

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Title: **Friday, August 4, 1989 10:00 a.m.**
 Date: 89/08/04

[The House met at 10 a.m.]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

PRAYERS

MR. SPEAKER: Let us pray.

O Lord, we give thanks for the bounty of our province: our land, our resources, and our people.

We pledge ourselves to act as good stewards on behalf of all Albertans.

Amen.

head: INTRODUCTION OF BILLS**Bill 254****An Act to Amend the Municipal Government Act**

MR. PASHAK: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill 254, being an Act to Amend the Municipal Government Act.

This Bill would permit municipalities to take more effective action to protect their citizens from dogs defined as dangerous.

[Leave granted; Bill 254 read a first time]

Bill 19**Appropriation Act, 1989**

MR. HORSMAN: On behalf of my colleague the Provincial Treasurer, I move first reading of Bill 19, the Appropriation Act, 1989. This being a money Bill, Her Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor is pleased to recommend the same for consideration by the Assembly.

[Leave granted; Bill 19 read a first time]

Bill 21**Appropriation (Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund, Capital Projects Division) Act, 1989-90**

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the hon. Provincial Treasurer, I move first reading of Bill 21, the Appropriation (Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund, Capital Projects Division) Act, 1989-90. This being a money Bill, Her Honour the Lieutenant Governor is pleased to recommend the same for consideration by the Assembly.

[Leave granted; Bill 21 read a first time]

head: INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, to you and to the members of this Assembly, I have some people in the members' gallery I'd like to introduce. I have two introductions. Mrs. Joan Wahl of Peace River; she's a member of the north Peace consortia board

and chairman of the advisory council. She's accompanied by her daughter Annemarie and her mother, a citizen of Edmonton, Mr. Flora Bochenko. I would ask them to rise and receive the warm welcome of this Assembly.

My second introduction, Mr. Speaker, is to introduce the chairman of the Grimshaw recreation board and a member of the best planning commission in the province of Alberta, the Mackenzie Regional Planning Commission, and for me to say that about any planning commission is somewhat unusual. But I'm pleased to introduce to you and through you to the members of this Assembly Mr. Tom Baldwin. Tom, would you stand, please.

MR. MITCHELL: Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to introduce to you and through you to the members of the Legislature Fred and Alice Kaarsemaker, who are notable, I'm certain, for many reasons, but in particular, in this context, for two: they are residents of the constituency of Edmonton-Meadowlark, and they are also the grandparents of Melissa Willock, one of our Legislature pages. They are accompanied today by Fred's brother Hubert and his wife, Hilda, who are visiting from Holland. I would ask that they rise in the gallery and receive the welcome of the Legislative Assembly.

MRS. MIROSH: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce to you and through you to members of the Assembly two young hockey players from the Federal Republic of Germany who are here touring Alberta and have hosted three Canadian hockey players for the last nine months. I'd like Till Feser and Carsten Plate to stand and receive a warm welcome from this Assembly.

head: ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**Conflict of Interest Guidelines**

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, to the Premier. A term of reference for the Premier's committee on conflict of interest, to use his words on July 24, and I quote:

to review as a specific matter the . . . situation of the Alberta Energy Company . . . and the ownership of shares by senior public servants, MLAs, and ministers of the Executive Council.

Mr. Speaker, finally, after the Official Opposition has brought forward a very good conduct and ethics Bill over 10 years, this Premier is going to have ministerial conflict guidelines examined. But instead of waiting for the findings of this committee, the government has introduced a Bill, Bill 15, the Alberta Energy Company Amendment Act, 1989, that we believe will again place a minister with shares in that company in a serious conflict of interest because they can vote on ownership changes that will inevitably increase the value of Alberta Energy Company shares. My question is to the Premier. Why did the Premier not wait for his committee to report before bringing in Bill 15, which inevitably could put money in the pockets of cabinet ministers?

MR. GETTY: Well, Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member knows, the legislation is very clear now that all members in the Legislature can in fact vote on the Alberta Energy Company Act and amendments to it. Now, it is true that the panel -- I have directed them specifically to look at the matter of Alberta Energy Company shares, because we have a unique situation here in this

province. But it strikes me that the legislation that's before the House currently does not deal with that matter. It deals with the matter of the number of shareholders it's possible to have in Alberta Energy and whether some of them can be other than Canadians and the percent that any one group can hold. I would assure the hon. members that as soon as the report of the panel is made to me -- and then of course I've also assured the members that it will be made public -- we would bring in amending legislation on the Alberta Energy Company on the areas, if any, that the panel recommends. So it's just a matter of timing. If the House were to sit in the fall, we could bring in the amendments. If the House sits in the spring, well, then we'll have the benefits of the panel report, and we would do whatever amending is necessary at the time. But the current legislation really doesn't reflect on those matters.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, that's precisely the point. Would the Premier deny, then, that the purpose of this Bill is, as he pointed out, to increase shares both inside and outside Canada, therefore making it more attractive to investors, therefore raising the price of shares? Isn't that the purpose of the Bill?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, that's not the exclusive purpose of the legislation. That may happen as a result of it; I don't know. The markets go up and down. But we do have a piece of legislation that is before the House, and the members can discuss it at second reading or committee. But I want the hon. members to know that we are dealing with the matter of Alberta Energy Company through the panel. They have been specifically asked to give us advice on it, and as soon as their advice is in, we intend to make the changes, if there are some recommended.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that this could clearly pose a conflict of interest -- which the Premier has acknowledged could occur, because he set up the committee -- especially for cabinet ministers holding shares, would he agree to hold Bill 15 until the next session, after this committee has reported? That seems to me the simplest thing to do.

MR. GETTY: Well, that was one of the options, but when you're dealing with a matter like this which involves shareholders and public knowledge of changes in the legislation, I think it's far better to deal with it while the panel is out, then get the panel's advice, and then deal with the amendment to the legislation. It seems to me it will accomplish the matter. In the meantime, we have legislation that clearly says . . . [interjections] Now, they've asked the question, Mr. Speaker, and they won't listen to the answer. I'm trying to speak to them as reasonably as possible and give them an answer to their question. What we would want to do is have the panel give us their advice, then bring in any amendments that might be necessary, flowing from their advice.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to designate my second question to the Member for Edmonton-Calder.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Calder.

Social Allowance Deductions

MS MJOLSNES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My questions are to the Minister of Family and Social Services. In order that this

province cost share social allowance payments under the Canada Assistance Plan, Alberta has had to define basic needs and to agree to cover those needs, yet this government continues to demand that repayments be deducted from a client's social assistance cheque. A recent Federal Court of Canada decision held that the government of Manitoba was exceeding its legal authority in deducting these overpayments from the cheques of welfare recipients. To the minister. Given that the minister's definition of basic needs is virtually identical to the one of Manitoba's in this court case, how can the minister justify making these deductions?

MR. OLDRING: Well, Mr. Speaker, as so often is the case, the member neglected one very important factor in describing the situation in Manitoba, and that's that this particular case is still before the courts. It is being appealed, and we are awaiting the decision of that appeal.

MS MJOLSNES: Well, Mr. Speaker, given that under the Canada Assistance Plan agreement the province has agreed to provide for basic needs and that the minister will not be covering those basic needs if he is deducting anything, will the minister take immediate action and stop deducting money that is essential for these people to live on?

MR. OLDRING: Mr. Speaker, again the member is incorrect. We are not deducting any dollars that are applicable as it relates to basic needs. This province is clearly meeting the requirements of the Canada Assistance Plan and will continue to meet those regulations.

MR. FOX: Maybe they could buy shares in Alberta Energy.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Calder, not Vegreville.

MS MJOLSNES: Mr. Speaker, in view of the court case in Manitoba, Alberta could stand to lose a lot of money from the federal government. I'd like to ask this minister: what actions is he taking to ensure that this does not happen?

MR. OLDRING: Well, Mr. Speaker, from two inaccurate statements to one hypothetical statement. Again, I will only reiterate that this government is committed to providing those basic services to those Albertans that need them, and we will continue to provide shelter, food, clothing, dental, optometric care. Clearly we are meeting the requirements of the Canada Assistance Plan, and clearly we are meeting the needs of those Albertans that need our help.

MR. SPEAKER: Member for Edmonton-Glengarry, leader of the Liberal Party; followed by Bow Valley; then Calgary-Forest Lawn.

Provincial Deficit

MR. DECORE: Mr. Speaker, on June 5 in this Assembly the Provincial Treasurer informed members of the Assembly that a special review group had been set up to look at the huge problem of unfunded pension liability. Subsequently, the Provincial Treasurer refused to answer any detailed questions with respect to that review group. Yesterday the Provincial Treasurer admitted, I would suggest, defeat and failure by informing Al-

bertans that the minister was advertising for an expert to assist the government in planning a program for deficit reduction. We know that Albertans now have the highest deficit with the exception of the federal government. My question is to the Provincial Treasurer. Given that a review group was put into place for the examination of the issue of unfunded pension liability, why did not the Provincial Treasurer put up the same kind of review group to look at and deal with the huge deficit that Albertans are facing?

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Speaker, it must be Friday morning, because the fuzziness of the reasoning is escaping me with respect to the member's question. I've seen oblique questions before, I've seen circuitous questions before, but this is about as fuzzy a relationship as I've ever seen. I'm not too sure just what the point is.

There are three factors here that I think he's referring to. One is that we do have a pension liability. We're managing it, controlling it, dealing with it. We're looking at a series of recommendations as to how to handle the size of that liability. All members know that we have a liability with respect to the General Revenue Fund and the Capital Fund. I have before the House right now a Bill to increase the debt limits to \$9.5 million, and we have publicly advertised for somebody to manage that debt. This is a very complex area, an area where the market moves dramatically. For example, the market in capital markets is moving so quickly that you need a contemporary person to ensure that the cheapest borrowing cost is afforded to the province of Alberta. Moreover, on the third point the member makes, we have reported time and time again about our fiscal plan, the way in which we're determined to balance this budget. We just completed on Wednesday the final discussion of that budget position, one which all Albertans understand and concur with and one which takes us forward to a balanced budget in 1991-92.

Now, that's the plan, that's the way it's laid out, Mr. Speaker, and if the member could sort it out in terms of these segments, then I'd be glad to respond more directly to these fuzzy questions.

MR. DECORE: Mr. Speaker, the track record of the Provincial Treasurer is an abysmal one indeed in dealing with the huge deficit. I wonder why it has taken the Provincial Treasurer so long to admit defeat and to advertise for this expert to help him with the deficit plan. Why has it taken you so long, Mr. Treasurer?

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Speaker, we are good managers, this government, and that is well understood, well understood. It's to be expected. [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: And now we'll have order. We will have order or there won't be any more questions in question period.
Provincial Treasurer.

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, I can understand, Mr. Speaker, that the socialist parties across the way wouldn't understand management. They've never been tested in the private-sector place.

As a result, this government puts in place managers at all key sectors. And as the times change, you have to hire different specialists as the requirements for information, for management, are

there. That's essentially what this government is doing and will continue to do, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DECORE: You continue to give evidence that the minister cannot do the operation of the budget at all. Mr. Speaker, given that we have had a number of matters coming to our attention that will likely increase the deficit, such as crop insurance changes, UIC, transfer payments, campaign promises, and now the Code matter that is going to cost Albertans \$100 million, my question to the Provincial Treasurer is this: in an ability to assist him, would the minister agree to provide quarterly statements as to the position of Alberta's deficit so that Albertans really do know the picture on that deficit?

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Speaker, it's interesting that the member comes up with these ideas. They're information which we've been providing for about 10 years. At various times we provide all kinds of data. The trouble is, the opposition doesn't use that information, Mr. Speaker.

But what is remarkable is that the Member for Edmonton-Glengarry talks about leadership, about management ability. I noted when the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon was the leader of the Liberal Party, they were on the edge of an abyss for a very long period of time. With the Member for Edmonton-Glengarry being selected, they have taken one bold step forward.

MR. SPEAKER: Bow Valley.

