

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA**

Title: **Thursday, July 27, 1989 8:00 p.m.**

Date: 89/07/27

[The House resumed at 8 p.m.]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

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

**Bill 11**  
**Senatorial Selection Act**

[Adjourned debate July 17: Mr. Pashak]

MR. PASHAK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Last day, when I adjourned debate, I attempted to make the point that I think the government's intentions in bringing this Bill forward were really quite well motivated. I think that along with the government side all opposition parties are concerned that with the perceived imbalance in power relationships in this country -- there's always been a perception that Ontario and Quebec together have been able to basically chart courses of action that not all of the regions of the country have been able to agree with and that the regions have been left out in the cold on important issues. Now, whether that argument would still have validity today, in light of the fact that only two provinces really have elected a majority of Progressive Conservatives to the House of Commons and that in fact Alberta and Quebec basically control those operations -- why Alberta should feel left out in the cold today is strange to me, but that's perhaps the perception that still may exist.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member, I hesitate to interrupt you, but I know you're just getting all set to go full flight.

Might we have unanimous consent of the House to revert to Introduction of Special Guests?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed? Thank you very much.  
Smoky River.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

MR. PASZKOWSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It gives me great pleasure tonight to introduce a true and loyal friend of this House, a man who has devoted many, many year of his life to the well-being of the province of Alberta. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce to you and through you a man who has a keen interest in tonight's discussions, Marv and Fran Moore.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you for yielding the floor, Calgary-Forest Lawn.

Qu'est-ce que c'est?

MR. CHUMIR: Mr. Speaker, in terms of introduction of special guests, I note that some special guests have just entered the House, and I would like to take this opportunity to introduce them to the House as well. There's Heather Molloy, Heather Smith, David Allen, and Irene Gouin -- I hope I've got them all

right -- who are here from the United Nurses association executive to hear debate on the Health Act, I understand, if we get to it. I'd ask the members of the House to join me in welcoming them to the Legislature.

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

**Bill 11**  
**Senatorial Selection Act**  
(continued)

MR. SPEAKER: Calgary-Forest Lawn, thank you.

MR. PASHAK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Now, to try and pick up the threads of the argument that I was trying to begin, I think we could view the Senatorial Selection Act as a measure that would bring us towards something that is on the agenda as a Triple E Senate -- an effective, equal, and elected Senate -- and that is seen as a measure that would help to bring about more fairness and more opportunity for the regions of the country to have an effective say in decisions that affect us nationally and that are made at the national level.

It's not the only way we can approach this problem. As members are aware, our former leader Grant Notley had proposed a House of provinces, and there are other approaches. In fact, I have indicated to the chairman of the Triple E group that I could support the notion of pursuing a Triple E Senate along with other ideas that might help to give the west a greater say in national decision-making. But as I say, it's not the only method.

However, my concern with the Bill that's before us, the Senatorial Selection Act, is that it might actually impede progress towards that goal of arriving at a Triple E Senate. To understand that, I think we have to go back to the Meech Lake agreement itself and how we got into this position of having a Senatorial Selection Act. Alberta, it seems to me, agreed to go along with meeting Quebec's demands, and the price they paid for that was to get Senate reform on the agenda of first ministers' conferences. The Prime Minister of the country agreed to that. He agreed to place Senate reform on the agenda of subsequent conferences. But what did we get out of that? Did we get very much? Just the very fact that Senate discussions appear on these constitutional agendas is no certainty that we are going to move any closer towards the Triple E Senate or a more effective voice for the regions of the country in national decision-making. It's rather like the meeting of the flat earth society. No matter how often they meet or talk about trying to make the earth round, they can never do that. So it seems to me that what Alberta gave up was its most important bargaining chip and got very little in return other than these meetings. Certainly there is no guarantee that Senate reform of any kind will take place in the future.

Instead, it seems that what the Prime Minister of the country bought was support from the provincial Premiers, and they got that through giving the Premiers the opportunity to have a say in the patronage game. Of course, a lot of Premiers would welcome that, but the Prime Minister's approach to this really was that the provinces should come forward with a list of names, and on the basis of that list of names the Prime Minister would then make a selection, and those people would be appointed to the Senate.

But I think Alberta in some respects has confounded the

Prime Minister by proposing an election. If anybody had an axe to grind with the Prime Minister and really wanted to get back at him, I think this would be the way to do it: to have the province actually select somebody and have that name go forward for his consideration. Because look at the tremendous dilemma he's placed in. If he doesn't accept the name that comes forward as a result of an election, then he's seen as going against the democratic process. But on the other hand, if he accepts that name, then he creates a precedent whereby every province that holds elections and sends names forward would have the right to expect the Prime Minister to name those people as Senators. I think in that it creates a real problem for us in Alberta if that process should be institutionalized, because if we go ahead with electing a Senator without dealing with the other parts of the Triple E package, if we go ahead without dealing with the effectiveness of that representation or the equality of that representation, then in fact what we would have is somebody elected to Ottawa in a situation in which Alberta and the other western provinces would still be quite underrepresented relative to central Canada.

As members are aware, 24 Senators are appointed from the provinces of Quebec and Ontario each and only six from Alberta and the other western provinces. In total there are 104 Senators, so if we had 48 elected Senators from Quebec and Ontario, they would far outnumber the number of Senators from Alberta. Why this is critical: if we began to actually elect Senators, then the only restriction on the fact that the Senators do not use their full constitutional powers would be gone. As members probably pretty well know, the Senate actually has considerable powers that go far beyond the ones they actually exercise. The Senate today can veto all legislation. If the Senate had wanted to use its actual constitutional powers, it could have vetoed the patent drug laws that came before it recently, it could have vetoed the trade deal; it could do any of these things. The only limitations on Senate powers are the fact that it can't initiate money Bills and that there are some restrictions on constitutional amendments. It can only use a suspensive 180-day veto with respect to amendments that would affect its own existence.

But the point I'm trying to make is that if you began to elect Senators, you'd be giving legitimacy to those Senators in terms of exercising their full constitutional rights, because at the moment the only inhibition on exercising those constitutional rights is the fact that they're not elected. They feel that because they're not elected, the only kind of veto they can really use is a suspensive veto. So Alberta could be in a worse position than ever if we began to actually in effect elect Senators.

In addition to that, I'm really not quite convinced that all Albertans, if we did . . . Supposing we got beyond all those problems, though, and we began to elect Senators here in the province of Alberta on an equal basis with other provinces in Canada. Suppose we had the situation that was recommended by the Anderson committee and we had six Senators coming from each province. If we elected those Senators on political lines, as we do today, all it might mean is that in effect we'd only have a replication of what we already have existing provincially; that is, we'd have two elected Chambers that now would be inserted between the people and those levels at which decisions are actually made. I'm not sure that this would improve the lot of Albertans in any significant way.

I think that if the government were really serious about introducing senatorial reform in this country, it would begin at home. There's nothing within our constitutional process to prevent the

province of Alberta from establishing a Senate here in the province. The same reasons for having a provincial Senate exist as for having a federal Senate.

AN HON. MEMBER: Patronage.

MR. PASHAK: Well, patronage, if you want to call it that.

There are the same regional differences existing within the province as exist within the country as a whole. We have significant differences between the cities and their interests and rural areas. In fact, many modern, democratic political states have within their territories Senates. I think the state of Nebraska, for example, is the only state within the United States that doesn't have a Senate. The way their Houses work within the states is that Bills have to be approved by both levels -- by a Legislative Assembly and by the Senate -- in order for them to be enacted. In Australia most of the states have Senates as well that are elected -- in the case of New South Wales on the basis of proportional representation.

So if we were serious about having a Senate in this country, why wouldn't we begin here in the province of Alberta and establish a provincial Senate? Just look at the different province we might have today if we'd actually had a Senate back in 1905. Maybe Edmonton might not have been the capital. The Liberals might not have gotten away with their gerrymandering of the province. As you're probably aware, there was quite a conflict between Calgary and Edmonton to see which city would become the capital. Most of the representation was in long, narrow bands throughout the province, except around the city of Edmonton where friends of the Prime Minister at that time, Rutherford and Oliver, decided to gerrymander. The way the constituencies ran were like little spokes out from the centre of Edmonton. So Edmonton had undue representation and undue influence when it came to choosing the site of the provincial capital of this province.

Today we may have had a very . . . Now, I've got to admit that I'm really delighted with the fact that the decision was made to locate the capital in Edmonton, because otherwise we might not have had so many New Democrats in the Legislature. On the other hand, if that hadn't occurred, Calgary might have had the university, the legislative buildings, and instead of having two large metropolitan areas that are vying with each other constantly for power and recognition, we might have had one major metropolitan area in this province that would have played a much more dynamic and important role in the Canadian confederacy. That's all speculation, I admit.

But even today there may be some advantages in having an elected Senate in the province of Alberta, especially if that Senate were elected on the basis of something like proportional representation. We know that there are some constituencies in this province that are relatively small in population. I think the vote of somebody in Little Bow, for example, has the equivalence of four of the votes of people in my constituency. The ratio is roughly that in terms of electors. So perhaps if we had a Senate that was elected on the basis of proportional representation, interests from all over the province could be represented in that Senate. There'd be more fairness, and maybe we'd have quite a different and more humane province.

These are just some things for the minister to take into account if this government is really sincere in its commitment to try to bring about an effective, equal, and elected Senate in this country.

MR. SPEAKER: Minister of Energy.

MR. ORMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is only on rare occasions that legislators have the privilege to debate parliamentary matters of true national significance. Bill 11, the Senatorial Selection Act, provides the hon. members of this Assembly with such an occasion. Providing as it does for the democratic election of Alberta Senators, Bill 11 should be rightfully considered as historic legislation. I have no doubt that future generations of Canadians will someday regard Bill 11 as a milestone in the evolution of democratic government in Canada. It is for this very reason, and with a strong sense of history, that I am exceedingly proud to stand in this Legislature this evening, both as an Albertan and as a Canadian, to add my voice of support for this legislation.

Before commenting on what I believe are some of the important features of the Bill, I would like to commend Premier Getty for his untiring pursuit of Senate reform, for as we all know, Senate reform is at the heart and soul of Bill 11. Mr. Speaker, historians will be hard pressed to identify another Canadian political leader who has been more committed than Don Getty to transforming the Canadian Senate into a relevant and effective governing institution, an institution that has both the respect and the support of Canadians. Our history books record how almost from the very beginning of our nationhood political leaders in Canada have talked about the urgent need for Senate reform. I can't help but think that our Premier's determination to achieve meaningful reform in the Senate will come to be viewed as a significant contribution to the ongoing process of nation building, a legacy that future generations of Albertans will point to with pride.

Those who are familiar with the issue of Senate reform will recognize that there is almost unanimous agreement that the Senate as it currently is structured is not fulfilling the important role originally envisaged by our Fathers of Confederation; namely, to represent and protect provincial and regional interests. Moreover, there exists today and there has existed for many, many decades a pervasive attitude among the large majority of Canadians that the Senate is an antiquated institution that serves little useful purpose other than a place for dispensing patronage. In this regard it is noteworthy that even the majority of Senators agree that reform is necessary.

