

Legislative Assembly of Alberta

Title: **Monday, April 9, 1990 2:30 p.m.**

Date: 90/04/09

[The House met at 2:30 p.m.]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: **Prayers**

MR. SPEAKER: Let us pray.

At the beginning of this week we ask You, Father, to renew and strengthen in us the awareness of our duty and privilege as members of this Legislature.

We ask You also in Your divine providence to bless and protect the Assembly and the province we are elected to serve. Amen.

head: **Presenting Petitions**

MRS. BLACK: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present the following petitions that have been received for private Bills.

1. The petition of the Sisters of Charity of Providence of High Prairie for the Sisters of Charity of High Prairie Amendment Act, 1990.
2. The petition of the Edmonton Research and Development Park Authority for the Edmonton Research and Development Authority Amendment Act, 1990.
3. The petition of the Nechi Institute for the Nechi Community College Act.
4. The petition of the Canada West Insurance Company of Edmonton for the Canada West Insurance Company Amendment Act, 1990.
5. The petition of the Calgary Jewish Academy for the Calgary Jewish Academy Amendment Act, 1990.
6. The petition of the Alberta Wheat Pool for the Alberta Wheat Pool Amendment Act, 1990.
7. The petition of the Grey Nuns of Alberta for the St. Therese Hospital (Grey Nuns) of St. Paul Amendment Act, 1990.
8. The petition of Satnam Parmar for the Satnam Parmar Adoption Termination Act.
9. The petition of La Société de Bienfaisance Charève for La Société de Bienfaisance Charève Tax Exemption Act.
10. The petition of the Campbell McLaurin Foundation for Hearing Deficiencies for the Campbell McLaurin Foundation for Hearing Deficiencies Act.
11. The petition of the Young Mens Christian Association for the Young Mens Christian Association Tax Exemption Amendment Act, 1990.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

head: **Notices of Motions**

MR. CHUMIR: Mr. Speaker, with respect to notices of motion, I would like to give notice to the House of my intention to move a motion under Standing Order 40 with respect to an initiative relating to Senate reform, immediately after question period.

MR. SPEAKER: Is a copy going to be provided to the Chair, please?

MR. CHUMIR: There will be. We're waiting for it to arrive, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Calgary-Mountain View.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to give verbal notice of my intention after question period to seek under Standing Order 40 the unanimous consent of the Legislature in order to introduce the following motion.

Be it resolved that the Legislative Assembly of Alberta urge the government to express to the federal government its strong disapproval of the use of closure to prevent full and adequate debate of goods and services tax legislation in the House of Commons and the recommendation of the Assembly that such closure be immediately revoked.

I do have copies for everyone, Mr. Speaker.

head: **Tabling Returns and Reports**

MR. MUSGROVE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table the report on the provincial Senior Citizens Advisory Council. I have four copies.

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Speaker, I am tabling today the required number of copies of the annual report of Alberta Agriculture for the year 1988-89.

MR. MITCHELL: Mr. Speaker, I table an excerpt from a promotional brochure on Jaakko Pöyry, the company that's been hired to review the Al-Pac review. In this document it's very clear that this company unabashedly bills itself as the largest "consulting engineering organisation in the world serving the forest-based industries."

MRS. MIROSH: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table the 1987-88 Health Disciplines Board annual report, the College of Chiropractors of Alberta 1989 annual report, and the Health and Social Service Personnel Working in Alberta, 1989 annual report.

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table the answer to Written Question 232. I had provided the answer orally on August 17, 1989.

MR. LUND: Mr. Speaker, I would like to file with the Assembly some 600 letters containing the signatures of approximately 650 Rocky Mountain House and area residents strongly supporting the Sunpine development and urging the government to get on with issuing the permits.

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

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I've received nearly 600 letters collected over the last two months from students at the Southern Alberta Institute of Technology. I wish to file five copies of a sample of these letters in the interest of saving paper. The students express their concerns regarding tuition increases, student loan guidelines, and inadequate provincial government funding for capital and operating expenses. I will make the entire file available for any member who wishes to determine whether constituents of theirs may have signed one of these letters.

head: Introduction of Special Guests

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to introduce to you and through you to the members of the Assembly a former member of this Assembly. Seated in your gallery is Mr. Lewis Mitchell Clark, better known to his friends as Mickey Clark, who represented the riding of Drumheller from 1979 to 1986. I'd ask that he stand and receive the normal welcome of the Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Banff-Cochrane.

MR. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's not often that I have an opportunity to introduce special guests from my constituency, particularly students, and so I am very pleased today on behalf of my colleague the hon. Member for Drayton Valley to introduce some of his students. This is the Riverview elementary and junior high school, some 70 members who are seated in the members' and public galleries. I would ask them to rise. Along with them are teachers Dresda Duperron, Joanne Nicholson, Alice Keylor, Alberta Combs, Doug Johnson, Reeva Rowell; parents Phyllis Mozil and Cheryl Wagner; as well as Yoko Nagai who is on a nine-month internship program from Japan. I'd ask all the members in the Assembly to join with me in welcoming these young people with the traditional welcome.

MR. DECORE: Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure for me to introduce students from Archbishop O'Leary high school in Edmonton. They're accompanied by their teacher Marc Poirier. They're in the public gallery, and I would ask that they stand and receive the warm welcome of this Assembly.

head: Ministerial Statements

Agriculture

MRS. McCLELLAN: Mr. Speaker, today marks the beginning of National Soil Conservation Week, April 9 to 15. Albertans are asked this week to give serious thought to the risks facing one of our most precious and most fragile natural resources: the soil. Each of us depends for our most basic needs of food, shelter, and clothing on a thin layer of topsoil. That soil is threatened by wind and water erosion and a host of other degradation problems. Alberta's farmers, the stewards of our agricultural lands and soil, are committed to responsible resource conservation and management efforts, but they cannot win the battle against soil degradation alone. If we are to protect our soil for the benefit of future generations of Albertans, society as a whole must make a commitment to supporting sound conservation practices.

The theme of this year's National Soil Conservation Week is "It's in Your Hands." The Hon. Ernie Isley and I wish to remind our fellow Members of the Legislative Assembly that soil conservation is indeed everyone's problem and that the solution lies in all our hands.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MARTIN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. In rising to reply to the ministerial statement, I certainly agree with the sentiment of this statement, specifically where the minister talks about Alberta's farmers, the stewards of our agricultural lands and soil, committed to responsible resource conservation and management

efforts. But they cannot win the battle against soil degradation alone. I think that's a very important point.

I say to both ministers that we have to concern ourselves with greater attention to the economics of agriculture. I've raised in the House that there is going to be a decline in terms of rural income. We can quibble: one report said 54 percent; the minister said the other day, "Don't worry, farmers; it's only going to go down 48 percent." But because of that pressure in rural Alberta on the farmers – and many of them have mentioned this to me – they do take shortcuts. They know better, but they take shortcuts because they need that cash flow immediately. As a result, we have a serious problem.

There are other reasons, too, but I would just suggest that while agreeing with the sentiments of this, I will be looking for policies flowing from this government in the future that will move away from sort of short-term gain, policies to deal with soil degradation, not only dealing with fertilizers and those sorts of things but also agricultural economics.

Thank you.

head: Oral Question Period

Goods and Services Tax

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the first set of questions to the Premier. Let me first of all say that it's good to have you back, Mr. Premier.

Mr. Speaker, I want to raise, though, a pressing matter. As the Premier is well aware, tomorrow the House of Commons is going to vote on the GST. This is third reading of this particular Bill. I say to the Premier that time is running out for opposing this bad, regressive tax. At least with lip service – we both talk about it. As the Premier is also aware, there was something else going on on the weekend. Albertans across the province took time to make their voices heard one more time. They called the anti-GST hot line, they sent in anti-GST postcards, they filled in ballots in shops and malls, and they knocked on doors to get their neighbours out to fight the tax. Now, we on this side of the House are still fighting the tax. Albertans are fighting the tax. There's only one day left, Mr. Speaker. We want this government to start fighting the tax other than with lip service. I want to ask: will the Premier tell us what he's doing as the Premier of this province to stop this tax before it goes to the vote tomorrow?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I'll try to respond to the hon. member in a reasoned way, and perhaps the hon. Provincial Treasurer may wish to augment my comments as well, since he has been working in this area. All Canadians know that when the federal government first proposed a goods and services tax, this government was the first government that raised the alarm, that drew to the attention of all Canadians the potential damaging impact of that tax. It was this government. Other provinces were not aware of the potential damage. Because they had their own sales tax, they were not taking the time, giving the consideration to the potential damage. The government of Alberta was not alone for long, because we took the time to go to national meetings, to bring together the leaders in Canada, in Alberta – the Premiers – and in a very short period of time we were able to pull unanimous support behind the government of Alberta. We dramatically focused national attention on the goods and services tax so that all Canadians – not just Albertans, all Canadians – were rallying behind the leadership of the

government of Alberta. That has caused a tremendous pressure on the federal government, obviously. The Bill has even been changed. They've changed their intentions. They've lowered it; they've changed other things they were going to do.

Now, it is a fact that there is a government in Canada and there's a Parliament in Canada that I respect, and they will move through their processes. We have not gone to anarchy. We have a system of government we've inherited from other countries. It's there operating. But let it be clear in everybody's mind that there has been one strong leader from the very beginning leading the battle against the goods and services tax, and that is the government of Alberta.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, the Premier can give us all the hot air he wants in here. They can pound their desks all they like, but they are going to vote on it in third reading tomorrow. That's how successful we've been.

When we've asked this government why they won't oppose it, we didn't even get the Treasurer to answer the question. I want to ask the Premier one more time: what is he doing now to oppose this tax? Because it *is* becoming law, Mr. Speaker. He can talk about the ancient past all he likes, but it's becoming law.

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Leader of the Opposition is incorrect with his second supplementary as well. It does not become law tomorrow. It has not made its way through the parliamentary process. He is completely wrong when he says that.

AN HON. MEMBER: Again.

MR. GETTY: Again, as one of my less charitable members says, but I'm trying to be reasoned here today. I was quite touched by the hon. leader's opening comments.

So, Mr. Speaker, I want him to know that we are leading the fight. It is true that in the course of time a government can continue through the various avenues open to it in our House of Commons and Parliament, and that will proceed. But it won't be without everybody knowing that the government of Alberta is doing everything possible, including considering legal methods, to prevent the goods and services tax being imposed on the people of Alberta.

MR. MARTIN: Well, Mr. Speaker, the Premier and I agree on one thing: he is touched. There's no doubt about it.

But my question to the Premier. Again, third reading and then it goes to the Senate: we agree with that, Mr. Speaker. What I'm trying to get from this government is: what are they going to do about it to oppose it? He now says he's going to oppose it legally, and that seems to me . . . Well, you suggested it. Now are you backing off? Will he explain, then, what he meant when he said that they're looking at opposing it legally?