Employment Statistics

MR. MUSGROVE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My questions are to the Acting Minister of Career Development and Employment. Mr. Speaker, we keep hearing about the high level of employment that we're having in Alberta, reaching record levels, and yet we all recognize that the gas and oil drilling activities are very low, and that does create a lot of jobs. Could the minister explain to us how, when we have a very low level of gas and oil drilling activities, we could have a record employment rate.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, Stats Canada today once again issued the national unemployment figures in a statement that I issued a couple of hours ago. The statement indicates that employment in Alberta has now risen to a high of 1.254 million people. That's a record high level of employment in our province.

It is true that oil and gas drilling activity in our province is at a very, very low level. I think that if you look at the statistics from July 1989 back to July 1988, you see some very significant growth in some important areas. As an example, we have 6,000 more people involved in construction in July than we had in July 1988; 6,000 additional people are employed in the area of trade; 4,000 more employed in the area of transportation and utilities; 21,000 more people are employed in July 1989 in the service industry as compared to July 1988; and we have other figures. It's a direct reflection of the economic diversification of this province and the strength in the economic situation in areas other than gas and oil in our province. I think it's a true reflection of what this government's commitment is to economic diversification.

MR. MUSGROVE: Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

During the summer, we are all concerned about jobs for our young people. Could the minister explain what the current environment is for jobs for young people?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, in July 1989 we have a record number of students employed in our province, 127,000, and of course many of them are employed in the areas I just talked about in the answer to the first question.

But there are also other kinds of very, very unique things happening in our province. As an example, there is a filming crew from Japan working in the city of Calgary right now that recently went out and hired some 3,000 young people to play a role in a film, to provide them with a diversified form of employment in the film and motion picture industry, the tourism industry. We have a filming of a miniseries here in the city of Edmonton, and we're co-operating, by the way, with this film crew from the United States, and will be using some sets of buildings owned by the province. The MLA from Fort Saskatchewan and I will soon be announcing that one of the sets for the filming that will be used is the old Fort Saskatchewan jail. Mr. Speaker, there's an overall feeling of different kinds of activity in our province, and our youth of course are a part of that and are participating in it. And it's a good feeling for young people in the province of Alberta in August 1989.

MR. MUSGROVE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the minister if, when he was compiling these figures for employment and unemployment, he took into consideration the loss of jobs that deals with the closure of Domglas in the Redcliff and Medicine Hat area.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, in the statistics put forward this morning, what the statistics do is of course give you an overall employment and unemployment level for the province and then also break it down into certain regions of Alberta. In the southern part of the province of Alberta our unemployment level is now 4.3 percent. These figures do not take into account what may or may not happen in the Medicine Hat-Redcliff area.

But there are three things that I think are very important. For the first time in a long time there's a very, very positive outlook with respect to agriculture in the southern part of the province of Alberta. This year, in 1989, our farmers and producers are getting enough moisture units. I was in Milk River just a few days ago, Mr. Speaker, and I've never seen a more positive environment among our agricultural people. Secondly, we're now reaching a peak point of construction on the Oldman River dam. And remember that the Oldman River dam, one of the most important environmental protection projects ever undertaken, period, is also providing employment for the citizens of Alberta. I would point out as well that recently there was an announced merger between Lakeside Packers and Centennial Packers, and they've indicated that in terms of the rationalization they may very well . . . [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Calgary-Forest Lawn.

Alberta Energy Company Shares

MR. PASHAK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As we heard earlier, the Minister of Energy has introduced a Bill that will change the ownership pattern of the Alberta Energy Company. Limits on individual ownership will be increased from 1 percent to 5 per-

cent, and nonresidents will now be permitted to own shares in this company. My question is to the Premier. Given that it was the Premier, who was then the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs, who said at the time the company was formed,

In order to provide the widest possible distribution of shares and to prevent any one person or group from acquiring a large block of shares in the future, the total share holdings of any one investor will be limited to 1 per cent of the shares issued, why is the government changing its policy?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, the member is quoting from *Hansard*, I assume, in 1973 or '74. Obviously, conditions change, and governments and legislation have to change with them. Other than that I'd just say to the hon. member that when legislation is before the House, he has every opportunity. I've told the members before: we have the first, second, and third readings, and we have committee study. Really, Mr. Speaker, I would expect you would want us to deal with the legislation during that process rather than in the question period.

MR. PASHAK: Well, Mr. Speaker, this is such an important matter that I think it's important that . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary.

MR. PASHAK: Well, similarly then -- and I suspect I'll get the same answer -- the Premier also said at the time, and I quote again from *Hansard*:

It is our intention that the ownership of the voting shares will be restricted to Canadian citizens or residents of Canada.

Why is this policy being reversed?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, that's exactly what should be discussed when the Bill is before the House.

MR. PASHAK: Well, finally, Mr. Speaker, again to the Premier, given that the clear effect of this proposed Bill is to increase the value of Alberta Energy Company shares, is this a prelude to the government getting rid of its 37 percent ownership in AEC so it can deal with the massive debt problem that it's created?

MR. GETTY: I'm pleased that the hon. member is following along the same route as his leader, and that is that they are now predicting great things for Alberta Energy Company shares. I'm glad that they're finally realizing how valuable that company is and the government's leadership in having it here in Alberta.

MR. SPEAKER: Westlock-Sturgeon.

Marketing of Milk in Four-litre Jugs

MR. TAYLOR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Agriculture today. As we all know and we've seen often, the four-litre jugs for milk are very much in demand by the consumers, as it markets more milk and it is more convenient to many large families. The past Minister of Agriculture five months ago assured the people of Alberta he would be pressing for immediate authorization to turn out four-litre milk jugs. Two months ago the minister told the milk processors of this province he would be proceeding with it. A couple of

weeks ago he told the House yes, he'd be going ahead with four-litre milk jugs. My question is: what in the dickens is holding up putting out four-litre milk jugs?

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would have to suggest that the hon. member's memory is probably a little at fault here. He should probably go back a couple of weeks and see how I did respond to his question. My response at that point in time was that I was leaning toward recommending the regulation change, the order in council change, to proceed with the four-litre jugs and at the same time give consideration to putting it under the Beverage Container Act. I think I also explained quite fully to the member at that point in time how regulated that supply-managed industry is; hence the reason why changes don't come quickly in that industry. We're still moving down the same path, and in due course a decision will be made and announced.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, the minister often leans, but he wasn't leaning that day. His statement that he was leaning is not correct. He definitely said he was going to put out four-litre jugs. Could we go . . .

MR. MITCHELL: He's backing off.

MR. TAYLOR: Backing off, Mr. Speaker.

But given that he's backing off, if he ever does get around it with the glacial slowness he's moving, will he be asking that there be a deposit on the four-litre milk jugs?

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Speaker, again I would suggest the hon. member go back and read *Hansard* before he starts to try to quote it. I believe the last question was: if we proceeded, would there be a deposit on it? I think my indication was that if we proceeded, it would be my recommendation we put it under the Beverage Container Act. That means something that maybe the hon. member should research.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, given that *Hansard* says as soon as I can get an order in council, leaning is not mentioned. Given the fact that no milk containers in Alberta now have to have a deposit, why would he consider putting a deposit on the four-litre jug? Why would he discriminate against that?

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Speaker, I believe I indicated earlier on that there were two concerns within the industry and outside the industry with respect to the move to the four-litre jugs. Number one was the potential added cost to a base product such as milk which is highly regulated, the price set by the PUB, if we simply change the packaging and allow the industry to pass the costs of retooling plants through to the consumer. The second major concern was environmental, and I would remind the hon. member that the other plastic jugs are recent new entries into the Alberta marketplace and would obviously be given the same consideration if the decision is made to put them under the Beverage Container Act.

MR. SPEAKER: Innisfail, followed by Edmonton-Strathcona.

Agriculture Trade

MR. SEVERTSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Agriculture. Recently the federal and provin-

cial ministers of agriculture met in Prince Albert, Saskatchewan. My question to the minister is: was there any discussion on the importance of agriculture trade to the overall economy of Canada? [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to report that there was considerable discussion on trade: the impact of free trade, the impact of the multilateral trade negotiations, and a fairly comprehensive assessment of the role that agriculture in Canada plays in the overall trade picture. There's been a significant growth in the trade balance in agriculture from less than \$2 billion two years ago to in excess of \$4 billion today. I would add, to demonstrate the importance of agriculture in the Canadian economy, that if it hadn't been for that \$4 billion-plus trade in agriculture, there would have been a net loss in the trade balance of this nation. That should be significant to Canadians, whether they live in urban or rural areas, that agriculture is still contributing very significantly to the life-style that we enjoy.

MR. SEVERTSON: Could the minister comment on how much the western provinces contribute to the trade in agriculture?

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Speaker, the leading products contributing to that positive trade balance were products like wheat, pork, canola, barley, many of which are produced in western Canada. I would underline -- and I would hope the hon. Member for Westlock-Sturgeon is listening -- that those products that are playing the leading role are not under a supply-managed system.

MR. SEVERTSON: Does the minister have any figures on the amount of trade with the United States, and does the minister expect this to increase with the free trade agreement?

MR. ISLEY: A review of our trade patterns over the past 10 years would indicate that while our trade with the European common community has declined significantly, our trade with the U.S. has climbed significantly and our trade with the Pacific Rim has also strengthened. I think this demonstrates the impact that trade barriers have had on the way we've had to adjust. The freer the borders, the better our industry has responded. I anticipate further growth under the free trade agreement.

Disclosure of Government Documents

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the minister of public works, et cetera.

MR. SPEAKER: Supply and services.

MR. WRIGHT: Yes. That's what "et cetera" means, Mr. Speaker.

Since October 13, 1983, Mr. Speaker, a high-powered committee called the Public Records Committee has held at least 55 meetings to establish amongst other things how you get access to public records. In the meantime hundreds of millions of dollars of public money has been committed on the basis of agreements and reports that the public cannot see. In response to my question last year, the then minister reported in a written answer that it is not government policy to provide internal reports. My question is: why is the document that tells us how we may have

access to secret reports itself secret? Is the rule book being written by Kafka?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, one of the guidebooks and the rules that all members in British parliaments follow is a book entitled *Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms*, sixth edition. Mr. Speaker, perhaps to be very, very specific to the hon. gentleman, could I just quote these relevant sections from *Beauchesne*? Can I just make mention of *Beauchesne* 446(2)(a), (1)...

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. minister. I'm sure that even though the question sounds like a point of order, all hon. members will make reference to yesterday's *Hansard* for the same citations.

Edmonton-Strathcona, supplementary.

MR. WRIGHT: Well, Mr. Speaker, will the minister come clean and admit to us that the true function of this committee is to do nothing while appearing to do something, like so much else the government does?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the reference to the debate that took place yesterday afternoon in the House with respect to certain motions for returns.

I think the hon. member should very well spend some time reading the rules for British parliamentary democracies, and *Beauchesne* makes it very, very clear which papers are to be provided and which papers are not to be provided. Surely the hon. Member for Edmonton-Strathcona's not asking me as a member of this Crown to bend the rules for his privilege.

MR. WRIGHT: Then in heaven's name why was the committee set up in 1983? It's obviously a failure, and therefore I ask the minister to pledge to this Assembly today that he will bring in forthwith reasonable rules to enable disclosure to be made to the public of all documents and reports that deal with commitments of hundreds of millions of public dollars so that we may see these reports, such as the Oldman River dam report itself, the forestry management agreements...

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. member. This is... [interjections] Order please. Order. This is the final supplementary question. Thank you.

Perhaps the minister would like to respond to the first question that was in that long series of questions.

MR. KOWALSKI: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I've been a member of this Assembly since 1979, and I had the great privilege of serving the people of Alberta in this Assembly as the Minister of the Environment from 1986 to 1988. Every document, every document with respect to the Oldman River dam that has been published has been presented and tabled in this Assembly, and there is television tape to see this minister standing behind tonnes of paper that has been provided to the Assembly, to the Legislature Library. It is in *Hansard*, and for the gentleman to suggest that we are withholding information... [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.
Calgary-North West, if you can be heard.

Applied Polymer Products Inc.

