteer organizations? That makes a very good story, but you know, it's not clearly spelled out in the Act or the amendments to the Act who gets these funds and when. It is rather a matter of, as we've heard, capricious decision-making on the part of the minister. That's what we find objectionable here. It's just the lack of opportunity to do our jobs in the Legislature that offends us with this Bill -- certainly not how the money is spent at this point in time but how it may, perhaps, be spent in the future. It seems difficult to get that principle through to the members opposite, but perhaps we will in time.

The problem arose, I guess -- the need to figure out how to distribute the extra lottery funds and come up with some sort of Bill that coped with that, and we've heard from other speakers -- due to the economic times in Alberta where people were finding it increasingly difficult to make ends meet. The idea of being able to cash in on the one big payday through lotteries certainly tempted me, and others like me, on more than one occasion. I think it is a sign of not strength in the economy but rather weakness in the economy -- tough Tory times. So the government was amassing quite an impressive fund of money without having any clear idea or mandate on how that ought to be spent.

Indeed, it became a matter of quite serious contention between some members of the Legislative Assembly. So that conflict was there, and I'm glad to see that in the absence of any particular legislative authority to dispense the funds, the government came forward with a plan that I generally support. Rather than do as some members in the other opposition party suggest, rather than getting into trying to fund some basic services for Albertans like education or health care through an unreliable and fairly fickle source of funding like lottery funds, they chose to, I think, generally expend that money on things that Albertans expected them to; that is, sports, culture, recreation types of facilities.

So we're certainly not quarreling about how this big nest egg of lottery funds is dispensed, Mr. Speaker. It's the process through which they are dispensed. We're going to keep hammering on that not only in second reading but certainly during committee stage, because it's just totally unacceptable to think that a minister of the Crown should have the authority to do as he pleases, that he should be able to accumulate money from whatever source and then make independent, uninfluenced decisions about how that money ought to be spent. If that's the principle of this Bill, then it's offensive and we're going to oppose it at every step.

The minister and some of his cronies like to suggest that the opposition is sort of denigrating or putting down the volunteer associations that spend this lottery revenue. Nothing could be further from the truth, Mr. Speaker. Certainly as a rural member of this Legislature, I have many occasions to see just what good work groups like the Alberta Sport Council, the Recreation, Parks and Wildlife Foundation, the Wild Rose Foundation, a variety of other groups, the Alberta Art Foundation, the Alberta Cultural Heritage Foundation, the Alberta Foundation for Literary Arts, the Alberta Foundation for the Performing Arts -- all these groups expend money in the most admirable of ways and that's not what's at issue here. Certainly we support the many worthwhile projects these groups involve themselves in, and we support the notion that their base funding be increased. Moneys that will be announced sometime in the future for agricultural fairs and exhibitions are going to be a great help to the ag societies in rural Alberta. For example, the village of Holden decided to put some of it toward artificial ice for their arena. So it's not the groups we're quarreling with; it's this government, Mr. Speaker. This government thinks somehow they have the right to amass money and spend it without the scrutiny of this public forum, which is, I submit, what the forum is for, what the Legislature is for.

I'm certainly supportive of the initiative of the Minister of Tourism to come forward with this new community tourism action program. I think it's an excellent program, and it will certainly enhance individual communities' abilities to promote their strong points, to attract tourism and help build an infrastructure right across this province that builds our third industry and makes it ever more prominent. I certainly like the part of his program that requires that communities sit down and hammer out a tourism action program before they can access those funds. But I'm really concerned, Mr. Speaker, that this was done in a totally offhand and capricious sort of way. These organizations can't count on their funding being secure in the future. They don't know what sorts of guidelines or principles the minister may use in the future to dispense that money, so that's really a concern of ours. You know, this minister seems to have a fairly level head, but we're not assured that he's going to be the minister in charge of distribution of these funds for any

particular period of time, especially given the likely future of this government. When it falls to our hands to make decisions like this, Mr. Speaker, we're going to turn it back into the Legislative forum where it should be debated.

The Deputy Premier made some comments about other governments in Canada and how voters reacted to them. He neglected to mention the most recent judgment of governments in Canada by the electorate. In the two by-elections in Saskatchewan, where neither of the Conservative candidates even got their . . .

MR. SPEAKER: With due respect, hon. member, let's come back to the principle of the Bill.

MR. FOX: I'm just trying to balance the debate here. I noticed they neglect to mention that, Mr. Speaker.

With respect, hon. members, the Legislature employs an officer. He's called the Auditor General, he's got a very competent and capable staff, and it's his job to review the expenditures of this Assembly. Audit procedures have grown so that auditors are not just in the position to determine how money is spent. They are going beyond that. They're getting into a value-for-money kind of auditing to determine if money is well spent, and they're also trying to determine in the interim, Mr. Speaker, if money is spent according to the guidelines. That's clearly what is at issue here.

These various foundations, be it the Alberta Sport Council or the Recreation, Parks and Wildlife Foundation, are inundated with requests for their valuable services. Their boards and executive directors work very, very hard to examine the requests from various groups in the province and make responsible, considered decisions about how that money ought to be spent, but with respect, the Auditor General said in his report in reference to the Recreation, Parks and Wildlife Foundation:

The Foundation lacks satisfactory procedures for determining whether the grants it pays to organizations are used for the purposes intended.

