

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Title: **Thursday, May 26, 1988 8:00 p.m.**

Date: 08/05/26

[The House resumed at 8 p.m.]

[Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair]

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

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

| No. | Title | Moved by |
|-----|---|------------------------|
| 4 | Energy Resources Conservation Amendment Act, 1988 | Young (for Oldring) |
| 7 | Tourism Education Council Act | Young (for Sparrow) |
| 9 | Alberta Research Council Amendment Act, 1988 | Young (for Bradley) |

Bill 11

Motion Picture Development Amendment Act, 1988

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleague the Minister of Economic Development and Trade, I move third reading of Bill 11, the Motion Picture Development Amendment Act, 1988.

MS BARRETT: Mr. Speaker, at committee reading yesterday of this Bill I'd asked the minister if he was going to commit himself to using the same clout that he's had, obviously, in presenting this Bill within his caucus and cabinet to enhance the statutory funding for grants to artists on an annual basis for all Albertans, actually, and if he was going to be able to secure that sort of commitment from his government. Perhaps I can just repeat the argument that I made yesterday briefly, and if the Government House Leader cares to respond on behalf of the Minister, he can do so.

The argument that I made, Mr. Speaker, is that this is quite a windfall for the AMPDC. It's a happily received windfall. It's an increase of \$7 million. That is, the amount going to the AMPDC is now going to be \$10 million, and that money is welcome. But for artists who struggle in other disciplines and in cross disciplines within the arts in Alberta, there is still a substantial shortfall of money. One has to spend fully one-half of one's time in this province just applying for sponsorship and trying to make ends meet by holding down part-time jobs in restaurants and at parking lots. I make the case that all artists in Alberta welcome this particular Bill, Bill 11, but what they would like to see and what the opposition New Democrats would like to see is a commitment from this government that this is the first step in many that will secure adequate funding for the arts in Alberta.

I've pointed out that between the foundation's grants and the departmental grants going to artists, the amount is about \$8 million a year. That is not very much money when you consider

that they are Canada's 10th largest industry, that they are very industrious themselves; they work very hard in full- and part-time jobs outside of their artistic endeavours just to keep themselves going. They would like to see that commitment from this government and so would the opposition. In view of the fact that it's the Government House Leader sponsoring third reading of this Bill, to which the opposition New Democrats have pledged their support, I wonder if he could now make that commitment on behalf of his colleague the Minister for Economic Development and Trade, whose department may not have to exist in a few years if we keep supporting the arts the way they are in Bill 11, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: May the hon. minister close debate on Bill 11?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hon. minister.

MR. YOUNG: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the comments and the support that's demonstrated in the remarks of the hon. Member for Edmonton-Highlands. I'm unable on behalf of the hon. minister to give the commitment that is requested. However, I would make this undertaking, and if you will, in a way it's a commitment, and that is that the government very much recognizes the significance and the industry of art and culture and particularly their contribution to a much richer tourism opportunity in Alberta. As has been pointed out, it is rightly a significant industry now, involves a large number of people, is well regarded both locally and nationally and internationally.

I am sure that the hon. member did not expect a commitment either from me or from the minister to the exact question that was put, but I believe that the Bill before us indicates the direction and longer term commitment of the government, our confidence in this industry, and I am sure that some of the moneys that we're talking about here will find their way indirectly to the very artists on whose behalf the hon. member has so eloquently made the case.

[Motion carried; Bill 11 read a third time]

MR. JONSON: Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please, hon. member. There has been a request by an hon. member that perhaps we could revert to Introduction of Special Guests. The Chair hates to interrupt the hon. Member for Ponoka-Rimbey. Would the Assembly agree with that?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

head: INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS

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

MR. YOUNIE: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I would like to introduce in the public gallery two good friends from the constituency of Edmonton-Glengarry, Walter and Judy Lewandowski. Walter has been working very diligently with the parents' committee pressuring the Minister of Education for an elementary school in their home community, and I hope, as they

do, that they'll be successful. I'd ask them to rise and receive the warm welcome of the Assembly.

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

Bill 12
Professional and Occupational Associations
Registration Amendment Act, 1988

MR. JONSON: Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill 12, the Professional and Occupational Associations Registration Amendment Act, 1988.

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

MR. CHUMIR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would rise to speak against this legislation. I find one of the provisions in this legislation to be particularly regressive, and that is the provision in section 33.1(3) which provides that if the governing body of the professional and occupational association finds

... that a complaint is frivolous or vexatious, the Discipline Committee may order the complainant to pay all or part of the costs ...

of that particular complaint. It's quite clear that that provision has been placed within the legislation for the sole purpose of discouraging complaints.

Now, I can understand the frustration of a professional organization that may feel it is being harassed by a member of the public who keeps coming back with what are perceived to be minor, trivial complaints. But self-governance by a profession or an association brings costs, and one of those costs is to be seen to be responsive to complaints from members of the public. That is part of the price that a professional association has to pay, and if it doesn't wish to pay that price, it's my suggestion, Mr. Speaker, that the particular association should not be given professional or special status.

Now, I've raised this with the introducer of the Bill, and he has presented to me some suggestions of precedents in the past. But when we went over those precedents -- and perhaps he has more since our discussions -- we find that they are really precedents which have arisen in the last two or three years in legislation brought before this House. Prior to that there is no precedent that I am aware of. I'm not aware of precedents in other jurisdictions. I can certainly say on behalf of the legal profession, that is particularly sensitive to complaints from the public, that I think they would be shocked at the thought that they might impose costs against a complainant. I think that would be the surest way to bring the complaint process into discredit and lead to rumblings of discontent amongst members of the public.

I think it's a very, very shortsighted trend that we find. The irony is that I appealed to the Solicitor General for assistance through his experience as a member of the legal profession on one day, and the very next day I found that he was introducing a Police Act that provided for the very same types of costs to be imposed in certain circumstances where there are complaints brought to the Law Enforcement Appeal Board. So what we seem to have is a trend, and I believe a very unhealthy trend, being followed by the government.

I think what you will find is that members of the public will hear of examples of costs being levied; when other members of the public consider complaints, they will have running through

the back of their minds the potential problem that if they do lay a complaint and it's considered by the professional body to be frivolous or vexatious, they can be stuck with costs. Accordingly, the complaints will be discouraged. That may seem quite reasonable in any given instance to a knowledgeable member of the profession or the occupation, but these professions or occupations are often privy to rather abstruse knowledge of the way their professions operate. Many of these complaints which they consider to be frivolous or vexatious will be considered to be serious by members of the public.

The process should be an open one. It should be one which invites complaints and resolution of difficulties, not ones which discourage them. I think it's a very fundamentally and seriously flawed concept, which, I repeat, has been introduced into this province only in recent years in legislation. We've heard the minister, with respect to Bill 10, talking about 14 years of precedent. Well, if we're now starting on the precedent concept, we've only got two or three years, and I think it's time that we stopped this nonsense and nipped this development in the bud. It's very, very shortsighted, so I certainly intend to vote against this legislation.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hon. Member for Wainwright.

MR. FISCHER: No.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: May the Member for Ponoka-Rimbey close debate on this Bill?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hon. Member for Ponoka-Rimbey.

MR. JONSON: Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to take a few minutes to respond to the Member for Calgary-Buffalo. He was good enough to advise me of his concerns, and I would like to just start out by indicating that, yes, certainly this Bill is in accordance with government policy on professions and occupations which, although I suppose in the life of the Legislature is of fairly recent vintage, has been in place for a number of years. I could, but will not, take the time of the House to quote seven examples here of legislation in the various sections which have exactly the same provision as does this amendment.

I'd like to emphasize, though, Mr. Speaker, that the possibility of costs being assessed against a complainant is at the second stage of the disciplinary process. There is the opportunity for any member of the public, without in any way being inhibited by that factor, laying an initial complaint, having an investigation, and having an initial assessment of whether the complaint has grounds supporting it or it is deemed to be, as the words say, "frivolous or vexatious." It is only when that initial judgment is appealed that this particular provision comes into play. Yes, it is felt that there should be the opportunity there, if the judging committee deems appropriate, to assess costs against the complainant. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, not a perfect system if the resources were there in the hands of a particular professional organization to pay all costs no matter what the circumstances, but certainly on an incremental basis this is a major improvement over no professional legislation at all.

The other comment I would like to make, since reference was made to the legal profession, is that although I agree that the legal profession itself does not have this particular provision I couldn't help but think of the fact that in a variety of civil ac-

ions in the court system of this province, be they dealing with, oh, perhaps slander and libel or matters involving debts, at the very first stage of the civil action costs can be awarded against the complainant. I believe that in legal terminology those are ailed "party and party" costs. They also have, as I understand it, a schedule of costs so that depending on how badly the complainant is judged, you can get charged anywhere from a very minimal amount at one end of the schedule to a rather onerous amount at the other.

So I'd just like to conclude, Mr. Speaker, by saying that I believe that this amendment is in the public interest. It is an improvement over the current situation. It will, I believe, attract more of these organizations to register under this Act in order that they can discipline their own profession in their own conduct and production, and therefore I would urge the support of the Assembly in passing it through third reading.

Motion carried; Bill 12 read a third time]

Bill 17
Municipal District of Brazeau No. 77
Incorporation Act

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleague the Minister of Municipal Affairs I move third reading of Bill 17, the Municipal District of Brazeau No. 77 Incorporation Act.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I will not take much time on this, other than that the group, I'm sure, had much discussion with the minister and probably both of the opposition parties. As a result of the good work by those people and, we expect, by the opposition and the minister, the Bill is now much more acceptable.

The only point I would make, Mr. Speaker: we might save ourselves some problems in the future if when we're bringing in these sorts of Bills we can have more consultation and input ahead of time so that we don't have to go through the problems and all the letter writing and petitions and all the rest of it. But it's certainly, I think, acceptable to the people that are affected, so we will certainly support it.

MR. TAYLOR: All I can say is amen.

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

HON. MEMBERS: Question.

[Motion carried; Bill 17 read a third time]

Bill 19
Marriage Amendment Act, 1988

MR. ADY: Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill 19, the [Marriage Amendment Act, 1988.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?
Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. TAYLOR: Just a short shot I can't quite understand -- and I think I touched on it in question period once -- the deleting of whatever mandatory blood tests we've had that have become acceptable through time from the Act, with respect to the whole question of AIDS. Here's a government that is willing on the

doctor's say-so to virtually incarcerate a person who has AIDS, yet here is a test that's been gone over and over and over, a blood test -- admittedly, it was just a Wassermann. We've become so used to the idea of the test that this is one of the easy ways of enlarging the whole question of AIDS testing. I think that if there was ever any credibility for testing for syphilis or gonorrhea before marriage, surely isn't it much more with a fatal disease like AIDS, one that can lie dormant for some time before? All the more important that we left that in. I just don't understand the government's new-found idea of dispensing with blood tests -- unless it's for some rather particular excuse that it saves money -- when we have an opportunity that a segment of our population that goes through with the blood tests each year could easily be picked up. The blood is already taken, and the testing of the blood [could] be enlarged to include AIDS examinations.

What we have now, virtually, is that the only AIDS examination done with blood is if you give blood. It's presumed that the Red Cross -- and I guess they do -- tests for AIDS. But why are we giving up? This is what I'd like to say to the proposer of the Bill: why are we giving up an easy, economical, and without-problem method of testing the blood of a segment of our population?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: May the hon. Member for Cardston close debate?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Opposed?
Hon. Member for Cardston.

MR. ADY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In order to not take the time of the Assembly, the question that the hon. leader of the Liberal Party puts was dealt with in Committee of the Whole on May 25, and I would refer him to *Hansard*, page 1248 for the answers that were dealt with. The question was put to the Assembly by the hon. Member for Edmonton-Strathcona. I believe he'll find the answers to that in there and satisfactory.

[Motion carried; Bill 19 read a third time]

Bill 20
Oil and Gas Conservation Amendment Act, 1988

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleague the Minister of Energy, I move third reading of Bill 20, the Oil and Gas Conservation Amendment Act, 1988.

MR. PASHAK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like the government to consider postponing third reading until I have an opportunity to hear from the minister on one section of this particular Bill. There was no debate at second reading, really, and the Bill passed through committee stage in a similar fashion, partly because the Bill is really quite highly technical in nature.

The minister did a fairly good job, I thought, of outlining most of the reasons why changes were being proposed in this particular piece of legislation. However, there is a key section, section 23, of the proposed Act that the minister did not touch upon. It seems to change the powers of the board with respect to restricting the amount of gas or, where gas is produced in association with oil, "the amount of gas and oil . . . that may be produced during a period defined in the order" from any pool in

Alberta. Instead of having hearings, the board can do that, and I would like to know from the minister if that change was introduced -- I think it is a key, critical section of the Bill; I think it touches on the principle of the Bill. I wondered if that section was introduced to alleviate a concern that a number of smaller gas producers have told me about. That's a situation whereby gas in pools comes under contract by certain producers that have access to rights within that pool, but because their gas is under contract, that's the gas that's drained from the pool, and it tends to lessen the recoverability opportunities for the remaining owners who may have shares in that pool.

So I would ask the government to consider postponing third reading on this Bill until such time as we can hear from the minister.

MR. TAYLOR: Speaking along the same lines as the hon. Member for Calgary-Forest Lawn, Mr. Speaker, I've been in this business all my life, and I find it a very, very complicated amendment. So what I did was circulate this amongst some of the more knowledgeable people of the oil industry, and personally we just haven't had the chance to get the answers back. On first blush, there's some rather draconian type changes. I might be wrong, but I read the whole thing through.

The hon. member's already touched upon the fact that there could be selective withdrawal from a pool. One of, I'd say, the earliest traditions we've had in Alberta: in order that the law of capture be not misused by developers -- and that's the only way we define oil and gas in Alberta -- what comes out of your pipe is considered your oil or gas even though some scientists may be able to argue that it sneaked over from a half a mile away from somebody else's property. The law of capture is one of the most basic principles. But in order to nullify that idea that the law of capture was God, we also had put in some years ago, back in the '20s and reaffirmed in the '30s and '40s by different governments, that nobody could suck harder on the straw in the bottle than the other people were sucking. Consequently, that meant that the law of capture indeed was a reasonable reflection of what was in the reservoir. But this seems to break that totally apart. Also, with respect. . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Excuse me, hon. leader. The Chair hesitates to interrupt, but the Bill has been dealt with in second reading, and it's very important that unless there's something new at third reading, we should not go through a recurrence of the principle of the Bill, which was passed by this Assembly in second reading.

MR. TAYLOR: That's a good point, Mr. Speaker, but as the hon. Member for Calgary-Forest Lawn mentioned, there was no debate on second reading. One of the reasons there was no debate is that this is so highly complicated that most of us -- and I'm sure that member was and the others -- were circulating to friends or technicians in the industry, because it takes both a lawyer and a reservoir engineer going through this. And we haven't had a response back. All I can do is respectfully request, as the hon. Member for Calgary-Forest Lawn's already done: why not put this on the shelf? What's the hurry? Just give us a chance to get some feedback. It may be all right. I'm not going to go off and stake my life on it, but I do, having spent a lifetime in here, see some references to common purchasers in the deletion and the canceling of common purchasers and common processors that could be quite different. So all I'm asking is whether the House leader or whoever is in charge would con-

sider postponing third reading on this so that maybe in another few days or a week -- I don't think they're going to call an election that fast -- I and some of us in the opposition, and I'm sure they probably should too, can circulate to some knowledgeable people.

AN HON. MEMBER: They're going to postpone.

MR. TAYLOR: Okay. Well, I'm sorry. Preaching to the converted again.

MR. ORMAN: Mr. Speaker, it's quite obvious that the opposition was not prepared during second reading. In that it is unusual in third reading to get into this type of element, I'm willing to move that we adjourn debate so that they can more appropriately prepare for a future occasion.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Minister of Career Development and Employment has moved adjournment on third reading of Bill 20. All those in favour, please say aye.

HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Opposed, please say no. Carried.

Bill 10 Interprovincial Lottery Amendment Act, 1988

[Adjourned debate May 19: Mr. Young]

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, in recommencing debate that was adjourned on Bill 10, I move that debate on this Bill shall not be further adjourned, in keeping with the notice of motion given earlier.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Having heard the motion by the hon. Government House Leader, all those in favour, please say aye.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Opposed, please say no.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

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

[Eight minutes having elapsed, the House divided]

For the motion:

| | | |
|----------|-------------|------------|
| Ady | Fjordbotten | Oldring |
| Alger | Hyland | Orman |
| Bogle | Jonson | Payne |
| Brassard | Kowalski | Pengelly |
| Cassin | McClellan | Reid |
| Clegg | Mirosh | Schumacher |
| Downey | Moore, R. | Shrake |
| Drobot | Musgreave | Stewart |
| Elzinga | Musgrove | West |
| Fischer | Nelson | Young |

Against the motion:

| | | |
|---------|-----------|-----------|
| Barrett | McEachern | Strong |
| Chumir | Mjolsness | Taylor |
| Hewes | Pashak | Wright |
| Laing | Piquette | Younie |
| Martin | Sigurdson | |
| Totals: | Ayes - 30 | Noes - 14 |

[Motion carried]

MR. MARTIN: Apparently, Mr. Speaker, it's been a while. I want to remind the members, being the helpful soul that I am, about the amendment we are now dealing with, as I understand it from my colleague from Edmonton-Avonmore. That this Assembly decline to give third reading to Bill 10, Interprovincial Lottery Amendment Act, 1988, because it establishes a method of disbursement of public monies that is unnecessary.