It is my view, Mr. Speaker, that legislators across the country, federal as well as provincial, must be concerned with this state of affairs. As legislators we must be concerned when our governing institutions are held in disrepute, and we must be concerned when our governing institutions show they are clearly incapable of effectively responding to the needs of the country.

Alberta has taken the position that we cannot continue to sit back and do nothing. Yet, at the same time, we have not moved precipitously, for we truly recognize the immensity of Senate reform and its fundamental importance to the way in which our country is governed. Rather, we have taken what I would consider to be a very judicious and comprehensive approach, which has at every stage actively sought extensive input from Albertans and the support of this Legislative Assembly and other governments across Canada. [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. ORMAN: The process we have followed in formulating our position on Senate reform bears repeating here tonight be-

cause it provides the context for understanding the purpose and intent of the legislation and it helps to illustrate the important point that Bill 11 is the next logical step in a series of developments that have consistently been supported by Albertans and this Assembly.

Hon. members will no doubt recall that in November 1983 the Alberta government established a Select Special Committee on Senate Reform headed by my colleague who is now the minister of consumer affairs, Dennis Anderson. What is perhaps most significant about the select committee, aside from its recommendations, of course, is the degree to which Albertans were canvassed for their input through advertisements and public meetings across this province. Further public meetings and hearings were held, and the select committee also had extensive discussions with other governments both inside and outside Canada, academic experts, and other key groups. The overwhelming response for Albertans was that the Senate was not functioning in the best interests of either the province or the country as a whole. There was a widespread consensus that Senate reform was badly needed. In fact, only about 2 percent of Albertans indicated that they believed the Senate should continue functioning as is, which was less than the number of Albertans who advocated outright abolishment.

What is most significant, however, about the select committee is the set of recommendations it brought forward supporting the Triple E Senate: elected, equal, and effective. Expressed another way, Mr. Speaker, the select committee recommended that the provinces have an equal number of Senators. This particular approach enabled the provinces to have a regional voice, and it was something that our original Fathers of Confederation envisaged. This is the only fully democratic approach to an elected Senate.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to say that with regard to our Premier, there has been significant achievement in terms of getting agreement of the other provinces and of the federal government's commitment to make Senate reform a priority in future constitutional discussions. As my hon. colleague the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs pointed out in his discussions on this legislation, the Meech Lake accord was at the fundamental heart of what we have achieved in entrenching Senate reform as a constitutional item for discussion amongst first ministers. It was our Premier, Don Getty, who at Saskatoon also was able to get unanimous support for Alberta in taking the lead in cross-Canada discussions on Senate reform.

Mr. Speaker, it is very important, in my view, that during the move towards the senatorial selection, we have a very firm commitment to working together as Albertans and Canadians to achieve the first selection of a candidate to then stand as our Senator in this province. I do believe very firmly that with the six Senators we have today, it is important that they step down, that they seek the elected process that we're putting in place today. I would challenge them, and I would hope that the candidates that stand for the one vacant seat extend that challenge to the remaining Senators who are in the Senate today by appointment. It would strike to the heart of what we believe to be the democratic process. As Canadians, as a nation, internationally we are recognized for our commitment and our strong sense of democracy. For that very reason I believe it would be very important that the existing Senators in this country resign their seats and stand for this elected process.

Mr. Speaker, there has been some criticism, and I find it very difficult to accept, that having the senatorial selection during a

municipal or a federal or a provincial election is somehow confusing to the electorate. I should say to you that I as an elector in this province find that offensive, and I can assure you that the balance of Albertans find that suggestion offensive. They are very capable of distinguishing between issues, between levels of government, and I believe they look forward with a great deal of anticipation to being able to select the first Senator in Canada.

As we know, the process that was followed by the state of Oregon in the beginning of this century was a very similar process. I'm sure at that particular time there was much debate by opponents to a elected Senate, that somehow it couldn't work, somehow it was coming at us too fast, somehow it wasn't the right thing to do at this particular time. Mr. Speaker, whenever we are breaking new ground, whenever we are moving on to an area that has never been moved on to before, obviously there are moments of doubt, moments of reservation. But I can assure you that it is the right thing in the minds of Albertans, and I'm sure that it is the right thing in the minds of the people in this Assembly, for they have themselves sought that very same democratic process.

We are aware of the enormity of this task, and we are aware of the enormity of what's proposed in Bill 11. It is historic legislation, Mr. Speaker, and I believe that Albertans are up for it. I would suggest that the Canadian Senate must reflect the same democratic principles that are reflected at the other levels of government. I believe that the time for change is real, and I believe the time for reform is now, and that is what Bill 11 is all about.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Glengarry.

MR. DECORE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm surprised to hear the comments from the New Democratic Party as to what the purpose of this legislation is: whether or not we would be in a better position then we are now. I can't think of examples of where we've won in terms of our or western Canada's relationship to the federal government. It always seemed to me that Alberta and western Canada received the short end of the stick and continue to receive the short end of the stick. I think one has to admit that if . . .

MR. McEACHERN: Even when the Liberals were in power?

MR. DECORE: And even the Liberals. When the Liberals were there, as the hon. Member for Edmonton-Kingsway is quite correctly noting, the Liberals weren't kind in some of the issues that they dealt with with respect to western Canada, in the same way that the Conservatives weren't fair in all of the issues that they were concerned with in respect of western Canada. The NDP will never get that opportunity, so we don't have to worry about that.

Mr. Speaker, one of the examples I like to use, and I used this in a previous debate in this Assembly, is to highlight the assessment that was done by a professor in Calgary and a professor in Edmonton. That report was printed and set out in the *Globe and Mail*. I think most of the members of this Assembly read it, but just let me remind members of the Assembly what these two professors found. They found that between the years 1980 to 1985, and put into perspective, that western Canada was in the worst recession since the 1930s during this period of time and that Ontario and Quebec were in boom times . . . They dis-

covered that in that five-year period all of the moneys that were paid to central government -- all of the moneys that Albertans paid in any way, shape, or form whatsoever that went to Ottawa were calculated, and then all of the moneys that were paid back from Ottawa to Alberta in any way, shape, or form were also calculated, and they discovered that there was a deficit position for Alberta in spite of the fact that we were in this recessionary period. When they calculated the moneys that Ontarians had paid into Ottawa and the moneys that Ontarians had received back, they were in a net benefit position.

If you look at statistics that The Canadian Press compiled that showed the kind of moneys that are given for economic regional development, Quebec and Ontario always get the lion's share of the money. The statistics I saw, Mr. Speaker, showed that even though Alberta has 2.5 million people, they didn't even get what they were entitled to during the Mulroney reign, didn't even get what they were entitled to by a prorated position to their population. The only province that suffered worse than us was P.E.I.

Now, you have to look at those issues, and you've got to include NEP, and say to yourself, "Are we going to continue wanting to get the short end of the stick?" The answer as far as I'm concerned is no. I don't want it. Our constituents in Edmonton-Glengarry don't want it, and I don't think Albertans want it.

So what do we do about it? I don't think you can change the representation-by-population principle. That's a principle that's sacred in our parliamentary system. That's the reason, to me, why the House of Commons and its makeup will never change. We'll always see a greater number of people from Ontario or Quebec in that Assembly than from elsewhere. If that's going to be the case, where do you look for some attempt to get some kind of fairness and equity, some kind of reasonableness in the whole process? Well, the only place left is the Senate. I think that's where the changes must come -- and that's where our party disagrees with the people in the ND Party -- that that must be the area that has change and has change effected.

Mr. Speaker, the government has spent much time focusing on one "E" of the Triple E, and that is the election of the Senator. I have spoken in this Assembly before and indicated that I think we should have packaged the whole thing together, that we should have had a strategy for the whole thing, that Meech Lake is a mistake, and that a plan or a strategy involving the election of a Senator and what "effective" means should have been worked out and should have been pursued. But, for the moment, we're dealing with this Bill, Bill 11. We're prepared, I'm prepared as the representative of the constituency of Edmonton-Glengarry, to give it our support. There are changes, I believe, that must be made, changes that will make it fair, more equitable. I'd like to draw the attention of this Assembly to some of those things that need change.

Mr. Speaker, one of the requirements of Bill 11 is that 1,500 people sign the nomination papers for a person wishing to be a candidate for the Senate. Now, I think most of us, many of us, have had experience in other levels of government. One never had to find 1,500 people to act as people who are pushing you forward and nominating you for this process. I think 1,500 is much too onerous, and I would suggest that something in the vicinity of 200 or 250 names would be more than adequate. The process of getting an affidavit and using an affidavit with 1,500 signatures is immense. I think this gives a decided advantage to big parties, to the three! parties, and if somebody wants to run as

an Independent, then this is a great detriment to that man or that woman coming forward.

The next issue that I wish to draw to the attention of the Assembly is the requirement for the deposit. Is it democratic? Is it democracy for us to say you've got to post a bond or an amount of \$4,000? I think that's outrageous. And I know there's the problem of candidates who give difficulty, act as spokesmen for all kinds of crazy causes, and you need some kind of a deterrent that ensures that you don't have to put up with 300 or 400 people of that kind, of that type, who simply want to go in there for a lark or a joke. But \$4,000, Mr. Speaker, I think is way too high and that that should be changed. Perhaps a deposit of \$250 or as high as \$500 would be more adequate.

Mr. Speaker, there is a requirement that no member of this Assembly . . .

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

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Calgary-Forest Lawn.

MR. PASHAK: Yeah. Under *Beauchesne* 659:

It is not regular on this occasion, however, to discuss in detail the clauses of the bill.

MR. DECORE: I haven't referred to the numbers or to the categories or the subsections. I'm alerting the Assembly to some of the issues that are of difficulty, that need to be attended to and watched and addressed at the time that amendments are put forward in more particular form.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair will take that as indeed the general thrust of the member's progress. The Chair also appreciates the intervention by Calgary-Forest Lawn, because I'm certain that all other members will indeed adhere to *Beauchesne* and that citation throughout the rest of second readings.

MR. DECORE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There is one other section here that I think may have crossed . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Don't cite it; just do it.

MR. DECORE: . . . may have crossed the minds of some of the members of this Assembly, and that is the restriction that is attempted to be imposed on people of this Assembly or people who are members of the Senate itself. Surely if Albertans want to see elected Senators, the best thing to happen would be for all of those Senators who are there now to resign and to involve themselves in an election. Surely that's what I would like to see and all of the members -- perhaps not all -- most of the members of this Assembly would like to see. To limit that -- and to say that a member of this Assembly cannot be a candidate or a Senator cannot be a candidate or a Member of Parliament cannot be a candidate, surely it defeats the very purpose of what we're intending to do. Mr. Speaker, I think that we've got to give some second thought to that provision, that it isn't fair. A provision that says that you can't hold two offices is, I think, the way to handle the situation.

AN HON. MEMBER: Mayors could be candidates.

MR. DECORE: Yes, indeed; mayors could be candidates, because this is a democracy. This is a democracy.