There's a lack of audit procedure there. It needs to be tightened up. The same criticism has been leveled against the Alberta Sport Council. I don't think that's a criticism one would direct to those foundations and councils. The buck has to stop here, with the ministers and government in charge. We would have hoped that a Bill that sought to amend the Act would include in its scope some kinds of provisions to tighten up that procedure. The audit procedures are certainly at question, and the lack of legislative scrutiny, the lack of input from all members of the Assembly about how these funds ought to be spent, I think is a shoddy procedure.

The Deputy Premier made some rather intriguing statements about this money not being . . . He said it was not government money. I'd like to tell a little story, if I may, about how these groups deliver the money they decide to spend, Mr. Speaker, because I think it applies directly to the principle of the Bill. There was a function held a couple of winters ago in the town of Tofield, a winter sports carnival. They sought some funding through the Alberta Sport Council so they could put on their dogsled races and chili cook-off and some other things. It was a lot of fun. The Alberta Sport Council decided to give them some funding, which was certainly appropriate and much appreciated. But the poor fellow working for the Alberta Sport Council, trying to live out the dictums of this government, told those well-meaning volunteers at the meeting that he had a cheque to present to them, some \$3,000-plus, but he would be

very concerned if their M.L.A., the hon. Member for Vegreville, was to be present when the cheque was given out.

I find that a shocking and shameful kind of procedure, and quite frankly so did the people who were at that meeting. They were offended by a procedure that doesn't take into account a basic respect for democracy. They asked the person: "What's at issue here? Why can't our M.L.A. come and be a part of that ceremony?" And the guy said, "Well, it's government money, not opposition money." Mr. Deputy Premier: "government money, not opposition money". Whereupon one astute reporter at the meeting said, "Well, with respect, isn't it everybody's money?" It's not money that belongs to a particular political party to be dispensed as they please; it's money that ought to be treated with the kind of respect the public deserves. That kind of shameless procedure in dealing with public funds offends a lot of people — I might add, a lot of people who in the past have been supporters of this government. Because when they sit down to make a decision, when they go into that polling booth to decide who they would like to have represent them, they're not trying to decide who gets to pass out cheques or who gets to decide which minister gets to capriciously distribute lottery funds. They're deciding who they want to have represent them in this legitimate legislative forum, who's going to take part, along with 82 other M.L.A.s, to help make collective decisions based on the the greatest possible good that can be realized out of the limited funds available.

It's democracy, and if that procedure is offensive to members opposite, I'd like to hear them stand up and say so. Because it's not offensive to Albertans, Mr. Speaker. Albertans cherish democracy, and it's democracy we need to reinforce through all the Bills and motions we debate and pass in this Legislature. It's a lack of respect for democracy that's central to this Bill, Mr. Speaker, and it's what makes the principle so offensive to us.

You want to ask now: do we in the opposition support the activities of these worthwhile government foundations and organizations? You bet we do. Do we appreciate the kinds of projects they involve themselves in, the kinds of things they spend money on in our communities? You bet we do. Are we inclined to support them in the future? You can count on it. But as far as agreeing to something, Mr. Speaker, that gives this minister carte blanche to dispense money at will, as he pleases, wherever he pleases, anytime in the future — that offends against the very principle of democracy, against the very principle of representation and elections that we cherish in this province, and we're going to seek amendments to this Bill.

I hope the hon. minister follows the example of some of his colleagues — you know, not too far to the left of him there — that seem to be able to listen to reason and accept some of our amendments, because we want to help make a better Bill, something that will provide these worthwhile foundations with some reliable funding. There's a number of projects I can refer to that show these groups are doing worthwhile work in the community, and we want them to be able to continue to do that. But they're not named, they're not spelled out in the Bill; they're not spelled out in the amendments to the Bill, Mr. Speaker, and it's left totally up to the discretion of a single person. I think that's without precedent in our system, and I hope we don't establish that precedent.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. A call for the question.

Hon. minister.

The Member for Edmonton-Beverly. And the Chair must at this point refer to *Erskine May*, that relevance in debate also does apply to the irrelevance and tedious repetition of the same arguments being brought forward time and time again by members in the House.

ANHON. MEMBER: What?

MR. SPEAKER: So some due care -- and in spite of the "What?" as heard by the Chair. Perhaps the hon. member would like to look at page 444 of *Erskine May*.

Edmonton-Beverly, please.

MR. EWASIUK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again, a pleasure for me to make a few brief comments relative to this Bill 10, and as has already been mentioned. However, I think lotteries in themselves, in my opinion, are nothing more than a sort of preying on individuals, and it's also another form of taxation, primarily on the average Albertan.

The real problem, I think, in this particular Bill, as has been alluded to, is the fact that it seems to be nothing more than a slush fund for the government, to be used when it feels appropriate. The Deputy Premier said that this is not government funds. And again I think, and my colleague for Vegreville alluded to the fact, that there have been many examples where this fund has been used as if it is government funding. I think the notion that the minister takes unto himself the fact that he can allocate funding if and when he wishes is totally inappropriate and certainly does not meet the principle under which this provincial Legislature functions.

