

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Title: **Thursday, May 12, 1988 8:00 p.m.**

Date: 88/05/12

[The Committee of the Whole met at 8 p.m.]

### head: **GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS** (Committee of the Whole)

[Mr. Gogo in the Chair]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would the Committee of the Whole please come to order. Perhaps, hon. members, before we begin, the Chair could explain to our very special visitors what this evening is all about. The Assembly is in Committee of the Whole to consider, as you well know, the committee stage of a Bill. I think you're all familiar with it. The Bill has received first and second readings. It passed second reading. According to the Chair's recollection, it wasn't quite unanimous in terms of support. It's now come to committee study where members of the entire House can ask questions, make comments, and propose amendments. The Speaker is not allowed in the House at this stage of a Bill. It's dealt with by a member who's elected by all members of the House.

The Bill that's been called by the government tonight is Bill 10, the Interprovincial Lottery Amendment Act, and it's a money Bill. A money Bill is a Bill that can only be presented to the Assembly by a minister of the Crown on authority from Her Honour the Lieutenant Governor under our parliamentary system. The sponsor of the Bill tonight, Bill 10, is the hon. Minister of Career Development and Employment, the Hon. Rick Orman. So perhaps the committee can begin.

#### **Bill 10** **Interprovincial Lottery Amendment Act, 1988**

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. minister, would you care to make introductory comments to the committee stage of your Bill?

MR. ORMAN: I would, Mr. Chairman. Thank you very much. I too would like to welcome our guests in the gallery. It may be, as we go, a little embarrassing for the opposition in front of our guests when I point out some of the contradictions. I guess "hypocrisy" is an unparliamentary word; I won't use that. But I'd like to begin . . . [interjections] Dishonesty? Okay.

I'd like to begin today, Mr. Chairman -- I had a chance to review *Hansard*, and I wanted to look at the hon. members' remarks to Bill 10. I should first thank the hon. Member for Edmonton-Highlands -- she referred to my cleverness, and with all humbleness I accept that compliment -- and the Member for Vegreville, who said that I was level headed. So I really appreciate the comments. As I was reviewing *Hansard*, it was kind of a refreshing experience for me. It's not often they come my way. [interjection] Yeah, two out of 61.

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to begin by first speaking to some of those contradictions, because I think it's important. They talk about maintaining the integrity of this Assembly and maintaining the integrity of the Bills and the Legislature, and certainly you would think that the party, the NDP, would come in with some kind of a coherent and understandable policy with regard to lotteries. I want to proceed to point out that during second

reading there were some very blatant remarks that were made that I think it's important that we go on the record so that we in the government and in fact all of us in Alberta understand where the NDP are coming from.

Firstly, the hon. Member for Calgary-Buffalo in his remarks . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: He's a Liberal.

MR. ORMAN: Yeah, he's a Liberal. It's difficult distinguishing at times, Mr. Chairman, and sometimes I get a little confused. The only way I can tell is that their chairs aren't beside each other. Outside of that it's sometimes very difficult.

But the hon. Member for Calgary-Buffalo pointed out in his remarks a couple of times, Mr. Chairman, that, firstly, he doesn't believe it's necessary to review and decide on each specific grant. Well, I'm very pleased to see the hon. Member for Calgary-Buffalo come around on that front, because obviously that wasn't his case at the outset. I recall members of his party suggesting that lotteries dollars should go into general revenue.

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to move on to his colleague the Member for Edmonton-Gold Bar, who in *Hansard* indicated -- in fact, took an attack on -- the Wild Rose Foundation. I think that's unacceptable. The Wild Rose Foundation is one of the finest foundations we have in this province. They grant to hundreds of bodies, hundreds of organizations, for very worthwhile causes. Her remarks in question period on May 10 on page 936 in *Hansard* indicated that the Wild Rose Foundation lacked in integrity and that in fact they were distributing lotteries moneys through our constituency offices. I find that very offensive. At that time I challenged the hon. member to prove that in fact her charge is correct, and that challenge still stands.

Mr. Chairman, the hon. Member for Edmonton-Highlands in her remarks -- and I must say I did appreciate the hon. member's remarks because she basically has an opinion that is not unlike the government's and pointed out that she wasn't concerned that all of the grants and the decisions on lotteries, the block funding, don't come to the Legislature. I think that's important because that's the view we have, that in fact we should recognize the volunteer organizations that make the decisions. It's really the community that decides where the dollars go. That's really the objective of our policy, that we want to move the dollars back into organizations and allow the hundreds of members of boards of directors from one end of the province to the other to assist in making those decisions. As a matter of fact, the Member for Edmonton-Highlands even suggested that we somehow guarantee a level of funding to those organizations, that somehow we address it in legislation rather than do it on a three-year basis. I'll return to that suggestion because I do not believe that it is appropriate either.

Mr. Chairman, the Member for Edmonton-Belmont also made some remarks that agreed with the recipients of dollars. He took no real exception to the manner in which lotteries dollars are expended and, much like the Member for Edmonton-Highlands, felt that some of them, indeed many of them, were worthwhile causes.

Now we move on, Mr. Chairman, to the Member for Calgary-Mountain View, who in fact . . . His comment was: how could this system possibly work? In his remarks on May 9 on page 918 of *Hansard*:

. . . that no system which does not require accountability for the spending of public money works well.

Well, in fact, Mr. Chairman, he has two of his colleagues who

suggest that it works just fine, basically consistent with the view of this government. He goes on to say that in fact there are probably better organizations out there than the ones that we fund. I find that quite surprising, that he's not talking to the Member for Edmonton-Highlands or the Member for Edmonton-Belmont, because in fact they have agreed with the organizations. As a matter of fact, the Member for Edmonton-Highlands suggested we entrench the funding in legislation. So I think they should have a conversation amongst themselves and possibly work towards a coherent policy.

Mr. Chairman, we move on to the Member for Edmonton-Kingsway. He says that legalizing something like lotteries -- I quote page 922, May 9 *Hansard*:

It's legalizing something that is totally scandalous. This is "totally scandalous," Mr. Chairman; the dollars that are raised through a voluntary tax system to go into worthwhile causes are "totally scandalous." Now, take that in context of what a couple of his other colleagues have said about the manner in which lotteries dollars are expended.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. minister, the Chair is extremely reluctant to interrupt, but the Bill has been passed in principle, and we are now at the committee stage dealing in sections, so we shouldn't really be redebating the second reading of the Bill.

MR. ORMAN: But, Mr. Chairman, I'm having such a good time.

I think it's extremely important in moving into committee study of this Bill that we review the position taken by the opposition. Because how can they in good conscience sit in here and move all over the map, when we want to have a serious, straightforward discussion about a Bill that is very important, Bill 10? I'm just trying to set the stage so that as they move into their comments, Mr. Chairman, we can judge as to whether or not integrity prevails. But let me move . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. minister, the Chair appreciates the comments, but perhaps the comments may be more appropriate in response to comments, questions, or suggested amendments to the Bill. With respect, hon. minister, we have been through second reading and we shouldn't be reliving the second reading.

MR. ORMAN: Okay. Mr. Chairman, would it be possible to then revert to the basic principle of the Bill in terms of the direction that we're going?

MR. CHAIRMAN: We can't revert to a . . . [interjection] Order please. Hon. minister, we cannot revert to another stage of the Bill without unanimous support of the House and . . .

MR. ORMAN: All right. Well, I'll defer to your good judgment, Mr. Chairman, but I certainly do think it is important for all members to review the position of the NDP.

Mr. Chairman, can I just close, then, in saying that I think it's important to respond to some of the comments that came at second reading stage, and certainly the issue of accountability is a very important one. I want to point out that accountability comes in a democracy not totally by what occurs within the walls of this Assembly. For the hon. opposition to suggest that the only way that government is brought to accountability is as a result of bringing all of their policy decisions, all of their programs, to this Assembly for their purview -- Mr. Chairman, every four years, every five years, accountability prevails. If the

people of Alberta do not like the way in which this government has dealt with lotteries dollars - and in fact we're confirming the way we've done it for 14 years - then I'm sure all members of this Assembly will agree that we will suffer as a result of it at the next election.

In fact, Mr. Chairman, I believe that all Albertans do support the direction we've gone in this Bill. With some 1,500 grants in one year, I think the system speaks for itself. The system is not arbitrary, and it is not ad hoc. We consult with all of the organizations on an annual basis. I do not agree that lotteries dollars should be locked into legislation to particular groups. We review and talk about forecasts and talk about take-up, and that's how we determine levels of funding.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would be pleased now to hear the comments of some of the members of the Assembly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Comments, questions, or amendments to Bill 10? The hon. Member for Edmonton-Highlands.

MS BARRETT: Thanks, Mr. Chairman. I'll willingly take the hon. minister up on his offer for comments, questions, and amendments.

Mr. Chairman, first of all, for the instruction of the hon. minister. When we're in committee reading, it's usually wise to refer to section by section of the Bill for debate, and that's the technique by which the minister can address the principles, if he so chooses, and get around the parliamentary rule which calls for specifics to be dealt with in committee reading. Now, I'd like . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: He's a rookie.

MS BARRETT: I know he's a rookie. I should have more sympathy. Rick, I do have sympathy for you.

I particularly have sympathy tonight, Mr. Chairman, because of sections 5, 6, and 7, which are going to be added to the lottery Bill under the provisions allowed under Bill 10, and it's the minister that's going to have to answer for those particular of-fending sections. Let me point out what the problem is with respect to those sections precisely; this I didn't get into a few days ago under second reading of the Bill. The minister will now "hold and administer a fund called the 'Lottery Fund.'" Most ordinary Albertans will call this "the slush fund." It will come to be the minister's albatross, I assure you, over the course of the next few years leading up to the next provincial election. It will not be commonly known as the lottery fund. It occurs to me that the minister might even consider just changing the phrase itself and being honest, telling what it is that he's establishing: the PC slush fund "into which shall be deposited the money received from the conduct, management," et cetera, et cetera, of the money generated from the sale of lottery tickets here in Alberta.

Now, that section might not be so offensive if that slush fund, or which he euphemistically calls the lottery fund, were going to be coming before the Legislative Assembly for scrutiny prior to the expenditure, on an annual basis. Now, Mr. Chairman, you and I know that you can only estimate how you're going to spend your money. My friend the Member for Little Bow was a cabinet minister at one time, and he'll tell you that you can only estimate how you're going to spend your money. That's fair enough. But the fact of the matter is that a responsible government does come to this Assembly to estimate how and where it's going to spend the money. For instance . . .

MR. HERON: Point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. Member for Stony Plain.

MR. HERON: I note the Chair had no reluctance to call the hon. minister to a point of order on the topic. Therefore, I want to point out Standing Order 62 and make the observation that this is probably just a replay of what we went through for three or four hours the other evening and encourage the hon. member to observe section 62 and encourage the Chairman to observe section 62(3): "The Chairman shall maintain order in the committees of the whole Assembly, deciding all questions of order. . ." Clearly, the line of debate is not within Committee of the Whole.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. Member for Vegreville, on this point of order.

MR. FOX: If the Member for Stony Plain would care to involve himself in the debate on these things from time to time, he might find it to be a more productive process, rather than interrupting what we consider the very worthwhile and important comments of the Member for Edmonton-Highlands.

MR. CHAIRMAN: With respect to the point of order I would point out with regard to the committee study Standing Order 77. If a member of the committee wishes to discuss each clause, each section, indeed each word, then that is the rule of our Standing Orders. The Chairman can only enforce the rule of Standing Orders.

Hon. Member for Edmonton-Highlands.

MS BARRETT: I guess you lost that point of order.

Mr. Chairman, I was referring to the section which allows the establishment of the lottery fund. That will add a new section to the Bill, known as section 5. It's referred to in the amending Act as section 6. If the hon. Member for Stony Plain bothered to listen, he'd of course know that that's precisely what the parliamentary rules call for in committee debate, just as I was advising the hon. minister a little while ago. I even went so far as to advise him how to get around the rules when he wanted to talk to the principle of the issue.