MR. SPEAKER: Through the Chair, please, hon. member.

MR. DECORE: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Energy used the word "offensive." I thought that a strange word to use with respect to the timing of an election. Some of us have been through other elections, and it's important to a school trustee or to a person running as an alderman or as a mayor to get the full attention of the public at a critical time. Perhaps the Minister of Energy hasn't noticed, but in some communities it's difficult to get five people out to a meeting that's going to be discussing a debate between candidates for the school board. It happens in the city of Edmonton. When you realize the kind of moneys that are looked after, spent, by those school trustees, by those candidates who wish to get the vote of the public, I think it's just an added burden, another problem that takes away from the focus of the election at that local level. I don't think we would want to see the focus taken away from the important issues that Albertans have to deal with with respect to municipal elections or, indeed, during a provincial election.

Mr. Speaker, I think that if you're going to go this route -- and there's a small period of time before we get all those Senators in place -- we've got to perhaps do these elections; these piecemeal elections I guess is the best way to explain them, or phrase them. But if we're prepared to do this, if we're prepared to have the courage in taking this action, I think we've got to have the courage to spend the kind of money that allows the full focus to be put on those men and those women who want to represent Alberta as its Senator. Nothing should be taken away from that focus: no provincial election, no federal election, and no municipal election. I think we owe it to those people who want to run for the Senate in the same way that we owe it to the municipal people or the provincial people or the federal people.

Mr. Speaker, there is need for this kind of legislation. We agree with the legislation. We think that to be fairer and more equitable, changes need to be made. Once this legislation is put into effect, I think it will have a positive effect on the way Ottawa must deal with Alberta in the future and the way it must deal with other provinces in the future.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

Red Deer-North, followed by Edmonton-Strathcona.

MR. DAY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't think anybody could stand in the House tonight and not have a sense of history and a sense of destiny and even a sense of taking charge in a greater way of our own destiny in a provincial way as we consider the implications of what we're doing here and what we're debating and what we're discussing: the possibility, the steps moving us towards a Senate in this country that's elected, equal, and effective. There is a sense of history to that, Mr. Speaker, and we truly are looking at taking charge of our own destiny. I see it in a way as linking arms, as it were, across over a century with our founding fathers in their initial drafts and redrafts of that BNA Act.

It's already been noted that they spent six of the 14 days, that one 14-day session, just addressing this topic. I believe that at that time they were committed to the fact, as history records, that we needed regional representation in the fledgling country that was beginning. They knew that if they were going to reach out from sea to sea, as they later declared it to be, they were go-

ing to have to assure those in the eastern and westernmost reaches that there would be that type of representation for them. So I believe the intentions were good, though we know that in practice it did not work out and that without equal, elected, and effective representation the Senate which they created at that time was doomed to fail. And in fact it has failed, Mr. Speaker, in terms of representing the interests of the regions.

Down through the century or more that has ensued, different notable figures in our history have stood and spoken and said that we've got to have an elected type of Senate. In 1908 Sir Wilfrid Laurier spoke about that. Other people have spoken about the need for regional interests. But in the history of Canada it's just been in these last few years that one province, under the leadership of somebody who had the vision -- it was Premier Getty who had the vision that it could happen, who had the vision that if we were willing to be tenacious and get in and fight for it, we could actually see it happen. It's just been these last few years; never before in our history have the steps been taken that are being taken now, even tonight, to see the potential of an elected, equal, and effective Senate come into being.

I won't go into the litany of problems that have besieged our country with the wrong type of representation or no representation in central Canada. We're all familiar with that . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: They're all Tory MPs.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. DAY: . . . and I won't stand here and say it's the Senators' fault. It is not the fault of any Senators. It's the fault of a system, a system that needs to be corrected and a system that is in our grasp of correcting.

We've done a number of things that are obvious in terms of strategy. The Member for Edmonton-Glengarry has said that there has been no strategy. There has been careful, there has been painstaking strategy over a number of years in bringing this to fruition. The Anderson report was a significant step in bringing to the attention of legislators and the public the ways and means of establishing and seeing a Triple E Senate come into being. We know that because of the focus of power in central Canada, not having an elected Senate is actually tearing at the fabric of our nationhood. Cries of separatism continue periodically, and it seems more and more to be coming from across our land: let this province go; let that province go; separate; get away. Not having proper representation, not having anything to outweigh the heavy population representation in central Canada is tearing at the fabric of our country, of our nation. In this Bill we see the possibility to take a significant step to weave the threads of strength through that torn fabric. This is not just an Alberta question; this is a national question.

Too often we hear the cries that it can't work; the United States is different: it can work there, but it can't work here. In the United States we can see a tiny state like Rhode Island with the same amount of representation as huge New York, a tiny Maryland stand up against California because they have an equal number of Senators, elected Senators, dealing in an effective Senate. It can happen, and it happens in jurisdictions around the world. Who would have thought, back at the turn of this century, when little Oregon stood up and said: "We need an elected Senate. We're going to elect our Senators." Many people in the nation south of here laughed at that time and said it will never happen. But it was like the proverbial prairie fire.

When that state took that stand, the moral suasion could not be resisted by the other states and other Senators, and the ensuing elected and equal and effective Senate took place. I believe we can make it happen here and that we can take the steps to counterbalance the ill effects of federalism that are tearing our country apart. I believe we can provide that irresistible force, that moral suasion.

People say that you might be able to convince the provinces on the outer limits of the country but you would never convince central Canada. Mr. Speaker, it was an honour to be a small part of a Senate task force that visited some provinces and talked to legislators, media, people at the university, and people in the streets about the potential for this type of Senate. It was exciting to see the following day in some of those provinces, after some open discussions and public discussions, already on the television and in the newspapers the excitement of the possibilities. It just caught fire, the reality of it being able to happen. People said, "The big provinces, Quebec and Ontario, we'll never get them on side." Mr. Speaker, it was less than a year ago that the province of Quebec, with its huge population and representation, the province that people had said would never embrace a Triple E Senate, watched with horror as a non-elected Senate threatened to stop free trade, the free trade which meant much for their province. They got, maybe for the first time in their history, a taste of what it was like to be under the rule of a Senate that is not elected, is not equal, is not effective. Other provinces, even the central provinces, are beginning to see the possibilities.

It is discouraging to hear remarks from the opposition when Albertans are saying we need better representation in central Canada and we need our regional interests represented. And I will quote, because if I was just to state this next comment, Mr. Speaker, members across would say that I was making it up. I'm going to quote from one of their members, the Member for Edmonton-Highlands, her reason for not going with this Act. I'm quoting from *Hansard*, so I do not wish to have it said that I'm saying something that's untrue, though people will not believe it was said. Here was the rationale, Mr. Speaker; here it was. She said she would support it "If it were a Bill that were sanctioned by the government of Canada . . ." Mr. Speaker, it's overwhelming that that would be -- and I wonder if that is the criterion? Of course it is the criterion of that party. If it's sanctioned and if it bolsters; centralism, they'll support it, but if it protects our regional interests and the concerns of Albertans, they back off. But the quote is there for history to sadly read.

I'm confident, Mr. Speaker, that history won't take time to read that as they look back on the successes of this initiative. To simply abolish the Senate, as they suggest, leaves us with the same problem: we cannot overcome the regional misrepresentation. Abolish it, and it solves nothing. Reform it, and we solve everything.

Mr. Speaker, the provincial Liberal Party wants us to cancel out our one hope of gaining an elected Senate by having nothing to do with Meech Lake. We have a chance, because it was our Premier, it was Premier Getty . . . When Quebec was asking for a special veto during those Meech Lake constitutional talks, it was our Premier who said that if Quebec gets a veto, we all get a veto. Every province deserves a veto, and having the potential for a veto protects us from having central Canada concoct a strange form of Senate reform that we could never live with, pass it under the present amending formula of seven provinces and 50 percent of the population, ram it down our constitutional

throats, and say: "There. We reformed it a little bit. Now go away and don't bother us any more." We are unprotected, if we take the Liberal leader's thought on that, from having a type of Senate reform that would forever extinguish our hopes of seeing true Senate reform happen. We have that possibility. It's the possibility of having it entrenched in every constitutional discussion until it's finally achieved. And we throw that away, we throw away our hopes, by going with the Liberal strategy.

Mr. Speaker, I do appreciate hearing from the Liberals that they will at least support the Bill, but we have the possibility here of claiming our birthright, of linking arms with our forefathers of 120 years ago and claiming our birthright. [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. You can continue in half a moment. The Chair just wants to remind everyone here that this is not Committee of the Whole, it's not Committee of Supply. There's more decorum required in this debate. Thank you.

Red Deer-North.

MR. DAY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I won't blame the entire commotion on the "decree."

Mr. Speaker, if I can leave the Assembly with this thought. We have the possibility of claiming our birthright with this Bill. As I look back in ancient history, Old Testament history as a matter of fact, we are familiar with a story of two people, Jacob and Esau. Esau had a birthright, but he came home one night and you know what? He was tired. He was just plain tired, and he gave up his birthright for a mess of pottage. I say, Mr. Speaker, that at this point in our history we cannot tire of this pursuit. We must see that our birthright is within our grasp, for Albertans and for Canada as a nation. And for a messy pile of pottage as has been offered to us by the NDP, by the socialist thinkers of this country, we cannot give up. We must press on and not tire and, like Jacob of old, grasp hold of our birthright and see us gain the promises of our inheritance.

I ask all members to support this Bill.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to congratulate the leadoff speaker for the Conservatives tonight, the Minister of Energy, in not reading more than two-thirds of his speech and reading it right well. His children must be real proud of him at bedtime.

This Bill, Mr. Speaker, is a typical Tory Bill: fraudulent. It's fraudulent because under the impression of being a reform Bill, it is not. There's a great flurry of activity signifying nothing. There is a problem; of course there's a problem. The problem is lack of regional representation at the centre. It is thought that this Bill is a way station to reforming the Senate so it will give that representation. It is nothing of the sort, Mr. Speaker. It is analogous to the jewel in Mr. Lougheed's crown when he came to power with the Conservative Party in 1971: Bill 1, the Alberta Bill of Rights. What a fraud. It signified nothing, and yet it has borne a heavy freight of self-congratulation by the Conservatives all the time since then. It signifies nothing.

This Bill is likewise in such a category, for this amongst other reasons. First, there is no certainty that after this expensive process the Alberta nominee will in fact be appointed. Secondly, it is in itself profoundly undemocratic in that there are no limits at all on the spending of a candidate for the Senate, quite apart from the other incidents that have been noticed, such as a high deposit. But even if the person who is nominated were

appointed by the Prime Minister -- and of course, the statements from the Prime Minister so far have been negative to that -- then it would only tend to add legitimacy to a very undemocratic and undesirable state of affairs. I refer to the fact that nearly half the seats, 48 out of 104, are in the possession of the provinces of Ontario and Quebec, so the rest of the country only has a slight majority due to the entry of Newfoundland and two seats, one each from each of the Territories. The chances of equal representation, which is one of the necessary attributes of a reformed Senate, will not be there, with little hope of ever being there, because of the provisions of the Constitution regarding Senate reform. There is sort of a degree of self-deception about this on the part of the government that would be surprising were it not the case that we do understand they are Conservatives. Take the last speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: No, no; don't, please.