I thought I'd also want to just -- maybe it's somewhat different from the other arguments. There are other groups and organizations in this province -- I guess specifically the city at present -- who also would like to have funding and make the funding raised from gambling available to them. Yet this government has procrastinated continually in making a decision. I'm speaking, of course, on the application from the Edmonton casino association, which represents over 400,000 individuals, 170 organizations, who really also are basically volunteers who want to be able to serve their community, again primarily because of the lack of funding made available to them from other sources. This seems to be the accepted mode these days. As much as I don't like it, I think it seems to be the direction most people are going. And yet this government through an agency, the Alberta Gaming Commission, who on the one hand says, "No, we can't make a decision; it's going to have to be the decision of the government, of the cabinet," and when we speak to the cabinet, of course the cabinet says, "No, it's not our decision; it's the decision of the gambling commission." Here we have 400,000 people waiting for a decision which has taken over two years to make, with nothing in sight that the decision will be made. Here we have a case of a minister taking it totally upon himself: no need of a cabinet decision; doesn't need any commission to make a decision. He is going to determine how funding from gambling in this province is allocated.

[Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair]

Again, I think the members have eloquently alluded to the principles involved here, that the practice as being suggested by this particular minister in this amendment is simply not acceptable, certainly to this House. And I would assume that it's cer-

tainly not acceptable to the people of this province, when one individual can assume unto himself the kind of authority to allocate funds, to spend money without any recourse, any rationalization or discussion prior to making those kinds of decisions of this Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, I re-emphasize the difference that is being done here, where this minister is going to allocate funds wherever he wishes; on the other hand, individuals who have made a commitment to their community, who'll want to continue to help their community, are not permitted -- certainly by the tactics of this government to even permit them the opportunity to get into the casino operations so they can raise funds and help their communities.

Mr. Speaker, the proposed amendment is wrong. It should be defeated. We hope, as has been alluded by other members, that the government members pay heed to the debate that's taking place tonight so we can indeed defeat this Bill. In fact, hopefully, someone will bring an amendment forward that will address this issue in a much more professional manner, so that the money raised by Albertans will be appropriately expended for Albertans as well.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hon. Member for Edmonton-Avonmore.

MS LAING: Mr. Speaker, thank you. I rise to speak against this Bill also. Many other members have made strong, articulate arguments against this Bill, and I would like to add my voice to theirs in speaking against what I see as arbitrary spending that would accrue to this minister. We cannot give a minister absolute authority to the spending of funds. It defies our sense of democracy. The government is here to answer to the people of this province, and this Bill circumvents such a process. It gives an undue amount of authority to one minister to spend as he shall see fit, and it allows that there will be no public debate or scrutiny of the spending.

We value the organizations that serve the people of this province in many ways, and we want to ensure that they shall be fairly treated in the spending and allocation of these funds. We do not want to see these funds given out willy-nilly at the whim of the minister, as seems to be happening now, and certainly the Auditor General raised some concern about that in respect to the dispensation of these funds.

The lottery funds are the moneys of Albertans that in many cases have been spent in hopes of bettering their own place in the world. Certainly we know from experience that in times of economic downturn, when people feel hopeless and filled with despair, greater amounts of money are spent on gaming and at lotteries. In addition, many people value the services that are provided by these charitable organizations, and therefore their needs and wishes need to be heard. We need to bring their views to bear through this Legislature.

So I would say, Mr. Speaker, that we live in a democracy, and a democratic system requires that the voice of the people shall be heard through its elected representatives -- if not through all the members of the Legislature, which is what we would hope, at least through the members of the government and through discussion within their caucus.

I would therefore move an amendment to this Bill. The amendment says:

Bill 10, Interprovincial Lottery Amendment Act, 1988, be not now read a second time but that it be read a second time this day six months hence.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. Perhaps the pages could bring the amendment to the Table, the Government House Leader, and each member of the House.

The amendment is in order.

Speaking to the amendment, hon. Member for Edmonton-Strathcona.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Speaker, this is one of the few ways, as I'm sure most of us know, that we can make known at second reading a strong objection — or any objection, I suppose — to the principle of the Bill.

I won't reiterate what has been gone over as to the reasons for thinking it a bad Bill, but I ask hon. members on all sides of the House — those on the opposition side need no persuading; those on the government side do, it seems — to reconsider in all seriousness the wording of section 6 of the Bill, which contains the nub of it, and that within the next six months perhaps cooler heads will prevail and that section be removed. That's all it needs, Mr. Speaker: to remove the section so that the money will fall into general revenue and will go through the estimates, just the same as money that was produced from the sale of liquor or from the pari-mutuel or any other way that is not imposed by a tax but which is government revenue.

I mean, if voluntariness is the test, Mr. Speaker, you might as well say you don't have to import goods; therefore, customs duties can be expended by the minister in charge of customs at the federal level, and so on. It is the lamest reason to say, as the minister did, that he promises the money will be spent on good objects. Dictators always say that — that they can be trusted to spend the money of the nation well — and that is a dictatorial attitude that has no place in a parliamentary democracy.