My point, Mr. Chairman, was that the lottery fund will come to be known as "the slush fund." Now, this lottery fund, as the minister euphemistically calls it, is not, by provision of this Bill, to come before the Legislative Assembly under the form of budget estimates. I was saying that surely every cabinet minister understands that estimates are only estimates. But what they are able to do and what they occasionally have the political guts to do is come before the Assembly and at least give targets as to where that money is going to go. Often they even know the organizations which will be recipients of public taxpayers' dollars. Sometimes those decisions are not very good. Sometimes the recipients are questionable, and you know, Mr. Chairman, that we've raised those issues with respect to the budget estimates that we just dealt with a few weeks ago, with respect to certain loans and loan guarantees.

But there's no such provision for that in this Bill. The lottery fund will be controlled by the minister. That brings me to the next point, Mr. Chairman. It's in the section that will be added after the current section 4, which will be known as section 6. It says:

The Minister may pay money from the Fund for purposes re-

lated to the support of initiatives related to recreation or culture  
o r . . .

Now this is the important part:

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

Well, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to point out that there are a few cabinet ministers in the government that I think have their heads put on right, and I encourage them on practically a daily basis to come and sit with the caucus that all have their heads put on right. I know that they know how to spend money, but for the most part I can't say that about this government.

Now, one might say: "Well look, you know, governments are subject to change. So, Barrett, would you be willing to live with a rule that said you have to bring 'the slush fund' estimates into the Assembly?" I swear to you, Mr. Chairman, yes, I would. Because fair is fair. If you're aboveboard, then there's no problem. Now, if you mistarget some estimates on some departments that are really big, well, you know, you might come in for a little criticism, but if you're playing the game honestly, you're not going to get your head cut off. We've seen instances of this before, Mr. Chairman.

Here we're not going to have a minister who's got the political guts to come in and tell us where he's dropping \$5,000 here or \$500,000 there. He's not going to have the guts or the authority or the responsibility or the duty to come in and explain to the Assembly how he's spending round about \$100 million a year. Now, he'll run for cover and hide under this argument that "it ain't taxpayers' dollars." That's about a good paraphrase of the minister's quote, I think. It doesn't matter whose dollars they are. If they come to be under the authority and responsibility of the government, then the debate thereon belongs in this Chamber, where 83 people were elected to be the stewards of the Alberta economy and the stewards of money collected by the Alberta government.

What are they going to do, argue that the money that they get whenever they charge fees for land title transfers doesn't belong in the general revenues and the revolving funds? That'd be nonsense. We've got a CA right in the front benches who wouldn't argue that, Mr. Chairman. Even the Treasurer knows he can't argue that. The government is recipient of a lot of money that doesn't come through the tax door. It comes through the fees doors, and those dollars do come under scrutiny of this Assembly. They come under scrutiny after the fact by the Public Accounts Committee, and they come under scrutiny before the expenditure fact in front of this Assembly. Everybody knows that we've argued that 25 days for the general budget estimates is not long enough, but they still have to come before the Assembly.

Now, the minister attempted to make arguments about observations as to the origins of this money. Well, some people are of the view that the sale of lottery tickets in this province has constituted a tax that is, generally speaking, going to be engaged in by the not very well off. The reason is because if they don't have a fairly promising future -- they might be unemployed -- chances are they're going to go out and spend a buck or five bucks of their very limited income, hoping to win the big prize. [interjections]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order in the committee, please.

MS BARRETT: You can't blame them, Mr. Chairman. I mean, if they've lost hope, then maybe they might as well gamble their buck or five bucks and hope for the big payoff.

So that observation held 15 years ago when this was a raging debate in this province, Mr. Chairman. I was part of the debate; I remember it. That doesn't mitigate the position of the New Democrats when we say accountability is the essence of every member of this Assembly and accountability is precisely what is lacking in this Bill. The minister argues that the new sections 5 and 6 will not prevent him from being held accountable because, after all, it's Albertans who are going to be sent out to elect or defeat this government. Well, that's true. But maybe they're not going to know just how it was that as a matter of political convenience any given minister or government backbencher happened to be able to drop a little extra funding into his or her riding because things were looking unstable. Maybe they couldn't win that riding back. Being able to draw up half a million bucks on a particular centre or purchase of an item, a piece of equipment: hey, that makes the person popular again, right? That's known as vote buying. I think that's what's really at heart here.

It's a lot harder for the Alberta government to come into this Assembly and say, "Hey, we're going to draw up all sorts of money in ridings that we think are politically vulnerable, and we're going to leave the rest of the ridings alone." Ultimately, it's true that they're going to make more enemies than friends, because as I think the Member for Clover Bar said a few weeks ago, "Don't you understand, Mr. Minister? Every time you favour the one and ignore the other 99, you've made 99 enemies." That is true. That logic does work in the long run. But in the short run, did everybody get a say on how the money was spent? Did they get to tell their MLA, "Go in the Assembly and argue for a little bit of money for this riding or that endeavour." No, they didn't. That is what is fundamentally flawed about this Bill, Mr. Chairman.

Therefore, I am pleased to sponsor an amendment to this Bill which I am confident the minister will be so happy to support. It will give him the power to spend the money just as he wants, but it will oblige the minister to come into the Assembly to show how he's going to spend that money. Now, I have 83 copies of my amendment. What I'll do, Mr. Chairman, upon your instruction is give them to the page, ask them to be distributed to yourself and every other member in the Assembly. I'll sit and wait a few minutes. I'm quite certain it's in order. And when you give me the instructions, I'll get up and read it into the record and explain the intent of the amendment. Is that fair enough, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. member, the Chair will consider whether the amendment is in order. Perhaps in the interim they can be distributed to hon. Mrs. Cripps, the Government House Leader, and other members of the House, including the leader of the Representative Party.

For the benefit of our guests: when an amendment is proposed -- and there is no limit to the amendments to a Bill at committee stage -- the Chair must consider whether the amendment is in order; that is, not contrary to the principle of the Bill, because the Bill has been adopted in principle. The Table Officers are doing this now and advising the Chair whether or not the amendment is in order, at which time the sponsor of the amendment will then speak to the amendment and the amendment only.

The amendment is in order, hon. Member for Edmonton-Highlands.

MS BARRETT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I felt quite confi-

dent that the amendment would be in order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To the amendment.

MS BARRETT: The amendment I'd like to read in whole for the record, Mr. Chairman. It may help for the people in the gallery as well who don't have benefit of the amendment.

The contentious part of the Bill, as you will recall, referred to the minister having authority over the expenditure of the funds. This amendment says:

... in section 6,

- (1) by striking out proposed section 5 and substituting:
  - 5(1) Money received from the conduct, management and operation of lottery schemes to which this Act applies shall be paid out,
    - (a) in the first instance, for purposes of defraying the costs of administering this Act, and
    - (b) in the second instance, to the General Revenue Fund.
  - (2) For the purposes of subsection (1)(a), the costs of administering this Act include, without limiting the generality of the foregoing,
    - (a) the costs of conducting, managing, and operating lottery schemes payable in respect of any lottery scheme to which this Act applies, and
    - (b) any costs incurred as a result of a license or an agreement, a n d ...

This is the important one:

- (2) by striking out proposed section 6 and substituting
  - 6(1) One of the Votes in the annual Estimates of the department administered by the Minister shall be called "Lottery Funds".
  - (2) The "Lottery Funds" Vote shall
    - (a) be sufficiently detailed to allow the Assembly to consider each and every separate proposal for the disbursement of monies out of the Lottery Fund to a foundation, project, or other person,
    - (b) appropriate monies for the purposes related to the support of initiatives related to recreation or culture, and
    - (c) comprise not less than 75 percent of the monies paid into the General Revenue Fund pursuant to section S.1(1)(b) in the immediately preceding fiscal year.

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to explain how this solves the problem that the minister has put himself into, the pickle he has basically cooked for himself, and at the same time allows the basic intent of his Bill to proceed unimpeded. The minister's determination is to establish a lottery fund. This will allow the establishment of a lottery fund provided that it is embodied in a vote that comes before the Legislative Assembly on an annual basis for scrutiny as to its intent for expenditure. It would also then be subject to the scrutiny of the Public Accounts on an annual basis after that expenditure has occurred.

It assumes that additional money not spent for the purposes of the stated intentions would be rolled back into the revolving account. It gives to the Legislative Assembly its authority under the Legislative Assembly Act for all members of the Assembly to be the stewards of the Alberta public dollars. Now, it's not just tax dollars, Mr. Chairman. It's public dollars, because all the dollars that go through the Treasurer's hands are public dollars. [interjections] All the dollars that go through any minister's hands ...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order in the committee, please. Members may want to hear what's going on.  
Edmonton-Highlands.

MS BARRETT: The member from Calgary doesn't like that. It's probably because it puts the government on the spot, Mr. Chairman. It's going to be tough for them to try to defeat this amendment, I can tell you, because this amendment solves all the problems that everybody has raised with respect to the expenditure of the funds. It makes the government directly accountable. It does not call into question those who hitherto have received funds from the existing lottery foundations.

Now, a few days ago, you will recall, it was discovered, and the minister even acknowledged, that the existing foundations are now going to be directed to channel funds, especially money that just got dropped in their lap, that wasn't predicted or projected, into other foundations. Now, you've already got a whole bunch of foundations. Why do a few of them get designated to channel some money that they get into other foundations? The reason, I propose to you, Mr. Chairman, is to cover up who made the decision as to where that money ultimately needed to go. That was made very clear in question period on Tuesday this week. That sort of thing wouldn't happen if we sponsor this amendment, because the foundations themselves, those currently recipient of the funds, who in turn designate the money to applicants, would be brought up for consideration under budget estimates -- all of the foundations, not just the few that the Culture and Multiculturalism minister wants to highlight for the purposes of what amounts to legal laundering.

It doesn't matter that X, Y, or Z person applies to any given foundation and receives or does not receive funding with respect to general or broad estimates unless a question is raised. So if a member from, oh, any of the government back benches, for instance, knows of somebody who applied to a foundation for sponsorship and was refused or can't get an answer, it's perfectly legitimate under consideration of estimates to come into the Assembly and say: "My constituent, X, Y, or Z, has applied to A, B, or C foundation. Do you know, Mr. Minister or Madam Minister, if they're going to be getting any money?" That's legal. It doesn't oblige the minister to walk in and say, "Oh, by the way, for the entire year the foundation is going to be awarding down to every nickel and dime to the following schedule of people, for the following purposes." He's not obliged to do that. That would be redundant.

Leave it to members to ask questions on specific applications if that's important or, in fact, to ask about the policy orientation hammered out by the government and enforced upon the foundations, as is currently the case. Those are the questions that would be asked. But more importantly, Mr. Chairman, people would be able to ask about the money that wasn't being pushed through the foundations. And remember: there's, you know, \$75 million, \$80 million of it that isn't going through the foundations but is available for expenditure by the government.

So you could ask them in the debate of that particular vote. And I've no doubt that it would be a very popular vote. It'd get a lot of attention, and every member of the Assembly would make sure to be in her or his seat to scrutinize those things, because they wouldn't be generally guided by the principles of a department under which the funding is covered. They would be guided by the ministerial determination.

Well, the minister might have to answer for why it is that he was prepared to give a big lump sum of money to one organization in one part of the province and not to another organization in another part of the province. He might be able to explain and might be asked to explain why it is that the department, whether it's of Transportation and Utilities or Hospitals and Medical Care, wasn't paying sufficient operating funds to the bodies that

it supports by statute such that he was asked to provide extra money out of his lottery fund to come up with, let's say, new equipment or additional operating funds for organizations, usually public organizations, that are controlled by government policy and supported by statutory expenditure.

