

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Title: Thursday, May 19, 1988 8:00 p.m.

Date: 88/05/19

[The House resumed at 8 p.m.]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: **GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS**

(Third Reading)

Bill 10

Interprovincial Lottery Amendment Act, 1988

[Adjourned debate May 13: Mr. Strong speaking]

MR. STRONG: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe that when I adjourned debate last Friday, May 13, in regards to Bill 10, what I was speaking to was accountability -- accountability for a lottery fund with in excess of \$100 million in it, where this minister under section 6 of Bill 10 gives himself the ability to hand out money "for any other purpose the Minister considers to be in the public interest." I believe what I said was that this raises a great deal of concern in my mind, specifically when we look at that minister awarding these moneys out. I think, just to draw one of the worst conclusions that I could: what would happen if this minister, on behalf of this government, went and bought 10 condominiums in Hawaii? Would that be considered in the public interest if he was only entertaining his friends? I'm sure that Albertans, those who can afford to go on holidays, certainly would enjoy one of those condominium units, but that's not available to them. That's probably drawing one of the worst conclusions that I could think of in regards to this minister handling moneys.

It's been said, Mr. Speaker, that this money should form and be part of general revenues. At least then we in this Assembly would have the opportunity to review how this money was going to be spent. This government can budget for many other things; it should be able to budget for in excess of \$100 million in a lottery fund and make themselves accountable to the opposition as well as the people of the province of Alberta. As I said, again it's a question of accountability. Should this minister, in bringing third reading of this before this Assembly and attempting to make this legislation, have the ability to empire build? I don't think so, and I think many other members of this Assembly have said the same thing.

Another concern is that if the minister turns around and has the ability to set up and administer a lottery fund as we see under section 5, how many other departments of this government could do the same thing, where we in this Legislative Assembly would be faced with all these little funds and no debate in a department's estimates or no debate on how this government spends money? I think certainly that causes everybody and should cause everybody in this Assembly a great deal of concern.

We have clearly here no appeals process. If a particular party is denied an application for lottery fund money, there is no appeal process in the legislation. Is this minister perhaps God? What happens to those who apply who are denied? Is there any recourse for them contained in the minister's proposal? Certainly not. I think the last time I spoke to this legislation, last

Friday, one of the things that did concern me was the appeals process. If we can put in \$500,000 fines for people or corporations selling lottery tickets without permits from this government, then certainly we should be able to look at an appeals process in the legislation that we're looking at. I think again that it's a question of perception, public perception, Mr. Speaker, on how Albertans, our constituents, view this type of legislation and the accountability of this government. As I said earlier, if a particular association or body was denied, why shouldn't they have the ability to turn around and make application for this minister or a tribunal to have the opportunity to sit and review any of the things that this minister has done, to say, "Well, why was I denied moneys from this fund?" There should be reasons and there should be some fairness.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, to give money to people is a wonderful thing. I think that certainly if you give people things, they never forget who gave it to them. It's a question of political patronage and, I guess, a patronage that's not enjoyed by all members of this Assembly, only by government members in this Assembly. I'm sure that if I could go the association for the handicapped or some of the different associations or bodies or groups out in my constituency of St. Albert and hand them cheques for \$4,000, \$5,000, \$20,000, \$30,000, I'm sure they'd consider me very favourably in the next provincial election in this province. I don't think that is fair. I think that to allow or even consider that this money is abused for political purposes by any government, whether it's a New Democratic government, a Liberal government, a Representative government, a WCC government in the province of Alberta -- no political party and no government should ever be allowed the right to have control of in excess of \$100 million. And the projections on this fund are over \$200 million, I think, in the neighbourhood of 1990, late 1989. If that's the case, then perhaps this money should go into general revenues and be dispensed there, not where a government's allowed to dispense some money for political purposes.

No, Mr. Speaker, I think to give total authority to any minister of any government to handle this vast amount of money on behalf of an individual rather than the population of the province of Alberta without accountability is wrong, and that's why I stood in this Legislative Assembly to speak in opposition to Bill 10 as proposed by the Minister of -- I used to call it "unemployment"; what is he? -- Career Development and Employment.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Kingsway.

MR. McEACHERN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill is a more important piece of legislation, perhaps, than the government realizes. I think they thought it really wouldn't matter to the people of Alberta or to the opposition that the minister would take unto himself the right to spend some hundred millions of dollars each year outside of the budgetary process. I hope he's beginning to realize that it does matter to a number of us on this side of the House and that it will matter to the people of Alberta. Bill 10 could be amended so easily to be a reasonable Bill, and my colleague from Edmonton-Highlands suggested amendments the other day that would have made the Bill acceptable, and the government turned them down.

Bill 10 allows the minister to set up a slush fund for himself outside of the budgetary process. Now, whether he would use it that way or not, as a slush fund, is not the question. The other day when we moved in this Assembly to reduce his remuneration for being the cabinet minister down to \$1 under vote 1 of

Career Development and Employment in an amendment to Bill 32, he was somewhat insulted and claimed that we were making a personal attack on him. I would just like to assure him that that is not the case. We fight the issues in this House, and it's the issues that we're concerned about, and it wouldn't matter which person was in the particular spot of Minister of Career Development and Employment. In fact, the minister is a neighbour of mine. He's moved in a block and a half away in a very nice neighbourhood of Edmonton, and I have nothing personal against the minister, I want to assure him.

But the minister, no matter how honourable he might be or might not be in terms of how he spends these funds -- that's not really the question. No one is saying that this minister would squander the money or this minister would necessarily use it for political patronage. The fact of the matter is that he opens himself up to that concern by not having the funds disbursed through this Assembly, which is where they should be disbursed from.

It's not to say that he would lose any control. He would still go to his cabinet colleagues with his proposals and debate them. They would still bring their budget before the government. We understand that budgets are set by a cabinet and will not be changed, that if they were to change one nickel, having listened to our debate in terms of the budget, that would be a matter of nonconfidence and the government would fall. Obviously, that's not going to happen with 61 members out of 83 on the other side of the House. None of us ever suggested that it would.

But the key thing, in spite of the fact that we can't change the budget by debate, is that the major expenditures of this government be brought before this Assembly for discussion. However much we might be able to change or not change the budget by that discussion is not really what's at stake. The fact is that the people of Alberta have had a chance for those questions to be asked, for the opposition to ask those questions, for the ministers to answer those questions so that there is knowledge about what's planned and why, and they have to put their policies on the line, so to speak. If the people don't like it, then in the next election they elect someone else instead. So I really don't understand why the minister is objecting to having the lottery fund placed under the budgetary process. It would not be that difficult for him. It would not be that much different from what he is presently doing.

But we are serious about the issue -- and not in any personal sense against this minister, as I said -- so I want to just reiterate some of the basic issues. Okay, the first thing is that the lottery fund should be set up under the budget and not outside the budgetary process. That provision, I believe, Mr. Speaker, is in 5(1) on page 2 of the Bill, where it says that

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, except for any money paid out for purposes of defraying the costs of administering this Act.

There is no provision for that money to be put under the budget, so that's what's needed. That's what the amendment that we suggested the other day said, and I think the minister should really seriously consider scrapping this Bill, starting again, and adopting the idea behind that amendment.

The lottery funds should be approved in this Assembly before they're disbursed. The Treasurer in defending Bill 10 the other day went to some lengths to say, "But these lottery funds will be accounted for in great detail." I say that's fine, Mr.

Speaker. I hope they will be, as they should be, but that is after the fact. The purpose of the budgetary process is really to debate the expenditures before the expenditures are made. We expect the public accounting process to take place afterwards, but that's always a year to two years behind in terms of checking what's happened. So it is important that we get a preview of what the intentions are for a fund of some hundred millions of dollars each year. So the minister should not be so shy about bringing that before this Assembly and letting us preview it, review it, and analyze it. Then he can go ahead and make the expenditures, and then they'll be accounted for afterwards. So, Mr. Speaker, I don't understand why he is being so sticky about this point, why he doesn't bow to what makes sense in a parliamentary democracy, where the power of the purse is supposed to reside in the Assembly. That's where it should be, and that's what we think should be the case.

There is a second part of this particular Bill that is very difficult to fathom also. It is the part that says that the minister shall disburse these funds for recreation and culture. Now, that part's okay, and we agreed in the amendment that that part should stay the same. But it's the words that follow the word "culture" in the minister's Bill that are a problem. I guess I'll read the whole sentence and then go back and tell him the part I think should be deleted. This is section 6, page 2 again of the Bill:

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

Now, we talked about Henry VIII clauses in this place before, and it is customary for the government to give the minister some kind of carte blanche in these Bills to spend money and to make grants for various purposes. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that there's no reason those purposes shouldn't be laid out fairly specifically and with some pretty specific guidelines, and we tend not to get that. But this expression tagged on to here:

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

is really just not acceptable. Again, it's no attack on this particular minister, but he does happen to be the one wearing the hat of the Minister of Career Development and Employment, so he has to take the criticism that goes with our criticism of the issue. I stress again that it's the issue that we're taking exception to, not the minister in any personal sense.

This expression, you know, paying out money

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

gives the minister licence to set up a slush fund. You've heard us talking about a slush fund on this side and calling it a slush fund. It's not meant to be a slush fund. I don't think you intend it to be a slush fund, so why do you set up legislation that makes it into one? Because it is made by this expression into a fund that the minister can do anything he likes with. Mr. Speaker, that's not really acceptable in a democracy, where the power of the purse is supposed to reside in the Legislature, where the cabinet has to consider carefully what money Bills it brings before this Assembly. So the minister should really just delete those words.

I would remind the minister that our amendment -- the Member for Edmonton-Highlands' amendment that we talked about the other day -- suggested that those words be deleted; in other words, these funds be directed toward recreation and culture, period.

MR. SPEAKER: With due respect, hon. member, that amendment was dealt with the other day. Please, you'll have to deal in more general . . .

MR. McEACHERN: It does summarize the problems with this Bill extremely well, and I don't mean to reiterate the amendment arguments in great detail. It's just that you can't really avoid it if that's the basic ideas that I'm suggesting that should be incorporated into this Bill, or into another new Bill and this one perhaps scrapped.

Now, it might seem that other projects would be worthwhile projects to put lottery funds into. Some people have suggested hospitals would be a worthy place. I think the Member for Calgary-Buffalo suggested that kids who go to school and don't have hot lunches might be a better place and a more important place to put money than, say, into some recreational or sports group or some cultural organization. I personally disagree with that. I think the lottery fund is an extra. It is something a little different. Although the money should be put in and spent with the other revenues of the province through the budgetary process, they are not normal taxes as such, although one could argue that they're a tax on the poor, and we've been through those arguments several times.

Nonetheless, I think they can be considered something a little separate and a little different. They can be used for the purposes that we told people that's what they were for when we set up these various lottery schemes, and that is for recreation and culture. I think there should be a period there and no other use should be made. The other very important needs of people must be met through the regular taxation system, the regular resource revenue system, and that sort of thing. It must not be at the whims of whether or not the lottery projects bring in the kind of money that they've happened to have brought in in the past. So therefore I would only be for spending the money on those things.

I think there was a little leeway provided, if I remember rightly -- just to refer to that amendment for a moment -- in that at least 75 percent of the funds would have to be spent in these two areas. Along with the administration fees that would pretty well use most of it, so if there was a little extra left over, it would probably just go into the general revenue account of the province of Alberta, and there would be no need to worry too much about what happened to them because there wouldn't be that many of them left over. But that, Mr. Speaker, would make a lot more sense than what we're getting from this budget.

I've got to also say that I've been rather disappointed in the pro this Bill arguments from the other side. We've not really had a very strong defence of why it has to be done this way. One of the defences has been that, "Oh, we've been doing it for 14 years, and there's a lot of people out there who are, you know, relying on this money." Nobody is saying that those same people won't get the same amounts of money, or maybe more if more comes in under the lottery fund, if we passed it through the Legislature first. Nobody's suggesting that we upset the applecart in terms of who's getting the money, what organizations are getting it. In fact, it's the way it's set up that allows the minister to play off groups one against the other or to hold up the money and not to hand it out on a regular basis. That's why the Bill should be a different Bill. It's why it should be brought into the Assembly first, so that people know ahead of time what they're expected to get.

The budgetary process is done in the spring for the coming year. The way the minister handled that \$113 million handout

the other day: we had a year or a year and a half of sort of holding up these grants and the minister sitting on a lot of money and a lot of debate and argument in this House about where it should go and what he should do with it, and then finally one day he just gets up and announces, "Okay, some of it's going to go to tourism; some of it's going to go to hospitals; some of it's going to go to these recreational groups." He didn't bring any plan before this Assembly where we could analyze it in detail and suggest what should be done. So it was an ad hoc handing out of money after it had been sitting around for some considerable length of time in sort of a limbo because the Auditor General did say that the minister had no legal right to hand out that money. So it was handed out in a sense illegally. Now what the minister is trying to do by this Bill is to make that process legal, and that doesn't seem to me to make a great deal of sense, Mr. Speaker.

The minister should decide ahead of time what it is he wants to do with lottery funds. He should bring the budget into the Assembly with those lottery funds included in his budgetary expenditure plans. We should be able to debate them . . . [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Let's bring it down a bit, thank you,

Hon. member,

MR. McEACHERN: He should bring in a budget including the lottery dollars and what he intends to do with them, and we should be able to debate that in the House the same as we debate all other aspects of the budget, and then he should expend those moneys.

What that would do, Mr. Speaker, is allow the recipients of these funds to plan ahead of time what they're going to do with those funds, because they would know how much funds they're going to get. The way it is now, it seems they have to wait and curry favour with the minister and hope to God that he'll make some kind of a big endowment to them in sort of a one-shot thing. We could build in some continuity and some preplanning for these groups that would make their lives a lot easier, besides which it would be handling the taxpayers' dollars. The people of this province have the right to expect a responsible way for the dollars of this province to be handled. What the minister is proposing here is not a responsible way to do it.

So although we've no personal attack on the minister about the way he's doing it, I do wish he would change the process by which he intends to hand out these funds and remove any possible cloud of suspicion that might occur about whether he's going to hand out money for elections and try to buy votes and influence different groups by doing that. He could do so by bringing this expenditure under the budgetary process.

Mr. Speaker, I will stop at that point, then, and ask the minister to look again at this Bill, to take seriously our representations, and to scrap Bill 10 as it presently is and bring in a new Bill putting these expenditures under the budgetary process, where they should be.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you,

Calgary-Buffalo,

MR. CHUMIR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It has been said, by one Henry Wadsworth Longfellow: "Whom the Gods would destroy they first make mad." That statement was meant, I believe, in the sense of madness reflecting bad judgment. And

this legislation indeed reflects the bad judgment within the context of that quotation.

Now, I can understand circumstances in which legislation of this kind might on occasion be passed without great thought and without realizing the important principles that are at stake. In the crush of events we can't all think through each and every act that we do definitively, and it is possible to make mistakes and to act inadvertently. However, this legislation is not being passed with any degree of inadvertence. There is no ignorance about what is happening to the democratic process here, for the opposition has, in fact, done its job of pointing out the fallacies and the problems. I must say that some of the debate by the colleagues on my left here has been of the very highest and the most admirable quality in fulfilling those duties which we have as members of this opposition. So there can be no mistaking the fundamental error of this legislation.

Now, let's be clear that this legislation in itself is not going to bring the government down, nor indeed will it in isolation cause the government great damage. But it is part of a pattern of bad judgment and of arrogance and of backroom dealing which is now becoming very symbolic of the government's style. This pattern is being recognized more and more by citizens of Alberta. I'm hearing about it every day. All of these little pieces -- the patronage appointments, the secrecy, the disrespect for the democratic process -- will join together like small streams flowing into a river, and they will ultimately carry this government away, because that quotation I began with fits this government.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Call for the question.
Edmonton-Highlands.

MS BARRETT: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move an amendment to third reading of this Bill. I have submitted a copy of the amendment to the Parliamentary Counsel at the Clerk's Table, who has initialed it prior to having it photocopied. While it's being sent around to members of the Assembly and yourself I'll await your instructions.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Highlands may proceed, speaking to the narrow definition of the amendment.

MS BARRETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker; I'll do that.
Mr. Speaker, I'll read the amendment into the record: . . . the motion for third reading of Bill 10, Interprovincial Lottery Amendment Act, 1988, on today's Order Paper, be amended
by striking all the words after the word "That", and substituting the following:
"Bill 10, Interprovincial Lottery Amendment Act, 1988, be not now read a third time but that it be read a third time this day six months hence."

I'll send a copy to *Hansard* for their records.

There's a good reason that I sponsor this amendment Mr. Speaker. It's because we attempted to convince the government in second reading that it was unwise to proceed with this Bill. When we couldn't convince them in second reading, in committee reading we decided to offer them the very best alternative available for this Bill if the government wanted it to survive. We offered an amendment which would allow the minister to strike his lottery fund -- which will be struck by this Bill, provided it's passed -- but would insist that the lottery fund be a vote, a separate item under his department that would come for-

ward to the Legislative Assembly for consideration of budget estimates on an annual basis. The government chose not to support that amendment either.

This amendment, which is commonly called a "hoist" in parliamentary language, is an attempt to get the government just for one more time to rethink passage of this Bill. They may not believe that this Bill is going to be the albatross that I have said I believe it will be, but I have no doubt Mr. Speaker, that Albertans are very unhappy with the nature of policy-making by the Alberta government. That did not used to be a problem, did not used to be a widespread consideration in the 1970s, but more recently Albertans have come to want a greater sense of accountability from their government. I think this has been demonstrated by the fact that there are 22 opposition MLAs in the House after the 1986 election, compared to four in the Assembly prior to the 1986 election. I think it's been made apparent by the public's ability to participate more frequently and more openly in lobbying campaigns, in attempting to persuade the government to see that the grassroots isn't always being reflected by government action. In this instance I believe that the Alberta public does not want the Alberta government from behind closed doors to be deciding where they're going to spend upwards of \$100 million a year without any sense of accountability until after the fact until after the money has been spent.

The minister, I believe on May 13 -- May 12, perhaps -- rose to say, "Now, just a minute folks. Don't you understand that the expenditures under this fund, just as they always have been, will be recorded in public accounts?" Yes, we understand that. But I'd like to make clear for the record, and make clear for anybody who's going to be reading *Hansard* in the future, that the public accounts are delivered to us about a year after the final expenditure of that prior fiscal year has been spent. That means it is sometimes almost exactly two years late compared to the commencement of the spending that is, so-called, going to come under scrutiny. And it's all fine and well for members of the Assembly and the public at large to say, "Oh jeez, you guys made a mistake here," or "Oh, oh, I don't like the way you spent the money there." But it's sort of like crying over spilt milk. There isn't a lot that can be done after the fact.

My intention in sponsoring this amendment is to convince the government that they need not put themselves further into that trap. I can't believe that I'm so inclined to want to do the Progressive Conservative Party of Alberta such a big favour as to give them the best advice that's available, Mr. Speaker, but the reason I am so inclined is not because I'm a closet Tory, I can assure you that I have never been a Tory.

MR. NELSON: You're a Commie.

MS BARRETT: The reason I am inclined to do so is because . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: And never will be.

AN HON. MEMBER: You're young enough; you will be.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order.
Edmonton-Highlands.

MS BARRETT: Mr. Speaker, thanks for calling order, but it doesn't matter. Those comments are irrelevant, so I wouldn't respond to them.

The reason I'm inclined to do this and help out even the

Conservative government, and the Conservative Party as a consequence, is because I believe that it is in the best interest of all elected officials to do everything we can to prevent cynicism from taking hold in the mentality here in Alberta and in Canada, as it has come to do, Mr. Speaker. I'm sure the members in the government are looking at me funny, and they might believe that I'm not sincere on this point. But I want to tell members in the government that I have gone out of my way in many instances to help people in a very nonpartisan fashion, even since being elected. Really gone out of my way -- in fact, volunteered information that otherwise might not have gotten to them, in a very nonpartisan way, in order to convince them that public officials really are here to help them regardless of which side of the House we sit on.

I believe that principle needs to be a more consciously governing principle in this Assembly and in all Assemblies in the democratic world. I frequently hear government members talk about the disgraceful lack of democracy in the eastern bloc, and I couldn't agree with them more. I believe democracy is fundamental and vital to the social and economic well-being of the human race, quite frankly. Where it doesn't exist, oppression inevitably does.