MR. GETTY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I've mentioned before, and throughout Alberta, that as well as government bringing the focus of national attention on this legislation, we have also waited to see how it would finally come out of the House of Commons. I've been telling people this: that we will look to make sure that it can be legally imposed on our province. There's nothing new about that. We would do that with legislation that we dislike. We always will. That goes on with government advisers and task forces.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, it's clear that the government has given up and forsaken Albertans for their federal cousins.

Alberto-Pacific Project Report

MR. MARTIN: I'd like to ask some other questions of the Premier, Mr. Speaker, now that we're both touched and happy about everything. On Friday the Minister of the Environment announced that the government will pay some \$300,000 to \$400,000 to a Finland-based engineering firm, Jaakko Pöyry, to review the review of the Al-Pac proposal. The government had to go a long way to find a company that would carry out the hatchet job on this excellent report. Before the Premier gives us his "world-class" speech, let me remind him that the review panel heard from many world-class scientists before they wrote this report. Three hundred thousand dollars to \$400,000 of taxpayers' money: waste and mismanagement. Three hundred thousand dollars to \$400,000 may not be a lot to this government, but the taxpayers think it's a lot of money. My question is this: how does the Premier justify spending between \$300,000 and \$400,000 – tax dollars – to trash an excellent report done by the Al-Pac review board?

MR. GETTY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I find that an unbelievable comment by the Leader of the Opposition. If he wants to talk about wasting hundreds of thousands of dollars, he should take a look at the Order Paper, at some of the foolish motions for returns that the opposition is putting there and costing taxpayers dollars. Now, there is a waste of money.

Mr. Speaker, when the government received the Al-Pac review board report, we said that we were accepting the report's specific recommendation that the Alpac project not proceed as presently planned.

We said that we would

start a comprehensive review of its recommendations right away [throughout the government]. In addition, an independent assessment of the scientific data in the . . . Board . . . will be launched. [We] will use recognized world experts [to do that].

That's not trashing the report. What kind of nonsense, to use a term like that? What we are doing is going through a reasoned assessment that the people of Alberta would want you to do. We're doing it, Mr. Speaker, with the best advisers we can. We're going to do it not on an emotional basis; we're going to do it on a calm, stable, reasoned basis. That's what the people of Alberta want us to do.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, the people at the Progressive Conservative convention may believe that, but Albertans don't. He won't get away with that.

My question to the Premier. He went through an open process where more than 5,000 Albertans attended public hearings, 750 presentations. Now, this particular hatchet job done by this company will take 40 days and be done behind closed doors. I want to ask this: why does the Premier think a closed-door, quick and dirty study is more acceptable to him than the thorough public investigation that was done by the Al-Pac review panel?

MR. GETTY: Well, Mr. Speaker, give the hon. Leader of the Opposition credit for having some abilities, but he isn't a scientific expert. Where does he get his advice? Obviously, if you can get world-class scientific experts to assess the document, that's helping; that's not hurting. That's helping lead to the right

decisions. That's what we have a responsibility to do. We said we were going to do it, and we're doing it.

My feeling from the people of Alberta is that they want these matters having to do with the environment to be handled not on an emotional basis, not jumping one way or another saying that it's this or that but saying, "Let's have balanced assessment, and then let's make a balanced judgment." That's what we are doing. For the hon. leader to somehow make it seem that this report, that we've received from a fine group of people whom I thanked and congratulated for the work they have done, because that kind of a process has never been done before . . . But having received a report, surely we have a responsibility to assess it. Surely that's what people would want us to do. As I've pointed out in the House earlier, we assess without accepting blindly the Auditor General's report; we assess the Ombudsman's report; we assess the Premier's Commission on Future Health Care for Albertans report. We assess the Brassard report. Mind you, he's got an extra little in with us. But still, we assess these reports. So, Mr. Speaker, it's what a government should do, it's what we are doing, and that's the way the people want us to do it.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, let's look at this "balanced assessment" that the Premier's talking about. I have a report from 1983 in front of me, and I notice that this particular firm, the same firm you're looking for a balanced assessment from, Jaakko Pöyry, recommended that the government proceed with bleached kraft pulp mills in the Athabasca area in 1983. Now, how can this Premier possibly say that this company is objective in assessing proposals that they've already advocated in 1983? What kind of a balanced proposal is that?

MR. GETTY: I take it, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. Leader of the Opposition would want somebody who knew nothing about the subject. That's, I guess, the way the NDP might do it. Surely when you get a world-class independent assessment, you get world-class experts. That is what we have.

MR. SPEAKER: Perhaps we could become world class if we made a little less noise on both sides.

Meech Lake Accord

MR. DECORE: Mr. Speaker, the understanding that Albertans have with respect to Meech Lake has improved dramatically over the last few months. The latest polls show that 64 percent of Albertans disapprove, do not like Meech Lake or its ramifications, and that some 9 percent of Albertans like it. On the weekend the Conservative Party placed itself firmly with the 9 percent who like the accord. The Premier spoke glowingly of the love of Canada that he has and that Albertans have. Well, emotion is fine, and at times it's needed, but it seems to me we need more than emotion at this time. We need some hard details on strategy. My first question is to the Deputy Premier. Given that in the Meech Lake negotiations Alberta has given more than it has received, what hard evidence can this House be given that indicates that the western task force has dealt with this and will come forward with a meaningful strategy with respect to Senate reform?

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. leader of the Liberal Party has taken a firm position against Meech Lake. Of course, he has indicated his interest in public opinion polls. We don't

govern by polls in this province. He might want to confer with Paul Martin, whom he allegedly supports for the Liberal leadership, but we'll see how long he maintains his support for that particular candidate in view of his past action of walking around convention floors and ending up on the right side of the issue.

Mr. Speaker, the task force of officials has met for three days: in Edmonton for two days and then again last Friday in Calgary. They're in the position now of preparing a report which will be submitted to the provincial Premiers from western Canada, and it's anticipated that there will be further discussions amongst those Premiers once that task force report is in their hands. Until such time as that is accomplished, I can't really respond much further as to what will be in those recommendations except to say that there has been a full discussion of all the issues facing us with respect to the Meech Lake accord and Senate reform, which, of course, is the initiative of this government.

MR. DECORE: Mr. Speaker, given that Robbie Robertson also wrote the theme for *The Last Waltz* and that is the theme now for the Conservative Party in Alberta, my next question is to the Premier. [interjections] Take a picture of that, Mr. Treasurer. Take a snapshot.

Given that Legislatures across Canada are now passing resolutions to perfect Meech or to stake out positions that better set out Senate reform or whatever, would the Premier be prepared to request Ontario and Quebec, the Legislatures of both of these provinces, to pass resolutions in their Houses before June 23 committing themselves to a Triple E Senate?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, certainly it would be a wonderful thing to have happen, but obviously the leader of the Liberal Party must have a greater knowledge of this nation than that. Surely he has some greater sense of Canada than that. He knows we are going through a dangerous, serious national debate, one that may lead to the pulling together of this nation into a great country able to reach our potential in the future or one that may lead to serious crisis in our country. One of the things we have tried to do is work in a positive way, starting with, again, just the Alberta government on Triple E Senate. We've now convinced eight Premiers. We have also now had a commitment by the federal government, the first, that they will be recommending in a paper an elected Senate and an effective Senate and, as the Prime Minister has said, we would like to discuss and debate seriously the "equal" feature of it. Well, that is progress, and it's being done on a positive, helpful basis.

The government of Ontario has just recently created a select all-party committee of their Legislature that is traveling throughout Canada, will shortly be in Alberta where I will meet with them, as will the Deputy Provincial Treasurer. I'm sure the Triple E committee under Bert Brown will meet with them, and we'll be making our case to them on the importance of the Triple E Senate. Then they will make the report back to their Legislature. It would hardly be the time, while the select committee is out traveling throughout the country, that back in their Legislature in Ontario they'd go ahead and make the decision for them and place a Triple E Senate resolution; in other words, wipe out the work of their committee.

Mr. Speaker, as far as the province of Quebec, I've told this Legislature and I'll repeat it again: no Premier of Quebec is going to be able to go into his Legislature and say, "I want you to rescind the Meech Lake accord, and I want you now to agree

to a weaker one from the province of Quebec's point of view." I think that will not happen. It certainly will not happen during the period of time we are carrying on constitutional discussions. Therefore, what we have to do is try and work in a positive way to bring Quebec into the constitutional family; to make sure that we have a unified country, to make sure, too, that the provinces continue to be strong and equal so that we can never be treated as we were during the 1980s under a Liberal government; also to make sure that we move strongly to meaningful Senate reform. Now, that is what our government is attempting to do and will continue to do, because in the long run we are not prepared to give up on this country. We're going to fight for it.

MR. DECORE: Mr. Speaker, given that the province of Alberta through the Premier has given in to the demands of Quebec, met the five demands and then some, and the Premier saw no unreasonableness in that, is it not reasonable for the province of Alberta to simply ask, because many Albertans don't believe that this would in fact be the case, that Mr. Bourassa put forward a resolution simply confirming that they agree with the concept of the Triple E Senate? Is that not reasonable for us to ask, Mr. Premier?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. leader thinks deeply about this at all. Surely when we have a conference on Senate reform, it'll be the first time in the history of our nation. We will have never discussed this before as first ministers. Therefore, we're going to have to go through a detailed process of assessment, discussion, and hopefully successful conclusion of those meetings. But they're going to take a considerable amount of time. We're going to have to come up with a reform of the Senate that gives us what we want: stronger provinces no longer able to be dominated by the centre of our nation where the huge populations are. But we must also have a federal government that is able to carry out the will of the people as well. Therefore, the Senate and its powers and its responsibilities must be of a very sensitive nature so that it just doesn't grind the government of Canada to a halt. So these are going to be sensitive, thoughtful, reasoned discussions, and we're working to get around that table all the partners in our Confederation. That's what's so important; we have to have them around the table. Why would you talk about reforming the institutions of a country if you don't have the country together?

I think, Mr. Speaker, on this matter I cautioned leaders throughout this nation that it is not a time for political one-upmanship or put-downs. Instead it is a time for some generosity of spirit, some understanding, some real deep thinking for a change about the future of this nation and what it takes to hold it together and allow it to be great.

MR. SPEAKER: Banff-Cochrane.