Well, let me stress the word "unnecessary," because that's the important part of this amendment. The reason is that we've been trying to make this government over here, that refuses to admit about democratic process and public moneys. . . . We have a process, and it's called British parliamentary democracy. British parliamentary democracy means that the Legislature or the Parliament is the one that looks after public money. That's what makes this particular Bill unnecessary.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I understand that governments don't like the Legislature, specifically this government right now, and they would rather avoid it. So they bring in Bill 10, because they were criticized in the Auditor General's department, to sort of try to make legal the illegal things they were doing before, according to the Auditor General. I'll come to the Auditor General's report, because it's the crux of the matter. But again, they tried to draw the line and say: "Well, this is public money that comes out of lotteries. It's not really taxpayers' money. Therefore, it's not necessary to come to the Legislature". That's why we're dealing with this Bill, and this is why this amendment says that this is unnecessary.

I can't believe, Mr. Speaker, as I was going through grade school and I was taught about democracy -- we were taught about how it came about, as I mentioned the last time, with Charles I and the Legislature served themselves, cut off the King's head -- that I'd actually be sitting in the Legislature asking a government with an overwhelming majority to practise democratic principles as set down by British parliamentary democracy. I find it rather appalling that we are supposed to do this in this Legislature. I thought it was self-evident, when I took a civics class in grade 4, that the Parliament did look after the purse strings. That's what we were all taught, and this is why the amendment is so important. It says that this is unnecessary, Mr. Speaker. This is supposed to be where we look after public moneys.

Now, the idea that the Legislature controls the purse strings is fundamental to what we're talking about. Mr. Speaker, we're talking about lotteries, lottery money that's under the control of the government. Again I want to make it clear to this government that we're not talking at this specific point who gets the lotteries -- although I certainly have some problems with the Member for Banff-Cochrane and the way he doled it out -- because there's many worthwhile groups getting it. What we're talking about here is fundamental democracy: that the Legislature controls the purse strings.

Now, I think maybe this Conservative government -- it seems to me it'd be more convenient for them if we didn't even bother with the Legislature at all. Maybe they can just set up a little dictatorship or an oligarchy and sit around behind closed doors and make decisions, just as the kings in Britain wanted to do before. It seems to me this is the first step in moving in that direction, Mr. Speaker, because it is, as I said, fundamental. Not only do we have this Minister of Career Development and Employment having one big slush fund of over hundreds of millions of dollars -- and who knows what it'll be in the future -- but now we find out that perhaps they all get together in the cabinet. . . . Or maybe some of the backbenchers say, "Boy, you could help me here with this or this or this or that." So we could have 25 or 50 little slush funds. They could run around the province and give out what they want.

Now, the minister says, "Trust me; I would never do that" Mr. Speaker, it's not up to us trust them. What we're talking about is the fundamental principle here, that we should be debating where this money is going right here in the Legislature, the same as we debate what happens with the general revenues, the same as we debate what happens with the heritage trust fund. Where the public moneys come from is irrelevant. The fact is that we're talking about public money, and that's why it should be debated in the Legislature.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I've listened today to the question from my colleague from Edmonton-Highlands when she asked the Premier, first of all about closure, but about why they were doing this. I just want to quote two lines from what the Premier said.

As I've already said, Mr. Speaker, the government isn't afraid of anything with regard to this legislation.

He goes on to say:

This legislation follows a recommendation from the Auditor General. This legislation has been before the House. It's gone through two readings; it's gone through committee study.

And so on and so forth. But the key point that I want to come to here -- he says:

This legislation follows a recommendation from the Auditor General.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I say to you and to the Assembly that that is misleading the House. That recommendation did not come from the Auditor General, if you look at what the Auditor General says. Let me quote under the section where he was dealing with the lottery operations. He says, and he makes a point that I was saying before:

A legal opinion obtained by the Audit Office indicates that the proceeds from these lotteries fall within the definition of "public money" . . .

Let me repeat that Mr. Speaker, because it makes a point that I was making before. It doesn't matter where the money comes from, whether it's out of taxation or lotteries. He says, and I quote again:

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

And he goes on to say:

. . . 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 . . . through the licence.

Now, that's the first important point a legal opinion from the Auditor General's department. It does not break it up, like this minister, and say that because it isn't tax money or it isn't that money or it isn't this money or wherever. He says very clearly that their legal opinion is that this is public money.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that's precisely the point we've been trying to make. Within their own legal definition, from their own government, they say that it's public money. Therefore, this is why this amendment is important, where they say it's unnecessary, because it's right here in this Legislature that we should be looking at public money.

Now, the other point, Mr. Speaker, flowing from the Premier's answer. He says that the Auditor General recommends this. As I said, this is wrong. I'm quoting again from this part in the annual report of the Auditor General. He says: I recommend

... that the Minister responsible for administering the Interprovincial Lottery Act:

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

That is the first recommendation the Auditor General made, that we deal with it in the Legislature, which we've been talking about. I'll come to that. . . . The Auditor General, knowing this government's penchant for secrecy, went on. And he did say, to be fair: that alternately, I recommend that the minister

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

The point that I make . . . He was giving the government an out, unfortunately. But his primary recommendation was that we debate it in this Legislature the same as we do any other public money. He says that if they're not going to do the right thing, at least don't be hypocritical about it; bring in the Bill. But, Mr. Speaker, it's not good enough to bring in the Bill. What they should be doing is following the main recommendation of the Auditor General. That's what he asked them to do, not hide behind Bill 10.

Now, I would just say to the hon. members -- and again I want to come back to this amendment -- that when we say in this amendment that disbursement of public moneys is unnecessary, I'd say, in fairness to my colleague from Edmonton-Avonmore, that that's probably an understatement. This particular Bill, Bill 10, is not only unnecessary, it's undemocratic, and it's immoral. That's the reality of what's happening here. I ask this government, following the principles of what they're doing here, their interpretation of public money -- again, different from their own Auditor General and from the Attorney General's department, but their interpretation of public money.

Where is it going to go next, when they don't want something else, when they want another slush fund? We can bring in another Bill. With the huge majority where does it go next? Is it: "Oh, well, gee, the oil companies like us, so we won't bother with royalties. After all, that's not taxation in the real way that we knew back in time. It's not personal taxation. Maybe we should set up a slush fund for that." Or maybe the next time: "Well, the liquor stores really aren't taxes. We make money off liquor, but it's really not taxes. Maybe we shouldn't come to the Legislature with that particular Bill; maybe we shouldn't." Or maybe all the fees -- we found a myriad of fees last budget to tax people, but not taxation in the simple sense, the user fees that we charge. "Oh, that's not taxation either. Maybe we should have another Bill, called Bill 10A and 10B and 10C and 10D, where we can take more and more and more and more of the public scrutiny away from the money that we spend." I'm

saying to this minister that that's the principle you're starting here with Bill 10. Again, I come back to that amendment. I say to you that it is unnecessary when we have the Legislature, where we're supposed to control the purse strings.

What to me is frankly appalling is to s i t . . . I would expect that especially with new members there would still be some idealism about the democratic process; that you can't be that cynical and jaded that you support a Bill like this, regardless of one's political persuasion, whether we're Conservative or Liberal or New Democrat or Representative, but especially some of the new members, with the grade 4 civics class still ringing in their ears, Mr. Speaker, could have come here and said, "Well, gee, the Legislature, we were taught, looks after public money"; that some of the backbenchers would revolt a little about this. I would think they'd be revolted about the legislation and say to the minister: "This is not good enough, because we still have some principles. We're not just going to follow the government, lock, stock, and barrel." But unfortunately all I've seen is that either backbenchers stand up or say very little, but generally sit on their duffs and vote with the government through closure, vote for the government, for this Bill, even though they must know -- Mr. Speaker, they must know, deep down -- how undemocratic this particular Bill is. I find that, as I say, irresponsible but certainly disheartening, that we can be that cynical and jaded on the opposite side that quickly.

Now, to make matters worse, Mr. Speaker, we saw the spectacle today of the House leader. Here we are in third reading, which we in the opposition believe is a fundamentally bad Bill. We debated it; they debated it last Thursday night. It went through three readings. But this government is so desperate to get out of here and so afraid of democracy, to allow this to go through, that we have the sad spectacle of bringing in a closure motion with a huge majority. Now, this is another precedent. What's the next time they're going to bring it in? After we've had two people speak on a Bill? "Gee, we're cutting short on time; we've got to get out on the golf links. We'll bring in closure." This is, frankly, outrageous, that at this stage we're bringing in closure on a Bill like this. Sure; they can ram things through. They can ram this Bill through; they can ram through closure. But if they think they're impressing anybody besides themselves by doing this, they are just wrong, and they're going to face a big surprise in the next election. It's a government that's become old and arrogant that brings in a Bill like this and then, to ram it through, brings in closure in the most ham-handed, arrogant way possible.

I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that we are going to stay here as long as we can to tell them a little fundamental story about what British parliamentary democracy is, what public money is. If they want to bring in closure, unfortunately we can't do much about it at this time. But I say again that they're going to pay a political price.

Now, not only am I worried about the closure motion, but I want to say that I was, frankly, surprised, flabbergasted, that in the third reading of a Bill they would bring in closure. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, what's the precedent of doing it with this Bill? How quickly is it going to become not the last resort? The minister may say, "Oh, well, it's in the rules." Well, sure; all sorts of things are in the rules. But the reality is -- everybody knows it that understands anything about British parliamentary democracy -- that closure is the last resort. In this case, they're using it almost as the first resort. I wonder about the precedent of that: every time they bring in a Bill that the opposition doesn't like, how quickly we're going to jump to closure. I for one

am going to be very interested to watch; I can tell you that.

I want to move on and just come to the ambit. As good as the Member from Edmonton-Avonmore's, my colleague's, amendment was, I believe I can even make it better. As a result, I want to look at the amendment also from the management of public money. It's not only the disbursement; it's also the management that I think we're discussing here. As a result, I have a subamendment that I would like to hand out to you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WRIGHT: About time too.

MR. MARTIN: About time?

Now, Mr. Speaker, just to quote the subamendment -- and I'll explain the need for it -- all we're adding onto this amendment is:

by adding "management and" after "establishes a method of.

So we're looking at disbursement and management. We're trying to add to the disbursement but also who manages it. This is also a key point. I think the subamendment makes the amendment much better. Because what we're also talking about is management. As I've already pointed out, this Bill allows the minister to deal with over \$100 million, behind closed doors, with one big slush fund and maybe have a number of little slush funds behind him. It allows him, behind closed doors, to do his.

So there's the two points about it. One, that it's unnecessary hat we should be debating this in the House; but secondly, it's how they're managing this. Again, I want to say to the Members of the Legislative Assembly, regardless of what side they're on: look at your conscience. Mr. Speaker, I think that all fair-minded people in this Legislature, if they still have a conscience, will look at this subamendment and this amendment and say, "Yes, this makes sense." Because we believe in parliamentary democracy. That's what we got elected to do. We believe in serving our constituents, and we believe in doing it the proper way. Besides that, at some future date when there's a change of government, I don't want to see the minister beheaded -- again, like Charles I was.

So I conclude by just saying . . . I was going to say maybe get beheaded because of the jacket he wore the other day, but I'll stay to Bill 10, Mr. Speaker, again I appeal to all members, regardless of which side of the House, to support the subamendment and the amendment, and let's do the business that we were elected to do here in the Legislature with all public moneys.

Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. Speaking to the subamendment, the Minister of Career Development and Employment.

MR. ELZINGA: Point of order.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Minister of Agriculture, on a point of order.

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, neither to add nor to distract from the debate, I think it would be noteworthy to point out to members of the Assembly that the score is 5 to 2 for the Oilers at the end of the second period.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Speaking to the subamendment, the hon. Minister of Career Development and Employment.

MR. ORMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. With regard to this subamendment, as the hon. Leader of the Opposition has indicated, it references management, and suggesting that

by adding "management and" after "establishing a method of.

I think I'd like to respond in the sense that in fact we have improved the management of lotteries dollars in terms of Bill 10 in its present form.

Firstly, the member should know that for the past 14 years the dollars that have accrued as a result of sales in the Interprovincial Lottery Corporation for Alberta's account have been held in the province of Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, it was traditional in the past that the ministers would make requests to Manitoba, requesting particular dollars for particular programs. I felt it was appropriate, as did my colleagues, that to increase the accountability under Bill 10, we would create a fund. Certainly we have referred extensively to the creation of that fund in Bill 10. Now, to suggest that this Bill diverges from the management that is referenced in the amendment, I reject.

I should also point out that with regard to the management under the Bill, the hon. Leader of the Opposition did indicate that, in fact, the Auditor General had made some recommendations, but I reject that the Auditor General prioritized his recommendations. He simply made two points in recommending to the government as to manners in which the dollars for lotteries funds should be used.

Now, what I'd like to read into the record, Mr. Speaker, to show that the government has responded to the management requests by the Auditor General is the paragraph the Member for Edmonton-Norwood left out. The Auditor General recommends that lottery proceeds "be paid into the General Revenue Fund as required by" prevailing legislation. I submit Mr. Speaker, that the prevailing legislation as it stands would require the government to put the dollars into general revenue. The Auditor General, however, noted that if the government would prefer that lotteries proceeds not be paid into the General Revenue Fund, legislation should be enacted to create a special statutory fund or a provincial agency through which the receipt and disbursement of the lotteries proceeds would pass.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that is as important a paragraph as the Member for Edmonton-Norwood read into the record. The Auditor General indicated that we either do one or the other. I would suggest that the Auditor General in his report made no prioritized recommendation as to how to deal with lotteries dollars.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I should also point out that with regard to the subamendment -- and we are referencing proper management -- the dollars that will be deposited into the fund will be administered by virtue of the Provincial Treasurer's powers under the Financial Administration Act, section 20(3) and section 21. That in the past has not occurred. As I indicated, we are improving the management of the lotteries dollars, because we are bringing them back and putting them into a pool. As I have indicated on numerous occasions in this Legislature, every nickel of the lotteries dollars that is spent is documented in public accounts, in the annual reports of all the boards and agencies that make the decisions. And I submit that the decisions the volunteers that man those boards and agencies make are very good ones. They come from across the province. To suggest that the decisions that would be made in this Legislature are better than the decisions that Albertans volunteering on these boards and agencies make, I reject that. I reject the elitist attitude, Mr. Speaker, that would suggest that this Legislature is the only place where good ideas are generated. In fact that is not the

case.

There are many capable Albertans who make recommendations in the area of 1,500 applications, 1,500 recommendations a year, through the boards and foundations that disburse lotteries dollars. I believe that is an appropriate way to do it. It allows these agencies to move in a timely fashion and to respond to the needs of the recreational organizations, the amateur sport organizations, and the cultural endeavours in this province. I refuse to make those decisions at the time this Legislature sits that would restrict and hamper the ability of those individuals to respond to the needs of Albertans. So I would ask, Mr. Speaker, that all members of this House recognize the increased accountability under Bill 10 and that with regard to the subamendment, they join in voting that subamendment down.

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

MR. YOUNIE: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I have a number of points to make about the subamendment. I had initially planned to spend some minutes profusely thanking and praising the hon. Leader of the Opposition for such a wise addition to an already fine amendment, but he did warn me that that might be seen by the Speaker as being off the topic of the motion, so I won't do that. I'll try to get right to the point. That notwithstanding, Mr. Speaker, the subamendment does make a very, very sound addition to it, bringing in the broader view of the whole management philosophy exemplified in Bill 10, the management philosophy just very much supported by the minister himself and the management philosophy that makes us so fearful that Bill 10 guarantees mismanagement of lottery funds in the future because of the management style of the present government.

The Leader of the Opposition mentioned a king being beheaded. I think it's safe to say that at least in the electoral sense a number of ministers of this government will be beheaded in the next election over this, and it will serve them right. What we see is nothing more or less than a Bill, and now a motion of closure to cut off any amendments and cut off any democratic debate. We see a Bill designed to dismantle democratic discussion of expenditures of a large sum of money, and we see an attempt to make sure that even that itself will not be democratically discussed to its fullest extent. For any member of the government to get up and argue that everything has been exhausted and there's nothing more valuable to say and there's no value in democratic discussion, at a point that I would consider fairly early in the debate on such a fundamentally important issue, is just insupportable and totally outrageous. It is something I will take some solace in at least in informing the electorate of the next election, because at that point, as the minister said, he will be held accountable, and he'd better be ready for it.

I would like to start by making some points about this amendment with an analogy, and although it may take a minute or two to get to the point, I'm sure members will understand and not interrupt too unreasonably soon. It involves something I saw today driving to a meeting in my constituency, that being a schoolyard at lunch hour with a young girl of 13 or 14 dancing most gracefully in a springlike fashion around her school chums in the schoolyard. Besides being something that was uplifting to the heart and made one wish for that age again -- as I'm sure many of us might after a day and an evening in this place arguing with each other -- it brought another thought to mind. What it brought to mind for me was the very fundamental reason for

fighting so hard against this Bill.

[Mr. Musgreave in the Chair]

I would not be surprised to find out, with the grace demonstrated by that young girl, that she was a member of a dance troupe somewhere in the city. It might be a dance troupe that gets funding through lottery funds under Bill 10 and the management style that Bill recommends to us. She might find that dance troupe in trouble if one of the directors of it happened to desire to become politically involved and much to the amazement of the minister in charge of lottery fund doling out, he found out that the political involvement involved an opposition party. That group might find themselves suddenly on the not-to-be-funded list, and there would be no recourse to discussion by the opposition, no recourse to democratic process. They would be out of luck. They would be out of luck not because what they did was not culturally valuable but because some minister who believed in a different management style believed this is the way you control people. This is the way you get the message to people who they should support come election time, so that maybe for another 14 years you can try to bribe them back into line. So I think witnessing that young lady dancing in the schoolyard today reinforced for me how important it is to fight this Bill every inch of the way, even if every inch of the way is only till midnight tonight and then we see the guillotine come down on democratic debate.