Now, I'm not arguing that if they don't go along with this hoist, we're going to be catapulted into a state of totalitarianism. I don't believe that's the case. But I do believe that the Alberta public will think more cynically about our actions than they have done prior to the passage of this Bill. Their perception, I think, is well founded. Their perception is that too many decisions are made behind closed doors and that governments use public money -- taxpayers' dollars in most instances, but public money in all instances -- to buy votes. I think Albertans want to see a reversal of that tendency. They're sick of patronage. They're sick of slush funds. They're sick of the perceived abuse of power by all elected officials. I believe they would like the opportunity to air those views in a six-month period that would be made available now if this hoist is approved.

People talked about the lottery funds for years and had come to call it the slush fund, but they didn't know what sort of legislation the minister would be introducing. It's only a matter of weeks since that Bill has been introduced, and I think the public at large would enjoy a six-month breathing space in which each member of society can contact her or his Member of the Legislative Assembly and cabinet minister of their choice and let them know that they want accountability prior to spending that money, not just after spending that money.

So on that note, Mr. Speaker, I'm hoping that at the very least the minister sponsoring this Bill, if he intends not to support this motion to prevent the Bill from passage for a minimum of six months, will at least have the political courage and conviction to stand up and tell us why. I hope my colleagues throughout the Assembly will support this amendment.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Strathcona, on the narrow confines of the amendment.

MR. WRIGHT: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Speaking from a party political standpoint, I wouldn't mind at all if this Bill were passed. I think it would do the opposition a powerful lot of good were it passed. I really think that. But there's more to life than just party political advantage.

Last night I was walking around my constituency knocking on doors and I came to the door of this chap, I imagine about 60

years old. He was of German extraction. In fact it was 35 years ago, he told me, the same length of time that I've been here, that he emigrated from Germany. He's voted for all the parties, both in Germany and here, but he has stopped voting. He won't be voting any more. "Because," he said, "there are no honest politicians. They all promise one thing before they're elected, and they're lying, because they don't deliver it once they're elected."

It's Bills like this, Mr. Speaker, that encourage that opinion amongst people, because there is contempt for the parliamentary process shown by this Bill. Hundreds of millions of dollars are voted on what is unkindly, I think, called the whim of the minister. But at any rate, it is at his discretion, based on his opinion of the public interest. That is a total inversion of the process of spending public money, and it does nothing but bring this Assembly into contempt. Because it's not just you that pass a Bill; it's all of us, by a majority. That's why I don't want it passed even though there is a party political advantage to it.

I remember when the Conservatives first got much of a toehold in this Assembly in 1967. At that time they said that the Social Credit government was complacent and out of touch and arrogant and contemptuous of the law, much as someone in this Assembly has just said about the present government. The parallel is quite striking. I remember that the opposition of the day, the Conservatives, were attacking the Social Credit government over welfare policy, and they cited a particular case of a gentleman from Fort MacKay. His name was McKay, too, Noël McKay, which was disclosed by the minister in breach of the provisions of the Legislative Assembly Act. That minor indiscretion -- or illegality, really, in the big scheme of things -- that was provoked by the attack, which the minister considered unfair, was nonetheless made a great thing of by the opposition and correctly so. Because it doesn't matter what the provocation; you cannot break the rules. That incident alone, when the next election came around in 1971, was made a big thing of by the leader of the Conservatives at that time, and you know that he won a surprising victory, a big victory, in 1971. The additional parallel is: there was a lame-duck Premier at the same time too. So the parallels are close.

But nonetheless, members of the Assembly should understand what is bad about this Bill. Everyone has spoken to it, ad nauseam, so I'm not going to speak on that again. [some applause] I'm speaking on the point that there should be . . . Yes, thank you. The hon. Member for Stony Plain always is contemptuous, expresses himself with some contempt of the efforts of other members to put feelings before the Assembly, while himself not encouraging the view that . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member, with due respect let us come back to the amendment.

MR. WRIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think the rest is probably best left unsaid anyway. I was going to say that.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that we ought to have a six-month pause and consider this Bill. You ought to search your heart about it; you really should. It is not the sort of thing we should be passing. The amendment to postpone the third reading of this Bill for six months is a genuine one. It is one you should consider, and you should pass it irrespective of which side of the House you're on.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Calgary-Forest Lawn.

MR. PASHAK: Mr. Speaker, if there was ever ample reason for hoisting a Bill, it was provided by the events that took place in Calgary Southeast at the Progressive Conservative federal nomination meeting the other night.

MR. SPEAKER: You've got to have a very intriguing argument to get this back to this, so let's deal with this.

MR. PASHAK: Mr. Speaker, I think it is very much related because we had evidence at that particular meeting that members of particular ethnic communities, some of whom have been rewarded through funds that in the past have been granted on this basis -- at least their leaders were -- were bused in large numbers to these meetings.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member, the six months' hoist please.

MR. PASHAK: Mr. Speaker, what I'm trying to suggest here is that this Bill, which gives the minister the power to disburse some \$113 million in revenues to groups as he chooses and sees fit, can give rise to blatant political patronage. I'm trying to suggest that that's part of what happened the other evening.

AN HON. MEMBER: That's ludicrous.

MR. PASHAK: I don't think it is ludicrous, and if I had a sufficient amount of time, I think I could begin to tie these two events together. If I may, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. KOWALSKI: Point of order. I would like to cite *Beauchesne*, section 804, page 239, 240, which clearly outlines what can be participated in in an amendment on the third reading of a Bill. I would just ask for the hon. member to deal with the substance of the amendment and to proceed on that basis. Of course, other sections of *Beauchesne* basically call all members, really, not to incite passion and debate and the other things that are associated with it. The Member for Edmonton-Highlands has moved an amendment to third reading, Mr. Speaker, and I believe it's important that we deal with the substance of the amendment.

MR. YOUNIE: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. A question more than anything else. As a teacher of English for many years I taught students that sometimes it's very valuable to bring in an analogous situation to illustrate a point. Just the other night I was interrupted by the member who just raised the point of order and asked what he considered a sufficient length of time to make an analogy and then explain how the analogy applied to the matter under discussion and if he thought five to 10 seconds was sufficient to do that. So I'm wondering if the Speaker could perhaps give some ground rule. A minute, two minutes . . .

MR. SPEAKER: At the moment it's been going for about three minutes, with some interruptions.

The Chair really must direct Calgary-Forest Lawn back to dealing specifically with the amendment, which is a six months' hoist, and not bring in any other extraneous material which may or may not have occurred in that member's own particular constituency the other evening. Please, we're talking about a six months' hoist. It's very narrow. The Chair realizes that both *Beauchesne* and *Erskine May* narrow the focus, and that's very difficult for all of us to come back to, because in this House most of us feel we can always go all over the map.

Calgary-Forest Lawn, please.

MR. PASHAK: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm trying to provide a reason, a justification for why we should have a six months' hoist, and I was looking to a particular example. Maybe if I begin from another, more general perspective, then I can tie it back to the specific case. It's pretty clear that there's a widespread practice that has developed across this country where governments do set up multicultural agencies. They fund these agencies. The funds often go to the leaders of these communities. Often these people become full-time employees of cultural organizations that are set up. They often employ their friends. They attain a lot of status and prestige out of this recognition by governments, and in return for that recognition, prestige, and status that they're given, they turn around and, in effect, offer a quid pro quo to the government by delivering large blocs of votes to that government in subsequent elections.

[Mr. Musgreave in the Chair]

I think that's really the purpose of this particular Bill. It gives the minister access to \$113 million to buy large blocs of ethnic votes. I'm trying to suggest that there's ample evidence to support that contention, and it was provided in that election meeting that was held in . . .

MR. ORMAN: A point of order, Mr. Speaker. If the hon. Member for Calgary-Forest Lawn had any guts, he'd say that outside of this House.

MR. PASHAK: Well, I'd just like to tell the hon. minister that I said the same thing to a reporter the other day.

AN HON. MEMBER: Was that a point of order?

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, order please.

I really don't think that was a point of order. I would ask the hon. Member for Calgary-Forest Lawn to try and stick just to the amendment.

MR. STRONG: Mr. Speaker, am I allowed to speak to the point of order?

AN HON. MEMBER: No. There is no point of order; sit down. [interjections]

MR. PASHAK: Mr. Speaker, judging by the reaction I'm getting from the members opposite, I've made my point.

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

MR. SIGURDSON: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. To my colleague the Member for Edmonton-Glengarry. I thank him for sitting down and allowing me to continue on.

AN HON. MEMBER: We don't.

MR. SIGURDSON: I'm sure you don't.

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

You know, Mr. Speaker, I want to speak specifically to the

amendment and talk about why we think it's important that we deal with this Bill in November. Because that's six months from now. Now, there's not going to be all that awful lot of difference between now and November. Hockey will be played tomorrow night; hockey will be played in November. We'll look outside and we'll see that the trees may have grown a wee bit, and we'll be able to come back and deal with this Bill. Hopefully over the course of time, though, the government will have taken the opportunity to look at some of the wording of this Bill and to look at the meaning of those words that are placed in the Bill.

The other day in the second reading, or committee stage, of this Bill I believe that my colleague the Member for Edmonton-Centre had gone on about how there was some biblical references about lotteries and lottery funds. Well, he used his Good Book, Mr. Speaker, and I pulled out my good book, which is the *Concise Oxford Dictionary*. There are a couple of words in Bill 10 that if we look at the definition of the word, we'll see the reason for the need to hoist the Bill. Now, we have that the minister is going to be able to manage and operate the fund. Well, what does "manage" say? It says that he can organize, regulate, be manager of household, institution, state; take control of. That's what we're doing here; we're taking control of funds.

MRS. CRIPPS: Point of order, Mr. Speaker, on 804. He's on the principle of the Bill again.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair agrees with the point of order, hon. member, unless it can quickly bring it to its conclusion.

MR. SIGURDSON: With due respect, Mr. Speaker, what I'm trying to do is give reason for the hoist, because they have to look at these particular words. If you don't look at these particular words, then there's not much reason for the hoist. There are particular words in here . . .

MR. SPEAKER: With due respect, hon. member, one cannot get back into the specifics of the Bill. One has to deal, in the general creative atmosphere of one's own vocabulary, through the necessity for the six months' hoist, with no reference to the specifics.

AN HON. MEMBER: We all know what "manage" means.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please in the rest of the House. Thank you.

MR. SIGURDSON: Well, Mr. Speaker, just to get back, then, to this extraordinarily narrow focus for this amendment, it is important that we take the time, that we collectively -- all of us in this Assembly, Mr. Speaker; not just you and I, sir, but all of us -- take the time to review this, take the time to go out and to listen to Albertans who have had input. They've called my office, sir. They have called and they have said . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: I haven't heard a word.

MR. SIGURDSON: Then you're not listening. And if you're not listening to me, you're probably not listening to your constituents. [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Perhaps the comments could be directed through the Chair, and then we would not be having this little

discourse. We could come back to the amendment, please. [interjections] Hon. members. Thank you.

MR. SIGURDSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I need your protection.

It is important that we take the time away from this Assembly and go back into our constituencies and listen to what Albertans are telling us and for the government to give the appropriate time to listen to that so we can come back in six months and then consider the Bill after the input, sir. Because Albertans are saying something very, very different. They're telling me even tonight at the dinner that we had. They said that this is not an appropriate Bill for this Legislature, that it puts too much power into the minister's hands, and it ought to be withdrawn.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

Edmonton-Glengarry.

MR. YOUNIE: Thank you. As you can tell, I've been chomping at the bit to take another verbal swing or two at this whole issue. I think it is an issue of extreme importance in terms of the principles that this Legislature is supposed to stand for, because I think the government needs time to find out from the people of Alberta -- because they obviously don't understand it -- that this is an odious Bill that strikes at the whole structure of democracy and debate in the Legislature and accountability for expenditures. Certainly if the government has lost that knowledge . . . They campaigned on it as an opposition party some years back. They've been in power long enough that they seem to have forgotten how important it is to be accountable in the Legislature and to be open to the people.

I think it strikes at the principle of not centering too much power in the hands of one minister. The government needs some time to do polling. Perhaps they shouldn't just rely on the rather unscientific method of how many people may or may not phone their constituency office but do some actual polling, do some consulting, have a few public meetings. There are lots of things that can be done in six months. In those six months I think you would find out that the average Albertan would tell you that what you're trying to do in this Bill is obviously wrong. It is obviously an attempt to set up a slush fund to improve electoral chances. It is obviously an attempt to circumvent the Legislature. If you do the honest research, you are going to find out very clearly that people won't accept that.

I started out exactly a week ago, perhaps even to the hour, not just the day, thanking the Member for Edmonton-Highlands for introducing an amendment, and now I thank the Member for Edmonton-Highlands for introducing this one. Because it will save the government in the long run a lot of embarrassment. It will certainly save me some embarrassment, because even though I speak out against it, in the minds of most people I as an MLA must have been one who helped to get this odious piece of legislation through the Legislature. When I go canvassing, I would rather not have to spend a lot of time explaining, "No I had nothing to do with that, other than to fight against it." The government needs some time to figure that out. We've had barely -- what? -- two weeks here to try to convince you. I think you've heard some very passionate, very detailed, and very excellent explanations of what's wrong with it. You haven't listened. I suspect you haven't listened because you believe that even though maybe the members of the opposition disagree with you, the public must all agree with you. Their silence, by definition, must be agreement.

AN HON. MEMBER: Well, they have for the past 14 years.

MR. YOUNIE: But they're quitting. That's why they had to move a lot of desks around here two years ago.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Through the Chair, please, through the Chair.

MR. YOUNIE: The hon. member should realize, if his party is doing any amount of polling, that the opinion of people of the government is changing, and it's going downhill quickly. It's going downhill because the government doesn't listen to amendments like this, doesn't listen to an opposition on Bills like this, and then has to go to the people to defend an abysmal record. The last election you got part of the lesson; next election you'll get the rest of it. Some of you'll be gone; some will be over here.

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, on 804. He's off the narrow point again. In fact, he's off the point totally.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair will deal within the matter that sufficient leeway is being given to allow the member now to bring it back in terms of the six months' hoist. He's working on the theory, the matter of having people listen. Thank you.

MR. YOUNIE: On the theory that this might give them a chance to sew back together a tattered image with the public and convince them that they haven't forgotten how to listen. Whether they do it with any sincerity or not, the exercise itself might prove helpful that a group that's been locked up in the ivory tower here so long could get in touch with the people again. We want to give you that opportunity. We're suggesting: take six months.

I'm sure the minister cannot be so anxious to have that power to run out spending money willy-nilly as he sees fit on various groups and avoid debate here that he has to start doing it in a month or two. Six months would be a sufficient way to use the procedures we've been using all along in the first place before he makes that kind of drastic change. So I think this government, if they had some common sense -- get away from the argument of integrity and just say political sense -- could see what kind of damage they're going to do to themselves by forcing this through, by refusing something as reasonable as a request to sit back, to let the people of Alberta find out what this is really all about, and to get a very large body of second opinion on it.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

Member for St. Albert, then followed by Calgary-North West.

MR. STRONG: I should have given the hon. backbencher an opportunity to speak to it.

Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure for me this evening to say a few words in regard to the amendment. I believe the amendment put before this Assembly by the Member for Edmonton-Highlands is an excellent one. I think the purpose of the hoist is to say to this government: "Reconsider the legislation that you have before this Assembly. Consult with Albertans."

It's illogical to proceed with this legislation, because it is ill-conceived. It would allow this minister time to rethink his

position with respect to Bill 10. That's the reason for the amendment. The reason for the amendment is to make this Legislature responsible to an open review of the monies that we call lottery funds. It's to call this government's attention to thinking of an appeals process. Perhaps the minister, if this legislation is delayed for six months, he'll have time to rethink his position after consulting with Albertans, his constituents, other members of this Assembly, to rethink his position with respect to Bill 10.

The Member for Edmonton-Highlands gave a very valid reason for this amendment: that it takes at times almost two years for we in this Assembly to scrutinize the moneys that are expended by this minister, that we call lottery fund money. What we're asking for is for this minister to demonstrate a commitment to open government. Mr. Speaker, I don't think there are any of us here in this Legislative Assembly that have not run into numerous constituents that hold politicians in low esteem. We're not just speaking about politicians in a provincial sense. We're talking about municipal politicians, federal politicians that are held in low esteem by the general public. And it's Bills such as this that create that animosity and that cynicism amongst the general public. I'll say it again, Mr. Speaker: Bills of this nature do nothing to improve the image of politicians in our society, absolutely nothing. I think that's a very valid and important reason for allowing this minister to rethink his position.

It's unfortunate the minister was called away by some emergency. I would hope that he reads the comments in *Hansard* tomorrow that will draw his attention to our concerns as the Official Opposition and rethink this piece of legislation, think about accountability, think about commitment to Albertans, think about this government's political image. I'd like to remind this minister also that perception is everything. And public perception when it comes to Bill 10 and Bill 10's creation of a massive political slush fund subject to political abuse by any government, not specifically this one, is something this minister should take into account in rethinking his position. Mr. Speaker, the amendment's very clear. It says that Bill 10 "be not now read a third time but that it be read a third time . . . six months hence" in order to allow the minister to rethink his position.

Mr. Speaker, all of us in this Assembly should be demanding more scrutiny of the actions of our government. This government should be demanding it. Why aren't they doing that? Again, coming back to the amendment, take the time to rethink the position of the minister of the government with respect to this legislation. It's wrong.

The Member for Edmonton-Strathcona pointed out as I pointed out, that the public is very cynical of politicians and the political process. Mr. Speaker, let's look at an example of this. Here we have a government that cuts back on many of the services provided to Albertans. Here we have a government that increased our tax bill a billion dollars. Sure, we got a few of those dollars back, but perhaps when the minister is reconsidering this piece of legislation, what he should reconsider is this: that with an excess of \$100 million in this fund, this government last year could have eased the tax burden for Albertans by almost 10 percent. That's what we're asking the minister to reconsider. If these lottery funds were part and parcel of general revenues, perhaps the tax bill of ordinary, average Albertans out there wouldn't have had to go up that billion dollars. Mr. Speaker, let's examine this: if these lottery funds were part and parcel of general revenues, perhaps we wouldn't have a hotel room tax of 5 percent in the province of Alberta.

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. He's arguing the principle of the Bill again.

MR. STRONG: You know, Mr. Speaker, it's interesting that these government ministers, associate ministers, backbenchers, can all jump up on points of order. Why don't they start jumping up . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. member. Back to the reasoned amendment. I'm sorry; to the amendment. Yeah, I'm already looking at seeing what else we might be doing here yet tonight.

But with respect to the six months' hoist, hon. member.

MR. STRONG: Mr. Speaker, I thought I was on the amendment, because what I am offering this government is some reasons to vote with us in the Official Opposition on this amendment, and stating very valid reasons for this government to reconsider their position and vote with the Official Opposition in this Assembly. I think those reasons are very valid.

Mr. Speaker, we look at this government suggesting to us that these lottery funds be put in a separate fund. That is wrong. That's why we're asking them to rethink their position, and that's the purpose of the amendment we see before us in this Assembly. This government, in reconsidering their position, should reconsider a position in cuts to education budgets, cuts to social services, cuts to hospital and medical care funding. Perhaps if this money was and did form part and parcel of general revenues in the province of Alberta, rather than cut back on those services, we could have kept and maintained those services for Albertans. That's what this government should be reconsidering on this amendment.

Those are very, very valid concerns and very valid reasons, Mr. Speaker. I'm not suggesting for a minute that this government or any government found the premise, the underpinnings, of any education system, any social services system, any health system on lottery funds. But certainly to have those lottery funds as part and parcel of general revenues, that money would be there to ease some of the burden on all Albertans, not special friends of this government.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. member. The six-month . . . Thank you. Back to this amendment.

MR. STRONG: Mr. Speaker, I guess I'm left in the position of asking for your guidance in my comments with respect to this amendment. Because I feel I am pointing out very, very valid reasons for this government to vote with us in passing this amendment. Now, I ask for your guidance. I would think that my comments are very valid in offering very legitimate and valid reasons to the government members that are present here this evening for considering our argument on this amendment. Now, isn't that in order?

MR. SPEAKER: If you're asking for direction, keep it to the six months' hoist. Thank you very much.