MR. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to continue the questioning on the issue of Meech Lake. June 23 is fast approaching, and every day it seems less and less likely that we're going to be able to reach a consensus on Meech Lake by that date, in light of and notwithstanding the fact that the provincial first ministers' task force has been meeting, and today in Ottawa we had the first day of the public hearings on the Meech Lake accord, with the plea of Premier McKenna for a parallel accord to deal with native issues, women's issues, and the concerns of the people in the north. My question is to the

Premier. In light of what is going on, Mr. Premier, will you undertake to meet with Premier Bourassa of Quebec in an effort to soften Quebec's position on the parallel accord so that we can look forward to a First Ministers' Conference in the very near future to get this constitutional accord passed?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I have been talking with Premier Bourassa; I've been talking with Premier Peterson; the Prime Minister on Friday. I've talked to virtually every Premier, I guess, and we are all working towards a successful pulling together of all the parts of our country. I agree with the hon. Member for Banff-Cochrane that it is not going to be easy, and it doesn't look good. But I also say again, as the Deputy Premier said, that we've had the task force meeting. The two Alberta representatives on that task force are, first, Mrs. Oryssia Lennie, who's the new Deputy Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. She's the only lady who sat through every minute of all the Premiers' discussions, either at Meech Lake or at the Langevin Block, who was able to have a full sense of those discussions and was able to make sure that the Alberta position, as I expressed there and as worked through our Legislature and into our intergovernmental meetings, has been faithfully followed. In addition, we have Dr. Peter Meekison, who is an outstanding constitutional scholar. Many know him as well as vice-president of the University of Alberta in the past. But they are representing Alberta. The other Premiers assured me they were sending their best constitutional people as well.

Now, I should let you know that the report is being completed. Premier Filmon has already contacted us to have a meeting within the next two weeks in Manitoba. In those meetings we will have the report, we will look at Premier McKenna's companion resolution, we will have talked again to the Premier of Quebec and other Premiers, and we'll see what we can do as western Premiers. Then, Mr. Speaker, there will be a period of time in which we can do some positive things, and then we will meet again as western Premiers in what is an annual meeting, and that is the Western Premiers' Conference. I expect that will be May 6, 7, 8. So it will come shortly after the first meeting in Manitoba. We will have two western Premiers' meetings then, which will be three, I guess, in some six weeks. All of our efforts are going towards being able to pull together constitutional reform in the way we in western Canada want, making sure, though, that we have an understanding and a tolerance of the needs of other parts of this country.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary, Banff-Cochrane, followed by Stony Plain.

MR. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This question is addressed to the Premier. Despite Quebec's position that it's all or nothing with Meech Lake, is there a time frame prior to June 23 when the province of Alberta will abandon its effort toward Meech Lake and focus its efforts on some kind of alternate accord, which would obviously only be a bare-bones, skeletal form, but at least something that could be on the table prior to June 23?

MR. GETTY: I think if the hon. member's referring to abandoning Meech Lake in terms of no longer trying to see if it can be changed or adjusted, that's one thing. We aren't going to abandon it. But I think, as he has concluded in his question, that he is saying, "Isn't it possible and shouldn't we be focusing on the companion resolution or political accord or parallel

accord, whatever that is?" I assure him and I assure all Albertans and this Legislature: we will look at every possible option to make sure that we haven't missed any chance of working together as Premiers and leaders in Canada to hold our country together and to get the kind of things we want. They aren't that difficult if you express them simply. We want to have national unity. We want Canada held together and strong. We want strong provinces; we don't want powers reverting to Ottawa. We've lived with that kind of a vision, and we know what it can do to the smaller provinces and less populated areas of our country. So we want strong and equal provinces, and we want meaningful Senate reform, Mr. Speaker. That is what we'll work for.

MR. SPEAKER: Stony Plain.

Smoky Lake Poultry Plant

MR. WOLOSHTYN: Thank you. It is a fundamental cornerstone of parliamentary democracy, Mr. Speaker, that a member of this Assembly should not use his or her public office for private economic gain. The Member for Redwater-Andrew has been actively lobbying the town council of Smoky Lake to approve the location of a chicken processing plant on a commercial site in which the member has a financial interest. The town would prefer to locate the proposed chicken plant in an industrial park south of town but have been told by their MLA that the required provincial funding for services will not be available for at least two years. To the Premier then. Given that the Member for Redwater-Andrew suggested to a meeting of town council that unless they approve the location of the chicken plant in the member's commercial subdivision, the plant would then be moved to another municipality, does the Premier believe that this is acceptable conduct by a member of his government?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I draw to the House's attention and yours, sir, that the member, I believe, subject to reviewing the Blues, has made a very serious allegation, one which under our conflict of interest legislation . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: We don't have any.

MR. GETTY: The Legislative Assembly Act, which is some of the strongest conflict of interest legislation in Canada, would actually cause a member to lose his seat. So, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the hon. member who raised the question to think seriously whether he has his facts at hand, because he should, then, be able to make them available either to me or a committee of this House, perhaps a Committee on Privileges and Elections – we'll have to see whether he is really heading down that route – or perhaps to you, Mr. Speaker. But I want him to be very careful when he is dealing with something that affects the privileges of a member in this Legislature.

MR. WOLOSHTYN: Mr. Speaker, I am satisfied with the validity of the information which I have.

Given that there is every appearance of a conflict of interest on the part of the Member for Redwater-Andrew, will the Premier commit himself to investigating this matter and report-

ing his findings to Albertans and to this Assembly?

MR. SPEAKER: First, the Chair directs that the Member for Stony Plain will supply the evidence to the Chair. [interjections] Thank you.

MR. DECORE: What's the *Beauchesne* citation?

MR. SPEAKER: Standing Order 23(h), *Beauchesne* 409(7), *Beauchesne* 411(5). Perhaps the hon. member will indeed be able to substantiate certain allegations.

The Premier, if you wish, on the supplementary.

MS BARRETT: Point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.
Edmonton-Meadowlark.

Alberta-Pacific Project Report

(continued)

MR. MITCHELL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Jaakko Pöyry, the company which has been hired to review the Al-Pac review, describes itself as "serving the forest-based industries" and as having done "250 engineering projects, representing a total output of 25 million tons per year of pulp, paper and wood products": quite the boast for a firm that has been hired to do – and I use this term loosely – an objective assessment of Al-Pac related environmental data. To the Premier. Could the Premier please confirm that Jaakko Pöyry has in fact done work directly for Mitsubishi in the past, and is this not a clear conflict of interest for this firm in this case?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, the selection of the company to handle the assessment of scientific data – and let's be clear: the hon. member in his question did not say that. He didn't even say what they've been asked to do. What they've been asked to do is a comprehensive assessment of the scientific data in the review board report, not to do an environmental assessment of the Al-Pac project. It's on the scientific data. Now, to do that, you get somebody who knows something about the whole matter. Mr. Speaker, obviously we've taken some time to find an independent, world-class expert, and they are doing the work.

MR. MITCHELL: Perhaps you should hire environmentalists instead of engineers.

Would it not be so much more appropriate to ask the Royal Society of Canada's Academy of Science to appoint an objective panel to review this data rather than risk undertaking this firm, which has a clear conflict of interest with Mitsubishi in this case?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of the Environment assured me that he had reviewed all of the available options for a detailed, independent, scientific assessment of the data, and that's what we have done. We have selected the organization to do it. It hardly brings credit on the Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark to now start to take shots at people as having conflicts of interest and so on. Surely he can accept that you can have organizations and companies that can do independent assessments for a variety of organizations and any business without being on one side or another.

Environmental Assessments of Pulp Mills

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I think it would come as no surprise to the people of northern Alberta, who are particularly fortunate to have a forest resource around them, to know that there are a great many people in southern Alberta, in my constituency and other places, who are concerned about various reports they hear about the forestry proposals. I think everybody knows that on the weekend there were a number of reports that came out of a political convention that spoke about a number of those projects. My question is to the Premier. The reports I think some of us are concerned about out of that convention – is the Premier in a position to comment on whether or not any of the directions that were discussed on the weekend have had an impact on the government's thinking with respect to the projects at this time?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, there was a very effective debate being carried on in the whole area of environmental matters in southern Alberta over this past weekend. I must say that if there's one thing that makes me very proud, it's to be able to see people from all over this province, from every part of the province, from all kinds of different backgrounds, come and in such an earnest and sincere way express their views about their love for the land and their love for our forests and mountains and love for the environment in this province, and, at the same time, make sure that their government and our party deal with these matters in a way that is sound and reasoned and with judgment. That debate went on, and it has led us to believe that the way we are proceeding in Alberta is the right way: tough, strong environmental laws, being strengthened again in this year's Legislative Assembly, a new natural resources conservation board being approved, hopefully, in this Assembly. To see Albertans coming together expressing their concern and yet wanting balanced assessment gives me a good feeling, Mr. Speaker, that we're going the right way in this province.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, we've heard today that there has been a firm hired by the Minister of the Environment, the government of Alberta, to do an assessment on a report that has already been done. Although it may have been more appropriate to address this to the Minister of the Environment, I would also ask the Premier to comment as to whether this firm, given the discussions that we have heard around this province, might also make comment on the technical information that has been provided to the government of Alberta on the other projects that are presently at hand.

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I'd certainly be happy to discuss the matter with our Minister of the Environment and our Minister of Forestry, Lands and Wildlife. There may be something helpful they could do. I draw attention to the hon. member that we want them, for the purpose of their current assessment, to be able to give us the best possible assessment of the scientific data in the AI-Pac report while the various departments of government are assessing that report. But it may be that we can get some additional information that will help all Albertans, and I'll discuss that with my ministers.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Kingsway.

Goods and Services Tax

(continued)

MR. McEACHERN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Premier. As far back as 1986 when negotiating the free trade deal, the federal government made it very clear that tax reform was an essential adjunct to the signing of an agreement. In fact, both Mr. Mulroney and Mr. Wilson indicated right from the start that the MST would have to be replaced by a consumer tax similar to the GST, and this government knew that. Is the reason this government has been not only hypocritical but very ineffectual in fighting the GST because all along they knew that the GST was an unavoidable consequence of free trade?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, feeling generous as I am today, I won't say that that *is* just nonsense, but surely the hon. member knows there are no facts in that allegation.

MR. McEACHERN: We're told day after day that the MST made our exports uncompetitive in the American market and, therefore, had to be replaced by a GST. This government had money to support the Tory MPs that are now trying to push the GST on us because he wanted a free trade deal back in the 1988 election. They've got no money for the Pro-Canada Network's anti-GST campaign. So I'd like to know: who is it that this government has double-crossed? Is it the federal Tory cousins or the people of Alberta or both?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member took a very strong stand in the 1988 election, I gather, and was repudiated and is still fighting the 1988 election. I'd like to drag him up into the 1990s, with the government.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Jasper Place.

Environmental Assessments of Pulp Mills

(continued)

MR. McINNIS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Premier talks about love for the environment, and he promised that he would protect our environment against polluting industries. He said he wanted reports to be tough on environmental issues. On Friday his Minister of the Environment had to admit that he wasn't even shown a copy of the draft legislation on the natural resources conservation board Act, and today the government appoints a company that first recommended a pulp mill at Athabasca to review a report recommending against it. I would like the Premier to tell us what assurance he can give the House today that his government will never again sell out the environment the way it did on Daishowa, Procter & Gamble, Weldwood, and on down the list.