I would point out that this government argues that a muzzle on the opposition is part of the democratic process. It seems to me that also reflects the management style of this particular government. To zero in on that whole problem of management style, I think what we see here are very clear battle lines between groups that believe in two completely different management styles for government, notwithstanding that some members of the opposition believe in one when they're in opposition and another when they're in power. That notwithstanding, we see two different types, and that's the corporate versus the democratic management style. And they are totally different. We have a Conservative government that obviously very strongly believes in corporate management style. Corporate management style is designed to be efficient. It's not designed to be fair; it's designed to work well in a situation of cutthroat competition. It's designed to work well preying on self-interest. It's designed to work well in a situation where might makes right. That is the management style this government is trying to push on us with this particular Bill.

They want to have a minister and his chosen few that might be comparable to a board of directors being able to sit down and make arbitrary decisions for whatever reasons of self-interest they might have. Now, those reasons of self-interest could be cultural if you happen to be lucky enough to have a minister who's very cultured and interested in cultural activities. I would point out that the fact that a minister is wealthy enough to afford a better tailor does not necessarily make him more cultural or better cultured, so we shouldn't get confused on that particular point. What we will see is the self-interest of the minister becoming the watchword and the operating philosophy of the doling out of lottery funds. Therefore, the whole management style of lottery funds will change with each successive minister, depending on his philosophy, just the same as if a business is taken over by a new owner and manager, its operating philosophy may change very drastically.

Now, I don't mind that in business. I think that has its ap-

proprate place in business. I happen to have a philosophy and belong to a party that has a philosophy that says, "In government the democratic philosophy is the one that counts." It's not the board of director style where everyone but the chairman of the board nods and says, "Yes, R.O., that's very good; we'll give that group lots of money this time," and so on. It's a totally different philosophy and I think deserves a closer look, because it's obvious the government party doesn't have the slightest clue what it's all about.

They obviously do understand the corporate style. I do not believe -- and I think this Bill proves -- that they understand democratic management style. First of all, it's not as efficient, I concede. Dictatorship is much more efficient than democracy. I will concede that. If all you want is efficiency, then maybe we should get rid of democracy. That's certainly what the government is trying to do with this Bill. If, on the other hand, you're looking for something that goes beyond efficiency, you're looking at all the ideals of parliamentary democracy as part of your management style, where you want open discussion, where you want a chance to look at all sides, where you want a chance to study alternatives, where you want a chance to give fair opportunity to everyone, then in that case you have to look at a more democratic management style. You're not going to see that under Bill 10. It just won't be there. So not only is the management process being instituted by Bill 10 unnecessary; it's downright dangerous if you happen to believe in the democratic management style.

What we're going to see under Bill 10 -- and I don't mean to offend any particular minister, but I think the history of Conservative governments in this country proves I'm correct -- is management by bribery of the electorate with what is, in effect, their own money, saying, "Well, you know, I suppose your group could get the grant and keep operating in this very important cultural area if you just happen to think the right way." I'm sure the ministers involved in future will have some way of making sure they gently get around to the point that this money is not just given for the fun of it; it's given to ensure faithful service to the governing party in future. Certainly, as I said, the history of Conservative governments in this country, provincially and federally, proves that that is standard operating procedure.

You're going to see management by self-interest. By definition the purpose of a political party is to first obtain and then maintain power in the political arena to carry out their own political agenda, so their self-interest will by definition be the maintenance of power. Hence that will lead to what I just mentioned, which is management by bribery. And what you'll see under the present government is management by typical Tory philosophy, which is the whole corporate structure mentality that I don't believe has done nearly as well for government as it has done for business.

Now, the minister leapt to oppose this subamendment and defend the Bill itself, and it was interesting that after making vehement accusations that we were just repeating ourselves, mainly what he came out with were the same tired arguments of a few others of his party who'd worked up the fortitude to get up and try to defend this horrendous Bill. So if anybody in the Legislature could be accused of wasteful repetition, it would have been the minister.

He did make a couple of new points, because he was also responding to what the Leader of the Opposition had said. Certainly what the Leader of the Opposition said was a new, improved look at this whole Bill that the minister may not have heard before. He talked about creating improved management

with Bill 10. There's only one way he can argue it's improved management, and that is if his only goal is brutal efficiency. And he dragged out the argument he'd used before about how he didn't want to have to hold up these cultural groups getting their grant money, so he was going to make it so he could do it on a wing and a prayer, so to speak, and dole it out to whomever he chose at any point in time he chose. Somehow that was absolutely necessary to the functioning of all the cultural groups in the province that receive lottery funds. That has to be one of the most ridiculous and insupportable arguments I've ever heard anywhere. I've had grade 8 students come up with better logic in classroom debates. That notwithstanding the minister's saying that.

Now, I would be the first to say that even in a democracy, where I believe you should take all the time necessary to exhaust all points of view on these kinds of important philosophical issues, you'll run into situations where that very efficient management style the minister wants to brag about might be necessary. That's why we have a minister of disaster services, and that's why we have special warrants capability: so that can be done. We do not need the Minister of Career Development and Employment running around his office like a chicken with its head cut off saying: "Oh, my gosh, this group's in an emergency. We have to give them another quarter of a million dollars so they can keep on doing their cultural activities." If that is a confession on his part that that's the best he can plan and that's the most foresight we can count on him giving us, then he should resign, because that would be a sign of the most abysmal inability to manage and gauge the future, see what these groups need, consult ahead of time, and bring intelligent suggestions into the Legislature so we can debate them and get them through in time to help the groups. I hope the minister isn't admitting that he's that abysmally inefficient. I'm sure at some point he'll want to respond to that.

He talked about the Auditor General's recommendations in a way that I think very clearly stated, from his point of view, that what he's doing in Bill 10 is what the Auditor General told him to do. That is just not factually correct. The Auditor General, in all the quotes I heard read tonight, including the quotes read by the minister to defend his position, never once said, "I think the Minister of Career Development and Employment should set up a political slush fund over which he alone has arbitrary and whimsical control." Now, if the Auditor General said that somewhere in the report, then I would appreciate some hon. member giving me the page number so I can read it. Until somebody says that, I refuse to believe that's a recommendation of the Auditor General. That is so obviously the whole management and disbursement method that is intended to be set up by this Bill that if the minister is saying the Auditor General supports him, then the minister is saying the Auditor General told him to set up a political slush fund over which he would have arbitrary control. That is just plain and obviously wrong.

So I think what we see, Mr. Speaker, through this subamendment, through the amendments that have been made, through the closure motion we just had a division on, and through the Bill itself is a very clear dichotomy developing in the House. I think it's a dichotomy that must be made clear to the voters. We have a party forming the government that believes efficiency and their own political self-interest override democracy, and we have an opposition that believes democratic process is important and has value in itself and should not be circumvented. We are here tonight debating a subamendment and eventually an amendment and then the Bill itself that is intended to allow a

minister of the Crown to override the basic, fundamental principles of democratic process and disburse funds of a very substantial nature without any discussion in the Legislature.

Now, the minister argued again -- and it was the same tired argument we'd heard before, but I think if he's going to bring it up tonight it deserves another response -- that the Public Accounts is a good enough way to do this, that two years down the road the opposition can come back and say, "Well, but hold on, a year a half or two years ago you gave to this group and left out that group, and maybe you should have thought of this group" and so on. That is the most silly and ridiculous argument that could be given for that point. Obviously, after-the-fact accounting is different than accountability. Again, I will define very carefully for the minister and all the government members the difference. Accounting is adding up the figures after you've spent the money to see what's left over. Accountability is being held accountable beforehand, to be scrutinized before you spend the money so that the public and all the people they elected to represent them in the Legislature, including the opposition, can scrutinize what you're doing and say: "Whoa; hold off. No, this is wrong. Change your mind a little." It's too late two years down the road. So I would ask the minister to abandon that fallacious and silly argument as quickly as possible, because it just doesn't hold water.

Mr. Speaker, I think eventually tonight we're going to see proof, recorded for every Albertan to see, that that dichotomy of those who believe the purpose of government is to get around democracy and those who believe the purpose of government is to democratically approach everything will be established. I'm very proud to be on the side that says there is value in democracy, there is value in parliamentary debate, and I'm willing to stand up at every opportunity tonight to be recorded that way.

Thank you.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Member for Westlock-Sturgeon.

MR. TAYLOR: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It's very much like a lottery. I think it must be some of the backbenchers of the Tories there.

Mr. Speaker, speaking to the amendment and the subamendment together, the public expenditure that is unnecessary, I think one of the things -- and I'll not try to cover the whole waterfront -- is the whole question of invoking closure for a taxing Bill. I think if you were to study the democratic procedures of the western world and the number of times closure is used, it's of course used very rarely, Mr. Speaker. But I don't think I've ever heard of it being used for a taxing Bill. It is used to get a pipeline done on time or an airline completed or a battleship built. There has to be some sense of emergency. Mr. Speaker, as you so often have lectured us, if we move a motion asking for a debate, there has to be some sense of urgency in it. Yet now we have a closure motion that, as far as can be seen by anybody in the opposition, may speed up the proroguing of this House by a few hours or maybe a day or so, but it's certainly not going to affect the collection procedures of the government. It's not going to affect the giving of largess by our fairy godfather over there.

MR. SHRAKE: Point of order. I'm sorry; are we still on the subamendment, or are we talking about the closure motion?

AN HON. MEMBER: That was already voted on.

MR. SHRAKE: Oh. Well, there must be some confusion. He seems to be speaking on the closure motion, and I think we're discussing the subamendment now, sir.

MR. TAYLOR: My understanding is that after a closure motion goes in, everything's fair up to midnight as long as it touches on the Bill. I am not debating the closure motion. That has already been passed, Mr. Speaker. What I am saying is: what was the rush?

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member perhaps could be better heard by all members of the Assembly if there was a little more order which would allow the hon. member to speak and be heard by all of us.

MR. TAYLOR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You sometimes have to pry their ears apart to drop an idea in now and again, but it is a good idea. They've all been raised with the thought that if you had an open mind, somebody was going come along and throw garbage in it, so they've kept it shut all these years. But I will do my best to get a bit in there.

Now, we've talked about why a closure motion would possibly be used to run through a taxing Bill. I see no possible sense in it, Mr. Speaker, except to show unbridled power, the macho instinct of a front bench that's gone wild. I can't blame the back bench on this, because this motion is as much against the back bench of their party, maybe more so, as it is against the opposition, because this Bill clearly sets up a crown prince system. You don't have to go to Saudi Arabia, Mr. Speaker, to see the number one, number three, number eight prince. We can tell here by which minister the Premier is going to allot with the joy of giving out the largess or greasing the wheels of the election machine. When one little gnome is picked -- and I would refer this to the backbenchers over here -- when one of their cabinet ministers is picked to be able to spend money without any reference back to the Legislature, it must concern them. Section 6 -- and I say this for the hon. Member for Calgary-Millican, because he'll have to get wise as to who to suck up to in a hurry here -- says:

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

Wonderful. But then it goes on, Mr. Speaker, and I'd like the hon. Member for Calgary-Millican to remember this if he wants to stop those evil smells floating through his constituency:

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

Not what the Conservative Party considers, not what the back bench considers, not what the rest of the bench considers, but what the minister considers is important. So gentlemen and hon. members of the back bench, I would suggest you polish your nose and get in line for the largess that might be coming to those who pay homage to those who have been appointed by the crown prince of distributing money.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is the type of Bill that stretches the imagination; it boggles. They use an argument, for instance, that whoever collects it can spend it. Well, I'm waiting now for the Solicitor General -- he has a pretty good kickback too: *pari-mutuels*. The same way: playing on greed or, if you want to call it, the expectation of people that buy a bet on a horse -- who knows, it might even be owned by the front bench -- to

possibly generate some money for them. This way, of course, a lottery is a little fairer than maybe a horse race. Nevertheless, are we going to see the Solicitor General given the privilege of spending his money? Or does he rank so far down in the Tory hierarchy that we don't feel he has to be given any money to go out there and bribe and gain support amongst the constituencies of this province?

We have a fuel tax. Now, that's collected by the Minister of Energy. Is the Minister of Energy so retiring and so lacking in ambition that they cannot give the Minister of Energy his little golden pot to swing through the neighbourhood to give out money here, there, and everywhere?

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: May I request the permission of the Assembly to revert to the Introduction of Special Guests?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hon. Minister of Agriculture.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**
(*reversion*)

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, with your consent, may I seek unanimous consent to introduce a guest in the gallery? [interjections]

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and my colleagues. I take great pride in introducing an individual I had the opportunity to serve with in the House of Commons in my former life. He's a Member of Parliament from Brandon, Mr. Lee Clark. I would ask him to rise in the public gallery and receive the warm applause of this House.

[Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair]

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

Bill 10
Interprovincial Lottery Amendment Act, 1988
(*continued*)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. TAYLOR: Yes, Mr. Speaker, continuing. And may I also pay tribute to the hon. member who used to sit in the federal House, I'm sure in all those years he was there he never saw any government, regardless of political faith . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: He still is there, Nick,

MR. TAYLOR: Oh, he's still there, I'm sorry, . . . that would have the gall to ask that one minister be allowed, as I read again, to spend money "for any other purpose the Minister considers to be in the public interest."

Now, to go on from that, I've wondered why the Minister of Energy hasn't been able to get this sort of pull with the front bench. And we might finish up with the Provincial Treasurer, the main collector of all -- and I'm sorry, the Minister of Agriculture says, "Why not me?" If I were the Minister of Agriculture and had designs on the top post of the Tory party -- and I

must admit that even in my worst nightmares I've never thought of that Mr. Speaker, But if I did, indeed, slip a cog and thirst for that at one time, it would bother me no end to see that one of my competitors had his left hand or his right hand so far into the taxpayers' pocket that he could buy almost any privilege he wanted from a gang of backbenchers wanting to get support and projects under way in their community. I wouldn't blame the Minister of Agriculture for thinking that, indeed, this had been some very, very, very discriminatory practice.

Now, we go on a little bit further, Mr. Speaker. I'm pointing out, and I want to get across, that it's the backbenchers I'm worried about. I hate to see them taken advantage of. Everybody realizes the opposition is there to sort of fight a cause, but we never really expect it. We in the opposition never really did expect that government was going to do any more than go through the motions and present the projects, but I think worthy of debate. But if you're a backbencher, I think you have every right to think that somebody in your party isn't selected out, touched with the golden wand or whatever it is, with the right to spend without checking back with anyone else. That must bother them a great deal.

Now, the Senate. If we're talking about the ability to spend money -- if I may talk about it in a democratic right -- one of the marks of an elected House is their ability to spend money. A Senate doesn't get the right to spend money. It is only the representatives of the people that are supposed to spend money. So consequently -- and this is rather interesting for a party that argues for an elected Senate, or a Triple E Senate -- when they indeed appoint somebody almost like a Senator that does not have to return to this House, does not have to ask for a budget, it indeed blows your mind. What kind of democratic process are we working at? It certainly strikes at the very heart of democracy, because everyone knows that he who pays the piper calls the tune.

Mr. Speaker, all I can do is go on record, and I know we're going to have a lot of time yet for many others. I know many other people are going to want to take a kick at this, because it is so fantastic to see, first of all, why this necessitated closure. Why the big hurry for the Bill? But even more so, why a Bill as odious as this? And I may quote a rather famous politician from years back: you backbenchers have been told to hold your nose and vote for it. A very famous politician made that quote, Mr. Speaker, and apparently this is what this back bench has been asked. I cannot understand why there isn't a revolt amongst the members not on the front bench that anyone on the front bench would have this type of authority. Mr. Speaker, it's fantastic. This will go down as one of the more amazing Acts of this government, and an Act I am sure, that I and all members of the opposition -- I'm sure all members of the Liberal Party -- are going to make sure we use time and time again. Every voter in this province by the end of the next election will know about number 10: the great slush fund. And if you haven't had your share, it means you weren't sucking up to the right slush fund.

So, Mr. Speaker, all I can say is that I don't understand how a government would commit hara-kiri in the way this government has. But I guess that's one of the opportunities and one of the things we in the opposition must expect from time to time: an opportunity to exploit that we would never have expected from anyone being in their right mind.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

MS LAING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to speak in support of this subamendment.

This Legislature has as its primary mandate the management and disbursement of funds collected by this government. This government somehow holds that it is only responsible and publicly accountable for the management and disbursement of funds that it considers tax dollars: those dollars which are collected as taxes. However these funds, the lottery funds, are collected from Albertans. They are public funds, and therefore the government is accountable. In fact, these funds are a form of involuntary taxation in the same way as the tax on alcohol, tobacco, or fuel is. And people who wish to buy lottery tickets, in the same way people who wish and choose to buy alcohol or tobacco do, must pay this tax. There is no escaping this tax, and it is, in fact, a form of tax and therefore a form of public funds. Management of these funds, therefore, must be covered under the present procedures and mechanisms of this Legislative Assembly and its committees.

In supporting this amendment, we hold to the mandate of this Assembly and its committee to do the work that it is their duty to do and that they are elected to do. Management implies thoughtful analysis of alternatives and priorities for spending, taking into account all possibilities and the specific and general needs of those groups applying for the funds and the needs of the populations being served by the groups applying for the funds in the context of the needs of all Albertans. Surely a sum of money this large, \$113 million, and how it is to be spent should be subject to public scrutiny and to a management process, not spent piecemeal, willy-nilly, through allocation here and there at the whim of a minister.