MR. BRUSEKER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just two weeks ago in this Assembly the Minister of the Environment rose and proudly told Albertans of his desire to create a world-class recycling industry in Alberta. Today there's a company, in Edmonton by the way, called Applied Polymer research, and this company is a world leader and has a technique to convert thousands of pounds, in fact millions of pounds, of used plastic pop bottles into recyclable, worthwhile products that are worth 10 times their original value. Temporary cash problems, unfortunately, will cause this company to shut down today, forcing possible loss to Alberta of a front-edge technology, and to date the ministers of the Environment, Economic Development and Trade, Technology, Research and Telecommunications have shown absolutely no concern. Since this is a concern dealing with money, I guess I'll have to ask the Deputy Premier: considering the recent announcement to stimulate the Alberta recycling industry, how can this government allow this company to falter, resulting in a loss of the technology, the second, I might note, recycling company that is likely to close?

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the ministers responsible directly, who today are in Fort Saskatchewan to announce a very major new economic development for Alberta, I will take the question as notice.

MR. BRUSEKER: Well, my second question, then, would be directed to the Provincial Treasurer. Why is it that on one hand Mr. Pocklington can come in and get \$67 million worth of public help, while on the other hand this company has been totally ignored, and it has the potential to export its technology all over the world?

MR. SPEAKER: Take it as notice.

MR. BRUSEKER: Well, my final question, then, will be I guess to the Deputy Premier again since, as you have noted, we can't note that they're not here. Will he please direct these ministers...

MR. SPEAKER: Hold it.

MR. BRUSEKER: Will he please direct the ministers... [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. member. We'll keep listening to Calgary-North West since that's the member who's involved.

MR. BRUSEKER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Deputy Premier please make a commitment -- since the president of the company is now, today, in the members' gallery, and he's here ready to meet today with the ministers. Will he please direct the ministers that I have cited to meet with the president to possibly help out this company?

MR. HORSMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I have no idea as to whether or not the member who just posed the question had tried to make any arrangements for such a meeting with the ministers in question. Had he done so, he would have been advised it would not be possible for them to meet at this particular time

because of other commitments that they had to undertake.

MRS. HEWES: Hasn't been possible for months.

MR. HORSMAN: I should just point out for all hon. members that ministers are pleased to meet upon reasonable notice with Albertans.

MRS. HEWES: No, no.

MR. HORSMAN: Well, the hon. member for Edmonton-Gold Bar keeps interjecting, saying "No, no." I don't know what she's talking about. Nonetheless, I'm trying to respond that I do not . . . [interjection]

MR. HORSMAN: Oh, Edmonton-Centre is so cute, isn't he, in his remarks?

REV. ROBERTS: Well, thank you.

MR. HORSMAN: Oh, my. [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. It's not only Friday; it's that the class is about to be dismissed for a mini summer vacation. Calgary-Glenmore.

Day Care Personnel

MRS. MIROSH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Recently there was a report prepared by the manpower planning unit for the Alberta Health and Social Services Disciplines Committee on day care personnel in Alberta and part-time casual employment in Alberta day care centres. In preparation of this report there was a questionnaire circulated to 647 day care centres, covering education qualifications and experience for employees working in a centre, and the employees had a great deal of input. Could the Minister for Family and Social Services give us a brief outline of the results of this questionnaire?

MR. OLDRING: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'd want to begin by talking about our government's commitment to providing quality day care in the province of Alberta, and I think it's recognized that our commitment is second to none in the nation. The member would also know that although our commitment to day care is as strong as it is, we of course constantly strive to make good things even better. In this instance, we are reviewing a number of the factors that are related to day care, and we felt that it would be helpful for us to, of course, get as much information as we could. With that in mind we made a request of the Alberta Health and Social Services Disciplines Committee, who prepare an annual survey of health care and social services employees, for the first time in 13 years to include day care providers as well.

We are very pleased that they would do that, and we're also pleased that some 647 day care centres were surveyed and some 92 percent responded. Through that process we were able to get some very helpful, invaluable information to the department. The information included vacancy rates, which we discovered were very low. They included turnover rates, which we discovered were higher than we would like to see. We also were pleased to note that 40 percent of all day care directors and 25 percent of all day care workers held a recognized certificate or

diploma or degree in early childhood education. Of that, we also noted that of those who didn't have that training already, 32 percent of them were endeavouring to undertake that. So some helpful information.

MRS. MIROSH: Mr. Speaker, the Calgary region recorded the largest turnover for directors in day cares, and the city of Calgary recorded the largest rate of child care workers at 34 percent. Is the minister addressing this situation?

MR. OLDRING: Yes, Mr. Speaker; that was one of the factors that stood out in my mind. I would only say to the member that it was something that I think has to be addressed not just by government but of course by the day care operators themselves. This minister has had the opportunity now of meeting with a number of the major umbrella groups here in the province, and I look forward to continuing to work with them and hopefully addressing this particular situation together.

MRS. MIROSH: Mr. Speaker, there seems to be a concern regarding the education of the employees in day care centres. Is there anything being done to encourage higher educational standards for the employees in day care centres?

MR. OLDRING: Well, Mr. Speaker, the member would recall, I'm sure, that in the throne speech of this session we made a commitment to reviewing and implementing day care standards here in the province of Alberta. This particular survey was done to help us assess that. I'm also working very closely, of course, with the Minister of Advanced Education and the Minister of Career Development and Employment and in consultation with day care operators across the province and in consultation with the parents of the children at day cares themselves. We hope by reviewing the situation thoroughly, by working together with Albertans, and by careful consultation, we'll be able to implement the appropriate standards in the not too distant future.

MR. SPEAKER: The time for question period has expired. The Chair would point out to all hon. members that because of the slowdown process today, at least six more questions were not asked.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed? Carried. Thank you.
Leader of the Opposition.

head: INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS (reversion)

MR. MARTIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In the public gallery are some good friends of mine, Bill and Elaine Sloane from Castlegar, B.C. Bill and I grew up together in the village of Delia, and I might point out that they are having their 75th anniversary. I'll be there with him, along with the Associate Minister of Agriculture. As I said, they are in the public gallery. I would ask them to stand and receive the warm welcome of the

Assembly.

[On motion, the Assembly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole]

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

[Mr. Schumacher in the Chair]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. members, come to order please. Order please. You could carry on those conversations outside the Chamber.

Bill 11
Senatorial Selection Act

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'd like to call upon the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs to introduce amendments to the Bill.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, the amendments, which have been now circulated, are two in number. I would just like to give a brief explanation of them now, before we get to them.

- A Section 5(4)(a) and (b) are struck out and the following is substituted:
- (a) shall be made not later than the 2nd Monday in September,
 - (b) shall appoint the 4th Monday in September as nomination day.

Those amendments are brought forward for the purpose of ensuring that the municipalities will have an extra week in the event we opt to go for the election at the time of municipal elections. So there would be a three-week period for the municipalities to print the ballots. That has been done at the request of particularly the city of Edmonton. Of course, the proclamation date would therefore also be advanced one week as well, and that's in subsection (a).

The second amendment is to provide that the elected authorities who are carrying out the vote under the Act shall provide for the holding of an advance vote in respect of an election.

But this will permit the municipalities to do so according to the normal system in which they operate. For example, Edmonton I think has a five-day period for advance polls. Others may not have that same length of time. There will be flexibility, but there must be a system of advance polls devised, and we are trying to accommodate the concerns of the city of Edmonton by this particular amendment. Therefore, subsection (2) of the new section 51 will provide that

an advance vote may be held on any day after the 4th Monday in September . . .

That's nomination day.

. . . but not within 24 hours of election day.

So that will give flexibility to the municipalities who are conducting the advance poll within their own prescribed methods within their own particular boundaries. That, I think, will alleviate the concerns expressed to us by municipalities.

I'm indebted to the work that was carried out in this regard by my colleague the Minister of Municipal Affairs in arranging for these amendments to come forward today.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Chair, for the purpose of

the record, omitted to call the Bill, but members will have gathered we're dealing with Bill 11. But for the purposes of the record, I would make that clear.

The hon. Member for Edmonton-Whitemud.

MR. WICKMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I thank you, too, for the opportunity of allowing me to speak before the Member for Edmonton-Highlands, because it normally doesn't work that way for some reason.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot support this amendment. This amendment, to me, when we look at amendment A in particular, ensures that the government is committed to holding the senatorial election during October 16, the same day as the municipal elections. There is absolutely no question that this amendment is there to clear that final hurdle that they would face.

Mr. Chairman, during the debate on the amendment that we had brought forward earlier, we pointed out as to why it should not be held during that particular day. To repeat those same arguments I don't think is required, I don't think is necessary, but it is very, very clear to me that this Bill is being brought forward now with this amendment in such a way that it is doing exactly what municipalities -- I'm not talking the Alberta Urban Municipalities Association, who had a gun held to their heads, but the individual elected representatives -- do not want to see happen.

Mr. Chairman, more and more as we get into the amendments that we have proposed, which are wise amendments, the one that was earlier . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please, hon. member. I hope you'll keep your remarks to this amendment. You'll have an opportunity, of course, to address your amendments when we come to them.

MR. WICKMAN: Well, the earlier amendment, which is very, very related to this amendment, Mr. Chairman, was defeated. It presented great difficulties for me.

Now, this particular amendment which the government is asking us to support, which I feel puts the nail in the coffin as far as their determination as to when they're going to hold the election, is totally unacceptable. I would certainly hope that members will not support this, because it will, I think, destroy any good intent that that particular Bill may have.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Highlands.

MS BARRETT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have one very brief comment about these amendments, and that is this. I find it very interesting and somewhat inexplicable that the major flagship Bill of the shortest session ever of the Legislative Assembly -- that is, February 17, 1989 -- was so flawed and faulty in the first instance that this is the second occasion upon which the sponsoring minister has had to come back with not just one amendment but more than one amendment. Thank you.

MR. HORSMAN: We listen to the people and act upon their representations to us. It's quite that simple. We are not as hidebound as the socialists to dogmatic direction, and we're pleased to respond when people come forward with reasonable suggestions. That's exactly what's happened.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Highlands.

MS BARRETT: Thank you for the information, Mr. Chairman, from the minister. I would point out that we certainly hope that's the case with respect to another contentious Bill involving conflict of interest. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is the committee ready for the question?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. TAYLOR: On a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No. No point of order . . .

MR. TAYLOR: On the amendment, are we just handling A, or did we lump A and B together?

MR. CHAIRMAN: We are dealing with the entire amendment, I believe.

MR. TAYLOR: Oh. Well then, I have something to say on section B.

AN HON. MEMBER: The question's been called.

MR. TAYLOR: Well, wait a minute. [interjections]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Order please. The question had been called, hon. member. I'm sorry, but we're in the middle of the vote and now I must call for those opposed to the amendment. The point of order, hon. member, was called after I called the question, unfortunately. [interjections] Order please. It's not orderly for us to proceed by having points of order raised during the middle of a vote. The point of order must be raised before the vote is called.

MS BARRETT: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No. Order please, hon. member. I'll recognize you for your point of order after this vote is completed.

MS BARRETT: Well, that's outrageous.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is not outrageous. Order please. Would those opposed to the amendment please say no.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The amendment is carried.
Point of order, the hon. Member for Edmonton-Highlands.

MS BARRETT: Mr. Chairman, it is the authority of this Assembly to do as it pleases regardless of what the rules state. By unanimous consent this Assembly can take any point of order at

any time it wants. Now, I believe that the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon has a valid concern insofar as it wasn't even spelled out which Bill we were dealing with in the first place -- in the second place, the separation of the votes that were presented under the amendment. I believe that the vote that just occurred should be called again.

[Several members rose calling for a division]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would the other hon. members please sit down.

MR. TAYLOR: We're standing for a division. This sounds like a real railroad job here. What's Horsman in a hurry for?

AN HON. MEMBER: Ring the bells.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We were on a point of order before the . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: Make up your mind, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I had recognized the hon. Member for Edmonton-Highlands for a point of order. I allowed her to complete her point of order. We'll deal with the division after I rule on her point of order. The point of order was that this committee could suspend the rules of the Legislature, and that is not correct at all. The committee cannot do that, hon. member. Only the Assembly can suspend or vary its rules. Now, that's parliamentary. Whether the hon. member recognizes it or not, that is the situation.

There has been a call for a division.

