

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

head: **TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS**

Title: **Friday, August 11, 1989 10:00 a.m.**
Date: 89/08/11

[The House met at 10 a.m.]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

PRAYERS

MR. SPEAKER: Let us pray.

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

Amen.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF BILLS**

Bill 23
Tobacco Tax Amendment Act, 1989

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill 23, the Tobacco Tax Amendment Act, 1989.

This Act, Mr. Speaker, introduces and reflects the changes outlined in the budget which we have presented and completed in this Legislative Assembly.

[Leave granted; Bill 23 read a first time]

Bill 251
"Whistle Blower's" Protection Act

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place.

MR. McINNIS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I beg leave to introduce Bill 251, the "Whistle Blower's" Protection Act.

The purpose of the Bill is to protect persons who report pollution violations from coercion and intimidation by their employers. It also protects persons who complain to the Ombudsman or who contact Members of the Legislative Assembly.

[Leave granted; Bill 251 read a first time]

Bill 218
An Act to Amend
the Landlord and Tenant Act

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Calgary-Mountain View.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I beg leave to introduce a Bill, being Bill 218, an Act to Amend the Landlord and Tenant Act.

This Bill would require landlords to give valid reasons when providing tenants with notices to vacate. The Bill, Mr. Speaker, would also discourage the abuse of security deposits and give tenants greater assurance that they would not arbitrarily lose their security deposits.

[Leave granted; Bill 218 read a first time]

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, today I wish permission of the Legislative Assembly to table some information, statutorily and otherwise; first of all, the pension plan annual reports for the year ended March 31, '88.

I'm also tabling, Mr. Speaker, the reports to the Legislative Assembly of payments made to members of the Assembly and also payments with respect to Legislative Assembly personnel serving on boards and commissions.

While I'm at it, Mr. Speaker, I will table the annual report of the Alberta Resources Railway for the year ended December 31, 1988.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, I wish to file with the Assembly copies of the responses to questions which I took as notice during the June 12 review of the estimates of the Department of Advanced Education.

head: **ORAL QUESTION PERIOD****Responsibility for Regulating FIC and AIC**

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, to the Premier. By the time the Premier was sworn into office on November 1, 1985, many people in government knew there were serious problems with the Principal Group's investment contract companies. The regulators had known for 12 years, the Treasurer and the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs knew, and the Premier himself was advised within two weeks of being sworn in. Shortly after taking office, the Premier started preparations for a cabinet shuffle that would be announced in February 1986, a shuffle whereby the Consumer and Corporate Affairs minister was removed from her post and the Minister of Advanced Education was promoted to the position of Provincial Treasurer. Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Premier. Is it not true that when the Premier called the Member for Three Hills into his office to tell her that she was leaving her portfolio, the member did indeed remind him that the Principal affair had hit a critical juncture and that she wanted to stay on in Consumer and Corporate Affairs to see the problem resolved?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is referring in some part accurately to history, and other parts are straight speculation and innuendo on his part and not at all a matter of fact. Obviously, discussions between a Premier and cabinet ministers are private discussions, but certainly the general tenor of his question is absolutely wrong.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, all we're trying to do is get the truth in. Tell us the truth; that's what we're here for.

Mr. Speaker, is it not true also that the Premier was looking for his briefing bible prepared by his staff? When the minister mentioned that, he didn't find the memo in there. And because he could find no reference to the problems of FIC/AIC in his briefing bible, the Premier told the Member for Three Hills that there was nothing to worry about and that any problem would be taken care of.

MR. GETTY: Again, Mr. Speaker, it's some kind of speculation on the member's part. All of this has been dealt with previously in the House in my response to the Code report and by

Mr. Code exhaustively.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, we have been waiting for answers from this Premier about what happened, and it's clear that he knew. It's clear that the whole government knew. I want to ask him again: instead of hiding behind the Code report and the Member for Three Hills, when is he going to accept his responsibility and tell us what happened so that we can make our own judgment on it?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I recognize the frustration of the hon. members when the government was faced with a problem largely not of its own making but nevertheless dealt with it through the Code report, had an exhaustive inquiry, and then made the tough decisions that were necessary to be made, and the people of Alberta have accepted those decisions as reasonable and fair. Now, I understand the hon. members are frustrated that the government has been able to deal with this matter on a reasonable and fair basis that the people of Alberta understand and support. But, surely, Mr. Speaker, having made a full response in the House, the hon. member is completely off base now to try and change the answer which the government gave or try and accuse the government of hiding something. There's never been a more exhaustive and complete inquiry into a matter, and we still have the Ombudsman's report to come.

MR. SPEAKER: Second main question. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MARTIN: The only one who believes that is the Premier himself, Mr. Speaker, not the people of Alberta; that's for sure.

I'd like to designate my question to the Member for Calgary-Mountain View.

MR. SPEAKER: Calgary-Mountain View.

Corporate Income Tax

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Provincial Treasurer would like us to believe that big corporations are paying their fair share of taxes in Alberta. Nothing could be further from the truth. In fact, in 1986 this government paid out more in tax credits and other expenditures to corporations than it collected in corporate income taxes. This is the unfair tax legacy of this government. Mr. Speaker, in 1988-89 the province of Ontario collected \$470 per capita in corporate income taxes, over twice as much as the \$225 per capita Alberta collected. As well, British Columbia collects more per capita than Alberta does. Given these facts, how could the Provincial Treasurer make the clearly indefensible statement in his recent budget speech that Alberta ranks first in per capita revenue from corporate income taxes?

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Speaker, it's fascinating. The people of Alberta really like it when the Member for Calgary-Mountain View starts spouting off these statistics, because quite frankly nobody understands him. And that's the fortunate message. What they do understand is this: that Alberta has the lowest tax regime in any province in Canada, with no sales tax. That's a very easy message to communicate. Now, we know how important it is to maintain good relationships in this province to ensure that new investment takes place here. That's why

you see the lowest taxes paid by Albertans, and the taxes paid by the corporations in this province will increase and grow as diversification takes place. All Albertans love this province. They're very confident of the future. They want this future to grow and be strong. That's why we maintain the tax regime.

Now, the Member for Calgary-Mountain View, as curious as it may be, does not understand even the analysis that is being presented by the boy with the cue cards in the members' gallery back here. They're not even given the right information, Mr. Speaker. We know and all Albertans know that we have something called the Alberta royalty tax credit system. Now, the Alberta royalty tax credit system is about \$300 million or so, and we deliver that through the corporate tax system. So when the member talks about the deductions and all the transfers made to corporations, well, of course we use the corporate tax system to transfer royalty tax credits to those people in the oil and gas sector, those small companies that are taking initiatives. Those companies are spending money for the service sector. Those companies are generating jobs. We use the tax system for that, Mr. Speaker. We use the tax system because it's an easy way to flow it through. Now, that doesn't mean, though, that the corporate tax is perverse; in fact, it's extremely fair. And the kinds of misleading statements from the opposition across the way because they have no knowledge of the private sector, no knowledge of what it means to take incentive, and certainly have never been in a corporate forum in their lives -- they have to retract those statements, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Mr. Speaker, Albertans understand Deficit Dick has gotten us \$10 billion in debt. They certainly understand that.

Mr. Speaker, given that all other provinces except Alberta have a general capital tax on large financial institutions such as banks and trust companies, how can the Provincial Treasurer justify not requiring big, mainly central Canadian financial institutions to shoulder their fair share of the tax burden in Alberta?

MR. JOHNSTON: Oh, Mr. Speaker, now it comes out. Isn't that great? Now we see the shape of the socialist policies across the way. They want to confiscate the opportunity of investment in this province. Moreover, you can see how they're driven by central Canadian policies. We have a different look at things here in Alberta. We want to encourage private-sector investment to come to this province. We like the notion of people taking risk, generating profits, reinvesting those profits, generating jobs. Now, it's happening here; it's happening in this great province of ours, and these people don't like to see the success. It's Friday morning in Alberta, Mr. Speaker. . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

MR. JOHNSTON: . . . and the truth always hurts more, it seems, when heard on Friday morning.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. We still have one more supplementary.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Well, Mr. Speaker, we know how well their strategy for helping the financial sector in this province has worked.

Given that the B.C. government, with a tax base comparable to Alberta's, has collected over \$250 million with its capital tax

in the last four years, given the \$10 billion that this Provincial Treasurer has given the people of Alberta in debt, when is this Treasurer planning to wake up, smell the coffee, and ensure that large corporations, especially big banks, contribute their fair share to Alberta's bottom line in paying fair taxes?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, we've seen what's happening. Alberta in 1988 had the largest real economic growth of any province in Canada. We look forward to a very abundant growth in 1989. I like the member when he mentions tasting the coffee in the morning, because I have said time and time again in this House that there's a superb sunrise in this province right now. And it's happening in this province: new investment, retail sales per capita the highest, the lowest tax regime of any province, and more people at work than ever before in Alberta's history, right here.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the socialists don't understand it. It's no secret. Give the private sector an opportunity, maintain individual rights, give them a chance to have a great opportunity to have meaningful jobs, to reinvest their dollars, and it happens. It's happening now, and they can't find a way to prevent it. Despite their negatives, despite the blue position they take, despite their socialist leanings, they can't stop it. It's happening.

Fiscal Policies

MR. DECORE: Mr. Speaker, recently under the provisions of the freedom of information Act, the federal Act, a member of the opposition was able to determine that transfer payments to Alberta will be some \$204 million less over four years than our own government determined, expected, creating an annual average shortfall of revenues of \$51 million per year. This figure is considerably greater in terms of shortfall than the minister expected. Also, Alberta revenues are very much dependent upon the value of the Canadian dollar. We sell heavily into U.S. markets, and we've seen an increase in the rise of the Canadian dollar. My question to the Provincial Treasurer is this: given that we as a resource exporting province sell heavily into that United States market, what was the value of the Canadian dollar that the minister used in computing his estimates, his budget?

MR. JOHNSTON: I'm sure glad he came to the question, Mr. Speaker, because for a while I was going to start talking about established programs financing and then about monetary policy, and now he's coming back to the budget discussion. It seems to me we've had a full opportunity to discuss the budget here. All that information has been presented. But simply to allow the member -- because somebody must have done a lot of research in that question. The amount that we used for our purposes was 81 cents, Mr. Speaker, through the period April 1, 1989, to March 31, 1990. I could go on to say that if the central government used a calmer monetary policy and set it to allow the rates to drop down as they have in the United States, you'd even see a stronger growth rate in this province, with new investment flowing in here. We expect that would happen, and therefore you'll see the dollar moderate, in our view, through the balance of this year, probably moving very close to our predictions sometime in early 1990.

MR. DECORE: Mr. Speaker, given that the feds have changed their position on UIC, crop insurance, transfer payments affecting advanced education and health, would the minister advise

the Assembly what changes need to be made to the estimates insofar as revenues are concerned for the recent budget?