This is the way of dealing with the Bill properly and responsibly at this stage, and I urge all hon. members to support the motion.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. Perhaps before we proceed, hon. members of the House may be interested in the fact that the Oilers were victorious over Detroit tonight.

Hon. Member for Edmonton-Highlands, speaking to the amendment

MS BARRETT: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to support this amendment to hoist Bill 10 as well. I'm sure all members of the New Democrat caucus in the Alberta Legislature agree with the position as articulated by several of our members tonight [interjection] Ed, you're causing competition.

In question, Mr. Speaker, is not the current recipients of the funds as distributed by the government. The question is the method for determining that distribution: wholly undemocratic, wholly indicative of a government that has gone scared, of a government that is now drawing up the bridge to make sure that the moat is impassable, a government that has no faith in the ordinary people of Alberta and no faith in the ultimate democratic process, a process established hundreds of years ago, hard fought for; lots of lives were lost.

I remind you, Mr. Speaker, that the distance between the government benches and the opposition benches from this direction...

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hon. member, the Chair appreciates the arguments. However, under *Beauchesne* 299 -- and I would suggest the hon. member read it -- would the hon. member please address the amendment before us: the reasons for the

six-month hoist.

MS BARRETT: The reasons for the hoist, Mr. Speaker, are to keep the opposition and the government MLAs at least two sword lengths apart from each other, as is the tradition in parliamentary democracy.

I can't tell you how fundamentally we are opposed to this Bill, Mr. Speaker. As I want to reiterate, it is not our objection that X, Y, or Z people or organizations are recipients of the funds; it is our objection that this government has no faith in the democratic process and has obviously no intention of coming to the Legislature for approval of expenditure as they should. Amen.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hon. Member for Edmonton-Glengarry.

MR. YOUNIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to support this motion to hoist as well. I think the argument has been well made about the lack of principle in the Bill itself. I think the basic lack is the lack of public input and the lack of the public's chance to be made aware of what expenditures government plans, that they will never have the chance to hear those expenditures debated in the Legislature that they helped to elect, that they will never see what the opposition's point of view on those expenditures is, so they can compare points of view.

The purpose of the hoist is to at least give the public of Alberta six months to find out what's in this Bill, to voice their opinion, and to let an arrogant government that doesn't trust them know that it's going to cost them, that they had better change that Bill, that they'd better make it a Bill with some principles and some respect for democracy. Because if they don't do so, they will suffer the penalty that comes to all arrogant governments that lose touch with people: they will be turfed out.

I think the public has a right to hear those expenditures debated. I think the public has a right to six months to voice their opinion about a government's attempt to run away with their right to hear those expenditures debated. I think it's very important that this Legislature allow the public that six months for, as was said, cooler heads to prevail, and to have some principle brought back into what is essentially a Bill without principle.

Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hon. Member for Calgary-Buffalo.

MR. CHUMIR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In my experience in this House I have seen two ways in which an opposition can reverse a government course of conduct. The first method is that of public pressure on a government. I must say that in the short term I perceive that the government is probably safe on this score. What appears to be a small bite out of the democratic process is not the kind of issue that will likely lead the public going to the barricades on this matter at this time. In the longer haul there may be a different result, but you're not likely to see public pressure at this stage.

The second methodology is the power of debate and common sense. And I believe the government has heard here what is the most forcible volley of arguments I've heard in my two years in the Legislature, arguments based on the fundamental principles of our system of government. I note that the government has been listening with unusual attention to this matter. I hope they are comprehending. I believe there are ways in which

this matter of lottery funds can come before the House in a manner consistent with the demands and needs of the democratic process and yet accomplish any reasonable goals of this government. This particular piece of business does not do it, and I hope the government has the wisdom to recognize the very major error of their ways in this odious piece of work.

Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hon. Member for Edmonton-Belmont

MR. SIGURDSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, too, want to support this motion to hoist for a period of six months. I noticed today on the television news when they came to the weather report that the temperature was about 19 degrees. Well, in November, six months hence, it will be much, much colder and a lot cooler. Perhaps then the government would consider this legislation at that time, because it really ought not to be considered at this time. This is an antidemocratic Bill. It's an anti-parliamentarian Bill. It's just deplorable that it should have ever been introduced in this Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, I go back to the March 21 press release made by this minister, the Minister of Career Development and Employment, wherein he announced that \$113.7 million in lottery funding would be disbursed to a number of very worthwhile groups. I go through page 7 of the government estimates for '88-89, and I see that the Premier's Commission on Future Health Care for Albertans has but \$1.95 million; for the Premier's Council on the Status of Persons with Disabilities, \$678,000 -- not an awful lot of money. Both groups doing very good work. The Department of Labour, \$26 million, but for personnel administration another \$9 million. A heck of a lot less in these departments than what the minister is going to be able to control out of his office and his office alone. That's what's important about this Bill, that's what's odious about this Bill: that the minister and perhaps one or two of his close confidants will be able to sit in the back rooms and determine which groups in which constituencies led by which members of those groups are going to receive certain funds that will never, ever come before this Legislative Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, we from all 83 constituencies were to come to this Assembly to debate legislation and to go through the estimates of this government. Here we have a minister of the Crown that says he's going to have a slush fund, a fund where he'll be able to send out money at any time at his whim alone. No debate; no consideration by this Assembly: nothing at all other than the minister sitting back with perhaps a few invited guests in his office or in the Executive Council rooms to determine who gets what. And no responsibility to this Assembly -- none whatsoever. This isn't the minister's money. It is not Executive Council's money. It is not the money that comes out of the coffers of the Progressive Conservative Party, although I'm sure that a number of members of the Progressive Conservative Party happen to buy lottery tickets. But they, too, would be offended to learn that this minister is not going to bring that money before the House.