[The division bell was rung]

[Eight minutes having elapsed, the House divided]

For the motion:

Adair	Fowler	McEachern
Ady	Fox	McInnis
Anderson	Gesell	Mirosh
Barrett	Gibeault	Mjolsness
Betkowski	Gogo	Moore
Bradley	Hawkesworth	Musgrove
Brassard	Horsman	Nelson
Calahasen	Hyland	Oldring
Cardinal	Isley	Paszkowski
Cherry	Johnston	Roberts
Dinning	Jonson	Severtson
Drobot	Kowalski	Shrake
Elliott	Laing, B.	Sigurdson
Elzinga	Laing, M.	Tannas
Evans	Lund	Weiss
Ewasiuk	Main	West
Fischer	McClellan	Wright

Against the motion:

Bruseker	Hewes	Taylor
Decore	Mitchell	Wickman
Gagnon		

Totals:	Ayes - 51	Noes - 7
---------	-----------	----------

[Motion on amendments carried]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before we start the next set of amendments -- I will call the amendments by the hon. Member for Westlock-Sturgeon -- do we wish to deal with these as a bundle or individually?

MR. TAYLOR: No, I'd like a day to deal with them separately under their headings A, B, and so on, and in sequence. I believe the first senatorial one is section 8. We could do it clause by clause. I believe the first one is . . . Yeah, then 8, 8.1, 9, 11, 34, and 56 are the ones I have in front of me, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The ones I have in front of me under the name of the hon. Member for Westlock-Sturgeon start with 9(1).

MR. TAYLOR: Except, Mr. Chairman, circulated the other day on July 31 were amendments by Mr. Decore, section 8(a). I think that must be . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do I understand the hon. Member for Westlock-Sturgeon that we're going to commence with the hon. Member for Edmonton-Glengarry's now?

MR. TAYLOR: Yes, I was hoping so, because they're earlier than mine.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, when I saw you rise, I thought . . .
The hon. Member for Edmonton-Glengarry.

MR. DECORE: Mr. Chairman, the effect of this amendment is to allow either a Member of Parliament, a member of the Senate, or a Member of this Legislative Assembly to be a candidate in the senatorial election that is forthcoming. I think it's appropriate in the way some of the media have designated this particular section. It is a section to discriminate against Mr. Taylor, our colleague in our Liberal caucus, the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon. [interjections]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order in the committee, please.

MR. DECORE: Mr. Chairman, the matter of Senate reform was discussed at some length on May 7, 1987. The Premier of our province returned from Ottawa, from Meech Lake, after having signed that disastrous agreement. That agreement provides for the selection of Senators by names being submitted to the Prime Minister. I think it's important to read for the record the exchange of questions that took place between the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon and the Premier of the province, because a great deal of time has been spent by members opposite to take credit for this idea of electing a Senator for Alberta. They have no right to do that. I think that right, from what I'm about to read back into the record, is the right of the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon.

On May 7, 1987, the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon rose in this Assembly and put the following question to the Premier. He stated that the Premier

has now a golden opportunity to start the ball rolling at least towards one of these, an elected Senate. Right now the Premier has the power to ensure that from this day forward every new Senator in Alberta could be elected. Will the Premier undertake to implement the system whereby Alberta Senators

will be elected by the people of Alberta rather than patronage appointments from the Premier's office?

The Premier responded in the following way:

Mr. Speaker, the temporary situation that we have established to put additional pressure on moving quickly to Senate reform and the type of Senate reform that we want, I hope will be for a short period of time and would not lend itself to the kind of proposal the hon. leader of the Liberal Party suggests.

Mr. Taylor, the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon, then continued:

Mr. Speaker, aboriginal rights were supposed to be a short period of time too. But would the Premier, for instance, direct his minister of intergovernmental affairs, when he stays home in Edmonton, to look into the history of how the United States Senate evolved from an appointed Senate into an elected Senate, the principle of elected Senators? Maybe we could adopt that here.

The Premier responded, "Mr. Speaker, that kind of research has been done."

Again, the hon. Member for Westlock-Sturgeon:

Possibly then, if he's asked intergovernmental affairs to check into how it should be done, could he go a step further, because the Premiers' Conference -- later this month there'll be a conference of the four western provincial Premiers. Would he take this idea of electing Senators to that conference and sound out the effect [this would have with] the other Premiers.

The Premier responded, "No, Mr. Speaker." The Member for Westlock-Sturgeon continued on May 7, 1987. He stated:

Mr. Speaker, I was afraid of that.

The Premier has stated that he'd like to see Triple E advocates appointed to the Senate from Alberta. Would it not be even better to have Triple E advocates elected from Alberta?

The final answer the Premier gave, Mr. Chairman, was this: Obviously, Mr. Speaker, those people who the government of Alberta would suggest would be people who we would expect would support our views regarding the Triple E Senate . . .

MR. GESELL: Point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please, hon. member. Before recognizing the hon. Member for Clover Bar, the Chair has been listening for some time, hoping the member would come to the subject of his amendments. Because we do have an amendment dealing with section 8, and for the life of me, the Chair can't really relate what the member has said to what the proposed amendment is to the Bill. If the member could try to relate what he's said to this amendment, it would be very helpful to the committee.

MR. DECORE: Mr. Chairman, I started off by stating to this Assembly that . . .

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

MR. DECORE: If you'll allow me to finish the question you put to me, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Chair did ask the hon. member a question, and I would like to have an answer.

MR. DECORE: The linkage I stated right at the outset, Mr. Chairman, was that this particular section, the section the government has proposed, is an attempt to not allow the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon to participate in this election. I think that's grossly improper. I'm setting out for the record the fact that it was the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon who proposed

this whole idea, and now there's some kind of feeling of holding back the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon because it was his idea that brought this matter forward in the first place. Surely that's a linkage.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, it's a . . .

MR. DECORE: Let me finish my last sentence, Mr. Chairman. The Premier responded by stating:

Mr. Speaker, those people who the government of Alberta would suggest would be people who we would expect would support our views regarding the Triple E Senate and then would be able to work for a Triple E Senate from within the Senate in Senate reform.

Now, Mr. Chairman, stop taking the credit, Mr. Minister of intergovernmental affairs. You, as the lead on this particular matter . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. I want to suggest to the hon. member that he begin adopting the habit of making his comments through the Chair instead of making personal references to individual members of the committee, which is totally improper. I would also say that this is the time to talk about why Members of Parliament and Members of the Legislative Assembly should be eligible for candidature in this election. That's the purpose of the hon. member's amendment.

MR. DECORE: Mr. Chairman, this does discriminate and does not allow members of this Assembly to participate in a very important process, the process of changing the parliamentary system in Canada completely, totally, to allow for a Senate to be put into place that allows anybody and everybody to participate. My fear, Mr. Chairman, is this: that this may well be the opportunity the Prime Minister takes, because the Prime Minister has expressed his position that he doesn't like this idea of senatorial election. And it could well be the Prime Minister's way out to say . . .

MR. GESELL: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The hon. Member for Clover Bar.

MR. GESELL: Mr. Chairman, I raise this point of order. It seems that the hon. member is just rambling on, even if it is to reply to a question you posed, Mr. Chairman. My point of order is related, and I cite from the Standing Orders, section 23(d). I'd like to read:

A member will be called to order by Mr. Speaker if that member:

- (d) in the opinion of Mr. Speaker, refers at length to debates of the current session or reads unnecessarily from *Hansard* . . .

That's exactly what the member had been doing when I raised my point of order, Mr. Chairman. I do not really appreciate having *Hansard* reread to me. I can read it for myself.

Thank you very much.

MR. DECORE: Mr. Chairman, I can see that I'm getting under the skin of the members opposite, because this is discrimination against the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon, a member of this Assembly who has expressed a desire to be a candidate in the forthcoming senatorial election. Let's call a spade a spade,

members of this Assembly. The intent is to stop the hon. member from running. Mr. Chairman, I make the point that if there is a way for the Prime Minister to wiggle out -- and he has shown his desire to attempt to wiggle out -- this is a good reason for the Prime Minister to say, "Well, in constitutional terms under the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, where everybody's entitled to be a participant in the democratic process in Canada, this doesn't fit that bill." Then we will not allow the elected Member for Westlock-Sturgeon who becomes our Senator to, in fact, fulfill that position.

So I urge the members to go with the amendment which will allow all Members of Parliament, all MLAs of this Assembly, all Senators . . . And surely that's a good point too, Mr. Chairman: that we would want to encourage those Senators sitting there now, that were appointed, to come out from behind the rocks and run, get elected.

MR. HORSMAN: Well, I've heard the height of nonsense when they suggest we should allow a sitting Senator to run for Senator. I mean, that really takes the cake. If they want to run, they should resign from the Senate to run, creating another vacancy. I've called upon them to do so, all those Liberal flacks sitting in there, all well known to the hon. leader of the Liberal Party. Of all people, he's knows all about appointments to the Senate and those things. He's been steeped in the patronage game all his life. Mr. Chairman, for him now to suggest that we should allow a sitting Senator to run for another senatorial vacancy surely stretches credulity beyond all bounds.

In any event, dealing with the other aspects of the amendment, this is not an attempt to discriminate against the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon. That's absolute nonsense. Absolute nonsense. I refer members of this Assembly to two other relevant pieces of legislation. The Election Act of the province of Alberta, section 52, says that a person is eligible to be nominated as a candidate in an election if on the day his nomination paper is filed, he is not a Member of the Senate or the House of Commons of Canada. I refer the hon. members as well to the federal elections Act, section 77, "Persons Eligible as Candidates":

The persons mentioned in this section are not, for the time specified with respect to such person, eligible as candidates at an election, namely,

- (d) every person who is a member of the legislature of a province, during the time he is such a member.

That is the law of Canada, it is the law of Alberta, with complete justification that you should not be able to use one parliamentary office in one parliament in Canada . . .

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Glengarry on a point of order.

MR. DECORE: Mr. Chairman, the hon. minister is referring to the law of the land. Surely the law of this province . . . The law is that Meech . . . [interjections] Mr. Chairman, Meech Lake was adopted . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Citation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Order please.

MR. DECORE: Mr. Chairman, I haven't been allowed to state my arguments.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But if the hon. member would give us a citation of the Standing Orders or *Beauchesne*, then we would know on what he's basing his point of order.

MR. DECORE: Mr. Chairman, the laws of this province must be adhered to by oath that every member of this Assembly takes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order.

MR. DECORE: Mr. Chairman, surely that's an oath you acknowledge.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Now, the hon. member must set out the basis for his point of order on either *Beauchesne* or our Standing Orders.

MR. DECORE: Mr. Chairman, it is the oath. Nobody has to point the Chairman to the oath of this Assembly. The oath says that you adhere to the laws of the province of Alberta.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order.

MR. DECORE: Surely that's a fact.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The hon. member is just debating with the hon. minister, and he'll have his opportunity to debate with the hon. minister by entering the debate after he's finished.

The hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs.

MR. HORSMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman. The law of Alberta is clear in the Election Act that a Senator or a member of the House of Commons cannot seek office as an MLA while they hold that office. My colleague the Minister of Economic Development and Trade was a Member of Parliament. In order to seek office as a member of this Legislature, he resigned his seat. It is a fundamental principle of parliamentary democracy that you cannot . . .

MR. WRIGHT: Did he have to resign his seat before he ran?

MR. HORSMAN: Yes, indeed. He had to resign his seat before he could file his nomination papers. That is completely in keeping with the tradition of parliamentary democracy in the federal state, and I said so in my opening remarks, Mr. Chairman. And for the Liberals to trot out this notion that we are trying to discriminate against one member of the Assembly is absolute and utter nonsense. Eighty-three members of this Assembly are so affected -- not just one, but 83 . . .

MRS. HEWES: They shouldn't be.

MR. HORSMAN: Two hundred and eighty-odd Members of Parliament in Canada are also not eligible to seek another elected office while they hold a seat in Parliament.

MRS. HEWES: And they should be.

MR. HORSMAN: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Gold Bar keeps saying they should be eligible, but the fact of the matter is that they are not, under the laws of Alberta and under the laws of Canada.

I mean, there is nothing in this that's sinister, and if my dear friend the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon feels so offended and discriminated against, I feel sorry for him, but he should have read both pieces of governing legislation. We wanted to make the Senatorial Selection Act completely consistent with the Election Act of Alberta and the Canada Elections Act, and for anybody to suggest otherwise is dragging a red herring across the path of an effort to make this selection process work.