That would put them on the hot seat, Mr. Chairman. I bet you a million bucks it would. I'll bet you the lottery ticket it would put 'em on the hot seat. He'd have to explain every time one of his cabinet colleagues came through with a deficiency in her or his department estimates, couldn't keep pace with either demand or the promises made at the previous election. Remember, people do keep those in mind. He might have to explain why it is that the lottery funds are being asked to support the ongoing endeavours in Hospitals and Medical Care or Education or Social Services, for battered women's shelters or what have you. That, my friend, would keep the government more accountable than virtually any other amendment that I can conceive of to this Bill and at the same time have the brilliance of not offending the essence or the principle of the Bill. Because if what the minister wanted was what he euphemistically calls a lottery fund, I'm prepared to grant him that in this amendment. I'm just going to make the lottery fund strictly a lottery fund, an accountable lottery fund, and not a PC re-election slush fund.

On that basis I urge every member of the Assembly to support this unusually good, remarkably good amendment to what is otherwise the most seriously flawed Bill this government has tried to introduce since Bill 14 of last year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Minister of Career Development and Employment

MR. ORMAN: Mr. Chairman, yes, I'd like to respond to the amendment. Firstly, I have an admission to make, and I feel a little guilty making that admission, but when we drafted this Bill, we took into account how Manitoba handles it. I'm ashamed of that. I'm ashamed that I would have to look to an NDP province for advice, but I thought it was important that I look at British Columbia, Saskatchewan, and Manitoba to determine the manner in which they handle lotteries dollars. To my surprise, Mr. Chairman, they handle it exactly the way it's handled in this Bill.

Now, I'd like to refer firstly to the accountability issue that she refers to in section 5 and section 6. Firstly, for the last 14 years prior to my taking responsibility for lotteries, the surplus was kept in Manitoba. It was contained in an account held by the Western Canada Lottery Corporation, and it accrued interest. As we requested dollars to be drawn down in Alberta, we phoned the WCLC and asked them to send the dollars to us, to the worthwhile organizations. Mr. Chairman, we're changing that. We're bringing the dollars to Alberta. Now, by doing that, by creating a fund and bringing them to this province, they then become an audit item of the Auditor General, and surprise of all surprises, the allocation of the dollars will show up in public accounts. So to suggest that there's no accountability or that somehow her amendment is going to improve that, I suggest that in fact that's not the case. By bringing those dollars to Alberta it in fact strengthens the accountability, brings it under the purview of the Auditor General in a more deliberate way and allows him to make decisions on the expenditures and report them in public accounts.

Mr. Chairman, I also want to refer to one of the comments that the Member for Edmonton-Highlands made during her discussion of her amendment. That was something with regard to

tax of Albertans, that I've suggested that it's not tax dollars. Well, that is not true, Mr. Chairman. I would agree that regardless of whether or not they're tax dollars, if they come to the hands of government, government is accountable. But that's a voluntary tax. Now, unlike the opposition, who would probably impose a sales tax or a tax at the pumps, this is a tax that is voluntary. People make the choice, the conscious decision as to whether or not they want to participate in the tax. So in that way it's completely voluntary.

Mr. Chairman, the Member for Calgary-Forest Lawn suggested that in fact people shouldn't be allowed to gamble; it's likened to the "collapse of civilization." Well, I submit that I find that a surprising comment when in the same breath he admits that he buys the odd ticket, and he's played the odd game of poker. Now, this hon. gentleman suggests that it's fine for him to gamble, but let's not let Albertans make that individual choice. His suggestion is that he is much more intelligent than Albertans, Mr. Chairman.

MR. PASHAK: Point of order. Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Point of order, hon. Member for Calgary-Forest Lawn.

MR. PASHAK: I don't know whether the gentleman who is speaking now has problems reading, but he certainly couldn't understand what it was I said. I think he's imputing false motives to me. I certainly . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: You said it the other night.

MR. PASHAK: They certainly misinterpreted and misconstrued the remarks I made at that particular . . .

MR. ORMAN: Well, so there's no confusion, let me read into *Hansard* his comment, Mr. Chairman. It's on page 923, May 9, *Hansard*.

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.

Mr. Chairman, he likened the gambling . . . Maybe we could arrange for a copy. He goes on to say that he gambles but Albertans shouldn't have the individual right to gamble.

MR. PASHAK: Point of order. I never said, and he cannot find in the record, any point where I said that Albertans should not have the right to gamble.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, hon. member, and perhaps . . . [interjections] Order, Order please. Let's not get into matters of privilege. If there's a dispute of facts, then perhaps those facts can be resolved between the hon. members. Perhaps, hon. minister, you could continue, bearing in mind the fact that an hon. member has taken some degree of offence to various comments. Hon. minister of career development and manpower.

MR. ORMAN: Mr. Chairman, I just want to again reiterate that in fact Bill 10 strengthens the accountability with regard to lotteries dollars, some accountability that wasn't there in previous years and, in fact, wasn't needed. The use of dollars and the integrity of the use of those dollars was maintained for 14 years in this province. Bill 10 recognizes that we should have the

fund in this province, and the surplus will be invested in Alberta at the discretion of the Provincial Treasurer under the Financial Administration Act.

So with regard to Bill 10 I urge all members to not support the amendment and support the Bill in its entirety. [interjections]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please, in the committee.

Before proceeding, the Chair should advise hon. members with regard to the hockey game this evening. The next game of the Edmonton Oilers is Wednesday evening.

The hon. Member for Calgary-Forest Lawn, on the amendment.

MR. PASHAK: Mr. Chairman, I didn't say that Albertans shouldn't have the right to gamble. With respect to the proposed amendment, I recognize that gambling has become institutionalized in our way of life. I just said that it was really unfortunate that gambling revenues are used to meet important social, economic, cultural purposes, that we have to fall back on a cut from gambling to support those activities. I think that in some general sense it's an immoral way of raising revenue. I recognize that we're doing it; it's institutionalized. I also said that you couldn't turn the clock back. What I was trying to point out on that previous occasion is that when civilizations come to the end of their . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: Tether.

MR. PASHAK: Not to the end of their tether. When civilizations come to the end of their cycle, often that's one of the indications. When sort of a sense of moral purpose is lost and we don't recognize that these things have value in their own right and that they should be raised through some meaningful, objective, and accountable system of taxation, then societies are in trouble. I think this is just one indication that this particular society is in trouble. But with respect to the proposed amendment . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. member, we are dealing with the amendment proposed by Edmonton-Highlands. We've passed the second . . .

MR. PASHAK: Getting back to the amendment, Mr. Chairman. With respect to this amendment . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Chair would deeply appreciate if the hon. member would get back to the amendment

MR. PASHAK: To get back to the amendment, Mr. Chairman, I think that in some respects this amendment does make a compromise, and an acceptable compromise to me with respect to the points I just made, because it does restrict the use of these lottery funds to specific purposes. It restricts them to recreation and cultural purposes, not any other purposes the minister has proposed in his Bill, and it also provides for those funds to be paid into the General Revenue Fund, where they'd be subject to legislative scrutiny. For that reason I think all members should support this amendment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. Member for Edmonton-Kingsway, on the amendment.

MR. McEACHERN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I rise to speak on the amendment. I find it a very good amendment. It hits at the heart of what was the problem with the original Bill 10. The hon. minister, of course, had to get into some extraneous discussions about other things, but I would like to go right to the heart of the matter in terms of the amendment and the contrast with what's in his Bill and show that in fact it makes a lot more sense than his Bill does.

Section 5(1) gives the minister the right to set up a fund separate and distinct from the budgetary process of this province, and that is what is the matter with his Bill. The amendment gets right straight to the point on that, and in section 5(1)(b) -- I won't read the whole thing, because it's been read before, but I will point to where it says, "in the second instance. . ." Okay, I guess I'll have to read some of the preamble to you.

5(1) Money received from the conduct, management and operation of lottery schemes to which this Act applies shall be paid out,

(b) in the second instance, to the General Revenue Fund.

And that's where the lottery fund should go, into the general revenue account so that they can be disbursed from this Assembly after full debate like the majority of the expenditures of this government. I won't say all of them, by a dam sight, because there are a number of other areas, as I pointed out yesterday on Bill 32, that do not come before this Assembly. But that doesn't mean they shouldn't, and it doesn't mean that this money shouldn't either.

So, Mr. Chairman, that is in contrast to section 5(1) of the Bill, which allows the minister to hold a slush fund to do with as he will. He can talk all he likes about how I said it was scandalous that he gives out money to certain projects. That is not what I said. What I said was that the process is scandalous, that you are doing something that was not acceptable in a democracy in terms of handling the funds. And I don't care how they do it in Manitoba or B.C. or anywhere else; it doesn't make it right or wrong because somebody else is doing it. What is right or wrong is what should be done in a parliamentary system of government. In a parliamentary system of government the power of the purse lies in this Assembly, or should lie in this Assembly, if we didn't have a government that was prepared to bypass that process.

So when the minister, as he did a short time ago, hands out some \$51 million to some umbrella organizations and brags about what an increase this was over last year, nobody is saying that those organizations shouldn't have gotten that money, and I want to make that clear. If the organizations are good ones and they deserve some money to work with and the lottery funds are there, then I'm in favour of them getting that money. But I'm not in favour of them getting it before this Assembly has decided they should get it. That is the point, and that is what is scandalous, not that the minister gave the money to those people but that he gave it to them without asking the permission of this Assembly first.

The second aspect of the amendment deals with an important part. One of the things that this government consistently does, Mr. Chairman, is give the ministers carte blanche to hand out money for whatever purpose without indicating any criteria or any guidelines by which they should give them out. And I will point out that this Bill is no exception. Bill 10, section 6 says:

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

That's okay; that's what we thought lottery funds were meant to be for in this province. But it adds:

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

I suppose he would consider it to be in the public interest to get himself re-elected. If he starts spending the money to do that, Mr. Chairman, that is not an acceptable purpose.

So I say to the minister that he should seriously consider the amendment, which says, very specifically, section 6:

(2) The "Lottery Funds" Vote shall

(b) appropriate monies for purposes related to the support of initiatives related to recreation or culture.

It does not say "for any other purpose that the minister might decide to hand out the money." So that is the difference, Mr. Chairman. Those two points are the main differences between the Bill and the amendment, and the amendment lays it out the way it should be laid out to this Assembly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please, Athabasca-Lac La Biche.

MR. McEACHERN: In any case, there are a number of other grants that the minister has made recently, to get down to sort of specific kinds of things. Nobody is saying that the hospital equipment shouldn't have been purchased with his recent hand-out. Nobody is saying that the regional library system shouldn't have gotten some money. Nobody is saying that the community tourism program, which by the way is rather a pale imitation of a suggestion that our members on the heritage trust fund committee made for a northern development tourism fund -- they took a watered-down version of it and put \$30 million into the whole province where we were talking of \$75 million in the northern part of the province. Nobody is saying that those programs aren't a good idea. What I'm saying is that they should not have gotten any money until the minister had the courtesy to bring before this Assembly his proposals and have them debated here as part of the budget. That, Mr. Chairman, is exactly what's wrong with that Bill, and I see no reason why he thinks he should just railroad it through and continue to do something that is not acceptable in a parliamentary democracy.

Mr. Chairman, if the members of this committee could bring themselves to pay attention to what is going on and think a little bit about what is right and wrong with the taxpayers' dollars, then I think you would find that even they would not support the minister. None of them has had the courage to stand up and support the minister in the debate; they all sit silently and do what they're told. We know that the power of the purse is supposed to reside in this Assembly. The minister knows it the Treasurer knows it, and the members of this committee know it, but they don't have the courage to stand up and say so or to vote to change this Bill by passing the amendment and putting the money into the general revenues so that we can disburse those funds after debate, the way they should be done.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Ready for the question on the amendment?  
Hon. Member for Vegreville on the amendment.

MR. FOX: Unaccustomed as I am. Mr. Chairman . . . [interjections] I'm somewhat taken aback by the hon. minister's comments in his opening remarks about the hon. Member for Vegreville having referred to him as level headed. I suppose I wouldn't want to backtrack on that but I must make note of the fact that he does seem to be perhaps a deliberately slow learner. Because we have on a number of occasions in debate on his pre-

clous Bill stood in our places and tried to tell him why we support the initiatives through the lottery foundation but why we're very concerned about changes that are being made to the Act and about the long-term implications of that and how that will, I think, jeopardize the integrity of the very worthwhile foundations and organizations that distribute that lottery revenue. Indeed, my colleague for Edmonton-Highlands has come up with what I think is a very sound, reasoned, and solid amendment. I think the . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: Is your tie too tight? Are you getting enough air?

