

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Title: **Friday, May 13, 1988 10:00 a.m.**

Date: 88/05/13

[The House met at 10 a.m.]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

PRAYERS

MR. SPEAKER: Let us pray.

Our divine Father, as we conclude for this week our work in this Assembly, we renew our thanks and ask that we may continue our work under Your guidance.

Amen.

head: INTRODUCTION OF BILLS**Bill 29****Mental Health Act**

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill 29, the Mental Health Act.

This Bill, Mr. Speaker, has developed from Bill 3, which was presented in the Legislature a year ago, and on introduction of it I would like to thank those many people throughout the province who offered comment on Bill 3 that resulted in the development of this new Bill, Bill 29, which we would hope would receive Royal Assent during this session.

[Leave granted; Bill 29 read a first time]

head: TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table the annual report of the Northern Alberta Institute of Technology, as required by statute.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Deputy Premier.
Member for Edmonton-Mill Woods.

MR. GIBEAULT: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table for the information of members the text of a petition signed by some 3,000 residents in Fort McMurray expressing their concern about the waste of taxpayers' money on administrative expenses at Keyano College in the city of Fort McMurray.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to table the annual report for 1987 of the Alberta Social Care Facilities Review Committee.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

head: INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS

MRS. McCLELLAN: Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to introduce to you and through you to members of the Assembly, 19 grade 9 students from Consort school located in my constituency of Chinook. They are accompanied by their teacher Mr. Kjearsgaard and parents Marlene Gould, Trudie Simkin,

Connie Wiechnik, and Cleona Weiss. They are seated in the public gallery. I would ask that they rise and receive the customary warm welcome of this Assembly.

MR. ZARUSKY: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure to introduce to you and to the rest of the Assembly today, two members of the Smoky Lake Legion. They are the president, Walter Sabrowsky, and the secretary, Mr. Steve Vitychuk. I ask that they rise and receive the warm welcome of the Assembly. They are seated in the members' gallery.

MR. SPEAKER: Calgary-Fish Creek.

MR. PAYNE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. With us today in the public gallery are nearly two dozen young men of the 173rd Scout troop from the Parkland community in the Calgary-Fish Creek constituency. They've journeyed from Calgary to Edmonton today to visit the Legislature, and they are accompanied by their leaders Joe Gerritsen, Blaine Lawlor, and Allan Wrubell, and their driver Ray Gorham. I wonder if they might all stand in the gallery and be welcomed by the Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER: Member for Lacombe.

MR. R. MOORE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's a pleasure this morning to introduce to you and through you to the members of the Legislature, 24 members of the Bentley Christian Training Centre, located in the heart of the Blindman valley. They are accompanied by their teachers Mr. Duinker, Mrs. Kooman, Mr. Kooman, and Mrs. Allan and also parents Mrs. Ellerby and Mrs. Kooman. They are seated in the members' gallery, and I ask them to rise and receive the traditional welcome of the Legislature.

head: ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**Employment Standards Enforcement**

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Labour. There have been many, many complaints from vulnerable employees who have complained that their complaints about exploitive practices by employers are not properly dealt with. My question to the minister: does the minister continue to argue that the problems are caused by the fact that immigrants come from countries where police are not their friends and they need to be educated? Specifically what has been done about the many complaints?

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, I take grave exception to the remark of the hon. leader, who is criticizing some excellent civil servants and members of the public service and alleging they are not doing their job. That's shameful.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, it's precisely these people who are complaining. One Mr. Rodger Lee from Calgary was fired because he was trying to do his job. We're talking not about the employees but the policies. I have appendix A of the Employment Standards Dispute Resolution Principles and Policy. Under the introduction, I quote: "The concept of prosecutions has been all but eliminated." My question to the minister. Why would the government bring in this outrageous proposal, a policy which says employers who violate the law shall not be prosecuted?

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, I was well aware of Mr. Lee's complaints about the department, especially since he was dismissed for good and valid reason. In that matter he has gone through the right process, and he has registered a grievance under that matter. That will be held in due course. I am not about to comment on Mr. Lee's specifics because of that.

Now, when it gets to the specifics of the matter, the situation, as I've said before, is that there are about 10,000 complaints a year registered with the employment standards. I've said before that a very considerable number of those are misconceptions and are not valid claims. The vast majority of the remainder are dealt with satisfactorily, and the employee gets their due financial recompense that they should have gotten in the first place.

Further to that, we educate the employers as much as possible. Where there is evidence of persistent breaking of the law, then we recommend prosecution, and prosecutions do occur and they are successful. The main purpose of the department is to make sure that claims are investigated properly and that the employee gets the money that is coming to them. That is the main purpose. The main purpose is not to have prosecutions which may be counterproductive by delaying the eventual transfer of the money back to the employee whose rightful money it is.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, this is unbelievable. If a worker's caught stealing from an employee, they're going to be charged. But if an employer steals from workers, we're going to work with them. My question is: where is the fairness of this? Why the double standards?

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, I've already explained that the primary purpose is to make sure that the worker gets their due return. I can give some numbers. About 10 percent of the claims are found to have no valid grounds. About a quarter of the remainder are settled over the telephone, which is that degree of minor misunderstanding that is involved. Of the remaining 70 percent, about 90 percent are settled to the benefit of the employee, with no further action required after an interview and an investigation. There are about 500 per year that go to the arbitration process through . . . What's the name of it? Not an arbitrator. . . But there is an appeal process which goes to the appropriate person, sometimes a Provincial Court judge, and that settles a large number of the remainder. In actual fact, Mr. Speaker, the process is working very well for the benefit of those for whom it is intended.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I'd be stuck for words trying to justify this policy; that's for sure.

What we're really saying. . . Take the Bill from the Solicitor General: if you catch a drunk driver, you're going to mediate and compromise. Is that the same policy we'd be following here? My question is a very simple one that average Albertans want to know: why is there a double standard? Why are there laws for the employers where they won't be prosecuted but different laws for employees in this province?

DR. REID: There is not a double standard at all, Mr. Speaker. The standard is the same for the employers and the employees, and they are both treated fairly. One has to realize that in some cases the complaints are not justified, that in actual fact the employee may be expecting something that is not within the statute. There has to be fair treatment of both sides. Where there is a persistent pattern, where the employer does not learn from the education process, then the employer is prosecuted. In

those situations we do recommend prosecution to the Attorney General's department. On the other hand, there is little point in prosecuting where there has been a genuine error on the part of the employer and he has made restitution to the employee. This is not a police state, as the hon. member of the ND Party would like to have.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

Calgary-Buffalo, supplementary.

MR. CHUMIR: Mr. Speaker, delay and frustration are the lot of those who have to deal with the minister's labour standards branch, and I'm wondering whether the minister will do the right thing and agree to an independent review of the way in which his labour standards branch is not doing the job in this area?

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member for Calgary-Buffalo is once again throwing insinuations about the function of the members of the branch. They do their job. They do it well; they do it to the satisfaction of the vast majority of those who wish to be served by the branch. The policies of their branch are under review at all times on a continuing basis, and where we find changes needed, then we make the changes. There's no need for an independent inquiry.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

Second main question, Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MARTIN: I'd like to designate my second question to the Member for Vegreville.

MR. SPEAKER: Member for Vegreville.

Ethanol Fuels Industry

MR. FOX: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In spite of the Minister of Agriculture's repeated claims that an ethanol industry would not be viable in Alberta, there is an industry alive and thriving in the town of Minnedosa, Manitoba, and the mayor of that fine community said in a letter to the minister:

As a Prairie community which has benefited substantially from Manitoba's 7-year old program, I and the members of Council, would like to take this opportunity to invite you and other interested Members of the Legislature to visit our town and see . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member, let's not have such lengthy quotes from letters in question period.

MR. MARTIN: Let's not interrupt.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. Leader of the Opposition. Thank you for your kind advice, totally unsolicited.

Member for Vegreville.

MR. FOX: I'd like to ask the minister if he will confirm that he'll accept the gracious invitation of the mayor of Minnedosa and travel to that community to see firsthand the benefits of ethanol in action?

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much the question by the hon. member. We received a fax of the invitation yesterday, and as I indicated to Paul Cashman of the *Edmonton*

Journal when I was talking to him last night, we were examining the possibility of accepting the invitation if we could fit it into our schedule, because I'd very much like to continue on with our very objective analysis as to what we would do for the ethanol industry, unlike the hon. member, who has proven not to be so objective.

MR. FOX: Well, that's unacceptable, Mr. Speaker, because the minister says that part of this objective consideration is sending the author of these thoroughly discredited and negative reports on ethanol in his place. I'd like him to confirm that he will go. I'll go with him.

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, his kind invitation is enough to deter me from going.

But in view of the fact that he's not been very fair in presenting the two reports, I want to stress the criteria under which we put those two reports together, because he obviously is taking a very negative aspect. We want to do so on an objective basis whereby we want to increase our markets for agricultural products. We want to improve our environment. We want to make sure that our industries operate within the law. We want to create new economic opportunities for Alberta citizens. We do not want to create industries that will be a burden on the economy in the long run. Those are the criteria with which the report was put together.

Again, I'm happy to indicate to the hon. member that regretfully there was an error as it related to forgone revenue. That was the only error to date that has been uncovered by all parties. We are using this paper for discussion purposes only. I should share with the hon. member, too, so that we do view these things on a very objective basis: if the hon. member's not aware, there were just six plants that closed in Louisiana that produced ethanol, because of the lack of economic viability. We've got to view this, and I'm going to look forward with great expectation to the public meetings, because we've got to do so on an objective basis so that we do have a net benefit to the agricultural community. That's what I'm pursuing on a very active basis.

MR. FOX: It's a shame to hear the minister contradict the direct experience of the people in the town of Minnedosa, and I'm concerned that his enthusiasm is beginning to peter out. I'd like him to stand up and tell us why he is not prepared to accept immediately this invitation so that he can go and view firsthand and have experience that's of benefit to farmers and producers in Alberta.

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, again it's a distortion of the facts that the hon. member is attempting to convey to this Legislative Assembly, whereby I answered that question in his initial question, whereby we are examining the possibility of accepting that very kind invitation. But the hon. member persists in attempting to distort the facts, as he has consistently done in this entire debate as it relates to ethanol.

MR. FOX: Well, final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. The minister said in his initial press release, "I am placing this matter on the agenda" at the national Agriculture Ministers Conference, in spite of the fact that it was on the agenda for a month before he even thought of it, and that can be confirmed in Ottawa. Does he not realize that if he wants to be seen as a promoter, as an advocate of this worthwhile industry at this meeting in Toronto, it would be in the best interests of not only his image but the

industry in Alberta to go there with some direct firsthand experience and share that with the ministers in Toronto?

MR. SPEAKER: The question's at an end, hon. member. Thank you.

MR. ELZINGA: Unlike the hon. member, Mr. Speaker, I'm not worried about image. I'm worried about doing something for the farming population.

MR. SPEAKER: Redwater-Andrew, followed by Edmonton-Meadowlark. [interjections] Redwater-Andrew. Thank you.

MR. ZARUSKY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Minister of Agriculture. Since we know that our government is trying to diversify in any way possible to help the grain farmers in Alberta and Canada and it's known that Mohawk Oil Canada owns the ethanol plant in Minnedosa, Manitoba, could the minister tell the House why some Mohawk service stations have pulled out the E10 gas formula from their sales pumps in Alberta?

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, that has been brought to my attention, but I don't know the reasoning behind it, and I'm more than happy to investigate it for the hon. member.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.
Edmonton-Meadowlark.

MR. MITCHELL: To the Minister of Agriculture. Could the Minister of Agriculture please indicate to the Legislature what steps he is taking to correct the errors in the report so that the public hearings process can be based upon proper information so that everybody can know exactly what the facts are?

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, what we have done is -- and the errors already have been corrected with the follow-up from both the Alberta Grain Commission and the Touche Ross consulting group. We're grateful that the errors were uncovered and that corrective measures have been taken, because it has underscored the importance of us following through with what we had originally planned, to have discussion amongst various groups as it relates to the establishment of this industry.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.
Main question for the Liberal Party, Calgary-Buffalo.

AIDS Policy

MR. CHUMIR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a question to the Minister of Community and Occupational Health. Proposed amendments to the Public Health Act provide for quarantining of AIDS carriers who place others at risk. We support the concept that action may be required in extreme cases, but only with the greatest protection for civil liberties. Unfortunately, the means by which this is being done in the Public Health Act gets a grade of only 1 out of 10 for protecting civil liberties, particularly compared to British Columbia, which has addressed the same problem. Now, in light of the reality that a form of imprisonment is being sanctioned, why did the minister not adopt the B.C. model and require that any isolation order re AIDS carriers be made by a Provincial Court judge on the application of a public health officer so that an element of judicial protection can be inserted into this very heavy-handed process?

MR. DINNING: Mr. Speaker, I take exception to the hon. member's comments and would say that there is no form of imprisonment here. The isolation orders provision in the Public Health Amendment Act are precisely the isolation orders that we have had in the Act for curable infectious diseases for the last 20 years. I would agree with the hon. member that these isolation orders will be imposed only in the most extreme of cases, and we have ensured in the original part of the Act that all citizens will be protected and that their civil rights will also be protected.

MR. CHUMIR: Well, that's not so, and this isn't isolation for contagion; it's isolation for conduct. It's conduct that's an issue.

In B.C. the medical health officer has to initiate all quarantine proceedings with respect to AIDS and provides a much needed buffer between the doctor and the carrier. Now, why has the minister decided to allow medical doctors, of whom there are hundreds, to issue isolation orders instead of requiring that any action be initiated by medical health officers who can more effectively be educated in means of protecting the public while also protecting the civil liberties of AIDS carriers?