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, again, Mr. Speaker, if he is coming back to established programs financing, then I have to make it very clear that his introductory comment is wrong. It's wrong. There'll be no reduction in the amount of established programs financing. That'll not be reduced on what we're getting today and the future going out. What has been adjusted, however, by the federal government has been the way in which the inflation rate factors into established programs financing. Now, in the first year I said before that through 1990 the cost of that will not be too many millions of dollars, probably in the order of \$20 million, and it'll start to move as you move out over the period, obviously.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the member can't have it both ways. On one hand, I heard him saying at one point in a rather curious speech he made about his sense of the need for fiscal responsibility, and then on the other hand criticizes both governments because they have taken tough decisions. For us in Alberta the impact in the first couple of years will not be significant, and we can absorb it because our economy is growing. Diversification is taking place. Corporate taxes are increasing. People are working. Personal taxes are increasing. And guess what else, Mr. Speaker? The price of oil is in fact, on average, above our forecast.

MR. DECORE: Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as the change in the value of the Canadian dollar is about 4.5 cents greater and impacts negatively on Alberta revenues, what's the change in revenues for the province of Alberta with this increase in the Canadian dollar?

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Speaker, the member knows that because the Canadian dollar on a cross-currency basis with the U.S. dollar happens to be 85 or 85 point something this morning, that doesn't mean that's going to be the average price of the Canadian dollar relative to the U.S. dollar. Things change. Now, he may take a photograph of things, but we're a future-looking government. We don't freeze ourselves in time. We continue to pursue the future, move ahead, expand the opportunities for this province. We think in terms of the interest rates, as I've indicated already, that Mr. Crow will come to his senses. Well, it's better to have Mr. Wilson down there than some of those socialist Liberals running the central monetary policy, I can assure you. He'll come to his senses, let the interest rates drop down, and you'll see monetary expansion take place and interest rates coming down. What does that mean for our province, Mr. Speaker? It means great opportunities for us, and it means a lower Canadian dollar on a cross-currency basis, which in fact does support our expansion of that market.

So, in summary, Mr. Speaker, the member doesn't know what he's talking about with respect to established programs financing. He has a very curious view as to what happens in a high interest rate regime. He should be talking about ways to reduce the interest rates, reduce the dollars, and I'm very pleased to announce that the budgetary plan presented by this government is doing even better than we forecast. Oil is up. Jobs are up. Investment is up.

MR. SPEAKER: Member for Clover Bar, followed by Edmonton-Avonmore, Edmonton-Meadowlark.

Dow Chemical Ethylene Plant

MR. GESELL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to ask about some new investment initiatives in Alberta. To the Minister of Energy. Dow Chemical Canada Inc., who is one of our valued corporate citizens in Fort Saskatchewan and operates in 32 other countries with annual sales of some \$17 billion, has recently announced an agreement with Shell Canada Limited for a \$120 million fractionation facility in Fort Saskatchewan. That facility is in conjunction with the \$800 million Dow expansion at Fort Saskatchewan as well. We in Clover Bar welcome this economic diversification, this initiative, because it creates jobs in our area. How does this project fit within the government announcement of October 1988, the ethane policy implementation?

MR. ORMAN: Mr. Speaker, let me first say it's just not fair that I have to follow the Provincial Treasurer, the show that he puts on, but anyways I'll do my best.

With regard to the Member for Clover Bar's question, I should say first that it has been a very good seven days for the hon. member. I recall, I guess it was last Friday, that my colleague the Minister of Technology, Research and Telecommunications announced a \$140 million diversification package in Fort Saskatchewan, the Westaim/Sherritt Gordon advanced industrial materials, and we now see that Dow Chemical is moving forward with their plans to build an \$800 million ethylene and derivatives plant in his area. We should say that Dow did announce yesterday, as the hon. member points out, their intention to acquire ethane feedstock for transportation to Fort Saskatchewan, where they will separate the ethane into a chemical feedstock. With regard to the ethane policy that was announced in October 1988 by my predecessor Dr. Webber, this allows Dow to take advantage of the opportunities under that ethane policy and allows them to bring in ethane feedstock from a variety of field sources.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary.

MR. GESELL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, given the initiation of the fractionation project, what is the progress and the status of the proposed major ethylene project that the member has referred to?

MR. ORMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, this is somewhat more in the area of the responsibility of my colleague for Economic Development and Trade, but let me say that he and I have worked closely on this project, on the ethane policy and how it affects the petrochemical complex, and a number of diversification initiatives in this province. I would like to point out that with regard to the progress, Mr. Elzinga, Minister of Economic Development and Trade, and I met with the president and vice-president of Dow Canada, and they told us that they were very pleased with the economic environment in this province, the fiscal regime as was outlined by the Provincial Treasurer, and the high participation rate in the labour force.

Notwithstanding that, Mr. Speaker, they did indicate to us that of the 32 countries that Dow has petrochemical complexes in around the world, Alberta has the toughest environmental regulations of any country they do business with in the world. I should also point out that they find it an attractive business environment in Alberta because of our fiscal regime but also because

we endeavour on a regular basis to clearly communicate our environmental standards, and they are consistent and there is not inconsistency or moving ground with regard to our . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. We still have one supplementary.

MR. WOLOSHYN: Send us a copy of the answer.

MR. SPEAKER: Stony Plain hasn't been recognized yet. Edmonton-Avonmore, followed by Westlock-Sturgeon.

Treatment for Adult Survivors of Child Abuse

MS M. LAING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Health. I've been receiving calls and letters from adult survivors of child sexual abuse about the lack of services available to them. We know that untreated incestuous assault has serious effects on adult functioning. Female survivors suffer from eating disorders, drug and alcohol addiction, long-term depression, and suicide attempts, while male survivors exhibit excessive aggression and often become sexual abusers themselves. Both male and female survivors have difficulty forming lasting relationships and developing effective parenting skills, which undermines their attempts to create and maintain a healthy family life. In view of the serious long-term effects of untreated child sexual abuse, how can the minister justify her inaction on the pressing need of adult survivors?

MRS. BETKOWSKI: I'm not sure what the hon. member's evidence is of my severe inaction on the matter, Mr. Speaker.

MS M. LAING: Mr. Speaker, the evidence is long waiting lists and a lack of resources for adults who have come forward as a result of the increasing emphasis on this. Treatment programs are in fact nonexistent in many areas of the province, and I would ask, then, what resources the minister will commit to aiding survivors in these areas.

MRS. BETKOWSKI: Well, Mr. Speaker, now we get to the more clear expression of what the issue is, and that is that the member feels that treatment is nonexistent in many areas of the province. In fact, there are treatment programs going on throughout our province both in a clinical or a medical sense and, therefore, through the institutional side, through hospitals; also, there are community treatment programs.

MS M. LAING: Mr. Speaker, mental health services refer their survivors to the sexual assault centres, where they exist, and the sexual assault centres have waiting lists as long as three months to a year. I therefore ask the minister to commit herself to looking into the need of adult survivors, including male survivors, and committing funds to these programs. I would ask her if she will make that commitment.

MRS. BETKOWSKI: Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't happen to believe that it is in the best interest of the effective allocation of health resources to disassociate from one another certain afflictions that people have, whether it's by way of child abuse, whether it's by way of alcoholism affecting their family, whether it's by way of the many other ways that adults and children arrive at a point of needing some help for mental difficulties. The system that we are attempting to build in this

province is one that will address the need and provide the resources to families, to individuals, both through the clinical and the institutional setting as well as the community setting. I fully acknowledge with the hon. member that we could do more in the community setting, and that is something that I will be pushing forward. But to allege in this House that there are no treatment facilities available is simply not the case.

MR. FOWLER: Mr. Speaker, could I supplement the minister's answer in respect to that? The government has long recognized that there are victims of crimes, and that's what the member in the opposition has referred to. Part of the proceeds from the victims' surcharge, which came into effect this year, and when the fund has accumulated, may in fact be used for those matters that she has referred to. However, the programs have not been developed, and we will be in consultation with the Minister of Health in respect to those matters. But it is something that we in the government have recognized that needs addressing.

MR. SPEAKER: Westlock-Sturgeon.

Agricultural Land Conservation

MR. TAYLOR: Yes, Mr. Speaker, thank you. To the Minister of Agriculture. In 1984 the Alberta zone Environment Council's number one recommendation:

That an Agricultural Resources Conservation Board be established, reporting to the Minister of Agriculture and charged with the responsibility on behalf of the Government of Alberta for conservation, maintenance, and enhancement of the agricultural land base.

Then the Alberta Department of Agriculture published figures in 1985 that said that over 10 years, although Alberta's arable land areas remained at about 30 percent of the province's area, or 160 million acres, we had lost 100,000 acres of prime numbers 1 to 4 land in that period and in effect had replaced it with numbers 5 and 6 farmland, much less productive. Now, given the replaced land, although admittedly more productive than it was 20 years ago due to technology but still much less productive than numbers 1 to 4, will the minister table a Bill following the recommendation of the Environment Council; in other words, an agricultural resources conservation Act?

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. associate minister may wish to supplement my answer, but I would share with the hon. member that we just recently announced a significant program jointly with the federal government on soil conservation, so we are certainly addressing it from that area and protecting much of our existing soil.

While I would have to recognize that the hon. member is making a point when he talks about the loss of good agricultural land to urban sprawl and industrial development, I would reinforce that there is still a significant amount of agricultural land that has not been brought on stream in this province, granted not of the same quality, but with today's farming technology certainly a highly productive quality. I think that realistically we have to look at a balancing act between the demands of urban life, the demands of industrial growth, and the demands of the agricultural community. I believe most of the mechanisms are in place to provide that balancing act.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, it's shameful that any Minister of

Agriculture would say that we have to balance and let good farmland go under industrial expansion.

Well, then, would the minister, if he's not willing to protect numbers 1 to 4 farmland, go as far as to require that the Alberta petroleum and natural gas conservation board never be allowed to put any of their processing facilities on numbers 1 to 4 land?

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. members and all legislators have to recognize that a balancing act is necessary, and there are a lot of factors that come into play in the siting of a plant. Now, you can make industrial development so expensive that we simply won't have it, and you won't have the good-news items like were discussed and shared with the House by the Minister of Energy.

On the other hand, I think we have to be concerned about our food-producing land base, and as I've indicated, I think the mechanisms are in place to bring about an adequate balancing act between the various industries over the years.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, the supplemental is to the Premier. Given this government obviously -- well, it's a shameful practice, saying numbers 1 to 4 farmland development has to be balanced. Would the Premier set an example and withdraw his application to rezone prime farmland for a country residence for himself?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, first of all, the government has not any shameful past. As a matter of fact, the government has built the confidence of rural Alberta, strengthened our agriculture industry, and it's probably stronger now than it has been for many, many years.