This is a government that we hear often proudly speak of their fiscal management skills and their accountability. Surely a government that holds to fiscal management and accountability will not turn over to one minister to spend at his whim and will \$113 million. It flies in the face of common sense. We would therefore ask that this government support this subamendment and reaffirm its commitment to the management processes already in place, management decisions that are open to public scrutiny and question. The Minister of the Environment has characterized this government as action oriented, and holds that as a reason we cannot bring these funds to be accountable to this Assembly. But surely he does not imply that they act for the sake of acting; that is, action for action's sake. What we need is thoughtful and planned action. That is management.

This amendment demands that we keep these funds in the management realm, not in the unreflective action realm. It holds the government accountable through public scrutiny, through this Legislature, through the questions of the opposition. I've heard many people say, "What we need is a strong opposition to make this government accountable." This subamendment guarantees that accountability. This minister says, "We're only doing in this Bill what we've done for the past 14 years"; that is, circumventing the Legislative Assembly and the managing function of this Assembly and its committee, and instead indulging and spending as ministers see fit. I would respectfully point out that the last minister who was responsible for administering these funds no longer sits in this Assembly. The constituents of Edmonton-Avonmore chose to send an opposition member to help hold this government accountable. I would invite this minister to pause and reflect upon such things.

Mr. Speaker, I do not support this amendment to protect the government and this minister from the folly of their ways. I support this amendment on behalf of the people of Alberta, be-

cause many have said to me, "Make this government accountable; make it accountable to the people of this province through the Legislative Assembly; make it accountable through the full Assembly, not just through a small subcommittee such as the Public Accounts Committee which scrutinizes spending after the fact."

Let us be very clear about what we are debating. We are debating a process of how decisions are made. We are not arguing the rightness or the wrongness of decisions that have been made in the past or that will be made in the future. What we are debating is the process of decision-making. We are arguing for a democratic process, a process of public scrutiny and debate around the management and disbursement of public funds. I therefore ask for your support of this subamendment.

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

MR. STRONG: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's a privilege for me this evening to stand in the Legislative Assembly and speak in favour of the subamendment offered by the Member for Edmonton-Norwood and the amendment offered by the Member for Edmonton-Avonmore. For the record, I'd like to read both in and combine them, because I'd like to distribute this to some of the individuals in the constituency of St. Albert who sent letters to me -- correspondence, telephone calls -- in opposition to Bill 10. The amendment, in connection with the subamendment, Mr. Speaker, reads that

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

Truer words were never spoken, Mr. Speaker.

I think it's interesting to comment that I like listening every once in a while to the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon, to some of the comments he makes. I especially preferred the one where he said that the backbenchers here with this Conservative government should polish their noses and get in line at the Minister of Career Development and Employment's office to see if they could get some of the largess offered by this government. Mr. Speaker, I think that gives me pause to reflect that there have been circumstances and events that have led me and others in Alberta to believe that this government treats constituencies who elect Progressive Conservative MLAs in a somewhat different manner than they treat the constituencies who elect opposition MLAs. I think that is a very good example of exactly what the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon referred to.

In speaking to the subamendment, the whole question of the subamendment is accountability. On the question of accountability, I think I'd like to refer back to *Hansard* of May 19, 1988, and some of the comments made by the Minister of Career Development and Employment. I'll quote:

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.

Mr. Speaker, it's obvious that this minister doesn't care, obvious that he doesn't care for the democratic process, or he wouldn't be leaping to his feet and speaking to matters that are very undemocratic, that do not allow for scrutiny, that do not allow for open government, the open government that these government members like to stand in public and spout about. Because when you get down to the reality, that's what the question is: do we as Albertans really have open government?

Mr. Speaker, the New Democrat Official Opposition and myself, as the Member for St. Albert, certainly are not opposed

to the utilization of lottery funds for recreational or cultural purposes. That isn't a problem. I think certainly we support that, and the constituents and residents of the province of Alberta support that. These lottery funds have been used in a very good manner and have brought a lot of benefit to members of this province, members of various organizations, associations, that have benefited from the utilization of these dollars. But, Mr. Speaker, it gets right back to accountability, accountability for in excess of \$100 million in lottery funds not only to us as Members of this Legislative Assembly but also to Albertans.

The minister of career development went on further in his comments and stated:

I'm accountable to the people of Alberta, and I'm not accountable to one of those individuals who represent the NDP.

Mr. Speaker, this is unbelievable. Certainly, being members of the New Democrat Official Opposition in this Legislative Assembly, we are Members of the Legislative Assembly, the same as everybody in this Assembly, and certainly we are Albertans. We might have some variances and some differences in political processes and ideology, but certainly we are elected Members of this Legislative Assembly, and I'm certain, from some of the treatment I've got from some of the various government offices and government ministries, that yes, Members of the Legislative Assembly, MLAs, are treated in a somewhat different fashion than members of the general public at large. But I only said "in some cases," because that isn't true in all cases, as evidenced, I think, in a letter I wrote to the minister who was responsible for Alberta Mortgage and Housing: it only took eight months to get an answer back from that particular department to a concern I had expressed to me from one of the constituents in St. Albert.

Mr. Speaker, no, we are not opposed to the utilization of lottery funds for useful purposes, but certainly are opposed to a minister, a single minister, having the total discretion and authority of what these lottery funds are going to be used for.

Mr. Speaker, again I read from the comments of the May 19th *Hansard* from the Minister of Career Development and Employment, and he states:

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.

Mr. Speaker, the whole question of lottery funds, the establishment of a special lottery fund and the disbursements by this person who thinks he is special in having total authority to disburse these funds, that's what's in question. This is not a political argument between a New Democrat caucus, a PC caucus, a Liberal caucus, a Representative caucus. It is an argument over what is in the best interests of Albertans. That is the concern; that's the major concern. It's not a political argument. It's an argument over protecting the democratic process and accountability forever, not just in this two years or three years that we will sit here prior to going into another provincial election.

Mr. Speaker, it's common sense, and a commonsense approach to the management of money. I think if you read the amendment, the amendment says we have an unnecessary process here before us contained in Bill 10. And in my view, I view that to be correct. There is no necessity to establish a special lottery fund, because it isn't necessary as it's laid out in section 5 of Bill 10. This minister knows that. Why he persists in trying to defend Bill 10 -- it's like attempting to defend the indefensible. It can't be defended. It speaks against the democratic process and against the parliamentary process of accountability of any government. The expenditures of these moneys should be scrutinized by this Assembly, and we have to protect

those processes. Not only the democratic process but the parliamentary process must be maintained and supported not only by us in the Official Opposition or the opposition members in this Assembly but by all members of this Legislative Assembly. It's their responsibility, and it's also their commitment to meet that responsibility to the citizens of Alberta. And, Mr. Speaker, I'd suggest to you, and through you to them, that they are not measuring up to the responsibilities Albertans gave them to govern in the province of Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, we're not talking about loan guarantees. And obviously they're not accountable for that, because we've asked many times on the Order Paper in questions; they're not accountable for almost \$2 billion in loan guarantees. Now, why is it that they want to again not be responsible in the expenditure of \$100 million-plus in lottery funds? These are public moneys. Public moneys deserve full disclosure, deserve full accountability, and even though this is a voluntary form of tax, it is still a tax that is public moneys, public funds. I'd hate to think that if all those corporate entities this government gave money to in the last few years went bankrupt or into receivership, the Alberta public, the public purse, would be accountable to the tune of \$2 billion. Now, Mr. Speaker, that doesn't make any sense to me, and it doesn't make any sense not only to the constituents I represent in St. Albert but also to the constituents we call Albertans.

I indicated earlier that I am not opposed to the utilization of lottery funds to support recreation and culture initiatives. We are not opposed to that. Why, even today, just this morning, I got a letter from one of my constituents that spoke of all the wonderful things this government had done with those lottery funds, but spoke out very vehemently opposed to the Minister of Career Development and unemployment -- Employment; I'll be nice -- having the total authority to decide what was in the public interest. Vehemently opposed, Mr. Speaker.

The method of disbursement is a primary concern I have encountered in the correspondence and telephone calls I have received. That is Albertans' primary concern. Why this minister will not address in his legislation putting these moneys into general revenues is just beyond me, and beyond common sense in most people's minds. Mr. Speaker, this government knows that the majority of Albertans do not support this government's utilization of lottery fund moneys as a political slush fund. Perhaps this government isn't doing that. Perhaps this minister isn't doing that. But where is the accountability? What perception do Albertans have in their minds when it's reported in the media that that's exactly what they're using this money for: as a political slush fund to garner themselves a few votes in the next election. Because that is the perception of the general public, certainly the general public I've talked to. This is unnecessary, as it creates the possibility for abuse, and that process has no place in a democratic society.

Mr. Speaker, this government has even insisted on closure tonight: closure on Bill 10. That's unnecessary too. Certainly this government still has 60 members who can vote. We've only got 22 on this side. You can't lose a vote. What are you afraid of? What are you afraid of that you have to invoke closure, that you won't allow us to debate intelligently the legislation that you've put before us . . . [interjections] . . . even in spite of some of the comments we're getting from some of those little people over here to my left? They know I'm right. They know it, and that's why they're flapping their lips. That's exactly why they're flapping their gums, Mr. Speaker: because they don't like what I'm saying, because they know it's the

truth.

Mr. Speaker, the expenditure of public moneys demands full disclosure the same as the loan guarantees that they won't give us. They won't give us the details on that: public moneys, Mr. Speaker. Now, that is not accountability, and it's not open government. Those processes are available in this Assembly. They're available to this government. All they have to do is put those lottery funds into the general revenues of this government and then we have no problem. But this government won't even listen to the Auditor General, who suggested that that's exactly what they do. You know, I'd like to ask the Minister of Career Development and Employment just exactly why it took him so long in responding to what the Auditor General recommended in his reports. Why did that take so long? You know, again the Minister of Career Development and Employment jumping to his feet to defend his particular Bill, Bill 10, I find almost ridiculous. You cannot defend the indefensible; you can't defend that.

Why, this minister even suggested to us on this side of the House -- because I was listening -- that by creating a separate lottery fund it would improve the management of the lottery. Mr. Speaker, that's absurd. We know that. How is that going to improve the management of those lottery funds? Certainly they are accounted for now, and they'd probably be even better accounted for if they formulated part and parcel as general revenues of the government of the province of Alberta. I'd like to ask this minister -- he went through a few ridiculous reasons why it would create better management. I'd like him to get some sound advice to us on this side of the Assembly, indicating just exactly how it will create better and more efficient management of this fund.

Mr. Speaker, the minister jumped to his feet again and told us again that all of the expenditures of these lottery funds -- you've got accountability; you've got accountability in the Public Accounts. But the only thing he forgot to address is that at times almost two years elapse before we as the Official Opposition or any opposition member or even any government backbencher has the opportunity to look at public accounts and then write a letter to the minister to say, "Well, who got what, and what did they use it for?" Because those details aren't in there. They know that. Now, why isn't the minister more open with the Members of this Legislative Assembly and the people of the province of Alberta when he makes statements in the Legislative Assembly? I call that into question, Mr. Speaker.

The minister also mentioned an elitist attitude. The only elitist attitude that I've seen during this debate has been demonstrated by government members in trying to defend a single minister's right, a Tory's right, a Progressive Conservative member's right, to dispense public moneys in the general public's interest, with him having total authority and total control over the expenditure of that money. I think I said in the last debate that I would certainly like to be King Tut passing out those jewels to my special friends.

Now, Mr. Speaker, is that fair? Is that fairness? Is it equity? Is it open government? Is it commitment to the people? It's none of those. It's secrecy. And I don't know why they want to be secret, because we can't win a vote either. What are they trying to hide? What are they trying to hide, Mr. Speaker? I don't know.

You know, I sometimes wonder here -- and I've sat here for just about two years listening to some of the statements made by the members opposite defending some of the ridiculous legislation that I've seen passed in this Legislative Assembly. I think

people out there are more concerned with jobs, some continuity of employment, some stability. Yet when we sit in this Legislative Assembly, we end up debating things like how to make a minister a special person, a very special person, where even the backbenchers are going to have to polish their noses up and get in line. But, Mr. Speaker, is that reality and is it common sense? I don't think it is.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I'd ask not only the backbenchers to my left but the government members to support this subamendment. Take this Bill back to the drawing board, back to the office, and re-evaluate just exactly who this minister and this government represent. Do they represent the people of the province of Alberta, or are they trying to represent a single minister having the right to play God?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hon. members, before we proceed, the pages have left for the evening. Hon. members who require assistance, perhaps they could indicate to one of our security officers for assistance, only in passing messages, et cetera.

Hon. Member for Edmonton-Gold Bar.

MRS. HEWES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to support this subamendment and amendment to this very curious Bill. At least the amendments introduce some modicum of sense and sensibility to the Bill.

You know, when I read the Bill, I said to myself, what next? What on earth will they do next? It's very hard to understand where this would come from. I'm frankly disappointed and appalled at the notion of closure on a Bill such as this that fundamentally changes the democratic process of stewardship of public moneys. This I believe to be an abuse of power to maintain power; that's what it is. It's one more flagrant example of centralizing control. In fact, it is endowing one minister with immense capacity to wield power and to impose decisions according to his own desires. And I frankly say, what next? At least the amendment would put some management mechanisms in place.

Mr. Speaker, the Auditor General recommended to the Legislative Assembly that lottery funds should be considered public funds and that the government should adhere to its own Bill in regard to them and return surplus funds to the general account. He suggested that otherwise, a mechanism should be developed for disbursement. So we said to the government, "Government, you should either obey your law or, of course, you have the option, I suppose, of changing the law." We even brought a court action from the Liberal caucus to draw the government's attention and try to force them to obey the Bill that they themselves had put in place. Now, you might call this piece of action that we're talking about tonight an out-of-court settlement, because that's literally what's happened here. Given the choice of obeying the law or changing it, to my horror what did they do? They changed the law, which shows very, very little respect, in my view, for the parliamentary and democratic process.

Mr. Speaker, I have not disagreed with the system that's been in place, apart from the surplus funds. I think the idea of using foundations to disburse money for recreation and cultural activities has been a reasonable one. But I've constantly, I must admit, been amused by the quaint methods that the government has applied for disbursing the funds. The foundations, the voluntary groups who are objective, supposedly, and knowledgeable, make the decisions, and then the government hands out the cheques and gets the photo opportunities. Now, exactly whom are we kidding? We're certainly not kidding the public. They

know precisely what this process is all about.

Mr. Speaker, the surplus should be returned to general revenue as per the original plan for a proposal to be submitted on expenditures, to be debated and determined on the basis of merit by the Legislature. Lottery funds are not found money. They cannot be accurately predicted. And I believe that what has happened in this last session, where extra funds were simply handed out according to some pattern, some priorities. I suppose, of the government, could well raise expectations among certain groups in our province that cannot be fulfilled in another year. The surplus this year was in fact spent without legislative input, and that's what this Bill, I suppose, is intended to pursue. Now, this system certainly doesn't build any confidence in the general public regarding government spending priorities being open to scrutiny, debate, and accountability.

You know, Mr. Speaker, this is a chance for the government to be a hero, to play it straight; here's a big chance. So I have to say: "Get ahold of yourselves. Think what you're doing here, government. Why go the loser route? Why choose the loser route?" And then I say, "Oh well, if they are determined to go on a collision course, I suppose they will do it, and some of the rest of us will be the recipients of the prize." But, Mr. Speaker, for the life of me I don't understand why they couldn't play it straight, why they couldn't do the right and proper thing, and we all know what that is.

[Mr. R. Moore in the Chair]

I believe this Bill, if unamended, would set an improper precedent for any other unanticipated revenues being disposed of without due process. Is the Heritage Savings Trust Fund next? Who knows what's going to go after this? Surprises, perhaps, are in order.

One likes to believe, Mr. Speaker, that under all circumstances the minister, who is now so nobly empowered with this immense fund, would be guided in his decisions by merit and need. But one also has to admit that this has the undeniable potential of a large amount of money to be kept and hoarded and stored and spent or squandered at the minister's whim and that it could be used for political purposes, to purchase friendship. Now, Mr. Speaker, there's a lot of cynicism out there about the integrity of government, and I think above all we must prove to the people of Alberta that this government is above spending public funds whimsically.

Mr. Speaker, this whole operation flies in the face of what the process is designed to accomplish. All of us in this Legislature are stewards of public funds. We have the capacity and the jurisdiction to raise essential funds through taxes and other means and to take custody of those and other revenues that accrue to the government and to disburse these according to a plan that is usually called the budget and is open to public scrutiny, to scrutiny in this House, to debate in this House, to public knowledge and understanding of how the decisions were made. But this particular Bill, if unamended, is a profound digression from that established tradition and pattern. I believe it's a dangerous Bill, and I think it will be found to be such. I think it's a mistake, and I think it's improper. I think it shows serious disrespect for the legislative tradition, disrespect for the legislative process, disrespect for members of the Legislature, and disrespect for the citizens of Alberta who contribute to the fund.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge members to support the sub-amendment, which, as I said, at least introduces some sense to the Bill.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Edmonton-Strathcona, please.

MR. WRIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The last number of speakers spoke of the very bad features of this Bill, and I don't intend to go over them, because by now you will have understood that what we object to is a thoroughly wrong method of the disbursements and management of the moneys. If the Bill said nothing on that score, we would be all right because the moneys would go into general revenue and there go under the ordinary scrutiny of the Assembly, which is shaky enough anyway but a darn sight better than what is proposed in this Bill.

I want to make a fresh point, which is that it is doubly important that we leave the management of this money as it would be were this Bill not passed, as the ordinary legislative process would have it, going through the Legislature and so on, because it is tainted money -- tainted, Mr. Speaker. And we only get to deal with it because of an exemption or concession in the Criminal Code.