MR. DINNING: Mr. Speaker, I want to put the provisions of the Bill in the proper context. The hon. member and all hon. members know that our approach to AIDS has been one of education. That was announced last October, and virtually all of our efforts and certainly all of our dollars are going to the only way that we can combat this disease, and that is through education. The provisions in the Public Health Amendment Act round out that circle. A very small portion of our effort is going to this last-resort initiative. Again, I take exception to the hon. member's comment. This is isolation for disease, and this provision is there as a last-resort provision to protect the public health of all Albertans.

MR. CHUMIR: Mr. Speaker, the minister can do so much better and doesn't seem to realize it.

Now, the Public Health Act our Act provides that any person -- now, that's not just a doctor or medical health officer, but any person -- can bring an application for quarantine before a Provincial Court judge. Now, why leave individuals who are carriers of AIDS open to abuse by any busybody instead of requiring that a public health officer be satisfied before such proceedings can be started, again as in B.C.? They've looked at it, they know the problems, and they've got sensible solutions.

MR. SPEAKER: It's been asked. Let's go.

MR. DINNING: Mr. Speaker, I am satisfied that the way that isolation orders have been imposed for curable infectious diseases in Alberta since 1905 should properly apply to those same diseases which are, in fact incurable.

MR. CHUMIR: To the Attorney General, Mr. Speaker. These procedures also raise serious Charter of Rights issues, and I'm wondering whether the Attorney General can advise what procedures he has set in place to ensure that all legislation which may infringe on personal liberties is in fact reviewed for compliance with the Charter of Rights and whether his department has reviewed these Public Health Act measures specifically for compliance with the Charter. Are these all right, in his view?

MR. HORSMAN: I don't know which question to answer, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member persists in asking so many questions in his supplementaries.

There are procedures, of course, with respect to review of all legislation as it may impact upon the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, and those are taken into consideration as legislation is being drafted.

REV. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, did the Minister of Community and Occupational Health consult with AIDS Network of Edmonton, AIDS Calgary, or his own provincial AIDS advisory council before he brought in these amendments?

MR. DINNING: Mr. Speaker, I consulted with a number of individuals throughout the province before we brought these amendments in.

Rural Economic Concerns

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Premier, and following to the Associate Minister of Agriculture. To the Premier. In the last few months and in the last few days, I've noted with concern the continued decrease in the economy of rural Alberta. I was notified in the last day of a very significant business in southern Alberta that is closing its doors. I've also been in contact with others that are in severe financial trouble. As the chairman of the agricultural and rural development cabinet committee, my question to the Premier is: has the Premier a formal procedure in place to monitor this rural economic crisis at the present time, or is the information that comes to the Premier by general information in a general sense from the various MLAs? But my question is: is there a formal procedure in place to document continually that crisis that's out there so that, in turn, we can deal with it in the best possible way?

MR. GETTY: Yes, there is, Mr. Speaker.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, if that policy is in place, could the Premier outline specifically the formal approach that the government will use to deal with that rural economic crisis? I'm not only talking about AADC or the programs where we've attempted to assist in input costs, but I'm talking about a formal approach, a concerted effort on a broader plain that will deal with that economic crisis that's facing farmers and agribusiness and dealers who are trying to serve the farmers of this province.

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, as I said, the government is constantly surveying and watching what is happening. It's all very well for the hon. member to say, "Don't talk about your programs." Well, how can you do that and say, "But tell us what you're doing to help"? Because obviously the programs are there helping. The beginning farmer program of 6 percent interest to farmers: that is helping. The \$2 billion of low fixed interest rates for 20 percent: that is helping. The \$1 billion for small businesses -- and many, many, many of them are in the ag and rural economy sector of our province: that is helping. The low prices for energy to farmers: that's a massive assistance to farmers and that is helping. The low fertilizer prices to our farmers: that is helping. The assistance with meat processing plants that are opening in rural Alberta: that is helping. We are doing these things. The assistance recently with industries in southern Alberta -- and the hon. member is talking about southern Alberta now. There are new industries helping which

strengthen rural Alberta because they're located in those areas, and it helps the rural economy because it flows into those communities.

Those are all things that are helping. We are very concerned and working constantly with our farmers and ranchers, their organizations, through the government's district agriculturalists, through reports to cabinet by both ministers involved in agriculture. The Minister of Economic Development and Trade may well want to also supply information to the hon. member, because he is working in this area constantly.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, supplementary question to the associate minister. To support a number of these businesses that are in financial trouble, we need to keep the farmers on the farm. To the associate minister. Will the associate minister be announcing changes to the AADC policy prior to September 1, 1988, which will be the time when new decisions have to be made with the current farmers that have already faced quitclaims and various changes in their arrangements in terms of farming? Will the minister be able to announce policy at an early date so that we can assist farmers to stay on the farm at least in 1989?

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Speaker, I think we just did announce a major policy which is directed at strengthening the rural communities: the commodity-based indexed deferral program. We've done that because we want to maintain the purchasing power of the rural communities. We want to maintain rural schools. We want to strengthen the agricultural sector as a whole. The response that I've been getting from people in agriculture is that it is working, and it is helping.

In terms of new announcements specifically before September 1, the announcement that I intend to make before September 1 would be in relation to the beginning farmer program and some new directions it may take that will not have any implications for the current beginning farmer programs. We've announced a number of changes that have been made to give those people options for restructuring their debt and maintaining their agricultural involvement.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary to the Associate Minister of Agriculture. The new policy that came out in May was requested last October, November, December, and January, and finally came out in May. Could the minister then confirm that during this period between now and the announcement of the new policy just mentioned with regards to the beginning farmer, all decisions possibly facing beginning farmers now will be put on hold until such time as that new policy is in place and can be used in tandem in analyzing these beginning farmer policies that they're facing at the present time?

MRS. CRIPPS: No, Mr. Speaker. What I'm talking about is a program for beginning farmers, people who want to get into agriculture. I think that we may be able to make some changes in the beginning farmer program that will meet the beginning farmer's need in a better manner, and that's the program I intend to announce.

In the meantime, we have to get on with the decision-making and the opportunities for farmers who are presently in agriculture to make decisions. The last thing that most of them want is the government to put a hold on those decision-making options.

MR. SPEAKER: Vegreville.

MR. FOX: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the associate minister. When she announced her indexed deferral plan, she made it clear that it was available only to those farmers who weren't in arrears. In other words, those who don't need it would likely receive it and those who do need it are ineligible. I'd like to ask her if she would consider that if a person's payments are in arrears and it approximates the amount they'd be eligible for under the two-year retroactive provisions, they would be considered for the benefits of this program as well.

MRS. CRIPPS: Well, Mr. Speaker, the member's comment is absolutely wrong. The program did not say that someone who is in arrears was ineligible. In fact, part . . .

MR. FOX: That's what he was told.

MRS. CRIPPS: I'm sorry.

MR. SPEAKER: Through the Chair, hon. minister.

MRS. CRIPPS: Part of the program is to allow for deferral of arrears, and there is some criteria where a farmer may become eligible for deferral of arrears. Number one, he has to have a genuine intent to repay his loans. Number two, repayment problems have to be attributable to unforeseen circumstances: drought, low commodity prices. Three, management ability has to be satisfactory. Four, the borrower did not accumulate assets at the expense of ADC. He also has to be able to show that there is a workout plan and that there is some hope for the operation. There is no point in looking at arrears where there is absolutely no opportunity to show a workout plan or repayment ability. But by all means, someone who can show that there is a possibility for repayment, and it can be demonstrated, is eligible to participate in the plan.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Agriculture. I wonder if the minister has any figures to share with the Assembly vis-à-vis the amount of farm bankruptcies last year compared to this year in Alberta.

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, I'm happy to share with the Assembly that in the year 1987 for the first year since the year of 1980 farm bankruptcies actually decreased by some 24 percent. They decreased to 71 from the previous year of 93. If we look at our farm numbers by province, we in this province have gone through the smallest decline, whereby our farming population has only decreased one-half a percentage point, '86 over '81: the smallest of any province. If you look at our production as it relates to bringing on new land, we've increased our acreage by some one million acres, '86 over '81. Statisticians indicate it is such because of our strong support for the agricultural community where there'd be marketing initiatives dealing with trade or the internal development of the agricultural economy within our province.

MR. SPEAKER: Calgary-Buffalo, final supplementary.

MR. CHUMIR: Thank you. This supplementary is to the Minister of Transportation and Utilities, Mr. Speaker. One of the ways of helping rural areas is to provide opportunities for diversification of activity by farmers. I'm wondering if the minister

can tell us about one of those opportunities; namely, what progress is being made with respect to his small power policy, which is such an opportunity, particularly in the south?

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

We're now moving on to Lethbridge-West, followed by Edmonton-Glengarry, Edmonton-Meadowlark, Cardston, Edmonton-Belmont, and Edmonton-Beverly.

Employee Retirement Incentive Program

MR. GOGO: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question to the Minister of Labour in his capacity as minister responsible for personnel administration. Last year the government of Alberta announced in its fiscal plan until 1990 to reduce the public service. I'd like to pose a question to the hon. minister with regard to the employee flexibility assistance program, which applies to those public servants over 55. Could the minister share with the House the approximate number of public servants who took advantage of that program and what the approximate cost has been to Alberta Treasury?

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, the total number of participants was slightly under 2,000 -- 1,800 and some, I think. Of that number some were, of course, in boards and agencies rather than in the direct public service and, as we know, a considerable number in management and administrative positions. The cost to the Treasury in direct cost was some \$34 million, but in addition to that, of course, there were some savings in that not all of the positions have been filled subsequent to the taking of early retirement by the people concerned.

MR. GOGO: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. An integral part of that program was to assist these people who left the civil service under that program to have counseling, et cetera, to get back into the work force. Those private counseling firms were hired, according to the annual report, so that they would assist these people. My supplementary: as that program ended at the end of March, is the counseling service still available to those public servants who left under the early retirement incentive program?

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, as members will remember, there was some flexibility in the program that allowed for a mutual consent process to allow deferral of the early retirement where the department felt that they wished somebody to stay on for a restricted length of time and the individual was willing to stay. The service of the outside consultants to the people who took early retirement was terminated a reasonable time after the individual had taken the early retirement. It is possible that some are still getting counseling, but I don't have direct knowledge of it.

MR. GOGO: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. An integral part of the program was innovative thinking by the government in terms of the employment options program or flexibility in job sharing. It was quite innovative a year ago. Could the minister share with us whether or not the job sharing attitude, where people could take a leave of absence without loss of seniority, has been successful in the context of allowing those people to come back into the government service and assisting those who would normally have been laid off from the government?

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, I don't have direct knowledge of all of the people who took advantage of that, since the individual departments now have a very considerable degree of flexibility. The personnel administration office has ceased to be a controlling organization and is more one of education and assistance to individual departments. On that basis, we do not have centralized figures for the numbers who took advantage of job sharing and the other alternatives that were made available.

I should comment, Mr. Speaker, about the co-operative role that the Alberta Union of Provincial Employees played in this exercise. Indeed, they brought to us the concepts for the early retirement part of the package and worked with us in the development and implementation of it. It has, I think, been a good demonstration to Albertans of what can be achieved by co-operation between employers and employees and the unions.

MR. GOGO: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker, one that's important I think, to many taxpayers in Alberta. Have any of these people who took advantage of the employee flexibility assistance program been rehired by the government of Alberta either in the capacity of an employee or under contract to this government?

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, the program was introduced on the basis that those who took early retirement would not be eligible for rehire by the government or for contract positions. We have, with one exception, managed to stick to that, the exception being due to the unfortunate death of Mr. Skoreyko, the chairman of the Alberta Liquor Control Board. Mr. Joe Forgione, who had been for a long time the senior administrative officer of the board, has come back for a fixed period of time to assist until a new chairman can be appointed. That's the sole exception that I know of.

MR. MITCHELL: A supplementary to the Minister of Career Development and Employment. Has the minister considered the problem of people over 50 who are being retired early for one reason or another, frequently because of job loss or business failure? Has the minister considered that problem and considered implementing programs of retraining to assist those people in adjusting to a very, very hostile employment environment for people of that age?

MR. ORMAN: Mr. Speaker, we do have a couple of areas. One is that many of our programs are not restricted to age. Individuals can access our retraining programs and many of our employment programs irrespective of their age category, although the emphasis in our programming is on youth between the ages of 16, 17 years old to about 25.

We do fund nongovernment organizations in our department. Opportunity "45" is a good example. We fund them in Edmonton, Calgary, and Lethbridge, hoping that we can assist particular organizations who are dealing with people who are in this category.

Certainly we are aware of it, and we do, on a regular basis, review the concerns of that age category. It's a difficult situation, Mr. Speaker. I do acknowledge that.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Edmonton-Glengarry.

Highway 40 Development

MR. YOUNIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. When I recently

asked the Premier about expensive improvements to Highway 40, the Premier did nothing to allay fears that the government is in fact planning extensive development in the area at some future point but is still in the denial phase and waiting to make an after-the-fact announcement. In addition to the cost of winter surfacing of the road and roadside parking areas of a summer-use road, the government purchased Highwood House, which is a gas station with cabin rental accommodations. Can the Premier confirm that the original reason for the government purchasing Highwood House was to close it and move it out of this critical habitat area?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, those are responsibilities that fall under the Minister of Transportation and Utilities.