MR. GETTY: I guess, Mr. Speaker, it's almost like Friday morning when we hear the hon. member with that kind of an allegation. As the Minister of the Environment said – and I reviewed the *Hansard* – this first draft has been changed. There could well be second, third, fourth, and fifth drafts. Now, why he would want to be concentrating on the first one, I don't know. Maybe the hon. member wants to. But let's be very clear about this: the government of Alberta and the people of Alberta have established this, as we said *in* our throne speech, as the most beautiful, environmentally sensitive, and strong

province in Canada. We don't say it idly at all. We say it because it's a fact, and we're going to keep it that way.

MR. SPEAKER: The time for question period has expired. Might we have unanimous consent to complete this series of questions?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed? Carried.
Edmonton-Jasper Place.

MR. McINNIS: Mr. Speaker, it's the Premier that focuses on the first draft of the legislation, not me.

My question to the Premier is a simple one. You sold out the environment on five pulp mills in Alberta. You didn't allow public hearings. The Federal Court of Canada has criticized Alberta's environment review process for not involving people and for not providing independent review. The question is a very simple one.

MR. SPEAKER: Let's have it.

MR. McINNIS: My question is: what assurance will the Premier give that this government will never again sell us out like it did on the first five pulp mills? That's the question.

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, this government has never sold out our province, and the people of Alberta have always shown that by their strong support of this government. We never have in the past, and we never will in the future. Those kinds of thoughts are a figment of the hon. member's imagination, obviously not a very good one.

MR. SPEAKER: Before we deal with a point of order and two requests under Standing Order 40, might we have unanimous consent to revert to the Introduction of Special Guests?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed? Carried. Thank you.
Edmonton-Belmont.

head: **Introduction of Special Guests** (reversion)

MR. SIGURDSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you to the hon. members of the Assembly. It's a pleasure today to introduce to you and to all members of the Assembly 17 very special guests from the McClure United Church, which is situated in the heart of Edmonton-Belmont. They're here with their president, Mrs. Doris Taylor, and their secretary treasurer, Mrs. Olia Musick. They're seated in the public gallery. I'd ask that they rise and receive the warm and traditional welcome of the Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER: Point of order. Edmonton-Highlands.

MS BARRETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In reference to questions asked by the Member for Stony Plain and your request for information or evidence to be cited. In the first instance, I believe the member did not quote any document at all; but in

the second instance, even if he had, I believe that those who are not members of Executive Council are exempt from the documents cited rule, *Beauchesne* citation 495(6). I also did look at the references that you made, and I believe the case could not be made that there was any violation of 409(10), as the member in question – that is, the Member for Redwater-Andrew – is not a member of Executive Council.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: There are two points to bear in mind here. Number one, again, as agreed by House leaders prior to the Assembly being opened, hon. members were going to indeed stand up and fight their own battles. Secondly, however, though the Chair was giving direction to the Member for Stony Plain that perhaps the member would like to share information with the Chair, the Chair was really bringing the member to order with respect to our own Standing Orders:

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

(h) makes allegations against another member.

And that's clearly what was happening.

(i) imputes false or unavowed motives to another member.

And that, perhaps, was what happened.

Then again, with the references in terms of *Beauchesne*, 409(7) comes into place here in terms of calling order.

A question must adhere to the proprieties of the House, in terms of inferences, imputing motives or casting aspersions upon persons within the House or out of [the House.]

And again, 411, the same reference needs to be read here.

Some further limitations seem to generally understood. A question may not:

(5) reflect on the character or conduct of the Speaker or other occupants of the Chair, Members of either House of Parliament and members of the judiciary.

The Member for Redwater-Andrew is indeed a member of this House, and so the Chair intervened in terms of bringing it to order.

head: **Motions Under Standing Order 40**

MR. SPEAKER: Standing Order 40 request. Calgary-Buffalo.

Mr. Chumir:

Be it resolved that the Legislative Assembly support an amendment to the Constitution of Canada to reform the Senate of Canada upon the terms proposed by Clyde Wells of Newfoundland as set out in the appendix hereto,* to provide, amongst other matters, for:

- (i) the election of six Senators from each province for a term of six years,
- (ii) equal legislative power with the House of Commons with the exception of the power to appropriate money and impose taxation,
- (iii) a reconciliation committee consisting of 10 members from each of the House of Commons and Senate to reconcile differences, and
- (iv) the power to veto major appointments to defined Crown corporations, boards, or commissions.

MR. CHUMIR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Other details are set out in the appendix to the motion.

Now, I will restrict my comments, of course, under Standing Order 40, to the urgent and pressing nature of dealing with this motion at the present time, Mr. Speaker. The motion is brought in the context of the Progressive Conservative Party convention

*see appendix

motions this past weekend in support of Meech Lake, which are, of course, in contrast to the motions at the Alberta Liberal Party convention opposing Meech Lake and a long-standing position of the Alberta Liberal Party caucus in opposition to this. [interjection] Ants in your pants, Jim?

It's clear, Mr. Speaker, that this government is very clearly committed to the Meech Lake accord notwithstanding its many flaws, particularly relating to the absence of guarantees for Senate reform, which render it almost impossible, through the requirement of unanimity, as well as having very foolishly given up our bargaining chips in advance for a mere promise to talk. Now, it's clear that if the Meech Lake accord passes, we can kiss goodbye to Senate reform. The Meech Lake accord is at this stage, in fact, in some trouble, but negotiations are in process in an attempt to save it. Now, it's very important to note that none of the new proposals involve advancements with respect to the cause of Senate reform. The current discussions do not deal with that. The Premier tells us that he has confidence in the future negotiations with other provinces on this matter, but that is not good enough. We need some commitments . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: We know what we're doing, Jim. Don't worry about it.

MR. CHUMIR: That's right; we're all right, Mr. Minister.

We need some commitments which are totally absent, and the fact of that absence speaks volumes. It's important, accordingly, that this government take some initiatives, Mr. Speaker, to at the very least tie down other provinces, particularly Quebec and Ontario. There's no sign that Quebec has any intention of moving towards Senate reform, so we need a commitment. And in order to get some commitment from these provinces, we need more than a general statement with respect to Triple E. [interjections] Listen. These . . . [interjections] Mr. Speaker, they're not listening. I'm directing my mind to this question of urgency. They obviously can't follow an argument.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member, take your seat, please. The Chair is listening, and the Chair is now watching the clock. It's up to about four minutes that the member has been speaking. Let's come back to urgency.

MR. CHUMIR: It's obvious the government can't follow an argument.

I was saying with respect to the element of urgency, Mr. Speaker, that we need some commitment from the other provinces rather than just general statements with respect to the Triple E Senate. In order to get that commitment, you need something specific, a specific proposal to confront these other governments with, particularly Quebec and Ontario. We have to see whether they agree with what our conception is, and if not, what changes are necessary.

This format, this model is very, very urgently needed in light of the June 23 deadline with respect to the Meech Lake accord, because once that date has been passed, we lose all leverage. So this House needs urgently to discuss what our provincial position is with respect to Senate reform. We don't know. That's what this motion proposes. We've gone almost three years since the Meech Lake accord has passed, and this government has not brought forward a single iota of detail with respect to what its conception is. How can you expect other provinces to agree with something if you don't yourself know what you're proposing? So it's time to get specific so that we can deal with other

provinces. That's the nature of this motion, and that's the urgency.

MR. SPEAKER: Under Standing Order 40, the request for unanimous consent. Those willing to give unanimous consent, please say aye.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed, please say no.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion fails.

The Chair would also like to point out to hon. members that in future particular motions that purport to deal with constitutional matters should probably be examined as to whether or not they need to be published in the two official languages of Canada.

Calgary-Mountain View.

Mr. Hawkesworth:

Be it resolved that the Legislative Assembly of Alberta urge the government to express to the federal government its strong disapproval of the use of closure to prevent full and adequate debate of goods and services tax legislation in the House of Commons and the recommendation of the Assembly that such closure be immediately revoked.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise under Standing Order 40 to seek the unanimous consent of this Assembly in order to place this resolution before it.

Mr. Speaker, in terms of the urgent and pressing necessity, the goods and services tax is bad for Alberta; the goods and services tax is bad for Canada. It's an unfair tax, a regressive tax, and it hits hardest at Alberta's middle class and Alberta's poor. Ordinary people know it's wrong. Only the federal Conservative government appears to support it.

Mr. Speaker, within the next 24 hours or so legislation presently before the House of Commons will have received third and final reading and will be well on the way to becoming the law of this nation. We have today to make our views known if we are in any way to have an influence on the federal government to prevent them from making a mistake that will severely harm millions of Canadians. We have a choice today, Mr. Speaker, and it is a choice today. Will we or will we not do all in our power as an Assembly representing the people of this province to try and stop this tax, even at this 11th hour, by sending an all-party message to the federal government? It would be, I grant you, an unprecedented move, but what's desperately needed at this late date is just that: unprecedented moves. If we're to have any success at all, we have to do what has not been done before, and we have today and no other day to do it.

Mr. Speaker, we've recently witnessed what happens when the Quebec Assembly from different sides of the House join to speak on behalf of their province when they perceive that their interests are at stake. When they join to pass resolutions, the repercussions are discussed all across our nation. Well, we in the New Democratic caucus believe that Alberta's interests are very much at stake with the proposed passage of the goods and services tax. We would like to find out if this government shares

our views. We must let go of the NATO strategy, Mr. Speaker; that is, no action; talk only.

The time for words, the time for briefs has passed. The time for action by the Alberta Legislature has now arrived, and it's only going to be in the next few hours, the next day or so, that we'll have this opportunity. Everyone in this Legislature says that they're opposed to the goods and services tax. Mr. Speaker, this unanimity is rare. At least we agree on the surface. Let's prove to Canada that our agreement is more than skin deep. Let's use our common sense and really send Ottawa a message. It's now or never, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Calgary-Mountain View, invoking provision under Standing Order 40, makes the request for unanimous consent to proceed. Those in favour of granting unanimous consent, please say aye.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed, please say no.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. SPEAKER: The request fails.

head: **Orders of the Day**

head: **Committee of Supply**

[Mr. Schumacher in the Chair]

MR. CHAIRMAN: The committee will come to order.

head: **Main Estimates 1990-91**

Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would recognize the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Chairman, 1989-90 was an eventful and important year for me and my department as well as for Alberta and Canada. I'd like to say that during the course of the last few months the services which had been rendered to my department by Al McDonald as deputy minister since February 1986 came to an end, and he has now become the Deputy Minister of Economic Development and Trade. I'd like to pay tribute to his years of service to the Department of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. During that time he has provided us with good judgment and strong leadership within the department, and I want all hon. members to be aware of that.