As for the hon. member talking about personal matters, he doesn't know what he's talking about. He somehow grabs the nearest press report, and -- strange, Mr. Speaker -- you might find now and then that some of them are incorrect; hard to believe, but they are. And here we have a member of the Legislature blindly accept that kind of baloney and then talk about it and show how little he knows about the facts.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

Also Westlock-Sturgeon in the . . . Perhaps you'd look up *Beauchesne* 409, subsection six -- six, rather. Six. You can do the other as well, if you wish. Your supplementary was out of order, as well as was my comment. All righty.

Calgary-Fish Creek, followed by Edmonton-Strathcona.

Function at Canadian Embassy in U.S.

MR. PAYNE: Well, Mr. Speaker, it is Friday.

Mr. Speaker, earlier this week in Washington, D.C., the Canadian Embassy for the first time made its facilities available to the provinces for tourism and convention promotion purposes. Even more importantly, the embassy invited Alberta to be the first provincial beneficiary of this significant policy initiative. Would the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs summarize for the Assembly this morning how Alberta capitalized on this unique promotional opportunity?

MR. HORSMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This was the subject of a question in the Assembly before by the Member for West Yellowhead, and I appreciate the follow-up of this question now. It was an opportunity for Albertans to display for a

very important group of people in Washington what we can offer by way of convention facilities and food processing in the very finest sense of the term. We were partners in this project with the Calgary convention centre, the Calgary Tourist and Convention Bureau, the Edmonton Convention Centre, the Edmonton Convention and Tourism Authority, and Alberta food processors. I might say the attendance was far beyond expectations and almost approached 400, people who were able to make decisions about locating conventions and conferences here in this province. The Alberta Culinary Arts Foundation provided an excellent opportunity of showing to that very important part of the world their skills, and it was very well received.

MR. PAYNE: Mr. Speaker, I wonder: is the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs aware of what criteria were used by the federal government or by the Canadian Embassy to select Alberta to be the first participant in this type of embassy activity?

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, it was done by dint of a great deal of hard work by our representatives in Washington, Mr. Stuart Freeman and his staff and the staff of the New York office of our Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs office; the foreign office we have in New York. Furthermore we had, I'm pleased to say, the very real co-operation of an Albertan by the name of the Rt. Hon. Joe Clark, who has a specific interest in making sure that tourism is promoted, and Jasper being part of his constituency I'm sure had a great deal to do with the fact that Alberta was the first, as it is in many, many ways in our relationships abroad.

MR. PAYNE: Well, final supp then, Mr. Speaker. Could the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs or possibly the Minister of Tourism provide the Assembly with any additional potential revenue data associated with the so-called association market in Washington? [interjections]

MR. HORSMAN: The opposition seems to think it's funny to promote Alberta, but that is so typical of the socialists' attitude. They just expect to sit here and expect the world to come to them without getting out and selling, because they've never had to sell anything except themselves, and they haven't been very successful in that. The fact is that there is a potential of hundreds of millions of dollars of convention business which could come to this province of Alberta, and not just Edmonton and Calgary or Jasper or the national parks but the other communities throughout Alberta as well. I certainly made perfectly clear to those people when I spoke that Medicine Hat is an opportunity place for them to come as well.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Strathcona.

Disclosure of Search Warrants

MR. WRIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Back to some real questions. To the Attorney General. Yesterday the Attorney General told us that he can see no reason for search warrants information being available to anyone except the accused; everyone else interested, like ordinary citizens, reporters, myself, anybody else, being characterized as "snoops." How can the Attorney General be so contemptuous of the rights of citizens to examine executed search warrants, which in the recent Supreme

Court of Canada case, of which he is aware, was described as an important right to citizens in a free society?

MR. ROSTAD: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member wishes to be referred to as a snoop, fine. That was not directed at the hon. member or any of the members here. I said in my comments that the search warrants are available to the public. I said that we weren't going to set up a Rolodex system where anybody can just walk in and easily access them. If they have an action number or if they have the name of a particular person they believe is accused, the file is open to the public, as any other court document is.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Speaker, that is simply not so. In order for someone to get access to a search warrant . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. WRIGHT: This is my question. [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Let's have the supplementary question.

MR. WRIGHT: This is my first supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

How can the Attorney General state that the Supreme Court ruling is being complied with when it is necessary, contrary to what he's saying, to know the exact date on which the search warrant was issued if you are to have a look at it at all, something that's completely impossible, normally?

MR. ROSTAD: Mr. Speaker, the file . . . [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. ROSTAD: The file of any particular action in the courthouse has an action number. The search warrant and the time it is issued is put into that file. If the justice at the time has sealed, then of course you can't look at the search warrant until such time that the justice has opened it. If it has not been sealed, it's part of the document. As soon as the search warrant has been acted upon, it's free to look at in that particular action number file.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Speaker, how can the Attorney General lead us to suppose anything other than this: that having regard to the practical inability of people to search these questions out and his own refusal to give us any information about what the government is doing vis-à-vis the principal players in the Principal Group, in fact the government is doing nothing . . .

MR. SPEAKER: That's the question. Thank you.

MR. WRIGHT: This is the question.

MR. SPEAKER: The question has already been asked, hon. member.

MR. WRIGHT: This government is doing nothing with respect to . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Order. It was the final supplementary, and when the member checks the Blues, he'll see the question

has been asked. Attorney General. [interjections] Thank you, hon. Member for Calgary-Mountain View; that's enough. If you'd like to check the Blues . . . [interjections] Thank you, hon. leader. Let's do it.

The Attorney General.

MS BARRETT: Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

MR. ROSTAD: Mr. Speaker, I don't feel in any way that this government is not complying fully with the Supreme Court ruling that those documents are open to the public once they have been acted upon. I discussed yesterday reasons why, until they have been acted on, they aren't made public, and that is addressed by the Supreme Court as well. In terms of inaction there's a number of things that are going on, but I also discussed in the House that we aren't about to divulge the actions that the RCMP and/or the Crown prosecutors are using. When the issue is brought forward and an action or a charge is laid, they will know, and until that time we'll leave it to the investigative process to follow that one through. There's a lot being done.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Whitemud.

Community Recreation/Cultural Grants

MR. WICKMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The community recreation/cultural grants have been reduced from \$12 to \$10 per capita during this fiscal period. This is a change in midstream. It's a change, for example, that impacts on the city of Edmonton internal departments to the tune of \$600,000, not counting the impact on the community groups in Edmonton or, of course, the impact throughout the entire province. There is deep, deep concern over this matter amongst the municipalities. There's a deep concern over this style of fiscal management and broken promises. To demonstrate the objections, the city of Edmonton at its meeting this week passed a resolution asking this government to restore it to \$12 on a per capita basis to fulfill its original commitment and to fulfill the commitment that they made to community groups. My question to the Minister of Recreation and Parks. Is the minister prepared to restore the budget to fulfill this government's original commitment to the municipalities and its commitments to the community groups throughout Alberta?

DR. WEST: Mr. Speaker, I've addressed this question before in the Assembly and have probably received the most amount of mail on this subject from all municipalities across Alberta that I've received since being appointed minister. Unfortunately, during our fiscal plan and decision on our budget we had to make some tough decisions. We had made priorities, as I said before, in several areas of health care, education, and in social services. These decisions are always tough, but the effect on the city of Edmonton is no different than the effect on all the municipalities throughout the province. It was a \$2 per capita flow-down to other years. The commitment of \$240 million that was made under the CRC program stands and will be delivered; \$163 million has been delivered to date, and my commitment is to deliver the following moneys from that. I cannot, because of the budgeting and fiscal responsibility that I have, change the decision already made.

MR. WICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Possibly the minister can tell me this then. Given the fact that they timed an election very inconveniently to the population and they knew full well prior to that election as to what the budget was going to be, why did this government then hide those reductions that caused this real hardship to the municipalities and those community groups that are now affected?

DR. WEST: Mr. Speaker, the budget came down on June 8 of this year. Unfortunately, as Mr. Wilson found out in Ottawa, you cannot open the window to your Budget Address before the day it is supposed to be announced. I would fully understand that the people of Alberta appreciate that.

MR. WICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, my last question is to the Premier. Mr. Premier, is this government simply phasing out the community recreation/cultural program to replace it with the lotteries slush fund, or better known as the community facility enhancement program, because the latter program provides a better opportunity for Tory MLAs to milk it for their own political purposes?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, the cynicism contained in the hon. member's question is just a shame. Now, I understand the opposition are having a bad session, but surely they must have a better sense of what's happening in Alberta than that. We have the recreation/cultural program with the grants the hon. minister's been talking about. We've had the minister of public works already telling the House during this past week the tremendous benefits to communities through the community facility enhancement program. Taken together, it's one of the greatest commitments to strengthen the community in the history of Alberta, and the people of Alberta support it tremendously. Surely the hon. member, who has some past history of service in communities, understands that and will eliminate from his thinking the kind of cynicism that was contained in his question.

MR. SPEAKER: The time for question period has expired. Point of order, Edmonton-Highlands.

MS BARRETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There are a number of sections in *Beauchesne* that I could cite, but I will limit myself to sections 409, 410, and 416, and I will cite also the Orders of the Day, which are subject to practically daily abuse. [interjection] Yeah, and by those guys right over there.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MS BARRETT: Mr. Speaker, the Member for Edmonton-Strathcona, who was engaging in a singular, one, interrogatory statement -- that is a question that falls into that particular grammatical form -- was not allowed to complete the question he was putting despite the fact that day after day ministerial statements are offered in the forum of question period in response to questions from MLAs who attend their weekly caucus meetings and have the ability to ask questions in there. Now, I would argue that if there is a position on the Order Paper for ministerial statements, whether or not the Government House Leader likes it, then that is the forum which should be used for the making of ministerial statements. In response to the elapsing time of ques-

tion period I would argue that it is not the role of anybody in this Assembly to cut off a question because of the grammatical form in which it is expressed. I think it is wrong.

MR. SPEAKER: With care. Perhaps one should examine the purpose of the Chair.

MR. WRIGHT: I'm only adding this, Mr. Speaker, that perhaps it was a case that you didn't hear the interrogatory form and supposed it was all preamble. It was, I believe, and certainly intended to be a single sentence in interrogatory form. [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Chair would point out that two issues are being raised by the Member for Edmonton-Highlands. One is with respect to ministerial statements. The Chair has absolutely no control over that, having made representations on a number of occasions as well.

With respect to the matter of the question, the Chair takes it under advisement. We'll look at the Blues and report back to the House at the conclusion of this morning.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

[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]

Bill 11 Senatorial Selection Act

[Debate adjourned August 4: Mr. Decore speaking]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Members of the Committee, when we were last visiting Bill 11, the Chair believes we were dealing with the amendment offered by the hon. Member for Edmonton-Glengarry relating to section 8 of the Bill, if that is correct. Are there any further comments or questions relating to that amendment? The hon. Member for Edmonton-Glengarry.