[Mr. Musgreave in the Chair]

So we must go back to the origins of what makes it tainted money, and I refer members to a statute that I'm sure they're all fairly familiar with which is the origin of the gaming legislation that is treated in part 5 of the Criminal Code, to which the whole scheme of devolving lottery management to the provinces is an exception. And it is, of course, the well-known statute, chapter 6 of Richard II in the year 1388. It's a wonderful statute in this sense, that it consists of two sentences only, Mr. Speaker. I do fear that the art of drafting statutes has declined somewhat in the exactly 500 years which have elapsed since this statute was passed. The title of it is:

No servants in husbandry, or labourer, shall wear any sword, buckler, or dagger. Unlawful games prohibited.

I think to get the full flavour of it, I'll have to read it, but as I say, it's only two sentences long.

Item, it is accorded and assented, that no servant of husbandry, or labourer, nor servant, or artificer, nor of victualler, shall from henceforth bear any buckler, sword nor dagger, upon forfeiture of the same, but in the time of war for defence of the realm of *England*, and that by the surveying of the arrears for the time being, or travelling by the country with their master, or in their master's message, but such servants and labourers shall have bows and arrows, and use the same the *Sundays* and holydays, and leave all playing at tennis or football and other games called coits, dice, casting of the stone, kails, and other such importune games.

That's the first sentence, Mr. Speaker.

And that the sheriffs, mayors, bailiffs, and constables, shall have power to arrest, and shall arrest all doers against this statute, and seize the said bucklers, swords, and daggers, and keep them till the sessions of the justices of peace, and the same present before the same justices in their sessions, together with the names of them that did bear the same. *And it is not the King's mind that any prejudice be done to the franchises of lords, touching the forfeitures due to them.*

So we're into the Franchises Act too.

That lasted until the 21st year of James I, which I believe is 1624, which is 236 years, and then . . .

DR. WEST: A point of order.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: A point of order by the Member for Vermilion-Viking.

DR. WEST: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Enough is enough. But I would like the relevance of what is going on at the present time in reference to this amendment. I don't have to sit here and go through tirades of reading of scripture that isn't relevant to the day, when we're discussing an amendment to Bill 10.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman would listen to what is being said, he would understand the matter is entirely in order.

MR. SIGURDSON: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order that was raised by the hon. . . . [interjections]

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: To the hon. Member for Edmonton-Strathcona, I must admit I was having some problem figuring out what his remarks -- how they related to the sub-amendment. I would suggest that he try and bring them back to that.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Speaker, with the very greatest respect, I do suppose that you did not understand what I was saying, because otherwise, Mr. Speaker, you would have seen it is in order. It is in order in this respect. We're talking on a sub-amendment that adds to the amendment the words "management and." So we are pointing out that the Bill is a bad one because it interferes with the management and disbursement of the funds in the way that they would ordinarily be disbursed were it not for this Bill. And I am saying that the reason why it is necessary to keep the management in this House is because of all the things that have been said already, but also because it's tainted money.

If the hon. Member for Vermilion-Viking would listen instead of going off on some fantasy voyage, you'd understand that there's a historical context that shows why it's tainted. And I will trace the statute that I just have read right up to the present so that the House would understand -- I know hon. members are extremely anxious to understand -- why this money is tainted and exactly why it is so very bad that the management of it be taken out of the hands of the House in the way proposed by the Bill. [interjection]

MR. TAYLOR: Give him a colouring book. Keep him quiet.

MR. WRIGHT: Yes. Perhaps I should read the statute again since the hon. member obviously did not get the import of it the first time. But I think, though, out of courtesy to the other hon. members, I won't.

Mr. Speaker, this prohibition against gaming which had its origin in 1388 has continued up to the present day and is contained in part 5 of the Criminal Code, the title of which is Disorderly Houses, Gaming and Betting. Of course, it is no longer the case that the only reason for the prohibition against gaming and disorderly houses and betting is so that people will attend to the practice of archery, which was the original reason in the statute, that people were playing tennis and football and the like and not practising archery. There are other reasons now, but it's the same basic principle. By a very curious compact -- unprecedented, I think, in Canadian parliamentary history anyway -- of a delegation of legislation, contractually, in 1985 by the Criminal Code lotteries amendment Act of the federal House, a deal was made to make that exception, which is now section 190 of the Criminal Code, in the list of gaming that is unlawful, to delegate a whole chunk of it to the provinces. That, just so hon. members will remember, says that

Notwithstanding any of the provisions of this part relating to gaming and betting, it is lawful for the government of a province, either alone or in conjunction with the government in other provinces, to conduct and manage a lottery scheme in that province.

That is why we have the Bill called the Interprovincial Lottery Amendment Act.

Mr. Speaker, you will understand that the general prohibitions against gaming, of which the statute I started with was the first, were incorporated into the first Criminal Code of Canada in 1892, which was simply a writing down of *Stephens' Digest of the Criminal Law*, in which he included a code of the criminal law which was intended to be passed into law in the mother country but never was. It was in Canada, so we have it here, Mr. Speaker.

The essence of what I'm talking about is that the money that comes out of these activities, which at common law -- actually, you think it's common law, but it's actually old statutory law which is incorporated into the law of Canada -- is unlawful, is tainted, is money that is allowed as a concession to human frailty and, therefore, must be under the strict management of the government concerned, which up until 1985, with relatively minor exceptions dealing with prizes of small value at agricultural fairs and exhibitions, although it had extended somewhat beyond that in practice, was solely in the jurisdiction of the federal government.

And then this deal was made, Mr. Speaker. You may remember that in consideration of the provinces paying a hundred million dollars into the Calgary Winter Olympics, why, they would get a much expanded jurisdiction over lotteries. But it was still tainted money. Now this tainted money comes into the purse of the particular minister, and he alone may disburse it for any matter which he considers to be in the public interest. Others have gone into that, and I won't. But it is important to understand that the basis on which this delegation of the federal jurisdiction has been made is a shaky one. It has been achieved largely through behind-the-scenes negotiation between the provincial ministers responsible for revenue and lotteries and the Minister of State for Fitness and Amateur Sport at the federal level. And only in the final stages of that negotiation, which lasted between the time of the short-lived Conservative government of Mr. Clark in 1979 and when the Bill was passed on the last day of 1985, which it had to be; otherwise, it collapsed, under the contract entered into -- all of that was done not between Parliament and the provincial legislatures but between ministers.

So that was a highly unusual way of dealing with some exceptional and important legislation, and we see it continued here, Mr. Speaker, in the way that the money will be disbursed. It is wrong. The thing has been exceptional from the start, and now it is not only exceptional but it is wrong. It is wrong for all the reasons that others have stated, but it is wrong also because it is the last way we should be dealing with money that is the product of gaming, which is illegal except for the exceptions allowed out of a concession to human frailty, I suppose one can call it.

So, Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasize that the legislation under which this lotteries amendment Act is passed is on shaky constitutional ground. As two learned writers, Messrs. Osborne and Campbell, in a recent paper have said, as long as provincial gambling regulations and lotteries are under their general rubric, Mr. Speaker

. . . as long as provincial gambling regulations can be characterized as a licensing scheme rather than as an extension of punishment for a criminal offence it would appear arguable

that they would be valid as pertaining to the regulation of business within a province, but not otherwise.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I say it is very important that at all stages of the handling of the money, of the regulation of the provincial end of any lotteries scheme, the fullest control possible remain within this House. Otherwise, we'll sink deeper into the morass of exceptional legislation.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Member for Calgary-Buffalo.

MR. CHUMIR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this amendment. The issue before us is the method of managing and disbursing of lottery funds. The Minister of Career Development and Employment, in his comments, stated that this Bill has in fact improved the management and disbursement of such funds. This reminds me of the old *Monty Python* routine about the new automobile tire that had 200 percent more gripping power, I hasten to add that the standard of comparison was a banana peel. By the same analysis, the way in which Bill 10 deals with lottery funds compares well with the parliamentary practices of General Noriega, perhaps, but not with the legacy of parliamentary democracy that we enjoy.

The minister also noted that the Auditor General stated in his report that a separate fund outside of the General Revenue Fund would be one of the ways of ending what he viewed as the illegal manner of handling lottery funds by the government. Malfeasance is a short legal term for the way the government was dealing with those funds. Well, that representation of the Auditor General's position is true insofar as it goes, but I daresay that it is, in fact, a half truth and a whole disservice to the Auditor General. Yes, a separate fund outside of the General Revenue Fund is one of the possible mechanisms, but there are, in fact, a veritable smorgasbord of possibilities whereby a separate fund could be established in a form which would bring the expenditure before this Legislature for debate.

Now, I suggested in some of my earlier comments in debate on Bill 10 one mechanism for establishing a separate lottery fund to be dealt with under the Financial Administration Act pursuant to approval of the Legislature. The Official Opposition has, in fact, suggested a separate mechanism outside of the ambit of the Financial Administration Act but with the same result. Now, I ask, Mr. Speaker: is it possible that the Auditor General just might have had in mind a separate fund which also comported with the established principles of parliamentary accountability? "Well, not so," suggests the minister. No, the Auditor General did not, perhaps could not, have had in mind a principled democratic approach; he must have had in mind the very private vault of chestnuts in the minister's backroom to be dispensed as the minister sees fit. Well, I'll believe that interpretation of the Auditor General's words when I'm advised that the Auditor General has also been appointed chairman of the Banff Television Festival. We of course all know that this festival, charming, delightful, valuable as it is, is also the recent beneficiary of a multifold increase in funding by virtue of a fiat from the local MLA, a nonelitist who writes letters.

And what about the Legislature? Why is this body given short shrift? Well, we find that it's because we're an elitist body. Yes, I heard the minister say it: a Legislature elected by the people of this province to represent them described as too elitist to make spending decisions with respect to lottery funds. Well, how long is it going to be before, to bring in historical allusion, the minister emulates Oliver Cromwell, I believe way

back in 1640, and calls out the troops to sweep this recalcitrant, this obstructionist bunch of elitists on this side of the House out so that the real decisions can be made by simple folk at the golf and country club or the owners' paddock at the track, places where you don't have to put up with the rudeness of the elitists?

[Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair]

The approach of the government and of the minister is, in fact, somewhat disheartening. The hon. members opposite do not seem to appreciate the legacy of parliamentary democracy which has been bequeathed to us. It is, in fact, a treasure. Many, many individuals have in the past paid with their lives and their freedoms in the struggle for parliamentary democracy, which we enjoy without having partaken of the struggle. We have, in fact received a free ride. We're beneficiaries, and the least we could do is leave the institutions of democracy in as strong a state as we have found them, out of respect for those hardy pioneers. Instead, we find this government moving through this foolhardy legislation in Bill 10 to weaken and erode the basic concept that spending be approved by the Legislature.

This is indeed quite a day in the annals of parliamentary democracy. This afternoon we were again exposed to the government's policy of not providing access to documents relating to government loan guarantees, the policy of secrecy, and tonight we see closure being invoked to terminate debate on legislation allowing the Minister of Career Development and Employment to spend hundreds of millions of dollars in any way he sees fit without recourse to the Legislature. This is, in fact quite a legacy which the government is leaving the tradition of parliamentary democracy.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hon. Member for Calgary-North West on the subamendment,

DR. CASSIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak against the subamendment, which really pertains to management Bill 10, in essence, deals with management, the management of the lottery funds. I know there's been a great deal of concern by members of the opposition about closing the debate, yet when this evening is finished, we'll have spent some 18 hours debating this particular Bill. That works out to somewhere in the neighbourhood of three-quarters of an hour apiece per opposition member to voice their concerns and make the points, and I would think the democratic process certainly has been served.

The thing I find interesting, Mr. Speaker, is that all through this debate and since the Bill was introduced, I've not had one telephone call, not one letter from one of my constituents, raising a concern about the management of this particular fund. During that period of time, I know some of the members opposite indicated they had gone door to door, and I again during this period of time have knocked doors in some 11 to 13 [inaudible] and did not have one question or concern about the management of this fund. Yet a year ago when there were some concerns and some very good suggestions perhaps at that time as to how these funds should be spent -- and we had some problems in Alberta -- I received letters and concerns from my constituents, who said: "Don't put it into general revenue. It's been great. It's helped many groups. It gives us that flexibility that so many other provinces don't have. It allows us to do things that other provinces can't do." It was nice to have that cookie jar. Many of us perhaps were brought up on the cookie jar, the money that

was put away for the rainy day for those special projects.

AN HON. MEMBER: Did you ever get your hand slapped?

DR. CASSIN: Interesting. The member opposite said, "Did you ever get your hand slapped?"

For 14 years this government has used those funds for very special projects, and the people of this province have been thankful. The people of Shortgrass are thankful to have the extra money for their library system. The people in Calgary are thankful to have the moneys to buy the MRI imaging equipment that has been furnished through this lottery fund. The Cross cancer foundation are very thankful for the special pieces of equipment they have. I think it would be naive, Mr. Speaker, for us to tie lottery moneys, which in fact are dollars that are gambled, that are here today, perhaps not here tomorrow. We can look at Ireland. It funded its hospital system for many years through a lottery until there was some competition across the water, and that fund is now broke. I would hate to think our hospitals, our schools, or some of our other vital services will be dependent on something that's based on lottery funds.

In principle I have difficulty with lotteries. I think in fact it is a tax on the poor. But those people, like the members opposite, dream that maybe someday it'll be theirs. And I understand, Mr. Speaker, that that, in fact, is the concern. I have to give credit where credit is due. They are sitting there and saying: "Oh my God, what would happen if someday we were the government? Who among our group would we give these dollars to?" I can see the Leader of the Liberal Party saying: "Will I keep it myself? Will they trust me to hand it out? Will I give it to the Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark to perhaps help win the next nomination and challenge me?" That's a major concern. What about the members across? It would be like throwing a bone to 16 hungry dogs. You know, that's really what bothers them. They're concerned about how they're going to manage these funds. They recognize that it'll be divisive, that it'll break down and disintegrate and cause them a great deal of problems because they have trouble dealing with anything that's not set and is not concrete. I understand that they have identified their weakness and their concern, and they don't know what to do with it.

Really, Mr. Speaker, I feel that the minister and the department and the government are wise in setting aside that flexibility to deal with problems, problems that aren't here today, that might be here tomorrow, that we can't identify. Let's not lock ourselves in. Let's leave all the options there. I really think that we should defeat this subamendment.

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

MR. McEACHERN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. What the member did for Bill 14 last year I think he's just done for Bill 10 this year. As usual when the government side tries to defend this abominable Bill, they focus on totally the wrong things. We're talking here about the management of the fund, who controls it, the process by which it's set up, and they keep getting into details: well, would you really take that money back from those poor people that need it for tourism, or would you take it back from the film foundation, or would you take it back from this other group? No, of course not. They keep saying that we can't stay on the topic, but they don't even get to the topic. They avoid it totally. They keep talking, for instance -- like today

with the motion for a return: nobody argued about whether they should or shouldn't disclose the information; instead they argued that it creates jobs. That's the same argument the Minister of Public Works, Supply and Services used on the Olympia & York thing. At least get on the topic, eh? They don't understand because they don't listen to what the Member for Edmonton-Strathcona says, yet they get up and talk about irrelevancies.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker. I will get back to the remarks that I had prepared before that member spoke. I want to make it clear what the basic objection to this Bill is just once again. This amendment allows us to get to that. This amendment says that this Assembly should

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

Mr. Speaker, it's not only unnecessary; it's wrong. It's wrongheaded.

The basic problem with the Bill is section 5, which says that this minister can set up a slush fund outside of the budgetary process of this province. It also says that the minister can use those public funds for whatever purposes he thinks might be a good idea or in the public interest or something of that sort. Now, why should the taxpayers' dollars in this province -- even if they're voluntary, they are kind of tax dollars -- be spent by this minister at his whim without bringing the plan of expenditure into this Assembly to be debated as it properly should be?

There are many pros and cons about how you might handle lotteries, including some of the other gaming things like bingos and casinos. I think it's time that maybe the government took a whole review of the process and got into some public hearings and found out what people out there really think about those things. But the minister in his defence sort of gleefully said: "Well, you know, Manitoba doesn't put it under the budget, so if that is good enough for what was the democratic government of Manitoba, then it should be good enough for you people across the way. What are you talking about?"

So I took a bit of a look at the Manitoba situation and will give a bit of a brief description. In the Manitoba situation they set up a lotteries foundation, that in turn sets out what they call umbrella groups: the multiculturalism group, arts group, sports group, community service group, community education, medical research, festivals, and heritage group. All of these get a share of the funds. Well, Mr. Speaker, the funds don't go into the budget; that's true. The minister was right on that. But neither do they go into a slush fund for the minister to decide how to hand them out. That foundation decides which of the umbrella groups get how much, and it's done independent of the minister.

The minister is not the one who sets up his own little personal slush fund and then says: "Oh, well, I'll give some here to hospitals. I'll give some here to tourism. I'll hand it out here, and I'll hand it out there." In fact, there's a fairly careful framework. I'm not going to go through all the details, but some of the basic framework under which they operate -- the first point, for example, says that the basic principle is that this lottery fund money in Manitoba is community money. There are several other points here, but the second and main point that I want to get to and that is relevant is that this is not government money and cannot be considered as such.

[Mr. Musgreave in the Chair]

Now, I don't really quite agree with that particular line, but at least it's coming down on one side or the other. It's saying that, okay, this is not government money; therefore, this community group will decide how the money is handed out to the various community groups. The minister does not set it up as a personal slush fund, as this minister wants to do. So you have to make up your mind. This minister is wanting to have it both ways. He's basically saying that this is government money in one sense, in the sense that he personally has to be in charge of it, yet at the same time he's saying that well, no, this House doesn't have to have any say in it. So he's trying to play the game both ways. Now, either it's government money and should be under the budget, or else it's community money and should be dealt with by the community and some kind of an independent organization set up by the government itself. But at least the minister doesn't set it up as a personal slush fund, as this minister wants to do.