Immediately upon that decision having been announced, it was my great pleasure indeed to recommend to my colleagues and Executive Council the appointment of Mrs. Oryssia Lennie as the deputy minister of the department. That marks only the second occasion on which a woman has become a deputy minister of our government, and she is, I'm convinced, going to provide extra special leadership to the department in her role as deputy minister. I want to thank her for her years of service as the assistant deputy minister, and before that, executive director. She is an expert in constitutional matters, and our province and Canada will be well served by her in her new capacity.

My department staff worked effectively with other departments, provincial governments, the federal government, and foreign governments to co-ordinate Alberta's intergovernmental activities and interests. A primary role of my department is to provide support to other ministers and their departments to help achieve Alberta's intergovernmental objectives.

With respect to international trade issues, my department continues to be involved in the Uruguay Round of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade Multilateral Trade Negotiations. There's a tremendous amount of work to be done in order to make the Uruguay round a success, particularly in the area of agriculture, and we will work hard with the ministers of agriculture to ensure that Alberta's concerns for world market liberalization are addressed as part of Canada's overall GATT strategy. Alberta's export-oriented sectors of grains, oilseeds, and red meats must see significant results from the Uruguay round. The multilateral trade negotiations are scheduled to conclude this December in Brussels, and I anticipate that I will be part of the Canadian delegation to that concluding meeting.

We will also continue to monitor developments and represent Alberta's interests in the U.S., particularly with respect to the Canada/United States free trade agreement. As hon. members are aware, there will be ongoing negotiations on the subject of subsidies, countervailing duties, as well as a number of issues now being addressed by the dispute settlement mechanism. My department will continue to represent Alberta's interests on these matters. I am pursuing with the federal government Alberta's position that the province must be a full participant in these ongoing negotiations.

Given the increasingly prominent role provincial policies, practices, and programs now play in international trade negotiations, there can be no question that the provinces need to be joint partners on the Canadian team in developing and advancing Canada's positions. In fact, I will be meeting my ministerial colleagues shortly to further refine Canada's negotiating position. I will continue to represent Alberta on the Canada/U.S.A. Legislative Project, a State Legislative Leaders Foundation, the newly established Pacific Northwest legislative leadership forum, the Alberta/Montana Boundary Advisory Committee, and promote our activities in Canadian studies and other programs to encourage a better understanding and closer co-operation with our American neighbours.

This last fiscal year also saw several developments in other areas of my department, including Alberta's special relationship program and the operation of our six foreign offices.

The department is currently involved in sister province relations with Heilongjiang in the People's Republic of China, Hokkaido in Japan, and Kangwon in the province of Korea. These special relationships, considered the most active of their kind anywhere, are based on the striking similarities of our climate, geography, and resources. With these provinces these relationships have resulted in the development of numerous exchange programs: international co-operation involving thousands of Albertans in areas such as science and technology, trade, education, culture, athletic training, agriculture, and medical research. This year will mark the 10th anniversary of our twinning relationship with Hokkaido, and there are several activities being co-ordinated by my department to celebrate this anniversary. In September a delegation of 800 will be led by the governor of Hokkaido. They will visit Alberta and participate in the full program of events in communities across the province, and in return I will lead a business and government delegation to Hokkaido this autumn.

This past October I returned from a mission to the Soviet Union where Alberta signed the very important memorandum of understanding with the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, the largest republic in the Soviet Union. This agreement provides the basis for exchanges in many areas, including culture, education, the environment, science and technology, political systems, but, most importantly, trade and investment. The Soviet and Russian governments through their policies of perestroika and glasnost are dedicated to creating an environment that will both make them more productive and competitive and able to trade in international markets and make their regions profitable and secure ones in which to invest.

I do not want to suggest, however, that there's not a very long way to go. It's going to take sustained efforts by the governments and workers in the Soviet Union to make their economy a competitive one in relationship to the world marketplace. In the areas of productivity, technology, management, packaging, advertising, and delivery, the Soviet Union lags behind the world's economic leaders, and they recognize this. It's going to take years to train enough people to gain the technology to make the business contacts that we know are so important. But I believe that they have a will to do it, and I believe Alberta can play a role in this perestroika, or restructuring, to use the English word. We already have a head start, since Alberta's oil and gas industry has established an excellent track record, and Alberta is acknowledged, even by senior politburo members with whom I met, as the most active Canadian province in promoting relations with the U.S.S.R.

Through this agreement we have just signed and through the trade Alberta has already done with the Soviet Union, we are well positioned to take advantage of the opportunities that exist in this redeveloping economy. In the areas of biotechnology, agricultural and processed food products, advanced telecommunications and other high technologies, oil and gas related technology and equipment, forest technology, waste disposal and environmental technology, and cold weather technology – areas where we have world-class expertise – we can do business with the Soviet Union. Over the next several months several exchanges and ventures that fall under the umbrella agreement will take place, and delegations from Recreation and Parks, the Alberta Research Council, Agriculture, and special waste management have already traveled to Russia this year.

As the news from the Soviet Union and eastern Europe indicates, every day sees change and reforms in the eastern bloc. Alberta would do well to follow these developments closely, for I believe the 21st century could well see the emergence of one of the most powerful political and economic blocs in the world as eastern and western Europe move towards integration. Our government is determined to expand our ties in this region, and my department will continue to help co-ordinate these activities.

Alberta's foreign offices play a vital role in promoting the province's international interests. The offices work in conjunction with Alberta's private sector, government departments, and Canadian embassies and consulates on a wide range of projects and activities. While each office has a somewhat different mandate, all six share a few primary objectives. First, each office works together with Albertans promoting the sale of Alberta projects and services in their regions. In addition, our foreign offices work to encourage and secure investment and, where appropriate, business immigration that will contribute to Alberta's economic development and our diversification and employment. They also provide intelligence and information on developments and competitors in their respective region, and this

information contributes significantly to the formulation of Alberta's trade and investment strategies. Finally, these offices enhance the awareness and understanding of Alberta, and thereby help to market Alberta in the broadest sense.

Most of the offices have an active and important role in promoting Alberta as a tourist destination, identifying high-technology products and services that could be of potential benefit to Alberta, and assisting with cultural and educational activities. As my outline of their activities indicates, the role of our foreign offices in expanding our markets and enhancing our existing markets is vital.

In addition to those activities related to Alberta's international relations, we are also actively involved in pursuing Alberta's interests as they relate to issues between our province and the government of Canada. In the areas of the goods and services tax, the current high interest rate policy, and implications of the recent federal budget we will continue to voice our strong opposition to policies which will potentially harm the economic growth of Alberta and the overall prosperity of our citizens. It's a vitally important time for Alberta's efforts to expand and diversify our economy. We want to ensure that the confidence that exists in Alberta today is not shaken by these policies.

We also want to ensure that our constitutional responsibilities remain firmly in our hands, particularly as they relate to jurisdiction over the environment. Federal government initiatives and the growing number of court challenges have created a climate of uncertainty that is weakening investor confidence in Alberta, and we will continue to work very hard to ensure that our constitutional responsibilities – and I underline that word responsibilities – are not infringed upon, and to ensure that the orderly, efficient, and responsible development of Alberta's natural resources remains within our hands.

Protection of our environment has long been a priority of our government. Alberta maintains the most stringent environmental standards and practices in the world, and while we are more than prepared to co-operate with other governments in addressing environmental issues, we will not allow the rights of Albertans to determine their future to be compromised.

The department plays a key role in communicating Alberta's economic and diversification priorities to the federal government. We have established and maintain an office in Ottawa to directly liaise with federal officials. In addition, the department is responsible for co-ordinating policy issues related to the federal Department of Western Economic Diversification and the Canada/Alberta Economic and Regional Development Agreement. This agreement provides for joint federal/provincial co-operation based on joint planning and programming, and I'm looking forward to concluding negotiations on a new generation of subagreements that will reflect Alberta's economic priorities.

We are also responsible for helping protect and enhance Alberta's role within Confederation. A major activity we have been and will continue to be involved in is Senate reform. As the hon. members are aware, at the 1988 Premiers' Conference in Saskatoon, Premier Don Getty received the support of all Premiers to lead discussions with the other provincial governments and the federal government. All Premiers – including, I note, the Premier of the province of Quebec, at a meeting in 1989 which he chaired in Quebec City, of the Premiers – asked Alberta to continue with its responsibilities in that area. As a result, the Senate Reform Task Force, the task force which I've just mentioned and which I chaired, visited every province, the federal government, and the territorial governments.

We completed our first round of discussions this past July. The results of the first cross-country mission were very positive. Today in Canada eight provincial governments support the Triple E concept in principle. As a result of this government's leadership in promoting Senate reform, we are confident that when we get to the constitutional table to discuss the issue, it will be the Alberta model that all the provinces and the federal government will be discussing. Alberta went a step further, as all members are aware, with regard to bringing about Senate reform and dealt with the issue, not satisfactorily yet, by the Senatorial Selection Act.

Closely related to Senate reform and another major issue facing my department is the Meech Lake accord. To comment on the accord as it relates to my present and future activities, I'd like to repeat some remarks I made this past week. I said:

I know all members are aware of the tension that exists in Canada today as a result of the controversy surrounding the accord. This tension is not simply between the governments of the dissenting provinces, the federal government, and the government of Quebec, but a tension that affects all governments. At the same time, the public and media debate on the issue has created a whole mythology surrounding the Meech Lake accord, and in fact, a mythology surrounding the very nature of Confederation.

An "it's us against them" attitude – whether it's Newfoundland against Quebec, or French against English – is becoming more and more prevalent. It's a major factor in the polarizing of positions we are experiencing now. And I can tell you, the mythology – the tensions – that attitude will only increase if the accord fails.

I'm not predicting that Quebec will separate from Canada, and I pray to God that it does not – for if it does, Alberta will lose its best ally at the constitutional table. Alberta and Quebec have long been the strongest defenders of provincial rights. It was Quebec that allied with Alberta in opposing the national energy program. It was Quebec who allied with Alberta as the strongest supporters of the free trade agreement. It was Quebec who supported Alberta on our position with respect to resource ownership leading up to the constitutional amendments of 1982. It is Quebec who supports Alberta in preventing federal intrusions into areas of provincial jurisdiction. With Quebec separated from Canada – or even absent from the constitutional table – it would be extremely difficult to improve our federal system, and more than likely, we would see the system degenerate.

If the accord succeeds, however, I believe Canadians will discover, in a short time, that the workings of our country have improved, not degenerated, and that Quebec isn't getting more than their share of the constitutional pie. A good analogy is the free trade issue. For all the fearmongering that the opponents of the deal created, it was not long before Canadians realized that our culture and our social programs weren't being sold out. It's business as usual; that's what we want to achieve with the Meech Lake accord – government as usual, with everybody participating, all the partners participating.