MR. FOX: I notice that the mouth from the south is getting antsy over there, Mr. Chairman. I hope that . . .

MR. McEACHERN: Mr. Chairman, point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The hon. Member for Edmonton-Kingsway, point of order.

MR. McEACHERN: I'm not sure that point of order is really the right word for it. But really the noise level in here has gotten so incredibly high that it's very hard to hear the speakers, and it's mostly coming from this corner back here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, hon. member.  
Hon. member for Vegreville.

MR. FOX: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I do think it's important to note that the Minister of Career Development and Employment seems unable to attract any support from his own side of the House for this Bill, and indeed there may even be some opposition that is muted for whatever reason. But I certainly don't see Stony Plain or Red Deer-South jumping to the defence of the minister in this regard. Or if they have concerns about the hon. Member for Edmonton-Highlands' amendment, I don't hear them expressing that either.

But I would like to remind hon. members, especially the hon. levelheaded minister, of some of the things that are contained in this very worthwhile amendment, specifically where it says:

6(1) One of the Votes in the annual Estimates of the department administered by the Minister [as defined in the original Bill] shall be called "Lottery Funds."

(2) The "Lottery Funds" Vote shall  
(a) be sufficiently detailed to allow the Assembly to consider each and every separate proposal for the disbursement of monies out of the Lottery Fund to a foundation, project or other person.

Now, Mr. Chairman, that is accountability. That's an essential, worthwhile process that would not in any way impinge on the ability of these worthwhile foundations and institutions to do the important work that they do on behalf of Albertans. In fact, it would enable them to do that. It would allow them the opportunity to have their worthwhile efforts debated in public and considered by this august Assembly, and I think that's very important.

[Mr. R. Moore in the Chair]

This perhaps goes a little further than what we're used to in most budget estimates, because it says that:

The "Lottery Funds" vote shall  
(a) be sufficiently detailed to allow the Assembly

to consider each and every separate proposal . . .

That's quite different from the jumble that the Provincial Treasurer presents us for debate on the estimates, but anyway I think we've got to look at that, Mr. Chairman. You know, that section I think is a very important one, because it's important that we have the opportunity as elected legislators on behalf of the Albertans we represent to look at, question, examine, and, indeed, support the way in which public funds are expended.

For the hon. minister to suggest that we have that opportunity through the public accounts process is, I think, a facetious argument, because he knows well enough, he's been in this Assembly long enough to know that the public accounts does indeed review the expenditures of government money, but it's after the fact. It's after it's all said and done. After the money's spent, about a year later, you get a chance to look at it in a blur and see what may or may not have gone on. That's not the kind of thoughtful review and examination that members in the opposition and government are supposed to be able to provide on the expenditure of funds. We're supposed to be there to examine, in the first instance, how money is proposed to be spent and, indeed, make suggestions about how it ought to be spent.

For the hon. minister and by implication his colleagues to suggest that this means the opposition doesn't support the efforts of the Wild Rose Foundation or the Recreation, Parks and Wildlife Foundation, the various heritage councils and arts foundations or the Alberta Sport Council or, indeed, money given to regional library projects or the community tourism action plans is absolutely ludicrous. We do support those initiatives, and we want the chance to be able to examine those year after year and restate our commitment and support to those worthwhile organizations.

I might point out, Mr. Chairman, to hon. members -- who on the government side of the benches I'm sure haven't even taken the time to read this amendment, because they probably put it where they put every other good idea from the opposition, in that little wastebasket under here -- section (c). Section (c) contains some protection that doesn't currently exist for those worthwhile foundations by saying that:

The "Lottery Funds" Vote shall  
(c) comprise not less than 75 percent of the monies paid into the General Revenue Fund pursuant to [the section] in the immediately preceding fiscal year.

I fail to see the humour in that section there, hon. Minister of Community and Occupational Health, but I appreciate your sense of merriment.

This is, I think, an important section in the amendment because it does propose that the minister, in his capricious and off-handed way, won't be able to jeopardize the existence and worthwhile operations of these important organizations by underfunding them in any given year. If the Conservative government, however long they may be in power, decides to spend taxpayers' money like drunken sailors -- and we all know it's their policy to spend, spend, spend -- if they decide to do that again just prior to an election and sink the province even deeper into a deficit situation than they already have, they may want to look at cutting the legs out from underneath some of these worthwhile foundations. We want to put in place some regulations that make sure they can't do that by ensuring that the funds allocated to the lottery funds vote shall comprise not less than 75 percent of the previous year. That's a guarantee that these organizations that have come to depend on lottery revenues to do their important work in the communities for a variety of other worthwhile organizations will not have their efforts jeop-

ardized or undermined by a capricious, mean-spirited government that has shown very clearly their inclination to underfund cultural, recreation, sports, and tourism activities by their budget estimates over the past two years in this Assembly. This is something the hon. Member for Chinook will have a chance to catch up with when she sees what this government's done to CRC funds and a variety of other things -- just cutting them to the bare bones, hon. member, and we want to make sure they're not able to do that.

So I do encourage the hon. members to consider these amendments very seriously. It's not going to tarnish the reputation of the hon. levelheaded minister. It's going to give him the kind of tools he needs to make sure his funding base, the revenue allocated to his department for his control, is not undermined by the kinds of squabbles that perhaps go on within cabinet in terms of how moneys ought to be spent. We're supporting you, hon. minister. We want to be able to help you continue to do a good and even better job on behalf of the worthwhile foundations and the Albertans they help. I believe this amendment is going to help you do that, and I encourage you and the members on your side of the bench . . . [some applause] Thank you, Calgary-Shaw. I'm sure there's a supporter there. I notice the Provincial Treasurer has expressed opinions that are similar to ours. I hope he stands up and adds his voice to ours. I thank you for your attention there.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Member for Edmonton-Glengarry.

MR. YOUNIE: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I would like to express a word of thanks to the Member for Edmonton-Highlands for this amendment, in that what it does is try to take a Bill that epitomizes misused power, epitomizes all attempts of governments to avoid the whole democratic process, and epitomizes self-interest and tries to bring a little bit of accountability to it, tries to bring to a very large extent a little bit of common sense to a Bill that should otherwise be dismissed out of hand as totally against anything democracy stands for. So I really think this Legislature owes the Member for Edmonton-Highlands a vote of thanks for that.

I think part of the problem is that the amendment shows that the Official and Loyal Opposition understands the value of accountability and the government, as a party that's been totally corrupted by power exercised over much too long a time, understands the value from a political sense of maintaining power of avoiding accountability. The whole intent of the Bill is to avoid accountability, and the whole intent of the amendment is to make the government accountable. So I think we have to look at what are the values of accountability, because that is what the Bill is trying to circumvent. The value is that a lot of very important and worthwhile groups in our society who get funding from lottery funds will not be in danger of being struck down by arbitrary and underhanded and politically motivated misuse of power, because the use of that power and the spending exemplified by it will be accountable in the Legislature. Anything the minister wants to do will not be governed simply by a few phone calls to friends who are politically angry at someone, if that should happen, but will be discussed in the Legislature by people who do not necessarily all agree with each other. I think we have to look at the dangers of 61 people who all agree with each other whether it makes sense or not having that kind of power.

So we have to look at the value of all those expenditures

coming before the Legislature. We also have to look at the value of open and honest debate, debate that is based not just on politics but on the social value of the expenses and the expenditures being contemplated. Sixty-one people who represent one party, one party that's had almost unchecked power for a decade and a half, will look at those expenditures from a purely political point of view. In view of what they're being told by their own polling, I'm sure they will be looking at what they have to do to maintain a very shaky and precarious hold on power. They will look at what kinds of expenditures they can make to solidify what few power bases they've got left and try to buy back some of the power bases they've been losing. What this amendment tries to do is to make sure that kind of very crass motivation for expenditures cannot happen. It can't happen when 83 people who don't necessarily agree with each other challenge each other's ideas, challenge each other's motivations, challenge the expenditures in an open and honest debate.

Now, if it offends members of the Conservative Party that I suggest that perhaps the debate that goes on in their caucus room, which is not scrutinized by the public, and the debate that goes on in cabinet, which is not scrutinized by the public, may not be as open and honest as we would like it, I apologize for suggesting that. But the fact is that nobody knows what motivations are behind the expenditures. What we know is that a minister who's only had to convince his own caucus and his own cabinet colleagues can say, "I plan to spend this money this way." What might happen back there is that he'll say: "This particular group has really upset us because they're willing to talk to the opposition. Let's cut their funding. This group, on the other hand, donates well to the Conservative Party. Let's increase their funding." I hope that wouldn't happen. Past history in this province teaches us that most of the time that is exactly what will happen.

I think every member of this Legislature with a shred of honesty and a shred of integrity is going to have to support this amendment to show that they believe in the value of holding government and cabinet accountable to the Legislature, not accountable to their cabinet colleagues that share the same political motivations but accountable to the Legislature that was elected. I think they have to realize how important that is: accountable and willing to face open and detailed and public debate. I hope we can count on every member of this Legislature to stand up and discuss it. Those members who lack integrity and honesty will wrinkle it up, rip it up, and throw it in their wastebasket.

MR. NELSON: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Is that privilege or order?

MR. NELSON: Point of privilege, I guess. The member is impugning the integrity of members, including myself, and I would suggest he retract that comment.

MR. YOUNIE: I didn't refer to any particular member. I referred to those who would treat it with disdain and disgust and not be willing to stand up and defend that opinion in open and honest debate in the Legislature that's supposed to represent the voters. I would challenge the members opposite to get up and convince me that this amendment is wrong and the Bill is right. I haven't heard any of you show that courage yet I would challenge you to do so. If you don't have that courage, then admit

it. Don't just stand up on a few frivolous points of order. On that note, I would ask some of the members opposite to get up and explain to me why this . . .

MR. NELSON: Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry; on a point of order. I don't think any member in this House has to be impugned by this member from Edmonton -- and to continually impugn the integrity of the members of this House and his own caucus on this matter. I would suggest you make a ruling, Mr. Chairman, relevant to that suggestion. I would suggest you rule on that, because the member over there is impugning the integrity of every member in this Legislature.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: On the point of order, if that's what the member rose on. If he's on a point of privilege, he's out of order. Was it on a point of order, Member for Calgary-McCall? Okay, on a point of order.

MR. FOX: Mr. Chairman, on the point of order as raised by the hon. Member for Calgary-McCall. My colleague the Member for Edmonton-Glengarry at no point in his impassioned remarks made reference to a specific member in the Assembly. In fact, his comments may not have been directed to any member of the House, because unless the Member for Calgary-McCall can prove that there were some members in the Assembly who were ripping up and crumpling and throwing away the piece of paper referred to, unless he has evidence to suggest that's the case, then I would suggest in all fairness the Member for Edmonton-Glengarry was making general comments that didn't refer to any specific member, indeed any member in this specific Assembly.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Well, the Chair would like to caution all members now that we're just debating the amendment that's before the House, and I will take this under advisement.

Hon. Member for . . .

MR. NELSON: Mr. Chairman, under that point of order, I'm sorry again . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: I think he's ruled already.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: On the point of order again.

MR. NELSON: I just happen to to be the person that was ripping up the paper prior to the member speaking. [interjections]

MR. ACTING DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Hon. members, order. Order please. We're not debating this now; we're debating the amendment.

Member for Edmonton-Glengarry.