MR. STRONG: Mr. Speaker, I've got many constituents in St. Albert that have asked me to represent their views in this Legislature. Those constituents are asking me, "Why are we setting up a special fund, lottery funds, when this money should be part and parcel of general revenues?" I told those individuals that I'd do everything I could to support their cause in this Legislative

Assembly, and I'm doing just exactly that. A hundred and thirty million dollars -- us cutting back on education budgets, the social services budget, kicking beginning farmers off their farms . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. member. The Chair will look after it. Back to the six months' hoist, hon. member. It's not all these other examples; it's why this needs to be done related to the specific Bill before us.

MR. STRONG: Mr. Speaker, again, the reason we have this amendment before us, and that amendment is for this government to reconsider their position and delay this for six months hence -- there are valid reasons for it. I would ask this minister and this government to consider the health care system: closing beds, emergency rooms, operating rooms; work stoppages because we don't have enough money to pay people in the medical system. Can you imagine that? When we've got \$100 million-plus in a lottery fund, we don't have enough money. I'd ask the government to consider looking at delaying this and putting that lottery fund money into general revenues. Perhaps we wouldn't be suffering, you know, some of the poor labour relations we see in the province of Alberta with work stoppages, illegal strikes by the nurses.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. member. Those two issues have nothing whatsoever to do with this. The Chair has now interrupted the hon. member at least four times. The member will draw his remarks to a conclusion in the very near future, staying to the point or else be ruled completely out of order.

AN HON. MEMBER: Four strikes and you're out.

MR. STRONG: Four strikes and I'm out. Yes.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I'd ask this government to consider very seriously the amendment put before us in this Legislative Assembly, review that amendment very carefully before voting against it. I'd ask all these government members, when considering this amendment, to remember you have a commitment to the people of the province of Alberta, not a commitment to a political slush fund. So let's start doing something for the people of the province of Alberta, not your special friends.

MR. SPEAKER: Calgary-North West.

DR. CASSIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to speak to and against the amendment. I really can't recall any Bill in this session that has received the debate that Bill 10 has. I believe all of the members of the Official Opposition have had ample time to debate it. A great deal of thought has gone into this Bill, and I have not heard any of the members opposite really give any valid reasons that would change in the next six months. I would suggest that we defeat this amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Gold Bar.

MRS. HEWES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to speak very briefly in support of the amendment. We're not suggesting something startling or earthshaking or unheard of or shocking here. This is not an unusual form of activity for this House. The government frequently introduces legislation and lays it on the table. In fact this last spring, a year ago now, we saw three very important Bills -- the labour Act, the education Act, the

Mental Health Act -- introduced and, in fact, allowed to the on the Order Paper in order that there could be extensive public discussion and opportunities for the caucus, the government, the cabinet to hear what the public were thinking. So this is a very familiar type of activity for the government when introducing new legislation.

I don't happen to think that this is a good Bill, Mr. Speaker, but all of that is notwithstanding. I do believe that it does desperately and urgently cry out for public input. I'm talking about input from the public in general and also input from the foundations that have been created to be the agents for lottery funding, for lottery moneys to be distributed to the public. I think we need to know what those foundations believe and think about the methodology that is being suggested here. I have not heard from the government that they are totally onside, that there has been extensive consultation with those foundations prior to this Bill being pushed through the House. In fact, on the contrary. We read from time to time and hear reports that there has been little, if any, consultation with them. What are the expectations of those foundations? We need to hear from the consumers or the beneficiaries from those foundations. What do they expect will happen as a result of this? There are many jobs at stake here. These are voluntary organizations, private and nonprofit. They've served this government long and hard and well over many years, and through them we fund many very important organizations in our communities. I don't know that we've asked those consumers: "What do you think about this? What do you think about the potential this Bill will have to make a difference in how the funds will be spent?"

We're talking here about how we respond and how we account to Albertans for our spending priorities. Now, this year, because there were extra funds, a surplus of funds, in the lottery account over and above what was spent by the foundations, we have seen new beneficiaries, and that's been a very important difference that we've acknowledged this year. Now, what do these beneficiaries think about it? Have they certain expectations for the future about more operating funds coming, along with the capital expenditures they have been allowed to make? Mr. Speaker, this House needs to know from those three important groups as well as from the public at large what they believe this Bill will prove, what the results of this Bill will be. Will they be benign for all of those, or will they work in an adverse fashion for the foundations, the consumers from the foundations, and the new beneficiaries?

Mr. Speaker, I think the amendment is a good idea. I think it would give the government, give all of us, time to test out, to invite commentary from those groups I've mentioned and others. I'm not suggesting holding up action here. There's nothing pressing about passing the Bill tonight. This is a very sensitive issue, and we all know why it's sensitive. That's been spoken to at great length in first and second reading. This is not just a housekeeping item. This is a substantive amendment changing how we are doing something that is important to Albertans. I don't believe any damage can be done by the amendment. There is no handicap to anyone. It's not holding up any important activity. There will be no hardship created for the organizations. There will be no hardship for the beneficiaries in our province of lottery funding. I suggest that the government should, in fact, support the amendment. Of course it was submitted by the opposition, but that doesn't necessarily mean that we all have to say it's wrong. I think that doesn't show too much respect for ideas from all parts of the House.

Mr. Speaker, this is a time that I think the government should

show they are responsive to the people of Alberta. They should take the high road and leave it on the table until the fall.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Mill Woods, followed by the Associate Minister of Agriculture.

MR. GIBEAULT: Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak on third reading of Bill 10, otherwise more commonly known as the slush fund to many . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member, with due respect, this is an amendment. We're not speaking on Bill 10.

MR. GIBEAULT: The amendment to Bill 10, indeed. What we're trying to do, Mr. Speaker, by having this amendment is to try to give the government and the people of this province an opportunity to have some thoughtful review of Bill 10 and the implications, serious ones, that it raises to the people of this province.

I don't know about the minister responsible for lotteries, but I can tell you that many of my colleagues in the city have certainly had many calls to our offices about the process this government is trying to ram through here, where they can have a sort of backroom, closed-door review of lottery proceeds and allocate them in their own particular pet projects and pet constituencies. Mr. Speaker, it doesn't matter whether people are from a Conservative, NDP, Liberal, or nonpartisan background; they're outraged at the unfairness of that process. People of the province are expecting more from this government than to ram through this kind of Bill that certainly gives very unusual authority to the minister responsible for lotteries in this province.

I would like to suggest that the amendment is entirely a reasonable one. Six months' consideration for such a major policy in this province is hardly unreasonable. I mean, we had yesterday or just recently, Mr. Speaker -- Tuesday -- an announcement of changes to the casino policy. It took two years for this government to come up with that, and still they couldn't seem to get it right in terms of responding to many of the community organizations in my province. I only use that as an example to indicate what could be a benefit hopefully, of giving this government an opportunity to hear public input from community organizations, from the foundations that distribute lottery funds, from the people who will benefit from lottery-funded activities. So six months' consideration hardly strikes me as being unreasonable. I think if the government wants to indicate to the people of this province a concern about public input, a concern for fairness, a concern for listening to grass-roots community involvement, then a six-month delay to such a major Bill is entirely reasonable.

As I said, and as other members have said, there is no pressing urgency. The minister hasn't said to us here tonight that he's got an urgent request from any of the foundations or any of the community groups to put through a Bill like Bill 10. If he has, let him put that on the table, because we haven't heard that, Mr. Speaker. I guess I just have to ask, and many of my constituents are asking: what's the rush on such a major policy change here? Is it that we may be coming up to a provincial election within the year and we've got to get some pork-barreling in place here and make sure we get some weak constituencies, some marginal constituencies, well lubricated or juiced . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. member. Let's turn it a little more temperately back to the narrow confines of the amendment.

MR. GIBEAULT: Well, I think this delay of six months, Mr. Speaker, would deal with that very, very significant apprehension many Albertans have. I just come back to that point: what is the rush? If it's not for an election, then what is the rush? As I said . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, behind the hon. member. It's a bit distracting for the member.

MR. GIBEAULT: . . . there has been no outrage, no outpouring of public sentiment, asking for this Bill to be put through. Has the minister received letters he'd be willing to share with the members of the House saying that we've got to have this new amendment to the Lotteries Act pushed through so quickly? Because if he has, he hasn't indicated that to us here.

What we're really talking about Mr. Speaker, is this whole concept of accountability. As my colleague the Member for Edmonton-Strathcona mentioned earlier, it is unfortunate that many people in this province and in our country -- in terms of their public perception of elected officials, very often it's not as high as many of us would like. I would like to suggest it's Bills like this, Bill 10, the slush fund Act here, that are contributing to this kind of problem. Now, if the minister and the colleagues of the government over here -- members of the back bench -- are concerned about integrity and concerned about the perception of elected officials, then why not have, as we are proposing in this amendment a six-month delay for public hearings, for public input to make sure that in fact this is the kind of Bill the people of this province want? I'm not convinced for a moment, from what I have heard, from what I've listened to from constituents and people around the province, that this is, in fact, what they want at all, Mr. Speaker. I think that's why the government is so keen to push this thing through.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on, but I think I've made the point here that this amendment is a very reasonable one. All we're asking for is a six-month delay. The minister has not made a case that there's an urgent necessity to press this, and we have all kinds of apprehensions about the motivations for pushing this through, what will happen. I think the only reasonable thing is to have a few more months -- that's all we're asking for here, just a few more months -- for some public review, some consideration of this very important policy change the minister is proposing.

MR. SPEAKER: Associate Minister of Agriculture.

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the concern of the opposition for the welfare of the government and particularly for the welfare of the minister, as many of the members have outlined. I note that when the Member for Edmonton-Highlands introduced the narrow amendment she said she worked for her constituents in a nonpartisan way, and I can assure all members of Alberta that we all work for our constituents in a nonpartisan way.

I'd frankly ask members to oppose this Bill, because I don't want to be dictated to by the opposition and be here on November 19, 1988. That's exactly what this amendment asks us to do: to be in this House, in this Legislature, November 19, 1988.

MR. WRIGHT: Well, suggest a better date if you can think of one.

MRS. CRIPPS: No, that's what the amendment says.

Mr. Speaker, the beauty of democracy is the time that it takes to go from first reading to second reading to Committee of the Whole and to third reading in this democratic system. Certainly this Bill has had adequate debate, and it's time to vote on it and pass it in this Legislature.

MR. SPEAKER: Call for the question?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. SPEAKER: Member for Edmonton-Kingsway.

MR. MCEACHERN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have often wondered why we didn't get more participation from the side opposite. I guess it's because they don't have very good arguments.

We have asked here for a reasonable amendment the idea that six months should be allowed to go by before this rather contentious Bill is reconsidered, so that the government can make some consultation, if you like, with various groups. I'll get back to that aspect in a minute. But I cannot believe what I just heard the Associate Minister of Agriculture saying. Her reason for defeating the amendment is not that it's a bad amendment not that we don't need six months, but that she doesn't want to be here in six months. I ask you, hon. minister, what were you elected for if it wasn't to look after the legislation of this province to see that it's sound and reasonable? So if it's six months, four months, eight months, nobody is going to worry about that, for heaven's sake. This is a symbolic kind of amendment to make, to suggest that the government take some time, which is the key thing, Mr. Speaker.

The minister, I believe, made too hasty a decision in bringing in Bill 10. I think he thought it wouldn't matter too much. His government has been handing out these moneys for 14 years. He says that you know, nobody complained very much. The Auditor General for the last three years has complained. He chooses the worst alternative the Auditor General gave him, and now he's in this mess and we're offering him a way out. We're offering him a six-month time to back off, do some consultation, ask some people what they think about it -- not just the opposition, not just us in this Assembly. Go out into the streets. Go out and knock on some doors. Go out and talk to some of the cultural groups. Go out and talk to the taxpayers of this province and find out that they do want their dollars to be spent in a responsible manner. Mr. Speaker, that's really what it's all about.

He should be consulting with all the groups I've mentioned, but he also should be thinking in terms of all-party committees working on this kind of legislation. There's no reason in the world that he has to bring this kind of legislation in in secrecy. The federal government uses all-party committees to plan their legislation and debate it and vet it and to hold public hearings and get input from everybody on it before they bring Bills into the Assembly. There is no real reason why this government shouldn't start doing more of the same.

Bill 54 would have saved a lot of problems. For instance, last year had they brought it in -- well, they did bring it in, and now they've had to back off and start over again because there was no public input. So this six-month period we're offering

will allow you to do that.

The same thing happened to you on the education Bill last year. Now look how much better Bill 27 is this year than Bill 60 was last year. So it's that kind of time period that makes the difference. When people have a chance to look at some draft legislation, to analyze it, debate it among themselves and among politicians and everybody concerned, then you come up with better legislation. That's been proved more than once, and the government should learn from that kind of lesson.

Bill 20 was perhaps one of the best examples of that last year. It was a Bill about marketing boards, trying to bring together all the diverse marketing boards under one piece of legislation.

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, 742 is a six months' hoist, and he's talking all over the range about the policies of the government and introducing Bills for discussion. We know we introduced some Bills last year for discussion. They're back here as Bills. Mr. Speaker, please.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.
Edmonton-Strathcona.

MR. WRIGHT: Just this, Mr. Speaker. In suggesting to the Assembly reasons why it is reasonable to postpone further discussion of this Bill for six months by this amendment to the motion, one may not give the reasons why it might help. But to ponder the matter further and the details of what might profitably be pondered in that time is illogical.

MR. STRONG: Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the point of order, I think it's incumbent on yourself to make a ruling. I think any comments that show reason for this government to reconsider and support this amendment are valid comments. It might not be things this government or this associate minister wants to listen to, with some of their failings in the reasons for listening to and supporting the amendment. But certainly those are valid comments, Mr. Speaker, and I hope you would rule that way.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, on previous occasions in the House it has been ruled that repetition in terms of the same argument time after time after time has indeed not only been brought to the attention of the House but ruled out of order. Some of the examples that have been cited this evening have been brought forward at least about five times. The difference in this case is that Edmonton-Kingsway has brought into play yet another statute. To bring that in and cite it is one thing, but to go into the details which Edmonton-Kingsway was embarked upon was indeed out of order.

Nevertheless, with respect to all this, I'm sure Edmonton-Kingsway can bring himself back to deal with the matter of the narrow confines of this amendment.

MR. MCEACHERN: Of course I can, Mr. Speaker. Actually, all I was trying to do was describe Bill 20 because I didn't remember the title exactly. So I wasn't really trying to describe the details of it.

I gather that in my previous comments when I mentioned the education Bill as another example where consultation really paid off, I said something about Bill 60. If I did, that's a mistake. It was Bill 59, and it has become Bill 27, just to correct the record.

Mr. Speaker, these are examples of this government having consulted with the public, and a six-month period will give them

that chance to do so again in this case. I guess I'm just trying to point these out because so often -- well, for one thing, for many years this government didn't have anybody in this Assembly to consult with very much; there wasn't a very big opposition. So it was difficult for them to think in terms of all-party committees and all-party committees going out and consulting with the community groups and so on. That doesn't mean the government couldn't go out and consult with the community groups, and in some instances they have. But I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that that technique has not been used often enough. I would, for instance, point out that the government steadfastly refused to hold any kind of public hearings on Meech Lake or the heritage trust fund, after 10 years.

So when the government sees itself getting into trouble on a major issue, they really should stop and check what's out there on the grounds: what are ordinary Albertans thinking about, what are their attitudes? That's why this government should take six months and think about where to go from here with Bill 10. Mr. Speaker, the problem if they don't, if they don't touch base again, is that they lose touch with the ordinary people of this province because they're not consulting with them and asking them what they think before they bring in legislation, as they did in this particular case. The result of that, Mr. Speaker, is that an awful lot of people get very disenchanted with the political process.

Now, I'm a member who, as everybody knows, does quite a lot of door knocking. When I go to the door, the most discouraging thing is not people who turn out to be Conservative, if they're politically minded, or if they turn out to be some other party -- of course, one loves it when they're New Democrats -- but it's when they are turned off from the political process. And unless this government starts consulting more with the ordinary people of Alberta about where they're going and what they're doing and what kind of legislation they're going to pass, they are going to turn off more and more people. And just in case you don't think that's a serious problem, I would like to point out to you that when we introduced Bill 201 in this Assembly, a freedom of information Bill, a member of this Assembly stood up . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member, with due respect, back to the amendment.

MR. MCEACHERN: Mr. Speaker, the amendment gives us six months on this particular and fairly major expenditure of government money, some hundred millions of dollars each year. If we don't do it right, if the people of Alberta get discouraged with the political process and say, "Look, all he's done is set himself up a slush fund," then it's that much more difficult for us in doing our job as politicians, because more and more people drop out of the political process.

I wanted to quote a member from the government side of the House in our debate in that regard when we were talking about information about how government operates, and it's directly relevant . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I'm sorry, hon. member. We're back to this amendment, please. [interjection] Order please. If I have to interrupt once more, hon. member, I'll take away the right to speak.

MR. MCEACHERN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think his comments are relevant. I think if you hear them you will understand why

they're relevant. I really . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member, please get back to this point.

MR. MCEACHERN: But I am on the amendment. The amendment says that we take six months to consult with the people of Alberta. I'm merely talking about the effect on the people of Alberta if we do not do that.

The comment -- so I won't read it from there then. Basically the comment by the member from the other side of the House was that if we don't tell the people of Alberta how we're spending their money, that's the reason why a lot of the people of Alberta think politicians have a standing somewhat lower than used car salesmen. When a minister sets up a slush fund or a fund that can be used -- or anyway is construed to be a slush fund -- then the people of Alberta are going to think that way.

So what we're really offering the minister is a way out, quite frankly. He could just let this cool for six months in this Assembly. We would leave it alone for the six months. He could set up a process of hearings around this province with some of the cultural groups. He could ask for an all-parliamentary committee. We would co-operate and work with him, and we could see to it that people really do feel like they're part of the political process, that it has some relevance to them, that they have some influence on it. Mr. Speaker, that's the main point I was trying to make. I don't really see why the minister would bypass a chance to do that.

My final point Mr. Speaker, would be that somewhere along the line the Auditor General suggested that he make legal the process he's doing. The Bill does make legal the process, but I would just remind the member that that doesn't necessarily mean it's a right and a democratic thing to do. Pinochet makes it legal to throw people in prison for no reason other than that they might have a different political stripe. So legality is not the key. It's democracy and consultation with people. And so we're offering him a six-month truce, so to speak, so that he can go out and consult the people of this province. We'll even work with him if he wishes, if he wants to get an all-party committee kind of thing, which I highly recommend, to find out what the people of Alberta think about it if he doesn't just believe this caucus.

MR. SPEAKER: Is there a call for the question on the amendment?

Edmonton-Avonmore.

MS LAING: Mr. Speaker, there isn't much new that I could add to this debate, but I would like to bring to this Assembly's attention some of the public response I've heard to Bill 27 and the minister that brought it forth. She went forward and got public input on Bill 59, which she tabled last June. She took the time to listen, to consider, and incorporate into Bill 27 the public input. After she brought forward Bill 27 she was congratulated for taking part in that kind of democratic process. I would suggest that the minister responsible for Bill 10 could well learn from the Minister of Education . . .

MR. BRADLEY: A point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Pincher Creek-Crowsnest on a point of order.

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, referring to *Erskine May: Parliamentary Practice*, 20th edition. Page 577 states the follow-

ing:

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.

I think the debate on this particular question is far beyond the limited restrictions provided under *Erskine May* in terms of debate on third reading.

MS LAING: On the point of order, Mr. Speaker. I am speaking on the amendment and not in third reading.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. member. The Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest did start by talking about third reading, but then went on to the other section in reference with respect to the limitations of amendments. So indeed, while I received the false signal myself, the member did go on and cite relevant information.

The Chair, on this particular issue, is allowing the courtesy of the House to this member to deal with this one particular example with respect to the Bill as cited, but will not look with favour upon additional Bills being cited at this stage of the evening.

MS LAING: Mr. Speaker, the Associate Minister of Agriculture suggested that the process was first reading, second reading, committee study, and then third reading, and that that all had to happen in one session. The Minister of Education did not seem to feel that way. She allowed for public debate and public input and I would ask that the minister responsible for this Bill do similarly and hold off this Bill for six months.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed, please say no.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. SPEAKER: The amendment is defeated.