If the hon. Member for Westlock-Sturgeon or the hon. Member for Calgary-Mountain View wants to run in the senatorial election whenever it may occur, well, let them do so. They cannot have their cake and eat it too. I mean, you cannot be a member of one parliament and use that office to seek an office in another parliament. It's basic and fundamental.

MR. WICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, a few notes here in support of the amendment. I'd like to hear one good argument as to why this amendment should be passed. [interjections] I've heard some argument, but I'm talking in terms of one good argument why it should be supported.

AN HON. MEMBER: It should.

MR. WICKMAN: No. I'm asking for one good argument as to why it should be supported. I haven't heard that one good argument yet. Now, that one good argument is going to come, but it's going to come from over here.

Mr. Chairman, there were references made earlier to other comparisons, like the former Member of Parliament that stepped down. We're talking here about a situation where there are no guarantees that even if that person is successful in this election that person is going to gain a seat in the Senate, unless the government can somehow give those guarantees, and it is very, very unlikely it can give those types of guarantees.

We talk in terms of a democracy, and here we see a situation that, to me, clearly discriminates against persons within this House, not just the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon but members within this House, members who are currently sitting as members of parliament in the province of Alberta. The Member for Westlock-Sturgeon certainly has been referred to, and he has indicated quite clearly his interest. On the other hand, there could very well be interest from members on that particular side. The Member for Three Hills could very well choose to run, possibly as an Independent, as was suggested by the hon. Member for Calgary-Elbow.

Mr. Chairman, if we talk in terms of a democracy we have to respect that democratic process, and this amendment that has been brought forward by the Liberal caucus, by the Member for Edmonton-Glengarry, would certainly ensure some degree, a large degree, of democracy within that Bill.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Calgary-Mountain View.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I listened carefully to the comments made by the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. I always appreciate his interventions, and I appreciate him pointing out the requirements under

the federal election Act. It leaves me a bit mystified, then, having heard that rationale, and then coming again and taking another look at the report of the Alberta Select Special Committee on Upper House Reform, a report titled *Strengthening Canada: Reform of Canada's Senate*. It was published in March of 1985 and was chaired by the hon. Member for Calgary-Currie, the present hon. Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. It was a very interesting report to read in that it gave forward a fairly comprehensive analysis of the government on behalf of a Triple E Senate. It talked about a number of suggestions, and I think some of them to some extent have been incorporated in Bill 11 before us.

But one of the recommendations in this report of the government in March of 1985 was this recommendation -- there were a number of recommendations made -- and it comes under the category called method of selection. Under that category of recommendations the committee said this, Mr. Chairman:

Upon winning an election, Senators should be required to resign from any provincial or civic elected office they hold.

In going into the body of the report to read the recommendation and the basis for that recommendation a little bit further -- here it is on page 30, section (h), titled *Eligibility For Office* -- the committee made this statement:

Upon winning an election, Senators should be required to resign from any provincial or civic elected office. The job of Senator is far too onerous to allow for other offices, and, of course, Senators should not be placed in a potential conflict of interest position. They should not however have to resign such positions before seeking election to the Senate.

Now, far be it from me to provide the rationale for this committee as to why it reached its positions, Mr. Chairman, but I'm mystified that a high-powered, blue-ribbon committee established by the government . . . There were a number of sitting members of the Legislature. All of them, as far as I can tell, were sitting members of the Legislature at the time. I see that two of them are now in cabinet, a third is the hon. Speaker, and another is still a member of this Assembly. I mean, these people, I would have thought, would have done thorough research and analysis of this situation. They've got a fairly thick and comprehensive report. In fact, they commissioned a number of reports that are included in this. I would have thought that they had gone to the people that could give them the legal advice we've now received from the Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs minister this afternoon about requirements under the federal election Act.

Nonetheless, this was their conclusion and their recommendation, and it mystifies me that either they were so far off base in making that recommendation it draws into question all the other conclusions -- if their analysis was so superficial and so flawed on that key recommendation, it then raises and begs the question: what if the other recommendations were also equally flawed? That's the one question. And secondly, maybe they were right; maybe there is room to allow this, and they for very good reasons arrived at this conclusion, in which case, on the other hand, it's mystifying why the government would introduce a Bill restricting a Member of the Legislative Assembly from seeking a Senate seat under the process that's been set up. I would like the Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs minister to address his earlier comments in the context of this report, *Strengthening Canada*, from the government's own select special committee.

The other point -- and I think the minister was quite correct on this point. This is not a personality issue. I think it was a bit

regrettable that the hon. Member for Edmonton-Glengarry concentrated on the personality issue in dealing with this recommendation and with this section of the Act in front of us. It's not an issue of personality whether an individual MLA who's pursued this matter in this Assembly, whether that individual should be allowed the right to seek election or not. It's not. It's obviously an issue that affects all of us.

But I think the point that needs to be made in this regard is that what we have in front of us really is not an election Bill -- and I keep coming back to this point; I made it in my remarks in the Assembly at second reading -- and this is where the government's whole thought and concept has been flawed from the beginning in bringing forward this Bill. They seem to believe that this is an election Act, that somehow we're putting forward an election process. We're not, Mr. Chairman, and that's the key difference that's been creating this confusion.

If you resign your seat in the House of Commons, as the hon. minister did, you seek election to the Alberta Legislature. You know that at the end of the process, if you're successful, you will be able to take your seat in the Alberta Legislature. By the same token, if you resign your seat in the Alberta Legislature and seek election to the federal House of Commons, if at the end of that process you're successful, you will have the right to assume your seat in the House of Commons. But under this Bill, Mr. Chairman -- and this is its fundamental flaw -- you can seek a seat in the federal Senate, you can go through this process, you can spend lots of money, and at the end of it you can be successful in having your name appear at the top of a list as receiving the most number of votes, but that does not guarantee that you will be successful in being able to take a seat in that federal Senate office.

This is why this is so much different. It's of a different category; it's of a different body; it's of a different -- I don't know the right word for it -- a different species from elections. That's why it seems to me -- given that it's not really an election at all, that it's simply a selection -- that at least the Member for Edmonton-Glengarry's amendments in front of us deserve some better consideration than to simply say that the federal election Act or the provincial Election Act would prevent a member from the Legislative Assembly seeking a seat in the House of Commons; therefore, it should prevent them from seeking to be successful under this selection process being put in place by Bill 11.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Calgary-North West.

MR. BRUSEKER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I rise, of course, to support this amendment. In the opening comments by the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs we heard much rhetoric about the revolutionary nature and the historic nature of the Senatorial Selection Act. I was feeling very disappointed for the members of the government that they hadn't retained more of their simian ancestors' traits, in that had they longer arms they could pat themselves on the back a little more appropriately.

We in the Liberal Party do, in fact, support the Bill in principle. But there are some changes that need to be made, and this amendment, presented by the hon. leader of the Liberal Party, is clearly one that needs to be made. Mr. Chairman, in the original debates we heard about the revolutionary nature of the Bill, the Senatorial Selection Act, and yet the Minister of Federal and

Intergovernmental Affairs says: "Well, hold it. We only can have half a revolution here. We're going to have a revolution, but we've got to follow the rules." Well, that to me seems a rather spurious argument. You can't stand up and say we're going to change the way the Senators are selected in the province of Alberta, but we have to maintain this rule and that rule and, gee whiz, it says in this, and so forth. And he cited all of the appropriate legislation.

Well, Mr. Chairman, if you are going to implement change, you don't ask for a parachute halfway down when you're making your changes. You look at making a change. If you're looking at setting a record and diving off a high board into a pool and you're going for a maximum height, you don't ask for a parachute halfway down. By saying we can't change the rules because it says that in an election -- which this isn't, as pointed out by the hon. Member for Calgary-Mountain View -- that argument is completely spurious. So what I would suggest is that the arguments as presented by the hon. minister against this particular amendment really do not apply, and I think we should consider these amendments and accept them. I would strongly support them. I think that clearly since we're not having an election but simply a selection, it should be open to any member from the population of the province at large, which is what the purpose of this amendment is to do.

So I strongly support this amendment and hope that members on both sides of the House will do likewise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Strathcona.

MR. WRIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The hon. Member for Calgary-Mountain View said the things I intended to say, but there's one addition. I'll just sum up the argument here. The hon. Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs minister has made an argument that is fairly persuasive on the assumptions that he makes, but those are wrong assumptions because they all are based on the proposition that the contests you win will be ones which will, in fact, for sure put you into the Assembly you run for. And that is surprising, because that's contrary to the conclusions of the committee on Senate reform that was presided over by the present Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. Of course the difference, anyway, is that there is no certainty that winning this contest will get you there.

The extra thought that occurred to me, and I haven't heard it expressed so far, is this: when you think about it, really only Conservatives can run, for practical purposes, with any assurance that they are going to be getting somewhere, because only Conservatives, really, are in a position to speak to the Prime Minister and say: "Look, if I'm selected in this process, am I going to be appointed? What are my chances?" There's a far better chance that a fellow-Conservative saying to the Conservative Prime Minister of Canada will get some such assurance than anyone else. That means that those who are not Conservative will have a considerably bigger hurdle to surmount, which will restrict the pool of those willing to go through this process still further. It is a rather sinister aspect of this whole thing, but it seems to me inevitable in the circumstances, and therefore to put further restrictions on the possible candidates would be unfair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Westlock-Sturgeon.

MR. TAYLOR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I had a point or

two to make because I've been closely associated with the elected Senate idea since 1971. One of the things in putting this Act together -- and while I was very keen when I saw it come forward, not only because of the recent *Hansard* explanation . . . I notice the Member for Clover Bar said he could read his own *Hansards*, but this was before he hit the House, so I thought the quote of the hon. Member for Edmonton-Glengarry was quite within keeping, because the new members wouldn't have had a chance to read the *Hansards* coming before.

The whole thing here is we're trying fashion a mousetrap, Mr. Chairman, that is perfect, that the Prime Minister cannot get out of. And this is what was so effectively pointed out by the hon. Member for Calgary-Mountain View: that the old committee had said anyone could be running. Also, as the Member for Calgary-North West said, this is a selection process, not an election process. And chances are, if the selection process ends up with a Tory at the top, probably the Prime Minister will go along, but if it doesn't, it will not. All these things can even go, and as important as they are, there's one other important issue -- and the hon. Member for Medicine Hat keeps citing the election Acts of the province of Alberta and the federal government. As the Member for Calgary-Mountain View pointed out, this is not an election; this is just a race, you might almost say a popularity poll.

But more important is that the parameters from which a Senator is selected now were never changed. They're still the same: \$4,000 worth of property, 30 years of age. So consequently, to quote the election Act, which allows 18- or 19-year-olds or no property mentioned at all, bears no relevance to this, because once we quote the election Act -- well, if we're going to follow the election Act, let's follow it all the way along. Why don't we say to the Prime Minister of Canada: "It's got to be 21, and it's got to be no property"? If we're going to follow the election Act, we follow the election Act, but he can't have a foot in both camps.

Mr. Chairman, when I saw this when it came out I thought, surely this is a horrible mistake. I talked to the Triple E people, and they agreed: "Yes, Nick, it must be a horrible mistake." I talked to some of the members in the government, and most of them said, "Well, we left that with our hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. And you make sense." I did some more checking, and I gather it comes from some gnome way down in the department who had put it together, thought he was fashioning something together with the federal election Act and the provincial Election Act -- which is quite right. If we're going to follow those Acts, let's follow them: 21 years of age, no property, and all the rest.

But, indeed, we wanted to craft this Act, and this is why I plead, almost, with the members here: let's not ruin this, because the Prime Minister will say, "Oh, you put in a thing here that says you cannot be an MLA or an MP. Well, Senate election process allows that you can be an MLA or an MP; you also have to have \$4,000 worth of property; you also have to be 30 years of age." Now to come along and say, "Well, we're going to accept the 30, we're going to accept the 21, but by God, we're not going to accept an MLA or an MP" means that we have destroyed the credibility and the strength of our argument. And this is what I argue from. As somebody who feels that there's a certain amount of paternalism involved in here, to my benefit or to my credit or to my curse -- however way you want to talk about it -- I'm bothered. I'm almost embarrassed as an Albertan to put out a Bill here that the Prime Minister can look

at and say: "Big deal. You sat and removed all MPs and all MLAs -- 120 to 121 elected people; some of those people I think quite highly of -- and you told them no, they can't run." This is what's so wrong about this amendment.