Mr. Speaker, this Bill is shameful -- shameful. It ought to be withdrawn completely, but having seen the responses of the government tonight, we know that it won't be. It will be rammed through this House. Therefore, we propose that the Bill be hoisted for a period of six months so that we can consider it after Albertans have had some input into this particular piece of legislation that ought to be flushed away.

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

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of the amendment put forward by the Member for Edmonton-Avonmore. Now, having heard all our arguments this evening -- well, some of our arguments this evening -- at first blush members opposite might wonder if we feel that the present situation is so bad, why would we want to see anything go on for another six months? Certainly by proposing such an amendment we in a sense are saying that the present process would be allowed to go on for another six months. Well, I'd much rather the government got it right and let the situation go on for another six months than to allow this Bill, which is so completely wrong, to go through and be a permanent piece of legislation in this province for many, many years to come.

AN HON. MEMBER: No, just two.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Well, that's right. It's certainly at least until the next election, which may be a little sooner than that.

I'd really like to know seriously: how seriously was this particular piece of legislation considered? I mean, I get a feeling, just given that the minister himself spoke very briefly this afternoon in introducing the Bill -- the only other member from the government side who seemed to have any idea at all about what is going on or is in any position to speak at all was the Deputy Premier, and he hadn't intended to speak in any event. He was simply prompted by the comments and debate that he's heard in the Legislature this evening. So if there's such a lack on the part of the government members to debate this Bill, perhaps it's because they've never even considered or thought seriously about what is in this legislation. They've not really had the opportunity to go through it and see what's at stake here.

I get the feeling, because of the lack of participation from the government side, that what likely happened was that the minister arrived one day in cabinet and said: "Hey, I think this is the way we're going to deal with this particular problem, this pesky problem of the Auditor General. You know, we're getting a bit of bad press out of this. We'll just do what the Auditor General said in one of his two recommendations, and this thing will just slide through and that'll be that." They probably said, "Oh, okay; if we've done it for 14 years and you think it's okay and you're bringing it to us, well, go ahead," without really debating or thinking through the implications of this thing. I mean, if something has gone on for 14 years -- it was never seriously considered 14 years ago; it just sort of happened to evolve. A former cabinet minister had money that he had to give out, and this practice has just grown up over the years. Well, maybe nobody over there has ever seriously considered this practice and what its real implications are. So when this Bill was brought forward to cabinet they said: "Okay. Well, that's fine. Go ahead."

But now that it's been debated, Mr. Speaker, perhaps they can see the difficulties that we're talking about and why we feel so strongly about it. For all I know, our comments may have touched a responsive chord over there. You know, I'm not one of those who believes that government members are beyond reason or appeal from the arguments of the opposition. We've seen some things that they've done in the past as a result of our arguments in this Legislature, so perhaps six months would give them the time they need to have a good look at it and to rethink

their process, their procedures, and their policy on this matter. In six months what could the government do? They could perhaps reconsider some of their priorities. Some arguments have been made tonight about the priorities that have been found in the way the funds are designated, but I'm not so concerned about that. What I'm more concerned about are all the unexpended dollars that the minister has available to him under this legislation. My quarrel, as I've said earlier, is not so much with where the money is going but all this other money that he's got at his disposal. Where are those priorities? Where are those moneys going to go? What areas are they going to be emphasizing or could they emphasize? The six-month time period in order to rethink those priorities, Mr. Speaker, I think would be advantageous to the government.

Now, the Deputy Premier in his brief comments mentioned -- and I don't have the exact words in front of me or the preliminary *Hansard* transcript. All I have is my memory, and what I heard him saying was something to the effect of. . .

MR. ORMAN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I'm sorry; I was out. . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Point of order, Minister of Career Development and Employment.

MR. ORMAN: Are we speaking to the amendment or speaking to second reading of the Bill? I'm a little confused by the hon. member's comments. Maybe you could clarify it for me.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is an amendment before the House.

Hon. Member for Calgary-Mountain View.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was hoping to convince the Minister of Career Development and Employment about the merits of waiting another six months. In the time that the six months would elapse, there are a number of things that could take place that I think would be advantageous to the government, to the Bill, and to the people of Alberta. My point was, in referring to a comment made in his speech earlier by the Deputy Premier, that he made some comment about how volunteer agencies are being designated as recipients of lottery funds. Now, as I said, at one time that certainly had been the practice, but that's not what's in the legislation. It's clear that that's not in the legislation. There's no reference made to any foundation, private or public. There's no reference made to any voluntary agency or anything like that. There's no reference whatsoever, so if this is the intention, if the true intention of the government is as mentioned by the Deputy Premier, then obviously a six-month time period would allow the government to go back, consider how those organizations could be named in this legislation, how they could be added or incorporated into the sections of where funds are designated. Now, I hope that comment helps the minister with his confusion. I hope that clarifies where I am in the discussion of this particular item in front of us.