Now, the real issues facing Canada are economic – the rising deficit, taxes, interest rates – balancing development with environmental protection, and international trade challenges – and these are the issues provincial and federal governments should be addressing. To expend all this time and energy questioning 123 years of Confederation, questioning whether Quebec is distinct or not when it has really been such since before 1867, and questioning the future of Canada, when it is a reluctance to ratify the accord that is placing this future in jeopardy – surely we must get on with it. Anything else before we approve the accord, do they really think that either Quebec or the federal government is going to sit down to discuss these issues as long as Quebec remains isolated with respect to the Constitution? The Meech

Lake accord is our best chance to achieve future amendments to our Constitution.

Under the leadership of the Premier we will continue in our efforts to see the accord ratified. I'm sure all hon. members are aware of the remarks made by the Premier on Meech Lake at our annual convention this past weekend and the support his remarks received by the party. Our Premier and our province are not prepared to turn our backs on our commitment to Canadian unity and the continued strength of our Confederation. I'd just like to quote briefly from remarks he made at that convention, and the views coincide precisely with mine and with the delegates at that convention and, I believe, with the people of Alberta. He said:

Let it be clearly understood in this room. Canada can be a great nation. Canada has great potential, but we can only achieve greatness by being unified, not by pulling ourselves apart.

In the coming weeks and months there will be unprecedented pressures and responsibilities on leaders in Canada. If they care about Canada, they will have to show a love of their country, a generosity of spirit, tolerance and loyalty – but these feelings are not being expressed across our nation by the people we lead.

I stand for a united Canada, despite the flaws, despite my frustrations, despite the confusions, and despite the turmoil.

It seems strange to even need to say that I stand for a united Canada, but such are the times.

Many Canadians are simply tired. They just want the debates to end.

Others, like the P.Q. in Quebec, want it all to unravel.

As your leader, I refuse to play games with my country. I will never gamble with Canada.

I will never turn my back on Canada.

Those words, I thought, summed up the great feeling that he has as a leader of our province, and I think all hon. members of this Assembly, despite what their political party may be, must recognize the leadership inherent in those words.

MR. CHUMIR: A father of Confederation. Another John A. Macdonald. How are the posters selling?

MR. HORSMAN: Well, the hon. Member for Calgary-Buffalo makes light of the Premier's words. I'm ashamed to hear him say that in this House, ashamed that the Member for Calgary-Buffalo would make light of that expression of patriotism and leadership delivered by our Premier. I'm ashamed of the Member for Calgary-Buffalo for having said that in this Assembly.

In conclusion, hon. members, I should state that funding for my department will increase by 9 percent in the forthcoming fiscal year, and the increase is due to the extra costs associated with operation of our foreign offices. It is a reflection of the increasingly important role our foreign offices play in protecting and promoting Alberta's international interests. As I have indicated in providing a background of the initiatives my department will be involved in over the coming year, my role as minister and as Deputy Premier often requires active participation in various conferences, meetings, and presentations. I will continue to travel extensively within the province, to other parts of Canada, and internationally as required to best serve the interests of Albertans.

Mr. Chairman, I'd be happy to listen to representations of members of the Assembly, to answer any questions which may be put to me. And should I not be able to respond today, I will undertake to do so in writing to specific issues which may be brought forward today.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Members of the committee, it's proposed to proceed in a similar manner as we did the other evening in the Department of Culture and Multiculturalism, whereby the hon. Member for Edmonton-Highlands will not use her allotted time in order to allow the Member for Edmonton-Avonmore – to be restricted to the total amount the hon. Member for Edmonton-Highlands would have otherwise been entitled to. On that basis, are we prepared to proceed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

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

MS BARRETT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, thanks very much. I would like to comment first of all with respect to some of the minister's comments. He started to talk about perestroika in the Soviet Union and eastern Europe. I'm glad that the minister has finally realized, after four years of me being in the Assembly telling him that the Cold War was over, that indeed it is. Secondly, I wish to heavens that the Conservative government here would realize the implications of something like perestroika, which is economic restructuring, and glasnost, which is a little bit more concrete a term for democracy than that which we have in our language, the important part of that being, Mr. Chairman, listening to people and stopping deals that are done behind closed doors. I would point out that this government has one sorry track record of secret deals having been conducted from behind closed doors, most recently the forestry management agreements, the deals with the pulp mills, and the deal with Peter Pocklington, their poor old friend Mr. Puck, which is costing Albertans untold millions of dollars. So while it's nice to give lip service to concepts like perestroika and glasnost, it might be worth while for the minister to consult someone who is fluent in the Russian language to get an idea of the deeper meaning of those words, and then apply them to the way this government conducts its business in Alberta.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I realize that the minister wants it both ways when it comes to the use of his office. He's proud to use his office to support things like the free trade agreement a couple of years ago, to sponsor positions of the government with respect to constitutional affairs, but he sure shies off, as does every other member of his government as far as I can see, from using the weight of this department when it comes to fighting the goods and services tax. On that basis alone I would shout "mendacity" at them, because the fact is that if the Conservative government had not spent three-quarters of a million dollars from taxpayers' coffers to sponsor their public advertising campaign in support of the FTA, we wouldn't be stuck with the GST. So I don't think you can have it both ways. In fact, I will allude later on to correspondence from the minister on matters unrelated to this which indicate that he's prepared to use his office under some circumstances, and in other circumstances he says, "Aw, the issue is purely federal; I can't do anything about it."

Now, he also took the opportunity – and I noticed the order of priority, by the way, Mr. Chairman – to say that we can't afford to have Quebec out of the Constitution because, after all, they've been our greatest allies in fighting the federal government over jurisdiction. And he goes on to say: for instance, the courts and the feds having too much power over our environmental policies. Well, there are two salient issues here. One is that if the minister's government, which is so honourable and

exhibiting such leadership, had had the political guts or wisdom to conduct environmental impact assessments of projects such as the Oldman dam, they would not find themselves in the situation of having had a federal court telling them that the permit has no validity. So if you want to protect your own jurisdiction, I would suggest that first of all you start recognizing the responsibilities that this government has under the Constitution; that is, to be democratic and to conduct EIAs when they are needed. The second argument I would make on this matter is that he should realize, and I would think after holding the position for all these years now that he would realize, that the federal government will always have jurisdiction or at least shared jurisdiction over matters that can be transmitted by air or water or shifting of any geographical expression to another jurisdiction. That is bound to happen. That was one of the original reasons for having a Senate, although I would certainly concur in the minister's assessment that that is a sorry excuse for an upper body if ever anyone saw one.

Now, I can't help but note that the minister did make an observation about the fact that the increases in his department funding are related to the Alberta offices – Mr. Chairman, I call these the Tory handshake offices. If you're a cabinet minister and you are defeated at the polls, guess where you get to go? Mary LeMessurier, come on down to London. If you are a former executive assistant to a cabinet minister who's fallen out of favour or who's gone on to greener pastures, you get to go to another green pasture. And, by God, if you failed in your job in the Premier's office as the communications officer, you get sent on a fancy deal. You get to go to London and join Mary le minister, the measurer of culture, as we used to call her.

Anyway, look at poor old Ron Liepert. Where is he stuck? He's stuck as the director of western U.S. operations out of Los Angeles. Tough life, Ronnie. Hey, whatever happened to Bryce Nimmo? Didn't he have one of these appointments? I thought he did. Oh yeah, and there's James Seymour; Jim, we used to call him around here, I think. He's doing okay. Where is he? New York. That's an exciting place, I hear. So I'm not sure that there's really a need for this kind of increase, quite frankly. I'm not sure that those people should be in those positions at all, given the jobs they used to do and given the way they're appointed to them in the first place, Mr. Chairman.

I think the minister has a very honourable attitude about Meech Lake, but I would point out that that honourable attitude is being quickly jeopardized by the Prime Minister that he purports to support. I mean, can you imagine this guy coming to Alberta last week, thumbing his nose at Albertans who, having gone through an election process, decided that Stan Waters was the guy they wanted this government to support for appointment to the Senate? The hon. Prime Minister's response is: "Too bad. Congratulations to you, Mr. Waters, and congratulations to me, but I'm more important and, tough luck, you're not in." What an attitude. Mr. Minister, why don't you use the power of your office? Why didn't you support a motion last week about this? – an urgent motion that would have told the Prime Minister, while he was still in Alberta, that we don't like that attitude, that we consider democracy and the right to vote and the right to have the results of that vote not only recorded but enacted as important to us. Too bad that this guy who pretends to be running our country – he is running it: into the ground – has an ego so big that he can't take the election results of a few hundred thousand Albertans. You should use the weight of your office to fight that, Mr. Minister. I sure would.

I would like also to talk about . . . We'll go back to the Cold War, Mr. Chairman, or a little bit of it. Last year, actually every year since I've been elected and have been charged with shadowing this department, I have brought up the issue of the cruise missile testing. Remember that fancy deal that was struck by Pierre Trudeau, that great Liberal, that great guy who wanted peace for the world, and, yeah, Mr. Lougheed? Yeah, a deal was struck: we'll allow those cruise missiles to be tested over Alberta, for heaven's sake. Well, obviously the Liberals in the 1970s and '80s hadn't come to the conclusion that a lot of us did in the '60s — that is, that the Cold War was over — and the Conservatives in the province of Alberta hadn't come to that conclusion. In fact, these guys have never piped up a word about the fact that the world spends — what? — \$900 billion a year on war. I mean, how offensive can you get? That comes to — oh, I don't know how much — darn near \$2 million a minute, I would think. This is an outrageous lack of sentiment or statement on behalf of the minister's department. But it was made worse last year when the minister said and did nothing about the fact that since 1987 American officials in the U.S. Justice department and the U.S. Air Force knew that the missile guidance system that was being tested over Alberta was faulty; it was flawed. It was failing in more tests than it was passing, Mr. Chairman, and this minister did nothing. In fact, only a few weeks ago that darn thing was flying over Alberta again.

Well, he might not have an ideological opposition to war. I do. I think it is the most disgraceful expenditure of human resource that could possibly and has ever existed. It is made worse by the fact that we live in a money system that allows people X amount of power depending on how much money they have, and we go and squander this type of money nationally and internationally on the means of destruction. The minister should show greater leadership and so should the leader of whom he is apparently so proud.