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, the purchase of that particular property was back in the days when I was Minister of Tourism. I was involved with that at that particular time, and there was the moving in of some buildings from Banff National Park. They were second buildings. At that particular point in time we had suggested that we would keep the site there as a service centre and remove some of those that were in there on a part-time basis.

MR. YOUNIE: Well, it certainly doesn't agree with the Kananaskis Country recreation development policy review, which said:

The current location of Highwood House and its operations are unacceptable and will be moved (before the 1982 summer season).

So it seems to have taken a long time. Can the Premier explain why the facility of Highwood House is now being upgraded rather than removed from this sensitive area, as was originally planned?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, we always intended to upgrade the facilities along that highway.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary question.

MR. YOUNIE: Thank you. That certainly is not what the regional wildlife biologist Harold Carr thought when he said:

Now that the Government has bought the place, surely we can close the cabins and campgrounds immediately.

That was supported shortly . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. member. It is a supplementary.

MR. YOUNIE: Thank you. I'm just wondering why that advice and other advice given over a long period of time about the important reasons for closing that area was never followed, even though it was the original policy of the government.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. member. That's enough.

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Transportation and Utilities may wish to supplement my answer, but I'd point out to the hon. member that there are a lot of people who want to have input into how various parts of our province are developed and used, and we certainly are not restricted to those with one point of view.

I can remember being in this Legislature when many people

said that there should not be a Kananaskis Country, that there should not be a Kananaskis Highway. They said that should be left for people who want to participate in that area in what they called the man/horse package: a person who would be able to enjoy that area would be the individual who went in on horseback. Well, obviously, there were an awful lot of Albertans who said: "No, that's our heritage as well. We want to enjoy that beautiful part of Alberta." There was a great deal of concern by some people, but it was done in a sensitive, environmentally positive way. Now Albertans from all over this province are enjoying something that very few people were able to enjoy in the past. Now they're really enjoying it. It's got tremendous support all over Alberta. Those are the kinds of things that it's necessary to do.

Now, I understand the hon. member has quite a narrow point of view about some of these things, but he should think about his constituents here in Edmonton who also want to participate in that area.

MR. YOUNIE: Thank you. This document states that the government's policy was to close it and that they even canceled Husky Oil's lease on it for that purpose. So it's hard to comprehend what the Premier is trying to say there.

Will the Premier assure us that he does not have plans for extensive winter recreation development in the area and that Highwood House will be closed and relocated rather than being used as a springboard for that kind of development?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I'll assure the House that the government will continue to take into account the interests of all Albertans in providing opportunities for them to enjoy this magnificent province.

MR. MITCHELL: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Tourism. Could the minister please tell us whether he has made any representations to the Premier or to his other cabinet colleagues indicating that this obsession with the southern part of Highway 40 is uncalled for, is not environmentally sound, when in fact Highway 40 in the north, between Grande Cache and Grande Prairie, could be developed properly to provide tourist opportunities for an area of this province that requires an improvement in tourism, an improvement in tourist opportunities . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. member. [interjection] Thank you very much.

Minister of Tourism.

MR. SPARROW: Mr. Speaker, we would like to have all ideas considered in the province. As you know, we're asking every community and Albertans across this province to get involved in the community tourism action planning, IDs and MDs included. I'm sure that if anyone in this House has some ideas of what they would like to see in tourism in the future, this is the year to put your ideas in writing, send them to the ID, MD, county, town, village, hamlet, city that you're talking about, and have them included in their community tourism action plans so we can look at them.

MR. BRADLEY: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the minister of transportation. Would he give consideration to upgrading Highway 40 from the Crowsnest Pass to Highwood House so that southern Albertans will have equal access into Kananaskis Country?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, Highway 40 has been a very important artery in the north/south movement of traffic within the province, and the priority from the north to the south is reasonably equal. I say that, all other things being equal, and I'll take the hon. member's representation.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Meadowlark, main question.

Free Trade

MR. MITCHELL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. People in Alberta are being faced with the prospect that the free trade agreement between the United States and Canada may actually be implemented. Responsible government should be anticipating the potential positive impacts and the potential negative impacts to provide for the opportunity to capitalize upon market opportunities in the United States, where they will exist, but more importantly to provide transition for those people who will lose businesses and who will lose jobs. Given cuts in overall funding to Economic Development and Trade's international trade program, given a paltry increase to export service programming in that department, and given the threat now of substantial cuts to wage subsidy programs in Alberta, one can only wonder whether this government is accepting that responsibility. To the Premier. Is the Premier advancing under the assumption that the U.S./Canada trade agreement will actually be implemented?

MR. GETTY: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MITCHELL: Will the Minister of Economic Development and Trade please tell us what specific programs of consequence his department is undertaking to identify opportunities for small businesses in this province, in the United States? How is he communicating that information to small business entrepreneurs in this province?

MR. SPEAKER: First question only, thank you.

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, it's been an important part of our strategy over the past two years to develop programs to assist Alberta companies to access trade opportunities not just in the United States but throughout other market areas of the world: the Pacific Rim, Europe, and other areas. We announced -- and if the member had been paying attention, he would have known -- a new management assistance program to assist Alberta companies to be export-ready to access markets in the United States. We've strengthened our offices and our trade director's capability to assist companies in identifying opportunities. We also have reinstated and expanded our export services support program. Our export loan guarantee program has assisted a number of companies in being able to access markets in the United States. So the emphasis on the U.S. market, as well as other markets, has been well established over the past two years.

MR. SPEAKER: The time for question has expired. Might we have unanimous consent to complete this series of questions?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed? Carried. Thank you.

MR. MITCHELL: Mr. Speaker, how can the minister stand in this House and say in any seriousness that in fact he has empha-

sized those areas of undertaking in his department? He has cut international trade development budgets, he has cut program marketing budgets, and he has only increased export services by \$800,000 on \$1.6 million. What is he doing to support Alberta business in confronting the potential new free trade context within which . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. member. You've now asked two questions in this supplementary.

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, I've dealt with the questions earlier in question period and also during estimates.

MR. MITCHELL: To the Minister of Career Development and Employment. Could the minister please indicate what specific programs he has planned to assist those people who will lose jobs, those businesspeople who will lose their businesses in making the transition from lost jobs to the potentially newly created jobs?

MR. YOUNG: Point of order, Mr. Speaker. The question has been asked.

MR. MITCHELL: No, it hasn't. [interjection] It has not.

MR. ORMAN: Mr. Speaker, I should firstly say that entrepreneurs and Albertans don't need governments to tell them where the opportunities are in the free trade arrangement. Secondly, I should let the hon. member know that the hon. Minister of Economic Development and Trade and I are participating with Norman Wagner, who is on a federal committee for labour market adjustment as a result of the free trade agreement, if, in fact there is a need for adjustment here in Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, I should let the hon. member know that 4 million Canadians a year change jobs, so to suggest that because there are going to be job changes under the free trade agreement somehow this is new to Albertans and Canadians. . . . We'll do very well under the free trade agreement and it will be as a result of the initiative and the hard work and the dedication of Albertans participating in that opportunity.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary, Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MARTIN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. To either the Premier or the minister of intergovernmental affairs. What assessment has the provincial government received from the federal government that the Mulroney trade deal could be in some jeopardy because of a constitutional problem in the United States dealing with Alaska oil coming into Canada?

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, the matter is now before the Senate and the House of Representatives in the United States, and that is one of the issues that is being raised relative to the trade agreement. I can't answer the hon. member as to the outcome of that particular question, but it is no doubt a matter that will be resolved within the United States itself. It is certainly not within the jurisdiction of the government of Canada or the government of the province of Alberta to answer as to the constitutional issues within the United States. We have enough of our own to deal with.

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member did as well ask myself that question. I should point out to him that the ambas-

sador from Canada to the United States, Mr. Gotlieb, has in conversations with me made it quite clear that while there's a great debate going on in the United States and there are little hang-ups over some issues, he feels that this trade arrangement will be approved by Congress and that it's a very positive move for Canada, a very positive move for Alberta because of the tremendous opportunities it provides for Alberta's entrepreneurs.

I must say, Mr. Speaker, just in confirming the comments from the Minister of Career Development and Employment to the Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark, that the real opportunities here are for the people of Alberta, the businesses. While you may have some left leaning Liberals and NDP who don't like the fact that it reduces the impact of the state on the public, it frees up businessmen, and businessmen and individuals take advantage of this agreement. We don't want the state in there with their left leaning thoughts about taking over from the businesses. We want the businesses to do it, and they will in this province.

MR. SPEAKER: Red Deer-South.

MR. OLDRING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's interesting to note that from time to time across the way, they express some concern about jobs in this Assembly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. OLDRING: Mr. Speaker, I'd be happy to continue once the Leader of the Opposition regains his composure and calls in the troops.

To the Attorney General, again in recognition of a concern about jobs in this province -- and I recognize that our unemployment is dropping rapidly. Could the Attorney General tell this Assembly how many jobs in this province are currently trade related and how many jobs in this province we stand to gain as a result of this new initiative?

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I don't have the statistics right at hand, but it has been estimated by reliable economic forecasters that the increase in jobs in Alberta as a result of the implementation of the free trade agreement will be greater than in any other province and that it will provide substantial new opportunity for entrepreneurs and small businesses to expand their opportunities in the United States, and the economic benefits will far, far outweigh any negatives.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: Might we revert briefly to Introduction of Special Guests?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed? Carried.

head: INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS (reversion)

MR. PENGELLY: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure to introduce to you and through you to members of the Assembly, 35 grade 9 students from Delburne school in the constituency of Innisfail.

They are seated in the members' gallery and are accompanied by their teachers Mrs. Colleen Butler, Mr. Gary Taylor, and Mr. Randy Tuff. I'd ask them to rise and please receive the welcome of the Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER: Redwater-Andrew.

MR. ZARUSKY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure to introduce to you and to the rest of the Assembly, 30 grade 6 students from the county of Thorhild central school, located in the village of Thorhild. They are accompanied by their teacher Mr. Ken Zinyk and one parent Mrs. Darlene Armstrong. They are seated in the members' gallery, and I ask that they rise and receive the warm welcome of the Assembly.

CLERK: Government Motions.

MR. SPEAKER: We have -- what? -- a variation in procedure here.

MR. MITCHELL: I would like to rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker, under those provisions of *Beauchesne* relating to answers to questions.

It's my contention that the Premier's answer to my question, one, was out of order to the extent that it should have been given at the time I asked the question, at a time when I would have had a chance to, therefore, rise and ask supplementary questions. If he wants to give supplementary information, it should be done in keeping with the rules and regulations of this House, which permit him, and rightly so, to do that at the end of question period, and then permits me to rise on at least two occasions to ask supplementary questions.

The second provision under which I rise is the fact that his answer clearly and specifically was designed to provoke debate, and while I don't mind debate being provoked in this Legislature, of course, what I do mind was the premise upon which that answer was presented. It was presented in a very frivolous manner. The fact of the matter is that we're not dealing with averages. We're not dealing with overall concept. We're dealing with specific human beings who are going to lose jobs and who are being treated in a very frivolous . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Order please. Order please, hon. member. The Chair is still awaiting the citation from *Beauchesne*, not the rest of this. Thank you. Anyone else? [interjection] Three fifty-nine what?

MR. MITCHELL: Three fifty-nine covers it. The fact . . . [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Order. Take your seat, please, hon. member. Three fifty-nine; which subsection? There are a considerable number. [interjections]

Thank you. That's not good enough, hon. member. It really is a series of . . . It's a complaint, and again the Chair can do nothing more than take note of the fact that the member has raised a complaint. But the member had full opportunity, because the House extended the courtesy to have the whole question dealt with. The hon. member had the main question, three supplementaries, and that's the nature of how the House happens to work. [interjection] Thank you, hon. member. [interjection] Hon. member, if you persist . . . Thank you.

head: **GOVERNMENT MOTIONS**

9. Moved by Mr. Young:

Be it resolved that the Legislative Assembly grant permission to McGraw-Hill Ryerson Limited to publish a table from the Report on Communal Property presented in 1972 by a select committee of the Assembly, on a nonexclusive basis, with credit being given to the Legislative Assembly.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, just a brief word of explanation. The report of the select committee of the Assembly of 1972 dealing with communal property is a public report. The rules of our Assembly require permission for anybody to use the report or any element of it for publication. This motion would make it possible for this company, as part of a larger documentation it's preparing, to be able to use those tables.

MR. McEACHERN: Mr. Speaker, before we give permission for this motion, would the minister tell us how much it will cost the Assembly, or the government?

MR. SPEAKER: May the Government House Leader close debate.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, it won't cost the Assembly anything. It's just a matter of the cost of sending a letter giving them the permission and the time it's taking now to move the motion and get it on the Order Paper.

[Motion carried]

14. Moved by Mr. Young:

Be it resolved that when the Legislative Assembly adjourns on Friday, May 20, 1988, at the regular hour of 1 p.m., it shall stand adjourned to Wednesday, May 25, 1988, at 2:30 p.m.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, Motion 14, as hon. members will understand, deals with the Assembly over the next holiday weekend that's coming.

[Motion carried]

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, if I could just give an indication of the work for the coming week, in view of the Lieutenant Governor's function on Monday evening, the House will not be sitting. The House will sit on Tuesday evening and Thursday evening. It is the intention to commence on Monday afternoon with the estimates of the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund and to proceed with those at least for Monday, and Tuesday if necessary. If not necessary, then we'll be moving to other work.

head: **GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS**
(Third Reading)

Bill 1

**Premier's Council on the
Status of Persons with Disabilities Act**

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill 1. The Bill is the Premier's Council on the Status of Persons with Disabilities Act. I urge hon. members to support this Bill. I think it is a new initiative in this province that will provide significant

benefits to the disabled in Alberta.