MR. DECORE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the hon. minister is ready to inform the Assembly that he has, in fact, reconsidered the government's position on this amendment and will allow this amendment to proceed. He's now had ample time to do that, including a trip to Washington to really allow him to relax and think about the issue.

The other matter that I would like the minister to answer is: could he respond to the motion that was passed by the city of Edmonton with respect to the holding of the senatorial selection at the same time as the municipal elections in Alberta? They, of course, oppose it unanimously.

MR. WICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask a couple of questions in addition to the questions that have been asked by the hon. Member for Edmonton-Glengarry. Is the minister aware that not only did the city of Edmonton pass that resolution, as stated by the hon. Member for Edmonton-Glengarry, but as well, on July 13, the city of Calgary passed a similar resolu-

tion. Those two municipalities make up -- and I remind the minister of this -- approximately 50 percent of the population within this province. I point out to the minister that school boards are now expressing concern throughout the province.

I do have a specific question, and that specific question is in addition to this response to the earlier questions by the Member for Edmonton-Glengarry. What was the basis' of the discussion with the Alberta Urban Municipalities Association in attempting to provide them financial incentives to win their support or to reduce their objections somewhat to the timing of the election? In other words, what compensation or what financial incentives is this government prepared to give to the municipalities to win them over or to attempt to win them over on this issue?

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Chairman, I will accept your direction on this, but the last questions posed by both the members for Edmonton-Whitemud and Edmonton-Glengarry relating to the issue of whether or not to continue the option in the Bill to permit the election to take place at the same time as the municipal government was dealt with when the amendment proposed by the Liberals was defeated, and therefore . . . [interjection] The hon. Member for Edmonton-Kingsway wasn't . . .

MR. McEACHERN: I don't think we voted on it.

MR. HORSMAN: I think we did vote on it.

MR. McEACHERN: The vote was on adjournment.

MR. HORSMAN: No. Well. I thought we had dealt with the subject earlier relative to the issue, but in any event I thought we were discussing the issue of the Liberal amendment relating to the eligibility for nomination, and that question is what I was prepared to answer this morning, the first question proposed by the Member for Edmonton-Glengarry. The answer to his question is no. We have carefully considered the implications of both the Canada Elections Act and the Alberta Elections Act. We believe that the fundamental principal is correct in both those pieces of legislation, and despite the arguments advanced by the members of the opposition, we are not prepared to accept the amendment the Liberals have before the House, which we were discussing when we adjourned last Friday.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, without belabouring the point too much that the hon. Member for Edmonton-Glengarry has shown in the amendment to Bill 11, I was struck by the tremendous charitableness of the Member for Medicine Hat, who has said not to worry. He was being very subjective, saying that if I were to resign and run for election for Senator and if indeed I didn't make it and wanted to run for MLA again, he would actually come out and campaign for me. Now, I thought that was very much a sign of goodwill and everything, but the point of the fact is that if I were to resign, or any MLA were to resign for that matter, and run for the Senate selection process -- not the Senate election process -- and win, within six months they have to fill the MLA slot that was resigned from by a by-election. Chances are that the MLA that won the selection process, if he or she is not a Conservative, is still going to be there, not appointed by the Prime Minister, who's made it very clear. So I think it's only fair that this government put an amendment to the Act.

This is what I challenge the Member for Medicine Hat to do

now, because if he really feels this is a cross for a resigning MLA to bear, he would guarantee that if in the six-month period the MLA that won the election as Senator was not appointed Senator, the government would either reinstate him or, at the very least, refuse to run a candidate against that MLA, because after all, the MLA had taken a chance, had resigned, run, won the second election, established a reputation in the Alberta government, and he or she would like a little bit more than the grateful thanks of a government that's stabbing them in the back by holding a by-election while they're waiting for the Senate appointment to come through. I mention this because I know the hon. Member for Medicine Hat is not likely to ever even try to do that. But it just shows you how ridiculous this Act is unless it is amended.

In effect, they're asking MPs and MLAs to resign, to sit there and wait, and then the seat gets filled in behind them and they still aren't a Senator. All it is, Mr. Chairman, the way the Act is presently set -- and I think every editorial writer in Alberta will spot it -- is nothing more than a setup to try to make sure that if a Conservative wins the Senate selection, they will progress to that higher place in heaven alongside all the other Liberals and Conservatives that are there, but if a non-Conservative were to win the Senate selection process, all that would happen is he would sit there in limbo forever and ever and ever and, in fact, if it was an MLA that resigned they would move in and try to fill the seat. So as somebody that had something to do with the paternity of this Act, I'd hate to see such a . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Could we reduce some of the conversations in the Chamber, please. With the level of background noise, it is really getting impossible to hear the speaker.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, that's the only chance the back-benchers in this government get to talk, in the committee thing, so just take it easy on them. The member for Red Deer runs a very tight whip, and all they're allowed to do is burp and make signs of hunger or speak while the House sits. Committee is the only chance they get, so I can quite understand the chatter of children over there.

I want to get back to this item on reform. The point is that having some paternity with this Bill -- or I'd like to claim some paternity -- I hate to see such a misformed child go out into the world as being a creature of this House. This Act, unless it's amended, is going to be a laughingstock. It's going to be a joke. In fact, the hon. Member for Medicine Hat's answers to questions during the Senate reform debate will be broadcast far and wide across this province and shown to the Prime Minister as one of the reasons why he can gleefully and without any repercussions ignore any result coming out of this selection process.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is the Assembly ready for the question on the amendment?

HON. MEMBERS: Question.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Those opposed, please say no.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. CHAIRMAN: In my opinion, the amendment fails.

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

[Eight minutes having elapsed, the House divided]

For the motion:

Chumir	Gibeault	Mitchell
Decore	Hawkesworth	Roberts
Ewasiuk	Hewes	Taylor
Fox	Laing, M.	Wickman
Gagnon	McEachern	

Against the motion:

Adair	Evans	Mirosh
Ady	Fischer	Moore
Betkowski	Fowler	Oldring
Bogle	Gesell	Orman
Brassard	Getty	Severtson
Calahasen	Gogo	Shrake
Cardinal	Horsman	Sparrow
Cherry	Hyland	Stewart
Clegg	Isley	Tannas
Day	Johnston	Thurber
Dinning	Jonson	Trynchy
Drobot	Laing, B.	Weiss
Elliott	Lund	West
Elzinga	McClellan	

Totals:	Ayes - 14	Noes - 41
---------	-----------	-----------

[Motion on amendment lost]

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

The hon. Member for Westlock-Sturgeon wishes to propose an amendment.

MR. TAYLOR: This amendment has been circulated. In it there are four amendments, but I'd like to take them one at a time. Amendment A is an amendment to section 9(1), where . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The suggestion has been made by the hon. Member for Westlock-Sturgeon that we deal with his proposed amendment in parts, starting with part A. Is that agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Opposed? The hon. Member for Westlock-Sturgeon on part A.

MR. TAYLOR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, because it indeed covers a wide arrangement here.

Section 9(1) now calls for 1,500 signatures, and we want to substitute 200. I think this is practical common sense, because the 1,500 signatures each have to be notarized. Each signature

has to be notarized independently the way the Act reads now. Here again, I think this must be a slipup of some sort. Now, it may well be that the hon. member will prove me wrong somehow or another, but my legal advisers . . .

1500 or more electors may nominate a person . . . to be a candidate . . . by signing a nomination paper in the prescribed form and filing it with the Chief Electoral Officer.

Well, if you look at the prescribed form, the prescribed form is that each signature has to be notarized. You know how much trouble it is to just get one signature notarized. You have to get the witness to sign, saying that they saw the signature, and then you've got to take an oath from someone who saw the witness witness the signature. Fifteen hundred times is absolutely foolish, and I'd like to question the minister on that. I mean, 1,500 signatures is easy, 1,500 signatures that are electors that are verified is easy, but 1,500 notarized and witnessed signatures doesn't make sense.

MR. HORSMAN: Section 9(2) makes it clear that the signatures of the electors shall be witnessed by another elector or electors. You could have a number of people out collecting signatures and they would then appear before a commissioner for oaths or a notary public who would then sign the affidavit. So it wouldn't have to be done 1,500 times. That's quite inaccurate. It's like anything. You get somebody witnessing; one witness could witness all 1,500 signatures and then appear before a notary public or a commissioner for oaths and one affidavit is completed, and that's all that's required. That's quite clear. That would be the same whether it's 200 signatures or 1,500 signatures. You may have, as I say, 10 different people out collecting signatures, each with an allotment of 150, and then have those 10 individuals appear before a commissioner for oaths, and that's all that's required. It's really not that big a deal to do. But we do believe it is important to have a substantial number of electors prepared to commit themselves to support a candidate for this office, since it is provincewide in nature.

We haven't, of course, included in here any requirement that the signatures of nominators come from different regions of the province -- we thought about that, but we felt it would be impractical to make those requirements -- but certainly a substantial number of people, because this is a serious process we're about to engage in.

MR. DECORE: Mr. Chairman, 1,500 signatures is a lot of signatures. It's hard to imagine one meeting where 1,500 people would come so that one person could watch 1,500 others sign and then become the witness and go to a notary or to a commissioner for oaths and get the affidavit concluded. This is really onerous. I think all of us accept the fact that we want serious candidates running for this position. We don't want the sorts of things that happen in some of the large urban centres in Alberta where you get crackpots running from time to time. But 1,500, Mr. Minister, is a very onerous number of people, and I think this flies in the face of democracy. We can accept the fact that there has to be some number, there has to be some way of limiting those people who aren't serious. But surely 1,500 is more than enough; 200 would be more than enough. I'm asking the minister, why not 200? Isn't that enough to satisfy the concern of getting only serious candidates put into place?

MR. CHUMIR: Mr. Chairman, if I understand the point being made by the minister, he's saying that it's only intended that one

witness make some statement that all these 1,500 people have signed this particular document. That may be the intent, but the language of section 9(2) refers to witnessing, and witnessing certainly implies some form of having seen the signature and attestation. I think there's a real complication in this legislation. The section is very unclear, and if it is the intent of the minister that his view shall prevail, I think he should have his officials look at this section quickly. If his view is the correct view, however, I must ask why it sounds so unusual as to have one person make a statement that this is the nomination paper. I've never heard of anything of that nature. I can see no purpose to it. The draftsman of this legislation seems to have clearly had something more in the nature of what we have in mind, that actual witnessing is required, and if witnessing isn't required, what then is the purpose of having some person make a statement or an affidavit -- on what? That this is the nomination paper? It's not required in any other circumstance. It's certainly redundant, but it leads to confusion and very serious confusion. I don't think members of his party want to have to go through that crazy process.