MR. YOUNIE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would make a commitment that if any member of this House wants to suggest another amendment, I will give it due and open and honest consideration, and I will be willing to debate it with the other members of the Legislature in an open and honest manner. I have expressed my opinions of the value of this particular amendment and how it will take an antidemocratic Bill and change it into something that recognizes the value of open debate and accountability as part of the parliamentary process. I believe very strongly that this amendment in fact embodies what the Bill

lacks, which is some respect for the parliamentary process and accountability, and all I have done is said that anybody who really believes otherwise should get up and try to explain to me where I am wrong. Because if nobody will get up and argue otherwise and just wants to sit there and watch it go through, that indicates to me that they have no arguments to present, they don't want to try to convince me it's wrong. And that indicates one of two things: either they know I'm right and don't want to admit it or they know they're wrong and don't want to admit it. Now, I'm inviting them to get up and explain to me where my logic and my reasoning and my respect for parliamentary process and accountability to the Legislature is wrong, because I believe I'm right I'm going to sit and wait and see if any of them will get up and explain where I'm wrong.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Stettler.

MR. DOWNEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I accept the challenge.

MR. YOUNIE: You're the first.

MR. DOWNEY: No, I'm one of 61, Member for Edmonton-Glengarry. And let me explain the basic reason, Mr. Chairman, in case he hasn't heard it on the several occasions when it has already been expressed in this House. The reason that lottery funds -- are you listening, Member for Edmonton-Glengarry? -- are not going into the general revenue account is because, as you know in your heart of hearts and as anybody who has studied the issue of taxation and public funding knows, lottery funding is regressive taxation.

Now, let me explain that concept to you just a little bit, if I may. It's amply shown in statistics and popular studies that the people who buy lottery tickets generally speaking are at the lower end of the conventional tax spectrum. In many respects, Mr. Chairman, they are gamblers. They are people who are looking for a windfall to improve their way of life, if you like. And it would be totally irresponsible of this government or any government to fund the general operations of the province out of a source of funding that is based on those kinds of principles. So there, Member for Edmonton-Glengarry, is the reason lottery funding is handled the way it is.

Now, there's just one other point I want to make while I'm on my feet Mr. Chairman.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Hon. member, would you sort of attach y o u r . . . [interjection] Order. Would you attach some of your remarks to the amendment, please.

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, sir, Mr. Chairman. I'm explaining why we oppose the amendment on this side of the House. And while I'm on my feet, I do wish to take liberty in commenting on the member's comments about the motivation of the decision-makers on the expenditures of lottery funds. I submit that we have a mandate of long standing and continued good standing with the voters of Alberta as to our motivations. I will stand on that one and suggest that the vote be called on the amendment and it be defeated soundly.

Thank you.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Member for Calgary-Buffalo.

MR.CHUMIR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. On the amendment, I must say that I find the amendment an improvement to this Bill in concept, but I find it to be faulty in detail and I won't support the amendment without a change. I'd like to make some general comments with respect to the difficulty and problems with this legislation and why a change is needed.

Now, as I've said before in this House, it's bad legislation. We've heard a misguided and self-serving defence of this legislation by that master the minister, who has given us a great deal of nonsense. The test should be whether or not this Bill proposes a sound way to spend public moneys generally. It's my contention, Mr. Chairman, that we can't isolate this funding as if it were a unique situation. We have to ask ourselves whether or not hospitals, social services, education, and yes, indeed, career and manpower and other expenditures should be made in the manner provided for in section 6 of this Bill in any manner considered by the minister to be in the public interest. Now, the obvious answer to that is clearly no.

The government has from time to time suggested as a rationale that we're not dealing with taxes here. Another rationale has been that we're dealing with an uncertain source of funding. Well, these aren't reasons; they're merely excuses. The same rationale could be used for oil and gas royalties, which are from one perspective not taxes but merely the province's share of its own resources. Should these, then, be spent in any way that the Minister of Energy may choose? What about the liquor store profits? Should the Solicitor General be given *carte blanche* with our \$300 million or so of liquor store profits? No. Obviously the only rationale for the proposed treatment of lottery funds, Mr. Chairman, is the convenience of the government. We have to ask ourselves whether this is a sound way to spend money generally. No, it isn't. Why, then, should lottery profits be treated in this way? The only answer is the short-term convenience of the government.

Now, is it a sound basis on which to build a strong democratic process? This should certainly be the fundamental question we should be asking with respect to the fundamental and sacred trust we have as elected representatives. Will the minister view this legislation with pride in the future as he looks back upon his accomplishments? I venture not, Mr. Chairman. It's neither sound in principle nor necessary.

The offending sections are sections 5 and 6, and I would suggest that the democratic principles and the goals of the government could easily be served by a scheme as follows. Firstly, it would be possible to set up under the Financial Administration Act a separate fund designated as the lottery fund. It could be defined very similar to section 5 in Bill 6. There are, indeed, numbers of separate funds in the Financial Administration Act. Secondly, it could be provided that this fund should be dealt with by appropriation through the Legislature. Thirdly, it could be provided that money from the fund would be applied for culture, recreation or, perhaps to paraphrase section 6 of Bill 6 but in a more acceptable way, other purposes to be approved by the Legislature. I emphasize "approved by the Legislature" because that's the fundamental issue here.

Now, these funds need not be locked into particular groups, as the minister frets about. We can have flexibility and we can have democracy at the same time. We get the same result but in a democratic form. No, it's not as easy. There's greater scrutiny. It's more complex. But the democratic system is not easy; it's often frustrating. However, experience has shown us that alternate forms of government to democracy are rather unsatisfactory. I hate to say it, but the minister is leaving us a Bill

which moves us in the direction, albeit in a small way, to those unsatisfactory alternatives and away from the democratic process. Now, if little thought is given to this question, it will seem unimportant, but the reality is that you're dealing, Mr. Minister, with the fundamentals of our system, and that is our primary duty here as legislators: to protect that process and that system above all else.

Now, what about the New Democratic Party amendment? Well, the concept they propose is close to the scheme I propose, but I find one part to be unacceptable. First, let me say that I stand second to no one in this House in my support for recreation and culture. I have a strong background and even a strong present of support for cultural and recreational endeavours. I have, through my contacts with them, discovered that they are desperately short of money; they need more; they deserve more. However, the question here under this amendment is: are we prepared to designate 75 percent of the lottery profits to recreation or culture regardless of the amount of profits, as is provided under this amendment?

The moneys we have at the present time are approximately \$100 million a year. That 75 percent, being \$75 million, may in fact be an appropriate level, but I ask the members in the New Democratic Party what happens when the lottery funds move up to \$200 million or \$300 million. What happens in that situation? Are we going to give 75 percent of those amounts to recreation and culture when we have drug-addicted children in this province without programs, when we hear them talking daily about hunger in our schools, when we hear them complaining, as I do, about a fee structure excluding poor children from programs in our schools, when we have mentally ill people around the province without facilities and proper accommodation? I find this amendment to be totally out of character with the purported concern of the New Democratic Party for fairness and equity. So I oppose this. I oppose the government Bill, but I must say that I find this proposal to be even more offensive, because the New Democratic Party knows better and they know this isn't a responsible suggestion.

So if they want to have an amendment, I will support their amendment if they are prepared to add to section 2(b) after the words "recreation or culture" the terms "or such other purpose as may be specifically approved by the Assembly." If they want to amend it, providing a generous, fixed level for the recreation or cultural purposes, something that will serve the needs of the recreation and cultural community, I will support that. But I won't support this *carte blanche*, which I believe is a patently cynical exercise. It's a slush fund of your own in a different form, and you can have it. Include me out.

MR. ORMAN: Mr. Chairman, just briefly, it's quite a delight to see those two groups over there fighting away.

Firstly, I want to reiterate with regard to the Member for Calgary-*Buffalo's* comments that accountability comes with being in power. We have a democracy. Governments get elected to develop policies and deliver programs, and whether or not they are approved in this Assembly doesn't mean to say we're going to get re-elected or not. Now, I respect the democratic process, Mr. Chairman, but to suggest that if I get their blessing in the way I spend lottery dollars I'm going to get the blessing of all Albertans or that it matters to all Albertans that I have their blessing -- in fact, it doesn't. Whether or not it's appropriate in the eyes of Albertans, that will be determined when they make their decision as to who to vote for. May I submit that for 14 years this fund has been handled in a way that Al-

bertans have been very satisfied with. There have been tens of thousands of organizations that have received dollars based on funding to organizations that are made up of volunteers. They make the decisions. Now, we did run into a situation where we had a surplus, and we have basically decided what to do with a large amount of that surplus. We did it in a very public manner and to the satisfaction, we believe, of all Albertans.

Now, the amendment is not necessary, because with the introduction of the Bill and the creation of the fund in Alberta, it will be subject to the scrutiny of the Auditor General and the allocation of those dollars will be a matter of public account. Public account is really the answer. Mr. Chairman. It will be in the records, and it will be laid out for all Albertans to see. As a matter of fact, all of those organizations develop annual reports, and they're filed in this Legislature for scrutiny. Now, I think what it does is open up to the people of Alberta exactly what the opposition, the Liberals and the NDP in their coalition, represent, and that is: it doesn't matter whether it's broke; let's fix it. Our attitude here is: it's worked for 14 years, we're strengthening the accountability, it's not broke, so let's not fix it. I don't see the sense in that.

So with regard to the amendment. Mr. Chairman. I just can't in good conscience support it. As a matter of fact, whether or not I support it is not going to be of any satisfaction to the people of Alberta. They'll make up their own minds.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman. I would like to make one or two comments, in that it's quite interesting to see how things get recycled. I remember so well when we had the Minister of Culture in this government, the hon. Horst Schmid, running around this province handing out cheques like they were candies. Now, he did a lot for the Kodak photo company, because every time you could see a picture of Horst Schmid handing out a cheque, there was a photographer there taking a picture. I think we're getting the same situation occurring here with the hon. minister of employment, where he's going to be handing out these funds. Now, Mr. Chairman, that is not the way to be responsible for the taxpayers' money, because it leaves too much discretion to the minister.

I remember so well the hippy-hoppy, tippy-toppy dance group. The hippy-hoppy, tippy-toppy dance group got a grant. The Blue Mist' ski club in Barrhead got a grant for a ski club. Horst Schmid loved it. He just loved it. He was handing out things to everybody. He was the most popular Minister of Culture this province has ever known because he was handing out money. But that money was not accountable to this Legislature or to all the people of the province. That's the point the government is missing. Now, I know why they are missing that point: because this is a great mechanism for buying votes. You pick off people. Hon. Dr. Reid, you know that too, so quit shaking your head. I'm always trying to help this government run the government. You know, I'm such a good guy, I just want them to stay over there. Because if there's anything I dislike more than Conservatives, it's socialists, you see. Now, they're good guys. I like them as individuals, but I just don't like their philosophy.

But if the government wants to control these funds the way they are proposing to do, then I recommend to them something that is really politically palatable and very popular - tie it and give it to hospitals and medicare. Because that's how the Irish Sweepstakes . . . You know, you really thought you were doing the hospitals in Ireland a great favour by buying those illegal

<sup>1</sup>This spelling could not be verified at the time of publication.

sweepstake tickets. So if you really want to do something that is politically . . .

MR. ACTING DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Hon. member, we're on an amendment here, not on hospitals or . . .

DR. BUCK: I'm just about finished with my speech, Mr. Chairman.

When we're talking about lottery funds, we're talking about funds and what you can do with them. Mr. Chairman. So I am saying to the rookie minister, who is the heir apparent as far as I've heard from the people in Calgary, the heir apparent when the Hon. Don Getty steps down, if he wants to be the heir apparent, then he'd better do something that will be popular to everybody. So if you're going to control those funds the way you're proposing to do them, put them into medicare and hospitals. Those funds, as they're accumulating and getting larger and larger, should be accountable to this Legislature. Therefore, that's the advice I give this government, Mr. Chairman.

MR. ORMAN: Mr. Chairman, I must respond because I certainly want to get on with the main Bill. But firstly, the hon. gentleman for Clover Bar would suggest that somehow I sit in my office and make a decision to give a cheque to the airy-fairy dance group or the hippity-hoppity dance group. That is not the case, and I would submit that when Mr. Horst Schmid was the chairman that wasn't the case too. Boards and foundations make those decisions.