MR. SPEAKER: Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MARTIN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. As the Premier is well aware, we are going to support the Bill, but I'd just like some clarification from the discussion the other day about the mandate, to be clear that it is the intention, then, of the government to include mental disabilities, disabilities that people may have in terms of mental health and the rest of it, that it's not just physical and that this is clear, at least in my mind.

MR. SPEAKER: May the Premier conclude debate?

MR. GETTY: Without closing debate, if I can, Mr. Speaker, invite the hon . . .

MR. SPEAKER: [Inaudible] close debate, hon. Premier. Thank you.

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I won't speak for a moment. I'd like the minister to speak on this as well.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

MR. DINNING: Mr. Speaker, if I may, I just want to respond to the hon. leader's questions and make it very clear that the steering committee which made recommendations to the government on establishing a Premier's council made it very clear -- and we have adopted those recommendations wholeheartedly -- that this council will address issues that are of importance to all persons of all disabilities, including physical disabilities, including those who suffer from mental illness and those who would suffer from a mental handicap.

The council will be addressing issues that relate to training and education, to job creation, to income security, to access to buildings, recreation, and community living alternatives. I frankly, Mr. Speaker, am very excited about working with Gary McPherson, the chairman of this council, who I believe will take on the responsibilities with his council, once it is appointed, to tackle these very important issues not only for the disabled of Alberta but for all Albertans so that all of us can better understand the issues that are of importance to the disabled of Alberta and so all Albertans will have an understanding and an ability to work with these people far better than we are today.

MR. SPEAKER: Other members? Mr. Premier, summation.

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I felt the members in the House should have an opportunity to hear the Minister of Community and Occupational Health on this matter. He will have important follow-up responsibilities with the council as his responsibility for community health. He's worked a great deal with the establishment of the council, so members should know that he will have ongoing responsibilities there.

This point about the mental disability is the reason I made on committee study with the hon. Member for Edmonton-Centre, I believe it was, to not narrow down the definition of disabilities, which was the intent of his amendment to the Bill, but rather to leave that definition as broad as possible, which was the desire of the steering committee, as I pointed out the other evening. So, Mr. Speaker, I think all members should follow through now, as I urged them the other evening, to provide nominations

for appointment to the council, because from all parts of the House, I think, we want to get the best possible individuals on that council.

I urge support at third reading and move, again, third reading of Bill 1.

[Motion carried; Bill 1 read a third time]

[It was moved by the members indicated that the following Bills be read a third time, and the motions were carried]

No.	Title	Moved by
2	Homestead Lease Loan Repeal Act	Fjordbotten (for Clegg)
3	Agriculture Statutes Amendment Act, 1988	Fischer

[Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair]

Bill 5
Oil Sands Technology and Research Authority
Amendment Act, 1988

MR. DAY: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Member for Redwater-Andrew, I would like to move for third reading Bill 5, which is the Oil Sands Technology and Research Authority Amendment Act, 1988.

MR. PASHAK: Mr. Speaker, I just would like it to go on the record that during Committee of the Whole the member that presented that Bill did not in any way explain just exactly why it was that this Bill was required, why \$34.7 million was spent through extraparlimentary procedures. I think the public really is owed a justification and explanation for that.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Ready for the question?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, it's a point that we made the other night. Now, the member's not here; the minister is here. I appreciate the problem that the Member for Red Deer-North is in, but clearly when we're debating Bills, we're trying to get information. It wasn't answered in committee stage. There has to be some obligation, rather than just yelling "Question," that we get answers to these questions. If the government doesn't have it, I suggest that maybe we wait on this particular Bill and bring it back. It's not the end of the world. That seems to me to be a logical procedure until we get the information.

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Speaker, we have no problem holding that Bill until the minister is in the House.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree with the motion by the Associate Minister of Agriculture that that Bill be held for whatever?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Opposed? Carried.

Bill 6
Health Disciplines Amendment Act, 1988

MR. DAY: Mr. Speaker, I move for third reading Bill 6, which is the Health Disciplines Amendment Act, 1988.

[Motion carried; Bill 6 read a third time]

Bill 10
Interprovincial Lottery Amendment Act, 1988

MR. ORMAN: Mr. Speaker, prior to moving third reading of Bill 10, there were some questions asked. Would it be preferable that I respond to those questions now, or would you prefer that I move third reading?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. minister should move reading and then make the comments.

MR. ORMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move third reading of Bill 10, the Interprovincial Lottery Amendment Act, 1988.

Mr. Speaker, last night in committee there were a couple of questions that were asked by the Member for Edmonton-Belmont, and I'd like to now respond to those questions. The hon. member was asking with regard to the monitoring process, the licences, ceilings, qualifications. I want to point out to the hon. member that of the 14 boards and foundations that receive block funding from lotteries operations, each and every one of them has a board of directors, and in the larger foundations there is an administration attached to that. Applications are submitted to the board and the board reviews them, many of them on a quarterly basis, and those applications are then approved or rejected. As an example, with the Wild Rose Foundation there is a 60-day follow-up. Once the dollars have been sent to the organization, there is a letter that is sent back to the foundation. It reports and describes how the dollars were used, how successful the program was, and that's what we call the program accountability, Mr. Speaker. In many cases the administration or some of the board members, if it's in a particular area of the province where a board member resides, will follow up with the organization.

With regard to the financial accountability, the president, chief financial officer, or the program manager must sign a statutory declaration confirming that the expenditures that were made were in fact made in the manner in which they had undertaken to make those expenditures.

Now, with regard to ceilings and amounts, it varies from foundation to foundation. Again, with regard to the Wild Rose Foundation, they have a \$50,000 maximum application funding amount, and they can only make that application once every three years. I'm sure the hon. member will recall when we amended the Wild Rose Foundation Act in this Legislature. I should also say that many of those boards and foundations do get their authority through statute. We do require that they all file an annual report, and there must be an accounting, an unofficial audit of the accounts in that foundation or board that does receive the lotteries dollars. The levels of funding and the amounts vary from foundation to foundation, Mr. Speaker, and those are all laid out in the criteria on the applications.

The Member for Red Deer-South did outline yesterday almost all of the boards and foundations that do get lotteries dollars, and as I indicated, many of those foundations have their reports filed within this Legislature for scrutiny. I should also

say, Mr. Speaker, that the Auditor General also comments and reports on each of the boards and foundations that receive lotteries dollars. So the accountability both from a program point of view and from a financial point of view is, I think, very, very appropriate, and there has been a high level of integrity both by the applicants and by the boards in terms of determining levels of funding and the appropriateness of the programming.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, at third reading of this Bill I'm tempted to say that the minister is now sort of the king of the slush fund as far as it goes.

If I may say so, I think the government and the minister are missing the point about this particular Bill. I understand their analysis of it is: because it doesn't strictly come from the taxpayers as taxes, somehow there doesn't have to be legislative scrutiny. You start this precedent, you start this as the principle, pretty soon there'll be more and more and more taken away from the Legislature. The fact is that regardless of where that money came from, it is government money. One of the principles in British parliamentary democracy we take seriously is that the Legislature or Parliament scrutinizes the money coming into the government. That's an inviolate principle, as far as I'm concerned.

Now, I say to the minister that maybe he doesn't intend it to be this way, but what it becomes is an automatic slush fund for that minister to sit on -- millions and millions of dollars, over \$200 million -- and basically do with it what he wants, Mr. Speaker. Now, while the minister says, "You have to trust me; I have great integrity on this particular Bill," the fact is that the principle is wrong. It becomes, if I may say so, a possible slush fund that the minister can dole out here or there or wherever he wants for such crass reasons as political reasons. It's an abuse of the system.

Mr. Speaker, the reason we're dealing with this particular Bill at this time is that the Auditor General was complaining about it. He said, in fact that this is a bad process, that it's not a good process in terms of looking after the people's dollars, making sure we get the best bang for the buck. He's indicated that it should be under legislative approval. So what the government does rather than take that criticism is come in and pass a law saying that they don't have to do it. Again, can you imagine the principle we're establishing here? That somehow, whenever we get criticized, we'll just take it away from the political arena here is precisely what we're doing with this Bill. I say to you in all sincerity, Mr. Speaker, that this is a very, very undemocratic Bill, and it should not be of a partisan nature. All of us would say that we believe in British parliamentary democracy and we believe the Legislature is paramount. I expect if I asked everybody here on both sides of the House, they would at least give lip service to that that all hon. members on both sides of the House should be opposing this Bill on principle.

Now, the government members may think: "Why, this is an excellent idea. Because we're in government, we don't have to come for public scrutiny here, and we will have this little slush fund and maybe we can use it politically to get re-elected." A lot of governments in the past have made that mistake. I say that there is a tendency, the longer governments have been in power, to begin to act more arrogantly, to begin to act more undemocratically, and I suggest it's happening here with this Bill. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, what's next? Bill 10 -- what other Bill when we get criticism from the Auditor General? What's coming next as this government stays in power? Well, I want to say to them that it's precisely Bills like this that eventually do

the opposite. They lead to governments actually being thrown out because all fair-minded Albertans know this is a bad Bill. I think deep down the minister does too.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is a bit disconcerting, a bit disappointing that in this House, while we certainly have our partisan nature, I think all of us should recognize the principles this Legislature is supposed to stand upon. It's disappointing to see that a Bill like this is brought in and that government members just sit there quietly and let it go through. I think that's a shame to all members who are going to vote on this Bill, and I say to you that this is going to become a symbol of what this government has turned into in its later stages of being in power.

Mr. Speaker, it's interesting that as we go back and look at it we've already had an example. It's not only this minister who sets up the big slush fund; we're going to have all the other ministers with their own little slush funds. I refer back to question period this week, when we found a letter went out from the minister of culture basically telling the lotteries that the member, the hon. minister, was talking about how they could spend their money, where they spend it already. One of the arguments the minister has given us is that they hire good people, they're non-partisan, they know their job, and they are the ones evaluating the programs; therefore, the Legislature doesn't have to do it. But we see at least in one case a letter that was leaked to us where that minister in one department is telling them clearly what they do and what they can't do -- in this particular case, probably a good number of Conservatives on that board. So not only do you have one big slush fund. You probably have 20 -- we have a big cabinet; how many ministers are there now? -- 25 or 26 little slush funds that they can run around the province and do what they want with. Well, Mr. Speaker, again I just say that they underestimate the people of Alberta when they do this, because the people of Alberta are fair-minded, they do believe in democracy regardless of their particular persuasion, and they find a Bill like this frankly offensive.

You know, Mr. Speaker, it's rather interesting when you look back in British parliamentary history when they went through this idea of who controlled the purse. The king thought he controlled the purse and the Legislature thought they controlled the purse. They had interesting fights during those times. You may recall that one Charles I didn't like the Legislature controlling the purse. He decided that he didn't like democracy, it wasn't working very much, very much like the minister across the way, so he decided to spend the money as he wanted. A rather interesting thing happened to that particular king. His name was Charles I. They beheaded him. Now, I'm not suggesting that we should go this far with the minister, but I think the point is made that they took the idea very seriously that the Legislature controlled the purse strings even back in those days. Now we have this minister and this government trying to overturn history, and I would hope now he's a firm advocate against capital punishment because he may be in some difficulty if it ever comes back.

But the point we want to make, Mr. Speaker, is that this is a matter of principle, and the argument that somehow because this comes with lottery funds and not from taxes -- the point is that it is still government money. And I think any fair-minded government that wasn't at the end and hadn't gone autocratic, wasn't listening to the people, would recognize this as a very, very serious mistake. I say to this government: for Bills like this, Mr. Minister, you people are going to pay a big political price.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hon. Member for

Edmonton-Meadowlark.

MR. MITCHELL: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I rise to establish once again the fact that I and my caucus will be voting against this Bill. It is very, very obvious to me that we have an exceedingly tired government in this province at this time. I'm reminded of the late . . . [interjections]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. MITCHELL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm reminded of the political process in Alberta in the late 1960s and early 1970s when the previous leader of this Conservative Party argued vehemently on the campaign trail that the Social Credit government of the time was not a government of bad people, not a government of evil people; it was a government that was extremely tired, that was exhausted. While there are many examples of tired government at this time, this tired government, this example, is absolutely classic.

No legitimate argument can be provided by this government in defence of this particular Bill. The argument has been made that this kind of revenue is different than normal tax revenue. Well, if that's the argument they're making, the next thing we will see is that revenues from alcohol sales or revenues from fees and fines charged and levied by governments will no longer come before the Legislature. If we're looking for precedent, every precedent we can see in the democratic parliamentary process argues strongly, argues powerfully, that this money must come before the Legislature. The ultimate irony is that a government with this kind of majority need fear nothing in expressing its priorities through the allocation of this money. It can still do exactly what it wants to do; we've seen that time and time again. Yet ironically it does not want to bring that particular source of revenue before the Legislature in keeping with standard parliamentary procedure, Legislature procedure.

The minister has indicated that volunteers all around the province review it -- another exceedingly weak argument. There are good volunteers around this province who deal with the money in the lottery fund, yes, and we are to congratulate them and be appreciative of their contribution and their efforts. However, again, to say that we should structure volunteer boards to spend liquor taxes, volunteer boards to spend fees and fines, clearly those arguments do not rank as strong arguments. They underline how silly and ridiculous it is that this government would stand in this Legislature and argue vehemently not to bring this money before this Legislature.