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

[Eight minutes having elapsed, the House divided]

For the motion:

Barrett	Laing	Sigurdson
Chumir	McEachern	Strong
Fox	Mjolsness	Wright
Gibeault	Pashak	Younie
Hewes		

Against the motion:

Ady	Drobot	Osterman
Alger	Heron	Payne
Betkowski	Johnston	Pengelly

Bogle	Jonson	Rostad
Bradley	Kowalski	Russell
Brassard	Mirosh	Schumacher
Cassin	Moore, R.	Shaben
Cherry	Musgreave	Shrake
Clegg	Musgrove	Stewart
Cripps	Nelson	Webber
Day	Oldring	West
Downey	Orman	
Totals:	Ayes - 13	Noes - 35

[Motion on amendment lost]

MS LAING: Mr. Speaker, I rise again to speak against this Bill, because I believe it contravenes the spirit and intent of democratic government. In a democracy, a Parliament, a Legislative Assembly meets together to determine two things. One of the things it meets to determine are the laws that shall govern how we shall live together, and secondly, it meets together to determine how the government shall collect and spend public funds. This Bill contravenes the second responsibility of democratic government; that is, the meeting together to debate the spending of public funds, that the spending of public funds shall be open to public scrutiny through the members of the Legislature and also, through them, to scrutiny by the citizens of this province.

This minister has suggested that the spending of these funds would be open to public scrutiny through Public Accounts. This suggestion fails the test of democracy on two counts, and I speak from experience of sitting on Public Accounts. Scrutiny after the fact cannot allow for debate as to the best way to spend funds, as to the appropriateness of grants. There is no debate as to which organization will best serve the needs of Albertans. As such, this spending of funds is too easily open to abuse or too easily seen to be open to abuse. Therefore, the power of spending these funds must be in such a manner operated that it cannot be abused or cannot be seen to be possibly abused. In addition, when we come to Public Accounts, what can we say about the spending of public moneys when they are already spent? We may be outraged at how the money was spent, or there may be a public outcry at how the money has been spent, but what is done is done and it cannot be changed.

We have heard much about the possibilities of such funds being used as a slush fund for patronage. Certainly we need politicians that can be above such charges. If the minister is indeed honourable in his intentions, he should have nothing to fear from the public scrutiny of how these funds will be spent. When one avoids, evades, or otherwise circumvents public scrutiny, one may well ask "Why?" What does that person fear? To leave it to Public Accounts is to leave it too late.

But another reason that Public Accounts scrutiny is unacceptable is that the committee does not meet often enough to scrutinize all the departments. In fact, there is a good chance that such expenditures would never come before the Public Accounts Committee for scrutiny and therefore would never be held up to scrutiny on behalf of the public. So this method of scrutiny is not good enough.

Mr. Speaker, this Bill also allows the minister to pay . . . for any other purpose the Minister considers . . . in the public interest.

Surely that is the responsibility of this Assembly: to determine what is "in the public interest."

As I have said, the second reason we meet in this Assembly

is to determine how we shall live together; that is, to determine and to debate what is, in fact, in the public interest. Why on earth else would we come here? Surely not to waste time filling *Hansard* with empty words and rhetoric. No, we come here to debate what is to be done that is in the public interest -- "the public" writ large; not one small segment of the public, not a favoured group of the public, but in the public interest to best serve all the peoples of this province.

Mr. Speaker, we're not in any way opposing or calling into question the values of the groups receiving the funds. What we are opposing is the process through which decisions are made as to how these funds shall be spent. The process is what is in question. We know naught of the criteria that would be used to determine what is in the public interest, how best these funds would be spent. The minister has stated, and I would quote from *Hansard*, page 913, May 9, 1988:

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that all of the best ideas are not contained within the walls of this Chamber, that the community also has [an opportunity] and an obligation to be a part of the decisions with regard to the allocation of lottery dollars.

Mr. Speaker, it is indeed true that not all the best ideas are contained within this Chamber. But far more good ideas are contained within this Chamber than are found in a single member's office, even if that member is a minister. How better to bring to bear the concerns of the community but through the members of this Assembly? Then we can ensure that all members of the community are heard, not just a few members of a few communities. Not only must all members of all communities be heard, but we also know that it must be clear and it must be seen to be done. There is a fundamental rule of justice: not only must justice be done; it must be seen to be done. This Bill very obviously contravenes this principle as it contravenes the principles of democracy.

Mr. Speaker, this minister has said he is not changing anything with this Bill. Well, to hold that inappropriate policies and practices which circumvented the democratic processes in the past is a justification for continuing such practices -- no person in his or her right mind would hold such a view. As we have often heard, two wrongs, one of the past and one projected into the future, do not make a right.

But this minister, as I have said, believes that this Bill is unnecessary, and I, too, would hold that it is unnecessary. We have in place the mechanisms and processes to determine the spending of these moneys: the Legislative Assembly and our deliberations on budgets and estimates and Public Accounts. Therefore, I move an amendment to this Bill. The amendment I would read is that the motion for third reading of Bill 10, Interprovincial Lottery Amendment Act, 1988, be amended

by striking all the words after the word "That" and substituting the following:

"this Assembly decline to give a third reading to Bill 10, Interprovincial Lottery Amendment Act, 1988, because it establishes a method of disbursements of public monies that is unnecessary."

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair will pause for a moment for a little bit of a reflection with Table officers.

This amendment is indeed a reasoned amendment, so debate may continue. But the debate may continue with respect, again, to the narrow confines of the method; the latter part of this amendment is what will be kept narrowly adhered to.

The Chair recognizes the Minister of the Environment.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in opposition to the amendment. I'm governed by the direction that you've given as a result, of course, of rules within *Beauchesne*. I would take it, sir, that in terms of the narrowness of the debate with respect to the amendment that has now been introduced by the Member for Edmonton-Avonmore, the restriction applies to the phraseology in the amendment that quotes:

because it establishes a method of disbursements of public [funds] that is unnecessary.

I would take it Mr. Speaker, that that would be the parameters for the debate that would follow in subsequent minutes from now with respect to this matter. And it is on that matter, Mr. Speaker, that I wish to rise in opposition to the amendment.

Bill 10 is a very important Bill that has been well scrutinized by hon. members through at least, I guess -- well, into the third reading now with respect to it. I take it in listening to some of the discussion and even the introduction that has been provided by the Member for Edmonton-Avonmore with respect to her amendment, that there is some hesitation being taken by some members with respect to clause 6 in Bill 10 which really provides for an opportunity for the minister to allocate dollars for the purposes of assisting people in the province of Alberta. When the Member for Edmonton-Avonmore stood up and quoted, I guess, three principles in support of the amendment it's on the basis of those principles that I would like to address just a few brief comments.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I think it's extremely important that we have to ask the question: what is the purpose of an elected person? An elected person, of course, is elected to serve people. And it is people in the province of Alberta that elected person causes an oath to be given. The purpose is not to provide for the spending of funds; what it is is to ensure that there's a proper allocation of funds for the needs expressed by the people of Alberta. Of course, it has to be very clear that all of those funds must be addressed to needy causes and needy people in the province, and it must be very clear how things are to be done. What Bill 10 does is provide for a very clear alternative of action and an action oriented alternative that will allow a minister of this government -- it would allow this government -- to respond and react to the needs of the people of Alberta.

The amendment does not suggest an alternative; it just simply says that the method of disbursements outlined in Bill 10 is unnecessary. Now, Mr. Speaker, it's to that very narrow point that I would like to just make a few comments. "Why is it necessary that a minister and a government should respond to the needs of the people?" fundamentally is the question that's being asked. When people have needs and people come forward and address those needs to members in an elected Legislature, it is imperative that that elected Legislature can respond, and respond as quickly as possible, to those needs.

Mr. Speaker, what concerns me about the amendment to this particular Bill is that it would really restrict the action and the action oriented response the citizens of Alberta are used to obtaining from the government that we are all members of in this particular Assembly, save for those who are elected to function in a position of opposition, which is quite a different responsibility than those who are elected to govern.

When the minister responsible in this Assembly for the allocation of these funds receives a request from the Fort McMurray women's crisis shelter society -- a needy request, an impassioned request for people to come forward and provide immediate assistance -- the minister must be in a position to respond. Now, when the minister receives a request from the Edmonton

Food Bank, the minister must be in a position to respond and respond quickly, because those are impassioned requests that are caused by driving needs within a community. When the minister receives a request from the Calgary Lions Eye-bank for immediate response to assistance, the minister must be, of course, in a position to respond. When the minister receives requests from the Calgary mentally and physically handicapped riding society, or from the Alberta Fish & Game Association, or the Calgary Zoological Society, or the Edmonton Jewish Youth Centre -- and of course the list goes on and on, Mr. Speaker.

And these are only a few examples, because I appreciate that many members will want to participate in this debate with respect to the amendment Mr. Speaker, and I certainly wish that one would really have an opportunity to go through a long list of immediate kinds of concerns and requests that have been made to a minister of this government, to members of this government from people in the province of Alberta who want action because they are in a difficult situation. That minister who has sworn an oath of allegiance to proper governance in the province of Alberta, that minister who has taken an oath of responsibility to ensure that public dollars are properly addressed and properly dealt with, and all members of this Assembly who believe in democracy and who believe that the ultimate purpose of democracy is to serve the citizenry we are elected to represent and to serve them in a way in which it is clear that when a question comes, "Can you help?", and when the government responds, "Yes, we can, and here's how we're going to do it" -- then it's very clear how that government is responding, and it is very clear that that response will be made public.

And of course, Bill 10 provides for that alternative. Bill 10 provides for a mechanism whereby the minister, in this case the Minister of Career Development and Employment will be in a position to ensure that the needs of the people of Alberta are responded to. And that is important that we have that mechanism in place, that there is immediacy of response. That is a tradition of the government that the government members in this Assembly are all about. That is what this government is all about. It is not one that will allow six months of study or eight years of investigation or what have you. When a group of people in this province need help, they must be in a position to know that they will get help and it will be forthcoming. And, Mr. Speaker, that is what Bill 10 is all about.

What the amendment that has now been brought forward by the Member for Edmonton-Avonmore will do is, in fact, just simply say that the mechanism is unnecessary and provide, unfortunately, not the alternative that's really required. Bill 10 provides a mechanism; it provides an alternative; it provides an exciting opportunity for the people of Alberta to be well served through the usage of the disbursement of lottery funds. All of these disbursements are made public. They are in the public forum, and they are meant to be of service to the people of Alberta. And it is imperative that all members of this Assembly defeat the amendment so that a very proper mechanism that's been outlined in Bill 10 might be implemented, and implemented quickly, for the benefit of the people of Alberta. It would be erroneous, totally erroneous, if this Assembly were to uphold the amendment and delay implementation of this Bill for months and months and months. How could we then explain to the people of Alberta what it is that we are all about? The purpose of this government is to be action oriented. The purpose of this government is to help people. That's what we will do, that's what we must continue to do, and that's what we have to do.

All members must defeat this amendment, support the Bill, and let's get on with the business of helping the citizens of Alberta, rather than coming here, giving speeches so that people can send them home to their constituents and say: "Ha, ha, ha. We've been an obstructionist." That's not what the people of Alberta want. They don't want any obstructionists. They want action oriented people. Those action oriented people are members of the Progressive Conservative caucus. The Progressive Conservative caucus forms the government of Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, I implore, I beg all members of this Assembly to defeat this amendment, pass the Bill, and let's get on with doing the job that we were elected to do.

MR. SPEAKER: Member for Vegreville.

MR. FOX: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. That might be referred to as a compelling performance, but I remain unconvinced by the arguments presented by the Minister of the Environment to urge all members of the Assembly to defeat this most reasonable, reasoned amendment and get on with the third reading and subsequent passage of Bill 10.

I need to add, Mr. Speaker, that this amendment as proposed by my colleague for Edmonton-Avonmore I think is an attempt to rescue this government, to prevent the government from doing something that in the long run I think is very foolish, and it would not bode very well for their reputation out amongst the public. I need to clear something up for the benefit of hon. members who have perhaps slept through most of this extended debate.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, hon. member. That really is not a necessary comment to be made.

MR. FOX: Those who would try to simplify the argument that has been presented, Mr. Speaker, in this Bill such that they want to be able to tell Albertans that we don't approve of the many worthwhile foundations that have the opportunity to spend lottery money, that because we're opposed to Bill 10 and the extraordinary powers given to this minister under Bill 10 we somehow don't support the worthwhile activities of the Alberta Sport Council, the Recreation, Parks and Wildlife Foundation, the various cultural and heritage organizations, the ag societies, all the many worthwhile organizations that get money -- they want to paint that as our argument.

That couldn't be further from the truth, Mr. Speaker, and for the hon. Minister of the Environment to suggest that we need to pass this Bill quickly so that effective action can be taken and money can be distributed to the worthwhile organizations I submit is a rather facetious argument. Because the decision, as I understand it to give extra funds to many of these worthwhile foundations out of surplus lottery revenue has already been done. What the minister is now asking for is the power to justify that action already taken and to give him the opportunity and the power to continue to spend that money in a very capricious and offhanded sort of way in the future.

We want to prevent that because we want to ensure not only that these worthwhile organizations, foundations, and ag societies, et cetera have access to this money in the long term so that they can depend on it but we want to make sure, further, that proper procedures are followed. The passage of this Bill, we believe, establishes a method of disbursement of public funds that's unnecessary but also, we believe, immoral. We're concerned that this Bill not set a precedent for the spending of

money in this Chamber, because it's absolutely vital, in spite of how limited the opportunity is for us as members in this Assembly to question the expenditures of the government, it's essential that we have that opportunity and that we be seen in a very public way in this forum to be asking the questions of a government about its spending priorities, about its plans to raise revenue and distribute moneys.

So we don't want the passage of Bill 10 to establish any sort of precedent that would allow members of this government, members of the cabinet to think that they somehow deserve the same kind of extraordinary powers that are being granted to the Minister of Career Development and Employment. That's the spirit in which this amendment is offered. And I don't mean to speak for my colleague from Edmonton-Avonmore; she did an admirable job of doing that for herself. But I believe that's the intent to try and protect this government in the short term from doing something that would be very wrong for them, but more important than that to protect the integrity of this system on behalf of the people of the province of Alberta, who, I might add, believe very strongly in the process of democracy. And inherent in that is the process for examining in a public way the spending of their money.

Now, I've heard it argued by members of the government here that it's not their money; it's not taxpayers' money. Even though the government chooses to distribute that money, once the spending plans are made, in a very partisan and offensive sort of way, they still say that it's not government money and ought not to be subject to the scrutiny of the Legislature. Further, they try and defend this method of disbursement of public funds, Mr. Speaker, by saying that the minister needs this kind of arbitrary power so that he can have a quick response to situations that arise, a kind of SWAT team of lottery fund dole-out. I think that too, Mr. Speaker, is a silly sort of argument to try to defend this method of disbursing funds. If this lottery revenue were included as a vote in the minister's department as members know full well, it's normally dealt with in about a two-hour process, more or less, for each department; sometimes considerably less for other departments. So certainly subjecting these moneys to vote under the estimates of that or some other minister wouldn't slow up the process, wouldn't prevent the government and indeed this Assembly from responding to the needs of worthy foundations and organizations in Alberta.

The other thing that really concerns us, Mr. Speaker, is the suggestion that the system of Public Accounts is an adequate forum for scrutinizing the method of disbursement of public moneys that the minister proposes. That's an utterly preposterous argument as well, because all that does is give some members of the Assembly who sit on that committee -- and we all know that not all members do -- an opportunity to see what was spent some time after it was spent. That's not nearly the same as having an opportunity to have input into how moneys ought to be spent an opportunity to help establish the priorities about the general disbursement of public funds. All it does is give you a chance to look at in a very cursory sort of way, how the money was spent if you can figure it out from the kind of information that's provided to you in public accounts. Again, the minister may or may not choose to answer questions that are put to him in that forum, in the Public Accounts Committee. So there needs to be a better method of examining the disbursement of this public money than what is being proposed under Bill 10.

And what better method do we have than the one that has been established through centuries of British parliamentary

tradition? That is the examination in the Legislative Assembly of the spending estimates of a government. I can't see why that argument is not appreciated by members opposite, Mr. Speaker. They continue to try to reduce this debate to a consideration of whether or not we in the opposition, we who express concerns about this, approve of the activities of the many worthwhile foundations and societies that are the current beneficiaries of lottery largess in the province. Certainly we support them. We support their activities. We want to be able to continue to support their activities. We want them to be able to be sure that their funding sources are going to be safe from the offhanded and ill-considered actions of a government that may or may not, in the near future, feel a little more desperate than they do now.

Certainly I want to emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that while we've moved this amendment and speak in favour of it and speak in a general way against the Bill, that in no way casts aspersions upon my friend opposite, the levelheaded minister. Because I think to date one could easily say that he's done a fairly responsible job of distributing these funds. I don't take issue with that at all, but one ought to take note of the fact that whether he be moving up or down, there's no guarantee that the hon. Member for Calgary-Montrose will be the minister in charge of distributing those funds for any length of time. We're worried about who might take his place: someone who may, perhaps, decide to be thoroughly partisan and capricious in the way he handles that. It may . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: Sheldon.

MR. FOX: Well, that's highly unlikely. We've got to deal in the realm of possibility here, hon. minister. This may be a fantastic debate, but we're not dealing in fantasy.

MR. SPEAKER: With respect, back to this amendment.

MR. FOX: Well, yes, I'm just trying to point out, Mr. Speaker, that we have no assurance, the people of Alberta have no assurance from the wording of Bill 10, that this minister will for any length of time in the future be responsible for the disbursement of funds as outlined in the Bill, the kind of extraordinary powers that he has to do that. That's why we're moving this amendment. That's why my colleagues fought for the hoist which was recently defeated, because it's important that this point be made. We're doing it at some length so that hopefully members in the government can appreciate what the long-term implications of their ill-considered actions are and also so that the people in Alberta, who at this time of the year are very busy and occupied with a number of things that are perhaps more relevant to their immediate lives, have an opportunity to see what is happening in this Bill. And anybody I speak to, Mr. Speaker, I can assure you is very concerned about the extraordinary and unhealthy powers that are being extended to this minister by this Bill.

In closing, I won't be able to raise my voice in the same kind of passionate tones as the Minister of the Environment did, but I do want to do my best to convince hon. members of the Assembly, especially those on the government side, to think very carefully about this reasoned amendment. Think about the amendment what the amendment is proposing: that we decline to give third reading to this Bill because it establishes a method of disbursement of public moneys that's unnecessary. Hon. members, that gives the minister an opportunity to take the Bill back, to think about what's being proposed here and what the long-term implications of that are, and to come back with some-

thing a little bit better, something that won't be as offensive, something that won't undermine this democratic process that we all cherish so much. And I believe that process being completed, we'll come up with a Bill that we can all, as members of this Assembly, be proud of and be prepared to take to Albertans.

That being said, I'm confident that I will have changed at least one mind on the other side, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Glengarry.

MR. YOUNIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I couldn't resist responding to some of the arguments of the Minister of the Environment against this very reasonable reasoned amendment. I think we have to look carefully at his arguments, because for all we know, they may be the only arguments we hear from the side opposite on why it shouldn't be passed. So I think scrutinizing the logic or lack thereof is important.

He discussed at some length why a member is elected in the first place and seemed to be leading to the idea that the member gets elected, if he's lucky enough to become a cabinet minister, to expend funds at will on whatever he sees fit. Well, I think that shows a lack of understanding of the whole structure and purpose of a parliamentary democracy. To follow his arguments, maybe the people of Alberta should have only elected one person and let that person pick a board of directors of friends and let them run the province, and things could be really efficient. They could react very quickly. They could also react very unfairly and even very cruelly on occasion. We elect 83 members in the province of a variety of political parties and philosophies so that they can come here and debate openly, honestly, fairly, and come to conclusions that show a certain amount of consensus. What this Bill aims to do that is most wrong and unnecessary in the way that it wants to disburse public moneys is that it wants to circumvent that and allow one minister to do it.

I think his argument, as well, about the Bill being action oriented has to be scrutinized. Certainly if any minister in cabinet and if any member of this Legislature should understand that we already have a very workable method of allowing emergency expenditures, it should be the minister in charge of disaster services, who used that process very well after the tornado hit Edmonton to expend money without coming to lengthy debate, without passing a new Bill, and he responded very quickly.