I would almost beg the minister to go back and think about it, because he can't use part of the federal and provincial election Acts to justify the argument that you can't run for this as an MLA or MP and then ignore the other parts of the Act that say you have to be 30 and you have to be 21.

I go on a bit further here. There's also another slight thing that nobody has looked at. Who says the election Acts of Alberta and the federal government are correct? It was only in 1983 that they started putting in -- restricting, in a tit for tat. Do you remember back in those days? Both the feds and the province used to sit there and tit-for-tat each other: "Now, you did that"; "No, you did that." One of them would forbid the MLAs to run, and the other one would say, "Oh, if you do that, I'll forbid the MPs." Nobody has challenged that yet. As a matter of fact, I have a pretty good hunch -- and I've had some pretty good advice from some fair legal articles -- that when they challenge that section of the federal and provincial Acts that say an MLA or an MP cannot run, it may not stand up. So here we're hanging our case for a Senator -- particularly I want to go back again to summarize it very briefly in this particular cause -- on only taking part of the federal and provincial Act, which may be out of phase anyhow.

[Mr. Jonson in the Chair]

Now, I just begged the minister to withdraw this bit, have another hearing, talk with . . . I know the committee for an equal and elected Senate does not like it. I don't know of anybody in the law faculties of Edmonton or Calgary who likes it. It's something that I think got in there by mistake, and blind pride and a stiff neck are trying to keep it in there. I submit that we will pay in the long run by the Prime Minister saying that it is a phony election. "You removed at least 120 people that I would like to look at as being possible Senators, and you said no, I'm not allowed to look at them." And under the present Act the Prime Minister says, "I am allowed to look at them."

So I would just say let's get off this political partisanship. It's not a question of scoring points. I would ask him to withdraw it and look at it, because I think it makes a mess out of this Act. It makes it almost impossible to do what we wanted to do with this Act and this election: put a hammerlock on the Prime Minister of the day so that he or she has to accept the result. And what we've done is given a huge barn door opening at the other side that he can get out of.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Taking the question, then, on . . . I'm sorry. The Member for Calgary-Mountain View.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just one other observation about the amendment, because it does make reference to "local authority pursuant to the Local Authorities Election Act." There's another anomaly in this Bill, Mr. Chairman, that I'd like to draw to the hon. member's attention, and that is this. Depending on which route the government takes as

far as cabinet in terms of establishing a Senate selection process, this Bill says that if an election is held as part of a general election under the Local Authorities Election Act, and if a person is a candidate at a general election under that Act, then that person cannot be nominated to seek a Senate seat under this selection process. And yet, Mr. Chairman, if there is this selection process for Senator under the Election Act, a person who has an elected office at the local level can be a candidate and can be nominated to the Senate under this Senate selection process.

So what it means is this, Mr. Chairman. Let's say you're a town councillor or a reeve of a municipality and a Senate selection process is conducted during provincewide municipal elections. It means that if you're a candidate for reeve or a candidate for town council, you cannot at the same time seek election or seek selection to the Senate under this Act. However, Mr. Chairman, if this takes place, as I understand it, during a provincial general election, and you're a sitting reeve or a sitting town councillor or whatever, you can seek nomination without having to resign your seat. That's as I read the Bill. Now, Mr. Chairman, I don't understand how it is that someone at the local level seeking re-election during a municipal election loses the same right that they have under a provincial election. In case that's still not clear, let me make the point again. If you are sitting as a local elected official, you have the right to step forward and seek nomination under this Act. That's a right you have. But if the selection process route decides that a selection for Senator shall take place during the municipal election, you lose your right to step forward and seek that nomination.

Now, how is it that you have rights on one hand in one situation, but you lose those selfsame rights in a second situation, depending on which route the government takes in establishing the selection process or the nomination process for the federal Senate? So, Mr. Chairman, the fact that the hon. Member for Edmonton-Glengarry has brought forward as part of his amendment to make it clear that any person who is -- and I should just read it.

A person declared elected under this Act who is appointed to the Senate of Canada . . . immediately upon such appointment, resign any elected office he holds:
of a local authority pursuant to the Local Authorities Election Act.

All it does, Mr. Chairman, is clean up that confusion and make certain that it's clear that once a person has a right, those many thousands of people across our province who hold elected office at the local level, they don't lose their rights depending on which process the government decides to follow under this Act. Regardless of the route the government chooses under this Act, those people retain their rights. I would think that it's one more argument to compel us to support the amendment in front of us.

MR. DECORE: Mr. Chairman, I think a number of excellent arguments have been put forward, including the last one, which I think puts this particular section in great peril. I wonder if the minister would either explain something that we're not seeing or agree to simply adjourn and allow the matter to be reconsidered. It think it's that important. We want to get this thing done. I don't want to give an opportunity to the federal government, whatever government, to shoot it down, to say that this wasn't done properly, these people weren't considered in the proper way, advantage was given to local politicians at some time and not at other times. Why give them the ammunition, when we're striking out in an area here that is revolutionary? And I agree

with the minister's term on that. Why give them opportunity to ruin our position on this most important matter?

MR. HORSMAN: I think there are two points that I would like to respond to: number one, the select committee report was done before the opportunity presented itself in the very unique way through the Meech Lake Constitutional Accord of 1987, before it was possible to bring about legislation in the way that we are now able to do. Having examined it very carefully, we've looked at the principle that if you're going to be in one elected office of a Parliament, you should make your mind up whether or not you want to seek the office. There's no guarantee of success at the polls; there never is. Therefore, one should make their mind up what they want to try to do, and that's the principle we are following.

With respect to the last one, the same principle applies -- the last argument, that of the Member for Calgary-Mountain View. If you're running in an election, period, you should make your mind up what election you want to run in. That's it, purely and simply. If you want to run in the senatorial election process, run in that. If you want to run for mayor of Edmonton, run in that. That's it, simply.

MR. TAYLOR: I just have another question of the minister. He points out that you make up your mind when you run in an election. Yes, I agree. I hope someday that an elected Senate will be that clear: when you win an election, you will then become a Senator. In those days I hope we have an election Act that says, "As long as you are 18," and property isn't even mentioned. But in the meantime we're trying to nominate somebody at the top of the list that the Prime Minister will accept as being the choice of all Albertans. If we restrict that list and say that MLAs can't be put on the list but mayors can and so on, I've think we've destroyed ourselves.

But most of all, I'd like to ask the hon. minister one question. Suppose it goes under the process he's talking about and candidate A wins the election, but the Prime Minister does not support it. Does candidate A stay in limbo forever? No pay; not allowed to run for an MLA because, after all, he did win the Alberta Senate election; not allowed to run for MP because, after all, he did win. So you've put somebody into limbo. To me it's not making legal sense. The hon. member is trying to defend something that somebody way down in his department put together; he's defending the indefensible. He either has to put the entire Act in and run it like the political Act it is, as I mentioned before -- there's no restrictions of any sort except that you can't hold office, which is the way the other election Acts read -- or it is to select somebody that the Prime Minister cannot say had been restricted in any way. As it is now, mayors can go forward; MLAs can't. MPs -- we've got a very controversial MP in Edmonton south who might want to run for Senator. But no, he's not allowed to.

So the whole point here is that we're destroying our own credibility. We're shooting ourselves in the foot, and whoever wins, then, is being put into political limbo if the Prime Minister does not appoint that person. No salary, no office, no right to run for MLA, no right to run for MP: all this would follow through. It's a very poorly crafted, illy thought out section of the Act that should be brought in line.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I propose to take the vote on . . .

MR. FOX: There is a member standing.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Oh, I'm sorry. I thought you were sitting down.

Hon. Member for Edmonton-Highlands.

MS BARRETT: Did you say you thought I was seated?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I thought you had come in and were about to sit down. I'm sorry. My apologies.

MS BARRETT: Oh God, you can tell it's summertime. We're back into the short jokes again.

Mr. Chairman, I have one further thought on comments that I heard the sponsoring minister make a few moments ago with respect to the rule that a member of the House of Commons must leave her or his seat prior to being allowed to run for another elected position. The question I have, although it is a political question as well: is it the minister's assessment that that rule is fair when in fact in other instances there is no rule? So the political point I would make is that if you have one unfair rule in a stream of rules that are otherwise not unfair, is it the smart thing to make all the other rules unfair? Or is it the smart thing to make things fair where we can, as in this Assembly and under this Act, and proceed to make what is unfair fair through the House of Commons?

I'm not quite convinced from the minister's reading that the rule is strictly that a Member of Parliament cannot run for another government, elected authority while maintaining that seat in the House of Commons. I would like that clarification, because my understanding was that the rule was that once you were elected to the other body, you must then resign the seat you previously held. But even if that is an incorrect appreciation of what he was saying, I still pose the political question: does he believe that that is fair and therefore all other rules should conform to that? If that's the case, I would argue that the House of Commons rule is unfair and that we should pursue fairness where we can in this Assembly and encourage the House of Commons to do the same.

MR. GOGO: Well, Mr. Chairman, very quickly with regard to the amendment before the committee. I think that after having listened to all hon. members, perhaps I have the ideal solution. I think the sponsoring minister spelled out very accurately the Acts of Canada with regard to those seeking federal or provincial office. It seems to me, recognizing the great confidence the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon has, that the proper solution would be -- and there'd be no need for this amendment, which is obviously not going to pass -- to go along with Bill 11 as amended. The hon. member, with the great confidence that he has and the great personal appeal he has and the great thoughtfulness he has indicated to the House about being the originator of the thought, I think should simply resign his seat as the MLA for Westlock-Sturgeon and run in this election. If he's unsuccessful as the senatorial candidate, I know of no law that would prevent him from running again in the by-election for the riding of Westlock-Sturgeon.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark.

MR. MITCHELL: Mr. Chairman, thank you. I would like to join the debate because I feel very, very strongly about the point that my colleagues have made. If we are to do this Senate election effectively, we have to do it properly; we have to do it in the right way. It has struck me, as I've listened to this debate, that the one thing that is missing here is a legitimate, acceptable, reasonable explanation for why the government is doing it in this way. It is so clearly inconsistent that they would allow members of municipal councils, members of school boards, to hold their offices while running in this selection process but at the same time exclude Members of the Legislative Assembly and Members of Parliament.

I don't know how many times we've heard the point made on the basis of precedent or this is how we've always done it or the government is making an effort to be consistent in its policy. This is clearly a government making an effort to be inconsistent in its policy, and there is no reasonable explanation. In two ways the explanation that they have given us is unreasonable. One, they say, "Well, it has to be consistent with the federal Elections Act." Yes, this isn't an election, of course; this is a nomination, a selection. It would not be inconsistent with a federal elections Act. It wouldn't have to be consistent with a federal elections Act to have a Member of the Legislative Assembly not have to resign in order to run.

What we're left with is trying to find some other explanation, some less proper explanation. The explanation that I arrive at, and that I think has jumped to the minds of most members of this side of the House, is that this is a self-serving, shortsighted, politically driven point in this piece of legislation. And why is that? Because there are people in this Legislature and probably Members of Parliament in this province who in fact could run and who could win and who are not Conservatives or who are not acceptable within the Conservative Party. I'm thinking of the Member for Edmonton Southeast, perhaps.

It is particularly ironic that this kind of self-serving political initiative would be so important in the minister's thinking when one of the reasons that we want to have an elected Senate is to overcome much of the political bias that we now see in central Canada and that one of the fundamental premises that this Senate must be based upon is an effort to do away with party politics. That's why our conception of an elected Senate would have a number of points. One, Senators elected would not sit in party caucuses in the Senate. They would sit in provincial caucuses. Two, they wouldn't be elected at the time of the municipal elections so that they would be driven to those kinds of issues. They would have a special time within a provincial boundary to have that election so that they would be focused on provincial/regional issues and not just political issues.

The government's bias in this regard was very, very clear in the way that it originally structured party donations to senatorial nominees. The fact is they were putting an emphasis on political party input. They were putting an emphasis on the politics of these positions. What we want to do and what the people of Alberta want to do is put an emphasis on the regionalism and the provincialism of these positions.