But there is a broader concern and a concern that always becomes apparent in the face of tired, exhausted government, and that is that government of that kind does not want to be held accountable. It is afraid to be held accountable. It doesn't have the energy and the consistency to face accountability, and we see it in many, many phases of this government's operations. Taken in isolation, the manner in which this government proposes to handle lottery funds is bad enough, but taken in a broader context, it is an indication of a very disturbing trend in the erosion of accountability by this government.

One, loan guarantees. Loan guarantees are not brought before the Legislature. The policy under which loan guarantees are approved has not been presented to the Legislature.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: With great respect, hon. member, we covered this the other day. We tend to get somewhat askew from the Bill. I would like to remind the hon. member that the

Bill has been dealt with in principle, has been adopted. We've gone through the amendment stage essentially, although amendments may be made at this reading. I would simply suggest the hon. member stay within the very narrow confines of third reading of this Bill.

MR. MITCHELL: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your point, of course, and I will make every effort to adhere to it. I am, however, driven to speak in this broader context, because I think it places a different emphasis on what this government is doing and underlines the point we in the opposition are trying to make. I will be extremely brief.

Loan guarantees and the manner in which this government handles them are an indication of erosion of accountability. The Public Accounts Committee, the fact that it does not sit between sessions and is the only major legislative committee that does not sit between sessions, is a further indication of the erosion.

MR. OLDRING: Point of order.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Red Deer-South.

MR. OLDRING: Point of order, Mr. Speaker. I cite citation 62(2):

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

Mr. Speaker, I recognize that you just reminded the Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark to try to get back to the subject in front of us. I know he's been under a lot of stress of late, but perhaps he could return to the Bill.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. . . . [interjections] Order please. Thank you, hon. member. I would remind hon. members that section 62 applies to committee stage. We're at third reading stage.

Hon. Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark.

MR. MITCHELL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The fact of the matter is that the lottery fund Bill addresses the issue of accountability. Loan guarantees and the manner in which this government is handling them addresses the issue of accountability. The Public Accounts Committee and the failure of this government to allow it to sit between sessions and review all departments' expenditures addresses the issue of accountability and its erosion. And finally, the manner in which this government handles special warrants and the manner in which it limits review by this Legislature of special warrant expenditure addresses the issue of erosion of accountability.

Mr. Speaker, we will be voting against this Bill because this is one further step in the erosion of accountability by this government, and it's a very, very serious one because it takes important, significant funds out of the public purview and has them handled in a way that can only be viewed in the context of political cynicism.

Thank you very much.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hon. Member for Edmonton-Mill Woods.

MR. GIBEAULT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have to get some comments on the record about Bill 10 here. I want to mention a number of concerns I have with this.

The whole principle that we could have a separate lottery

fund is really very offensive indeed. Mr. Speaker, we have already enough problems with this government bringing spending proposals before this Assembly with inadequate review, and then to have the gall to suggest that we should set up a private little lottery fund somewhere that only the minister and his friends can look at and deal with and decide who will be the beneficiary of is patently offensive. We have, as I said, enough difficulty already trying to monitor the granting from various programs that come before this Assembly. We have the Alberta business and community development program and many others, and it's interesting for me, of course, to note how often there are projects in Conservative government members' ridings and not in opposition ridings. I can just see that if we pass this Bill, it's going to be even worse under this private little lottery slush fund.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if I was taking this from a partisan point of view, which I am not, but if I was a s . . . [interjections] If I was approaching this from a partisan point of view, I'd let this go by because we're going to be the government next time and we could do the same thing. But I object to that fundamentally as a taxpayer and as a citizen of this province, that that is a fundamentally bad process. I cannot support it, and I will not support it. I'll be voting against that unless there's an amendment to it.

I don't know why the minister has not learned from history. We just had a federal by-election -- three of them -- last summer, and I just refer to one, for example. In St John's East, which the Tories lost to the New Democrats, it was exactly the kind of thing they did in that by-election that this government I'm sure, is planning to do if this Bill is passed. What they did was dump all kinds of federal projects and money into that riding during the by-election, and -- Mr. Speaker, I'm trying to help the minister here, but he doesn't learn from history -- the people of that riding did not appreciate the government in a very corrupt manner, basically, trying to buy them off. If the minister is intent on repeating history in Alberta, well, so be it, you know. But don't let it be said that he has not been warned about the process and the outcome that's going to take place if this Bill is passed.

And if we pass this Bill, Mr. Speaker -- I mean, why stop here? Why don't we have a special little hospital fund and a special little school fund, and the ministers will just decide where their best political mileage is to be gained by where they put public facilities. Why stop with the lottery fund and just recreation and culture? Let's go whole hog here. Why bring anything before this Assembly? You know, this whole process is really quite bizarre, especially when you keep in mind that the Auditor General of this province not once, not twice, but at least three times has made reference to the inappropriateness of the way lottery funds are handled in this province. I am troubled by the minister and his government's consistent efforts to try to refuse to comply with the Auditor General's recommendations in this regard.

Mr. Speaker, when I was looking at the original Interprovincial Lottery Act for which this is an amendment, it was interesting for me to observe that the amendment is substantially more extensive than the Act itself. The Act itself is a meagre four little paragraphs. I don't want to let this whole debate go by without bringing to the attention of the minister that there could have been a whole lot more done in an amendment to the Interprovincial Lottery Act than what has been put before us. What has been put before us, as I said, is nothing less than an opportunity, or an authority here, for the minister to establish his

own fund for favourite projects. But there's a number of things that really need to be covered in legislation covering lotteries, and the present Act, with its four skimpy little paragraphs, just doesn't do it.

I want to bring, among other factors, to the attention of the minister that there really ought to be some provision in lotteries legislation to prevent children from buying lottery tickets. I want the minister to know that in my constituency many parents have complained to me about the fact that children are buying lottery tickets and that convenience store owners who don't seem to have too many scruples in this regard are selling them, taking their allowance and so on for these fantasy tickets for which they have about as much chance of winning as someone has of getting a conviction on a labour standards conviction -- four out of 10,000 or something.

So, Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of things that really ought to be in here that aren't, and there are many things that are in Bill 10, the amendment Act, that are in affront to the process of justice and accountability. I want the minister to know that unless he brings forward amendments that deal with these concerns, he will not be getting the support of me or any of my colleagues on this side.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make two comments on Bill 10, certainly one with regards to accountability and the other, second, comment with regards to priorities.

In terms of accountability, the minister indicated to us at an earlier date that there are two steps in terms of accountability. One is the public accounts, and the other step are the boards that have been appointed to look after the various allocations of funds out of the lottery funding. The concern I have, and I think it's been expressed also by other members in this Assembly, is the approving, or just the examining, of the various expenditures out of these funds prior to the expenditure being made. Now, through an amendment in this Legislature, it was suggested that we should place a vote in the estimates to do it. That could have been one of the mechanisms.

But since we're in third reading of this Bill, I'd like the minister to consider possibly presenting in the form of a paper to the House or a ministerial statement or through a resolution or through some medium by which we could have a little more input of the broader Legislature into looking at the various programs or the allocations of those funds so that we could remove some of the possibilities of one area of the province getting more of the funds than another area, or the urban centres getting more of the funds than, say, the rural part of the province of Alberta. And it can happen. As I note from what has happened here, the funds would be allocated, I guess, on the importance of the program, whatever it may be, versus an allocation by a per capita basis or some kind of formula that treats all citizens of the province on an equal basis. I haven't seen evidence of that kind of formula being talked about by the minister.

Now, to me it wouldn't matter how you present that to the House, but some way or other we as all members of the Legislature should have that kind of assurance, that if a little community in my constituency only needs \$50 for some project they can make a submission and they would receive equal consideration to other communities such as the community of Edmonton that may need \$1 million. But I haven't noted any kind of indication from the minister that there is a formula of equality that's part of the accountability.

Now, priorities, and I've spoken to that in part already. I've noted some of the various foundations that allocate the lottery

funds and have tried to go through the programs and determine just what are their priorities and how they treat the community of Pincher Creek any differently than they do the community of Lac La Biche: why they would agree to a golf course project, say, in Pincher Creek and maybe not in Lac La Biche. The guidelines to these foundations, I think even within themselves, are not really clear, and what happens is that there's a sort of ad hoc judgment made on whether a certain application is approved or not. Now, I don't fault the committee on that basis, because maybe that's the term of reference they have been given, and they're doing the best job they can. And as far as I know, their job is excellent.

But usually, with government funding or public funding you have to try and follow the formula that every Albertan or every community or every grouping of Albertans, whatever kind of association they represent, should have equal access to qualify, and that it shouldn't be done because one group is able to write up a better application and apply a little more pressure than another group. We should try and eliminate that as much as possible in that process. So what you have to establish is a system of priorities where these kinds of projects will receive more consideration from lottery funding, others will receive a lower amount of priority and consideration, and each one of them in the various categories has to meet certain standards or requirements. A community then will qualify, whether it's a per capita formula or whatever it is.

I'd like the minister to consider those two things. We all recognize that this Act will be passed today in third reading, and it will follow through. But the two concerns I have and that others have here in this Assembly can be remedied by the way the minister follows through and makes a formal presentation, and a very open presentation, back to this Legislature prior to the funding being allocated, and also some type of terms of reference could be tabled, as a ministerial statement could tell us what the priorities are in terms of fund allocation to various programs.

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Point of order, Pincher Creek-Crowsnest.

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'm quoting from *Erskine May: Parliamentary Practice*, 20th edition, page 576, relating to debate on third reading. In the last two years an unusual practice has crept into the procedure of the Assembly; that is, we are having debate on third reading of a Bill. It seems to me that the debate that has been taking place here today should have taken place at second reading and in Committee of the Whole.

To quote *Erskine May*:

Debate on third reading

When a motion has been made for the third reading of a bill the question is put without debate unless at least six Members have given notice of an amendment to the question, or of a motion that the question be not put forthwith.

So the debate that's been taking place today is highly unusual with regard to parliamentary practice. It's been slipping into this Assembly the last two years that we've been having these types of debates on third reading.

Further, if there is an amendment put, debate on third reading, however, is more restricted than at the earlier stage, being limited to the contents of the bill; and reasoned amendments which raise matters not included in the provisions of the bill are not permissible.

So I would submit that any debate on third reading can only take place if there is an amendment before the House.

MR. SIGURDSON: On that point . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. Before the hon. Member for Edmonton-Belmont . . . The Chair appreciates very much the point raised by the hon. member and quoting various sources. However, our primary source is our Standing Orders, and the Chair would refer the hon. member to Standing Order 18, which refers to which is and which is not debatable, and third reading is debatable.

On this point of order, Edmonton-Belmont.

MR. SIGURDSON: My very point exactly. Thank you.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

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

MR. SIGURDSON: Phew. Jack-in-the-box. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I want to start my remarks by thanking the Minister of Career Development and Employment for responding to some of the questions I posed last evening, and they beg a couple of other questions that I would hope the minister would be able to respond to when he closes debate either Monday or Tuesday.

Those questions are: if we have an application that is made before the boards, if they're rejected, are there appeal mechanisms? So that worthwhile groups that make an application may have that application turned down for any variety of reasons -- community groups, sports groups, cultural groups, recreational groups -- is there an appeal mechanism they're made aware of? It's a two-part question, I suppose. Not only, is there an appeal mechanism in place, but are those who happen to have their applications rejected advised of that very appeal mechanism so they may reapply with corrected information, and then hopefully get some of that funding?

The second reason I want to thank the minister, quite frankly, is that this is an election issue. This, Mr. Speaker, is going to show quite clearly. It's in a nice brief form. I'm sure that most political parties will be able to have sufficient copies made so that we can distribute these door to door with some notes, because this is an election issue, and I thank the minister for that. This shows that there is limited accountability by this government. Now, the minister has indeed said that mere are going to be some annual reports coming before the House, but that's after the fact. Mr. Speaker, that's after the fact. Nothing is going to come before this Assembly prior to the expenditure of this public money. That's what the debate is all about: public money and accountability; not the minister's bucks, not the government's bucks. This is public money going to be managed by a minister for a period of time that we don't even know about. Let me just go through section 5 of the Act. Section 5(1) says:

The Minister shall hold and administer a fund called the "Lottery Fund" into which shall be deposited the money received from the conduct, management and operation of lottery schemes to which this Act applies,

and it goes on a little bit more. Section 6 reads:

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

lated to the support of initiatives related to recreation or culture or for any other purpose the Minister considers to be in the public interest.

Now, you know what I find a bit amazing about this, Mr. Speaker, is that it doesn't say how frequently the minister's going to have to disburse those funds. We've not addressed that yet. Do you know that we've failed somewhat in failing to address that particular matter? It doesn't say that the minister has to disburse those funds annually, whatever the amount is. It doesn't say he has to do it every six months or every two years.

I wouldn't be surprised to see the minister holding back surplus funds for extended periods of time, year after year after year, but I would hazard the guess that just before the election year -- just before the election year -- all kinds of ribbon cutting ceremonies are going to avail themselves for all the members of the government party; that plaques will be raised on walls of public facilities so that we might have an unveiling and the smiling face of a government member. You know, I'm surprised that we didn't pick up on that earlier. There's no annual accountability for this. Nothing says that the minister has to bring those funds out annually. Nothing says that the minister has to disburse those funds and the surplus lottery profits annually to those groups. In fact, this clearly allows for the minister or the government to decide that well, we've just had an election period and we have a number of members that have returned; let's hold back some of that money. Let's hold it back for a year, two years. Let's really build up a fund so that we can be seen out there in the trenches just prior to the next election. This is the very creation, Mr. Speaker, of a slush fund. This leads to the kind of patronage politics nobody in Alberta wants to see.