MR. WRIGHT: Take him anyway.

The level of debate there is summed up by his taking so out of context the remarks that fell from the hon. Member for Edmonton-Highlands when she said yes, she might well go along with the part of the Bill that deals with the nomination if the government of Canada undertook, in fact, to appoint the nominee. But since there is no such undertaking, it's a nonstarter.

The same member said that the election of the Senators would solve everything. It's bad enough having members appointed to such an undemocratic institution as constituted at present. It would be worse having members elected to a similarly unbalanced constitution. But worse than that, we don't need a second level of election. We do need a counterpoise at the centre, but to have a second House which is elected across the country and is permanently there is a completely unnecessary expense for what it will achieve. It would presumably function like the Senate is supposed to function and mercifully doesn't; namely, as a second House reconsidering everything that the House of Commons passes, with certain restrictions on money Bills. We don't need that for 95 percent of the legislation, but we can't be sure in advance what we do need it for.

So we in the New Democrats say that the Senate should be abolished and replaced with a better system. Now, the attempt that the government is making to make a reform shows no imagination at all. We simply adopt an American solution, much as we tend to in other ways in this country these days. There are other ways of doing it. The New Democrats some years ago, when Mr. Notley was with us, proposed that way, and it is a House or council of the provinces. So that hon. members can realize the barrenness of this Bill before us, Mr. Speaker, I will describe what could be the case if another solution were adopted. And I'm not saying that even this solution is the ideal one; perhaps there's a better one. But it's certainly much better than lamely chipping away at trying to elect people to a fundamentally flawed second House.

The council or House of the provinces would be a body that is called together by a majority of the provinces when they considered that there was some legislation that the House of Commons was passing that was unfair. Now, there's no magic in a majority of the provinces. It would be a minority of the population, quite possibly. It could be any two provinces or three provinces, but we happen to say a majority of the provinces, that could call that House into session. Then the governments of

each province would nominate an equal number each. Now, the number, whether it be two or half a dozen or whatever, from each province would be something to be settled, but an equal number from each province. They would then sit on the matter in question. It is expected that the sort of matters they would deal with, Mr. Speaker, would be matters affecting the areas of concurrent powers, the definition of issues justifying use of federal emergency powers, the exercise of federal emergency powers, treaties relative to provincial jurisdiction, shared-cost programs, and ratification or rejection of federal appointments.

So there would be quite a list of important things it would do, and the list would not be exhaustive because it cannot be anticipated always what turns out to be important; but certainly emergency measures, shared-cost programs, the sorts of things that go to the root of our social and economic life in the province. Certainly a national energy program would be one such. That's not a shared-cost program but a very important program that might not be anticipated if you were to draw an exhaustive list of topics. So the list should not be exhaustive.

But the essence is that each province would nominate their number. And note that this is democratic because it is a democratically elected government that does the nomination, and those nominees only sit for the length of the session. They could be Members of the Legislative Assembly of the province, they could be civil servants, they could be other appointees. But there is no expense entailed in the selection of them, nor is there a permanent burden of expense as would be the case with permanently elected representatives.

That is the sort of imaginative solution that I commend to any people in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, who are seriously concerned with Senate reform. Lift your eyes; just don't look at models close at hand. This particular model, the House of provinces, is modeled on the upper House in West Germany. You probably know they have a very good, in my opinion, method of representation in both the lower House and the upper House of West Germany.

The powers of the council would not be such as to undermine the federal government's responsibility to an elected House in the main areas of action such as money Bills, although again, if there was unfairness there, it could be called into session.

Mr. Speaker, the basic objection, then, of this Bill is that it would, if followed, tend to legitimize the status quo. Far from being a reforming Bill, it would legitimize exactly what we don't want. Because if other provinces followed suit and elected their Senators, then the province of Ontario and the province of Quebec would be delighted at together forming nearly half the total and would be that much less willing to do anything about reform. We must clear out the Senate lock, stock, and barrel now and start afresh, Mr. Speaker, not tinker around with half measures. The problem is that both the American Senate and the Canadian Senate are anomalies -- fossils, you might say -- because each of them tried to reproduce in their respective countries the British Constitution in its essence at the particular time that it was drawn up. Thus the House of Lords in England was still strong in 1780, and so the American Senate was reproduced as a strong House. It was not so strong in 1867, and so an enfeebled second House was reproduced. In the light of experience, the whole idea of a second Chamber of that type permanently sitting on all measures they choose and being effective is seen to be not in keeping with the times.

There should be a second Chamber, to sum up, Mr. Speaker,

that is effective for the matters at which it is important there be one, but that is a far, far different thing from having a permanently sitting, elected second House.

MR. SPEAKER: Smoky River.

MR. PASZKOWSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for allowing me, a newcomer to this House, to participate in what I consider will become an historic debate.

I find it very unfortunate, though, that we actually are spending time here debating a Canadian institution which indeed is expensive, ineffective, and works counter to our elected officials in many cases. I think that's a sad, sad, sad day when we actually spend time debating an institution such as that. If Senate Reform is to be accomplished in a worthwhile manner, it must be equal, it must be elected, and indeed it must be effective.

The reformed Senate must be elected if it is to have any legitimacy in exercising its role, and this is what I find so exciting about this whole process. Because indeed this would allow me to have an opportunity of actually being part of that selection process, of actually having an opportunity of choosing that Senator who would represent me in Ottawa, not someone else who is chosen for entirely different reasons, for entirely different objectives. This is what excites me, when I stand here today and speak to this issue.

The reformed Senate must also be effective in order to adequately represent our regional interests. A Senate without the power to affect legislation might just as well be totally abolished, because it provides no useful function. The Meech Lake accord reaffirms the equality of all the provinces in Confederation, and this, Mr. Speaker, is important. This is why Meech Lake is so important. I hope everyone here realizes that and hears that. Therefore, a reformed Senate is the opportunity for our federal institutions to reflect equality.

The Triple E Senate would allow the provinces a meaningful voice in the federal legislative process, and certainly we don't have that today, Mr. Speaker. It would allow us that one opportunity, and today we have that opportunity, more so than at any other time in our lives. Canada would be a better and a more unified country when its federal institutions represent the needs and aspirations of the individual regions in the provinces. A Triple E Senate will result in better federal legislation and will give Canadians added confidence in their federal institutions. The legislative review, a sober second thought role of the Senate, will finally be realized in practice as well as in theory, which is what we have today.

The Triple E model of the Senate reform has been accepted in principle by all the western provinces and New Brunswick as well. So it's not just a pie in the sky type of thought that Alberta has dreamed up. Indeed, there is recognition in many parts of Canada, and that recognition is growing. I find it strange, Mr. Speaker, that we actually have people amongst our own group in this House today who don't realize that, and I think it's a sad day for us. The Triple E Senate would not change the representation within the House of Commons, and this is important. We have the representation in the House of Commons by population. We're not changing that process; we're merely adding to that process. And that to me is what we should be striving to achieve.

Mr. Speaker, I urge everyone here with vision and with foresight to grasp the tremendous opportunity that we have here today, that we have presented to us today. Let's all come to-



gether and work for the improvement and development of this country and of this province, and let's develop an institution that's going to serve us with a very useful and a very prolonged function. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

Edmonton-Meadowlark, followed by Pincher Creek-Crowsnest, followed by Edmonton-Centre.

MR. MITCHELL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Much of the constitutional debate in this country in recent years, and the last several decades in fact, has focused on one thing and one thing alone, and that has been the importance of having Quebec as a full, participatory partner in our Confederation. I think there are few people in this country and certainly in this province who would deny the importance, the significance, the consequence for the strength, the value, the character of Canada to have Quebec as a full, participating partner in this Confederation. I believe that Quebec adds a specialness to Canada, distinguishes us from the United States, makes us unique, gives us a special character. It is important that we get Quebec into this Constitution. But at the same time, there is an equally important issue with significant substantive constitutional implications, which I believe has been overshadowed by this obsession with that one component of constitutional debate in this country, that component that has focused on Quebec.

This second and equally important issue is the issue of regional imbalance. We have, I believe, experienced the worst feature of that regional imbalance in this province throughout the '70s and into the early '80s. I was interested to listen to the catcalls from the New Democrats as the leader of the Liberal Party was speaking, that said: "Yes, look at the national energy program. Yes, look at what the Liberals did to this province through the national energy program." I believe there is nobody in this province who would defend the national energy program. But what I also know is that the manner in which that national energy program was imposed upon this province underlines the point that all of us except the New Democrats are talking about in this debate tonight: the issue of regional imbalance. The national energy program was not a question of Liberal ideology or Liberal philosophy. It was, more importantly and much more significantly, an issue of central Canadian government. There are more votes in Ontario and more votes in Quebec than in the rest of this country, and regardless of the ideology, those votes find expression to this point in national, federal policy.

How do we know for certain? Just look at what Brian Mulroney is doing to this country and doing to this province. He reneged on the Husky Oil Upgrader for I don't know how many years, a Husky Oil Upgrader that was committed to in the early years by the federal Liberal Party. He put the CF-18 project not in the west but in the east. And when we see the impact of the value-added tax on this province, we will understand finally that it is not an ideological question, it is a question of central Canadian government, because that value-added tax is going to treat Alberta in much the same way as many other national policies have done in the past: it's going to treat Alberta unfairly. It is a classic example of east-west politics, and it has not been done by a Liberal ideology; it has been done by a Conservative Party. My point is: it does not matter. What we must focus on is central Canadian government and the distribution of interests, the distribution of votes which defend and support those interests in this country.

There are ways to redress the imbalance that the distribution of those interests continuously and consistently entrench in this country. First of all, we should be seeking as a government to establish western Canadian coalitions. There have been times when the interests of the four western Canadian provinces have been very similar. There have not been times, certainly under the leadership -- and I use that word loosely -- of this government, where those opportunities to build a western Canadian coalition have been pursued. Look at the CF-18 project. There was a classic case where the leader of this province could have taken the four western provinces and got them together and said, "We will support Manitoba in that bid, because later, one day, we will ask the other provinces to support us." We could negotiate more effectively as well.

I notice the Speaker shaking his head about this departure to discuss federal/provincial relations. But it is a point, Mr. Speaker, that I feel very strongly about making. We could negotiate more effectively.

But thirdly, and to the point of this debate, we have to also seek structural reform that reflects the need to redress regional imbalance in this country. The structural reform that most of us in this House agree must be pursued and must be achieved is Senate reform -- a Triple E Senate: equal, effective, and elected. I believe very strongly that we need a central Canadian government with the level of powers that government has today. I am very concerned that were we to erode it and hand those powers, or a certain portion of those powers, to Quebec, to Ontario, to Alberta, and the rest of the provinces, Alberta could only lose, because at this time those powers remaining in Ottawa at least will pay some regard to regional interests. If they go to Quebec and to Ontario, they will pay no regard to regional interests and we will only lose.