So there are two problems here. One is the affidavit process and the second is just the absolute number of signatures that are required, which is quite an onerous number, as has already been stated by speakers from this side of the House.

MR. DECORE: Mr. Chairman, would it not be sufficient to satisfy the rationale the minister has -- that is, to keep away people who are not serious -- to simply put the onus on the person wishing to run, to say, "The onus is on you, candidate, to ensure that X number of people are in fact Albertans and residents of Alberta and have lived here" and so on, and leave it at that, in the same way that the Municipal Election Act or the Election Act in Alberta calls for 10 people to nominate for the position of mayor in the city of Edmonton or in the city of Calgary? There is no requirement of affidavits, only that the onus is on the candidate to ensure and convince the elections registrar that these people are in fact residents of Edmonton or Calgary, or of Alberta in this particular case.

MR. HORSMAN: We are dealing with an amendment which deals specifically with numbers, and now the hon. members for Calgary-Buffalo and Edmonton-Glenarry have both questioned another subsection to which they have not proposed an amendment. I don't think there's any particular problem in dealing with it now in discussing it in committee, but I just want to point that out. The number is there because we believe it is important to have a very substantial number of people engaged in this process, and the question of completing an affidavit which says they have witnessed a document is no different from any other affidavit of execution that is done countless times in Alberta every day. There's nothing particularly onerous about completing an affidavit of execution, whether it has the signature of three witnesses to a mortgage or two witnesses to a mortgage or . . . [interjection]

MR. CHUMIR: Jim, it's always witnessing the signature. Every affidavit: "I have witnessed the signature on this."

MR. HORSMAN: Well, the hon. member continues to argue, but the fact of the matter is that this is a very easily understood section. I can't understand why they are raising objections to it. In any event, we are discussing an amendment which doesn't

have anything to do with the point just raised by the hon. Member for Calgary-Buffalo. I'm happy to restate our position. We believe 1,500 is the number that was chosen because it requires a substantial commitment on the part of anyone seeking the office to get the support of a substantial number of citizens province-wide because of the unusual nature of this particular proposal.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Chair understands the sense of the committee was that we would debate these amendments separately, but just so we all know how we'll end up, would we dispose of them separately or vote as a package at the end of the debate after we debate them separately? All those in favour of one vote on the proposed amendment?

MR. HORSMAN: On a point of order. I do think that the request by the mover of the amendment does make sense, because the issues that are raised in the amendment are substantively different and should, in my view, Mr. Chairman, be voted on separately.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does the committee agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any further comments? The hon. . . .

MR. DECORE: Just so I'm clear, is that not the right of a member of this Assembly, to in fact ask for a split? All we had to do was divide the amendments amongst eight people and we could have solved the problem of . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry, but I think we've resolved it. We're going . . . [interjection]

MR. DECORE: Just so I'm clear for the next occasion, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. member, it's up to the committee to decide how it operates on these amendments. The Chair feels they certainly had different subject matters, and the Chair recognizes what the hon. Member for Edmonton-Glengarry is saying. But the Chair wanted to know whether it wanted to make . . .

MR. DECORE: All I'm asking for is a precedent, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, the committee is the master of its own procedure while we're dealing with matters of this sort.

So it's agreed that we'll have a decision on part A. All those in favour of part A will please say aye.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Opposed, please say no.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. CHAIRMAN: In my opinion, part A fails.

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

[Eight minutes having elapsed, the House divided]

For the motion:

Barrett	Gibeault	Mitchell
Chumir	Hewes	Taylor
Decore	Laing, M.	Wickman
Fox	McEachern	Wright
Gagnon		

Against the motion:

Adair	Evans	Moore
Ady	Fischer	Oldring
Betkowski	Fowler	Orman
Bogle	Gesell	Payne
Brassard	Gogo	Rostad
Calahasen	Horsman	Severtson
Cardinal	Hyland	Shrake
Cherry	Johnston	Sparrow
Clegg	Jonson	Tannas
Day	Laing, B.	Thurber
Dinning	Lund	Trynchy
Drobot	McClellan	Weiss
Elliott	Mirosh	West
Elzinga		

Totals:	Ayes -	13	Noes - 40
---------	--------	----	-----------

[Motion on amendment A lost]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before proceeding further, the Chair would like some direction from the committee as to future recorded divisions. Could there be agreement to, say, have a 30-second bell, a one-minute wait, followed by a one-minute bell? Agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Opposed? Carried. So ordered.
The hon. Member for Westlock-Sturgeon.

MR. TAYLOR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Speaking to this one, too, it may be that the hon. minister can cover it up by putting out different regulations, but here we have a case of a \$4,000 deposit being asked to be put down with the election as evidence satisfactory to the Chief Electoral Officer that the candidate owns property of a net value of at least \$4,000 -- putting \$4,000 down. Apparently that was done with the idea that in order to be eligible to be appointed to the Senate, you have to have \$4,000 worth of property.

[Mr. Jonson in the Chair]

Now, there are two things wrong with this amendment, again, and I'm sorry to see them take the whip and the rather truculent attitude that all these amendments are perceived to be political and not questions of draftsmanship and some legal reasons for it, because I think we're going to end up with a rather misformed Act. But this one, again, is something we'll have to do some stickhandling on, because there are two things wrong with the present wording of 11(1)(g), saying that "it is accompanied by a deposit of \$4,000." First of all, it doesn't comply with the Senate's regulations that you have to have \$4,000 worth of

property. A \$4,000 deposit could easily be put up by a party or a friend or whatever it is. It doesn't accomplish what the minister, I think, wanted it to, but maybe he has some other answer to it.

The second reason is that in constitutional democracies I have never heard of somebody having to put up a \$4,000 deposit -- the chances of which they can forfeit unless they have half what the winner gets -- in any election in the western world. Unless the Canadian dollar goes down to something like the peso, \$4,000 -- if you'll pardon the expression -- is a hell of a lot of moola to put up. I know the minister's intention was to keep out the malcontents and people that I suppose are going to run just because it costs very little. But I think \$4,000 worth of property should be in a different thing entirely, because \$4,000 doesn't accomplish that here. The person can still have no property. A friend could put up the \$4,000, win the election, and still not qualify for the Senate.

Secondly, I think the message we're telegraphing to the public out there . . . This is an election we want all people to feel they can participate in. This is an important thing. It's going to be Canada's first elected selection process. Who knows? If the Prime Minister accepts the winner, it may even be the first elected Senator. I doubt if he's going to go that far, but it could be. So here we have an electoral process that we're telling people "\$4,000." This sets democracy back to the 1700s and 1800s in England, where you had to own so many sheep and so many acres of property before you were allowed to vote. I think it's out of order in two ways. It doesn't accomplish assurance that the person has \$4,000 worth of property, and it telegraphs a rather unseemly message to the people of Alberta: that you have to be rich if you want to get a chance at taking an election on the Senate.

MR. HORSMAN: I just want to respond that the reason the \$4,000 figure is in is to make it clear that those people who will seek the office are serious. It has nothing, I can add, to do with the eligibility issue, which is dealt with in another section of the Act. The fact of this \$4,000 figure is coincidental. It has nothing to do with the fact that the current Constitution Act requires a person to have that amount of property and be 30 years of age. I have already said -- not inside the Assembly; I will do it now in the committee -- that we don't agree that that should be the future eligibility requirements. While those requirements are part of the Constitution, we have to deal with them, but this deposit has nothing to do with that eligibility requirement. It is there for the purpose of ensuring, as was section 9(1), the 1,500 signatures, that the person who seeks the office is serious about doing so.

MS M. LAING: Mr. Chairman, I would have to take exception to the suggestion that one has to have money in order to be considered a serious contender in the political arena. It seems to me that particularly for women, who are often disadvantaged in the financial realm, this just virtually excludes people who may have strong intentions and are very serious about the matter. So I think to have this kind of money requirement certainly is incorrect and wrong.

I think we also have to look at the notion of property as a requirement to stand in the Senate. If we want true Senate reform, let's get away from the old notion from the House of Lords where the moneyed landowners had to keep control of the commoners in the House of Commons.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Westlock-Sturgeon.

MR. TAYLOR: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Just in answer to the hon. Member for Medicine Hat. It can wait a minute if he wishes. I take the minister's point, and this is what I was trying to get at: that the \$4,000 may be covered somewhere else in the Act for property. But where is it? It says that a person has to meet "the qualifications set out in section 23 of the Constitution Act." I don't have that with me. Is that the \$4,000 one?

MR. HORSMAN: That's the Constitution Act.

MR. TAYLOR: Is it?

MR. HORSMAN: Yes.

MR. TAYLOR: You wouldn't pull the leg of an old fella, would you?

AN HON. MEMBER: Not one with crooked glasses.

MR. TAYLOR: That's better than somebody's mind, but . . .

MR. HORSMAN: Perhaps I should put the answer on the record. The Constitution Act requirement is the one which refers to a person being required to be 30 years of age, a resident of the province, and have property worth \$4,000. Now, I said before, and I'll say it again: we do not agree that that should be a future requirement for a truly reformed Senate. That is anachronistic. It is wrong, but it's there, and it would be futile to allow someone to seek the office and then have the Prime Minister say: "Well, you've sent me the name of an 18-year-old person of no means. I can't possibly appoint that person because the Constitution will not permit me to do so."

MR. TAYLOR: He indeed is correct. I found the reference Act here, and it does mention \$4,000 property. But it still means, then, that \$4,000 here now is definitely a penalty. It is definitely a cash penalty that I think is exorbitant. I think we're amending here, suggesting that \$250, the same that we MLAs and MPs had to risk when our deposit was put up. To ask somebody to put up a \$4,000 deposit I think is hurting the credibility of this Act. If indeed they meet section 23 anyhow, and they get their 1,500 signatures that you're now talking about, \$4,000 seems to me to be pounding the possible idea of weeding out unworthy types to a lamentable degree. It seems out of reason entirely.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Edmonton-Highlands.

MS BARRETT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd point out that I guess I understand the minister has no authority to change the BNA Act by himself, but I would question why it is that if this government is so determined to proceed with this selection process whereby one person or several people will make it to a list for consideration for appointment to the Senate, they wouldn't go back to the bargaining table and ask in advance of proceeding with this process that the \$4,000 land ownership requirement be dropped. I hear the Treasury minister every day, I hear the Premier and the Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs ministers say, jeez, we've got clout down there in Ottawa; we're gonna go down and fight this and that. For the most part, Mr. Chairman, they come home with their tails in between their legs.