This is an antidemocratic Bill, and it really, truly, ought to be stopped and held. But it's not going to be. And why is that? Because it's politically expedient to have a fund. It's politically expedient for the government to have a fund of substantial resources with which they can turn to certain deserving groups and individuals who may be active in local communities and local politics, and feed that group, feed that group so they're thankful, so they're beholden to the very government that gives them money.

You know, that's pretty shameful. That's pretty shameful, but it's a possibility that may happen if we don't have some kind of commitment from the government to amend this Act so there at least is an annual accounting of this slush fund. We ought to be able to find out how much is going in on a monthly basis. Now, I'm sure the members of government will say that's a question properly put on the Order Paper. Well, we know the record of their answering these questions. Those questions that appear on the Order Paper are almost eight times out of 10 almost exclusively denied. I think I may be corrected, but I've yet to have one of my questions on the Order Paper responded to in a favourable way by the Minister of Career Development and Employment. We've argued those points, and this is going to create more arguments. This is going to create more arguments in this Assembly because members that were elected by their constituents were elected to serve and elected to scrutinize the spending of public dollars, and we are not being allowed to do that. We're not being allowed to do that because the government has decided to take the second recommendation of the Auditor General. The first recommendation was: put the money into general revenues so that we can look at the expenditure of those funds. The second recommendation, Mr. Speaker, was: change or amend the law. Amend the law -- that was the out. If you don't want to do what's proper, there's the out.

You know, it wasn't all that long ago -- and I think it's an important point to be made -- when contractors were locking out their employees for 25 hours and changing the terms and conditions of re-employment. There was a question of the law being violated, and this government introduced Bill 110 to correct that procedure. That was pretty shameful. And Albertans remembered that Albertans remembered that amendment to the Labour Code and they acted upon this. I'm sure that Albertans are going to also remember this Bill 10, and they will act upon that too. Because, Mr. Speaker, this Bill is going to lead to favouritism, and there's not going to be any controlling mechanism for us in this Assembly to try and change that. It's not good enough that the minister says, "But we will have annual reports, annual reports before this Assembly so that we can look at the money that has been spent" -- already spent. It's gone. What if we disagree? We can't get it back -- not very likely anyway. It's tantamount to closing the barn doors after the horses have left. It doesn't do very much.

There is no accountability in this Bill for millions of public dollars that are going to be expended by this government -- no accountability whatsoever -- and that, Mr. Speaker, is shameful. That is shameful. I regret that last evening the minister didn't take us up on the offer to amend the Act. I truly regret that, because that was a reasoned amendment, one that could have allowed us to scrutinize the very expenditure of those millions of dollars. But it was defeated, with the help of that Liberal/Conservative coalition. That was defeated.

AN HON. MEMBER: For good reason.

MR. SIGURDSON: For good reason. Yes, I know. We've always said that it's us against them, and "them" is over there.

But, Mr. Speaker, I wish we had introduced at least one more amendment because it is an amendment that will lessen the severity of the legislation. And that is that we should have introduced the word "annually" in section 6. I truly regret that we didn't introduce that because I do not want to see and Albertans do not want to see this minister, this government, save up money for two or three years and then suddenly, just prior to the election, send that money out to open up the financial floodgates and fund all those services that have been restricted and held back and denied over the previous two or three years. All of a sudden they're going to have all kinds of moneys and "Happy days are here again" and "Isn't this government great?" [interjection] Cynical? No, I don't think so. That's not cynicism; that's skepticism. Because this slush fund is only there to be leading to patronage politics and political expediency.

This Bill, and the minister full well knows it, is antidemocratic and violates parliamentary convention. I think it's a very sad day when we get to the point that this government agrees to pass this Bill as it exists.

Thank you very much.

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

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I made some heartfelt comments on the fundamental shortcomings of this Bill at second reading, and I won't repeat them.

On a point of order in a sense, an unusual point of order, I do notice in the Bill that sections 7 and 8 are missing, Mr. Speaker. The Bill cannot be passed in this form, with two missing sections, obviously. So it will have to go away and come back in

proper form. There are sections 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 9. What's in missing sections 7 and 8? I suspect it's just a mistake at some point in the process, but the Bill will have to come back in proper form anyway.

To get down to the meat of the matter, this Bill is very bad for the reasons that a number of people on this side of the House have mentioned, to do with a lack of accountability. My hon. friend the Member for Edmonton-Norwood has adverted to the king who lost his head for the very reason that he did not believe it was necessary to account to Parliament for the expenditure of public money, and I concur that this minister should lose his head, electorally, for exactly the same reason. He has only a limited number of honourable courses. He should resign or simply decline to be the minister entrusted with such an unlawful power, or at the very least he should take a half honourable course, which perhaps is more usual to Conservatives, of voting against the Bill. He told us that there would be an annual audit. We weren't even questioning that part of it, that somehow they would be covering up where they put the money, not paying it to the people they said they were paying it. I'm surprised to see that perhaps we should be worried about that too. We weren't worried about that. It's just the question of where it's going beforehand.

But Mr. Speaker, there's far worse when you look into it more closely. The rottenness just doesn't end with the process. This government is so anxious to take what advantage it can with public money, treating it as a pot from which to bribe the electorate, that they will stop at little, I respectfully submit, to achieve that end. Look, for example, at the letter written by the minister of culture on April 21, 1988, to the chairman of the Alberta Foundation for the Literary Arts. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that this foundation is funded from the lottery funds. He addresses the chairman in these terms, and I will just excerpt the words that are relevant:

As you know, additional funds were made available from lotteries revenue to all cultural foundations. The increase to the Alberta Foundation for Literary Arts is \$1.125 million dollars making the total... [of] \$2.125 million.

Going on to the next paragraph:

During our [last] meeting... I informed you I would be giving the Foundation direction on the spending of the additional funds.

And skipping to the next important passage:

It is important however, that we agree on the policies which guide the provision of public funds.

And then, Mr. Speaker, of the \$1.125 million, as the House was informed earlier this week in question period, \$500,000 was earmarked by the minister for the Banff Television Foundation and \$300,000 for film and video support. Leaving aside the fact that five-elevenths of the money was to a foundation in the constituency of the minister making the direction, which is bad enough, it's pork-barreling. That observation had already been made.

The entire thing is illegal on two counts. The first is that the government should pay attention to its own legislation and only make grants in the manner that they are entitled to make. The Foundation for the Literary Arts is set up under the Cultural Foundations Act under section 2 thereof, and the objects are set out in sub (3.1) of that section. It says:

The objects of The Alberta Foundation for the Literary Arts are

- (a) to promote the literary arts in Alberta;
- (b) to provide persons and organizations the opportunity to participate in the literary arts;
- (c) to support and contribute to the development of

the literary arts in Alberta;

- (d) to support and contribute to the publishing and marketing of the literary works of Albertans, by assisting in developing library services and the book and periodical industry in Alberta.

Where do grants to television companies fit into that? The whole thing is illegal. Here we have what we say is a slush fund. We have positive proof of it, not only that it's being used in a way which might be legal but electorally dishonest; i.e., pork-barreling in the minister's own constituency. The whole grant is illegal from the lottery funds. But more than that Mr. Speaker, it's illegal anyway, because the Auditor General has repeatedly said that the money should be in the general revenue of the province. This Bill has been brought in to make the absence of the money legal. Until it is passed, the absence of the money is illegal, and yet it is that money which is absent from the public fund which is being doled out. So they know they aren't entitled to it; they're doing it on top of that. They are giving it in a way that they're not authorized to do under the Act.

That isn't the end of it, Mr. Speaker. Because under section 6 of the Cultural Foundations Act the minister may give directions to a foundation, true, but what are those directions he may give? Directions for the purpose

- (a) of providing priorities and guidelines for it to follow in the exercise of its powers, and
- (b) of co-ordinating the work of the foundation with the programs, policies and work of the Government and of public and private institutions, in order to avoid duplication of effort and expense.

Now, compare that with what the minister -- I can't refer to his absence, I guess -- did. He told them where to spend the money. He removed their discretion to do anything about it in the case of the first direction as to the Banff Television Foundation, half a million dollars. The Alberta Foundation for the Literary Arts, he said in the letter,

will not be required to enter into discussion with the Banff Television Foundation on the uses of this money. The amount and how it is to be used will be the subject of discussion between the department and Banff Television Foundation.

It's very clear that this hon. member was wanting to do something in his constituency, and they had no compunction at all in resorting to illegal measures to do it. That is instinct in their approach on this subject.

I don't know what it is with lotteries. They've found a wonderful pot from which to bribe the electorate. I'm obliged to my hon. friend from Edmonton-Belmont to point out that there is no time limit on the disbursement.

MR. DAY: Point of order.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Point of order, Red Deer-North.

MR. DAY: Mr. Speaker, I'm citing citations 316(e), 326(2), 357(q), 360(5), just as some of the few we're hearing. Again I've heard from the member opposite words about bribing the electorate. Previously we heard words reflecting corruption, et cetera. This type of approach is purely imputation of wrong motives and reflects on the character and conduct of members, and I would ask that the member opposite withdraw his reflections.

MR. MARTIN: Point of order on that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MARTIN: He's talking about total government. Under no occasion does this have to do with individual members, and the words aren't unparliamentary. So there is no point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Chair appreciates the Member for Red Deer-North bringing that to the attention of the Chair. The Chair will defer a decision on that Hon. Member for Edmonton-Strathcona.

MR. WRIGHT: I'm speaking in metaphor, Mr. Speaker, with the greatest respect. The metaphor is an accurate one, though.

So I continue that not only is the object unlawful but also the method adopted is unlawful in the case of this distribution of this money, as to all of it fundamentally. And then in particular when you compare it with the mandate under the Cultural Foundations Act, as to eight-elevenths of it -- that's, say, \$800,000 of the \$1.1 million was given to an unlawful recipient. On top of that, as I'm pointing out, the minister did not merely give directions in the way of providing priorities and guidelines, he gave very specific orders where the money was to go and that no discussion would take place between those beneficiaries and the people supposed to be dealing with the money according to the Act; namely, the board of the foundation. The same sort of direction was given in respect of the other unlawful gift of \$300,000 to film and video support:

The proposal for such a program is still in the planning stage and should not be announced until further consultation occurs between you and me . . .

Those aren't planning priorities or guidelines.

. . . and discussions have taken place with members of the film industry and within government. This money should not be allocated in any way until further direction is received from the government.

[interjections] Providing priorities and guidelines. Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please.

The hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest.

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, again referring to *Erskine May*, page 577. It refers to debate on third reading. It says:

Debate on third reading, however, is more restricted than at the earlier stage, being limited to the contents of the bill.

And we've had far-ranging debate -- far, far, farther afield than the contents of the Bill. I would ask the hon. Speaker to rule on this.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That's a point well taken, hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest. The debate has somewhat gotten away from either the minister sponsoring this Bill dealing with other ministers of the Crown. Perhaps the hon. Member for Edmonton-Strathcona could come back more to the content of the Bill.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry if some hon. members lost the thread of my discourse there. The thread of it is that this Bill, the principle of it is dishonest and I'm giving concrete illustrations of the dishonesty in practice. That's all. That's all, but it should be enough.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Ready for the question?

Hon. Member for Edmonton-Centre.

REV. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I did not participate in this debate insofar . . . [interjections] Mr. Speaker, I don't want good seed to fall on such stony ground over there. If he would shut up.

Now, I haven't been too involved in this discussion. I really don't know what to make of lotteries nor this Bill; I've never bought a lottery ticket in my life. There are certain biblical injunctions, in fact, against this Bill and its contents. There are certain things that say that the use of lottery moneys in some biblical historical records are really quite evil. The fact you know, you could see the Roman soldiers casting lots for Jesus's garments at the foot of the cross or lots taken as to who was going to replace Judas: that person was chosen by a lottery, and we never heard of him since. I certainly hope that this Bill we don't hear of since, because it really, both in its principles and practices, is very evil and presents some concern which we have. It's entirely unacceptable, both in terms of its appropriateness and in terms of the accountability which it just does not have.

I don't know just how much we can add to what's already been said. I want to raise a couple of other matters about it, Mr. Speaker, that haven't been touched on, to my knowledge, at this point and have to do with the contents of it. It does refer in the Bill to the minister, and we've had certain discussions, not only about the minister's actions under this Bill but I'd like to raise the question as to why it is that this particular minister of career development has jurisdiction over lottery funds. It seems to me that the Minister of Culture and Multiculturalism provides far more in the way of grants under his department or the Minister of Recreation and Parks. So I think part of the principle of the Bill is begging, insofar as: why is it that the Minister of Career Development and Employment has jurisdiction in this area? Even the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care is getting into the act, and you might want to wonder about his jurisdiction in terms of the funds and how they're distributed.

But in terms of the accountability, Mr. Speaker, we really want to say, as we've tried to illustrate with various examples, why it is that section 6 is so offensive and why it is that if it were to have public debate by dutifully elected people from the public -- those MLAs in this Legislature -- then some discussion, some debate, could be brought to bear as to not only the accountability but the appropriateness of grants made through this slush fund. I would like to raise the concern about the degree to which grants from lottery funds are made to programs which help people who are compulsive gamblers. Now, it seems to me that I have not heard anything to date about the nature of those who are afflicted as being compulsive gamblers. I know the moneys go to good culture and recreation programs and good parks and recreation programs and now to lithotripters and MRI machines and everything else. It would seem to me that in a public debate in this Legislature we could raise some concern that there's increasing plague out there in society if people who are afflicted by gambling in a way that they are compulsive gamblers . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: With respect hon. member, third reading stage must deal primarily with the Bill before us, not the matter of what Albertans may be doing with regard to lotteries. With respect, hon. member, the principle stage of the Bill has been passed. We passed the amending stage. We must now narrow debate related to the Bill before the House.