Now, I know the opposition to a man and a woman oppose the way we handle these lottery dollars. Mr. Chairman, you know what? Then they complain that they can't hand the cheques out. They don't like the program: they're in here arguing about and calling the government on the manner in which we distribute the funds. And then in the next breath, on the other side of their face, they're saying, "Let me hand the cheque out." Now, how's that for integrity? So, you know, I think it's important that we do bring this to their attention.

With regard to Irish Sweepstakes, to give it to hospitals is probably one of the biggest mistakes the government of Ireland made. They gave 20 percent of the revenue to hospitals. The Irish Sweepstakes went bankrupt, and all of a sudden the hospitals have a 20 percent cut in their revenues. Now, we had a debate about a 1 percent cut, a 2 and a 3 percent cut. How about a 20 percent cut? So let's go create a demand by hospitals for lottery dollars, and then in the event that Albertans no longer are enamoured with lottery dollars, let's try and find 20 percent for that budget, Mr. Chairman. I don't think that makes good sense.

I would suggest that if the opposition is suggesting in this Bill, in this amendment, that somehow the dollars should be handled in a different way, they should go to some of the 14,000 organizations that have received dollars from this funding, and let's get their point of view. Mr. Chairman.

[The Member for Vegreville rose]

MR. ACTING DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: On a point of order, hon. Member for Vegreville? You've spoken once on this. Oh, pardon me. I take that back. I've just been informed you can speak as often as you want.

I'll recognize the Member for . . .

MR. FOX: On a point of order. I feel somewhat sensitive about

the remarks of the Member for Clover Bar, and I just want to point out that he's talking about heir apparent. Well, in his case and my case our hair is anything but apparent.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We'll ignore that.  
The Member for Calgary-Fish Creek, please.

MR. PAYNE: Well, Mr. Chairman, in the debate we've had this evening with respect to the amendment, several of the opposition members have complained or berated the fact that there hasn't been very much participation on the part of government members. Now, if the members of the opposition really want to know where the government members stand on this amendment and on this Bill, let's bring the whole shebang to a vote right now.

Mr. Chairman, several years ago as the former minister responsible for the Wild Rose Foundation, it was my privilege to develop and introduce and take through the Legislature the Wild Rose Foundation Act. Now, it's not my intention to speak to the Bill. I think the minister's comments on introduction and in second reading more than adequately have covered the rationale behind the Bill. However, I would like to make a brief comment or two with respect to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to suggest that this amendment provides a very useful focus on not only the philosophical differences between the government party and the opposition parties, but it also provides a very useful focus on the managerial style of the government, as opposed to the managerial style of the opposition. Now, speaking to the amendment, Mr. Chairman, how often have we heard the opposition in question period and in other forums berating the government for taking too much time to respond to urgent issues and funding needs that are immediate and pressing. The heart of this amendment, in clause (2), states:

One of the Votes in the annual Estimates of the department administered by the Minister shall be called "Lottery Funds."

And this vote shall

(a) be sufficiently detailed to allow the Assembly to consider each and every separate proposal for the disbursement of monies out of the Lottery Fund to a foundation [or] project . . .

MR. ACTING DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. PAYNE: Mr. Chairman, I referred earlier to the managerial style of the government as opposed to the opposition. Although perhaps it's a simplification, the amendment before us now on the one hand and section 6 of the Bill on the other hand illustrate the NDP's utter fascination with structure and bureaucracy as opposed to Bill 10's intent in flexibility and rapid response time to deal quickly with matters deemed by the minister "to be in the public interest."

Speaking to the amendment, Mr. Chairman, I opt for rapid response time, not heavy state structure, and urge all members to defeat this amendment now.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Hon. Member for Vegreville.

MR. FOX: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I did want to get back into the consideration of this amendment so that I would have time to comment on the remarks of my learned friend from Calgary-Buffalo. Although what he suggested in the end would have to be in the category of a friendly amendment, because he

did suggest -- although he certainly didn't take the time to prepare any amendment, he did allude to what he would like to propose had he made the effort -- adding a few words at the end of section 6(2)(b) that I don't think would jeopardize the intent of the motion tonight, and I appreciate that.

But I do object to the kind of terms in which he described the intent of our amendment to the motion, Mr. Chairman, and it's not because he didn't make a very eloquent, impassioned statement on behalf of a number of very worthwhile and needy individuals in our society, be they children who go to school hungry or people who suffer drug and alcohol addiction problems: these are all very worthwhile and needy people, to be sure. He could've gone on to mention debt-ridden farmers. He could've gone on to suggest that we use the money to construct this, that, and the other thing. But all the world's problems cannot be solved, hon. member, with lottery revenues.

I might point out to the hon. Member for Calgary-Buffalo that nowhere in the amendment proposed by the hon. Member for Edmonton-Highlands does it say that these words shall be cast in stone forever and a day. If we encounter a situation where lottery revenues seem to be increasing and where there is room to fund some additional projects over and above what's included, well, then we introduce another amending Bill and make the Bill right. This is something, a constructive activity, put forward by the Official Opposition in an effort to point out not only what's wrong with the government's Bill but what could be made right if a little bit of effort was put into drafting and debating the amendment.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Belmont.

MR. SIGURDSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. May I say to the hon. Member for Calgary-Fish Creek that I very much appreciate his input. It is true that we in the Official Opposition do appreciate a sense of structure and that we really, quite frankly, deplore totalitarianism. Whether it's on the right or on the left, it doesn't matter. We deplore totalitarianism, which is what this may be leading to.

It seems a strange evening, Mr. Chairman. We have a Conservative minister of the Crown defending the Bill and making a very important point about the amendment, and related it to the Irish Sweepstakes lottery. He said that's very important, and that's why our amendment specifically does not contain certain eleemosynary institutions.

AN HON. MEMBER: What?

AN HON. MEMBER: It's unparliamentary.

MR. SIGURDSON: No, it's not unparliamentary. In fact, it's in the Canadian Constitution. Look it up. It's an old one; it's an oldie but a goody.

Anyway, we are concerned that certain institutions -- hospitals, education -- be properly funded out of general revenues not having to rely on the good graces of folk going out and purchasing lottery tickets.

Also, Mr. Chairman, the Member for Stettler made a couple of good points. I want to praise him for that. He noted that lottery taxation -- and it's not taxation -- was regressive. Well, take it the other step. Just to get back to the regressivity of certain kinds of taxation, I hope the hon. member will address that concern when we talk about educational funding, because prop-

erty tax, too, is regressive. I hope he will stand up and speak to that when we deal with that.

But what happens is that the hon. member forgot what the Auditor General said, Mr. Chairman. The Auditor General said, on page 89 of his report in the second paragraph:

... these lotteries fall within the definition of "public money".

Not regressive taxation, not regressive fund-raising mechanisms, but public money. And here we have no accountability for it. The accountability is going to be imaginary, if any. The expenditure of funds from surplus sales is going to be completely in the hands of the minister, his cabinet colleagues, and perhaps the government caucus. I can hardly wait, Mr. Chairman, for Peter Pocklington to declare himself a charitable or a cultural or a recreational institution. You know, I wouldn't be surprised if he turned the Gainers plant on 66th Street into some kind of tour house.

AN HON. MEMBER: A what? [laughter]

MR. SIGURDSON: A tour: t-o-u-r. You know, we might have some cultural films . . .

MR. ACTING DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order. Order. Hon. member, we're speaking to an amendment, and I don't see where we connect that into the amendment. Would you get back to the amendment, please.

MR. SIGURDSON: Yes, sir, absolutely. I'm talking about accountability, which is what section 5 of the proposed amendment deals with.

You know, we could have, Mr. Chairman, films about battles on 66th Street, talking about labour history. That could be cultural. We could have lectures on how to bust the hog marketing board. That would be educational. Perhaps to some that may be cultural as well.

AN HON. MEMBER: How about a loan guarantee?

MR. SIGURDSON: Oh no, we don't have to even worry about loan guarantees anymore because the Minister of Career Development and Employment, the minister responsible for this would be able to say, "There's the money." We wouldn't even have to worry about putting a motion on the Order Paper, which would be denied anyways.

But this is a reasonable amendment. It brings the money back before the House. You know, what this suggests is that there be a lottery funds vote contained in the minister's department. Now, I can't imagine why the members would be upset about that. We only have 25 days to debate the budget. I could see members being upset if we were asking for an extra five days to debate the budget, but we're not doing that, Mr. Chairman. We're asking that there be one extra vote contained in the Department of Career Development and Employment so that we can discuss the expenditure of funds. That's all. We're not asking for any extra time to come out of the Legislative Assembly to address budgetary matters in the global sense. We're not asking that. We're not asking for the Legislative Assembly to extend itself on the budget debate. That's not in the amendment. We're only asking that we have contained in the minister's department a vote, a vote that solely deals with lottery expenditures. No extra time.

If the critics on the opposition side of the House, the three parties, want to stand up and then address vote 4, which we pro-

pose to be the lottery funds vote, so be it. We'd have that two-hour frame in which to address those specific funds. There's nothing wrong with asking for that. It's not extra time. No members would have to stay any extra days. They might have to listen to a little more, but that's fine; that's the process. And it's the process that must be addressed. Bring it before the Legislative Assembly. We have 25 days to discuss \$10 billion, an awful lot of money. Twenty-five days only. That works out to about -- what? -- \$400 million a day. Here we have a minister who last year had an extra \$113 million kicking around, and he just sent it out. No accountability, Mr. Chairman. None whatsoever.

We don't dispute, as the minister has well noted, the groups that receive the money. We have no dispute with them: very worthwhile projects all of them, each and every one of them. Probably they should have had money out of General Revenue, but that's beside the point. It was an arbitrary decision. And who made the decision? It wasn't the Legislative Assembly. And there's no way to check up on that before the money is expended.

You know, we have heard time and time and time again, the minister saying: "Well, we're only doing what British Columbia is doing, what Saskatchewan is doing, and what Manitoba is doing. We're only doing what is consistent with other provinces." Well, Mr. Chairman, that doesn't make it right. That doesn't make it right. I would suggest, if you look at some of the polls there that come out, that an awful lot of folk in British Columbia are tired of the regime they have there; people in Saskatchewan are tired of the regime they have there; people in Manitoba have yet to become tired of the regime that's now currently in place, but that soon will fade. They will grow tired of that too. Mr. Chairman, those are three other provinces, very distinct, very separate. This is Alberta, and this is the way we ought to be doing the expenditure of public dollars: having it accountable to the Legislative Assembly.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Member for Edmonton-Glengarry.

MR. YOUNIE: Thank you.

Just a small point on the arguments made by the Member from Calgary-Fish Creek. He argued that the whole value of defeating the amendment and carrying through with the Bill as it is is that it would allow the minister quick response time, would allow him to take quick action in emergencies. First of all, I don't see anything in the Bill. It says:

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 don't see anything in there that talks about responding to emergencies in a hurry. It just says that he can spend it on whatever he wants. That's totally different from what the Member from Calgary-Fish Creek argued, that it gives him a quick response time.

Then I look and I think, how does the government now, if they haven't been able to use this to respond quickly to emergencies, how have they done it in the past? I look to Schedule "A" of the appropriations Bill, and I find out that they've responded very quickly to such things as Financing of Technology and Research Projects: \$5.6 million. I thought research and technology was a long-term thing, and here they're responding in a hurry with a special warrant to that. Or Transportation and

in a hurry with a special warrant to that. Or Transportation and Utilities, Construction and Operation of Transportation Systems: \$38.85 million, as if they had an emergency road for that amount to build and they couldn't wait to discuss it in the Legislature.

What it proves to me is that there is already a mechanism in place that is abused horribly for dealing with emergencies and spending money in a hurry when emergencies come up, and it's used for things like long-term projects in road building, on . . .

MR. ACTING DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Hon. member, I'm having great difficulty attaching this to the amendment.