Although I won't give more examples of other emergency expenditures than the minister gave examples of groups that need the money, I think we should look at a few others as well. The Premier's Commission on Future Health Care for Albertans: that got emergency funding. A long-term project to look at the future of health care in the province had to get emergency funding today in the same category as the tornado. I think if somebody can justify an emergency expenditure for that, then this minister would never, ever encounter a cultural group or organization that's presently funded under lotteries or may not be funded, that he couldn't find some excuse to give emergency funding by special warrant.

[Mr. Musgrave in the Chair]

Things like intergovernmental co-ordination and research; what kind of emergency did that take? They got emergency funding. Financing of technology and research projects, obviously a long-term venture, got emergency funding as if some

20-year research project had to be started tomorrow. Natural sciences and engineering research got emergency funding. Construction and operation of transportation systems -- as if we plan a road and build it on an emergency basis. Well, if this is the kind of planning this government exhibits, then maybe it's time to get a new one, if their planning for roads is so inefficient that they have to do it on an emergency basis. But nonetheless, that did get a special warrant. I think it should be obvious that there can't possibly be a situation -- if those things can get special warrants for emergency expenditures, there couldn't conceivably be a situation in which the minister couldn't justify a short-term emergency expenditure until the next year when we debate further expenditures to that particular group. So I think it should become obvious that any argument to say that the minister needs this emergency response time is a fatuous argument with no grounding in logic whatsoever.

I think we have to look at the whole argument that there only needs to be one person decide. That violates every principle of debate and parliamentary discussion, that the minister should be able to just go ahead and decide on his own. Other members have tried to imply that we want to block funding to a lot of worthwhile groups that are getting the money now. I would argue that it's quite the opposite. We are worried that some embittered future minister, after an election where a particular cultural or ethnic group may have worked for some other candidate in his riding, might become the minister responsible for allocating lottery funds. And he might remember that group, and not in a very friendly fashion. He may use this power very arbitrarily to punish that group for not supporting him.

Now, I think that anyone who's read any amount of history knows that that is a very real possibility, and I think that is one of the most important reasons for making sure those funds are scrutinized by the Legislature: to make sure that that kind of abuse cannot take place in the future. Because it well could under the powers that are in that Act. We want to make sure that all members of the Legislature look at those expenditures, that all members get to discuss the validity of what it is being spent on, and that those groups can be protected from the capricious and arbitrary actions of a single minister who may be operating out of either anger or prejudice or some other less worthy motive than the present minister would operate under.

The amendment suggests that what's outlined in Bill 10 is unnecessary as a method of expenditure. I think any argument that says that this minister needs that power . . .

MR. HERON: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I think that over the course of the evening we've had numerous points of order called and that there's an obvious disrespect for the parliamentary procedure shown by members in the opposition. I would invite you, Mr. Speaker, to invite our member back to the amendment and see if we can't do something else than to fill *Hansard* with a lot of regurgitated opinions over and over and over. Now, I understand as well as anybody the process of filibuster, but I think the onus is upon our hon. members to have some respect for the parliamentary procedure, some respect for the rulings that have been passed down this evening by the Speaker. I would appeal to your sense of fair play, Mr. Speaker, to bring the member back into discussion about the amendment.

MR. MCEACHERN: A point of order, Mr. Speaker. It seems to me that if there's any disrespect for the democratic process, it comes from that corner over there. He's really saying that the Speaker isn't doing his job, and that's just not correct. In fact,

the member was on topic, and that's why the Speaker wasn't interrupting. So the member really should go back to sleep and forget it.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Member for Edmonton-Strathcona.

MR. WRIGHT: Thank you. On the point of order, Mr. Speaker. The motion before us is to amend the motion for third reading in a certain way, and the reason given, because it is a reasoned amendment, is

because it establishes a method of disbursements of public monies that is unnecessary.

The speaker is confining himself, I must respectfully submit, to the reasons why it is unnecessary to have this Bill, because in the absence of it, the method of disbursements of public money that would click into place is entirely adequate to meet the case. I submit that far from wasting the Assembly's time, objections which clearly aren't logical waste the Assembly's time.

MR. ORMAN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to comment on the amendment.

MR. MCEACHERN: On the point of order? [interjections]

MR. ORMAN: On the point of order?

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: If the minister rises, it's on the point of order.

MR. YOUNIE: I'm not finished speaking yet; you can count on it May I continue now?

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Member for Edmonton-Glengarry.

MR. YOUNIE: Thank you very much. I was just waiting for the member to finish interrupting me to see if he couldn't disturb my train of thought. Then I would really like to get back to the point I was trying to make, which is that the amendment is very reasoned in that it says the method of expenditures outlined in the Bill are unnecessary.

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

Now I've looked at one method of expenditure that would already cover part of what's covered there, which is giving this ridiculous emergency response time that the Minister of the Environment tried to hint was necessary, as if there's some kind of chaotic situation out there where the minister has to be doling out funds on one-day's notice to save cultural groups from annihilation. I would suggest that if the Bill is designed to do that it would be proof that the minister has been doing a lousy job, if that's the situation that exists under his responsibility. So I hope that isn't an accurate argument at all.

The other argument is that if this minister needs that kind of power and if there's any argument to support his need, that argument would apply to every minister's expenditures and every line of the budget that we spend so many days, although not enough of them, debating in this Legislature. Every minister has just as much justification to say: "There are emergencies in forest management that I have to respond to quickly, and I can't afford to waste time coming to the Legislature to debate them. I

have to make these decisions on my own. After all, that's what I was elected to do, to make these decisions on my own." I think we're setting a precedent which would see minister after minister come before the Legislature with a Bill to prove that he needs emergency powers, to not bother debating his expenditures in the Legislature, and just to spend them as he sees fit on whatever he sees as being socially necessary. Every argument that's been given to support this minister's need to use that kind of authority and arbitrary power on expenditures for cultural groups can apply to every other minister. I would say that you could apply it more justifiably to other ministers.

We have a method of providing emergency expenditures. Other expenditures have to come before the Legislature. We have a procedure in motion. It's carefully regulated, very stiffly regulated. It's called estimates. It seems to work well enough to satisfy government members for every other department of government. I fail to see how any member has proven that this minister and this department is so different that he needs these kinds of emergency powers. Therefore, I would ask the support of members to not give him this arbitrary power, unnecessary power, and to bring his expenditures under the normal purview of estimates.

Thank you.

MR. ORMAN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to comment on the amendment before us, because there are some suggestions in this amendment that in fact the reason for the amendment is that there is an inappropriate manner in which we are spending these dollars and allocating these dollars. The opposition seems to think that on a regular basis they should have to pass their blessing on the use of these dollars. This is another example of trying to delay the process of responding to the needs of the community with regard to lotteries.

The manner in which lotteries dollars have been expended has continued for some 14 years, and I don't know where they were over those 14 years. I haven't heard one comment from them. If, in fact, they don't like the way the dollars are spent or if they see other initiatives, then I think they should bring them forward. They've gone on and on during this debate and during the discussion of this amendment talking about problems as they see them, but I haven't heard one example. I have not heard them suggest throughout this evening or during other readings of this Bill that in fact there's an inappropriate manner in which the dollars are spent.

Now, this amendment, Mr. Speaker, would in fact delay this process further. They indicate that there is no public scrutiny or that, in fact, they don't have an opportunity to pass their judgment. I don't care, Mr. Speaker. I don't care. I'm accountable to the people of Alberta, and I'm not accountable to one of those individuals who represent the NDP. So it actually makes no sense to me, because if I start listening to them and responding to their beliefs, then I'm going to be in the opposition. As long as I believe in the Conservative ideals and I'm representing the people who elect a majority in this province, then in fact I'm satisfied. As we come to an election, those decisions would be made.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the amendment would suggest that there is not accountability, and I thought it was important that I do respond in discussion of this amendment with regard to public accounts, which I brought in here today. If they wanted to turn in public accounts to 5.35, they'll see under the Alberta Art Foundation an item under Revenue, "Contributions from the Western Canada Lottery Corporation," 1987: \$1,375,846.

Now, Mr. Speaker. I can then turn to the Alberta Foundation for the Performing Arts, and on page 5.45, "Contribution from the Western Canada Lottery Corporation": \$125 million. I can turn to, in fact, the Wild Rose Foundation, and I can draw their attention to page 5.109, public accounts, 1986-87, volume 1. On that page, with regard to the Wild Rose Foundation, "Western Canada Lottery Alberta Division," revenue, 1987: \$1.25 million. Now, there's accountability. It's right there in public accounts.

Now, with regard to this amendment, Mr. Speaker, if the individuals are suggesting, "Fine, we don't mind the money going to the Wild Rose Foundation, but we want to make a decision as to how they spend the dollars or we want to scrutinize the manner in which they spend the dollars," I'll draw their attention to the Wild Rose Foundation annual report, which is tabled in this Legislature. Now, I'll bet you dollars to doughnuts that not one of those individuals has had a look at this document. You know, they come in here and make all of these pious statements about how they can make suggestions and make recommendations and judgments as to how dollars are spent by the Wild Rose Foundation. Well, Mr. Speaker, I reject that. As a matter of fact, this annual report documents every dollar spent by that foundation. If the hon. individuals on that side of the House take some exception to those -- and there are hundreds of them in all of the foundations -- then why don't they bring them forward and make comment on them? They have the opportunity during discussion of public accounts to say, "Minister, I do not like the way that the Wild Rose Foundation expends their dollars."

This amendment would suggest that in fact there's something draconian in terms of the way Albertans, the volunteers that make the decisions in the Wild Rose Foundation and others, handle the dollars. We've got a member from Calgary, two members from Edmonton, one from Medicine Hat, another from Calgary, Grande Prairie, Whitecourt, from all corners of this province, making decisions about where lotteries dollars should go. Then I see an amendment. As I sit here, I see an amendment, a noxious one at that. Mr. Speaker, that would suggest that in fact there's no accountability and that we shouldn't be passing Bill 10 in this Legislature because there's no accountability.

Well, let me tell you something about Bill 10 in terms of the accountability. These dollars were in Manitoba for 14 years, and they were contained in a trust account for the government of Alberta. We would draw on that trust account when we saw fit, when the dollars were needed to distribute to the boards and foundations. Well, to increase the accountability and to bring it under the purview of the Auditor General, in this Bill we created a fund here in Alberta. So those dollars will be repatriated to the province of Alberta as a result of the sales generated here in the province, brought under the purview of the Auditor General so that the Auditor General can in fact make judgments as to the expenditures of those dollars. In the past the Auditor General would comment simply on the dollars as they came into the province and the appropriateness of the expenditure. Now the fund will be here, and the investment of that fund will be administered, Mr. Speaker, by the Provincial Treasurer. So to suggest in an amendment to Bill 10, the amendment before us, that there's no accountability, that we must not pass this Bill because it lacks accountability, they do not have an understanding of the Bill. They haven't listened to us when we've talked about the Bill, because in fact it increases the accountability.

So before I close on the amendment and before I urge all

members of this Assembly to vote against this amendment, I'd like to point to the fact about the timeliness of making decisions. The Member for Edmonton-Glengarry stands up and makes a suggestion that he doesn't have any proof of a need for timeliness. Well, let me tell the hon. gentleman -- I know his memory is short, so I'll refresh it, and I'll refresh it for all members of this Assembly. When Rick Hansen visited this province, we were able to make a decision immediately about establishing an endowment, under the licence, in excess of \$200,000 a year to go to the centre for the physically handicapped at the University of Alberta, change the name to the Rick Hansen Centre in his honour, and immediately make a decision about lottery dollars to enhance the Rick Hansen Centre for the physically disabled.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the member opposite will sit here and say, "Well, I don't know of a timely reason; there's nothing that can be justifiable in my mind." They're suggesting that as Rick Hansen comes to this province and makes a tremendous commitment to the physically disabled, let's wait until the session is in and then we'll talk about it. Well, I reject that. I will stand on that decision outside of this Legislature in front of the people of Alberta and as I visit the Rick Hansen Centre and as I talk to the disabled of this province, who will benefit from the research as a result of the decision of this government.

Mr. Speaker, I am not here to please the opposition; I'm here to please the people of Alberta, and I rue the day that that side of the House agrees with the actions of this government because then I'll know we're in trouble. I urge all members of this Assembly to reject this amendment.

[Several members rose]

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for St. Albert caught the eye first.

MR. STRONG: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to speak in favour of the amendment proposed by the Member for Edmonton-Avonmore because I think it's a fairly logical one. It's obvious that this minister and this government just haven't been listening. We might be here all night, Mr. Speaker.

What we're speaking to in the amendment is the establishment of a method of disbursement of public moneys that is unnecessary. It isn't necessary. This money could be part and parcel of general revenues. That's all that's necessary.

I listened very intently when the Minister of the Environment was up speaking against the amendment. He suggested to us in the Assembly that this was an important piece of legislation, an important Bill. I couldn't agree with him more. It is important. It's important that this Bill be defeated. One hundred and thirty million dollars totally disbursed by one individual. As the Member for St. Albert, Mr. Speaker, I'd certainly love to disburse this money to all those organizations and associations that are in St. Albert, and if I were the Minister of Career Development and Employment at some time down the road, I'd have that ability. But I don't want that ability. I want some accountability, not only for the members of the Official Opposition but also for Albertans.

The minister also said that people agree with what this government is doing. Let me assure the minister that all people don't agree. Many of them disagree with the way this government is handling the disbursement of moneys from this lottery fund. And, Mr. Speaker, why is it that we are going to have this political slush fund for this government to gain or garner perhaps more votes by being kind to some of their friends in some

areas of the province of Alberta? This money should be used to benefit all of the people in the province of Alberta, and that's why we want accountability specifically in the disbursement process of this Bill.

The Minister of the Environment also stated that this government wanted to respond to the needs of Albertans. Certainly the minister should be responding to the needs of Albertans, and I can think of many ways for him to respond. One of the ways that he could respond is by supporting the amendment that we see before us in the Legislative Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, it's my belief that if these members sitting on behalf of government wish to get elected in the future, perhaps what they should do is support this amendment. I think it's a very valid reason: people want accountability. Albertans want accountability from this government. They don't want political slush funds set up to reward the few.

[Mr. Musgreave in the Chair]

The Minister of the Environment also spoke to the question that we in this Assembly would not be able to provide immediate assistance to many areas and many Albertans if speedy response was involved. Mr. Speaker, that's simply nonsense. This government last year, I believe, passed special warrants in the amount of \$380 million. It didn't come through this Legislature until after. This government the year before that, I think, spent about \$4 billion in special warrants. So as to the necessity that Albertans need this legislation or some could be doing without is absolute nonsense. That is not justification for pushing this legislation through, specifically when it comes to disbursing moneys unnecessarily and with unnecessary methods.

The minister also spoke to public accounts, that there was accountability through public accounts. Again, Mr. Speaker, it's been said that in many cases the public accounts do not come before us till sometimes two years after these grants, these gifts, these forms of political patronage are handed out to some of their special friends. So that is not accountability to Albertans. It's not a proper method of disbursing funds, specifically lottery funds.

The Minister of the Environment stated, I believe, that . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: Wake up, Bryan.

MR. STRONG: Yeah, I'm awake. I'm awake. . . . that we were erroneous, obstructionist. I don't believe that we in the Official Opposition are obstructionist, Mr. Speaker. I think we're making some very valid points as to why this legislation should fail. And the facts speak for themselves. The legislation should fail.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that this government should also look at the number of opposition members now in this Assembly. There are 22 of us here now. I believe that prior to the last provincial election there were only four. Perhaps what we should do is go back to the people of the province of Alberta and ask them what they want, ask them what they feel is in their best interests before introducing legislation that makes one individual almost a King Tut of King Solomon's mines in handing out diamonds to whoever he chooses under the guise that it's in the public interest.

What we saw, Mr. Speaker, as far as I'm concerned, was a command performance from the Minister of the Environment in speaking to the immediacy of getting this legislation through the Legislature. Well, Mr. Speaker, he's wrong, because it's not

going to be an easy process. It's going to be a rather lengthy one, and it's obvious that this government certainly isn't listening. They're not listening to us in the Official Opposition and certainly are missing the point totally.

The Member for Vegreville brought up a very valid point; why should we give to one individual minister these extraordinary powers of disbursing moneys at his command: \$100 million-plus? Why should we give that one individual this immense power to distribute money? I don't think that should happen, Mr. Speaker, and that's why I'm standing here speaking in favour of the amendment. The amendment calls into question the disbursement of public funds, calls into question the way this government is going to disburse public funds, and that method is quite clearly the wrong method. Accountability after the fact: that's what it is, Mr. Speaker, and certainly not in Alberta's best interests.

What we have here in Bill 10 is a method of establishing political largess and political patronage that's not necessary, and, Mr. Speaker, I'd ask this government, through you, why they can't be fair and open in the disbursement of what I consider public dollars, public tax dollars, even though they're voluntary tax dollars. Why would this minister place himself in a position of public ridicule for political slush fund purposes? Why would this minister allow himself to be accused of patronage? Why would this minister do that? Why would this minister choose to be the only individual to pass out and authorize moneys being passed out of the lottery fund? It doesn't make any sense to me. How he can stand up and try and support the Bill that he introduced in this Legislature is beyond me, because quite clearly, again, it's wrong. The minister can dispose of the money as he sees fit: again, wrong. I don't know how many times we have to stand and tell him it's wrong, but I guess if we have to stay here all night, we'll stay here all night and repeatedly tell him he's wrong.

The minister of career development stood and suggested in debate on this amendment that what the Official Opposition was doing was delaying or frustrating his legislation. Mr. Speaker, again, this is clearly not the fact. The Official Opposition is trying to get it into this minister's head that perhaps he should rethink his position with respect to Bill 10 and everything that he's put in there, examine exactly how this is going to apply in Albertans' best interests.

Again, Mr. Speaker, the minister addressed who got the money. We're not opposed to who got the money. It's not a question of who got the money. It's how the money is disbursed. I think the organizations that got money through the lottery funds are certainly deserving. They provide many good things for Albertans. So it's not a question, with this amendment, of who got the money; it's a question of how the money is disbursed. What I'd suggest to this minister, Mr. Speaker, is that perhaps he pay more attention in question period and debate with respect to the issues that are brought forth on the floor of this Assembly. That's what I'd suggest to him. All the facts that he quoted, the figures that he quoted clearly don't speak to the amendment. What we're talking about is how the money is disbursed and accountability. That's what we're talking about.

Mr. Speaker, the minister also suggested that we didn't examine some of the public accounts as the Official Opposition. Again, quite clearly, these are not the facts. We spend a lot of time researching public accounts and every government document that we're handed, every one of them, and we've found many areas that cause us a great deal of concern. Otherwise, we wouldn't spend our time standing here in this Legislative As-

sembly berating this government, including the backbenchers, who like to talk rather than get up and speak to the amendment.

What we're suggesting, Mr. Speaker, again to this minister is that the minister must be fair, because while I agree that this minister is fair -- he's doing an excellent job for Albertans. I don't want to cast any aspersions on him as a minister or anything that would call into question his accountability, but what I'd ask him, through the Chair, is: who is going to be the next Minister of Career Development and Employment that's going to have all these powers to disburse money as an individual? That's what I'd ask him. Perhaps we might be the government, and I might be the Minister of Career Development and Employment, and maybe what we'll do is start rewarding some of our special friends. Or I can make all the decisions without any accountability for my actions, until perhaps two years later, in this legislation. I wouldn't mind that.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Career Development and Employment has also noted that in his view this was a "noxious" amendment. Well, again the Minister of Career Development and Employment is wrong in what he's suggesting, not only to us in the Official Opposition but to the Liberal Party over here and the Representative Party, when they're here. That's what he's suggesting. That clearly isn't the case. Do Albertans think we would be willing to stand or sit in this Legislative Assembly, all night if need be, to protest something that we don't feel is fair, that we don't feel is right? It's not just us saying it. It's our constituents, Albertans, who don't think it's fair. It calls into question the whole question of perception, and that's what's wrong.