The key element, however, in this equation, is that the power remains there but that it is tempered by a Triple E Senate that does pay regard for regional interests, that has moral suasion because of the fact that it is elected, that has power because of the way in which its powers are structured, and that those two things will add up to effective representation and effective redressing of the regional imbalance in this country. Senate reform is one very, very important way to achieve progress on that second important constitutional issue in this country. Quebec is one, and regional imbalance redressed by Senate reform is a second one.

Mr. Speaker, the best way at this time in our history to achieve Senate reform may have been lost. We have had an historical opportunity to negotiate Senate reform with the rest of this country, an opportunity that is all but lost by this government. Mr. Bourassa campaigned in his provincial election on the issue of bringing Quebec into the Constitution. He has to bring Quebec into the Constitution. Mr. Mulroney has wanted to campaign in the last November election on being a statesman, the statesman that brought Quebec into the Constitution. We had unprecedented historical leverage with those two critical politicians to the negotiation of Senate reform. We should have said to them: "We will sign Meech Lake. We will sign, bringing Quebec into this Constitution, at exactly the time that you choose to sign Senate reform." We lost it. We lost it because this Premier sat down with the other Premiers of this country and the Prime Minister and said: Quebec, we'll give you everything you want; oh, and by the way, thank you very much; I know you'll let us talk about Senate reform just after you sign Meech Lake and Quebec's in the Constitution. Well, we lost a

huge opportunity, a huge opportunity if we had understood, if this government had understood the process of federal/provincial negotiation to achieve a breakthrough in Senate reform.

What we are looking at in Bill 11, therefore, is only a fallback position. Let's not call this an historical debate about an historical piece of legislation. It is a fallback debate about a fallback piece of legislation. It is second best. It is all that we have left.

What I want to ensure, and what my caucus colleagues want to ensure, is that we do it right. Yes, the leader of the Liberal Party did raise some concerns with certain elements of this Bill, and they must be debated in detail, because if this Bill is to work and to have any chance of success, given the distance that it must go, given that it is a fallback position, then it has to be done exactly right. I would ask the members across the way to consider what they are doing when they put into a Bill things like MPs and MLAs have to resign before they can run. Clearly, that excludes a number of very good candidates, and I would argue that excludes the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon, the one person who perhaps God put on this earth to be the first elected Senator in this country.

It is a fact that these people on my right continue to raise the question of this weakness in equal representation. I believe that they have missed the point of Senate reform. Clearly -- clearly -- our political system must progress and work towards the objective of perfectly proportional representation, true democratic representation. Efforts have been made to achieve that through the representation in our parliamentary system. It doesn't always work. If it worked, we wouldn't have the kind of bias for central Canada. If it worked, we wouldn't be getting the value-added tax today, because more people voted for parties that were opposed to the value-added tax than voted for the party that was in favour of the value-added tax. It doesn't always work.

Clearly, the Senate, in electing equal membership from each province, will not be proportionately representative and therefore will not be purely democratic in that sense. However, what it will do is allow the equal representation of interests which are of comparable importance, interests that may in the case of P.E.I. only be the interests of 100,000 people, but in the context of what those interests mean to the structure, the unity, the strength of this country, they are equal and comparable interests to the interests of people in Ontario, to the interests of people in Quebec, and to the interests of people in Alberta. And yes, therefore I believe very, very strongly that the question of equal representation is not an anti-democratic question. Quite the contrary, it is a structure that will facilitate the democratic expression of interests in this country that must be treated in a comparable and equal fashion if this country is to achieve unity and be strong and have the kind of strength of character and longevity that we in this Legislative Assembly and people across this country feel very, very strongly about.

[Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair]

Mr. Speaker, yes, I and my caucus colleagues do support in principle Bill 11, the Bill to elect a Senate. But it is not a Bill that we rush out to wholeheartedly endorse. In fact, it is a Bill that we support with some sense of loss and some sense of opportunity lost, some sense of sadness, because, yes, we could have had an historical debate in this Legislature -- maybe not

tonight; maybe one year from now; maybe five or 15 years from now if it took that long to get Quebec and Canada, the government of Ottawa, to sign to bring Quebec into the Constitution at the time they sign to create a Triple E Senate. That would have been an historical debate, and I only hope, Mr. Speaker, that by some long-shot chance we can turn this Bill 11 into some kind of negotiating leverage that will see us have an historical debate that will bring a truly Triple E -- elected, effective, and equal -- Senate to this country.

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, it is with a great sense of honour and privilege that I stand today to speak on this historic occasion: voting for the first time in a provincial Legislature on a Bill which will give the people of a province the opportunity to have a say in the selection of a Senator.

But before I get into my remarks, I want to make one comment with regard to the remarks of the Member for Edmonton-Strathcona. I thought that his personal remarks relating to a speech by one of the hon. members was uncalled for and beneath the dignity of this House.

In speaking on this historic Bill, I want to congratulate Bert Brown, chairman of the committee for the Triple E Senate, for his work in advancing the concept of Senate reform and a Triple E Senate; our Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, the Hon. Dennis Anderson, for the work he did as chairman of the select committee on Senate reform which toured across Canada and brought back to this Legislature a very comprehensive document which outlines -- perhaps one of the premier documents in Canada regarding the whole question of Senate reform, the reform of the upper House, and in terms of setting a direction in terms of constitutional reform in this country which will address the regional imbalances. I congratulate our Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs for his excellent work in leading the provinces in the Senate task force, which is across the country talking to other governments and creating increased support for the concept of Senate reform and a Triple E Senate; and in particular our Premier, who's shown dramatic leadership with regard to the Senate reform issue in this province and across this country.

In terms of this particular Bill, Mr. Speaker, I see it as being a catalyst, a first step on the road to achieving a Triple E Senate. There are those who have talked in this House this evening that the problem in our country is regional imbalances. But who is really doing something about it? This piece of legislation is initiating, starting the movement towards reforming those regional imbalances, reforming the upper House, reforming the imbalances in terms of Canadian nationhood. It is a small first step, but is an important step.

The members of the opposition have said, "Well, we don't support the Bill because the Prime Minister has said he won't appoint the person the people of Alberta select as their nominee." Well, Mr. Speaker, I say to them and I say to the Prime Minister, how could he dare not appoint to the Canadian Senate the will of the people of Alberta? So that's a fallacious argument. When our elected nominee takes his place on the floor of the Senate Chamber, there will be a fundamental change in the upper House of Canada, a fundamental change. There will be two classes of Senators. There will be one who has been put there by the will of the people, and the other ones will be there who are appointed.

We've heard the arguments on the other side of the House about patronage: they don't like patronage. Now, here they

have the opportunity for the first time to support a Bill which will give the people of Alberta the ability to exercise their franchise, the ability to vote for the first time, to become involved in the process to put forward our Senate nominee. Now, that is an end to patronage. And here these people on that side of the House will not support this movement towards the end of patronage. On the one hand they rail day after day about patronage appointments, but now they won't support a process which will see an end to that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there have been some other statements made that I want to talk about briefly. I really didn't intend to speak for a long time, but we have some of the comments by the members of the Liberal Party. They say they support this Bill, but yet they don't support the initiative which sees the opportunity for this Bill to come forward. They don't support Meech Lake. Well, that's hypocrisy, because we only have the opportunity to move forward in terms of the Senatorial Selection Act because Meech Lake provides that opportunity. So I say, hypocrisy. We have the Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark saying there are two things we need to do in this country. We have to bring Quebec into the Constitution, and we have to resolve the question of regional imbalances. What we see in Meech Lake, what it reflects is the minimum requirements put forward by the province of Quebec to sign the Constitution to become a full partner in the Constitution of Canada. I get from his remarks that his party would fully support Meech Lake if there was a requirement for the Triple E Senate in it. So I take it that his position is: if Meech Lake had Triple E, all the other requirements which are in Meech Lake, which his leader has rallied against in this House, are acceptable to him. So that's an interesting point, Mr. Speaker.

The Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark talked about regional imbalances and mentioned our Prime Minister, that nothing had been done. Well, Brian Mulroney was the Prime Minister who dismantled the national energy policy which brought devastation on this province, which was a creation of the Liberals supported by the NDP. Brian Mulroney brought forward one of the . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: I have a question.

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member's had his opportunity to speak.

But in terms of regional imbalance, the dismantling of the national energy policy was a great service to western Canada and western Canadian interests. Another very important thing that was brought forward in terms of taking away from regional imbalances is going to be free trade. And we know what the positions of the members opposite are with regards to those areas.

The other interesting thing I saw, Mr. Speaker, was the Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark talking, I believe, about supporting proportional representation in terms of Canadian elected institutions. Well, we can look at the example of nations in the world which have PR, proportional representation, and they're governments like they have in Italy, which are very unstable. Every six weeks or six months they're forming a new government. I think our parliamentary democracy, our representative democracy, works very effectively and provides stable government for our country.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to come back to the Bill we have in question, the Senatorial Selection Act. It is a historic

document. It is a first step. I believe it will propel the Canadian nation forward, because once started, once the first elected Senator is on the floor of the Senate, they will not be able to stop in terms of other people in Canada saying, "Why cannot we elect Senators also?" They will be our strongest advocates. There are other people in Canada. They will also want the opportunity to elect their Senator, and when that movement comes forward to their governments, whether it be the federal government or other provincial governments, those governments are going to now seriously examine exactly what powers the Senate has. They are going to then start to address the question of effective powers for the Senate, and because Meech Lake gives and recognizes the equality of provinces, I think we will have strong arguments by those other Canadians in terms of getting the third E, the E of equality, into these discussions. So this is a small step we are bringing forward but a unique opportunity for all of Canada to truly reform our central parliamentary institutions.

So, Mr. Speaker, in closing . . . Oh, there was one other thing I wanted to say. Other members have alluded to this. The NDP is against Senate reform. They say abolish it. Well, it's really because they don't understand the nature of a federal state. We need that second upper House to address the regional imbalances. They don't understand the nature of a federal state and, true to form, they're centralists. Because a reformed upper House, a Triple E Senate, would certainly be a strong point, a strong balance, in terms of the centralist policies that have come out of the central government over the years.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I just want to paraphrase Neil Armstrong, and this is the 20th anniversary of a man landing on the moon. This one small step by Alberta will result in one giant leap forward for Canadian nationhood and unity. I ask all hon. members to support this Bill.

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

REV. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't really want to say too much on this or worry myself into *Hansard* over such matters as this, but a couple of things have been said over and over again which have really disturbed me. I just would like to comment on them. They don't have to do with regional differences and parliamentary structure and all that, but they have to do with a couple of things which should have been said and which have been disturbing to me.