Now, the minister to his credit backed off on that bias he placed in the hands of political parties, and he should be congratulated for doing that. He didn't quite back off in the way that we would have, because he should have reduced the maxi-

mum amount, but he did back off. He was big enough to admit that he or his staff or his caucus or somebody in developing this Bill had not developed it as well as he might have, and to his credit he took advice and changed it. What we are asking him to do here is to simply do that for a second time, to look beyond shortsighted, small-minded partisan politics and to pursue the broader perspective and the broader aim of this particular piece of legislation, which is to structure a Senate that will look beyond political partisanship to emphasize regional/provincial issues and perspectives in Ottawa.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that if we start now with this kind of structure, we are starting in the wrong way with the wrong foot, and we will defeat our long-term objective. I know this minister to be a very, very determined person. I know that he is a minister who, from time to time, will take a position, will be driven harder and harder to that position, and will become more and more difficult to change. That is one of his strengths, of course, that he is a determined politician and that he will take a position and drive it. Strengths become weaknesses. We've heard them talk about the historical moment that we are involved in. Yes, and I have argued that that could be more historical and a greater moment if in fact we weren't signing Meech Lake and we were going for Senate reform before.

But let's say there is a vestige of history here. Let's not have what we can achieve in that moment for history marred by the determination and the stubbornness of a single individual in this province and in this government.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Hon. member, let us get back to the amendment.

AN HON. MEMBER: Question.

MR. MITCHELL: No, I'm still talking. Is there a problem?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I was just suggesting that you return to the essence of the amendment, but please proceed.

MR. MITCHELL: Mr. Chairman, I am speaking about arguments and reasons why this amendment is being resisted by this government. I have personal knowledge that there are many back-bench Conservative MLAs who are in favour of this amendment within their caucus internally and probably have spoken out about it or would like to. I'm therefore looking at the reason -- I'm looking at him right now -- for why this isn't happening the way it should. It may, I believe, be one individual who has become entrenched and polarized in his position, who's got some sense of personal pride about this, and I'm saying to this minister: please look beyond that. Look beyond the shortsighted. Look beyond the personal. Look beyond the pride and talk about what is right for Alberta and look at what we can achieve if we do this properly with this amendment.

One, we can be fair. We can be just. We can take all Albertans and not allow some of them to run who are in the same circumstances of some of those who won't be allowed to run. A mayor is elected. He has other elected public responsibilities. He's allowed to run. That doesn't seem to me to be consistent with a Member of Parliament not being allowed to run or a Member of the Legislative Assembly not being allowed to run.

Second, perhaps some of the most qualified, most high-profile, exciting candidates in fact are Members of Parliament and are Members of the Legislative Assembly. Let's remember

that more than anything this process is to send a message to the government of Canada. It is to create profile for our idea and publicity and exposure for our idea. If we exclude some of the highest-profile candidates in this province, then we reduce the likelihood, we reduce the possibility and the potential that we will get somebody who can fulfill that feature of what it is that we are trying to achieve with this senatorial election.

Mr. Chairman, I am disturbed, as I know my colleagues are. I am disturbed that something that is this important, that in fact is premised upon the idea of reducing partisan politics and emphasizing a perspective that will enhance and be positive and powerful for Alberta, for Alberta's regional and provincial interests, having those expressed properly in Ottawa; that that would be marred and mired in an initiative that is clearly self-serving, that is clearly political, that is clearly trying to emphasize Conservatives over anybody else. I just simply ask this minister to listen to this debate, the arguments against his position; listen to those backbenchers of his who, in fact, are not in favour of his position, and do what is right to make this Senate election as effective and as proper as it possibly can be.

MRS. GAGNON: Mr. Chairman, I also would like to speak very briefly to this amendment and urge members of the Chamber to support it. It's just a technicality in response to what the Minister of Advanced Education brought up that a person should make a choice and resign and run for one thing or the other. The problem is that there is no other. If you resign an existing office, what you are running for, as has been stated so often, is to become the nominee from Alberta. That's all that you will be.

I would ask, following up from his argument, what your status would then be. You are the nominee from Alberta. You have resigned as an MLA, but you've become the nominee in this selection process. Could you then run again as an MLA, waiting for the Prime Minister to make up his mind as to who he would select from Alberta? I think that would be an interesting question to have answered by the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.

MR. HORSMAN: I will answer that question, because it is a legitimate question and not in the nature of a speech, which we've been hearing from some other members. The answer is yes. You would be able to, certainly. As we envisage this Act, once the name has been selected by the people in a democratic way, submitted to the Prime Minister by the leader of government in this province -- I would make it perfectly clear that we will abide by the results of the people's decision. Whether the member is a Progressive Conservative or a Liberal or a New Democratic Party member or an Independent, the person who leads the polls, that name will be submitted. That is perfectly clear.

But if the Prime Minister should reject the democratic process -- and I find it hard to believe that that would take place -- it would certainly be possible, after that rejection by the Prime Minister, for the person, had they been a Member of the Legislative Assembly, to run again in the by-election which would result, inevitably. I would suggest that it would be almost a lead-pipe cinch that that person would be returned to the vacancy in the Legislative Assembly by virtue of the fact that the person had been rejected by the Prime Minister of Canada. My goodness, if we happened to be using a hypothetical case, the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon, running again in a by-

election to fill the seat as an MLA, I'd come up and campaign for him myself. If the Prime Minister had rejected the nominee, I would campaign for that nominee, because I believe in democracy. That's the answer to the question.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for Edmonton-Whitemud.

MR. WICKMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have still not heard from that side of the House one good reason why they are not prepared to support this amendment, why they are not prepared to make Bill 11 a viable Bill that can be supported by all members of this House.

Mr. Chairman, I would have to say the references that were made just now by the minister, that had earlier been made by the Member for Lethbridge-West -- that's got to be the ultimate in foolishness: to ask someone to step down and then to turn around and seek re-election in a by-election. How do you think the constituents in that particular riding are going to feel about a member who forces the cost of a by-election to seek a nomination? And it's been clearly pointed out that we're not talking in terms of an election; we're talking in terms of a nomination or selection process. That has got to be totally, totally unreasonable to even propose that. Alberta taxpayers would have to laugh at that type of proposal.

As to whether the minister would be prepared to go out and campaign for the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon, again, I'm not sure what's being said there. The arguments that are now coming forward from that side of that House are no longer reasonable. There is no sense of reason. They weren't reasonable to begin with, but now all sense of reason is lost. I would still like to know, specifically on what grounds, specific good rationale, why the minister has dug his heels in on this one and is not prepared to consider these amendments that have been put forward, that have been explained by so many people as being reasonable, where the logic has been put forward.

I would also ask: is it reasonable for us to accept references that whether the person who is selected is a Tory, a Liberal, a New Democrat, that the same emphasis is going to be put on by the government to go down to Ottawa and say, "Yes, we want this person put in place"? Certainly, they're going to feel more loyal to one of their own kind. That's got to be expected. We see that loyalty every week within this House and outside this House when we see appointments and so on. It isn't reasonable to expect a government member to go down to Ottawa and say: "We want to see the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon, who is a Liberal, to be part of the Senate." I think it would be a farce, I think it would be a laugh, to even expect that to happen.

I would like to ask the minister, Mr. Chairman: is he prepared, if a motion were made to adjourn this House at this time, to allow this discussion to again take place next week some time? Would the minister be prepared to accept that type of adjournment motion to allow him and his caucus some more time to go back, take a look at the implications of the amendments to Bill 11, take a look at Bill 11 without those amendments, take a look at the Anderson report that was referred to earlier, take a look at the transcript of the comments that have been made today, so that some good, solid rational thinking can be put into the whole process, rather than have members of the Tory government, the MLAs, simply stand behind their minister without feeling, I don't think, themselves comfortable that the proper approach is being taken. I'm asking at the very least that

the minister demonstrate that, and I want to see that demonstration, Mr. Chairman.

At this time I'm going to move that this Assembly adjourn until Wednesday at 2:30.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: As I understand the rules, hon. member, your motion is not in order. We are in committee, and I would not accept your motion. Now, if you're finished with your speaking, I would move on to the next hon. member.

The hon. Member for Edmonton-Kingsway.

MR. McEACHERN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just a short question to the minister of intergovernmental affairs. He indicated that this government would obviously support the person who won the election, very, very strongly, at the federal level. And I can accept that; I'm sure they would. But there is the prospect that the Prime Minister would reject that person. Of course, there is a stronger prospect that he would reject it if it were a New Democrat or a Liberal or an Independent, as opposed to a Conservative. I think one would accept that.

Now, my question to the hon. minister is: would the government then draw up a list of several other people and say, "Well, these would be acceptable," as the Prime Minister asked originally anyway? Of course, one would expect that list to be headed by some fairly prominent Conservatives, which would be the logical and usual thing to be done in those circumstances. In other words, what I'm really asking him is: just to what degree would the government of Alberta be prepared to really fight for the person who won, regardless of . . . You know, if the Prime Minister rejected them, would there be any acceptance on the part of this government of any other person subsequent to a dismissal by the Prime Minister of that person who was elected? I think it's an important question, because it would be so easy . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Excuse me, hon. member. I'm not, to be clear, questioning . . . [interjection] Hon. member, I'm not questioning the importance of the question you raise, but it has moved a considerable distance from the message of the amendment.

MR. McEACHERN: I'll leave the question there. He did partly answer that question. I'd just like some additional clarification.

MR. MITCHELL: Mr. Chairman, I would like to address the argument made by the hon. Minister of Advanced Education and reiterated in parrotlike fashion by the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. This argument is: well, the MLA can resign, run for Senate selection, be selected by Albertans, be turned down by the Prime Minister, and then run in the by-election. However, there's a very serious timing problem here. From the moment the MLA resigns, there are six months until such time as the government must call a by-election. What is to prohibit the Prime Minister from taking seven months to make his or her decision? So six months come by, and we don't know what the status is of the MLA who has now resigned, who has run, who has been selected by Albertans, and won't have the chance, therefore, to run in the by-election because they haven't yet been turned down or accepted.

It is a glib, illogical, easy solution that does not address the problem. The fact is that it is very, very possible that the MLA would not get the chance to run in the by-election, because we

don't control the Prime Minister's timing as to whether he will make his selection or she will make her selection within six months or after six months.

There's also the question of cost. This government has gone to tremendous lengths to make sure this will be held during municipal elections to reduce costs. Why would the government potentially require a by-election, which has a cost, when it's not necessary? Why not simply have the MLA resign their position as MLA once they're appointed by the Prime Minister? It seems that it may definitely hurt if we do exclude MLAs, and it certainly won't hurt if we don't exclude them. So why do we not allow MLAs to run -- to avoid the problem of their being discriminated against -- to run as MLAs and to resign once the Prime Minister makes the decision? The argument that the MLA could run in the by-election is, one, costly, results in an unnecessary cost, and two, hands the agenda to the federal government, because we don't control the Prime Minister's time.

MR. TAYLOR: Also, they could call it early.

MR. MITCHELL: That's another point, Mr. Chairman. There's nothing to stop the government from seeing the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon resign, for example, to run in the senatorial election on August 31 or whenever and immediately the government calls a by-election that's held before the senatorial election. Again, looking at how cynical this initiative of the government is in the first place, we would only be suspicious that that cynicism could carry them to do exactly that: to call a by-election so quickly that it would exclude the member from running in that by-election or, on the other hand, to hand the agenda to the federal government, as we have done time and time again, as we did with Meech Lake -- sure, we'll sign Meech Lake and then talk about Senate reform later -- to make their decision after the time deadline for our by-election has expired.

This is just totally illogical; it's self-serving; it's a glib, easy debating point. We're not here to make debating points. We're here to make the right decision, and this is not the right decision that is being advocated by this minister.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for Edmonton-Gold Bar.

MRS. HEWES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just sitting here listening to the points brought forward in this debate, it's my view and I submit to you, Mr. Chairman, that there has been no compelling argument whatsoever from the government, the sponsor of the Bill, as to why this amendment should not pass. I have not heard any of the fundamental principles that are in his Bill brought to bear on this particular amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I spoke the other day about the significance of this Bill in Canada at this time. Certainly there is more than one objective that we're trying to achieve in the Bill. We're trying to lead the way to convince other Canadian provinces and Canadian legislators that an elected, reformed Senate is the way to go, and we're trying to get a Senator elected and thereby appointed from Alberta who does have a commitment from the province. Now, I suggest to you that if we do not pass this amendment, we will not achieve either of those objectives.