I just hate cynicism, Mr. Speaker. I hate negative people. I'm like the Premier: I don't like negative people. I'm a very positive person; always have been. Mr. Speaker. Quite clearly we have positive reasons, as members of the Official Opposition, in posing all these amendments and spending all this time in the Legislative Assembly speaking against and trying to get this government to review some of the legislation that they so carelessly put before this Legislature in the hopes that we are foolish enough to allow them to pass something that is not in anybody's best interest, except perhaps maybe the Minister of Career Development and Employment, because he gets to be King Tut in passing out all the jewels.

Mr. Speaker, let's examine the case of full accountability through this Legislature. That's the democratic process that we have here, not to allow an individual to hand out gifts. Let's have some respect for the democratic process. It's obvious that with the legislation that we see here before us, this government is somewhat suspect in the legislation that they place before this Legislature in attempting to gain for an individual minister the full and free right to pass out all that gold. It's quite clear that this Bill lacks accountability and certainly, as the Minister of Career Development and Employment stated, does not provide for an increase in accountability, as he suggested, but clearly provides for no accountability until after the fact.

Timeliness of distribution, Mr. Speaker: I spoke on that previously. The minister had a concern with that. He knows full well that he does not need his legislation, his method of disbursing funds, in order to do his job as a government minister. He doesn't require that. Why fool people, Mr. Speaker? You don't have to fool people. All you have to do is be honest and open with them. Demonstrate some commitment to their concerns and their feelings. That's all the people want. That's all Albertans want. When are Albertans going to get that commitment to open government, the commitment to honesty, to in-

tegrity, and all those other things that we as Albertans hold in high esteem, Mr. Speaker? This certainly is, if the minister was listening, for his benefit and the benefit of Albertans, not special interest groups.

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

MR. SPEAKER: Question? No? Edmonton-Strathcona.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I will confine myself, as bidden by you, to the narrow confines of this amendment as interpreted by the speeches of the members on the opposite side.

Starting with the amendment itself, I notice that it is an amendment to government Bill 10, of course, entitled the Interprovincial Lottery Amendment Act, 1988. The eyes of other provinces are upon us, Mr. Speaker, because it's the interprovincial lottery that we are dealing with, and we should set a good example. We should set that example by not proceeding with the third reading of this Bill, because the existing methods of dealing with the lottery money are adequate, and I will come to that in a moment. It is no answer to say, as has been said by hon. members on the other side, that other provinces -- they allege; I don't know whether this is true or not, but assuming it is true -- deal with their money the same as we do. Just because they're wrong doesn't mean to say we should be wrong too.

Turning further to the motion, I notice that it is the amendment not of the Bill but of the motion for third reading, and that itself is an interesting point I am sure members will ponder. That does enable one to not deal with any of the individual sections of the Bill, which of course would be wrong at third reading, but with the motion itself. It is a reasoned amendment, because it points out that the Bill is unnecessary and therefore should be defeated.

It goes on to say that we strike out all the words after "That" And that's another interesting thing. If you look on the Order Paper, the word "That" doesn't appear, Mr. Speaker. But this is the conventional way of dealing with the matter. So I know, as we get more deeply into this motion on the floor, members will become intensely interested in the mechanics of the motion before us, and it becomes indeed fascinating.

Then we come to the operative words of the amendment:

this Assembly decline . . .

Now, there's a wonderful thing, Mr. Speaker. That is the subjunctive mood, the word "decline," and that is one of the beauties of the English language that isn't very often used. When it is used, it strikes a resplendent chord in one's idea of the language. To have, even in a short amendment like this, the subjunctive mood appear I think almost recommends acceptance of it on those grounds alone.

That we

. . . decline to give a third reading to Bill 10. Interprovincial Lottery Amendment Act, 1988, because it establishes a method of disbursements of public monies that is unnecessary.

Again, there's very strict attention to the logic here. It is not just a single disbursement but "disbursements of public monies that is unnecessary." On the word "monies," I see that the Parliamentary Counsel, though legally trained, has permitted "monies" to be spelled m-o-n-i-e-s, which is the layman's way of doing it, but lawyers seem to prefer m-o-n-e-y-s. Either is acceptable, and I really make no cavil at this somewhat loose way of spelling "moneys."

MS BARRETT: Loose?

AN HON. MEMBER: You're incorrigible.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I won't exactly appeal for order . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: It's his own caucus.

MR. SPEAKER: As pointed out by another hon. member, indeed it is the member's own caucus. I must say that the Chair never gets a chance to smile much up here openly, but the Chair is enjoying this to some degree. And when a poet is waxing poetic, he should be allowed to continue uninterrupted.

Hon. member.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry that the Assembly's not treating my remarks with the seriousness with which I think they should be treated. It is a serious matter indeed.

Coming to the matter of the "method of disbursements of public monies that is unnecessary," I want to remind hon. members of what the Auditor General said about it in the 1986-87 report recommendation 2.29.3, under Lottery Operations:

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

Then his actual recommendation went -- I won't read it. It recommended

that the Minister responsible for administering the Interprovincial Lottery Act:

-direct that the proceeds from the Province's lottery operations be paid into the General Revenue Fund.

So that is why it is unnecessary. If the legal opinion is followed in the absence of amendment, that's what happens. Then if special dispensation needs to be made for the expenditure of the funds, it can be made by a separate vote, as we had suggested in the Committee of Supply, and you know, that would have fixed it up right there and we could have avoided all this further examination of the iniquities of this Bill.

There have been statements by hon. members, Mr. Speaker, that the Auditor General only said this three times. He said it four times, in his report of '86-87, his report of '85-86, his report of '84-85, and his report of '83-84, in much the same terms every time. That itself tells a story which should give us pause in considering that the government is doing the right thing in this Bill. Because it persistently did the wrong thing for four consecutive years after it knew what the right thing was. At least they're consistent. They have unerringly chosen the wrong thing this time, too, which is to make what was illegal legal, but what was wrong still continues wrong. The previous year was much the same, and I won't be repetitious by repeating that part of it that was the same. But this Auditor General remarked with some exasperation -- even the next-to-last time in his last two annual reports, the Auditor General commented on

the manner in which the proceeds of the major lotteries currently operating in Alberta are dealt with.

And he went into the details.

The implications of this amendment are not that the Bill is defeated but that we simply decline to give third reading to it. So it stays on the Order Paper at the third reading stage while

the Bill is reconsidered. Now, we can compare that to the school Bill, the labour Bill, the mental health Bill, and the volunteer corporations Bill in the last session, which all were left on the Order Paper and not proceeded with. Of course, they died on the Order Paper at the end of the session. But they were left there for very good reason, and so this Bill should be left on the Order Paper for very good reason. I see a minister over there who left the school Bill on the Paper for very good reason while the objections to it were considered. At the risk of praising a minister on the other side -- which we aren't supposed to do -- it does seem that sensible amendments were made to that Bill when it was brought back in amended form this session. The same thing could happen with this Bill if this motion were acceded to. We know the reasons why it needs to be radically altered. I needn't go into that. But it certainly stands as an indictment and a very bad example to our comrades in the other provinces who take part in the interprovincial lottery as to how to deal with the proceeds of the lottery.

Now, the Minister of the Environment made an impassioned plea for passing this Bill on the grounds that there would be many people in dire straits, in emergency situations, if the Bill were not passed. This process has been happening in various Legislatures that follow the parliamentary system -- and others that don't exactly follow that system but a similar one -- for 300 or 400 years without lottery funds being a necessary part of the process, or any other funds for that matter which are voted outside the process. They seem to have staggered along and survived somehow. I speak of countries such as the United States, the commonwealth of Australia, the various states of Australia. I know that Western Australia works very well without a lottery fund or the equivalent thereof. So we can see that the method of disbursements referred to in the amendment is, indeed, one that is quite adequate without this Bill being passed into law. The same in the state of New South Wales. The same in the state of Victoria. The same in the state of South Australia . . .

MR. SPEAKER: With due respect, hon. member, let's not go through every parliamentary situation in the world.

MR. WRIGHT: No, just Australia, Mr. Speaker. Queensland was the one I was about to say.

So I must respectfully reply to the Minister of the Environment that his alarm is misplaced. If worse comes to worst, we have special warrants. They have been misused; we know that. They have been too freely given; we know that. But there is a big difference between a special warrant and the process that is suggested here. Because with a special warrant, you still in theory have the right to disapprove it when it comes up in the Appropriation Act, in schedule A thereof, each year. You do have the right to disapprove it. I suppose it has happened on occasion, in which case the ministers responsible for disbursing the money unlawfully, because they're taking a chance with a special warrant, are personally responsible for the disbursement. So that is some kind of check on their -- or cabinet's or the Lieutenant Governor in Council's -- making irresponsible disbursements via a special warrant. But here there is no such check, because . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order in the House, please.

MR. WRIGHT: . . . so long as the minister, in good faith -- or even in bad faith; how can we tell? -- exercises his opinion that the disbursement is in the public interest, that's the end of the

matter. The money is legally spent, even though we've not had the chance to deal with it in any way, shape, or form beforehand.

Now, the minister himself spoke of the accountability, as he put it, by looking into the public accounts. He went through a list of the -- I'm sure without exception -- worthy objects of the beneficence of the donors of the lottery fund in the last year or two. Not the point, Mr. Speaker. The point is that after the event you can only see whether the money was, in fact, expended as it was supposed to be in conformity with the direction of the minister, and you can notice where it went to and moan a lot if it went to the wrong place and moan a lot if it didn't go where perhaps it should better have gone. But it's all past. And it's two years past as a rule, not just a month or two past. It is a perversion of the system. And for the minister to say that this is accountability indicates that the minister does not know the difference between before and after. For a minister not to be aware of the difference between before and after is really quite disconcerting, Mr. Speaker, and perhaps the minister should consider resigning.

The minister, in giving reasons why this amendment should not pass the House, said, "Well, we've been doing it for 14 years, and therefore there really isn't any point in coming to a different state of affairs." I should point out that quite a number of people believed the earth was flat for several millennia -- who knows how many millennia. In fact, arguments much, much more forcible than that of the hon. gentleman, the Member for Calgary-Montrose and Minister of Career Development and Employment, were advanced against Galileo when he had the temerity to say the earth was round, and it did not avail us at all. It does not avail us now in decrying the opinion of those, Mr. Speaker, who proceeded on the argument that because something had happened for many thousands of years and was received as being correct, therefore it was still correct. We are not talking about a thousand; we're talking about 14 years. This minister has not learned any lessons from history, it seems, which again is another reason why one must doubt his ability in having the correct opinion on this Bill. [interjection] I'm getting to the second page of my notes already, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: That would be fine by the Chair, as long as it relates back to this motion.

MR. WRIGHT: Yes, Mr. Speaker, it certainly does, because I'm strictly confining myself to replying to the hon. members on the other side, who of course were speaking in order and were not corrected. I'm sure they were speaking in order. I defend their right to speak as they did, Mr. Speaker. Let no one say they were speaking out of order.

They say that we are negative; we are simply opposing good legislation. I remind them that on Bill 13 we spoke on this side for -- it was clocked -- 35 and half seconds, Mr. Speaker. That was because the Bill was a good Bill. We do not oppose for the sake of opposing. If the Bill is a good Bill, we are in favour of it and say so. We even try to tell the press that we're in favour of it sometimes and they don't report it at all. That's how the opposition gets the knock that they're always negative.

The Minister of Career Development and Employment spoke about the Wild Rose Foundation and the excellent work that it does, and it does. He spoke about the worthy representatives from many parts of the province who decide how the money is to be disbursed. Well, no one's quarreling with their method of doing it, Mr. Speaker. Far from it. But who gave them the

money in the first place, at least in the next place up the line? It was the minister's department who gave it. That was according to some rule of thumb, which may or may not be a good rule of thumb but on the whole has worked out quite well in the past. That's really saying, "Trust me." I suppose in the best of all possible worlds you could dispense with most of the parliamentary rules altogether, Mr. Speaker, and the government could say, "Trust me." Mussolini said that, I think. Dictators say that. And occasionally it's true; they can be trusted. Mussolini made the trains run on time.

MR. SPEAKER: Let's put this train back on the track.

MR. WRIGHT: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm simply replying to the argument of the minister -- which to my dying breath I defend his right to make -- that the minister has been a good judge of the objects of the lottery fund distribution and therefore we should let him and successive ministers carry on despite what might happen in the future in the way of mental mishap to a minister or mishap to the portfolio so it falls into the hands of a perfect fool, and certainly there's no such person in the House at the present time, Mr. Speaker. But we aren't talking about this week or next week or the following week; this is forever. This Bill is forever, Mr. Speaker, if it's passed.

Then we look at how, in fact, it works. The minister has spoken of the responsible way, he claims, in which the money under his dispensation is paid out. I do have some question about that. His pal the Minister of Culture and Multiculturalism -- I suppose he is his pal -- put in for half a million bucks for a shindig in his constituency and got it and paid it out, or proposes to pay it out. Perhaps that's a very worthy object. If so, it's more luck than good judgment, I suppose. I wish that I could put in for half a million bucks for the Fringe Festival in my constituency. [interjections] I'll tell you something. If or when we become the government and this Bill were passed and we were foolish enough not to repeal it and to operate on it, I could put in for a half a million bucks for the Fringe Festival and it would be an arbitrary thing, perhaps a good thing, but quite an unparliamentary thing, Mr. Speaker. And so on it goes on that point of the particular disbursements.

To illustrate how you can get away with a perfectly arbitrary thing, which you couldn't if this amendment were passed and it went through estimates, Mr. Speaker, we note that that particular festival existed with \$150,000 of public money from the Department of Economic Development and Trade last year, and suddenly it gets an increase of something like 400 percent -- no, less than that, but threefold anyway. And perhaps, as well, the \$150,000 will come too. I don't know, but it illustrates clearly the evil of this Bill that's so arbitrary decisions can be made in the confines of the club that decides how to dispense the lottery money, arbitrary decisions which come to light by chance until the public accounts arrive a year and half later, and that's all we know about it. Mr. Speaker, it is an unparliamentary way of dealing with the matter. It is a way that can be reclaimed if this amendment is passed.

One also notes from the example I've been talking about and from the other \$300,000 that the whole thing is invested with an aura of questionability. Again, if the thing goes through the estimates, you can see what you're doing beforehand. Even if there are special warrants, you can tell before the warrant has been spent and certainly before it's been approved. All that is missing from the Bill as it stands. All of those considerations will compel a fair-minded person to vote in favour of this

amendment, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Kingsway.

MR. MCEACHERN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to speak on this amendment because I think that unlike Bill 10, which is unnecessary, this amendment is necessary.

I would like to start by replying to some of the comments from the minister when he was . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, Member for Edmonton-Kingsway. With due respect, in terms of the speakers who have gone before, perhaps your comments with respect to what others have said in the debate could be somewhat limited and come back to what the real amendment is, because in the opinion of the Chair a previous member speaking in that regard has dealt with that quite amply.

Thank you.

MR. MCEACHERN: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker, for those words, but I do think I have quite a different slant to some of the comments on what the minister from the opposition said. For instance, I would ask him to clarify just a factual point from some of the numbers that he read out. He indicated that the public accounts for '86-87, which is the current ones before the committee, on page 5.35 in revenues, said that the revenue of lottery funds was some \$1,375,846, which is fine. I'm sure he read it correctly. He also went on, though, to say that the art foundation -- this, I think, was page 5.45 -- received \$1.25 million. Although that's all very commendable -- that takes up most of the funds. So what I'm wondering is -- and certainly he gave a funny impression if. . . . There's obviously an explanation, which perhaps he would like to dig out and give to us.

The Wild Rose Foundation also received \$1.25 million. Now, I don't know how \$1.375 million stretches into \$2.15 million in endowments. So perhaps the minister, if he's going to read out stats to impress this House, should at least make sure they add up in some kind of a way that does make some sense. So I would ask him, if he gets a chance, to clarify that.

The particular point, though, that he spoke to was that somehow accounting for these funds in an accurate manner in public accounts would justify spending them without the approval of this Assembly. Like the Member for Edmonton-Strathcona, I guess he just needs to learn the difference between the words "before" and "after." But I did want to take him up on this accounting of the funds because if, as he says, the public accounts is going to list in great detail all the giving of grants to different groups, then that will be very nice. I mean, we should have that kind of detailed accounting for the dollars expended by this Assembly. I wonder why they didn't use that argument before. The Treasurer did sort of mention the other day that somehow these funds are going to be accounted for. I guess he means better than the normal budgetary expenditures.

I guess if they're put in one place where we can see them all lined up there in one particular part of the public accounts under one title and on several pages so we can see them in one place, then he's right they will be accounted for better than what they do for the budget. Because the expenditures from the budget Mr. Speaker, are detailed over 300-odd pages in alphabetical order by recipient, and we have to try to sort out each government department's part and each program for each department through these 300 pages. So the government is doing an abysmal job of accounting for the budgetary dollars, and I suppose in

that sense, if we talk the minister into putting these expenditures under the budget, we're asking him to account for them less accurately.

But, of course, there is a simple remedy, Mr. Speaker, and that's to have all the public accounts accounted for not only by the way they are in that supplementary document that lists them by payee in alphabetical order but also by department and by program, in one place so that we can see what a particular department is spending in each and every program for that department. There is a crying need for that in this Assembly. I guess what the government wants to do is keep us in the dark, of course, so that we've got to do an awful lot of work just to find out where the government is spending the money. So I'm amazed that the government side would even raise the idea of accounting for these funds, because it gives us a chance to point out that boondoggle we have for accounting for the funds of this province.

The accounting for the funds, however, as I said, is still not what's at stake in this Bill. What's at stake in this Bill is whether or not this Assembly gets to review the expenditures before they're made, and that's why this motion is necessary. The Bill itself is unnecessary. The Bill itself doesn't improve or change anything. It makes legal something which is inadequate and which should not be done. Therefore, the members should really take this chance to just let this Bill be on the Order Paper, as this motion would have it do, and start again another time.

Mr. Speaker, the accounting of the funds is something that's very dear to my heart, and I wish that he would decide to put those expenditures under the budgetary expenditures of his department and then account for them properly in the manner which I just outlined.

Now, one of the things the minister did was challenge us to name a grant that was not proper. For these 14 years of this government handing out money, they've been so wonderful; they've never made a mistake; they've never given money to anybody they shouldn't have. Mr. Speaker, either the minister was not listening the other day when I gave him an example or else he's got a very short memory. It is true that a minister of this government handling the lottery funds of this province was giving grants to a number of organizations. In fact, the Member for Clover Bar gave him a whole list of them. But I have one that I just love to tell. The society for the preservation of the Gaelic language in Alberta requested that they be given \$200 to help preserve the Gaelic language. They listed their 16 members, starting, I might add, with Pierre Trudeau and Ma Thatcher and a few other well-known names, so that it was so obvious to anybody that took a cursory look at it that it was a total hoax. Yet not only did the Minister of Culture decide to give them the \$200, he gave them \$2,000 without even looking at the list. The person who did that then made it public and embarrassed this government no end.

So there's an example for you. That's the kind of thing that we're trying to prevent. So, Mr. Speaker, it's an example that makes it obvious that a similar kind of thing can happen again, that when election time comes around, there's a great temptation on the part of people in power to spend taxpayers' dollars to try to get re-elected. I said earlier that we were not picking on this minister in any personal sense, and that's still true. But the temptation is there, and it's difficult and it should not be put there. There's a very simple way to see to it that the temptation is not put in front of the minister, that the temptation does not exist by merely changing that Bill so that the expenditures from the lottery funds would be done under the budget as they should

be done.

The minister also said that he was going to refuse to do that, because he was going to stand on Conservative ideals. Well, I guess Conservative ideals, then, say that it's perfectly okay to set up a slush fund. I find that totally reprehensible. I just do not believe that this government really thinks that setting up slush funds is an ideal. It's a lowering of ideals. It's what puts politicians in disrepute, as I quoted the hon. Member for Calgary-McKnight as saying in the previous debate in this House. So, Mr. Speaker, the minister should really rethink his shallow arguments that he raised earlier and change his mind and support this amendment instead of saying that it should be defeated.

Now, another member of this Assembly, in debating this issue, said that to put the expenditures under the budget would be a really silly thing to do because, after all, that would [allow] the members here to ask questions about all that long list of recipients of grants. Now, really, Mr. Speaker, wouldn't that be tragic? I know we don't get the time in the estimates to really deal with all of those many details or go that long on a long, long list. But at least the list would be there, and we would be able to scrutinize it, and we could raise questions about some parts of it. So the fact that this committee, this House might have to work hard or take a long time to look through things and to really know and understand what was going on doesn't seem to me a reason to pass what is in fact an antidemocratic, anti-parliamentary Bill.