I would also like to say that I'm not impressed with the minister's response with respect to the — at that time proposed — hazardous waste mechanism for ridding Alberta of the accumulated stockpile of nerve gas and other agents at Suffield. I have never had an explanation, although I've asked both provincially and federally, how the heck it is that tonnes of this stuff were amassed at Suffield when it's supposed to be a research station and not an arsenal station. Secondly, I think the minister's response was to go right along with the federal government until finally they changed their minds. The minister should use his office to stand up for the protection of the health and safety of Albertans first and forget toeing the party line. You know, your Conservative buddies federally are no doggone example to follow, and the sooner you see that, the sooner you may be able to save yourselves politically, although I do not hold out any hope for the latter either.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I would point out that again the minister has had sort of bizarre responses when it comes to opposition concerns over federal participation at any level in countries where citizens are being oppressed, sometimes being killed, one example being in Burma. The Burmese are supposed to go to an election I think on May 27. So far, we know about the military having killed 3,000 demonstrators. All these people want is democracy and a few rights. The opposition leaders are still in jail. The minister writes back and he says: "Well, we don't like any violations of any human rights in any country, but in this regard the federal government has formally expressed concern to the Burmese government over its human rights record, and Canada has advocated a return to democracy in

Burma." I think what's critical here is that these guys are always willing to throw their weight around when it comes to a country whose economic model is one to which they are ideologically not predisposed, but when it comes to one that at least attempts to imitate capitalism, by God, it doesn't matter how badly you treat your people. It doesn't matter if your apartheid regime is really meant to prop up your international monetary system; anything's game here because these guys like the general economic orientation of a government.

If I were the minister, I'd drop that ideological baggage so that I could at least brag about consistency when it comes to on what points we will lobby the federal government, on what points we will take action directly as a province and on what points we won't. As I say, he's proud to have power and might when it comes to lobbying when the issue is one that he favours, and when it's one that he doesn't really care about, he goes silent on it or says it is a federal issue. Stand up and fight the GST, Mr. Horsman, and you'll probably get re-elected. But if you don't — if you don't — and if you don't tell your constituents to do what I've been telling my constituents to do, or urging them to do, what every New Democrat has been doing since 1987, going out knocking on doors, telling people about this GST that they were going to get if they re-elected a Conservative government . . . Tax reform is what is needed in this country. Tax fairness is what is needed, not the GST. Go out and tell the people of Alberta that this government is of the view that any MP who votes for the GST will fall into disfavour with this government, that this government will actively campaign against their re-election bids come the next federal election, and then you would show us at least one example of really doing a good job around here.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Edmonton-Avonmore.

MS M. LAING: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to address a couple of concerns that have been raised with me by my constituents and other people in this province in regard to our province's involvement in military endeavours.

First of all, I would like to read a quote, to put it in context, from this year's National Defence estimates. I have copies here to be tabled. I would quote:

The most serious direct threat to Canada is a Soviet nuclear attack on North America. At present, the only effective counter to such a threat is a strategy of deterrence based on the maintenance of diversified nuclear forces. Such forces . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. I hesitate to interrupt the hon. member, but these documents really cannot be tabled in committee. The House is the only . . .

MS BARRETT: Yes. She's filing them.

MS M. LAING: I'll file them. Sorry.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't think there's really a provision for filing either.

MS BARRETT: Isn't there filing of . . .

MS M. LAING: Filing returns and reports. Okay?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Very well.

MS M. LAING: Okay.

Such forces must be capable of surviving an attack and retaliating in a manner so devastating as to convince any potential aggressor that the penalty far outweighs any gain.

Mr. Chairman, surely such a mentality in 1990 is more reflective of what was going on in the U.S. in the 1950s, and it's time we gave up this Cold War rhetoric. But, more importantly, it's inconsistent with what is happening in eastern Europe these days, in the Soviet Union itself, with our trade agreements which the minister has just spoken of with the U.S.S.R. So why are we supporting our federal government in this kind of endeavour? It's inconsistent with what we know of the effects of nuclear exchange and the survivability of life on Earth in the wake of such an exchange. We've heard the weary, worn phrase "mutually assured destruction," MAD, and what madness it is to believe in such a philosophy. But, more importantly, this mentality, as articulated in the federal government's defence estimates, is inconsistent with what Albertans and Canadians believe and want. I would therefore ask that the minister commit to the people of this province that he will communicate their abhorrence of this '50s mentality in this year of 1990.

As the Member for Edmonton-Highlands said, we continue to oppose cruise missile testing over Alberta, and the majority of Albertans and the majority of people in Edmonton-Avonmore, the constituency I represent, also oppose the continued testing of this missile over Alberta lands. In the second most recent test an Alberta pilot, a young man, died needlessly so the American war technology can be tested. It is our lands, our environment, our people who are at risk to aid the American military, and it is as outdated as our federal government is in this department. This particular weaponry represents an escalation of the arms race. It is not defensive but offensive, in every sense of the word. It is a first-strike weapon, and it further destabilizes the world in terms of our attempts now to build a peaceful world, to disarm our world. And it is not part of our NATO commitment, as our Prime Minister tells us.

We have further concerns about the low-level bombers that are tested over Canada and, in some cases, Alberta. Albertans have great concern, and they have contacted me about, again, our complicity in the American military buildup. Also, the environmental impact assessments indicate risk to people and animals in the flight paths.

So I would ask this minister to discourage the federal government from its competition for the NATO base. Take a lesson from our European allies, who don't want these flights jeopardizing their environment, their lands, and their peoples.

[Mr. Jonson in the Chair]

I would also like to make note of a NATO conference scheduled for Kananaskis Village for May 2 and 3, surely a travesty in view of the beauty of that site, because the arms alliance, which the NATO alliance is, is a threat to our world, as all arms alliances are. We should be putting our energy and resources into supporting the United Nations and finding ways of keeping the peace or building the peace through peacekeeping efforts and negotiation, rather than arms buildup. I would then ask the minister to convey to the minister of defence our opposition to that meeting, an opposition that is being guarded against because of the setting of this conference at Kananaskis Village, where they can build ironclad security so that Albertans will not have an opportunity to express their protest.

Mr. Chairman, this government and its counterparts cloak their defence spending in a rhetoric of sovereignty, but again I would note from the federal government defence estimates that they have a commitment to the rationalization of the defence infrastructure. This rationalization is with the American military defence infrastructure and is designed, as a government task force said a couple of years ago, to eliminate national boundaries. It will serve to integrate the Canadian military into the U.S. military, and this cannot be said to protect Canadian sovereignty. Indeed, it extends American sovereignty over Canada and is but an example in one sector of how the trade deal will really work. I would, then, request the minister to convey the grave concerns Albertans have about the increasing militarization of the Canadian economy and our loss of sovereignty.

In the same vein, I would raise concerns about the Defence Research Establishment at Suffield. Information has come to me about the proposed level-four biohazards containment facility that is being proposed to be built at DRES at a cost of \$10 million. It would appear that the Canadian defence department is proposing to build a research facility that poses such an environmental risk that the citizens of the state of Utah in the United States took the U.S. Defense Department to court to delay the building of such a facility at a cost of \$8 million U.S. Sounds like the same facility.

I understand the environmental impact assessment will be done by Chem-Security, the company building the incinerator at Suffield to destroy the nerve gas stored there, as was called for by the Barton report. We must have grave concerns about this initiative, because it can be used to test genetically engineered material that would pose a grave risk to the people of Alberta if there were an accident, leak, or spill. They will be testing new life forms that can threaten human life, with no known antidotes. They are artificially created life forms and, in some cases, may be developed at Canadian universities that have no facilities for testing. They will then be serving the purpose of testing these abhorrent organisms. Like cruise missile testing, the people of Alberta are at risk in order to serve the United States military industrial complex.

I would therefore ask this minister to demand that public hearings and the result of an environmental impact assessment study be made public. I secondly ask the minister to convey to the federal minister the outrage Albertans have in regard to Canadian complicity in the chemical and biological warfare testing and development often done in the name of defence. These weapons in most recent times have been used against civilian populations, so to say that what we're developing is defensive is simply incorrect. And indeed, in the case of biological weapons, they cannot be contained; that's the very nature of them. These are reprehensible forms of warfare, the poor man's nuclear weapons, we've heard, or weapons being developed to replace nuclear weapons in view of the international movement toward elimination of nuclear weapons.

I would therefore ask that the minister investigate the state of research and development at DRES, the proposed initiatives, report to this Assembly and the people of Alberta what is going on there – we have a right to know – and bring to the federal government in the strongest terms possible our distaste and opposition to these proposed developments.

Thank you.

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

MR. CHUMIR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm pleased to speak on these estimates. This is an important department of government despite its size, and I have a few short questions with respect to the numbers.

I would just note that the government has provided a 9 percent increase in the budget for this year notwithstanding it is a year of announced austerity. I'm wondering whether the minister might be able to provide an explanation this afternoon if time permits, or alternatively in writing, as to the 12.9 percent increase in expenditures for Alberta government offices and the 11.7 percent increase in Intergovernmental Affairs, just the nature of the additional programming and services that will be provided.

I note also, Mr. Chairman, that there's been a reduction in the amount dedicated to Conferences and Missions in the amount of 9.4 percent, but that reduction relates to a reduction from the estimates of the previous year rather than the expenditures. The estimates were \$545,000, and I'm wondering whether the minister might be able to provide us with an idea of what the actual Conferences and Missions expenditure was for 1989-90.

Now, in terms of government offices, an office has been established through the aegis of the Alberta Chamber of Commerce in Taiwan. I'm wondering whether the minister could advise . . .

MR. HORSMAN: That's not my department.

MR. CHUMIR: That was the question I was going to ask the minister, who has indicated it's not his department. I was going to inquire whether it is his department and whether he's able to advise of the amount and nature of the funding.

Moving on to free trade, Mr. Chairman, I have a few particular concerns I would like to raise at this point in time. One relates to the energy provisions in the free trade agreement. The energy provisions were a very generous concession to the United States, providing access to our resources. Now, I could understand this if perhaps we were given concomitant consideration on the part of the United States, but it was a very, very strange provision in the energy section of the agreement which excluded the provisions of the agreement from regulatory agencies such as the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission in the United States. The fact is that the main complaint the natural gas industry had with respect to access into the United States was the regulatory decisions of this very same Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. Here we find the agreement says that, well, this regulatory commission is not covered by the agreement per se. You can't go to a disputes panel in the event you have a problem. The best you can do, in the same way as the best we're going to be able to do with respect to Senate reform after we pass the Meech Lake accord, is talk without any leverage. So I'm now hearing from the industry that there is increasing concern with respect to the activities of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission and regulatory obstacles in general with respect to access of our natural gas to the United States.

I wonder whether perhaps the minister will be able to give us an explanation of why it is that FERC was exempted from the provisions of the free trade agreement and what initiatives this government has planned to see that we do get the benefits of the free trade agreement, the freeing up of the marketplace, in light of the fact that we have given up access to our resources and very certainly need and deserve unimpeded access for our natural gas markets.