MR. YOUNIE: Well, I'll try to explain. I thought it was perfectly clear. What I'm saying is that it was argued a few moments ago that the whole purpose of defeating the amendment and getting on with the Bill is that the amendment would make the minister accountable to the Legislature, which would slow up his ability to spread around the slush fund, whereas if we pass the Bill as it stands, it will speed up his ability to dispense with the slush fund that we object to. I'm arguing that there's already a mechanism in place for the government to respond to emergencies, spend money in a hurry, and deal with those things that require quick response. And it's such a totally illogical and unfounded argument to say that we have to defeat this amendment so the minister will have the wherewithal to respond quickly to cultural emergencies.

I think it is just so patently absurd to argue that such an argument should be discounted out of hand and that every member should realize the government already has so much ability to spend money on an emergency basis and in a hurry through special warrants that they abuse it horribly. And to give another power to respond not only in an emergency but on the personal whim and say-so of a single minister, if that's the way he wishes to do it, is totally against all the principles we follow in discussing the budget each year in the first place. And to argue that this amendment is wrong is to argue that the whole budgeting procedure we go through is a waste of time and maybe we should throw the whole \$10 billion out and let the ministers divvy it up as they see fit and run around and throw it around the province for whatever motives they may have as a minister without bringing it into the Legislature to make it accountable. Because any argument you can extend to this amendment, you could extend to the entire budgeting procedure. I think the minister should recognize that in effect -- and every member who argues against this is in effect arguing against the whole budgeting procedure we now follow.

Now, we've certainly seen a number of cases where in fact members have said, "We shouldn't be bothering with this because it's going to go through anyway." The fact is, it has a great value in terms of letting the public of Alberta know how their money is being spent. This is another area where they should have a chance to know how their money is being spent. The purpose of the amendment is to protect their right to know how their money is being spent; the purpose of the Bill is to make sure they never get a chance to exercise that right. And I think the amendment will make better what is a bad Bill. It won't make it perfect. The only way to make it perfect is to throw it out in third reading, but we're trying to at least make it a little more acceptable at this point through this amendment.

Thank you.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for

Athabasca-Lac La Biche.

MR. PIQUETTE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think other members from the opposition, the New Democrats, have already said what I'm going to say, so maybe I should say it in French so that that other language can express the same outrage I feel about this proposed Bill 10.

Now, Bill 10, in terms of our amendment, by striking out the proposed section 5 and substituting

Money received from the conduct, management and operation of lottery schemes to which this Act applies shall be paid out,

(a) in the first instance, for purposes of defraying the cost of administering this Act and

(b) in the second instance, to the General Revenue Fund

is by all means a very sensible and democratically inclined amendment, because it does answer the concerns that the government appears to be moving in a direction where they believe that they have the right to decide unto themselves the issuing of funds raised through lottery sales, when in fact the Auditor General has indicated that these are public moneys and they are moneys that should not be taken outside of the general revenue or outside the procedures of the House in terms of its accountability.

In my statements I made in the estimates for Tourism, I complimented the minister for having set up a community tourism action plan but criticized him for the fact that we did not have any accountability of that money, which came from the lottery fund, in the House here. Because the community tourism action plan is, I think, a tremendous initiative by the government. It doesn't go far enough. However, again we could not properly debate the expenditure of that fund because it is not part of the budget of the Tourism minister, and it is not accounted for by occupational health in his department's budget.

You know, 300 years ago there was a revolution in the British empire to basically settle this issue of nonaccountability of public funds, and we even had a king who lost his head over the whole issue of the lack of accountability. The decision of the British people at that time was to make sure that the expenditure of public money collected via taxes or collection of any other moneys through property taxes, et cetera, would not be spent without the consent of Parliament. This Bill 10 goes contrary to this 300-year tradition that the British people fought to retain in their Parliament. And if we allow this government to proceed with Bill 10, we are going to be party to an Act by which . . . The history of our nation has proven that the best system of government is to provide accountability in terms of the expenditures of public funds.

The amendment that we proposed should be supported by all members of this party because it continues this very proud British tradition, where for many years we tried to strike up a system of government that had checks and balances and where accountability of public money was always handled in the means by which . . . The public interest was protected by not allowing anyone -- the King, the Lieutenant Governor, the Premier, or any one individual member -- to have a complete say over the expenditure or how that expenditure will be done by the Legislature.

I think it's very appropriate when I read the *Hansard* of May 9. The Member for Edmonton-Strathcona I think made some very pointed arguments.

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.

Bill 10, whatever way the members would like to explain it, does not make it right . . .

MR. ACTING DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Hon. member, order. Hon. member, you're a long way from the amendment. The amendment was introduced tonight, and you're back in *Hansard* from wherever. Let's come back to the amendment.

MR. PIQUETTE: Not at all, Mr. Chairman. The point that I'm making is that the amendment here ensures accountability. And just because prostitution is not illegal, it's still not right. And this Bill here is not right. The amendments that we have presented will make it right. It will make it right for Albertans.

Now, there's no reason why, and one of the arguments, I guess . . . Perhaps the only attempt at a reasonable argument was the Member for Calgary-Fish Creek, where he indicated that, well, by putting it through the Legislature in the votes, in the estimates, we're going to take away the emergency power of the minister. I fail to see where his argument makes sense. I mean, we do have the ministers, when we are outside the Legislature, through order in council appropriate moneys when estimates are not enough to fund various government programs.

[Mr. Gogo in the Chair]

So that argument -- the Member for Calgary-Fish Creek, I think, is a little bit out to lunch, but it was a good attempt at making . . .

MR. BRADLEY: Point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Order please. Hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest, a point of order.

MR. BRADLEY: The hon. member referred to my participation in debate this evening. I haven't participated, so he's in error in his statements.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: He said Fish Creek, not Pincher Creek.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, hon. member.  
Hon. Member for Athabasca-Lac La Biche.

MR. PIQUETTE: I did indicate it was the member for Fish Creek. Maybe my . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: Your French isn't too good.

MR. PAYNE: That's poisson creek. [interjection]

MR. PIQUETTE: Tu parles en français, M. Payne.

In terms of the criticism of the amendments that we have presented tonight, the Member for Calgary-Fish Creek was perhaps upset with section (c), which indicates:

comprise not less than 75 percent of the monies paid into the General Revenue Fund pursuant to section 5.1(1)(b) in the immediately preceding fiscal year.

It's a very minor criticism. I think the intent by both the Representative Party and the Liberal Party is the same as the Official Opposition, that we do feel that there needs to be accountability in terms of the operation of the lottery funds, and that it should be managed by the Legislature and it should not be the decision

of the minister to make decisions relating to expenditures of this fund. Because as the Auditor General so clearly said, it is public funds and they should be accounted for in the Legislature.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Ready for the question?  
Hon. Member for Red Deer-South.

MR. OLDRING: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Unlike the members opposite I intend to address the amendment in front of us and spend a little less time watching the clock and wasting the time of the members of this Assembly.

Clearly, Mr. Chairman, again the amendment that's been brought forward has been very ill thought out. It's very shallow thinking, and I'm amazed that they would even propose an amendment like this in front of the Legislative Assembly. But clearly, they don't understand the process that's being utilized to disburse lottery funds today. And to suggest that we take up the time of the Legislative Assembly to consider each and every separate proposal for the disbursement of moneys -- clearly, they don't understand the time and the effort and the countless hours that are put into reviewing projects that receive funding through lottery dollars.

I made just a quick list in front of me of the various boards and foundations that we have undertaken that massive undertaking on behalf of the government at this time. And just to name a few: the Wild Rose Foundation; the Recreation, Parks and Wildlife Foundation; Alberta Cultural Heritage Foundation; Alberta Foundation for the Performing Arts; the Rick Hansen Centre; the Alberta Sport Council; the Alberta Museums Association; the Alberta Foundation for the Literary Arts; the Banff Television Foundation; the Alberta choral foundation; the Alberta Band Association; the Fort Macleod Provincial Historical Association; the Alberta Historical Resources Foundation; the Alberta Art Foundation; the Alberta Crafts Council. And there are our fairs and exhibitions, Mr. Chairman: Edmonton Northlands, Calgary exhibition, the Red Deer Westerner, and many, many more. And thousands and thousands of volunteer hours that go with each and every one of those foundations.

But "Oh no." The collective wisdom of the members opposite -- they're going to review all these grants themselves, because they know more than all these Albertans. They know more, and they're going to have time to look into each and every grant the way these boards and foundations do. Mr. Chairman, that's ludicrous. It's absolute insanity to suggest that they're going to know better than all these boards and foundations and they're going to deal with it here in the House. Every member in this Assembly receives an annual report from every one of these foundations and organizations, and they, upon their own good time, can make the effort to read through the reports. They'll see where every cent went to, totally accountable, but they want to push all these boards and foundations aside and the thousands of volunteer hours that go with it. They're going to push it aside with an ill-thought-out, ill-conceived amendment as is being proposed this evening.

Mr. Chairman, again, I don't want to continue to waste the time . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Hon. Member for Red Deer-South.

MR. OLDRING: I don't want to continue to waste the time of

the Legislative Assembly the way members opposite do. Again, they seem to spend more time watching the clock to see that they can fill out the necessary time than they do addressing the matters in front of them. Clearly, Mr. Chairman, this amendment is frivolous and vexatious and a waste of time in this Legislative Assembly, and I would hope they would at least show the decency so that we can put it to a vote. Let's have the decision made, and let's get on with some real business.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. Member for Edmonton-Kingsway.

MR. McEACHERN: Sorry, Mr. Chairman. I did want to make a couple of points in reply to the Member for Calgary-Buffero, but of course the Member for Red Deer-South just begs a couple of replies. He went through this great long list and said how we wouldn't have time to go through them in this Assembly, and of course he's quite right. We don't have time to do the estimates properly in this Assembly, because we only get an hour and a half to two hours for as much as \$1.3 billion for Education, for example, and those kinds of numbers.

AN HON. MEMBER: Speak to the amendment.

MR. McEACHERN: But, Mr. Chairman, what it would allow -- and it is germane to the topic. What bringing this amendment to the Bill before this Assembly would do, if it were passed, is it would bring the expenditures of lottery funds into the Assembly, and we would have a right to review that list. Nobody would expect that we would ask questions on every one of the whole list. But we'd have the right to ask on any one of them that might interest us or that we might have some questions about. And the minister would have to answer in this House, which is exactly what is required out of 5(1)(b), if we were to accept this amendment.

As to this long list of things that he was bragging about, why didn't the Member for Red Deer-South also brag about the time that Len Grant asked the minister of culture of this government for \$200 for the preservation of the Gaelic language?

MR. OLDRING: A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, sit down.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Member for Red Deer-South has risen on a point of order. Let's hear what it is.

MR. OLDRING: I cite 62(2), Mr. Chairman. I know how much the Member for Edmonton-Kingsway likes to hear himself, but I would again remind him that

Speeches in committees of the whole Assembly must be strictly relevant to the item or section under consideration.

And I'd appreciate it if the Member for Edmonton-Kingsway would get back to the amendment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, hon. member. Edmonton-Kingsway, are you concluded?

MR. McEACHERN: Well, all I was doing was adding one more grant to the list that he was referring to. So it seems to me that if he wasn't relevant, then I guess I would say that what I was about to say wasn't relevant. But in fact it was relevant, and what the member got for his preservation of the Gaelic language was \$2,000. And the list of names that belonged to the

committee were Margaret Thatcher, Pierre Trudeau, other people of that ilk. The minister didn't even look to see who were the directors of the company that was getting the grant absolutely and totally scandalous. And this member has the gall to stand up here and brag about all these grants.

Now, we would at least have the right to review the grants, and that is the key point. If the expenditures were made after an assessment by this Assembly and questions by this Assembly, then that is the relevant and main point: restore the power of the purse to this Assembly where it belongs.