So, Mr. Speaker, this Bill is really unnecessary. In fact, it's more than unnecessary; it's a wrong Bill. It's a wrong-headed direction to go. So it's unnecessary to pass the Bill, but it's necessary to amend the Bill, or change it and bring the expenditures of lottery funds under the purview and under the scrutiny of this Assembly, which is what we're elected for. The fact that there are 83 of us from a number of different parties gives us a chance to have a number of different perspectives brought forward. The minister could benefit by the advice given from this side of the House. His own arguments have all been refuted in great detail, and he's not got one leg left to stand on. So this minister should reconsider. He should urge the members of this Assembly on his side of the House to support this motion that would leave this Bill be on the Order Paper. It would give his government a chance to start again next spring.

They've been doing the funds this way for 14 years. I'm not in favour of the way they're doing them, but they've already just made the last big disbursement of funds, of some \$113 million, in a totally back-room, cabinet, or caucus secret decision, with no input from the public in any way, shape, or form. So they've illustrated already the fact that that's the way they like to operate. It fits in with Conservative ideals. It's perfectly okay to use it like a slush fund. So now, let that ride for another term, rethink this thing, and do the Bill right next time. Put those expenditures under this Assembly's purview in the same way they should be for any other government expenditures. In a parliamentary system the power of the purse is supposed to reside with this Assembly. You can talk about how you account for the dollars after they're spent all you like, but the fact of the matter is that it's deciding how they should be spent before they're spent which is really the name of the game, and that's really what we should be doing. So the minister should urge his colleagues to pass this amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.
Edmonton-Calder.

MS MJOLSNESS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure tonight to rise and support this very reasonable amendment to this very unreasonable Bill.

I'd like to just make a comment based on the Minister of the Environment's comments a few minutes ago, when he was talking about the various organizations that receive funding. They make representation to the government; then, consequently, they do receive funding. But all the decisions are made behind closed doors. Now, this is what the minister said, and this is precisely what our concern is. This is precisely the point. He mentioned expediency, Mr. Speaker, and I would ask him: where is the responsibility? I think that's of major concern here.

Now, if the Minister of the Environment would like us to believe that the government is always fair -- and certainly there are times when they are fair in making decisions. But based on their practice in the past, I think for him to make that assumption that we're going to believe that they will be fair at all times . . . Well, he's certainly not as quick as he would like us to believe he is.

Mr. Speaker, I know it's not just the opposition that are concerned about this particular Bill. There are many Albertans out there who have very serious concerns about this particular Bill, and they are very offended by it. Now, this amendment will attempt to deal with this Bill in the stage that it's at, in third reading. Because this is public money. That is stated in the Auditor General's report. My colleague from Edmonton-Strathcona explained very well this evening that it's public money. We have heard from various members of this Assembly in the past few days in this debate on the disbursement of the revenue from lotteries, that it should be done in the Legislature. That is what we are elected to do, and that is our responsibility in this House. This, Mr. Speaker, is a very responsible way for the government to act, it is the right thing to do, and this amendment is a very reasonable amendment.

Now, although they might not like to admit it, the government has a track record of dealing with issues behind closed doors, not consulting with interested parties who are involved in a lot of the decisions that are made on the part of the government. This decision-making behind closed doors, this secrecy that they operate under, is well known. All one has to do is talk to the many agencies out there that are receiving funds from the government. They will tell you how decisions are made. They're not brought into that process at all. So I think this particular Bill will just open another door. And we need this amendment, Mr. Speaker, because this is the responsible thing to do at this particular time.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the government members' refusing to accept this particular amendment simply shows that they have a disrespect for democracy, because that is what they are saying. We heard it from the Minister of Career Development and Employment this evening, and we're hearing it and seeing it by the actions of the members not supporting this particular amendment.

I'd like to come back to a point that has been made by various members during this debate: on what criteria will the minister make these decisions? Because he will be making these decisions solely, arbitrarily. Who will receive these funds? On what criteria will the decisions be made? Mr. Speaker, even more importantly, where is the accountability? Because the truth is that there is no accountability. So I think this amendment is a very reasonable way of dealing with the kinds of concerns we have expressed with this particular Bill. I think this is why it is imperative that this Bill sit at third reading and we take

it to the public and the public has a chance to respond to this particular Bill. I would hope that sooner or later the government members will realize how wrong this particular Bill is and will support this amendment.

Now, we know what happens to a Bill that is held on the Order Paper, Mr. Speaker. We have an opportunity to examine it very closely. We can examine the fine points of the Bill. We can evaluate the merits, if there are any, in the particular Bill. We can receive representation from our constituents for their concerns on a particular Bill. Now, when we look at what has happened -- and this has been mentioned before by various members, the happy story that we hear with Bill 27. We did get input on that particular Bill when it was held on the Order Paper. The many members that were at the dinner this evening that was held by the Alberta Association for Community Living heard their pleasure in the fact that they had an opportunity to have input into Bill 27. This amendment is asking for the same opportunity. If the Bill is held at third reading, people will have an opportunity to have input into the Bill and make their concerns known. Now, we saw this evening that these people really appreciated having input. I think even more important for the government is that this gives them an opportunity to come out looking like they are listening to people and care about what people say. Certainly that to me, is a message the government should consider very seriously.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that this government sees the value in this amendment, that they're all listening closely to what I'm having to say this evening, and that they will support this very, very reasonable amendment.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Belmont

MR. SIGURDSON: well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to look at the amendment closely because it says something important in here, in that

this Assembly decline to give a third reading to Bill 10, Interprovincial Lottery Amendment Act 1988, because it establishes a method of disbursements of public monies that is unnecessary.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we don't disagree with the groups that have received the funds, but we do, however, have some problem with the method of disbursing those funds. I've gone to the Financial Administration Act to look up what constitutes public money, and right in the Financial Administration Act, section 1 says:

- (p) "public money" means money
 - (i) owned by the Crown,
 - (ii) held by the Crown for the benefit of or in trust for any other person,
 - (iii) held by a public employee, public official,

which this minister certainly is

personal service contractor or revenue officer in his capacity as a public employee, public official, personal service contractor or revenue officer . . .

- (iv) held by any person for the benefit of or in trust for the Crown, or

- (v) owned or held by a Provincial agency,

which excludes the provincial Treasury Branches.

Now, what do we do with that public money, with those public dollars, Mr. Speaker? If we go a little further along in the Act we get into part 2 of the Financial Administration Act which talks about the General Revenue Fund. Now, section 19 says:

- (1) There shall be one General Revenue Fund to be appropri-

ated to the public service of Alberta into which all public money shall be paid except . . .

And then there are a couple of subsections that allow for this kind of legislation that we're dealing with tonight to be passed.

- (a) money over which the Legislature has no power of appropriation, and
- (b) money that is otherwise specially disposed of by this or any other Act.

Now, that's what we've done with Bill 10: wanting to put it aside, aside from general revenue, a long way away from the accountability of this public Chamber. I still say, Mr. Speaker, as I've said before on every amendment and every reading and every committee stage that this Bill has gone through, that that's shameful. Here we have, elected by Albertans, 83 members to go through legislation and to go through the budget of this province so that we can take messages back to our constituents to tell them what we've done. What is going to happen here is that \$100 million -- perhaps more, perhaps less -- is going to be kept away from this publicly elected body, these 83 members, so that we will not be able to go back to our constituents for at least 18 months after we have the public accounts books in front of us to tell our constituents what's happened with those public moneys. [interjections]

We seem to have some excitement in this back bench here, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: That's fine. Just keep going.

AN HON. MEMBER: There sure isn't much in the House.

AN HON. MEMBER: Just keep talking.

MR. SIGURDSON: That's all right. Did you get your piece of pizza?

AN HON. MEMBER: Two.

MR. SIGURDSON: Two? Good for you.

Mr. Speaker, this is a most reasonable amendment. It provides yet another opportunity for the government to come back in a responsible way to this Assembly and bring those public moneys before the Assembly. Why is that important to do? Why is it more important to debate those issues in this Assembly rather than have them in the minister's office or in the minister's vault? Well, we have all kinds of indications from the Auditor General that indicate that there have been problems with the past accounting methods of the government with the ways in which the government has held back these moneys in the past.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Career Development and Employment who happens to be responsible for the lotteries fund, is asking us to look at public accounts, that that's an accountable way to deal with this money. Now, the fact is that it's not. After we've spent the money, after the money is gone, he asks us to consider where it's gone to. How do we get it back? How do we get it back if it's not being spent in a responsible way? Go and take bricks out of certain buildings, destroying foundations? How, then, do we get that money back if it has been expended improperly? It can't be done. It's impossible to do. The Minister of the Environment said that they need the money so they can respond quickly. Well, you know, the Minister of the Environment and this government responded rather quickly last year when we had the tornado damage. Didn't need a special fund for that. Couldn't plan for that. Didn't have to.

Shouldn't have to. And he responded quickly without a slush fund. Amazing. Amazing.

MR. KOWALSKI: What a man.

MR. SIGURDSON: That minister. Yes, what a man, that minister. Able to respond because of the emergency. I know the government here would be able to respond in any other emergency situation if it had to. It doesn't need to set up the slush fund.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the very point: what is the money needed for? Why can we not look at it? Why can we not look at the proposals for the expenditure? Could it be that it's going to be used for political purposes? I don't think so. Surely not. But one never knows. The Minister of the Environment is quite correct: one never knows. If, in fact, the public accounts is such a good way of accounting for the expenditure of public dollars -- this minister asks us to accept the public accounts system as a method of accountability for his department and for this fund, for which he's going to be responsible -- why, then, would the Auditor General come back and make recommendation 11, which is:

It is recommended that the Department of Career Development and Employment establish procedures designed to ensure that year-end accounts payable are reported accurately in the public accounts of the Province.

Mr. Speaker, even the Auditor General says that the department of career development hasn't been able to accurately report year-end financial statements. And the minister now says: "Trust me, because I can provide that information at the end of the year. Trust me." Oh, but the Auditor General says no. The Auditor General says it's not quite accurate enough. So we have on one side a servant of the Legislature saying that it's not quite accurate enough to have it just in public accounts, because we don't have accuracy in public accounts from this department. Then we have the minister of career development, a servant of the people, who says, "Ah, but it is accurate."

Well, we play partisan roles in this Assembly, Mr. Speaker, and it begs the question. Who do we believe: the public servant, the minister, a partisan member of this Assembly, or the Auditor General, a public servant as well but a servant of this Assembly? I would suggest that what would end up happening is that we would indeed start to believe more often than not the Auditor General, not the minister. That leads to the kind of cynicism and skepticism that, regrettably, is ever on the rise in our society. There's not that level of confidence, not that level of trust, in our publicly elected bodies that there once was. All this is going to do is create more mistrust, more distrust, of all of us. Regardless of our political persuasions, it's going to create more mistrust and distrust for all of us in this Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment does not defeat the Bill. It just refuses to give third reading to the Bill. The Bill will be able to stay on the Order Paper, as it exists, without any amendment that would change the nature of the Bill. It stays on there for a period of time till the government wants to bring it back, not six months from now, as we had suggested, not eight months from now. You could bring it back in the autumn. You could have another session next spring without ever proroguing this session. You could have any number of meetings at any time that you wanted to call this particular Legislature back into session.

MR. SPEAKER: Back to the disbursements. We dealt with this in the hoist issue, thank you.

MR. SIGURDSON: I said specifically, Mr. Speaker, that this does not deal with a time limit. This deals with putting the Bill on the Order Paper unamended.

MR. SPEAKER: [Inaudible], thank you.

MR. SIGURDSON: Mr. Speaker, this would allow the opportunity for Albertans to advise the government how those moneys ought to be disbursed, not simply by the whim of a minister and a couple of colleagues. The people of Alberta would have input into this legislation as they had in Bill 59, which became Bill 27, as they had with Bill 60, which got worse and became 21 and 22. Perhaps we'd be able, in a period of time, to come back and deal with Bill 10 in a very different way after the government listened to the reasonable folk of Alberta.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Calgary-Buffalo.

MR. CHUMIR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Listening to government members, I must say that I don't know how the province ever managed to survive all these many years without lottery funds. Listening to the Minister of the Environment, one would think that the government had been incapable of handling financial emergencies without the availability of the bag of lottery chestnuts reposing in the Minister of Career Development and Employment's vaults these many months. The Minister of the Environment's comments indeed stand high, I would suggest, in the pantheon of specious arguments heard in this Legislature since May 1986. To his argument I am impelled, in fact irresistibly, to quote my great dear friend, and I'm sure Edmonton-Strathcona's great and dear friend, Jeremy Bentham, who would have described the minister's arguments as nonsense, rhetorical nonsense, and nonsense upon stilts. I'm sure that wherever Jeremy may be at this moment, he is nodding his agreement.

MR. SPEAKER: And I'm sure he could deal with the method of disbursements.

MR. CHUMIR: Better than the minister. [some applause]
Thank you.

Clearly, there is no need, Mr. Speaker, for lottery funds in order to enable this government to spend wisely and quickly as public needs arise, or indeed, I might add, to spend profligately as ritzy tastes or partisan interest from time to time, indeed frequently, have dictated. I seem to recall back in the good old days, when there were only four opposition members in this House, that this Legislature did not sit for approximately one and a half years, yet the ship of state hardly sank. Yes, those were part of the happy 14 years when lottery funds were being doled out, those were available. However, not even the serendipitous growth of this source of revenue was adequate to float our ship of state alone, and certainly, I might add, not to fund the champagne the former Premier quaffed in Ottawa upon celebrating the iniquitous national energy policy.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member, with respect, please, let's come back to this particular amendment with this particular Bill. That's far too wide ranging.

MR. CHUMIR: Mr. Speaker, we needed something beyond lottery funds in that glorious opposition-free year and a half. That something else was the good old standby of the special

warrant, which should perhaps have been renamed the common warrant in that era. But no, the practices of some 300 years are no longer good enough for this government, and particularly for our Minister of the Environment. We're now in desperate need of quick action by the minister of career development to cover sudden emergencies. For example, you can never tell when you'll need a dam in a hurry.

Mr. Speaker, the issue is whether this legislation is necessary. Now, where is the necessity, Mr. Speaker? Why do we need this piece of nefarious legislation? For the minister to be able to demonstrate a need would indeed be tantamount to having him show us a white blackbird. The reality is that expediency is behind the legislation and not necessity.

We hear the minister alleging the precedent of the past 14 years. Well, we have a much longer precedent of parliamentary tradition in which a king was beheaded in Merry England in, I believe, as I recall -- my memory is fading -- 1648, in order to protest acts of that king which were not totally dissimilar from what is being proposed here. I would hasten to put the minister's mind at rest -- I'm sure his ear is now to the speaker, the electronic speaker, I would note -- by ensuring him that there is, however, sufficient dissimilarity to eliminate any risk of a similar fate befalling him.

So I would urge the minister to eat what were once described as a few reality sandwiches, to recognize that this legislation is unnecessary and declare his unequivocal support for this amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: Calgary-Mountain View.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's been two years since I first became a member of this Assembly. Yeah, two years, I guess it was, this month, very shortly. I've seen this place at many times, but I think I've rarely seen it at 12:08 a.m. But it still looks as good as ever. I'm pleased to be here, and I'm pleased to be able to speak to the amendment put forward by the hon. Member for Edmonton-Avonmore.

Now, Mr. Speaker, really, the amendment is in two parts, in a sense. It first of all requests the Assembly to decline to give third reading to Bill 10. That I would like to speak to in terms of the effect of what would happen if the Assembly adopted that; that is, if it declined to give this third reading. The second half of this amendment gives a reason for that. It argues that this declining to give third reading ought to take place because the Act itself establishes a method of disbursements of public moneys that is unnecessary.

I think it's painfully evident to us on this side that it's unnecessary. It seems to take a lot of effort to make the point known, heard, listened to, and for it to sink in to the members on the opposite side that it's unnecessary for the government to move in the direction it's moving in Bill 10. And it bears repeating. If the message doesn't get through the first time, Mr. Speaker, then we're eternally optimistic on this side of the House. Maybe it'll sink in the second time it's spoken. And then if the message doesn't get through the second time, we have to speak out again, a third time. And if it hasn't sunk through then, well, I don't know what kind of a thickness of the cranium there is up there on the members opposite, but somehow it has to be repeated again and again. And if it still doesn't work, well, we'll just keep right on repeating it until it does sink in.

Mr. Speaker, when there's an important principle at work and in place here, we feel that it is important to ensure that

that's adequately brought to the attention of the members of the government and to keep reminding them of it and not allow them to simply dismiss it without their being aware how important we think it is. By explaining it again, coming at it in as many different ways as we can, it's our way of emphasizing how important a principle it is.

As has already been pointed out on a number of occasions, we are the recipients of a tradition in this place, a tradition which others have made an ultimate sacrifice for. We can go back many generations and many centuries to find where the origins of this tradition came from, and that is that laws which are made for this society for a parliamentary democracy are made in Parliament, and the expenditure of money for the operations of government are made in the Legislature. So that's why the Auditor General, who takes his responsibilities very seriously, who's a professional, who has an Act to administer, who operates under a mandate from this Legislature to review the operations of government, has felt seriously and strongly about a situation regarding the disbursement of lottery funds. He felt strongly enough about it that he's told the government that they lack appropriate legislative authority. I think those are very key words: legislative authority. Well, not just any legislative authority, appropriate legislative authority.

The manner in which these lotteries are dealt with is just not being handled in an appropriate manner. The reason he says that, Mr. Speaker, is because he feels that lottery funds are public moneys, just like any other funds, revenue, accruing to the province of Alberta are public moneys. He said that they should be paid into the province's General Revenue Fund.

The Interprovincial Lottery Act makes no "special disposition" that would allow the proceeds to remain outside the General Revenue Fund, nor does it empower [the minister to do so through the licence].

It's because of that recommendation, and only because of that recommendation, that Bill 10 has been introduced.

Now, the Auditor General gave the government two options. He said that the minister responsible for administering the interprovincial lottery fund ought to direct that the proceeds go into the General Revenue Fund, as required by the Financial Administration Act, and then if any moneys are to be disbursed, they should do that under the authority of appropriations of the Legislature. That was his recommendation.

I suppose as a way of allowing the government, if they chose, to give legal authority to what they're doing, he did give them an option whereby they could seek an amendment to the Interprovincial Lottery Act to allow lottery funds to remain outside of the General Revenue Fund. But what we're seeing by way of this amendment is that it's unnecessary for the government to choose this second option. They could have chosen the first option which was put forward by the Auditor General. Or if they wanted to, I suppose they could have amended their practice in the interim. What the Auditor General is saying is that the practice is illegal and what is needed to be done is to change that practice.

We believe that the way this government has gone about drafting Bill 10 is simply unnecessary, that all that would be required would be for the minister to change his practices, for the government to change their practices. It would probably take virtually nothing more than that to satisfy both the requirements of the Auditor General and the requirements of parliamentary practice and parliamentary tradition. But the minister has chosen to proceed with Bill 10, a Bill that allows the minister, authorizes the minister, to "pay money from the Fund for

purposes related to the support of initiatives." My golly. I don't know who drafts these things. It sounds like the minister did it in the back seat of his car while he was driving to the airport or something.

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

Well, Mr. Speaker, we don't agree that it's necessary for that kind of amendment, that kind of direction, that kind of authority, that kind of power to be given to one minister. What really needs to be established is the principle that the Lieutenant Governor in Council is the method by which government is accountable to the people of Alberta, through the Legislature, through the estimates, and through the whole tradition of parliamentary accountability, for the expenditure of funds. It's not something that one individual should be given legal authority to do. Government, the cabinet, the Lieutenant Governor in Council, ought to be responsible for any expenditure of public funds. All the government would need to do would be to change its practices in order to do that, and do that properly.

So what I'm saying, Mr. Speaker, to you and to all members of the House, is that all that's necessary to be done is to decline to give this third reading. Government often introduces Bills. Again, it's all part of the parliamentary procedure, that government has to go through many steps. It's not something, when you're making legislation, that you do on a whim. The whole process of making legislation has many steps in place. First it goes on notice, first reading is given, it's introduced, it's published, it's provided to every member. But that's not enough to make it law. Then at second reading you give it debate in principle. But just because you agree to something in principle does not make it ...