The minister spent some time saying, "But it will be more accountable now, because actually the Treasurer was going to have some say in how these funds were expended." I don't see anything in this Bill -- and I've read it over very carefully; I just did it again after the minister spoke -- that refers to the Treasurer in any way, shape, or form. It is the minister that will disburse the funds. The Treasurer will hand them out when the minister tells him to. I don't really care whether it's this minister, the Minister of Career Development and Employment, or whether it's the Treasurer or whether it's the whole cabinet. It doesn't really matter. The fact is that once they've decided what they want to do with it, they should bring the plan into the Assembly and let this body have a go at it and discuss it and ask questions and scrutinize it, the same way that we do other parts of the budget. So the minister has chosen the worst of both worlds. He's just set it up as a personal slush fund and says he can do with it what he likes. Mr. Speaker, the minister should really drop Bill 10 as it is and restore the power of the purse to this Assembly, where it belongs.

I said that the government should take a second look at casinos and bingos and lotteries and that whole ball of wax of gambling. He should hold public hearings, should have a provincewide debate, and should make some determination as to what direction we should go with that. My father had an expression for the present system. He said that this person wasn't really brought up, that just like Topsy they just kind of 'grewed,' and that's how this situation we find ourselves in has come about.

My colleague from Edmonton-Strathcona gave some of the history, and I did spend some time looking at some of the recent history. It would seem that the decision that the province could have control of the lotteries, for example, really stems from the fact that the federal government got so much flak when they decided to get into a big lotto scheme, because they would be competing with the provinces, that they backed off and said, "Well, if you'll give us \$100 million to put toward the Olympics, we'll stay out, okay, and let the provinces have it." Now, considering that gaming, which this is a form of, was really under the Criminal Code of Canada, it's a pretty casual rewriting of the statutes and the management and the rules by which we play the game of gambling in its different forms.

So it is time, then, that the government -- and actually the federal government should be involved in this, and other provinces might well do a second look at this. But I'm more concerned about Alberta, particularly because this minister is precipitating a focus on the lottery funds right now by this Bill

-- that this province do it right, that they not rush into something and then just say, "Oh, well, we'll just give this minister this nice political slush fund and let it go at that and not worry about doing it properly." There should be a full debate in this province. It should be fully analyzed. There should be a lot of public input. I know this government doesn't like public hearings and that sort of thing, but they really should learn, and they should not really be afraid of the public of this province. You'll find people in the long run willing to sit down and talk and express their ideas and to work out something sensible for all of us. Certainly this Bill is not the way to go.

There are a number of reasons why the government should really seriously consider where they're going with lottery funds and also the bingos and the casinos. Most of us have ambiguous feelings about the rights or wrongs of gambling: the fact that it's the poor that pay and that most of the money, no matter how it's distributed, ends up in the hands of sort of middle-class and well-to-do people in the sports facilities, in cultural facilities, in the arts, even in the medicine technologies, in tourism. It doesn't matter which way . . . [interjection] Well, I'm saying that we should really stop and think a little bit about what we're doing, how much we want to rely on those kinds of funds for the province, what we want to spend them on.

You know, most of us agree that it's okay for a community league to hold a bingo, but when it gets to the point where the government is actually advertising the good life for everybody that can win a lottery and the chance of winning is so small . . . I know it's about the only hope that the poor people have in this province; the Horatio Alger dream is dead because this government has killed it. They basically run a society for the elite, leaving the poor poor and keeping them that way, and the only hope they've got is the lottery. We all know that the money comes from the poor, and those that do win it, if it happens to be poor people, don't know how to handle it and end up poor and with broken families anyway. Somebody was just quoting the numbers again the other day; it was true of the old Irish Sweepstakes, and it's true of the modern-day lottery.

So there are a lot of problems associated with this whole gambling thing. The Attorney General was much too casual about dismissing this casino bid the other day. It just seems to me that we've done a lot of things in an ad hoc manner, and that's the way this government tends to operate. So it's time, Mr. Speaker, that we had a full and thorough investigation of this.

One of the things that bothers me also about the handing out of the moneys to these various groups is that I don't think anybody ever really checks who's getting what from what groups. Oh, the minister talks a lot about accountability afterwards, but of course we're basically talking about scrutinizing before the expenditures are made, which is the prerogative of this Assembly. But even the looking back afterwards or as the decisions are being made -- there are so many different ministers handing out moneys for so many different programs besides the lotteries, special one-time grants for this, that, and the other thing, and then there are the lottery groups, and I don't think anybody is co-ordinating the whole thing. So we really don't know until afterwards that maybe one group's got two or three different donations from different programs and another group that may have been just as deserving maybe didn't get anything.

Mr. Speaker, I will wind up by just going back to the main and central problem, and that is that the funds expended by any cabinet ministers belonging to the government that are in this Legislature should be decided in this Legislature. I know that

the minister and the cabinet have the right to make the original decisions, but they should bring them here for scrutiny, and Bill 10 doesn't allow that. This government should scrap Bill 10.

MR. SHRAKE: Mr. Speaker, I think the amendment has some very important words here: "management" and "method of." I think "management" and "method of" become very crucial if you look at other areas, other places, where they've gone out with funds to accomplish certain things.

One of the real interesting ones is that the U.S. once decided they really were going to get into a lot of programs for the underprivileged, the poor. By the time they got the administration set up and they finally got the program rolling, not much of it ever poured out the other end to go out to the people. And as far as your Communist countries, they too actually set up programs and moneys. Unfortunately, usually it takes you about two to three years to get much money out of the program once they budget it.

Before we feel too smug, you take a look at the dear old province of Alberta. We've got one grant program. This grant program is called MCR -- no, CRC. It used to be called the MCR, multicultural/recreational grant, and that is multimillions of dollars. It's now called the CRC grant. It's the same program with very little change. But it's a very interesting program. We have now got it worked around to the city parks and recreation board putting application forms out, and basically after the first of the year you can apply for this grant to commence your program. I guess it's 40 pages now. The average organization, even if you have some good businesspeople on there, can't really fill out one of those programs or get it rolling.

The one program I was involved in, I think we had an architect, a lawyer, a consultant, and me as a politician, and we were able to put this program application together. It went to the parks department, and some months later it actually went to the parks and recreation board, and some weeks later it reached the Community Services Committee for the city of Calgary. A little bit of ward politics entered in there, because certain aldermen on the board did have projects which didn't get funded. Then it went to city council, where again the battle erupted over a little shuffling of who was going to get the money took place, and we had a little bit of a problem. The group I was involved with, from the time they started, it was 14 months, and they spent 8 percent of the funds they finally received on putting the application form together.

If we contrast that to method of and management, I had a little group out on the east side of Calgary, a good little group. They did a lot of good things. They applied through the Alberta Wild Rose Foundation. Volunteers, good old ordinary citizens, were able to put this application form together themselves and get it through the Wild Rose Foundation. It wasn't a great, massive grant. It did a lot of good. And I've seen the grants pour out through the Alberta Sport Council.

So as far as any grant program coming back to this Legislature, I mean, this is what I almost heard one person referring to, and I thought well, what is he referring to? Is the method going to be to come back here? Are we going to have a meeting of the Legislature and vote on who gets these grants? Oh boy, heaven forbid that. By the time we get the amendments through, get all the debate done on it, the organization would be out of business before they ever get a penny of the funds.

None of these CRC grants -- I've never seen one in my six years ever come through here and be debated here. So I think as long as we've got a system where the money gets out, gets to

the people, as long as we got our auditors -- and the auditors initiated some of this -- I think if I must choose a mode or choose a way that this is handled, I sure like the way the Alberta Sport Council, the Wild Rose Foundation, and these types of grants go out. It's sure a lot better than the other systems.

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

MR. SIGURDSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The subamendment that we're dealing with really looks at adding to the amendment that's already on the floor, and that's that Bill 10 is rather redundant in that it establishes a method of management and disbursements of public moneys that is already available to the Minister of Career Development and Employment. Now, just to remind the Minister of Career Development and Employment what that ability is, it's the budgetary process. The budgetary process where he comes in, brings the budget in, has the opportunity to debate the budget in the Assembly -- because after all, we are talking of public dollars -- has the opportunity to discuss the expenditure of those \$100 million in this Assembly, is the more appropriate manner in which to disburse those very funds.

Now, I think that's an important point to be made, because what the minister has asked us to do with Bill 10 -- it's sort of a "trust me" Bill. "Trust me. I can handle my department. I can ship out the money out of the slush fund whenever I want to. I can handle all of those extra public dollars that will accrue in my vault. I can handle it." You know, the Member for Calgary-North West said that we worry about what we would do if we had that kind of money. Well, I'm not too concerned. You know, we're not over on that side yet, so I don't have to worry about having that kind of access to those kinds of dollars. But I sure as heck am worried, Mr. Speaker, about the minister who will have access to that public money, because you know . . . [interjection] Well, I haven't said the following, so just listen up.

You know, Mr. Speaker, what we have in the Auditor General's report is, and I'll quote:

Expenditures for the fiscal year then ended, were both overstated by approximately \$3 million. Similar inaccuracies had also occurred in the two previous years.

Oh, it's only "overstated." "Similar inaccuracies" in the last two years prior to that. Well, this was the year before. The Auditor General noted that in this year there had been some improvement. Indeed, the Minister of Career Development and Employment noted that there had been some improvement in the accounting methods of his department, this very department, this very minister that's going to be looking after these lottery funds -- a big improvement. I quote again from the Auditor General's report:

. . . revealed that the Department has made further efforts to improve its procedures for determining year-end accounts payable. Notwithstanding these efforts, however, accounts payable at March 31, 1987 in respect of training and employment grant contracts expenditures were overstated by approximately \$1 million.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that's management. That's management overstated by a million bucks. Not bad, I guess. What's a million here? What's a million there?

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

A million dollars, and we're asking this particular minister to

carefully control the public moneys that will accrue from lottery sales. Now, he can't handle what he's got, and we're going to give him more. How much more is going to be lost? How much more is going to be overstated? What a nice word: "overstated." Why don't we just call that a big oops?

Scrutiny versus accountability. Scrutiny is what has to be done, and accountability is something that may be done. But quite frankly, I'm not too sure that even this minister understands to whom he is accountable. When we last had the opportunity to debate this very piece of legislation, the minister -- and I still have difficulty with this one, Mr. Speaker -- got up and said:

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.

That's what the minister said: "I don't care." Mr. Speaker, he went on to say:

I'm accountable to the people of Alberta, and I'm not accountable to one of those individuals who [happen to] represent the NDP.

Well, Mr. Speaker, let me tell you that we in the New Democrat caucus happen to be very proud of the people that we represent, and it's not just one or two people that we represent. We do not just represent the members of our political party, nor do we just represent the members of our constituencies who voted for us. I happen to be very proud of the fact that I and my colleagues happen to represent every single constituent regardless of how they voted in the last election, not how they voted for just my political philosophy or how they voted for the hon. minister's political philosophy. Mr. Speaker, that's shameful. It's shameful that the Minister of Career Development and Employment would be so callous to say that he doesn't care, that as long as he has the support of some of the electorate who happen to subscribe to a particular political theory at a particular time, he's satisfied.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that's not good enough. That's not good enough, because in the last election there were three-quarters of a million Albertans that voted, and only 366,000 of those happened to vote for the Progressive Conservative Party, and that's the political ideology that he says should trust him. Incidentally, you know, Mr. Speaker...

MR. SPEAKER: This is Bill 10.

MR. SIGURDSON: This is Bill 10, and it deals with management, which is the subamendment. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Incidentally, you know, we talk of how the public perception of politicians has waned over the last number of years. It couldn't be more evident than when we look at voting patterns of Albertans: 1975, approximately 600,000 Albertans voted, and it went up in '79; it went up in '82, but in 1986 Albertans were upset, especially Progressive Conservative Albertans. They stayed home, and we had a significant drop. We went from 947,000 voting individuals down to 715,000. Most of those were Conservatives who stayed home. Now, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to you that with legislation like this, the electorate is going to become even more skeptical and more cynical, and come the next election, what they will do is that they will not stay home; they will go out and vote, but they sure will not vote Progressive Conservative.

MR. SCHUMACHER: That'll make you sad, won't it?

MR. SIGURDSON: Oh, I'll be so sad when that day comes.

Believe me, when you're back in the palaeontology museum, I'm going to be sad. I'll even come down and visit you. I'll come and see you, I'll dust your bones, and I might even light a candle at your altar.

But you know, Mr. Speaker, this Bill, this antidemocratic piece of legislation, has gone too far. It takes away the scrutiny from the people who were elected to serve. In fact, what this Bill does is it says: "We forgot who we were elected by. We're just going to go out and do what we want to do regardless of what anybody says." And that just shows that the tired old Tories that were taught, tried, and trusted are now tired and rusted.

Thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Highlands,

MS BARRETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's a real pleasure to speak in favour of this subamendment, and of course I implicitly speak in favour of the amendment that it is attached to.

I wonder, though -- I realize it's 8 minutes past 11, I cannot help, Mr. Speaker, but observe that three friendly strangers have come into the public gallery and are watching the proceedings tonight. I'm so surprised to see people walk in at this late hour, and I wonder if we can agree to give them the traditional welcome, whoever they are. I've always loved politics and I used to love being up in that gallery, but even I don't think I've ever walked into the Assembly at 11 o'clock at night to watch the proceedings. These people are neat.

Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the subamendment tonight, as moved by the Leader of the Official Opposition New Democrats, I'd like to point out, first of all, that the minister's response to that subamendment, and implicitly to the amendment moved by the Member for Edmonton-Avonmore, was substantially flawed. In the first place, I think that the minister is attempting to speak out of both sides of his face at the same time. This is going to prove to be difficult.

MR. YOUNIE: A Tory trait of long standing.

MS BARRETT: It is true, it is a Tory trait of long standing, as my hon. colleague mentions, but it's going to prove to be difficult and eventually paralyze his ability to speak in the long run.

You see, Mr. Speaker, I was interviewed today by a reporter on this subject and on the issue of closure. The reporter had come from the minister's office and said to me that the minister was claiming that the opposition is opposed to this Bill 10 because we don't like the recipients of the money that has been allocated in the current fiscal year.

AN HON. MEMBER: True.

MS BARRETT: A colleague from the Conservatives, I believe the Minister of the Environment has just quipped "true." The minister knows full well that is simply not true. I'd like to... [interjections] That's right. That's a nice way of saying "lie."

MR. STEVENS: Point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Your point of order is?

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Speaker, that is absolutely false, and I would ask the member to withdraw it. There was no meeting in my office with a reporter. There's been no comment made by

myself. [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Have we clarified which minister the member is referring to?

MS BARRETT: Well, obviously the minister sponsoring the Bill, Mr. Speaker. That's what we're talking about, isn't it? [interjections] Yes, I talked about the groups that are receiving . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Perhaps all the discussion could come through the Chair, hon. members. Thank you.

MR. MARTIN: Paranoid, paranoid.

MS BARRETT: Yeah.

Mr. Speaker, I understand and I sympathize with those who can't keep up and aren't listening carefully, but I did not cite culture. I said the minister was interviewed, and the reporter came to me after that interview and said, "That minister is saying that the opposition opposes the recipients of the funds." And of course, that is absolutely not true, no matter what the Minister of the Environment says. [laughter]

Now, on the issue . . . [interjections]

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker. . . [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: The minister has kindly parked it.

Does the minister have a point of order? Is that what this is about?

MR. KOWALSKI: Well, sir, that's correct. Mr. Speaker, it was on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: A citation from *Beauchesne* or *Erskine May* or Standing Orders.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, in *Beauchesne* there are a fair number of very important rules that basically call on members to basically make sure they do not misunderstand what any other hon. member would want to say. I have great respect for the Member for Edmonton-Highlands, but basically when we have *Beauchesne*, section 312, dealing with content of speeches, there are a fair number of rules in there that basically ask hon. members to cite it as it is, Mr. Speaker. And when the hon. member says that the Minister of the Environment would quip, that really is insulting to me, because I would never do such a thing. I never stood up and interrupted the hon. member's speech, so I would ask the hon. member at least to deal with comments from the Minister of the Environment with all decency that's expected from one hon. member to another. And that . . .

MR. WRIGHT: On a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. No, no. The Chair will not recognize this as a point of order nor another point of order, but recognizes Edmonton-Highlands.

MS BARRETT: Hallelujah, Mr. Speaker. In responding to the subamendment as advanced by the Leader of the Official Opposition New Democrats, the minister says that the Legislature basically has not a monopoly on good decisions, and the minister is correct. I am referring to the Minister of Career Develop-

ment and Employment, for the benefit of the hon. Mr. Stevens, who must be nodding off by now. He argued that that was one of the reasons that we should not support this subamendment. I understand that very minister told this reporter who interviewed me this afternoon that one of the reasons the opposition is misguided in opposing Bill 10 is because we fail to understand that, in fact, there's a multiyear commitment to the funds, and indeed it won't be a slush fund Act: ergo, no amendments are necessary; the Bill should fly as is.