Now, the Member for Calgary-Buffero -- and I want to deal with that in a little different way -- comes in here and screams and hollers about the fact that if we put 75 percent of lottery moneys . . . This is point 6(1)(c) of the amendment. That if we guaranteed

75 percent of the monies paid into the General Revenue Fund pursuant to section 5.1(1)(b) in the immediately preceding fiscal year

into recreation and culture, then some other programs might go begging. Well, I accept that that might be the case if a Conservative government is in power. I accept that that might be the case if a Liberal government is in power. But that would not be the case if a New Democratic government were in power. We would find the funds through regular taxation procedures to make sure that kids who go to school have enough food to eat so that they aren't hungry in class time. We would make sure that drug abuse and alcohol problems were being dealt with. We would not be so callous as to give money out on frivolous things while other people were in dire need. But those other needs would be met through the regular taxation system in an adequate manner by a New Democratic Party government. For the Member for Calgary-Buffero to imply otherwise and that we were being frivolous or silly with taxpayers' dollars is nonsense. The basic idea here was merely to see to it that recreation and culture, which is the purpose for which most of these funds were collected and set up in the first place, would go to those two departments.

I would just point out one more thing in that regard. You notice how we stopped after the moneys would be appropriated for recreation and culture purposes. We left out the expression that is in the Bill where it says "or any other purpose" the Minister wishes. That's another major part of this amendment, to stop the minister from having a slush fund.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. McEACHERN: Whenever this Assembly passes out money to different groups, there should be a purpose, a rhyme and reason, a set of criteria, and there should not be a slush fund for the minister to do with as he wishes. That's why this amendment is a good one, and that's why we should pass it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Ready for the question on the amendment?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All those in favour of the amendment, please say aye.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Those opposed, please say no.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The amendment fails.

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

[Eight minutes having elapsed, the House divided]

For the motion:

Ewasiuk	Pashak	Sigurdson
Fox	Piquette	Strong
Gibeault	Roberts	Younie
McEachern		

Against the motion:

Adair	Fischer	Orman
Ady	Getty	Payne
Alger	Heron	Pengelly
Bogle	Hyland	Reid
Bradley	Johnston	Rostad
Brassard	Jonson	Schumacher
Cherry	McClellan	Shaben
Chumir	Mirosh	Sparrow
Cripps	Mitchell	Stewart
Dinning	Moore, R.	West
Downey	Nelson	Young
Drobot	Oldring	Zarusky

Totals:	Ayes - 10	Noes - 36
---------	-----------	-----------

[Motion on amendment lost]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. Member for Calgary-Forest Lawn.

MR. PASHAK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have two questions that I'd like to put to the minister with respect to section 6 of the Bill. From my point of view this is perhaps the most offensive section in the whole Bill. It not only gives the minister all kinds of powers, but it also gives him carte blanche in terms of how he uses these funds.

AN HON. MEMBER: Carte blanche.

MR. PASHAK: Carte blanche, okay.

MR. SIGURDSON: Not if you knew Blanche.

MR. PASHAK: Not if you knew Blanche, yes.

AN HON. MEMBER: Do you have Blanche as your girlfriend?

MR. PASHAK: One of them. [interjections] Eventually, Mr. Chairman, I'll get around to putting these questions.

In the debate on second reading I pointed out that the whole British parliamentary tradition is one of the common man trying to get some control over the public purse. [interjections] It's late. I'm getting tired. They're confusing me.

My first question to the minister. I'd like to hear his jus-

tification for the raising of tax dollars through what is essentially a regressive tax measure on the poor and how he justifies paying for programs that disproportionately benefit the already advantaged with those tax dollars. The Member for Stettler, in fact, agreed with that. He pointed out that raising taxes through any kind of gambling is really a regressive measure because poor people are more inclined to gamble than are others. These funds that are taxed on the poor are then spent for recreational and cultural purposes, and when you look at those programs, those programs essentially benefit those people who are better off and more well to do. I would like, first of all, from the minister a justification for that.

Now, I don't want to leave the wrong impression in the minister's mind. It's not that I don't support recreational and cultural programs. I think they should be supported, but I think it would be much more effective to support them through a percentage of the general revenue funds, through revenues that are raised for that purpose. This would have an added advantage for cultural and recreational groups that are looking for funding: their funding wouldn't be dependent on the uncertainty of revenues that are raised through gambling purposes.

My second question to the minister is another question that would call for a justification on his part, and that's how he can take unto himself so much extra parliamentary authority for distributing these funds in any way that he sees fit without that funding being authorized or scrutinized or being limited in any way by the Assembly itself.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Minister of Career Development and Employment.

MR. ORMAN: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to respond to the hon. Member for Calgary-Forest Lawn. Firstly, his question asking how we can regressively tax Albertans. I believe I've answered it to some extent. In fact, it's a voluntary tax. It's barely a tax. People have the choice as to whether or not to participate in the tax. Other taxes are not voluntary. If they feel it's regressive and they don't like the nature of the taxation, they don't have to participate in the purchase of the tickets.

Now, Mr. Chairman, as I alluded to earlier, the hon. gentleman has a holier-than-thou attitude and suggests that he can figure this out, but Albertans can't. I don't think the hon. member should underestimate the intelligence of Albertans. If they choose to participate in the purchase of lotteries tickets and as a result generate income for charitable organizations, so be it. Why should this gentleman sit there and make a decision and a judgment about what Albertans should and shouldn't do? I as an Albertan find that's totally offensive. I'll make my own mind up, thank you very much. I don't need him telling me: yes, he goes to the race track and he likes to play poker, but for the rest of Albertans, no way; they're not smart enough to figure that out. Mr. Chairman, I beg to submit that in fact . . .

MR. PASHAK: Mr. Chairman, can I get back in the debate on that point? Point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. minister, I believe the hon. Member for Calgary-Forest Lawn is raising a point of order. Is it a question to the hon. minister?

MR. PASHAK: No, it's not a question. It's under section 22. I asked the questions, and my remarks again are misconstrued. I'm not saying that Albertans shouldn't have the right to make

those choices. I'm asking the minister a question about the purpose to which those funds are being put and his justification for using those funds for that particular purpose.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's a point of clarification.  
Hon. minister, continue.

MR. ORMAN: Mr. Chairman, secondly, I wanted to point out to the hon. gentleman that a profile of purchases of lotteries tickets indicates that, in fact, in the main they are not the lower end of the spectrum in terms of income. I should also point out that profiles of purchasers indicate that they take into consideration the manner in which lotteries dollars are collected and distributed throughout the province in the conscious decision to buy those tickets. There are many people that say: "Look; I understand that these dollars go to culture, recreation, amateur sport, rural fairs, and exhibitions. I'm willing to take a chance. I also might have a chance at winning a million."

I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, and I'm making a guess, that if these dollars went into general revenue, such as the Liberals would suggest, in fact there may be a reduction in the level of revenues because of the attitude of the buyer. I would suggest, too, that possibly other provinces keep it out of general revenues for those purposes. I just wanted to respond to that point.

For the member to suggest that somehow governments are only accountable because of what goes through this Chamber, I would submit, is not the case. I'm a minister of the Crown. I'm sworn to accountability. My colleagues as MLAs are accountable in their constituencies, and the policies and programs and the actions of governments -- the decision is made by the electorate every four years. For the past 14, Mr. Chairman, they seem to be satisfied on the accounts in terms of how we handle lotteries.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. Member for Edmonton-Belmont.

MR. SIGURDSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In response to the minister, the point about people being satisfied for the last 14 years with the handling of the funds coming out of the department May I point out to the hon. minister that -- and this is a direct quote from the Auditor General's report, sir -- "this matter has been reported in the last three annual reports." So not all Albertans have been satisfied with the handling of these public moneys as they have been handled by this minister. The Auditor General has pointed that out for the last three years, and the hon. minister really ought to know that.

Mr. Chairman, I've got a number of questions. I would like to know, as it relates to section 6, when money is being paid out "from the Fund for the purposes related to the support of initiatives related to recreation or culture," if it's going to go in block funding to the Department of Culture and Multiculturalism and then that minister is going to determine the specific expenditure of those dollars? Is it going to go to the Department of Recreation and Parks, and is that minister then going to be responsible for the disbursement of those funds?

Is there going to be a ceiling, Mr. Chairman, on the limits for an application? I think a ceiling is important, because we have a finite number of dollars and we have to disburse them fairly. Is there going to be a ceiling on the amount of money that will be handed out by whatever department, or is it going to solely be the Minister of Career Development and Employment that hands out that money?

What qualifications are there going to be? We know what

some of the qualifications now are. However, the specifics are going to be changing, so I want to know what the specific qualifications are going to be for the new applicants.

Are there going to be deadlines for applications so that we can have a fairer chance for the thousands of groups that will be making these applications? Is there going to be a deadline so that groups can make an application and then all of them can be funded, or is there going to be so much money given to every week of every year, and it's going to be first come, first served? I would like to ask that.

The number of people. The Member for Red Deer-South suggested that some 14,000 groups have received funds. Now, quite frankly, it says in section 6 that "the Minister may pay money." Well, it doesn't say anything about a review process. I'm wondering the number of people that will be reviewing the very applications that go to the department for these funds. How many people are going to be reviewing these applications? What criteria do they have to review them? How is their appointment going to be made? Is it only going to be the cabinet? Is it only going to be a couple of people appointed from the government caucus reviewing these applications, or are there going to be appointments from outside the Legislative Assembly? Who are those people going to be, and what qualifications is the minister going to establish for those people to review those very applications?

I would like to know currently how many applications the minister receives for lottery funding in a particular year, because I am very concerned that the minister is not going to be able to look at each and every application fairly, give it the time that it ought to have, and review the process. I'm wondering about this current year, or perhaps we can look at the 14 years the minister likes to talk about where we've had this operation on-going. How many applications have we had in total? How many per year can we expect it to increase? Have there been incremental increases over the course of time? Have we had periods of stagnation? What makes the groups respond in one year over another? I think that's important for us to know so that we can try and determine what years seem to attract more applications than other years.

I'm also curious to know, Mr. Chairman, what kind of monitoring system is going to be in place to ensure that the money that is being asked for and the group that is the lucky recipient of these dollars is spending the money on the projects that they have submitted to the minister. Now, I know that in other programs that the minister is responsible for, the STEP and PEP programs, the monitoring system in place there -- I've asked the minister on a couple of occasions in the House what kind of monitoring systems are in place. Regrettably there are very few monitoring systems in place, and I'm very concerned with the amount of money that we have the potential to hand out out of the lottery fund surplus. I'm very concerned that we have an effective monitoring system in place, and I would like the minister to give the assurances to the Legislative Assembly that we are indeed going to have an effective monitoring system in place to ensure that those funds are being properly expended once in the hands of the recipients and not, as my colleague the Member for Edmonton-Kingsway pointed out going to a Len Grant so that he can fund some -- what was the program? -- language study program that was completely nonexistent. I want to be sure that with this public money that the minister and the minister alone may or may not control, we have an effective monitoring system in place to review those very applications, to review the applicants who receive those funds.

I don't know if the minister wants to respond now or later.	Ewasiuk	Mitchell	Strong
MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question on Bill 10?	Fox	Pashak	Younie
	Gibeault	Roberts	
HON. MEMBERS: Question.	Totals:	Ayes - 27	Noes - 11
MR. CHAIRMAN: All those in favour of Bill 10, please say aye.	[The sections of Bill 10 agreed to]		
	[Title and preamble agreed to]		
SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.	MR. ORMAN: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill 10 be reported.		
MR. CHAIRMAN: Opposed, please say no.	[Motion carried]		
SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.	MR. YOUNG: Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee rise and report progress.		
MR. CHAIRMAN: Carried.	[Motion carried]		
[Several members rose calling for a division. The division bell was rung]	[Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair]		
[Mr. R. Moore in the Chair]	MR. R. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has had under consideration Bill 10.		
[Eight minutes having elapsed, the House divided]	MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Having heard the report, those in favour, please say aye.		
For the motion:	SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.		
Adair	Getty	Pengelly	
Ady	Heron	Reid	
Alger	Hyland	Schumacher	
Brassard	Johnston	Shaben	
Cherry	Jonson	Sparrow	
Cripps	McClellan	Stewart	
Downey	Oldring	West	
Drobot	Orman	Young	
Fischer	Payne	Zarusky	
Against the motion:	MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Carried.		
Chumir	McEachern	Sigurdson	
			[At 10:48 p.m. the House adjourned to Friday at 10 a.m.]