But what I would say is that if you insist on proceeding with this type of Bill, why don't you at least go back to the drawing board and try to get your kissing cousins to change the rules? This is a preposterous requirement, and the Constitution itself should be changed so that it is no longer a requirement. I don't see how putting the cart before the horse in this instance is going to help one little bit. If you have to go through this process of selecting a series of nominees for consideration for appointment, then at least what we should have the right to do is have any Albertan run for this so-called selection as opposed to just the landed gentry. So you know, put up your dukes, get your courage up. Go down to Ottawa, do a little fighting, see what you can get, and then bring the Bill back.

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

HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: All those in favour of amendment B proposed by the hon. Member for Westlock-Sturgeon, please say aye.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Those opposed please say no.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

[Motion on amendment B lost]

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Moving on then to item C. Westlock-Sturgeon.

MR. TAYLOR: Okay. I thought we were going to a division, but it's all right. Section C deals with the requirement . . . Now, I indeed look like a Senator with my glasses straight and, if you'll notice, with a gold rim. My God, what have you got here?

This is to be added after section 34: to have the government sponsor a debate across the province. I think if you've been following what we've been talking about here, Mr. Chairman, the Liberal amendments all lend themselves to try, within the limits of what the federal regulations will do, to allow us to popularize this election, to make it one of the masses; not to try to get the elite of the elitists or the best of the best or the *c r è m e d e l a c r è m e*, if you'll pardon French in this House, hon. Member for Medicine Hat. Right now, with a provincewide election and the amount of moneys -- and the hon. member just amended that amount to go as high as \$30,000 per donation, the highest donation allowance known in the western world, where there are any elections. All we're asking here is that government sponsor one provincewide debate in the election -- just one -- because there again we would telegraph to the public that you don't have to be a millionaire or a millionaire's baby or a millionaire's friend in order to run in this. We indeed are interested in trying to get a Senate that's elected, that represents the ordinary Albertan, not just the rich or the chosen puppet of some party or another.

This amendment we're putting forward, Mr. Chairman, is nothing more than that, and many countries are moving to that in the ordinary elections of the day anyhow. Even our national elections have it; our provincial elections go to a debate. So why not one provincewide debate for all the Senators running in

any particular Senate election?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for Edmonton-Whitemud. Pardon me, the minister.

MR. HORSMAN: I'll wait.

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

MR. WICKMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We, of course, are in a democratic process. All of us here would have a great deal of respect for that democratic process, and we would want to ensure that that democratic process is maintained, and maintained as democratic as possible, to allow all Albertans the opportunity to participate in this type of selection process. The hon. Member for Westlock-Sturgeon has already pointed out the financial implications that can be involved if there are not debates covered by the public purse or at the public expense. There is an expense to candidates in the sense that then they may be forced to revert to high-cost paid advertising to get their message across.

I can remember as a youngster, Mr. Chairman -- relatively young, in any case -- watching one of the first all-time great debates in the United States presidential elections in which John Kennedy made his mark. That seemed to set the tone, even in Canada, for televised debates to occur. We see them happen in federal elections. We see them happen in provincial elections. And of course there's always a winner and always a loser, at least generally speaking. We saw in the last federal election that the Liberal candidate came out of that debate as a hands-down winner, I would say. But that's beside the point as to who won. Nevertheless, there was an opportunity there for candidates from all three parties to debate. There are instances, I suppose, that candidates may be afraid to debate. They may be afraid that they may not have a knowledgeable enough grasp of the issues or they simply can't project their responses to the public. But that's shirking their public responsibility, in my opinion. Whether they can project, whether they can get their points across, I think is something that goes with the territory, and they have to be prepared to debate; they can't run away from it. We see now in this particular Bill that the option, of course, is there, that they can simply run away from it because without this amendment there is no provision to ensure that televised debates do occur.

We can look back at last February and March here in the province of Alberta, where we saw during that election that the Tory leader was afraid to debate with the leaders of the other two parties. I believe that the people of Alberta missed out a great deal because of his failure to respond to the invitation to debate, and I think the people of Alberta don't tolerate that type of behaviour. I think it was really demonstrated within my own constituency, where we didn't have debates. That may seem minor when we look at Edmonton-Whitemud in terms of the province of Alberta and in terms of the impact on the Senate selection. Nevertheless, I think there was a point made there. I think the electorate made their point. The electorate clearly said that they feel there is an obligation on the part of leaders and candidates to debate. And here is an opportunity for us to ensure that that provision is there, not only for the Tory candidate but for the Liberal candidate, the New Democrat candidate -- if there is a New Democrat candidate -- or any other candidate, to

ensure that all of them will get up there and fulfill their responsibility and engage in that televised debate. I would certainly hope that the members across the House would respect our democratic process and ensure that it is fulfilled to its greatest extent.

MR. DECORE: Mr. Chairman, originally when our party was looking at the process of having a Senator selected in Alberta, we took the position that we not have partisan parties putting forth candidates, that we wanted an Albertan, a man or a woman, who could stand up for Alberta on all issues and not in any way be fettered by the partisan political process. We've seen all kinds of evidence of inequity to Alberta -- this is the reason we want Senate reform -- and we continue to see that inequity in spite of the fact that we have an overwhelming majority of Conservatives that have been elected to our House of Commons from the province of Alberta. It still hasn't made any difference. But if that won't work, if that can't be accepted, then it seems to me that the second best position is to convince Albertans that this man or this woman should really be truly acquainted with the issues that affect Alberta. What about the inequity, the disparity in economic terms? How are they going to represent Alberta with respect to that issue? What are they going to say about Senate reform? What are they going to say about issues that Alberta is keenly interested in? How are we going to know that unless we all have an opportunity of hearing that man or that woman debate these issues with others?

Mr. Chairman, there is no possible way -- no possible way -- that the candidates who wish to run in this senatorial selection process can get to every Albertan. There is no way that they can go to every community in Alberta and give their message and satisfy the voters as to how they're going to look after the interests of Albertans. They're going to try, but by adding this requirement to have a television debate we ensure that all Albertans are convinced that they, in fact, are voting for the best man or the best woman.

My hon. colleague from Edmonton-Whitemud has talked about the last provincial election, where we had an unusual situation where the leader of the government refused to debate the leaders of the other two parties; unusual because in all elections in Canada that I'm aware of, that I've seen in the last five or 10 years, leaders have always had the opportunity to debate the Premier of the province in a general election or the Prime Minister in a general election. The Premier used the argument that he was too busy, a phony argument, an argument that didn't allow Albertans to get all the issues heard debated.

I might also add, Mr. Chairman, that the Premier of our province said, when he was too busy to debate the leaders in the provincial general election, that a person who was interested in running in Edmonton-Glengarry should go back and debate in that particular constituency. Well, I did. It was the Premier who would not even debate with the now sitting Member for Edmonton-Whitemud, because, I guess, he was too busy. It seemed to me that the Premier and the government would have learned through the process they went through in Stettler that it's not such a bad process, that the four debates that were held in Stettler were a good process for making sure the people in Stettler did know what the issues were. People came out to those meetings in great numbers. Why is it, Mr. Minister, that there is a fear on your part or on the part of the government to allow this matter to go to the people of Alberta by way of a public debate so that everybody can understand and hear the issues

and hear how these people respond to the issues?

Mr. Chairman, one of the things that Albertans are very interested in is the issue of Meech Lake, and one could easily draw the conclusion, because the government is following the parade rather than leading the parade -- most Albertans are against Meech Lake rather than for it, unlike the government -- that they're afraid to debate this particular issue on television because they know how silly they'd look defending a Meech Lake document that is really indefensible.

The last point I wish to make is the fact that the electoral officer is the officer who is called upon to set up and conduct the debate. There were some indications in some constituencies during the last provincial election that some of the debates that were called were phony debates in the sense that candidates set up their own mechanisms to control the debate, to control the questions, and so on. We don't want to see any part of that kind of skewing, any kind of bias that would be given to a particular candidate. Therefore, the elections officer is called upon in his unbiased position to make this as clean and neat and tidy as possible so that all Albertans get the full story on who these candidates who wish to be our Senator are.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Edmonton-Kingsway.

MR. McEACHERN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I don't intend to speak at length to this motion, but I think it is one of the silliest motions I've seen in a long time and should be rejected out of hand.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Does the Member for Edmonton-Gold Bar wish to speak?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is being called.

MR. HORSMAN: I think we should put on record the position of the government with respect to this amendment. We don't believe that any particular method of campaigning should be enshrined in legislation. It's just fundamentally wrong, in my view, to require a candidate to campaign in a particular way, given the fact that we want candidates to operate within the law in terms of not buying votes and all those things which we have legislated against. Certainly to require this type of campaigning to be enshrined in legislation is just wrong. Furthermore, the constitutional structure of Canada being what it is, I think we are unable, quite frankly, in view of the responsibilities of the federal government with respect to broadcasting, to order a television network or the broadcast media to carry out an election-type campaign the way this amendment is worded. Therefore, I just don't think it's acceptable.

MRS. HEWES: Mr. Chairman, I support this amendment. We've spoken before in the House about the fact that this is not an election we're talking about here. This is a very unique piece of legislation to select a nominee. That's a very clear distinction in my mind. I suppose in a sense it's an imitation election.

I believe that there are three quite compelling reasons why this kind of an amendment should be made to the legislation, Mr. Chairman. Some of us have sort of deplored the kind of hype that goes around elections in this country, where it depends

on how much money you can put into signs and into professionally directed advertising, whether we're talking about the print media or TV or radio. The candidate who can get his or her picture and message before the public with increasing frequency as election day nears is the one who gets in, simply because of name recognition and face recognition. Mr. Chairman, I think this then leaves off those other perhaps very desirable candidates who are not in a position to afford that kind of professional support. So this is a balancing factor between the candidates -- the have and the have less of candidates -- that I think is important to achieve.

Mr. Chairman, I also believe another reason of course is that Albertans now have a very unique opportunity to select someone to go as the representative from this province and hopefully represent western concerns as well to Ottawa, who is their choice to go to Ottawa and speak for us and take our thoughts into that arena. It's important to me and I believe to all Albertans to have the opportunity to see that person perform in public. What better medium than television? We know that with the geography of the province it would be very difficult for any candidate to present themselves throughout the province in a comprehensive fashion.

The third compelling reason for me, Mr. Chairman, is visibility in the rest of the country. Now, if in fact one of the objectives of this piece of legislation is to show the rest of Canada the leadership of this province in putting forward the notion of Senate reform and to encourage other provinces to follow this leadership, to show other provinces that this is a way they, too, can go and can support, if this is part of our objective in this type of legislation, which I believe it to be, then I think the notion of a televised debate is a very significant one. There's no question this would increase in large measure the visibility of this action throughout the rest of the country. This would be picked up nationally and be seen nationally in a way that our local debates and our local opportunities for the candidate to speak to Albertans would not be possible.

Mr. Chairman, I believe it's a golden opportunity, and I think, since this is a unique piece of legislation perhaps only going to be necessary for a short term, hopefully having been the leader in Senate reform, this election debate should be written in.