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you very much, hon. member. All members of the House are indeed familiar with the parliamentary process with respect to the Bills. Perhaps the member would come back to this amendment, please.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was just coming to third reading, actually, which is what the ...

MR. SCHUMACHER: Point of order, Mr. Speaker. I would like him to come to the amendment, not third reading. We're supposed to be on the amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. That is indeed what the ... [interjections] The Chair has made that direction.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I said earlier, what we're asking the Assembly to do is to decline to give third reading to Bill 10. You can't get to third reading until you've been through first reading, and we've [inaudible] the first reading, second reading, committee ...

MR. SPEAKER: Great, hon. member, and now -- order please -- this amendment.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Well, Mr. Speaker. I'm asking the Assembly to decline to give third reading.

MR. SCHUMACHER: We've heard you say that three times.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Well, when . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Member for Drumheller, please stop with the interjections. But also, Member for Calgary-Mountain View, if the Chair has to interrupt one more time on this same matter, you will lose your right to speak on this matter.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Mr. Speaker, when one's train of thought has been interrupted, you have to get . . . [interjections]. Mr. Speaker, I'm supporting the amendment that the Assembly decline to give third reading, to prevent this from being enacted into legislation. I'm saying that at each stage along the road a government can change its mind. It can decide not to proceed, if it wishes. What we're saying to the Assembly and the government tonight is that it's a bad law, it will become a bad law, it will legislate and enshrine in legislation a practice that is a poor practice which is not in keeping with parliamentary procedure, and that the government would be well-advised not to do that. It's not necessary for them to put into place a bad law. What's necessary for them is to put into place good practice.

In speaking to this amendment, the minister said that he didn't particularly care. He said he was accountable to the people, as if therefore, if you're accountable to the people, you don't have to be accountable to this place, this Assembly, the parliamentary system that's been established, the form of government that we enjoy in this country. In essence, the minister was saying he's above the normal restraints and constraints that apply to a government minister. Mr. Speaker, I really think that also betrays and underscores the sort of practice that seems to have evolved in the administration of these lottery funds, that they are above the normal constraints and review of the Legislature. We're saying that's wrong. The minister also seems to feel that he's above the normal review and constraints of the Legislature. In fact, I think he may have used these words. No, he didn't.

What I'm saying, Mr. Speaker, is that this is an unparliamentary practice. The law is not in keeping with our whole parliamentary tradition. I'm not saying, as the minister seemed to think, that because he's a member of parliament, somehow that's enough to make him accountable for his actions. That just runs contrary to the whole tradition. He doesn't understand the tradition of parliamentary democracy. It's not enough, for example, for him to say, "Oh, well, we account for the way lottery funds have been expended." He seems also to have confused the difference between accounting for funds and being accountable for funds.

MR. SCHUMACHER: Mr. Speaker, a point of order. I've been listening to the hon. Member for Calgary-Mountain View speaking, unfortunately, for the last five or six or eight or 10 minutes, talking about parliamentary procedure and how this Bill offends it. He's speaking to the Bill and not to any amendment that I've heard placed before the House, and I'd like him to stick to the amendment and not speak to the merits of the Bill, which he's been doing.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. [interjections] The Chair will recognize when the Chair recognizes, gentlemen, in a moment. Edmonton-Belmont.

MR. SIGURDSON: With due respect, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Calgary-Mountain View has been talking about the method of disbursements of public moneys, which is in the last

line of the amendment.

MR. SCHUMACHER: He's been talking about the parliamentary process.

MR. SPEAKER: This is not a debate, hon. members.

MR. SIGURDSON: We're talking about accountability and the disbursement of public moneys.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair would like to think so. Thank you, hon. member. Edmonton-Strathcona, on the point of order.

MR. WRIGHT: Yes, Mr. Speaker. As I understand it, the speaker is simply speaking of the odious reasons for the Bill, which should incline hon. members to adopt the amendment and not see it read into law.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In his remarks about this amendment the minister spoke about the public accounts, how we can go into the public accounts and find where all these dollars have gone. He went on with his comments without being interrupted by the Member for Drumheller and being called to order by the Member for Drumheller. I felt that I could also perhaps go into the public accounts and just see where these funds are found and what's entailed in them.

I go, for example, to the General Revenue Fund, and I can find in this where an accounting is made for a number of revenues which are received by the government. But because revenues are found in the public accounts, for example, for the Alberta Liquor Control Board, that somehow doesn't mean that the minister responsible for the Alberta Liquor Control Board is exempted or freed from coming to the Legislature and seeking vote and estimates approval from the Legislature for expenditure, for the support of that from this Assembly. We notice, for example, motor vehicle licence fees are all . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. member. With due respect, one example is sufficient for comparative purposes with your point.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm glad my point has been made with one example. I see that the minister had to use many examples in making his particular point.

MR. SPEAKER: The minister was listing the source of funds.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: I find quite interesting, for example, where the funds are going. There's a lot of difference between taking the retroactive or retrospective view of where moneys were spent in a previous year. It tells us very little about government funding and government expenditure in the current fiscal year. It's not enough.

The point I'm trying to make, Mr. Speaker, is that the Minister of Career Development and Employment seems to have confused the two terms "accounting" and "accountability." For example, you can go to the public accounts and get a listing for all these foundations where the money went last year. I'd be interested to refer to a point the minister made earlier. There's not an exact reconciliation between the public accounts for the year March 31, 1987, and in the accounts for the disbursements of net lottery proceeds made on behalf of the province of Alberta

for that year. In one instance, and I just point to the Alberta Historical Resources Foundation as an example, the public accounts for the disbursements of net lottery proceeds say that that foundation got \$1 million. But then if you go to section 5.51 of the public accounts volume 1 for the same year, it states that they only got \$951,946. You know, there's already a discrepancy of approximately . . .

MR. KOWALSKI: Point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Point of order, Minister of the Environment.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to the hon. gentleman, *Beauchesne* is very, very clear, in section 744(1)(a), in terms of the amendment that is now before us. The amendment says:

it establishes a method of disbursements of public monies that is unnecessary.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw to your attention and to the attention of all members of the House *Beauchesne* 744(1)(a). For the last number of minutes the member has been talking about public accounts, talking about past expenditures. *Beauchesne* is very clear, sir, in terms of what the confining restraints are for participation in this debate with respect to this amendment. Mr. Speaker, I would respectfully ask that the honourable gentleman be held to the provisions that are provided to all members of the Assembly in dealing with this particular amendment. We appreciate the wandering that we've heard tonight. We've been to Australia. We've talked about Galileo. We've talked about a whole series of things, and now we're talking about past expenditures.

Mr. Speaker, we are talking about an amendment which is very clear, very narrow, and I would respectfully ask the gentleman to confine himself, with his best usage of his own intelligence, to stay within the confines afforded to all members of the Assembly. And then surely there'll be an opportunity elsewhere for him to give his gifted knowledge, as well as the gifted knowledge of other members of his caucus as they take us on journeys around the world. But let's tonight deal with a very important piece of legislation that is of urgency and necessity for the people of Alberta.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: In just a moment hon. member. The last reference from *Beauchesne* was 40 . . .

MR. KOWALSKI: Sir, section 744(1)(a), and (1)(a) is very clear that "It may not propose an alternative scheme," and the amendment deals with one.

MR. SPEAKER: And the other? Okay; thank you.
Calgary-Mountain View on the point of order.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Yes, Mr. Speaker. My attention was drawn to these particular pages in public accounts by the hon. member . . .

MR. DAY: Citation.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: On the point of order. I'm speaking to the point of order raised by the Member for Red Deer-North. My attention was drawn to these pages of the public accounts by

the speech given by the Minister of Career Development and Employment. The Minister of the Environment at that point in the debate earlier this evening did not stand on his feet to draw the minister to order for having made reference to the public accounts. I felt it important that if it were in order for the minister to make those comments, that in debate in refuting his arguments I, too, could go to the same source and quote and cite from the same source in my arguments, Mr. Speaker, to refute those that he put on the floor earlier this evening. [interjection]

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of order? [interjection] Thank you.

AN HON. MEMBER: Can we leave?

MR. SPEAKER: Not yet.

A point of order was raised. The point of order was responded to by the Member for Calgary-Mountain View. When the member did indeed come back to public accounts records, the member was indeed in order, since the Chair had allowed the Minister of Career Development and Employment to cite some specific examples. Therefore, in that part it was in order.

With regard to the motion that is before us, it is extremely broad in scope, dealing with most of what the Bill is all about in terms of the disbursement of funds.

The Chair would now recognize the Member for Calgary-Mountain View and would also point out that his time is about to expire in three minutes.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Mr. Speaker, you mean that all the time that other members are speaking to points . . .

MR. SPEAKER: That's correct hon. member.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: . . . that all the time other members are speaking as a point of order . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member, if your loudspeaker is not hearing, the Chair said that, so let us not continue with that. Let's get on with the rest of your points, please.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Mr. Speaker, I find that other members using my allotted time . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. member. You have now forfeited your time.

Edmonton-Highlands.

MS BARRETT: I'll gladly take up the cause, hon. colleague. [interjections] Pardon me?

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Highlands, please proceed.

MS BARRETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will happily proceed to support the amendment in front of us. I agree that the latitude for discussion is fairly broad and was fairly thoroughly, if somewhat incorrectly, explored by the minister in his comments on this amendment. I recall that the Environment minister talked on this amendment as well and observed that the moneys that have been spent over the last 14 years -- and perhaps he was referring to even during the last year specifically -- that were generated by the lottery funds and were administered by the current Minister of Career Development and Employment

were moneys that were desperately needed by the quarters that they eventually were destined to serve. He pointed out, you know, the desperate circumstances of the battered women's shelter in Fort McMurray that was able to get money from the Minister of Career Development and Employment and the Food Bank, for instance, that should be in a position to get money from the Career Development and Employment minister.

I think my hon. colleague the Member for Calgary-Mountain View has really hit the nail on the head in this issue altogether. What he has pointed out is that government members themselves are confusing the issue here. You see, the issue has to do with whether or not the government is disbursing the public moneys in a fashion that is necessary. The argument that is implicitly proposed but expressly explored by all members of the opposition -- well, I guess the New Democrats remaining anyway -- was that the people the hon. minister was talking about need not ever, under any circumstances, have been denied the emergency funding that they might have required. In fact, one is really hard pressed to think of a reason legitimizing the Career Development and Employment minister for being the sole decision-maker, for handing out money as a supplement to departmental budgets, which are ordinarily handled by 24 other cabinet ministers.

Does it not strike you as odd, Mr. Speaker, that if a battered women's shelter is running short of funds because they've never been able to get adequate funding from the Department of Social Services and are meeting a higher than anticipated demand, they would go to the Social Services minister? That's certainly what I would do if I were involved with the battered women's shelter. I would find it very odd to think that I should go to the Minister of Career Development and Employment. That's not his department. I would think it similarly odd if I needed money for any one of the number of areas that the most recent disbursement of the windfall, such as Hospitals and Medical Care, for instance -- I would find it odd that people would go to the Career Development and Employment minister saying: "I need advanced medical equipment for the Misericordia hospital and the Cross Cancer Institute and the Foothills hospital and the Holy Cross hospital." It wouldn't occur to me, Mr. Speaker.

[Mr. Musgreave in the Chair]

The reason it wouldn't occur to me is because everybody who has studied anything -- like even, you know, the grade 4 or grade 5 level of social studies -- knows that governments divide their responsibilities through ministerially run departments, and departments have titles, and titles refer to the nature of the policy formation that they may engage in and the nature of the expenditure that they may disburse. [interjections] Pardon? My friendly colleague from Edmonton-Belmont says that the new description for the Minister of Career Development and Employment might now be known as the minister of goodies. And I think that's not just an amusing but a fairly astute way to capture the argument that I am presenting. Why on earth would it be necessary to go to the Minister of Career Development and Employment for money which might be needed to supplement funding that ordinarily would come from one of 23 other cabinet colleagues? That makes no sense at all.

So therefore, Mr. Speaker, the issue is not that those people who ask for money are undeserving or that those people who are recipients of the money are undeserving. That's not at all the issue. It's a very clever smoke screen posed by certain government members, certain cabinet ministers in particular, to try to

divert attention from the heart of the issue. The heart of the issue is that no substantive argument can be launched at all to convince anybody with a modicum of common sense that all of the public funds that are given out by the government directly and not disbursed by existing foundations should not come through the Assembly for consideration. It is almost a redundancy.

The Minister for the Environment in his comments referred to how it was so vitally important that the opposition stop barking about this Bill, get it passed and, you know, get on with the important business of the Assembly. I remind the Minister of the Environment that this is important business of the Assembly. Blockage of a Bill by whatever parliamentary means are available is an important part of the parliamentary process. If the government, in its severe lack of wisdom under these circumstances, is determined to proceed with this Bill, there is relatively little that anybody can do about it. I can give you a beautiful example of this, Mr. Speaker. I remember being in this Assembly -- I was sitting upstairs in the gallery -- and Grant Notley presented to the man who is now Deputy Premier a petition that had more than 70,000 signatures on it. At that time the Deputy Premier was the hospitals minister. Grant asked a series of questions, and finally, in his frustration, he said to the minister, "What does it take to get this government to believe that these signatures are serious and that people do not want the Edmonton General hospital closed?" I can only paraphrase the Deputy Premier, but I can daily recall the shock that I felt when he said, and I paraphrase, that it would take one signature if the assumption was appropriate.

That, I think, underlines my message, Mr. Speaker. Seventy thousand people may have been of the common view, but they had no ability, even in this parliamentary forum where some of the right-wingers talk as if the day of totalitarianism is practically upon us . . . Right in this forum a senior cabinet minister basically said "no way" to 70,000 people.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The hon. member is reflecting upon the Assembly, the way the Assembly operates, and the members of the Assembly. It's quite out of order, and it's also way off the topic.

MS BARRETT: Mr. Speaker, my purpose in raising this very brief anecdote is to indicate how thin . . .

MR. RUSSELL: Finish it then. Tell how Rev. Roberts then campaigned for that very thing that I proposed. Finish your little anecdote, why don't you? Finish it. Yeah.

MS BARRETT: I'm sorry. Does the minister want to finish it for me? I'd gladly sit down while he does that and I'll take my position here after.

MR. RUSSELL: The record's there.

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

MS BARRETT: Mr. Speaker, I think the Deputy Premier is unhappy that I told an anecdote about something that he said in the Assembly. The point is, he said it. The point is that the democratic process is already fragile. The minister can take his time to explain the rest of the anecdote. I'm really not sure what he's talking about. My point was to paraphrase what he said about the assumption of one signature versus 70,000. I know

it's a sore point with the minister, and I'm sorry about that, but I wasn't the one who said it; he was. And the real issue here is that the democratic process is already sufficiently fragile to have me worried that further erosion should be condoned by any member in this Assembly. That is why I declare that this amendment, which acknowledges that the giving over to a single minister the power to disburse funds which are not to be governed by statutory policy or orientation . . . It's irresponsible. It's going a bit too far, Mr. Speaker, and to boot, it is unnecessary.

We sit in Committee of Supply to contemplate the main budget estimates on an annual basis for 25 days in the spring sittings of the Assembly. That's one day for every department that shall be contemplated. The opposition has always said that that's not a whole heck of a lot of time for a \$10 billion budget.

[Mr. Musgreave in the Chair]

Would it be so difficult, Mr. Speaker, to include one additional vote under the minister's department or perhaps the Deputy Premier's department -- I don't care, but somewhere in the estimates. A policy, a forum which is already sanctioned by this Assembly and all other parliamentary assemblies in the world? What the heck is the matter with adding one other vote? The minister can identify, if he wants, areas, broad areas that he believes should be available for expenditures. He can identify 5 percent for supplementary income to Hospitals and Medical Care so that the equipment that has been promised for purchase now with the recent windfall could go ahead and be purchased. Under the Social Services component a certain percentage could be set aside for contingency funds for that department's regular budget. It could, if it wanted to, be contemplated for reversion to the general revolving fund to be available in the event that special warrants are required.

There are any number of means by which my proposals, the proposals of the New Democratic opposition, could be handily dovetailed into existing procedure. And I'll bet you a million . . . Hey, that's Don Getty's line, right? -- when he said, "What's a million?" Well, now I'm going to bet the "what's a million." I'll bet you a million it could be done and add no time to the Assembly's contemplation of the annual budget estimates. But it would be done, and it would be available, and the process would be one of accountability prior to expenditure.

The minister's orientation in sponsoring this Bill actually worries me. He's a new member of cabinet, and I fear that he individually is going to be hung with this albatross in the long run. It may appear that it's handy and convenient to walk around with a blank chequebook worth up to -- what? -- \$100 million, \$110 million a year and, you know, like some philanthropist drop cheques here and there according to expediency.

But I think Albertans understand that there is a procedure already in place, tried and tested, that works for keeping the government accountable. The Environment minister I think insinuated that that's not an important role for the opposition. He referred to the fact that the government's responsibilities are different from the opposition, and therefore they should have the authority and the latitude to spend this money in any way they deem appropriate without coming to this Assembly. Well, I point out to the hon. Environment minister that when he gets his chance to sit in the opposition benches -- I expect relatively soon from now -- he will come to understand firsthand how important it is that an opposition exists, and secondly, how impor-

tant it is that an opposition oppose things that violate the principles of the parliamentary tradition and support government initiatives which enhance that tradition.

As a member of the opposition for two years I think my colleagues and I have done a good job in agreeing to government motions and Bills which we thought were in the better interest of the public at large and enhancing the parliamentary traditions. The minister, I believe, is a little shortsighted when he comes to the assumptions about the responsibilities of government versus the responsibilities of opposition. I think that's particularly true when he trots out these examples of how it is that there are emergency circumstances that lead agencies of any description to come to the government for help. I'm reminded that the opposition was particularly keen to advise the government in 1986 and especially in 1987 as to how deficient their Social Services budget was when it came to the support for battered women's shelters in Alberta. Now he tells me that it was important that the Wild Rose Foundation had that money to kick in to the Fort McMurray battered women's shelter.

Well, it was important that the money was there, Mr. Speaker, but it could have been accessed through a special warrant. Or the government could do something we've invited the government to do on many an occasion: recall the Assembly if you've got a bit of a financial crisis. If it's that serious, don't worry. We'll help you through. You can count on the opposition to be responsible when it's in the best interests of the public at large or a constituency that genuinely needs help. You could recall the Assembly for a day. You've got that mechanism. That, too, makes the minister's Bill redundant and its provisions redundant.

AN HON. MEMBER: They don't want to go through question period.

MS BARRETT: Oh, that's true. They don't like the question period. But anyway, there are means by which that could be accomplished so no one in need would ever have to be denied. In fact no one in need ever has to be denied under the current provisions of this Legislative Assembly, whether through special warrant and order in council, some of which are pretty darned specious anyway, let's face it Mr. Speaker, or by recalling the Assembly or doing the really efficient thing -- hey, doesn't this speak to your interest, efficiency? -- letting members of the Assembly vote on the issue on an annual basis prior to the expenditure.

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

Mr. Speaker, it's a reasoned amendment, and it seems eminently reasonable to me. [interjection]

MR. SPEAKER: What point of order would it be, Edmonton-Strathcona?

MR. WRIGHT: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Concerning the calculation of time, which I presume is going on as every member speaks, Standing Order 29(d) -- you know it off by heart

except as provided in clauses (a) to (c), no member shall speak for longer than 30 minutes in debate on a motion or a Bill.

Time obviously cannot run unless the member is speaking, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair doesn't . . . Government House

Leader.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I move to adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: With due respect, the practice of the House, if the Chair is not mistaken, has been that the clock does indeed keep running throughout, whether there are points of order or not. It's also one of the other difficulties under Standing Order 13(4)(b), this matter of interrupting members except to raise points of order. Interruptions often take place: "Will the member entertain a question?" That's where the usual practice is to

decline taking the question, because if you do take the question while you're speaking, then the clock is still running against you on your time. That has been part of the experience of this House. Nevertheless, the Chair will take it under advisement as to what the past practice of the House is.

The other matter was . . . That was with respect to the clock. Thank you.

The Government House Leader has moved adjournment of the House.

[At 12:54 a.m. on Friday the House adjourned to 10 a.m.]