Mr. Chairman, we need to make this work. We really need to make it work. This is admittedly not an election Act; it's a

selection Act. It's an anomaly in legislation at present, and we need to make it work and work properly with no difficulties and as smoothly as possible because once again all of Canada is watching this and hopefully will want to copy.

[Mr. Ady in the Chair]

Mr. Chairman, many problems have been raised: problems of inconsistencies with the report of the government's own committee on Triple E, inconsistencies with other elections Acts. Other problems of inequities have been raised, the inequities that exist if the Bill is passed without this amendment related to municipal officials and how permissive it is for them to run as opposed to provincial or federal elected individuals.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that unless we pass this amendment, we may in fact destroy our chances of the wider objective of Senate reform. The Prime Minister has already indicated that he doesn't favour this process. He's made that very clear. Now, we should be trying to do everything we can to make it impossible for him to resist the process, to make it impossible for him not to appoint the person elected in Alberta. I suggest to you that to leave the Bill without this amendment is simply an invitation to the Prime Minister to discredit the whole process. He has indicated he doesn't want it. This will make it easy for him to say: "This is not a properly constituted Bill. This is inconsistent with the elections Act, it's inconsistent with other pieces of legislation, possibly even the Charter, and therefore we will not go along with what Alberta has done."

Then where does that leave us? Where does it leave us in our wider objective of leading the way, of sending to Ottawa a Senator that has a commitment and the support of Albertans through an election? Where does it leave us in trying to provide leadership and offering an incentive to other provinces to follow? Mr. Chairman, I submit this can lead us to a dismal failure, and I believe that, in the wider sense of our objectives, would be tragedy at this time.

[Mr. Jonson in the Chair]

I think this amendment is an appropriate one, and I plead with all members of the House to support it.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place.

MR. McINNIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to comment briefly on the proposed amendment. There's a certain drift to the debate which I'm not really comfortable with. The Member for Edmonton-Glengarry moving the amendment chose to dwell on the question of the personality of the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon rather than the principle at issue. This is something that affects not only every member of this Assembly, every member of the House of Commons, but also every Albertan. I think it should be dealt with in that framework rather than the other one. It seems to me that some very telling points have been made in the debate, and I'm hoping somebody from the government will at least attempt to respond to them before they so quickly dismiss this amendment.

I think a lot of the problems the government has in coping with this amendment stem from the fact that they seem to believe in their own minds that this is an election process rather than a plebiscite. It is, in fact, a plebiscite. What's proposed by

this Bill is some type of an advisory plebiscite which someone, I guess the government, would then present to the Prime Minister to aid the Prime Minister in a selection. We've got to remember we don't have a reformed Senate here. What we have is the existing Senate, and we're talking about a method of selecting somebody to serve in the existing Senate. That person serves in a Senate that is replete with flaws, and in many ways this may actually contribute to prolonging the life of that institution as it presently exists, because we're talking about an advisory plebiscite to help potentially select someone to join the existing Senate.

If a Prime Minister of Canada -- not necessarily the incumbent Prime Minister but any Prime Minister -- receives a name under this list, under this selection process, he or she may or may not be disposed to accept the name on the list. The unfortunate aspect of passing this Bill without this amendment is that we have a selection process which excludes a fairly large number of, I would say, highly qualified candidates for the Senate. It is a very simple matter for a Prime Minister, whether it's this one or any other, to say: "Well, in this advisory plebiscite system you've neatly, for whatever reason, excluded a certain number of members of the population from even being considered. Therefore why should I accept your advisory plebiscite?" I don't believe that's the outcome the government would like to have from this process.

Somehow they've got in their own minds that this is an election, and therefore, the argument that was used by the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental was: if you're in the House of Commons and you want to run to be an MLA, you have to resign your seat and vice versa. But that's an election. That's not an advisory plebiscite of the kind that we're having here. They're two totally different things. If you want to set this thing up as an election, then you've got to bring in a different Bill, basically. You've got an advisory plebiscite.

Now as far as the practicalities are concerned, I think it's pretty easy to see that the remedy suggested could break down rather rapidly. Let us suppose that member X decides to run in this advisory plebiscite and does turn out to be the top name on the list. That person, of course, would have had to resign their seat in order to contest the election under the Bill. Then there's a period of time in which it has to be decided by the Prime Minister who's going to be appointed to this vacant Senate position. That period can drone on and on, as I think every member in this House would know. There is no obligation on the part of the Prime Minister to fill a Senate vacancy within any given period of time. In fact, the position could remain vacant almost without limit.

During that period of time MLA X may decide to resume his duties in the Legislative Assembly. Well, the minister has said: "No problem. Call a by-election, and he'll run in the by-election." I believe he even said that he would campaign for that person, whatever political stripe they are. So they run in the by-election and get back in the Legislative Assembly. Now, you have an MLA who is both eligible, as all MLAs are, for appointment to the Senate and carries the weight of the advisory plebiscite. Then one day the Prime Minister relents and says, "Okay, MLA X is it." There's the Senator. Now, the MLA has to resign again, a second time, and we're going to have another by-election.

AN HON. MEMBER: No.

MR. McINNIS: Oh yes. You can't sit as an MLA and a Senator at the same time, sir. I see the Minister of Federal and Inter-governmental Affairs is shaking his head as if he either doesn't understand the argument or thinks it's ridiculous.

MR. HORSMAN: That's right. The argument's ridiculous.

MR. McINNIS: You understand and you think it's ridiculous. Okay. Then perhaps you can tell me why it's ridiculous that MLA X, who has the absolute right to return to this Assembly -- and you, sir, said you would campaign for him . . . Why is it ridiculous to suggest that he would then resign if he's ultimately appointed. Because this is a person who's been selected. Of course he'll resign, and you've got a second by-election in connection with this same silly business.

I think that the remedy is at hand. The amendment has been put forward to allow members of the Assembly and Members of Parliament to put their names on the ballot. There's no guarantee that they'll win, and it certainly would save the expense of at least one by-election and potentially two by-elections in respect of the same individual. Of course, there's always the question that more than one member of the Assembly might decide to run. There's nothing in this Bill that prevents that. You may have more than one by-election to cope with in the first go-round.

There's absolutely no reason to think about wasting that kind of taxpayers' money on this political initiative in the first place. I think we can argue and agree or disagree about the effectiveness of this advisory plebiscite in reforming the existing Senate. My position is it isn't going to do a thing to reform the existing Senate, but at least if you're going to do it, make a sensible process.

MR. WICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, going back to earlier comments, I have still not heard one good argument come forward as to why the government is not prepared to consider this amendment. As a member elected to this Legislative Assembly, I feel an obligation to work in the best interests, not only of the constituents of Edmonton-Whitemud, the riding that I represent, but also in the interests of Albertans. Without question, what is in front of us in Bill 11 without the amendment is not in the interests of Albertans. It's not in the interests of taxpayers. If we have to continue to sit here day after day to attempt to debate or debate these amendments to make this piece of legislation workable -- and the potential is there to make it workable. It's been said very clearly at least by members of our caucus that yes, we do support Senate reform, but it has to be within reason. It has to be a fair piece of legislation, and it has to respect the input from all members of this House. Obviously, this particular Bill 11 does not.

I would again ask why the minister is not prepared to do some soul-searching. There's a long weekend coming up. It gives members three days to kind of reflect and look at the possibilities of taking this amendment to see how they can work it into Bill 11. I would again ask, because there is no process within our procedure that we operate under to formally request that the debate adjourn, I would again request through you, Mr. Chairman, to the minister that he rise and report and allow debate to adjourn until next week so that after some soul-searching by members of the government, we can again consider this on a more reasonable, rational level.

I would like a response from the minister on that, Mr.

Chairman.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman, I just want to reiterate our general position that this is a flawed Bill, but if it's going to go forward, it should go forward in the least objectionable form. The more one looks at this particular matter, I think fair-minded people will have to appreciate the objections. One after the other they come forward, and there has been an attempt by the minister to answer the criticism. He says, well, you should make up your mind whether you're going to stay in your job as an MLA or as a mayor or as a House of Commons member, or run for the Senate.

Well, exactly the same arguments applied when Mr. Anderson's report was delivered, signed, of course, by him, now the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs and by the Member for Lacombe and also by the Member for Little Bow. They're still in this House. I'm looking at the Member for Lacombe. I haven't heard him say why he signed his name to something that was wrong. Having not heard that, I presume he's still saying that it was right, in which case he'll have to support us on this amendment, because we will be voting in favour of this amendment, as we will be voting against the Bill eventually.

Similarly, the hon. Member for Calgary-Currie, who opened as the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs the debate on this on second reading as I recall, presumably because he had published this report, didn't draw attention to this anomaly either. The answer that Meech Lake has occurred in the meantime, which gives an opportunity to provinces to make nominations, may be a reason for this Bill coming forward at this time, but it doesn't speak at all to this point that we are making, that it's an unfair restriction on the candidates who can run for the Senate and that the committee, of which these people were members at the time, was right. And so I'm interested in hearing from the Member for Lacombe why he has changed his mind.

MR. DECORE: Mr. Chairman, I would have hoped that the minister would have taken the initiative and asked that we not proceed with this Bill so as to give him and his caucus more time to remove the impediments that I think have been clearly shown to him. I think the point that the Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place and the Member for Calgary-Mountain View have made with respect to my observations about the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon are appropriate. I was trying to use, as an illustration, the fact that one member of this Legislative Assembly has in fact indicated his interest to run and that that member is being precluded. It goes without saying -- I should have made that clearer -- that every member is affected in this Assembly, and there may be others who wish that same opportunity. I think this matter is of such great importance.

Another issue that just came to my mind is that it was the minister along with our Premier who signed the Meech Lake Accord. And that Meech Lake Accord -- I don't have it in front of me, Mr. Minister, but my recollection is that what the province of Alberta agreed to do by the signature of our Premier, and as it was ratified by this Assembly, was to submit names to the Prime Minister for the selection of a Senator for Alberta. I'd like to know from the minister how he reconciles the signature on Meech Lake, the ratification of this Assembly of that particular submission of names, with this initiative that is being taken under this Bill. He's used very selectively the provisions of the elections Act to say, "Well, we can't do this, and we can't do

that." What about the signature on that Meech Lake agreement and the ratification of this House that says we will proceed in a certain way? How does he reconcile that?

Mr. Chairman, I think this matter is of such great importance that I would move adjournment of debate to allow the government to consider this most important question further and to come back with appropriate changes or agreement on this amendment

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Hon. member, as I indicated earlier, a motion for adjourning debate is not in order in committee.

MR. WICKMAN: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry. My apologies. I was confusing it with adjourning the Assembly. Adjourning debate in committee is not debatable. I'll put the question. All those in favour of the motion, please say aye.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Those opposed, please say no.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

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

[Eight minutes having elapsed, the House divided]

For the motion:

Bruseker	Hewes	Roberts
Decore	Laing, M.	Taylor
Fox	McInnis	Wickman
Gibeault	Mitchell	Wright

Against the motion:

Ady	Fowler	Mirosh
Barrett	Gesell	Moore
Betkowski	Getty	Musgrove
Bradley	Gogo	Nelson

Brassard	Horsman	Paszkowski
Calahasen	Hyland	Rostad
Cardinal	Isley	Schumacher
Cherry	Kowalski	Severtson
Drobot	Laing, B.	Shrake
Elliott	Lund	Tannas
Elzinga	Main	Weiss
Evans	McClellan	West
Fischer	McEachern	

Totals:	Ayes - 12	Noes - 38
---------	-----------	-----------

[Motion lost]

MR. GOGO: Mr. Chairman, I move the committee rise and report.

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

MR. JONSON: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has had under consideration Bill 11 and reports progress thereon.

MS BARRETT: He's exaggerating.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Those in favour of the motion, please say aye.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed, please say no.

AN HON. MEMBER: No.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion carries.

In accordance with the motion passed previously this week, the House stands adjourned until Wednesday afternoon at 2:30.

[The House adjourned at 1:07 p.m.]