MR. HORSMAN: I'll just briefly respond. All the points the Member for Edmonton-Gold Bar has just made are very valid points in support of a televised debate, but to legislate it as a requirement is wrong.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MS BARRETT: It's rare that I agree with the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs, but I must say I still like democracy being a voluntary participatory activity, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Edmonton-Whitemud.

MR. WICKMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just a couple of short statements. I am really, really surprised, disappointed, disillusioned that members in this House, including members of the New Democratic caucus who have indicated they will not

support this amendment, shy away from this type of public participation. I'm sure the hon. Member for Edmonton-Beverly will recall during the civic elections the importance that we placed on the public forums, on the radio commercials that were paid for by the city of Edmonton, to ensure that we as candidates were able to get our arguments across and, more importantly, that the public was able to determine to some degree what the positions of the various candidates were.

I can recall -- and I'm sure the hon. Member for Edmonton-Beverly will recall -- when we debated in city council the procedural bylaw dealing with similar type situations. One of the candidates made her alliances with the New Democratic Party very clear in the race for the mayor's chair, in fact very forcefully promoted the concept of believing in paid advertising for television and radio for the candidates, proposed amendments to the procedural bylaw that would provide for a question and answer period for candidates and the public, and also supported public forums to be held in all areas of the city to allow debates to occur, to allow the public to be heard. I am shocked, Mr. Chairman, that now the New Democrats, who maintain that they are in fact the grass-roots party, a party of democracy, would back away from an amendment that reeks of nothing but enhancing democracy. I am stunned.

MR. FOX: Well, I'd be happy to concur with the Member for Edmonton-Whitemud's assessment that he's stunned.

This amendment has nothing to do with legitimate public participation in the democratic process. I was as offended as members of the Liberal caucus, and indeed all Albertans were offended, when the Premier refused to take part in legitimate debate during the last election. I think that was shameful. It's a precedent established by his predecessor, Mr. Lougheed, who after challenging Ernest Manning to debate or Harry Strom to debate, whoever he challenged -- I'm not that old; I don't remember -- then himself refused to take part in legitimate televised debates, realizing that he had nothing to gain and lots to lose by exposing himself to public scrutiny. I'm offended by that process, and I think legitimate public debate is an important part of the democratic process. But this amendment is based in part on the spirit in which the hon. leader of the Liberal Party offered Bill 240, an Act to Amend the Election Act. I think that Act would more fairly be named the compulsory broadcast Act.

I can understand why the Liberals may feel a need to compel through legislation the media to pay attention to them and what they're doing. But legislating it just isn't going to wash, Mr. Chairman, and to suggest that it will . . . I'm not sure what they'd follow up this sort of draconian Stalinistic kind of legislation with. Would it be an Act to compel people to pay attention to the broadcast once it's been forced onto the airwaves by legislation? I think it's just silly, and we're wasting our time here dealing with an amendment like this.

[Mr. Schumacher in the Chair]

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

MS BARRETT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It'd be hard to elaborate more fully than my colleague from Vegreville did except to acknowledge one thing, and that is that the Member for Edmonton-Whitemud is completely wrong in assigning the motivations to me that he did. As the House leader for the Official

Opposition New Democrat caucus, during the recent provincial campaign it was me who was assigned to debate the then Government House Leader publicly and the Treasurer publicly, because the Premier would not engage in the debate. I want to let him know that I caught a flu during one of those occasions, and I paid a heavy price for that. So let the record show that I went out and did the job, and I was glad to meet the challenge. I don't shy away from it even if a flu is approaching, Mr. Chairman.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, it's unfortunate in these things . . . One thing I've learned for the few years I've been in the House, they get so politicized so much that one side says they're for motherhood; the other side immediately goes the other way. If there's anything -- and this is what surprised me a little bit about the New Democratic Party criticism -- there is a tendency in modern western society . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please. I hesitate to interrupt the hon. member, but we seem to be having a disagreement between parties here and not really talking about the amendment before the Assembly.

MR. TAYLOR: I'm just doing the lead-up to try to get their attention. As an old rural person you know we have to hit the mule over the head with a two-by-four before you start talking, Mr. Chairman.

The question here is that if there's any trend in modern society, it is towards controlling expenditures of individuals running for election. We all recognize that if there's no control, to the rich go the spoils. So we have dollar donation limits. We have all the accoutrements. In this province there's no limit to the amount you can spend, but there's a limit that you can collect. Many other provinces have a limit that you can spend, many other countries. So all this is doing is moving slowly, I'll admit, maybe glacial slowness, to the era, that nirvana down the road someday where democracy actually exists, where everybody who runs for office has an equal opportunity and it is not based on the size of their wallet.

So this is just a step, one broadcast across this province, in that direction of reform that I thought all us were moving towards in the western world to try to democratize the election expenditure program, instead of going to the U.S. system where the more put into money, the better. Asking the province to arrange one -- we're talking about arranging it, not compelling. You'd have to pay for it, naturally. But I think at the ultimate end it is cheaper for the taxpayer. It gives the taxpayer more information than it would if we just left it wide open and said whoever could give the money.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would the committee agree to reverting to Introduction of Special Guests?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Opposed? Carried.

The hon. Member for Edmonton-Kingsway.

head: INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS

MR. McEACHERN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you to all the members of the House. It's my pleasure today to intro-

duce to you and to the members of the Assembly 16 English as a Second Language students from the Winnifred Stewart campus in my riding. They are accompanied by Jennifer Semchuk, and they are in the public gallery. I would ask that they rise and receive the warm welcome of the Assembly.

MR. TAYLOR: Point of order, Mr. Chairman. If you could make it clear to the visitors that the hon. Member for Edmonton-Kingsway seldom uses English, and so [inaudible].

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

Bill 11 Senatorial Selection Act (continued)

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Calgary-Buffalo.

MR. CHUMIR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I've been reading the legislation back and forth trying to psychoanalyze it and find where there is any evidence of these draconian elements of compulsion that we have been hearing from some of the speakers here.

AN HON. MEMBER: Well, we got carried away.

MR. CHUMIR: Yes, they got carried away, really got carried away into another land where this legislation is on channel 2 and many of the speakers are on channel 10.

There is no compulsion even implied in this legislation. There is no compulsion of the broadcasting channels; in fact, they'd probably love it. But they're probably going to get paid for it, Mr. Chairman. If they're not going to get paid, they'd probably be clamoring amongst themselves for the right to carry this particular debate. So nobody's forcing the media to do anything. We're not going back to the old days of the old Social Credit press Bill. Similarly, there's no compulsion here of any candidate to participate in these debates. If a candidate doesn't want to participate, he doesn't participate. All that's being stated in this amendment is that a debate is a part of the electoral process, and it's a much needed part of the electoral process in this province.

There may be some defect in the detail of what has been proposed. I haven't heard any; none has been pointed out. But for crying out loud, the concept has to be a good one and particularly for a party that's concerned about greater democratization and greater opportunity for those who don't have the money. This is a benefit to those who don't have the money. Those who do, like the Premier who doesn't want to debate . . . It's always those in power who refuse to debate. They can afford to buy all the ads.

But this is an excellent way of providing that other avenue, that other alternative for every candidate to have an opportunity to have their say. I think it's a very sensible resolution which many may disagree with but certainly not on the grounds that it's draconian or compulsive.

MR. MITCHELL: Mr. Chairman, I would simply like to emphasize the point made by my colleague from Calgary-Buffalo. If the New Democratic members would take the time to read this amendment properly, they will see that the wording isn't

such that any television station or radio station would be absolutely irrevocably required to do anything. In fact, all this amendment does is direct the electoral officer to arrange, and if in fact he couldn't arrange, then he couldn't force -- there's no power in this amendment under this legislation that could force the Chief Electoral Officer in turn to force any media outlet to televise or publicize in any way this particular debate. It smacks once again of a very irritable and cranky New Democratic Party that has put itself in the position of opposing Senate reform for whatever shortsighted political reason and now is making every effort to thwart and create obstacles for the progress of this legislation, for improving this legislation in a way that would make it operate more effectively for Alberta and more effectively in the pursuit of that one objective which we would hope that we all in this Legislature share and that is to create structural institutional reform in this country that would redress regional imbalance in a way that will strengthen Alberta and strengthen Alberta within Canada.

MR. McEACHERN: Just a very quick point. I would point out to the last speaker that in fact we supported some of their amendments, some of the more reasonable ones. I just feel that the Chief Electoral Officer has other more important things to do than organize a televised debate, and you do not enshrine that in legislation that he must do that. It's a silly suggestion. Let's defeat it and get it over with.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All those in favour of part C of the amendment proposed by the hon. Member for Westlock-Sturgeon to section 34, please say aye.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Opposed, please say no.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

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

[One minute having elapsed, the House divided]

For the motion:

Chumir	Hewes	Taylor
Decore	Mitchell	Wickman
Gagnon		

Against the motion:

Adair	Fowler	Moore
Barrett	Fox	Oldring
Betkowski	Gesell	Orman
Bogle	Gibeault	Payne
Brassard	Horsman	Roberts
Cardinal	Hyland	Severtson
Cherry	Johnston	Shrake
Clegg	Jonson	Sparrow
Day	Laing, B.	Tannas
Dinning	Laing, M.	Thurber

Drobot	Lund	Trynchy
Elliott	McClellan	Weiss
Elzinga	McEachern	West
Evans	Mirosh	Wright
Fischer		

PARLIAMENTARY COUNSEL: Mr. Chairman, for the amendment eight, against the amendment 50.*

[Motion on amendment C lost]

MR. CHAIRMAN: The next amendment is to section 56. The hon. Member for Westlock-Sturgeon.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, are we ready for the question? The hon. Member for Calgary-Buffalo then.

MR. CHUMIR: Point of order, Mr. Chairman. In terms of the count we only detected seven.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The point of order is noted, and the matter has been corrected. Thank you.

MR. TAYLOR: I would be interested, Mr. Chairman, where you put that vote in limbo. [interjections] That's right. Actually it was the hon. Member for Edmonton-Whitemud who put up both hands.

Section D is again involved with the amount of money involved. The House would have to recall that the original Act as it came in had those candidates that were blessed, if you can call it that, or cursed by being the nominee of a political party allowed to collect up to \$30,000 per donation, whereas independents were only allowed to collect \$1,500 per donation. The hon. House leader came in at the early stages of this debate last week and introduced an amendment, which is typical I guess from the Conservatives, to fit a procrustean bed that they had conspired or put together for the Senate candidate. You will remember Procrustes was that great Greek innkeeper who, when somebody stayed overnight, had a bed that if you were too short, he'd put you on the rack and stretched you to fit it, and if you were too long, he'd cut you off at the ankles.