As well, Mr. Speaker, six months would allow this government and its members to reconsider the whole process. First of all, the entire caucus could have a go at it now that they've heard the arguments from the opposition. In light of that, they could go back and take a look at these clauses in the Bill. Six months would allow them to do that. And I would remind all hon. members in the Legislature of the wisdom of that kind of

delay, because without an amendment, but in their own way, this government did the same thing with Bill 59, the School Act. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, at the dying hours, the closing hours of the session a year ago -- in fact, I believe it was the last day of the session -- only then was the School Act, Bill 59, tabled in this Legislature. We adjourned until the fall, but even then that Bill was not proceeded with. What was the government able to do in that time period? They were able to get that Bill out into the public, amongst those who have a stake in the education system of our province. And what did they find? They found that there were a lot of very serious flaws. They started out with good intentions. I presume that they had certain objectives which they felt were in the best interests of the province when it came to its educational system, but when they actually got the people out there who are delivering that service, they found that there were a lot of problems which they hadn't anticipated.

Now, the same with this piece of legislation, Mr. Speaker. When the public out there realizes what is being asked for, particularly in clause 6, by this minister and the government, they may well have the same reaction to this Bill that they had to Bill 59, in which they expressed their concerns, their reservations, their criticisms. As a result of that, the minister, in this case the Minister of Education, listened to that concern, listened to that criticism, and brought back a very much improved piece of legislation. I would like to think that the Minister of Career Development and Employment listens as much as the Minister of Education listened, but I don't know. That may be, again, wishful thinking on my part.

The problem, Mr. Speaker, is that this Bill is being proceeded with today. The public hasn't had any chance to review it. We haven't had any kind of time to get it out to those in the community, the province of Alberta, that might have a stake in this or might feel strongly about it. It's proceeding with it on the first day that Bills are being given second reading in this session. So comparatively, it's being rushed through the process, and there hasn't been the opportunity for sober second thought. So I'm saying to the minister and all hon. members that a six-month review of this would help them get the public input. I know that if the public had that opportunity, the kinds of criticisms they would raise would change this government's mind. I'd much rather have them realize their error before they make legislation than for them to realize or be forced to realize their mistake after legislation has been passed and it's too late.

Mr. Speaker, they could also consider other alternatives in that six-month process. The minister has said that he wanted to preserve the integrity of the lottery funds. He doesn't want them to be lost in the whole pot of the General Revenue Fund. Well, six months would give him and his attorneys in his department, the lawyers who draft these pieces of legislation, lots of opportunity to consider ways in which the integrity of that fund could be maintained, while at the same time there could be put in place a means of ensuring accountability to the Legislature. They might look, for example, as pointed out earlier by the Member for Edmonton-Strathcona, at the way that the vote is brought forward under the Solicitor General's department for the Alberta Racing Commission. It's one way; it's only one alternative. There may be many others out there that could be considered that would respond to the concerns we've raised yet also maintain the objectives which the minister wants to achieve for the fund.

Now, the Deputy Premier didn't seem to understand the similarity between the lottery funds and a grant to the Alberta

Racing Commission. So perhaps in the six months the Deputy Premier could find some time to study the situation as it affects vote 5 in the Solicitor General's department and how that funding is provided to that Racing Commission and the way these lottery funds are administered. He also mentioned that he couldn't understand our language, the words we were using, "immoral" being one of them that he was offended by. Well, perhaps he could take that six months and go bone up on his history books and understand some of the democratic process that we're hoping to protect in this province in our debate. Six months might allow him to do that.

In six months they could also -- again, I'm trying to be positive, Mr. Speaker: all the things that the government could do in six months. One thing they could do is go out and determine who it is in Alberta that's buying lottery tickets. One of the concerns that has been raised here earlier this evening is that it's people from lower incomes who are particularly vulnerable to the appeal or the advertising that government carries out for lottery funds. Well, maybe in that time a study could be undertaken, and they could rethink their advertising policy. Perhaps in that time period they could understand a little bit better their policy of how much they really do want to stimulate that particular demand, because it may be that it's creating quite a bit of hardship amongst ordinary families or lower income families in this province.

Mr. Speaker, in those six months there are lots of things that this government could do. I think it would be in the interests of this government, in the interests of better legislation, in the interests of the process we are entrusted to uphold in this place as members of this Assembly to give this Bill another chance. But not today, not tomorrow, not this week or next week or next month, but to give it the kind of chance it needs. We want to see good legislation. We want to see the minister do it right. We want to see him do the right process, to have the right priorities to uphold the principles of this House, and six months, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, is what it would take in order to do that.

So I would certainly hope that all members of the Assembly, in hearing the debate on this amendment, would be persuaded that the six-month time period would allow for cooler heads to prevail, would allow for a sober second thought. We don't have a Senate here, and heaven forbid, I wouldn't want one. But in the absence of that second body of review, that second Chamber of review, this kind of an amendment is the only process that we have available to us to ensure that that kind of reflection takes place, and I would certainly hope that this House would accept this amendment.

Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Minister of Career Development and Employment.

MR. ORMAN: Just briefly, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Speaking to the amendment.

MR. ORMAN: Speaking to the amendment, I would urge all members to vote against the amendment. May I say that I don't pretend to be able to clear up all of the confusion in the mind of the Member for Calgary-Mountain View, but I want to clear up a little bit of the confusion in the limited time we have here in this session.

First, Mr. Speaker, is to say that we as a government and we

as a caucus, before we bring legislation to this Assembly, it goes through a number of processes, at least one time through caucus. We all have all the time we need to discuss the legislation, and this legislation is no exception. So for the hon. member to suggest that our government's caucus did not have the opportunity to discuss Bill 10 is in fact not true, and I didn't want him to go away today labouring under that misconception.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, he likens this Bill to the labour Act and to the School Act, that it should be put out for public comment. We're not changing anything. We're just confirming in legislation what's been going on since we've been in the business of lotteries, for 14 years. So it's not a matter as though there's some major policy change with regard to Bill 10 that should raise some concerns by the communities at large.

Mr. Speaker, to conclude, it's good enough for Manitoba to handle the lotteries funds in this manner; I'm sure it's good enough for Alberta to handle in this manner. I hope it's not the reason why Manitoba got thrown out of office; I don't think it is. I can assure the hon. members that the way in which we handle lotteries in Alberta is the same way they handle it in Manitoba and in a lot of the other provinces in this Canada.

So in conclusion, I'd like to urge all hon. members to vote against the amendment proposed by the NDP.

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

MR. McEACHERN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm glad to see that somebody on the government side finally got up and at least had something to say on this Bill. I guess the hon. minister sort of implies that he has the caucus with him, that he consulted them. I can't quite believe that all of them sat back and let him get away with introducing such legislation.

As to bragging about the fact that it's been going on for 14 years, it's not something you should be bragging about or proud of. It's something you should be ashamed of: to do something as ridiculous as what you've been doing with it, and then to turn around and make it legal. It's a bit like what this government did with Bill 110, Mr. Speaker. It's making the unacceptable legal, which I find totally ridiculous.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment is really meant to save this government from a lot of embarrassment. Why any government would want to put this legislation on the books, I can't understand. So if they would just take our advice, which is given in all good faith, and back off for a few months and talk to a few people out there in the real world and ask some of these people who are getting these lottery moneys and who aren't quite sure whether they'll get it next year or not unless they promise to vote Conservative in the next election and all of those kinds of various issues, that we raised earlier. . . . Mr. Speaker, I don't understand why the minister doesn't take us up on the offer and back off a little bit and take a little time to think about it and see whether or not we're going in the right direction.

I mean, even the Treasurer doesn't like this Bill. The Treasurer knows in his heart of hearts, although he often doesn't admit it when you talk about the heritage trust fund and some of those other things I mentioned earlier, that this is the place where you're supposed to make the decisions about the spending of the money in this province. The Treasurer knows, so that's why he said he doesn't like this Bill. He's quite right. Of the two choices given by the Auditor General, one is acceptable and the other one is not. This minister chooses to take the unacceptable solution. The Legislature is supposed to be able to ex-

ercise the power of the purse, and unless you back off and think about that for a while and come back with that kind of solution, then there is no reason in the world why this Assembly should accept the solution you're proposing.

In case people think this is all incidental money, this \$113 million, for instance, that they passed out a short time ago, all you need to do is look at the budget and realize that the whole Department of Economic Development and Trade is only going to spend \$38.8 million. The whole Department of Economic Development and Trade is going to spend less money than this minister is going to spend out of his pocket, just on his own say-so, on whatever whim he might choose to decide who will get the money. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Energy is only going to spend \$44 million; the Department of the Environment, \$85 million: less again than this minister is going to decide to spend by himself. The same for the Department of Labour, some \$26 million; Recreation and Parks, \$86 million; Tourism, \$33 million. I'm sure I could find other departments that are going to spend less money than this minister is going to spend with no legislative accountability whatsoever.

Mr. Speaker, we're trying to do him a favour. He really should take this amendment seriously, spend a little time thinking about it, go out and talk to some other people out there, and see if we aren't right. There's nobody in here who has stood up to say that we're wrong except the Deputy Premier and the minister himself. Nobody else in here has had the courage to stand up and put themselves on the line and say: "This is a good Bill. This is the way it should be done. Everything's up front and proper."

AN HON. MEMBER: We'll do it by a vote.

MR. McEACHERN: Yes, that's right. You'll do it by a vote, the same way that you handled a lot of the things in the heritage trust fund. Proposals that we put forward you sit totally silent on because you're afraid to say that they're not good ideas, and then you just vote it down in silence. That's exactly the way this government has been operating in a number of areas. You people, you backbenchers, had better start taking a second look at where this cabinet is leading you, because they're going to lead you into a lot of defeats in the next election if you carry on in this manner.

Mr. Speaker, this minister should back off for the six months that this amendment would allow him to. It would let the minister take this to the public. It would let him get back to this Legislature with a renewed vision, and I'm sure he won't bring this particular Bill back in again. I'm sure he'll bring something else, different, that does not say, as section 6 does, that

the Minister may pay money from the Fund for purposes related to the support of initiatives related to recreation or culture or for any other purpose the Minister considers to be in the public interest.