Now, I wonder just which way it is, Mr. Speaker. I don't think that that Minister of Career Development and Employment can have it both ways. It is true that some of the allocations under the current regime announced in March of 1988 are for a commitment which would expand beyond the current fiscal year, but interestingly, the monopoly of good decision-making seems now to be vested in the hands of this minister. Now, I ask you, Mr. Speaker, on the basis of sheer logic: when, to your knowledge, through the history of civilization, has it been true that one decision-maker has monopoly of good decision-making powers over a collective of 83 elected people? And I'm just not convinced that that's the case. Therefore, the management that is called into question in this subamendment reflects directly upon the minister who now claims that, first of all, 83 MLAs haven't got a monopoly on good decision-making, but essentially validates himself as being the exclusive good decision-maker in this Assembly or from behind closed doors -- ministerial doors, that is -- when he decides how he's going to hand out \$100 million, \$110 million, \$115 million, \$120 million. Who knows? By the next election it might be \$140 million, Mr. Speaker.

So I believe he's caught in a conflict of his own logic, and I'm not a bit surprised. Because if I were advancing Bill 10, quite frankly, I'd be squirming. I'd be making up excuses as fast as I could to try to defend this thing if I were forced to even open my mouth to defend it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, he says, in arguing against the subamendment advanced by the Leader of the Official Opposition, that the Auditor General's report didn't just say, "Mr. Orman, you'd better change the procedure by which the money is allocated." He says he didn't say that "He gave me the alternative." And the alternative was to legislate the poor behaviour that this government has administered over the last 14 years. Well, the Auditor General also didn't say, "Don't have votes or estimates presented to the Assembly, regardless of which way you go." The Auditor General didn't say that. The minister said that. The government said that. They were the ones who decided that they would so-called adopt one of the recommendations of the Auditor General on this contentious issue and then try to ram it through the Assembly and make like the Auditor General is endorsing this. I have every reason to believe that the Auditor General, if asked, would not feel comfortable answering to a current government Bill, but I'll bet you previous Auditors General would have a very strong view of that sort of manipulation, Mr. Speaker, and I object to the minister attempting to use that sort of manipulation in speaking against the subamendment sponsored by the leader of the New Democrat opposition.

Now, I think that most of the people who have spoken on this subamendment have pointed out that the essence of the issue is accountability. The essence of the issue is: who in their right minds would place so much money, without a process of prior accountability, into the hands of one person? If one accepts that we have to go through a lot of debate in the process of keeping parliamentary democracy alive, and if one accepts that

we go through an annual process of analyzing government projections for income and expenditures thereof, then one is forced to ask: what on earth is the matter with putting one more little vote into the Legislative Assembly budget estimates which are dealt with on an annual basis?

It couldn't theoretically take up any more time, because this government forced a closure motion in 1981, and by the way, that's the last time closure was used, for the information of the Government House Leader. The last time closure was used was on a motion to impose closure on debate of estimates. Debate of estimates is now 25 days, Mr. Speaker. That's all there is to it until the Standing Orders are changed, which they will be the next time the government changes, but until then there's, you know, the 25 limit debate. What's the minister worried about, that we're going to extend the debate beyond 25 days? Unless we can get Conservative co-operation, I don't think that we're going to get a change in the Standing Orders, so it's not going to take any more time. And certainly, if the minister's acknowledging that he hasn't got the ability to do some forecasting, then he should surely acknowledge that if he hasn't got that ability, he also hasn't got the ability to manage the fund that he is establishing in this Bill. And if he hasn't got the ability to manage the fund, then surely he has at least the ability to follow the logic that we have placed before him and support the subamendment that is now on the floor of the Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, I've spoken at every reading on this Bill, and I've presented some very good alternatives, despite what the Premier insisted through his rose-coloured glasses this afternoon in question period. All of those amendments have been defeated. Now, I would like to point out that this is basically a nonconfidence motion in the minister's ability to manage a large sum of money without coming to someone else for approval prior to the expenditure. He argues, he counters: "Ah, you don't need that. You get accountability after the fact. It's by way of the public accounts." Well, that's true, Mr. Speaker, you do, and sometimes it's up to two years later. How do I know that the minister has acted properly or spent the money properly in the last year, which won't show up until the following year? I don't know that, and I'm a legislator. The reason I don't know it is because he doesn't have to make the information public. That's not a good sign.

The accountability has to be up front just like it is for everything else, just like it is for the good old parliamentary tradition of having three readings for each Bill, which was denied to us, of course, tonight. But good old parliamentary tradition. If the minister can't find his way to supporting this subamendment, and consequentially the amendment that it's attached to, then I think that he should do the honourable thing and drop the Bill altogether, which was of course another of our recommendations by way of amendment, Mr. Speaker. If he can't see his way to doing the honourable thing, drop the Bill. I won't even ask that the minister resign. Just drop the Bill. Talk to the Government House Leader. We could have it all fixed before midnight that it gets dropped. He can reverse the closure motion. I'm sure if the Conservatives agree to it, I can guarantee the opposition would agree to it. Drop the Bill. Bring it back in a year if you've got the guts. If you've got the guts.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Mill Woods.

MR. GIBEAULT: Mr. Speaker, I want to speak to the question of the subamendment that's before us this evening, and that is trying to emphasize the principle of management as it applies to

the Interprovincial Lottery Amendment Act, Bill 10, because a common belief among some people in the province is that this government and this party, if nothing else, has some ability to manage things. I think this whole Bill is really compromising that belief. I'm trying to be helpful to the government here. I don't think they ought to compromise the one thing that people of this province have some belief in, their ability to manage. There was that belief, I think, that this government would account for the dollars, and go through proper processes, and the books would be kept in a good shape.

[Mr. Chumir in the Chair]

But I have to say, Mr. Speaker, that this Bill 10 that is before us now, if we let it go -- and the government seems to be hell-bent to do so. But if it goes through as presented here before us tonight, I'm only apprehensive that the government is going to have a . . . [interjections]

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Do I hear a call for the vote?

MR. GIBEAULT: Mr. Speaker, this might be considered treasonous by my colleagues in the Official Opposition, but I don't want to see the Conservatives wiped out in the next election, and that's why I am trying to get them to see some sense about this.

AN HON. MEMBER: We want at least a small opposition.

MR. GIBEAULT: We'd like to see at least a few of them. I mean, we don't want to see a New Brunswick happen again. You know, I'm trying not to be partisan about this, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: What's wrong with New Brunswick?

MR. GIBEAULT: The whole question here that we're dealing with in this important Bill, Mr. Speaker, is the whole principle of management, and very closely related to that is the principle of accountability. Why the government is so intent on bringing in Bill 10 which is going to have backroom decisions, lack of an accountability, is really very much beyond us, and I want to say beyond many Albertans that I have talked to. Now the . . .

MR. OLDRING: Mr. Speaker, point of order. I know how harsh your decisions have been in the past, but the member keeps referring to the Bill and not the subamendment.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Overruled. [interjections] I've been waiting all year to do that.

MR. GIBEAULT: Mr. Speaker, I like your style.

As I was saying, some very basic principles are at stake here, and we're trying -- for the benefit of the Member for Red Deer-South -- through this subamendment to get to the point of management and accountability, and that's really the principles that we're talking about here. That's what Albertans expect out of public officials. They expect to have some accountability and good management of the public purse. That is one of the main functions of the Assembly for goodness sake.

Now, the Member for Calgary-North West in his comments earlier referred to the need to have flexibility in the process of dealing with lottery funds. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think flexibility

is a great thing, of course, but I have to wonder if this means a flexibility to pork-barrel the public funds. I think if that's what he had in mind, I don't think that's something Albertans will stand for. I have to wonder if what he meant by flexibility was the flexibility to be sure that only government members have their hands on the cheques when they're being handed out. If that's what he had in mind as well, then I have to object to that. I think the people of Alberta would object to that kind of partisan manipulation of what are really tax dollars.

Let's be honest about that. That's what they are. They're not some private slush fund for the benefit of the minister responsible for lotteries and his various buddies around the province in Conservative ridings. Now, I know that makes great photo opportunities when government MLAs and ministers are handing out cheques, Mr. Speaker, but we're really talking here about the principle of proper management of the public resources and accountability of those resources, and they must come before the Legislative Assembly. That is the process that has been established in parliamentary democracy, and why this minister and his government are so intent on trying to subvert that basic process of historical parliamentary democracy is indeed a shocking thing that is not understood by people of conscience in this province.

Now, I want to tell the minister that this evening over the dinner break my colleague the Member for Edmonton-Beverly and I were pleased to have an opportunity to take in the county of Strathcona's annual awards dinner. While many people who were there noticed with interest the absence of the MLA for Sherwood Park at that event, many of us were trying to have some discussion about the issues of the day. And one of the persons who we were talking with, who told us at great length that he was not a political person, said to us, "Why does the government not want to submit lottery fund expenditures to the Assembly for public review like other tax revenues and expenditures?"

Mr. Speaker, this fellow had a business background, and he was telling me that he'd been following this story in the papers and in the media and that he'd been talking to auditors and accountants and that they were horrified that the government was trying to slip through this Bill that would provide a private slush fund for the minister and his friends to do with as they pleased. Because that's not the way it's done in legitimate business practices, this fellow indicated to us. Mr. Speaker, this fellow had said that in years past he was a fervent PC supporter but that he was really quite disgusted by this whole sleazy affair with Bill 10 and how it was trying to undermine the standard practices of accountability for public tax expenditure. He thanked us after we explained to him the principles that were involved and that were being compromised by Bill 10 and our efforts through amendments like the subamendment that is before us to try to maintain the integrity of the public purse and the review process of the Assembly. He thanked us, and he said he was glad that at least some party in this province was trying to preserve what's left of principles like integrity and accountability and financial responsibility for public resources. One of the other things that he asked me, Mr. Speaker, is, "You know, with all the scandal of the Principal affair, you would have thought that the government members would have finally learned that. . ."

DR. WEST: Point of order, Mr. Speaker. Again, I bring us back to the topic. We're drifting off into the Principal affair, which has nothing to do whatsoever with this Bill, and I would like a comment from the Chair on how he's handling the topic.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: I agree. I would like to see the matter sticking to the topic please, Edmonton-Mill Woods.

MR. GIBEAULT: Thank you for raising that matter of principle for me, Mr. Speaker.

Now, to get back to the issue at hand. I only raised the Principal affair because, you know, in the Code inquiry we've heard about that special slush fund that Don Cormie had: division 8, they called it. It was that special fund that nobody knew about, that there was no review about. It was a secret little fund that he had lots of opportunities to amuse himself with with the moneys of shareholders, the people who are out of pocket now. And I only refer to that because that's really the kind of thing that's before us in Bill 10 and why we're proposing these amendments to try to save this government from hanging itself.

This gentleman that I spoke to was beside himself in trying to understand why the government was going to introduce this Bill which was the division 8 of the lotteries fund, just like in the Principal affair. This man just couldn't understand why a department 8 fund in terms of this Interprovincial Lottery Amendment Act was being seriously suggested.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in this particular Bill we're talking about lotteries, and lotteries are increasingly popular in our province and elsewhere. Now, the odds on winning the Loto are of course not very good, something like 5 in 10,000, depending on the game, you know. That's about the same chance, Mr. Speaker, that a person has in this province of getting a conviction on a labour standards complaint. Now, it's very marginal -- very, very, marginal -- but one of the reasons that the people of this province are willing to accept those odds on lotos and pay those voluntary taxes, because that really is what they are, is that Albertans believed and continued to believe, at least until this whole issue on Bill 10 has come before us, that these funds were going to be going to worthwhile community projects in the province and that they were going to be properly reviewed by the Legislative Assembly in the traditional sense that we have with parliamentary democracy.

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, that if people get the impression that their loto ticket charges are going to be going into a slush fund that's dealt with behind closed doors and not subject to public scrutiny the way other revenues and other expenditures must be, then who knows? Maybe we'll have a decline in loto sales and maybe the minister will even be subverting his very own purpose in trying to have additional revenues that can be put forward to good community purposes.

Now, I think one of the reasons that lotos are increasingly popular is a result of the failure, really, of the Conservative government of this province to manage the provincial economy. So many more people are now put into a position where, after having lost their jobs and so on due to mismanagement of the people on the other side there, they feel that the only alternative, the only economic hope that they have to get a bit of the economic pie is to buy a loto ticket. And as I said earlier, one of the reasons that people are willing to buy these tickets and to take that chance even though the odds are so poor is that people do believe that those funds are going to be going to good purposes and that they will be properly accounted for.

And I'd just put it to the minister simply in this way: if he has confidence and if his government has confidence in their

ability to manage and to account for public resources -- and as I said, that is one of the myths that commonly exists in the province about this government -- then let him do the honourable thing: let him withdraw this Bill. Let all those revenues and those expenditures in lottery funds come before this Assembly, as the Auditor General and all kinds of conscientious and reputable people in the province have suggested. Let's get away from this sleazy backroom stuff of slush funds, just like department 8 in the Cormie affair. Has the minister not learned a single thing? I want to put him to that on behalf of my constituents. I want him to either approve these amendments that we are putting forward or just get this whole Bill off the Order Paper. Let's have some hearings about the proper distribution and expenditure of these funds. Let's have them come before the Legislature, and let's get away from sleaze and slime.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. member. The member has been called to order about the use of the word "sleaze." We really don't need those words again.

Minister of Culture and Multiculturalism. Any additional on the amendment?

Call for the question?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

Minister of Culture and Multiculturalism.

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Speaker, I guess it's getting rather late, and there are a lot of comments going on. I apologize; I could not hear you call me to recognize me.

Mr. Speaker, I've received a great deal of correspondence -- I think all of us have -- and suggestions of how lottery dollars should be used. But I also have some letters that I'd like to share with the members, at least one letter. Because I know the Premier and other members of the House, we've heard the opposition members say they've received letters. Well, I have some letters. We're hearing from many, many citizens of Alberta. I'd just like to quote from a portion of one letter, which is someone, I suppose, who wanted me to receive a copy of this, because it's a letter addressed to my colleague the minister responsible for lotteries, and a copy has come to me as minister of culture. The person writing extends appreciation for the minister's continued support through lottery profits to the Alberta Museums Association special grants program, a program that is under the umbrella of the Department of Culture and Multiculturalism. Now, the writer goes on to mention the museum and its location and the fact that it

lends itself to this community, not only in retaining our history as the oldest community in Alberta but also as a teaching tool for the many students who are able to take advantage of its location within our city.

Now, it's interesting, Mr. Speaker, that this letter is addressed to "Dear Rick," and it's from the Member for St. Albert. It goes on to say, "Thank you for your continued support of our community." This same member just earlier tonight and earlier on May 13 and again on May 19 mentioned that he felt the lottery fund was a fund that was designed for the government to go out and give out money [and] cheques to various organizations in order to gain votes from the general public.

And he called it "a political slush fund." That was on May 13.

Well, then the same Member for St. Albert and other members of his party on May 19 said:

It's important that this Bill be defeated. . . . 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.

Now, he does go on to say that he doesn't want that ability. He does go on to say that he doesn't feel that -- because he couldn't handle it, of course. But it is interesting to note that while he may not want to be seen delivering cheques, he may not want to be involved in the decision-making, he's certainly prepared to piggyback on the top of a government that has decided that lottery dollars will not be in general revenue, on a government that has decided to disburse those lottery dollars through a number of cultural and multicultural and sports and recreation organizations and foundations. He's certainly trying to piggyback onto that even though he's here tonight and for 17 or 18 hours on debate on Bill 10 and its amendment and subamendment delaying the opportunity to get on with the business of this House, which is to deal with economic opportunities, job creation . . . [interjections].

MR. SIGURDSON: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Standing Order 23 clearly outlines that the member must speak to the matter that's before the House. Now, I appreciate, Mr. Speaker, that you have allowed a lot of latitude tonight, but the minister has yet to even refer to the subamendment, the matter that is before the Assembly. Now, surely to goodness he can at least refer to that once in a half-hour speech that he has planned, I'm sure -- at least once.

MR. SPEAKER: But the . . .

MR. STRONG: Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: A different point of order or on the same point of order?

MR. STRONG: No, it's another point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Then you'll have to hang fire for a moment, hon. member.

MR. STRONG: We'll get this one finished, and then we'll get to the next one.

MR. SPEAKER: That's generally the way it has worked in this Legislature for some 80-odd years.

First, with regard to the point of order as raised by Edmonton-Belmont, the Minister of Culture and Multiculturalism, I'm sure, has listened to every golden gem as uttered in the point of order. And since the minister only did start to speak at 11:34 p.m., he has a few more minutes to get back to the subamendment, which we will look to immediately after we deal with St. Albert.

MR. STRONG: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to call a point of order with respect to 23(i) of the Standing Orders, where another member "imputes false or unavowed motives to another member." Mr. Speaker, clearly the member opposite has stated things that certainly I don't believe in. And if he's going to quote from *Hansard*, I would appreciate it if he'd make the whole quote, not a partial quote to impute false motives or falsehoods to the Legislative Assembly. I think that's very important, that the member opposite remember that. Because cer-

tainly as the Member of the Legislative Assembly for St. Albert, I made my comments very, very clear in speaking against the whole concept of Bill 10 through many amendments, subamendments, and the minister knows that.

MR. SPEAKER: The Minister of Culture and Multiculturalism on the particular point of order as raised by St. Albert.

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Speaker, I believe it's quite clear and the record will show that I referred to the *Hansard* of certain specific dates. While the member I referred to in my comments made those comments, I went on to say that he had taken a different position. But it's his correspondence that I was bringing to the attention of the House, and I'll file that tomorrow at the appropriate time, Mr. Speaker, so that all of us will have a copy of that correspondence which indicates that he wishes to piggyback on a government program.

MR. SPEAKER: All right. The Chair recognizes this as being a concern raised by various members, and I'm sure we can now revert to the business of the House for this evening. Because indeed there has been some extreme latitude in statements made about motives in the House in the course of the debate, motives of the minister and so forth, and we've allowed a certain latitude this evening. Perhaps the minister will now come back to the subamendment.