Well, what happened here is that instead of going to the \$1,500 short bed, our Member for Medicine Hat went for the long bed, put everybody on the rack, and stretched them so that now any candidate running for Senate can collect up to \$30,000 for a single donation. Well, nowhere in the western world that I know of are you allowed to collect \$30,000. There's either a limit, and it's usually in \$2,000, \$3,000, \$4,000, \$5,000 categories, or there are no limits at all. So we have, in effect, a \$30,000 limit, which might as well be no limit, once again bringing forward, when you remember that this government spoke out against allowing a lower deposit, wanted \$4,000, spoke out against a provincewide debate. It shows again that they're trying to structure this as an election for the rich.

Now, the \$30,000 donation indicates quite clearly that a multinational or a utility company can literally buy their own Senator. I think it's probably a Conservative tradition. Years ago we used to settle our disputes by trial by combat, so whoever had the biggest horse, a knight in armor, and so on and so

*[Totals: Ayes 7; Noes 43]

forth won whatever the dispute was. Then we moved on, with the advent of lawyers, to hiring lawyers to fight for us rather than trial by combat. It's still the same thing. The fattest pocketbook can hire the best lawyers and usually win the fight.

What we have today with this \$30,000 donation is a telegraphed message again to the public that whoever can collect the most money is the one who should win the election. This is what's important. Whether they win the election or should win the election is two different things, but I think being allowed to collect \$30,000 is ridiculous. Our amendment in fact goes back to half the original intent of the government. Where they said that independents collect \$1,500 but others could collect \$30,000, we're saying that the government was right in recognizing that there was discrimination between the two types of candidates: an independent and a government candidate. But what they've done is average up rather than average down. What it should be is that every candidate, independent or party nominated, should be limited to a donation of \$1,500 from any individual rather than \$30,000. The \$30,000 is a bit of a joke, Mr. Chairman.

Also, while we're at it, sections 30 and 30.1 mention that the federal parties can't donate. In other words, the only tax receipt that will be issued is the provincial portion. I'd be interested in what the hon. Member for Medicine Hat interprets here. Does he mean here that the federal party could donate \$30,000, but there will not be a tax receipt issued for it, that the provincial party can give \$30,000 if it blessed the person and the candidate can issue a tax receipt? I have a little bit of difficulty following that.

If it is true that the federal party cannot donate money to a Senate election, have we gained anything in the idea of a Senate that's truly independent? We've just moved it from one patronage pen to another patronage pen. Indeed, we have the intriguing thing here in Alberta that the only political party of the major parties represented in this House that has a provincial and a federal party distinctly separate from each other is the Alberta Liberal Party. So here we have the Conservative Party and the ND Party that are both part of a unistruature. Anybody can look at it. There's only one Conservative association, there's only one New Democrat association, but there are two Liberal associations. So, intriguingly enough, we have the government sitting here putting a cockeyed Bill through saying that you can collect \$30,000, but it's got to be through the provincial party, and they are part of the federal party. My understanding of how the fountain of truth can sit there squirting at each other -- I mean, who runs who over there? To have the government over there try to intimate that by sections 30 and 30.1 this is going to be under the thumb of the provincial parties is ridiculous, because there's only one provincial party in this province that's registered as a provincial party. Look it up in your Societies Act if you don't believe me. There's only one, and that's the Liberal Party. The Conservative Party is registered jointly. They have two wings, maybe, and they maybe need two wings to fly; I don't know. But the point is that they are one party.

So we have here again an Act saying that a \$30,000 maximum can be donated and also the federal parties can't contribute. Now, I would like to submit, Mr. Chairman: let's go back to what we originally wanted the elected Senate, the Triple E Senate, to do, and that is to caucus by province, not caucus by party. I don't care whether you're a Liberal or a Conservative or a New Democrat, and I've been in politics a long time. For you to just stand up and say that you're calling your own tune

on the national scene is a bunch of malarkey. The Ontario and Quebec Conservatives control the Conservative Party. The Ontario and Quebec Liberals control the Liberal Party. And I've got news for you: the Ontario and Quebec NDP control the New Democratic Party. So to come out now and say that you're getting around this because you're making party donations that the provincial party is given the receipt of is ridiculous. It's flying in the face of common sense. So what we'd like to see is a \$1,500 limit to any candidate, and I know it's difficult to get through at this stage of the game, but I'd like to see taken out of there reference to Conservative or Liberal or registered party. I think a good Senator is one who represents all Albertans and not one who takes his orders from either Edmonton or Ottawa.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Question. All those in favour of the amendment proposed by the hon. Member for Westlock-Sturgeon to section 56, please say aye.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Opposed, please say no.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

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

[One minute having elapsed, the House divided]

For the motion:

Decore	Laing, M.	Taylor
Gagnon	McEachern	Wickman
Gibeault	Mitchell	Wright
Hewes	Roberts	

Against the motion:

Adair	Evans	Moore
Betkowski	Fischer	Oldring
Bogle	Fowler	Orman
Brassard	Gesell	Payne
Cardinal	Horsman	Severtson
Cherry	Hyland	Shrake
Clegg	Johnston	Sparrow
Day	Jonson	Tannas
Dinning	Laing, B	Thurber
Drobot	Lund	Trynchy
Elliott	McClellan	Weiss
Elzinga	Mirosh	West

Totals	Ayes -	11	Noes - 36
--------	--------	----	-----------

[Motion on amendment D lost]

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

[The sections of Bill 11 agreed to]

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill 11, the Senatorial Selection Act, as amended be reported.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Having heard the motion of the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs, all those in favour, please say aye.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Opposed, please say no.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Carried.

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

[One minute having elapsed, the House divided]

For the motion:

Adair	Fischer	Moore
Betkowski	Fowler	Oldring
Bogle	Gesell	Orman
Brassard	Getty	Payne
Cardinal	Horsman	Severtson
Cherry	Hyland	Shrake
Clegg	Johnston	Sparrow
Day	Jonson	Tannas
Dinning	Laing, B.	Thurber
Drobot	Lund	Trynchy
Elliott	McClellan	Weiss
Elzinga	Mirosh	West
Evans		

Against the motion:

Decore	Hewes	Roberts
Fox	Laing, M.	Taylor
Gagnon	McEachern	Wickman
Gibeault	Mitchell	Wright

Totals:	Ayes - 37	Noes - 12
---------	-----------	-----------

[Motion carried]

Bill 5

Department of Health Act

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Minister of Health has tabled an amendment to Bill 5. I don't know if all members have received copies. In any event, I'll recognize the hon. Minister of Health with regard to this.

MRS. BETKOWSKI: Mr. Chairman, in moving committee study of the Bill, there is, as you reference, a government amendment before the House, and I look forward to members' comments thereon.

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

MRS. HEWES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I spoke briefly on this amendment at second reading. I think it's a tremendous improvement in the Bill and will make a great difference. However, I do have some questions about the amendment itself, and I anticipate making some changes to it later on if this amendment is passed.

Mr. Chairman, I still believe that the definition of government health care facilities is infinitely too open-ended. Perhaps the minister would comment on why this definition is used as opposed to the definition that is in the Mental Health Act, newly written and not yet proclaimed. If this definition in fact only relates to four facilities for their disposition, which I appreciate has been stated over and over, then I believe it should be the same definition as the one that relates to those used in the Mental Health Act. I see no reason that these two should not conform. In fact, I think that causes a great deal of confusion and leaves open-ended the matter of whether or not this relates to other facilities that are not now known or understood. So I'd like the minister to respond to that.

Section 11(b)(iii): the section regarding the Nursing Homes Act. Mr. Chairman, I'd like the minister to respond as to whether or not this means that any or all of these facilities could be sold to private for profit institutions in the province or if that somehow is related only to hospital boards or existing boards as we now know them. I think we need to be absolutely clear whether these can be privatized.

Further, the same section that I just referred to specifies the owner of a nursing home as defined in the Nursing Homes Act, which it's my understanding does not define the owner. I believe that should be clarified and amended if in fact that is the case, that the Nursing Homes Act refers to the operator but does not refer to the owner. So we have an absence of a definition there.

Further, Mr. Chairman, I need to know whether this would refer to public health labs. Now, the minister once again has said that this doesn't refer to any except those three institutions. But back to my earlier comments about the definition. Where is the Provincial Laboratory of Public Health? I have not yet had an answer as to where it exists in legislation and if in fact it could even within these amendments fall within this piece of amended legislation. I believe we need to have an answer to that before we should take a vote on it.

[Mr. Jonson in the Chair]

Mr. Chairman, the minister, further, has not in this amendment referred to my concerns expressed on section 8, I believe it is, relative to suppress and control disease. Perhaps I can ask those questions after we give consideration to this amendment in our general discussion of the Act as a whole.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

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

REV. ROBERTS: Yes. I'm interested and pleased with the questions of my colleague from Edmonton-Gold Bar. But I'd also like to say on behalf of our caucus that I think it does show some political sensitivity and courage for a minister to bring in such an amendment as this, as she has before us. It's no great matter in many respects. It simply restates what's already in legislation under the previous Department of Community and

Occupational Health Act, and clearly . . . Well, maybe not so clearly, but it strengthens, at least, how government health facilities are disposed of. The whole language of it being disposed of to any "person or organization," of course, is language that we just find to be ultimately dangerous and unnecessary. So for the minister to bring in this amendment I think shows some courage and some sensitivity, and we applaud her for doing so.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

[Motion on amendment carried]

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I would like to comment that prior to going into Committee of the Whole this morning, the Speaker announced that he had a matter to deal with in addition to the normal adjournment proceeding. So I would now recognize the hon. Government House Leader.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee rise, report progress, and request leave to sit again.

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

MR. JONSON: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has had under consideration the following Bills, reports the following Bills with some amendments: Bill 11; and reports progress on the following Bills: Bill 5.

MR. SPEAKER: Having heard the report, does the Assembly agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed? Carried. Thank you.

With respect to the matter held over from the end of question period, the purported points of order. On an examination of the Blues, which have been distributed to the members for Edmonton-Strathcona, Edmonton-Highlands, and the Leader of the Opposition, examination of the Blues does indeed confirm the fact that a question had been asked as the final supplementary.

An additional matter was raised by the Member for Edmonton-Highlands, who pointed out -- and the quote goes this way:

I would argue that it is not the role of anybody in this Assembly to cut off a question because of the grammatical form in which it is expressed.

The Chair would refer that hon. member to *Beauchesne* 414, part of which reads:

The extent to which supplementary questions may be asked is in the discretion of the Speaker.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, by way of advice to the Assembly as to business for Monday, it is proposed to deal in second reading with Bills on the Order Paper. It will be a day in which we will devote our attention to Bills which are the responsibility of the Provincial Treasurer in second reading before we move on to any other Bills in the names of other ministers. We'll see how we proceed before Monday evening.

[At 12:56 p.m. the House adjourned to Monday at 2:30 p.m.]