MR. MARTIN: Well that Mr. Speaker. [inaudible] clearly on a

point of order, though. How this is going to impact this particular Bill on Albertans certainly should be relevant. I don't know why the government's so anxious to get themselves in trouble here, but clearly the effect of a Bill on Albertans is what we should be debating about.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: On the point of order, Leader of the Official Opposition, the purchasing of lottery tickets is not contingent upon the passage of this Bill, with respect. That's something that's been in effect for some time. I believe the hon. Member for Edmonton-Centre was addressing what effect it will have if people buy lottery tickets. That is somewhat distant -- order please -- from the third reading stage of this Bill. Edmonton-Centre.

REV. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I was referring to section 6 of Bill 10 where it says:

The Minister may pay money from the Fund f o r . . .
other purpose the Minister considers to be in the public
interest.

And I'm making the case that I thought that with some legislative discussion and with some support in this House the minister may see one of the purposes to be considered in the public interest: grants from the fund to go to help support programs for those who are afflicted with an addiction to gambling. Now, I don't want to cast aspersions on them if they want to buy lottery tickets. I did have some questions about whether lottery tickets should be purchased with VISA or MasterCard or whether children should be allowed to buy lottery tickets. So I can see that those questions might be out of order. Well, they are of great concern, and we do want to continue to raise them.

But, no, I would like to make the case that if it's going to be this minister who's going to decide on his own what is funded and what in the public interest is to be funded, it would seem to me that there is great public concern growing around those people who are compulsive gamblers. We know that in fact the ruinous behaviour of people who are compulsive gamblers in terms of their families and their jobs and other aspects of their lives is a very serious matter. I would think it should be incumbent upon this minister, or his conscience at least, that if we're going to be receiving money from people who may be buying lottery ticket after lottery ticket, perhaps some share of that could go back into programs which would fund support programs and servicing and other agency supports for people who are compulsive gamblers.

I know our gaming policy in the province is somewhat lacking with respect to just how far we want to go in various directions and what we want to do in terms of how much gaming we're going to allow and in what centres and so on. But it seemed to me that if there is a bona fide lottery fund and if the minister is in good conscience going to be one who is going to be distributing those funds, then I would like to make the claim that in the contents of the Bill, even at third reading, the minister could well consider it to be in the public interest to fund agencies and groups, whether they're through AADAC or through Social Services or Community and Occupational Health or Hospitals and Medical Care or wherever that are going to help to deal with what are often invisible horror stories or extreme cases -- but they do exist -- of Albertans who are afflicted by an addiction to gambling, whether they be in the form of buying lottery tickets or whatever.

So it would seem to me that under section 6 of this Bill the minister should be able to have that kind of consideration given.

And again, Mr. Speaker, all we're saying is that this is just another example of something that can be raised through the due process of the Legislative Assembly. I don't know; maybe the minister has thought about it and, as I say, in his own good wisdom, his own good conscience, these concerns have been brought to him and he's got plans in this regard. But I've not heard anything about it. In fact, whenever it's raised, it seems to be sort of shuffled under the carpet. And so this is why if the amendment as we had tried to present had been accepted or if there was the accountability, which this Bill is so lacking, which would bring expenditures before the Legislative Assembly not only for accountability and review but also for suggestions in taking some initiatives in some new areas, perhaps the whole business could be improved upon and its evil somewhat lessened.

So with those comments, Mr. Speaker, I again urge all members to defeat this rancorous Bill.

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

MR. EWASIUK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, too, want to make a few comments relative to this Bill, Bill 10. I want to start my comments by refuting any suggestion that somehow the opposition to this Bill is geared at the present recipients of this funding. That is certainly not the case, nor have we presented arguments to that effect, nor are we directing any criticism at the directors and those that are responsible for the administration of the various organizations that are recipients of the fund. That, of course, is not the issue in this debate. There's no doubt -- I think it has been alluded to quite clearly -- that the issue here is the responsibility of this Assembly, and that is the accountability of public funds. And more importantly, I think, it's the need for the government to demonstrate accountability of public funds. That is the issue in this debate, Mr. Speaker, not the issue of individuals who are now recipients of those [funds].

The Deputy Premier, in debate during second reading, defended this Bill by arguing that this was not in fact government money and therefore it really didn't need to be brought before the House for deliberations on how it's going to be spent. Well, I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that in fact the reverse is the case. The fact that it is not -- and we accept that theory -- public money . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please, hon. members. Carry on, Edmonton-Beverly.

MR. EWASIUK: . . . then I would argue that it is even more prudent, then, for the government to be accountable and to in fact bring the proposed expenditures before this House during estimates for discussion and proposals. So the issue is not whether the Assembly agrees with the minister but if the minister should have an unencumbered authority to simply spend lottery funds as he chooses. Or is the government going to do the right and proper thing and have the democratic process exercised so that we the people, the representatives of the people that elect us to be here, will in fact have the authority to determine how this funding is going to be spent? It has been referred to as a slush fund, and certainly one has to be suspicious when the government wants to bring this kind of legislation before us. Why? Why did he not wish to bring the legislation as to how the funding is going to be handled before this House?

I believe, Mr. Speaker, what is really going to impact on all

members of this House is that we are being tainted by this proposal, by this Bill, as being undemocratic, not only the government but, unfortunately, I think all of us in this House, because people will see it as a decision of the Legislature. And that is unfortunate because there's no doubt that already the federal Progressive Conservatives have lowered the esteem of government and government members to unprecedented lows, and I don't think that we in this House want to be compared or matched with that group in Ottawa.

I would therefore, Mr. Speaker, urge the members to give serious consideration to defeat this ill-conceived Bill. The government members to this time have not risen to defend it. They have risen to ridicule and to perhaps misinterpret the intent of our arguments, to suggest that somehow we are attacking the groups that are being funded. As I say, that is not the case. We are simply saying that there needs to be accountability for the expenditure of these funds. There needs to be accountability by this Assembly as a whole, because it is all of us that are responsible for that funding, and I want to be part of the decision-making process that decides how and where this money's going to be spent.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hon. Member . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: Forest Lawn.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Chair is aware of the member. The Chair is not yet -- order please -- assured whether or not the member has previously spoken. Thank you, hon. member.

Hon. Member for Calgary-Forest Lawn.

MR. PASHAK: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

In view of the importance of this Bill, I was really quite surprised that it came back so quickly after really the whole study of the Bill. I think a lot of important questions were raised during that debate. I for one would have appreciated some opportunity to have looked at the *Hansard* before we came back for third reading. In saying that, however, I do recognize that it's the government's prerogative to bring that Bill back at any time it so pleases and that it's our responsibility to be prepared to engage in debate. Having made that point, I'm just trying to underscore the fact that I think this is a singularly important piece of legislation because it does set a tone for the government's view of morality. I think that view of morality can be held up to public scrutiny. I think it will when the public begins to understand just what's being proposed in this particular legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to clarify a misconception that I believe the minister brought into the debate during Committee of the Whole study. I think the misconception is very germane to the question of the principle of the Bill. The minister seemed to be implying that whereas I personally was prepared to gamble and indicated that that is sometimes a pleasing form of relaxation, I wouldn't permit others that same opportunity. Well, nothing could be further from the truth, and I want to deny that interpretation of my remarks quite categorically. I said no such thing. I agree with the Member for Edmonton-Centre that gambling can in fact become a very addictive form of behavior, and it can create a lot of problems for people. I personally know of many individuals who've caused great distress for themselves and their families by intensive gambling that has got out of control for them. In fact, I know people who belong to organizations such as gambling anonymous.

I did make the point during first reading, and it is a question of principle, that widespread gambling and abuses thereof are a sign of moral breakdown, and many writers who study civilizations -- the rise and decline -- have commented that moral decline is a concomitant feature of the decline of civilizations. So it's not a trivial point to make, and it ties into what I think is the crucial issue here, which is that governments in a sense condone gambling when they use it as a form of indirect taxation.

I think it was really tragic that back a number of years ago in this country governments did look to gambling as a way of adding to their revenue base. I remember a woman from the city of Calgary that urged that Canadians have an opportunity to participate in lotteries.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hon. member, the Chair is reluctant to interrupt, but the city of Calgary is a long way distant from this Bill. We must restrict our discussions to Bill 10. We've gone through the principle stage; people could elucidate all they wanted with regard to lotteries at that stage. We're now at that stage where it's been adopted in principle; amendments have been made. In fairness, there's opportunity for amendments, but we must deal with the very narrow context of the Bill. Would the member come back to that?

MR. PASHAK: Yes, Mr. Speaker. In fact, I am referring to section 6 of the Bill. It says that the minister has these discretionary powers to not only make revenues that are derived from lotteries available for recreational and cultural purposes, but he can make those funds available for whatever other purpose he deems fit. I'm just trying to point out that historically, when lotteries got off the ground, the original principle for which people argued that we should have lotteries was to raise extra money for our hospital system. That was the original inspiration behind the pressure that developed throughout the country to have lotteries, and I think it is germane or relevant to the Bill under consideration.

I want also to enter into a disclaimer. I'm not trying to present myself as holier than thou in this particular issue. I think there's no one in this House or this Assembly that can claim to have the characteristics of Jesus Christ. I think everyone in this Assembly has warts of some kind or another, and all we can expect of people is that they try to live as morally and as responsibly as they can. Again, it's very relevant to the purpose of this particular piece of legislation, because it's up to governments to try to provide a moral perspective for people, to provide guidelines that encourage people to make moral choices rather than choices that are less moral. And when we condone gambling in any form -- especially this form, by raising revenues from gambling for cultural or whatever social purposes we deem important -- I think that is a very, very retrogressive step. Mr. Speaker, it is not, it's clearly not, in the best interests of the public ever to raise revenues from gambling for public purposes. But I must admit that we've gone in this direction, we've opened the bottle, we've let the genie out, and it would be very, very difficult to roll the clock back and go back to a time when we didn't raise revenues in this particular form.

I also want to point out why this particular form of raising revenues is so particularly offensive and odious. It really does come on the backs of the poor. It doesn't come, at least from the studies that I've looked at, on the backs of those people who are in the middle class, as the minister asserted during debate last day. I would really like to see the minister provide some information or some studies that would support his contention

with respect to that.

In fact, the minister in his remarks, and I think this is really clearly important to the principle of the Bill, tried to make the point, as did the Treasurer during second reading stage, that this is a voluntary tax, that people participated in it on a voluntary basis, that people choose to gamble and in that sense it provides a legitimate form of revenue for the government if they choose to tax that. Well, I would argue that low-income people really do not have a choice. At one time there was certainly a belief, a myth, in this country that a kind of Protestant ethic worked. If one kept his nose to the grindstone and worked hard and lived a moral life, he could achieve success in this world. Sometimes that myth is called Horatio Alger myth. If you work hard and you keep to a set of principles, you, too, will be rewarded in later life; you will become wealthy.

It's pretty clear that no one believes in that myth anymore. There aren't opportunities like that. If you're born into conditions of poverty or into low-income families, the chances of moving out of those situations are very limited. This is related to the principle of the Bill, because that's one of the few opportunities now that people have to escape those conditions. They believe that they have to gamble, they have to buy lottery tickets in order to try to improve their condition of living in this world. And so in that sense it's a compulsion for low-income people. They feel forced to gamble in order to try to live the kind of life-style that's presented to them as being ideal through the media and that sort of thing. So it's not voluntary at all. It's a fixed choice. They have to gamble in order to make it, and make it is what we're all conditioned into believing in this world.

Mr. Speaker, in that context I think this Bill should be withdrawn. We as a political party are prepared to take it to the people. We think it gives the minister of the Crown unbridled licence to use these funds for partisan political purposes. So with that I would just like to say that I hope this is an error in the printing of the Bill and that therefore the Bill is not legal and will have to be withdrawn, at least for that reason.

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

MR. YOUNIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think it would be ironic that we should find out that perhaps a Bill which is so totally and completely flawed in principle was also flawed in the printing, although I think it would certainly be appropriate to find out that it is flawed in every way possible.

I think, and you correctly point out, it's been passed in principle. I think it's lamentable that we've passed a Bill in principle when that principle is obviously so infinitely broad as to not just allow but invite almost any sort of unethical use of spending power, without check. I really think that is something that no Legislature should have been party to in any way.

That notwithstanding, we're now looking at the Bill as it stands and what might be done with it and why it should not be passed as it stands. The Member for Edmonton-Strathcona made the comment that the government should pay attention to its own rules and then outlined a number of sad situations in which it is not. We've seen so many examples of that in the last two years that I think one has to be fantasizing to hope that this particular government will live up to and live by its own rules, unless it has a very conscientious and very observant opposition looking over their shoulder every second. Because any possible way they can get around the rules as a government they will.

So I think what we've been trying to tell the government and the minister all along is that this legitimizes getting around the parliamentary process of scrutinizing what the government does.