MR. STEVENS: Thanks, Mr. Speaker. Speaking to the subamendment and the amendment on the Bill, there's no question that lottery revenues will fluctuate; that's been referred to tonight by a number of members. They have been going up, it's true, for a long period of time and not, as the Member for Edmonton-Mill Woods said, because of the economy but because of the opportunity of job creation and employment and people have disposable income more and more in this province. Thank goodness we don't have the kind of government that Manitoba had, where today the debt payment in Manitoba is now 14 percent of income: 14 percent of their income is committed to debt. That's the inheritance now that the Conservative government has got to deal with, and that's why lottery dollars are being used very wisely in this province. But they can go down, and that's the concern that was referred to by the Member for Calgary-North West in his remarks earlier tonight. This Bill gives the minister responsible the power to cope with these uncertainties in a manner designed to serve the people of Alberta very well.

Now, the Member for Edmonton-Strathcona said that I might be a pal of the Minister of Career Development and Employment. I'm glad that I'm a pal of that minister and other colleagues, very much so. Because I have the greatest of respect for this minister... [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Speaker, thank you. I have the greatest of respect for this minister's decisions that will be made with his cabinet and caucus colleagues for the benefit of the people of Alberta.

I want to say, too, that the experience has shown that the minister responsible has dealt with the stewardship of these lottery moneys in a very responsible way. And I'm going to indicate, Mr. Speaker, just some of the areas in which these allocations have been made. The grants given to culture -- and it's

referred to in the Bill specifically -- support and promote Alberta's arts and culture all through Alberta, from community to community, from organization to organization . . .

MR. SIGURDSON: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Belmont on a point of order.

MR. SIGURDSON: With due respect, Mr. Speaker, I just wish that the minister could use a paint brush and hit the broad side of the barn -- Standing Order 23 -- because still, again, he has yet to even mention the word "management" or anything else that's related to the subamendment or the amendment. Now, Mr. Speaker, I again realize that . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. member. That's sufficient. The minister once again will take it under advisement. The matter of having to make points of order about relevancy could have everybody jumping up and down on each other all night long, and that's entirely a waste of the time of the House.

MR. STEVENS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Before the interruption I was intending to show how the word "management" is used very carefully in correspondence to each of the foundations so that the moneys that are allocated are spent very carefully with no duplication. Now, in response to the Member for Edmonton-Gold Bar, I indicated to the member and to the members of the Assembly that I would table that correspondence. The only proviso I discussed with her was that I could reach the chairmen of those boards to have their understanding that I would be filing this correspondence. I'll do that at the next sitting of the Assembly, as I now have reached all of the chairmen.

But talking about management and the comments by a number of members, and particularly the Member for Edmonton-Strathcona, I want to say this: that the Act clearly provides for direction and supervision of those funds that are assigned to these foundations by the Minister of Culture and Multiculturalism. And that's management. It's important that we direct the broad areas of the disbursement of these funds and that the boards themselves determine the individual artists, the individual theatres, the individual areas for their use. So therefore, Mr. Speaker, I want to just indicate what has been so conveniently neglected to be referred to by the members of the opposition and how broadly these funds have been allocated across this province, and not to duplicate the work of the department of culture but, in fact to enhance the opportunity for artists, writers, creative people throughout this province. That's some idea of the kind of direction that this government has given with these funds, much to the appreciation not only of the foundation members themselves who have had the discussions with this office but with the recipients involved throughout this province, from the Fort Vermilion area of the province right down to the bottom southeast corner.

For example, Mr. Speaker, the Alberta Historical Resources Foundation. There's no question that that foundation is well known to the citizens of this province, but these additional funds that were announced just recently, a 50 percent increase, are going to Fort Macleod to continue a very, very extensive program there which will soon run out at the end of its three-year term; it's something like next year. But let me explain that of the extra funds that were provided to this office and directed to the foundation, \$800,000 will now be going annually to the Alberta Museums Association to benefit 132 museums across this

province. Now, that has enabled the department to take its limited amount of funds and develop it and manage it in a much more appropriate way. We'll be able to do that in a number of areas, whether it's staff training or volunteer programs throughout this province, in helping people manage those artifacts.

The balance of the funds going to the Alberta Historical Resources Foundation will be assisting in our Mainstreet programs. Now, those programs are well known and members are very proud of the way the communities have responded to the five programs we have in this province. What a wonderful matching program, and what a way to involve the private sector in developing our communities. There is an increase to that program alone of over \$225,000, so that the program will be nearly half a million dollars this year. The same foundation will be receiving another \$300,000 to enhance the current architectural preservation programs. Now, that is good management. It allows the department to ease out of that part of the program and involve itself instead with preservation strategies in other areas. The foundation will also be providing \$100,000 to be directed towards assisting communities and individual nonprofit organizations to undertake research and planning and feasibility studies so that when we have our revenues return and our restraint program is easing as our revenues increase, those programs will be there on the shelf for a community to reach out and say: "We're now able to address this problem. We can now do this preservation."

MR. McEACHERN: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The member talks about the money that's been handed out for various programs, and he does not talk about the problem, which is how you set up the process. It's the process that is at debate here tonight, not what is handed out. No one has complained about the particular moneys given out under the present arrangement. What we're talking about here is the arrangement, and he's just listing off a whole list and bragging about what money the government's given out.

MR. SPEAKER: What standing order is that?

AN HON. MEMBER: Twenty-three.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Nevertheless, with regard to the subamendment the minister has heeded the admonition that Edmonton-Belmont has given to him twice and has thrown in the word "management" and dealing with the management of the funds. It's still within order. Granted, it's a difficult issue to try to determine relevancy in terms of the debate this evening.

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your comments. The difficulty that this member has, too, is that he was very patient and listened carefully to the opposition members all evening and for the other evenings and mornings; that has been 17 hours. All I am trying to do is respond to the debate, which indicated that there were no management decisions being made and that there was no obligation on the part of this minister to make sure those funds were spent appropriately.

Mr. Speaker, I want to mention a direction given to the Alberta Art Foundation. Again, it's part of the management of the funds that are provided to this department. The government has brought a number of the smaller lottery recipients, the six licences under the purview of these four foundations -- and I've explained that over and over to the Member for Edmonton-Strathcona particularly. If you're going to manage, then you

have to listen, so what I've said in correspondence directed to that foundation, the Alberta Art Foundation, is that the present allocation will be increased and will provide assistance to the Alberta Crafts Council and the Alberta Potters Association. Now, if this group of 16 over there are uncomfortable helping potters or uncomfortable with the the crafts association, then that's unfortunate, but I'm very pleased that we've been able to do that for the first time. The remainder of the funds have now been available to umbrella groups and organizations.

Now, the ability of this department, then, to work with the foundation allows the department to use its funds more wisely and to reach out to more Albertans. For example, recently the members may have seen a press conference and a press release. I know they don't like to see this good news, but \$300,000 was allocated to gallery funding as additional funding to help manage . . .

MR. McEACHERN: Not relevant.

MR. SPEAKER: You may keep talking about relevancy . . . No, please, hon. member, we're going to have a little discussion here. But the matter is that all night long the difficulty with third reading -- and the Deputy Speaker and the Deputy Chairman of Committees and myself have talked about this matter with Table officers -- is that there's been such a wide-ranging debate on this subamendment that it is very difficult to be able to deal in terms of the relevancy. And for an hon. member to keep shouting out relevancy, I'm sorry, is beside the point. The admonitions are still there, and if the minister is going to finish shortly, then we'll have the same difficulty with whomever else stands up from any part of the House. Sorry, hon. member.

The Chair recognizes Edmonton-Strathcona.

MR. WRIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's the same Standing Order, I'm afraid, but I can just remind you, Mr. Speaker, that you will call to order a member who speaks to matters other than the question under discussion. It's not relevancy in a wide context; it is the question under discussion. Mr. Speaker, with respect, the question under discussion is democracy or fascism in the management of the funds, not the identity of the beneficiary. He's just reeling off a mindless list of beneficiaries.

MR. SPEAKER: With due respect, hon. member, two terms were used there that it's hard pressed for anybody to see.

Speaking to the point of order as raised by Edmonton-Strathcona, Edmonton-Belmont.

MR. SIGURDSON: Well, just further to that on the same Standing Order, Mr. Speaker, is that if the minister were to take the subamendment to the amendment, he would find that it's not just management but unnecessary management and disbursement of the fund. The operative word, perhaps, is "unnecessary," and perhaps what the minister ought to be addressing is the unnecessary management and disbursement of these public moneys.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, thank you for the direction.
Calgary-McCall, on the point of order.

MR. NELSON: Mr. Speaker, I just find it amazing, the cat calling the kettle black.

AN HON. MEMBER: You mean the pot, not the cat.

MR. NELSON: Some people call it the pot, but I'll call it the cat.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, we've had such a wide-ranging debate on this very narrow amendment that's been given here, this subamendment tonight. And I find it just incredible that these people here would just stand up and start arguing with the minister who is discussing the subamendment in the same light that these folks over here were. [interjection] Oh, shut up, you wimp. [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: First, I'm certain the hon. member would be gracious enough to withdraw his comment. Secondly, the Chair points out that when we deal with points of order, it is not the tradition of the House to be engaged in catcalls. Thank you. [interjection] No, it is not, and it will not be tolerated by the Chair.

Calgary-McCall, would you please . . .

MR. NELSON: I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker. I'll withdraw the comment. I would just indicate to the member there that certainly it would be useful for him to have the courtesy to allow other members to address the House in the same manner that we offered to him.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, I find it incredulous that these people over here . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: What Standing Order?

MR. NELSON: The same one you're discussing.

AN HON. MEMBER: Which one?

MR. NELSON: Twenty-three.

Mr. Speaker, the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. members. There'll be no more of that. The member will now wrap up the comments on the point of order, please, to be followed by the minister.

MR. NELSON: Mr. Speaker, I think the minister has been addressing the subamendment in the same form, in the same light, that the members who are complaining at the present time have been all evening. So I would suggest we allow the minister to make some reasonable comments, some comments that'll bear some fruit to the issue.

MR. SPEAKER: The Minister of Culture and Multiculturalism on the point of order or not? Thank you. No. That's fine.

The Chair is still regarding this as a difference of opinion and a complaint of the House, because once again we're caught on third readings and the great scope that's been allowed.

Minister of Culture and Multiculturalism, concluding comments or carrying on with the subamendment? Thank you.

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to conclude, but I would like to indicate that I appreciate the interruptions and I appreciate the expressions of concern. It is late, and what I would like to do is this. Rather than perhaps embarrass the members of the opposition with numbers, I'd like to just indicate this: these foundations across this province are managed very well by the citizens who have been appointed to those boards. These boards

have been given specific direction, including general guidelines that cover the broad framework of where the dollars should be spent. Now, that's wise management. It provides an opportunity for the boards to know in which areas the funds should be spent so that they won't be duplicating the work of the department; in fact, they will be enhancing that work. They will be reaching out to the citizens who will receive these opportunities throughout the province. There'll be no duplication.

Now, they may not be able to spend all of the dollars. Those dollars may be sitting at the end of the year, and what I'd like to say, Mr. Speaker, is this. In general terms the fundings have been provided to art festivals. One of the members indicated earlier in the debate on this same subamendment that there were no funds for festivals. Well, moneys have been provided for festivals now across this province. Moneys have been provided for arts presentations to schools, a very worthy project. This new program will be worked out with the branch to make arts accessible across this province, to school after school across this province. Programs will be developed in consultation with the foundations to support in-province touring of theatre, classical music, and dance.

And yes, there's money going to the Banff Television Festival, but unlike the Member for Edmonton-Strathcona who said on May 19 that there was \$150,000 of public money and it's now gone up 400 percent, that's not a fact. That information has been requested in a question and has not yet reached the floor of this House. But that's not a fact. The lottery dollars have gone to that festival for nine years, just as they have gone to other festivals. And the Fringe this year, the Calgary Jazz Festival, Nova playwrights, the Banff summer festival, and others will continue to receive funding, but now through the art foundation.

There are other programs, as I mentioned before the interruption, Mr. Speaker, that are very well received across this province: the gallery funding program, and there's \$200,000 now for public art. All of these programs involve management decisions as to how the money should be spent by the foundations on a broad basis. Those foundations will determine which artists are chosen. They may select juries, and the juries will make recommendations.

I think, Mr. Speaker, I would like to indicate this: there must be guidance; there must be management. The subamendment has proposed the inclusion of words with regard to management. I agree. There must be management but under the legislation and under the terms of the lottery licences that management is now provided. The Minister of Career Development and Employment has indicated that those moneys will now be under a fund in this province, not in Manitoba, not where he must write and seek funding. It'll be here under the control of this government and under this minister. This minister will be continuing to work with foundations across this province, and in addition to that recently the library support for regional systems was announced. Now, that could not have been done in the normal process. Those five regions were at different states of utilization of their headquarters. Some were in rented buildings; the announcement now means that those rents will no longer have to be paid once that building is built. That will give them additional money for library purchases or other library programs. The grants that are being given this way will help all sorts of social, spiritual, educational, and economic opportunities,

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Order please.

Under Standing Order 21. It's the stroke of midnight; there-

fore, the question must be put on the subamendment, the amendment, and the Bill.

All those in favour of the subamendment as proposed by the Leader of the Opposition, please say aye.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed, please say no.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

[Several members rose calling for a division]

MR. SPEAKER: Division.

If the House will bear with the Chair for half a moment, then after the Chair makes comment, the Chair will indeed recognize the fact that the procedure is about to take place. Because of the way Standing Orders are written, the Chair must have that sort of blind eye and inform the House that there has been a request made with respect to any divisions that might possibly take place in the next while, that unanimous consent might be given to waive the various time/bell sequences which should take place after the first division takes place. Now, is there unanimous consent to agree to that procedure?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed? Carried unanimously. Thank you.

The Chair puts the glasses on and recognizes that there were enough members for a division.

[The division bell was rung]

[Eight minutes having elapsed, the House divided]

For the motion:

| | | |
|----------|-----------|-----------|
| Barrett | Martin | Roberts |
| Chumir | McEachern | Sigurdson |
| Ewasiuk | Mitchell | Strong |
| Gibeault | Mjolsness | Taylor |
| Hewes | Pashak | Wright |
| Laing | Piquette | Younie |

Against the motion:

| | | |
|-------------|-----------|------------|
| Ady | Getty | Orman |
| Alger | Hyland | Payne |
| Bogle | Jonson | Pengelly |
| Brassard | Kowalski | Reid |
| Cassin | McClellan | Schumacher |
| Clegg | Mirosh | Shrake |
| Cripps | Moore, M. | Stevens |
| Downey | Moore, R. | Stewart |
| Drobot | Musgrove | Trynchy |
| Elzinga | Nelson | West |
| Fischer | Oldring | Young |
| Fjordbotten | | |

| | | |
|---------|-----------|-----------|
| Totals: | Ayes - 18 | Noes - 34 |
|---------|-----------|-----------|

[Motion on subamendment lost]

MR. SPEAKER: Call for the question with respect to the amendment as proposed by Edmonton-Avonmore.

Those in favour, please say aye,

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed, please say no.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion fails.

[Several members rose calling for a division]

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair would remind the House that because of our decision earlier this evening, we'll just have the recorded vote now.

For the motion:

| | | |
|----------|-----------|-----------|
| Barrett | Martin | Roberts |
| Chumir | McEachern | Sigurdson |
| Ewasiuk | Mitchell | Strong |
| Gibeault | Mjolsness | Taylor |
| Hewes | Pashak | Wright |
| Laing | Piquette | Younie |

Against the motion:

| | | |
|-------------|-----------|------------|
| Ady | Getty | Orman |
| Alger | Hyland | Payne |
| Bogle | Jonson | Pengelly |
| Brassard | Kowalski | Reid |
| Cassin | McClellan | Schumacher |
| Clegg | Mirosh | Shrake |
| Cripps | Moore, M. | Stevens |
| Downey | Moore, R. | Stewart |
| Drobot | Musgrove | Trynchy |
| Elzinga | Nelson | West |
| Fischer | Oldring | Young |
| Fjordbotten | | |

| | | |
|---------|-----------|-----------|
| Totals: | Ayes - 18 | Noes - 34 |
|---------|-----------|-----------|

[Motion on amendment lost]

MR. SPEAKER: Those in favour of third reading of Bill 10, please say aye.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed, please say no.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

[Several members rose calling for a division]

MR. SPEAKER: Division. Thank you.

For the motion:

| | | |
|----------|-----------|------------|
| Ady | Getty | Orman |
| Alger | Hyland | Payne |
| Bogle | Jonson | Pengelly |
| Brassard | Kowalski | Reid |
| Cassin | McClellan | Schumacher |
| Clegg | Mirosh | Shrake |
| Cripps | Moore, M. | Stevens |

| | | | | | |
|---------------------|-----------|-----------|--|-----------|-----------|
| Downey | Moore, R. | Stewart | Gibeault | Mjolsness | Taylor |
| Drobot | Musgrove | Trynchy | Hewes | Pashak | Wright |
| Elzinga | Nelson | West | Laing | Piquette | Younie |
| Fischer | Oldring | Young | | | |
| Fjordbotten | | | Totals: | Ayes - 34 | Noes - 18 |
| Against the motion: | | | [Bill 10 read a third time] | | |
| Barrett | Martin | Roberts | | | |
| Chumir | McEachern | Sigurdson | [At 12:17 a.m. on Friday the House adjourned to 10 a.m.] | | |
| Ewasiuk | Mitchell | Strong | | | |