One is this constant reference by members of the government caucus about history being on our side, that this is a historic Act, this is a historic movement, and this Bill before us is history in the making. Well, I would just like to caution and warn members of the government that it is indeed a very dangerous thing to say that history is on our side. In fact, it seems to me it's almost a sectarian way of saying what they used to say in the Middle Ages in terms of God being on our side. We've learned our lessons from that, Mr. Speaker and members of the Assembly. Anybody who presumes to say that God is on their side or history is on their side is really dealing not only with a lot of arrogance but also with a lot of presumption. We as politicians, as people doing our business with the stuff of daily life, do it to the best of our ability, and it's for history to decide how historic our actions have been. It is for history and historians to decide where this is taking us in terms of Canadian history. It is not for us to presume that what we are about or what we're doing is

history on our side any more than before some sectarian ideologue would say, "God is on my side, God has told me what to do, and this is the way you all must comply to do your business, because God has told me." It smacks of such presumption. I find it quite offensive, and I think it needs to be set straight.

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

This may, in fact, be a Canadian example of the Idaho or Montana sense of a piece of history, or it may go up in some constitutional smoke if, as we know, Meech Lake, being as fragile as it is, fails and this whole business sends us, in terms of Senate reform, back to the Constitutional drawing boards. As the Minister of the Environment said today, we do not see into "crystal balls." We do not look into the future. We are not given that skill or that insight. I submit it's only dangerous Visigoths and ideologues -- even like Hitler, who once said that history and the destiny of the German people were on his side. It smacks of a very, very dangerous tendency, and I really would hope members of the government would realize they're here to deal with their experience, their perception, with the stuff of daily life as we see it in our sense of experience in Alberta, and cease from this presumption that history is on their side.

The second thing I would like to comment on is this American influence which seems to be not just creeping but leaping into our way of life here in Alberta. We've got it in the trade deal. I know it's much more a matter of life in southern Alberta and Calgary and so on that this American influence is everywhere we turn, Mr. Speaker. Again, we've heard example after example of the American example and the American system of Senate elections. Well, I lived in the United States for three years. I was at school there on the east coast -- in Boston, New York, Washington -- traveled up the east coast for three years, and I got to know a lot of Americans pretty well. Though I'm not an expert on the American political system, I was acquainted with the way it works and some of the American sensibilities about their own politics and their own political system.

I do remember meeting my first Senator at an ordination of a friend up on the main line in Philadelphia. He was quite a portly, loud gentleman, who said, "Oh, you're Canadian, are you?" He said, "Yeah, we've been talking about how to get your water down here. You've got more fresh water than any place else in North America, and we need more of that than ever." They were working even at that point. That was in 1975 in terms of Canadian water and this big Pennsylvania Senator bringing it to my attention back then. I then began to note that there isn't one U.S. Senator elected today who is not a millionaire with a gross income of over \$1 million or much more than that. Not one U.S. Senator is not a millionaire. Every one of them is. There's not one U.S. Senator who's elected with more than 50 percent of the vote. In fact, in most states Senators are elected by 30 to 40 percent of the vote. If that's democracy, that you have a club for millionaires who are elected by less than half the people even going to the polls, then I think it leaves a lot to be desired.

Now, that's just a few comments. But I think Americans, when they hear some of the comments made here tonight in this debate, would be quite offended by a couple of things to do with this Bill before us. One is this business -- and the buck stops here for me, Mr. Speaker, when I see this provision -- that the person, whoever they are, is elected for life. Now, it just galls me to think that we're going to set in process an election which

is going to put somebody in office where they don't have to be re-elected, where they don't have to be accountable to the people that elected them. They are in fact elected for life. Now, any American looking at that would say, "My goodness, that really is beyond the pale." That's more of the sense of an emperor or some dictator or someone who wants to get some sort of democratic power to give them some sense of office that they're going to keep for life. I think that's most reprehensible. If anything, they should put in some provision that -- again, in the American system it's six years or every interval -- they have to go back to the people and say, "What about the job I've been doing? What about the kind of activity I've been trying to raise on your behalf, and do you want to reinstate me or re-elect me to this position?" This business about being re-elected for life I really find to be a very dangerous and very shameful kind of provision.

Second, you know, it's a basic lesson in politics or a political system that the Americans have a President and executive branch which is separate from the legislative branch. So they have Congress and an upper House, a Senate, which really is the will of the people, but there's an executive branch outside that. Now, I'm wondering, if we have an elected Senate, what the long-range implications are for our executive branch. Does that mean to say that the will of the executive and the Prime Minister and the will of the Commons can be upheld by an elected Senate as well as, as we have currently, an unelected Senate? What if the Prime Minister and the House of Commons were of, say, a Tory party and the elected Senate was a Liberal Party who refused to pass their legislation? What kind of constitutional crisis would that mean for us, Mr. Speaker? As we know, in the American system there's a much better way of checks and balances. To try to bring that American influence into our responsible government in terms of the executive being the legislative branch is to me very difficult to try to understand -- the long-term constitutional implications.

Then Americans would say, "Okay, you Albertans, if you like this idea of electing Senators, why don't you do it in your own province?" As we know, all states but one have state Senators as well as Congress in the state House. I think that if you're going to be consistent, members of the government caucus, why not bring in some Bill to have some provincial Senators here and have an upper House here in Edmonton at the Legislature? I mean, that's again the American way. There are certain regions here in the province which are underrepresented. We hear it time and time again from the people in the southeastern part of the province or in the northwest. Why don't we have the American system of dividing the provinces, as they do divide the states into various regions and districts, and have a state or provincial Senate system as well? Well, we just aren't wanting to model that part of their system, and I'm wondering why not if we're going to at all be consistent with this kind of Senate reform which is creeping its way up from the U.S.

Then I must say how surprised I am at the Deputy Premier here, the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. I recall a statement he made when he first introduced this. He had a kind of castigation in his voice when he said that members of the Senate are summoned, or some words to that effect -- in fact, these appointed people are summoned -- and what a ridiculous process that is. Well, I'm surprised to have heard that. As democrats and as New Democrats, certainly our bias is toward a democratically elected process. But it's true that in our parliamentary system there has been a history of appointments and

people being summoned into certain positions, and I'd just like to hear if the Deputy Premier wants to enforce this kind of election process on every aspect of people who are otherwise summoned. The judges, for instance. Are we going to start electing judges in Canada as, again, the American system does? Are we going to continue to summon certain lawyers to the bench, as our system now is? I heard an interesting debate with Lou Hyndman and Roy Romanow and some others at the Law Faculty. They were talking about this, that maybe in Canada the time will be coming when we'll have to find some way of getting a short list and electing our judges. But I'm wondering, if the Deputy Premier is saying that people being summoned are really not worthy of any sort of vested authority, whether he's going to apply that to judges in this case or to the Minister of Health with her hospital trustees who, as we know, are still in large cases appointed, whether in fact the move among government is that all of them are going to be democratically elected.

I read in the *Calgary Herald* last week, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Health has appointed a new trustee for the Calgary General hospital. It says that she's a very worthy person, that she was the campaign manager for the Member for Three Hills and a founding member of the Triple E Senate and this qualified her to be appointed to the Calgary General hospital. Well, I don't know. If the Deputy Premier would really take a second look at that kind of process and say, "Oh no, such a person being summoned in such a blatantly political way is really not what we're going to do in our Senate reform," why don't we consistently do it in other parts of our provincial life?

Mr. Speaker, those were my few remarks. This Bill, this Triple E business, I think is the product of a government badly adrift. It's certainly slipping in power. It has a Premier that couldn't even get elected and had to have a by-election, with fiasco after fiasco after fiasco, as we've seen in this summer session. They're now grasping at right-wing straws with some shameful arrogance. We New Democrats, I'm sorry to say . . . I'm not sorry to say. New Democrats are the people of the people. We want to just be the people of the Commons. So let's get on with the work of improving the life of the people for the common good, and thank you very much.

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, as others have done, I'm going to be fairly brief in my comments too.

I couldn't help but enter the debate somewhat recognizing a sense of the history that has taken place and recognizing the importance of this Bill. Because I recall in the federal House of Commons, as a federal Member of Parliament, when Mr. Trudeau attempted to ram down our throats a Constitution that would have made this province a second-class province, and it was greeted with glee by both the Liberal and New Democratic parties. It's important that we recognize that history, because too often we forget. And they talk about consistency. One hon. member rises and says we should have a Senate here in the province. Another hon. member rises and says we should abolish the Senate. Another hon. member rises and says we should have a House of the provinces whereby he can appoint the people. Another hon. member says we shouldn't have any appointments. What I would like is a little consistency for a change from the New Democratic Party, but that's beyond the realm of understanding from the New Democratic Party.

The hon. Member for Edmonton-Strathcona talked about fraud. Again, he talked about fraud and asked us to accept his recommendation of a House of the provinces whereby we can

appoint the individuals. And tomorrow he will offer us criticism as to the appointments that we are legitimately doing. Now, you want to talk about an inconsistency. Only a legal mind could participate in that type of inconsistency.

But I do want to indicate -- and I say this with all sincerity -- my congratulations to the Liberal Party for their support. I recognize some of their concerns, but again we can't have it both ways. When I stood for office to become a Member of the Legislative Assembly, I had to resign my federal seat, and I think that's only right. If one doesn't have the courage of their convictions, they shouldn't stand for office. Why should an individual, when he's elected to represent a specific area, have that opportunity to campaign for another? Mr. Speaker, I could not support that recommendation. I do appreciate their thoughts as it relates to a stand-alone election. We have some concerns as it relates to the costs, and I'm glad to see the Liberal leader indicated he didn't have any concerns as it relates to the costs, that we should go full steam ahead and do it.

I want to offer warm commendation, too, to the individuals from Red Deer-North, Smoky River, and Pincher Creek-Crowsnest and my dear friend the Minister of Energy for being so thoughtful in their approach. I would ask the House's forgiveness, because occasionally I get a little overinvolved in partisanship. But this Bill quite frankly is beyond partisanship. This Bill is a Bill that would allow the Alberta electorate a direct say in the selection of a Senator from this province, which we believe is very important.

I go back to when I was a federal member. It was Alberta that took the lead ensuring that each province was treated equally. The Liberal and New Democratic parties wanted to make us second-class citizens in this province. But it was the Alberta amending formula that was adopted because of the strong fight of this province and of the federal Conservatives. Mr. Speaker, we see this province again taking a leadership role under our present Premier, who was the chairman of the Premiers, who brought forward recommendations on constitutional reform and on trade reform. I'm very proud -- very proud -- to be part of a party, to be part of a government that wants to ensure that people do have a direct say in how the affairs are going to relate to their lives. We sometimes underestimate the desire and the wish of people to have a more meaningful role in our elected process. It would be my personal desire, too, to have a stand-alone election. I recognize the strong desire of our Deputy Premier to come forward with this commitment -- because it is a commitment -- and I admire the leadership he has shown in making sure we carry through with ensuring Albertans a voice in our senatorial election reform.

Mr. Speaker, I indicated I would be short. But I do wish to offer my strong commendation to our Premier, who was so forceful in making sure we do have a veto within the proposed amendments to the Constitution that is presently before us and also took such a strong, forceful viewpoint as it relates to senatorial election reform. My warm commendation, too, to our Deputy Premier, who was also one of the strongest proponents in making sure again that our Alberta population will have the opportunity for meaningful input into senatorial reform. I'm delighted that we do have this Bill before us, and it's worthy, notwithstanding the concerns that have been raised by the New Democratic Party.