If the minister is going to try to tell us that an audited statement at some future point down the road -- a year, two years, whenever the bureaucrats get around to deigning to let the opposition actually see this statement -- it will be time to scrutinize the expenditures and say, "Oh, you shouldn't have done that" or "This wasn't in the best interests of the people." Anyone who can actually stand in this Legislature and say that a year or two down the road, after the money has been spent, is soon enough to scrutinize the expenditure and judge whether it's right or wrong would also believe that you don't need to put safes in banks; you can just check later to see what the bank robber spent the money on and why he shouldn't have done so. It's obviously a ridiculous and silly argument.

AN HON. MEMBER: It sure is.

MR. YOUNIE: I meant your arguments, except the part where you quoted the Member for Edmonton-Highlands so eloquently in describing how this deals with regressive forms of taxation and it shouldn't be used to put money into the hands of the government for running ordinary day-to-day operations.

I see nothing in the Bill that says that the minister won't use that money for running the ordinary day-to-day operations of the government. It says he can spend it on whatever he wants. If he decides he should set up a fund to let backbenchers travel more than opposition members, one presumes he could do so, and a couple of years down the road the opposition would be able to look at the statement and say, "That wasn't really fair and legitimate and within the principles that are supposed to govern the spending of lottery money." Obviously, that's just not the case, and no member can really, honestly believe that it is, although we've heard a number arguing it.

We were told that the Bill would allow for speed of ministerial action, that that's a good reason for passing it the way it is, and that the minister can respond quickly in funding organizations that deal with the long-term cultural development of the province. Well, I would point out that mob justice that disposes of judges and courts would be quick. It would be immoral, it would be unethical, it would be socially unacceptable, but it would be quick. I would argue that the parallel is contained in this Bill. The minister can do whatever he wants quickly. It may be unethical, it may be immoral, it may be socially unacceptable, and the opposition may a couple of years down the road get to tell them that it was all of those things. But the money will be spent on purposes that might be unethical and socially unacceptable, and it will be too late to say to the minister, "You're wrong; you can't do that" because he would already have done it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Or illegal.

MR. YOUNIE: Yeah. Or illegal, which may well be the case as well. We are told that lottery funds are voluntary and that this fact makes the lottery funds different. Well, I do agree with the Member for Calgary-Forest Lawn to some extent in that some people are not spending the money voluntarily but in fact are driven by economic desperation to buy lottery funds and are therefore victimized or taken advantage of in some ways. I don't believe that applies to all of the people, but from what I was told by my sister who sold tickets in a lottery booth, it cer-

tainly dealt with a large number of the people.

I would point out, however, that I don't see myself when I go buy a lottery ticket as being victimized by economic deprivation to do it. I do it for a certain amount of enjoyment. I do it on the chance that it may make me independently wealthy all of a sudden. I do it because I believe I might be supporting a good cause. If this Bill gets passed, I may quit buying them, because I don't consider giving this minister carte blanche to spend money on whomever he chooses, for whatever horrible political motivation he may choose, is a legitimate reason. So I might be thinking twice before I buy any more.

But I think, by and large, that it's just utter balderdash to try to tell us that the fact that those funds are voluntary makes them different. I've also gone to some of the provincial outlets to buy a bottle of liquor on occasion. Dealing with members opposite could drive almost anyone to drink after some days.

AN HON. MEMBER: Didn't cross the picket line doing it.

MR. YOUNIE: No, I didn't cross the picket line doing it.

But I have on occasion . . . It was voluntary, and the money went into the general revenues of the province. Other members of my family smoke, and their taxes -- that's voluntary, although some could argue that they have a bad habit and it's not really voluntary.

MR. OLDRING: Point of order.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Point of order, Red Deer-South.

MR. OLDRING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again I cite standing order 23(b)(i). I know that the members opposite have tried your patience very much this afternoon. They continue to show no respect for this Legislative Assembly. They continue to constantly just try to fill in time, continue to spend more time watching the clock than they do addressing the matter in front of them, and I would hope that at some point they'd come back to some common sense and get back to dealing with the issue in front of them. I know, Mr. Speaker, how trying it's been for you. You've attempted time and time again to bring them back on track, yet they continue to wander.

MR. McEACHERN: If that's all you've got to say, why don't you sit down?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please.

The Chair appreciates the Member for Red Deer-South raising what obviously is a matter of concern to him. However, I'm sure all hon. members appreciate that no hon. member spends time looking at the clock. I'm sure they do the very best they can within the debate. The Chair would simply come back to the point that we have been through, the principle of the Bill. We've had every opportunity to debate amendments to the Bill. We still have that opportunity. The Chair would simply ask the indulgence of members speaking to the Bill to attempt to stay within the confines of the Bill and not the Alberta Liquor Control Board.

Hon. Member for Edmonton-Glengarry.

MR. STRONG: On the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hon. Member for St. Albert.

MR. STRONG: Mr. Speaker, I find it somewhat offensive as a Member of this Legislative Assembly to have the Member for Red Deer-South imply that I, as a Member of this Legislative Assembly, am more interested in watching the clock than I am in listening to the debate in third reading of Bill 10. I find that offensive, because the member is implying that we don't care. That is not the case. The debate has been justified. The members standing in their place to make representation in respect to Bill 10 have brought out some very valid and logical arguments, and for the Member for Red Deer-South to imply anything else is misleading the Assembly and the general public who read *Hansard*.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. Member for St. Albert. The Chair is of the understanding that there was no intent of that, as, the Chair just explained. Perhaps we could continue with the debate.

I want to assure hon. members of the House that it has not been the debate of the House that has caused these 100 Albertans in the gallery to leave. It's probably just their schedule.

Hon. Member for Edmonton-Glengarry.

MR. YOUNIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am most concerned about the Bill, about the fact that the Bill's whole purpose and reason for existence is to avoid debate on expenditures of a cabinet minister in this Legislature. I'm awe-struck that any member would argue that we shouldn't even debate whether or not the government should get away with such a disgusting attempt to circumvent the whole reason for this building's existence, which is to debate the expenditures of cabinet ministers, among other purposes.

I think the worst part of this Bill is its obvious intent to take what are revenues of the province, put them in the hands of a cabinet minister, and make sure that he never has to account until after the fact for what he's going to spend them on.

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

Now, one of the arguments that justified it -- and that was what I was dealing with -- was that they were voluntary donations to the government and thereby should not come under the same rules of scrutiny in the House in debate that other funds do. I was pointing out that others, including taxes on alcohol and taxes on cigarettes, do come in here in general revenue, and their expenditures do get debated in the House. To argue that funds from the lotteries should not get debated in the House is no more justified than arguing that we should in fact put revenues from liquor sales into a special fund and let some other minister decide what he should with it, in consultation with a few of his powerful friends perhaps. It has to be decided in debate in this Legislature. The design of this Bill is to make sure that doesn't happen. That is offensive to anyone who has any respect for the purpose of this building's existence.

We are told by a number of others that in fact we shouldn't even be bothering to debate this; it's so obviously wonderful to give this power to the minister and save people's time and effort and so on that we should just let it go through. Well, I resent that. I think the principles involved and the structure of this Bill and what it is going to do within our province is so basically wrong, so ethically wrong, that it should be fought in every way possible. It should be made clear to the people of Alberta that what the government plans to do is wrong, and it's wrong for some purposes of which people should be very skeptical.

Thank you.

MR. STRONG: Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure for me to stand today in the Legislative Assembly to speak in opposition to Bill 10...

AN HON. MEMBER: You think it's a pleasure for you. It's no pleasure for us.

MR. STRONG: ...the Interprovincial Lottery Amendment Act, 1988...

AN HON. MEMBER: Why don't you guys go home, if you don't realize why you're here?

MR. STRONG: ...presented in this House, Mr. Speaker, by ...

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, hon. member. With due respect to some of the catcalls in the House, both of them are entirely uncalled for. St. Albert, please.

MR. STRONG: Mr. Speaker, I try and not listen to the catcalls, because most of them don't make any sense anyway.

MRS. MIROSH: They're from your side.

MR. STRONG: No, they were from your side, hon. member.

MR. SPEAKER: They were from both sides, hon. member.

MR. YOUNIE: But ours made sense.

MR. STRONG: It must have been the loyal Liberals over here then, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I think it's important that we, as Members of the Legislative Assembly, stand, not just and say we're in opposition to a particular Bill, legislation introduced by this government, but certainly justify our position in speaking against the legislation that we see, in this case, before us. I think it's also important to state that lottery funds, money raised by this government, are nothing more than another form of taxation, although that form of taxation takes a more voluntary role in today's society.

But I think, Mr. Speaker, I'll come back to section 5, where it says:

The Minister shall hold and administer a fund called the "Lottery Fund."

What are we going to see next? Are we going to see the Minister of Social Services develop a social services fund where we don't in this Legislature debate that particular budget? Are we going to see the Minister of Education bring in an education fund that we won't be allowed to debate in this Legislative Assembly? Would we see the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care bring in a hospitals fund, funded by lotteries, that we wouldn't get to debate in this Legislative Assembly? I think those are the things that concern me, Mr. Speaker. It gets right back to what many of the hon. members in the Legislative Assembly have said during this debate, and that's a question of accountability.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, if we go down into section 6, it states:

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

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

And then, Mr. Speaker, here is a problem. It says:

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

That causes and raises a red flag, certainly in my mind. Because where is the accountability? Could this minister under this legislation make loans to Mr. Al Olson of Stuart Olson? Could he make loans to Mr. Peter Pocklington? Gainers? Now, could he do that under this section of this Act? Because it says:

...any other purpose the minister considers to be in the public interest.

Almost everything this government does -- well, everything, Mr. Speaker -- is the illusion of, "We're doing it all for you, Albertans helping Albertans." I think that's what the Premier said here the other day when I was in attendance, "Albertans helping Albertans." I guess what leaps into my mind is: are we helping all Albertans or are we helping only a specific few Albertans?

As far as I'm concerned, this section gives the authority to this minister to make or pay money to anything or anybody or any group or any association that the minister considers to be acting in the public interest. Now, I guess what I'd say, Mr. Speaker, is that it's my feeling that these lottery fund moneys are used for nothing more than political purposes or political gain. It's almost as if this government was using this lottery slush fund that they've set up as a cane for a tired, old, and worn-out government with no new initiatives, no new thought processes, and certainly perhaps not in the best interests of all Albertans. It's patronage. It's political fuddle-duddle. What this minister is asking us in this Legislative Assembly to do is trust him. I think not, Mr. Speaker. And certainly many of my colleagues on this side of the House have indicated that as well.

The Member for Edmonton-Belmont brought up a very valid point, that not all appeals and applications to this minister for funding through those lottery funds is approved. Who is approved? If you don't get approved, do you get an opportunity to go back and appeal the decision of Genghis Khan to say, "Well, sorry; you didn't fit," for whatever reason? Do you have a chance to appeal that decision of this minister? Where is an appeals process? There isn't any appeals process in here, not one that I've seen, anyway. If anybody making application for money is denied, certainly they should have the right to appeal in front of a panel, in front of a body, certainly not bow down before this particular minister and ask for fairness when they're not going to get any. Certainly there has to be some third party, some third body there to make that appeal where those that do apply for lottery fund money have the opportunity -- equal opportunity, fair opportunity -- of finding out the reasons why they were declined on their application for funding by the minister. I think that's only fair.

Clearly, the minister in section 7 has indicated very, very clearly that nobody else, "unless lawfully authorized pursuant to [the] Act" can sell, advertise, or distribute lottery tickets. If they do that in opposition to this Act, there are clear fines leveled out: "\$500,000 or ... imprisonment for not more than 6 months." Is that fair? If this minister can take the time, the trouble, and the bother to put in specifics saying that nobody else can sell lottery tickets unless I say so, you'd think certainly this minister would also take the time to create for the general public some sense of fairness, a perception of fairness that all Albertans, all Alberta organizations or associations will be treated equally. That demands an appeal process. Why did the minister forget to put that in?

This is a separate fund, as I said earlier, Mr. Speaker. Certainly, again I'll state that it draws into my mind an automatic red flag to say, "What else could come from this particular type of legislation where we would have no authority to debate those issues, who gets money?" There's been allegations by many of the Albertans that I represent, people in my constituency, that there is some unfairness, that if you don't carry the right political card, as a director on some of these associations making applications for funds, you're denied. Now, is that fair, Mr. Speaker?

What I'm calling on is for every Member of this Legislative Assembly to enhance the image of politicians not only in the province of Alberta but right from the east coast to the west coast in Canada. Because anytime the public perceives that all, each one of us, are not dealt with in a fair and proper manner, there are all of these allegations, that I spend much of my time trying to defray to protect the integrity of all Members of this Legislative Assembly. But it's very difficult in certain aspects and certain dealings that this government has had in the past and no doubt will have in the future to try and inform people that there is a sense of integrity and honesty with this particular government.

Mr. Speaker, this is nothing more than an election fund, and I think that point has been raised by many of the members that

have gotten up in debate on third reading of Bill 10. It's an election fund specifically for this government, this minister, where they can go out and give money, cheques, to various organizations in order to gain votes from the general public. A political slush fund.

Due to the hour I'd like to adjourn debate on Bill 10. [interjection] Is that possible, Mr. Speaker? If not, I'll carry on.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair has heard a motion to adjourn debate. The Chair is a bit amazed to find a member from the same caucus jumping up to say, "No, he can't do it."

MR. STRONG: I'm asking for your advice.

MR. SPEAKER: Indeed, hon. member, and the Chair recognizes your request for leave to adjourn debate. Those in favour, please say aye.

HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed, please say no. The motion carries.

[At 1 p.m. the House adjourned to Monday at 2:30 p.m.]