I suppose he would consider it in the public interest if he were to give money to somebody as long as they promised to vote for you. I mean, is that the kind of thing that we're allowing by that legislation? Well, of course it is, and it's totally unacceptable.

My colleague from Calgary-Mountain View raised an idea that I wanted to elaborate a little bit on. He talked about how Bill 59 was brought forward and then the government had to back off and wait another whole year before they could get out some of the kinks that were in it and some of the things that should not have been there. The same with Bill 60 last year; not to say that with Bill 60, when they replaced it with Bills 21 and

22, they've got it right yet. Nonetheless, the government should think about its process, the process of taking time to put ideas before the public, to have the public consider them, to give them some feedback, and then bring in the Bills. The federal government does it all the time. The federal government puts its Bills before all-parliamentary committees who hold public hearings, and then they decide the final form as a committee. Of course, the government has a majority on the committee and can still in the final analysis bring what they want before the House. But at least they've had a lot of that input already, and a lot of the democratic process has taken place before the Bill gets to the Legislature.

This Bill was ill conceived, ill thought out, and brought in too hastily. It's just the sort of cheap solution of the two alternatives offered by the Auditor General to try to get themselves off the hook instead of taking the right alternative, the one that restores the power of the purse back to this Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, the only time I can remember that this government put out a Bill to the public to have a look at before they decided to bring it in to the Assembly -- and it's happening in this session. Probably half of you didn't realize it, but I think it was an accident. The Treasurer or somebody in his department accidentally released the amendments to the Credit Union Act, and the Treasurer was quite startled and surprised when somebody started asking him questions about it, because he hadn't realized that it had been released. So the next day he called a press conference and told everybody about it because it was a little too late then.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hon. member, we're a long way from the substance of the amendment. Please come back to the amendment before the House.

MR. McEACHERN: Okay. But with all due respect, I'm talking about the process of putting an idea out to the public and letting them have a look at it, and that's what this six-month time lag that we're suggesting would do for this Bill. I was drawing the analogy that the Treasurer has in fact done that with the Credit Union Act; whether by accident or not, we're not quite clear. But at least there are people out there reading it and concerned and asking questions about it, and we will then be able to critique that Bill and decide whether it's a good one or not in a way that we've not been able to do with any other Bill when it came into this Assembly, because we never see them until the government presents us with a fait accompli, as they have in this case.

So it seems to me that the government should learn from other Legislatures how the democratic process works, how you can have all-parliamentary committees, how you can have time to bring in good legislation that has already been tested with the public and with those people who are interested and concerned, instead of just coming up with something that's what they think they want and what will be most convenient for them and cause the least problems. They won't have to be accountable to anybody: this is the way we're going to do it, and bang; we've got 61 seats out of 83, so that's what it's going to be. And then sit there, and nobody has the courage to stand up and defend the Bill. I mean, that's very obvious. We've had two speakers who've spoken very weakly on the Bill, one might say. So it seems to me that if you don't have the courage of your convictions, then back off, take it out to the public, find out what should be in that Bill, and then bring it back. If you do that, you will never bring this Bill back. You'll bring back a different

one, I assure you.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

ANHON. MEMBER: [Inaudible] close debate.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Sorry, hon. member. There's no closing debate on an amendment.

Are you ready for the question on the amendment? Those in favour of the amendment as proposed by the hon. Member for Edmonton-Avonmore, please say aye.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The amendment is defeated.

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

[Eight minutes having elapsed, the House divided]

For the motion:

Barrett	Hawkesworth	Sigurdson
Chumir	Laing	Wright
Ewasiuk	McEachern	Younie
Fox		

Against the motion:

Adair	Isley	Payne
Ady	Johnston	Pengelly
Bogle	Jonson	Russell
Brassard	McClellan	Schumacher
Cassin	Mirosh	Shaben
Clegg	Moore, M.	Shrake
Drobot	Moore, R.	Stewart
Elliott	Musgrove	Trynchy
Fischer	Oldring	West
Heron	Orman	Young
Hyland		

Totals: Ayes - 10 Noes - 31

[Motion on amendment lost]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: All those in favour of Bill 10, Interprovincial Lottery Amendment Act, 1988, please say aye.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Opposed, please say no.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Carried.

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

[Eight minutes having elapsed, the House divided]

For the motion:

Adair	Johnston	Payne
Ady	Jonson	Pengelly
Brassard	McClellan	Russell
Cassin	Mirosh	Schumacher
Clegg	Moore, M.	Shaben
Drobot	Moore, R.	Shrake
Elliott	Musgreave	Stewart
Fischer	Musgrove	Trynchy
Heron	Oldring	West
Hyland	Orman	Young
Isley		

Against the motion:

Barrett	Hawkesworth	Sigurdson
Chumir	Laing	Wright
Ewasiuk	McEachern	Younie
Fox		

Totals Ayes - 31 Noes - 10

[Bill 10 read a second time]

[At 10:45 p.m. the House adjourned to Tuesday at 2:30 p.m.]