I'd be interested -- and I see the hon. Member for Calgary-Mountain View is going to rise to speak -- what the position of the New Democratic Party is. Do they support the House of the

provinces? Do they support a Senate in the province of Alberta? Do they support the abolishment of it? [interjections] I was kind enough to listen to the hon. member without interruptions. I recognize that they don't want to extend those same courtesies to us, but I would like to know if he would be kind enough to extend the courtesy to us of letting us know exactly what his position is, because there is no consistency in the presentations that are coming from that party, which is consistent with the way they do their affairs.

MR. SPEAKER: Calgary-Mountain View.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Senate has often been referred to as a body of sober second thought. By implication, it would seem the elected body is apparently a forum of drunken first impressions. I would say that if . . .

MR. SPEAKER: That's pretty close to comment on this House, hon. member.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to make the point that when it came to Bill 11, it's in desperate need of sober second thought. I'm sure all hon. members in the Legislature tonight will be very relieved to know that I will provide just those comments in the remarks I'm going to give.

There's been a lot of talk tonight about the notion of electing a Senate. I wonder if the members have read the same Bill I've read. This really isn't a Bill for the election of anyone, Mr. Speaker. I think what the hon. members of the government are doing is confusing what they wished might be in this Bill with what is actually in the Bill. You know, tonight we've heard a lot about the notion that this Bill is going to bring us the Triple E Senate, the elected, effective, and equal Senate. Well, this Bill is nothing more than a triple E exercise -- expensive, exaggerated, and excretion -- and hon. members might want to look up what that description is. This is pretending to be reform, Mr. Speaker. In the disguise of reform, however, it's going to be entrenching some of the most regressive notions towards democracy that we haven't witnessed for a long time in this country. I want to make the point again and again that this is not a Senate election. This Act doesn't say anything at all about an election. It talks about a selection process by which someone might get on to a list, a list that would be presented to the Privy Council but for which there is no guarantee that that appointment would be made to the Senate. I think that point has to be made and emphasized again, because based on the comments I've heard tonight, I think a lot of people have missed that essential point.

As I understand, the genesis for Bill 11 came out of the Meech Lake accord, whereby there was some agreement between the 11 first ministers at the time that appointments to the Senate to fill vacancies would be made from the list submitted by individual provinces. So in order to provide the Alberta list, the government has introduced this Bill. This was on the prompting they received from the Liberals. Well, they may rue the day that they ever took advice from the Liberals, but let's take a look at what really is being presented here. What if, for example, an election were held or this process was embarked upon during the municipal elections this fall. First of all, there is no requirement in this Bill that the person whose name appears at the top of the list as a result of that election -- there's no requirement setting out the maximum length of time the govern-

ment of Alberta can take before submitting that name, nor is there any maximum time spelled out before that person, having received that name at the Privy Council, would be appointed to the Senate. So, Mr. Speaker, you can see a situation unfolding where, presumably, we proceed with this process this fall and we take a look down the road for the ratification deadline for the Meech Lake accord, which gave genesis to this Bill in the first place. That deadline for ratification is going to expire in June of next year. So we could see a process whereby people could spend a lot of time and effort and money going through the process of trying to get their name on this list. If it wasn't the name that was most favourable to the government, they could take a bit of time before they submitted it to the Privy Council, and having received it, the Privy Council could simply put that name on ice until after they see what might happen by June of 1990 with the Meech Lake Accord.

So we could be faced potentially with a situation where someone could step forward and it could be completely and totally a waste of time. As far as I'm concerned, Mr. Speaker, that's why I say one of the Es of this exercise is that it could be expensive. This Bill is held out to be something it's not, so it's exaggerated and it's trying to grow something abnormally out of something else. Again, Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier, it's a triple E exercise.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the qualifications of somebody who could be a candidate is also an important issue. I note in the Bill that there are sort of three different ways in which an election could be held, and depending on which route is chosen by the government, the qualifications would vary. So in one situation a person might qualify; if another were chosen, they couldn't qualify. I've never known of any Act ever passed . . . Certainly under the Charter how can a person qualify in one section of an Act, depending on which route is chosen, and then lose their right to be a candidate if a second route is chosen? That strikes me as being both arbitrary . . . If you've got a right, you've got a right. I don't understand how you lose it if one route is chosen and gain it if another route is chosen. This is unheard of. I don't understand, in any election Act anywhere in the country, where that sort of concept has ever been put forward. If it has, it hasn't been for many, many years.

Under section 23 of the Constitution Act, 1867, a person has to have attained the age of 30 in order to qualify to be a Senator. Yet as I understand the Act, you can attain the age of 18 and be an elector in this process. I've never heard of a situation whereby an elector could not also stand for election. That's also a basic concept of democracy: if you are an elector, then you are qualified to also be a candidate and seek election. What this Bill is setting out, Mr. Speaker, is something again that I've never heard of in Canada, and that is establishing two classes of citizens, one class that can vote but not qualify for election and another class that can vote and qualify under this process. It's totally unheard of and quite flawed as far as the principle of this Act.

Mr. Speaker, the term of office. Again, I've never heard of an election whereby someone is so-called elected for life. The whole notion of a democratic elective process is based on accountability. Accountability is based on periodically having to be forced to go back and seek re-election before the people that you're designed, presumably, to represent. I can't see how anybody could think that we would be achieving an effective Senate through this Bill when what we're only doing is setting up a process whereby someone is going to be appointed for life

through some so-called elected process. Where's the effectiveness in that? You get nominated, perhaps through this process. As a result of that you might get appointed, depending on the whim of the Prime Minister. Then, having overcome those two obstacles, you're never required to go back to the people. I don't understand where there's any reform anywhere in that kind of process. It's totally unheard of in any electoral process in this country.

I can see candidates in this process coming to the position where they're putting out these kinds of messages, Mr. Speaker: "If you vote for me, I'm 65 years of age; I'll only be there in the Senate for 10 years. If you vote for my opponent, who's 45, he or she's going to be there for 30 years." Or you might get promises to the citizens: "If you elect me, I promise to resign after five years." And the other candidate says, "Well, if you elect me, I promise to resign after four years." I mean, it's a totally absurd situation that's being created by trying to graft a totally foreign notion onto a body that fundamentally is not reformable in that way. It has to be something that's done in a coherent, total process. Like trying to prune a branch onto a tree, you can't expect that whole tree will take on an entirely democratic process. You can't do it. It's fundamentally flawed to try and graft some sort of democratic process onto a body that's just fundamentally not democratic. I think this whole process is headed for the reefs, and there's going to be a lot of disappointment, because it holds out a certain promise which it can't deliver, which is why I come back to my initial comment, Mr. Speaker. It's not leading us to any kind of equal, effective, or elected Senate, but it's simply going to be a triple E exercise of being expensive, it's an exaggerated process, and it's trying to graft in an excrescent way something foreign to the Senate that is simply not going to take. Mr. Speaker, I've heard a lot of rhetoric about what the government hopes to achieve by this Bill, but in looking at the principles laid out in it, I can't for the life of me see how it's going to lead us in that direction.

Thank you.

MR. HORSMAN: Well, I appreciate the fact that so many members have taken part in the debate on second reading, in principle. In concluding the second reading debate, I want to make a few comments because unlike some other people in the Assembly I do believe that there is a sense of history which attaches to any new, bold, and dramatic initiative undertaken by a Legislative Assembly. That is what we are doing with this legislation. You know, I couldn't help but think when the Member for Edmonton-Centre rose to speak . . . And I must say this: I listened carefully to his opening remarks in which he said he would be brief, but I have learned over the years to be somewhat skeptical of a preacher who stands up and says in the pulpit, "I will be brief." He didn't disappoint me in that respect. He was extremely lengthy and said very little.

AN HON. MEMBER: Eight minutes; that's all.

MR. HORSMAN: Eight minutes. Well, eight minutes too long in terms of what he offered.

He said there's no sense of history. You know, when the Lord delivered his Sermon on the Mount, I daresay he felt there was a sense of history about it. I would think that there would be . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: Don't mess with a preacher.

MR. HORSMAN: No, and don't mess with a Harvard man. You can always tell a Harvard man, but you can't tell him much.

Now, what has happened, I ask members of this Assembly, since the time when we embarked upon the whole question of trying to reform the Canadian Senate? In 1983 this Assembly set forth upon the path to do something that no other province has done before. We established, Mr. Speaker, a select committee of this Assembly, and that committee went across Alberta, listened to Albertans; went across Canada, listened to Canadians, and came back in 1985 with a well-considered, well-documented, well-researched report which was put before this Assembly and approved unanimously in this Legislative Assembly.

MR. DECORE: I didn't agree with it.

MR. HORSMAN: The hon. leader of the Liberal Party says he didn't agree with it. Well now, isn't that interesting, because after the 1986 general election the then leader of the Liberal Party rose in this Assembly and asked unanimous support of the Assembly to reaffirm the support this Assembly had given prior to the '86 general election. And he got that support with an amendment from our government to his motion. Now, the current leader of the Liberal Party says he doesn't agree with it. I thought the inconsistency in the House came from the NDP. I thought there was consistency in the Liberal Party. But obviously now, Mr. Speaker, we see a tremendous split having developed between the Member for Edmonton-Glenarry and the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon. I think we should note that because it is very significant, and I daresay the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon will be heartbroken to know that his current leader doesn't support that resolution, as did the other members of the Liberal Party who were in the Assembly in 1986.

What happened to the members of the NDP? Many of them were here in this Assembly and stood in this Assembly and voted in favour, unanimously, in principle of the Triple E Senate, and I wonder why now we hear all this timorous wavering on the part of the NDP on this issue. I wonder why. Because I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, having listened to their arguments, the only member from the NDP who touched upon an issue of very great significance in this whole legislation and quite correctly put his finger on something which is extremely important and difficult, and which I recognized in my opening remarks, was the Member for Calgary-Forest Lawn. I want to touch on some of his remarks.

The other speakers on behalf of the NDP, quite frankly, being bound by their party decision that they would not run a candidate in the senatorial selection process, have come into this Assembly and made the most specious arguments against the Bill. Well, that's fine. They don't have to run a senatorial candidate whenever the people of Alberta have the opportunity of making for the first time in history the selection of a person to be in that Senate and forever change its face. They don't have to be in that process, and if they don't want to be, that's their business, but the people of Alberta are going to notice their absence, and they're going to wonder why this democratic party is not prepared to take part in the democratic process. I really must say I'm extremely surprised.

I shouldn't say I'm surprised, because they have no sense of history. They have no vision. They have only one narrow point

of view, and that is centralized government: let the state control. That's their vision, and they don't like what we're proposing because it will truly bring about a democracy to a terrible place in this country called the Canadian Senate and will reform it, and it will be . . . [interjections] Oh, the chuntering that goes on from the Member for Edmonton-Strathcona, chunter, chunter, and I know, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. Member for Edmonton-Strathcona . . . [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: I'm sure hon. members can find their own dictionaries. The other thing is that there have been 20 speakers on this issue, and perhaps we could all be quiet enough to hear the final remarks.

MR. HORSMAN: Well, I don't want to excite them too much. They are an excitable lot, aren't they?

Yes, well, Mr. Speaker, I do want to just wrap up quickly, if I could, to say this: the Liberal Party's position -- I appreciate their offer of support in principle to this legislation. They have brought forward some particulars about the Bill, which perhaps we can deal with more effectively in committee, except this: there is one matter of basic principle which, I state, is fundamental to the operation of a democratic system in a federal state. In a parliamentary democracy, it is my considered opinion, as is borne out by both the Canada Elections Act and the Alberta Election Act, that a member of one parliament, in order to seek office in another parliament, must resign their seat in order to be able to do so. That's a fundamental principle of parliamentary democracy in a federal state, and for anyone to suggest in this Assembly that that is not the case -- they are simply camouflaging or demonstrating that they do not understand the basic principle of federal democracy, and it is quite different than a democracy in a unitary state.

Therefore, it is absolutely clear to me, Mr. Speaker, from my review of this whole nature of parliamentary democracy in the federal state. I can assure members that I've gone across this country, visited every province, visited the federal Parliament, the Senate. I've talked to Senators from Australia, our sister Commonwealth country. I've visited with people in the United States. I would say this: the United States model is not one that we propose to follow with respect to the Triple E Senate, and that's made abundantly clear. For the hon. members of the NDP to drag in that red herring is just very unfair, because the principles set out in the Triple E Senate proposal make it perfectly clear that we are not proposing to follow the United States model. That is fundamental. We are developing within Canada a system which is truly Canadian, and that is what we are aiming for.

Now, I want to just go back to the Member for Calgary-Forest Lawn because he is right when he says there is a danger. He's right when he says there is a danger inherent in this proposal, and that is that if every province were to do what we are doing, we could by about 2020 AD have entrenched into the Constitution of Canada an elected Senate with its current powers. But I can assure members of this Assembly that there isn't a government in Canada, a province or the federal Parliament, that would want to see that happen, and that will therefore serve as a greater spur to getting on with the constitutional discussions which are necessary to bring about true Senate reform.

That's why we're going ahead with this Bill. That's why we are putting this before members of this Assembly and the people of Alberta. If there are members of this Assembly who want to

opt out of the democratic process, so be it. They will be remembered on election day, whether it be on October 16 or in a stand-alone election. That decision has not been made and will not be made until such time as we know that we have the support of this House for this Bill.

Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill 11, the Senatorial Selection Act.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs has moved second reading of Bill 11, Senatorial Selection Act. Those in favour of second reading, please say aye.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed, please say no.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. SPEAKER: Motion carries.

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

[Eight minutes having elapsed, the House divided]

For the motion:

Adair	Drobot	Nelson
Betkowski	Elliott	Oldring
Bogle	Elzinga	Orman
Bradley	Evans	Paszowski
Brassard	Fowler	Payne
Bruseker	Gesell	Schumacher
Calahasen	Horsman	Severtson
Cherry	Laing, B.	Shrake
Chumir	Lund	Speaker, R.
Clegg	Mitchell	Stewart
Day	Moore	Tannas
Decore	Musgrove	Zarusky
Dinning		

Against the motion:

Barrett	Laing, M.	Sigurdson
Doyle	McEachern	Woloshyn
Ewasiuk	Pashak	Wright
Hawkesworth	Roberts	

Totals:	Ayes - 37	Noes - 11
---------	-----------	-----------

[Motion carried; Bill 11 read a second time]

## Bill 5

### Department of Health Act

MRS. BETKOWSKI: Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to rise to present Bill 5 for second reading, the Department of Health Act, the proposed legislation to amend the Department of Hospitals and Medical Care Act and the Department of Community and Occupational Health Act.

Mr. Speaker, our health agenda is in a constant state of change, and there are some very difficult decisions to be made. There are health options today that were never envisaged in the



past. There are moral, legal, ethical, and economic questions which seem to permeate every decision that we make. How we administer our resources to give maximum benefit while at the same time maintaining quality care is a big issue. In Alberta a major step has been the formation of a Department of Health, a single administrative body for the range of services both community and institutionally based, each of which is equally important and each with the same goal: to provide a continuum of health services that will encourage Albertans to achieve a new and integrated health system. This department is a conglomerate of many of the health services in this department. As a government we are now under one umbrella, one portfolio, one mandate.

Rarely has there been such a high degree of enthusiasm for the integration of two departments which, though distinct, blend together so well. This enthusiasm was expressed by both the Member for Edmonton-Centre and the Member for Edmonton-Gold Bar in the review of the Department of Health estimates last Friday, though the hon. Member for Edmonton-Centre took perhaps overenthusiastic claim that the integration was his own idea.

We now have an opportunity to become a single team with a single focus, a network of professionals, of administrators, of programs, and of facilities. Many other Acts controlled by other departments impact on the health of Albertans as well, including legislation in the Solicitor General's department, the Family and Social Services department, Education, Advanced Education, and the Department of the Environment. A multitude of Acts administered by the Department of Health as well are issues of health for Albertans.

The Department of Health Act provides for an administrative centre for developing policies under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Health. It is enabling legislation; it is a means to an end, and not an end in itself. The primary purpose of this Act presented this evening, Mr. Speaker, is to establish a new department of government and to provide the minister with various powers to conduct the business of the Department of Health. The Act will replace the Community and Occupational and Health Act and the Department of Hospitals and Medical Care Act and largely incorporates provisions of each and follows the pattern of standard departmental legislation governmentwide.

A number of questions have been raised, Mr. Speaker, in this House on this Bill, questions which would have us believe there is a threat of selling off hospitals to private interests under Section 11 of the Act. I stated clearly in this House on June 19, in response to the hon. Member for Edmonton-Norwood, a number of points I'd like to repeat here this evening. Firstly, the legislation was written to refer to government health care facilities, specifically three psychogeriatric facilities and a nursing station all currently under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Health. Secondly, the option of moving from being directly operated by a government department to management in some other form. Thirdly, private ownership of general hospitals was never the intent of the legislation, despite indications by some members of the opposition that this was the case. Fourthly, I indicated that I would review the Bill and am prepared, as I hope I will be throughout my public life, to propose a change. These changes, I feel, will clarify the intent and improve the Bill.

The amended section allows the transfer of a government health facility, as defined in the Act, to a hospital board, as defined in the Act . . . [some applause]

MR. SPEAKER: That's inappropriate in the gallery. Thank you.

MRS. BETKOWSKI: . . . and a similar provision is found in Section 11 of the Community and Occupational Health Act. The amendment will clearly list the organizations and the bodies to which the government health facilities, as defined in the Act, may be disposed to, and I trust this will address concerns by some Albertans who were led to believe differently.

I would also like to make a few comments, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the term "privatization," which is often bandied about by the opposition as some horrible spectre. This government, as indicated by the Premier, is not afraid to explore ways to provide Albertans with the most effective use of limited health dollars. There may be ways, as I've said on June 19, to effect efficiencies in our health system through the private delivery of nonmedical services such as dietary, maintenance, laundry services, waste disposal, and other examples. The private sector plays a very important role in supporting the health care system in Alberta, and many different products and services are currently provided by the private sector. As you are aware, in this province hospital boards have legislative mandate to manage hospitals. The department assists these boards and provides guidance. Several boards have used private consultants to help them with management and organizational problems, and some boards have contracts with senior management, and this could be considered, certainly, in the context of a management contract. As well there are two facilities in Alberta that have employed private management groups to advise the board. In these cases the funding for this service comes from within that hospital's global budget, and in both cases the boards are very pleased with the approach. It appears that the private consulting firm has improved management practices and has implemented effective new policies and procedures within the hospital itself. But, again, I would stress they are hired by the board. We will continue to explore ways in which the private sector can be involved in the provision of products and services to the health industry, with a view to continuing to provide a cost-effective health care system of the very highest quality for the people of this province.

Despite all of that, Mr. Speaker, I want to clearly emphasize that we believe that the current publicly funded and supported health system in Canada is one which should be seen as a crowning achievement of this country. Private delivery of medical services, as seen in United States, costs more and delivers, I believe, some very poor discrepancies in care levels. American health policymakers are looking very closely at the Canadian model, which I hope they do adopt, as the principles outlined in the Canada Health Act, including the principle of public administration of the system, are ones that we can be proud of to ensure accessible, universal, and comprehensive medical coverage for all Canadians anywhere in Canada.

Our universal health system is, I contend, a Canadian value. We were all made so much aware of this during the free trade debate. Now the Americans are looking to Canada as the role model of health care delivery, a far cry from the threat of dismantling that some had suggested. Mr. Speaker, we all know that health is often the subject of thoughtful and intense debate in Alberta. I, as minister responsible, will always welcome those discussions. My goal is to bring together the various facets of health. We have community health, mental health, acute care, long-term care, and the Alberta health care insurance

plan all working towards the same health objectives.

I want to spend a few more moments, if I may, with respect to how one defines health, because I think it's an appropriate time to do so in the second reading of this Bill. In my view, health is a very complex state of being, and in fact is probably one of the most complex issues that we are going to have to define as we head into the 21st century. It encompasses the physical, the mental, the spiritual, and social well-being. It involves our relationships with our environments: the physical environment in which we live, work, and play; our social environment; our relationships with our families, our friends, our colleagues, and the community. Health is feeling good about our bodies, our minds, and the relationships we have with others. In truth health is the essence of life because without our health we have little else that matters.

Health has greater significance in Alberta. For one thing, it is central to our values and our culture. Albertans and Canadians in general regard their health system as a precious commodity, a sacred right, one worth preserving whatever the cost. We've become very educated, discerning, and demanding consumers of health services. In short, we know what we want, and we want information on how to get there. As Minister of Health, I am working from one single agenda: providing the best health services to the people of Alberta that we possibly can. Whatever that takes, whatever that involves, health for Albertans is my major focus and priority, and as I've said on a number of occasions, it is my bottom line.

As Minister of Health, I am pleased to present the Bill and the proposed amendment which I will file in the House now for distribution to hon. members, which will clarify the intent of the

Department of Health Act. Our health system is not a fixed and rigid entity. It is viable, open-ended, and created to serve the people of Alberta. There is no greater reward for all of us in the Assembly than having the confidence of knowing that our health system truly serves the people that it was intended to serve.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all members of the House to support this important piece of legislation, and I look forward to members' contributions to the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: Member for Edmonton-Centre.

REV. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate, as do members of our caucus, very much the minister's remarks and tabling of the amendment, and I beg leave to adjourn debate.

MR. SPEAKER: Having heard the motion to adjourn debate, those in favour, please say aye.

HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed, please say no. Motion carries.  
Government House Leader.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, as I've advised the House leader for the Official Opposition and the leader of the Liberal Party, it is proposed that Motion 13, standing in the name of the Premier on Votes and Proceedings today, will be called for debate and discussion tomorrow morning.

[At 10:35 p.m. the House adjourned to Friday at 10 a.m.]