Now, a second area of the free trade agreement that currently is outstanding relates to that of the countervail and subsidy negotiations. It's quite a paradox with respect to the free trade agreement that rather than resolving our problems, to most observers it seems that we seem to be having more difficulties with the United States than we had before. It's a kind of paradox, but I always wondered as this agreement was being negotiated whether or not when you enter a deal of this nature you don't just increase the expectations of your free trade partner above what they would have been the previous time. We see in our society the importance of expectations with respect to benefits and rights in relation to government. It's attitudinal, it's psychological, and I'm just wondering whether we haven't snookered ourselves in terms of those expectations.

Nevertheless, we're in motion and we have to try and nail something down with respect to these subsidies, one area of which is impacting Alberta quite significantly, and that relates to the 8 cents per kilogram hog tariff arising out of subsidies. So I'm wondering whether the minister could advise as to what's happening with respect to negotiating these countervails and subsidies. Have we secured full provincial participation, as the minister said we would do in his comments during the past year or two in estimates, and what position is the government taking with respect to some of the particular problems of concern to this province?

A related area is that of procurement policy within Canada. It's almost becoming a bromide how ironical it is that we are advancing in the realm of free trade with the United States and trying to reduce barriers through GATT at the same time that we have many barriers within this country. There seems to be general or, at least, academic consensus that we need to end provincial barriers. I wonder whether the minister could provide us with a report as to what is going on, progress with respect to reducing barriers between the provinces. Now, I understand that an agreement has been negotiated between the provinces in relation to a government procurement to free up access to Out-of-province bidders. I also understand that a minority of provinces have refused to go along with this agreement. I'm wondering what Alberta's position is with respect to the agreement. Has it signed, and if not, why not and when will it do so?

The GATT round of negotiations is particularly interesting with respect to agriculture, Mr. Chairman. There's a great deal of concern being expressed in this country with respect to subsidies being provided by the United States and the European Common Market with respect to agriculture. I was quite interested to read within the past month the results of, I believe it was, an OECD study which indicated that Canada was in fact the highest international subsidizer at the rate of, I believe, \$61,000 per farmer. Now, I believe it's important that we support our farmers, but I find it hard to believe, in light of the current state of our agriculture, that these numbers and that ranking of Canada as being the highest subsidizer internationally are accurate. I'm sure the minister's department, being involved in these agreements, must have that information, must have chapter and verse. I know for certain that the farmers don't think they're seeing the benefits of that magnitude of subsidization. So I'm wondering whether the minister could advise us whether he agrees with these numbers and perhaps just give us a general report with respect to where we stand as a nation in the degree of subsidization and how we make our arguments vis-à-vis freer international trade in agriculture in light of whatever the true numbers are.

Now, there is another issue on the table which has received a tremendous amount of publicity, and that relates to supply management. The government has finally come out with a very strong statement in support of supply management, which of course will be a relief to those sectors of our agricultural industry. However, it's still a topic of very hot debate in the journals in this country. I'm wondering whether the minister might advise what the province's current position is with respect to this issue, which is causing so much debate and which is also the subject of pressure as a result of the free trade agreement, particularly with respect to complaints of food processors. I know it's a very difficult issue and would appreciate some comment on that.

In terms of Senate reform, earlier today, Mr. Chairman, I moved that this province adopt the format of the Senate constitutional amendment proposals presented by Premier Clyde Wells of Newfoundland. The minister showed some extreme impatience with respect to my discussion of that motion, perhaps engendered by embarrassment of not having come forward with a more formal position of any detail in a previous time. Perhaps we may see the government coming forward with a motion very similar to Mr. Wells' fairly shortly. I hope so.

We have here, Mr. Chairman, a very, very important issue and no specific government position with respect to the details of where we stand on Senate reform. It's time we did have one, so I would like to ask the government what their position is with respect to the details of Senate reform. What exactly are we looking for within the parameters of the Triple E concept? Does this government support, for example, the proposals of Mr. Wells, which I might note are very similar, almost identical in many ways, to those which have been proposed by the Triple E committee? What is the position of the government?

Now, in terms of the concept of Senate reform as a whole, I can't help but think back to a description often used in jest by my former dean of law, and perhaps the minister's dean of law as well, who might have said in respect of the governments position, "Horsman, you couldn't be wronger." Meech Lake, Mr. Chairman, is a mistake. It's a mistake for Canada; it would fragment the country. The members of the government talk of a united Canada, when in fact they would fragment it. They wrap themselves in a verbal flag of patriotism while moving to support initiatives which would create two classes of province by giving to Quebec, through the distinct society clause, powers other provinces don't have and would otherwise support provisions which erode the strength of our federal system and fragment the country. That is a concern I have as a Canadian from a national point of view, but from a regional and a provincial point of view I'm concerned at the fact that the Meech Lake accord is a sellout of Senate reform.

I think one would be hard pressed to find anyone other than the 59 members of this caucus who thinks it's easier to get the approval of 10 out of 10 provinces than to get seven out of 10. Lord knows, it's tough enough to get seven out of 10. It has, of course, rendered it almost impossible to push any meaningful form of Senate reform through by requiring unanimity. I mean, they say we can stop any reform we don't want. Hell, our job is not to stop something. We're on the offensive; we need rules that help the offensive. We need to throw the long bomb. We need rules that make it easier to accomplish rather than to give vetoes. The strategies of the government are absolutely incomprehensible, and they're certainly incomprehensible to the 91 percent of Albertans who aren't supporting the Meech Lake accord. Can you believe it? Only 9 percent of Albertans are

supporting the Meech Lake accord, yet the government forges on.

The second concern, aside from the unanimity thing, though – and it's all bundled up with the unanimity aspect, Mr. Chairman – is that by executing Meech Lake, the government has given up all our bargaining chips. I suppose the idea of a good deal for this government in negotiating is that you sign away what the other guy wants and then agree that you'll talk about what you want later on. It would be comic if it didn't have such serious implications for this country. I mean, I would like to negotiate with this minister sometime. How about selling me your car and we'll talk about whether I pay for it later? Well, let's talk about the house or the cottage.

The proof of the difficulties with respect to Senate reform can already be seen in the way the provinces are lining up. Taking the minister's own statement, he states – and I hope this is accurate, because he deals with the other provinces directly – that eight out of 10 provinces approve of the Triple E Senate concept in principle. Well, that raises the question. Eight out of 10 leaves two. What two? Who doesn't approve? Well, surprise. Which two provinces don't approve of the Triple E Senate concept in principle? Could it be they're Ontario and Quebec? Well, it sounds like it to me. The two losers, the two provinces that carry all the clout under the present system, the ones that would lose power, are going to fight tooth and nail against any meaningful Senate reform. These are the main beneficiaries of the Meech Lake accord, and they're the two that haven't approved it in principle.

But of course we have nothing to worry about. It's foolish to be worrying about that, because everything will be well once Meech Lake is signed. In a spirit of generosity, without any bargaining chips, without any leverage, these two provinces are then going to sign over the clout they have in this Confederation to the rest of the provinces, sign over all their power and influence. Premier Bourassa must be laughing as he reads the humbug in the speeches of this government.

I'd like to move on briefly to a few other topics, one of which relates to the policy of the government with respect to China. We all share the horror and sadness with respect to the events of Tiananmen Square and the subsequent tightening of the screws, so to speak, in terms of the democratic movement in that country. I'm wondering whether the minister might give us some assessment of his government with respect to what is transpiring and how this is impacting on government policy. Are we now back to full steam ahead, as it were, in respect of our policies previously? Are we at double steam or quarter steam? Just what impact is this having on our future relations, economic in particular and otherwise, in relation to China.

Now, a side issue but an extremely important one from humanitarian terms relates to the Chinese students who were here in Canada at the time of the Tiananmen Square problems. I hear from time to time of difficulties these students are encountering with respect to getting permanent residence and other difficulties, and I'm wondering what the position of the government is with respect to the rights of these students to obtain permanent residence and just what it is doing to ease the difficulty of what are true refugees from repression.

Now, the native land claims are another area I would appreciate some information from the minister with respect to, Mr. Chairman. Specifically, I'm wondering whether the minister would provide our caucus with a complete list of the outstanding native claims in this province and the current status of the

negotiations with respect to them so we have a comprehensive picture of where we are on this issue.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I want to talk a bit about some of the federal/provincial agreements and concerns I have with respect to the failure of this government to ensure that Alberta obtains the greatest financial benefit possible under these agreements. Now, I don't know whether these are or are not within the complete or partial ambit of the minister's department. Perhaps he might give us some explanation as to what his role is, for example, with respect to the Canada Assistance Plan or other agreements. But there are two agreements that have caused me some concern with respect to the management, or perhaps I should say mismanagement, of this government. One relates to the failure of the government to get a fair share of our funding under the forestry agreement with the federal government. For a good chunk of the 1980s we did very, very poorly. This was pointed out in research done by the current Minister of Municipal Affairs, Mr. Chairman, when he was in opposition leading the Representative Party. He did some excellent research, in which he showed that our receipts from the federal government in respect to forestry programs were very, very low in relation to other provinces and in relation to our entitlement.

I've also raised in this House, particularly in last summer's session, the failure of the government to access the Canada Assistance Plan funding available for civil legal aid. I amused, probably not in a happy sense, and caught the minister's attention by erring in the assumption that it was his department's main responsibility with respect to that issue when it was the Department of Social Services'. I continue to have concern with respect to that issue, and I'm going to be doing more. I'm going to be releasing some more information with respect to the issue, probably sometime this week, to enhance my concerns about how we have failed to access federal funding under that program which would provide up to 50 percent of the cost of civil legal aid.

We've been spending in recent years close to \$3 million a year. We should be able to have access to a million and a half dollars. Almost every other province in this country has been accessing civil legal aid almost to the tune of half their civil legal aid spending since 1978-79. There's quite a packet of money on the table that we could have obtained. I don't like it. If this funding is available, its absence shorts the people who would otherwise be able to obtain legal aid assistance and aren't, because the province is in fact extremely chintzy with respect to legal aid. We stand very low in the pantheon of legal aid funding. We're somewhere in the middle to the sixth or seventh range in terms of total per capita funding for legal aid, and I find it totally unacceptable to see a million to a million and a half dollars a year going wanting. I've been told that there's only perhaps \$200,000 up for grabs. It defies logic to see how almost every other province is able to get fairly close to half their civil legal aid spending paid for, yet this government wants to say that we're spending \$2.8 million and we're only going to get \$200,000. We're going to get one-fourteenth, which is about 3 point some percent instead of 50 percent. My math may be a little shaky on that one.

So what we need is more co-ordination. Perhaps the thrust of my comments might best be described as a representation as opposed to a question. My representation is to suggest that there is a greater need for co-ordination, a good steady hand on the rudder in terms of making sure we do as well as we can in respect of getting our share of funds from federal programs. Now, the reality is that a large part of our failure relates to

hubris: the hubris of the good days when we had so much money we could spend it like sweepstakes winners and were unwilling to accommodate ourselves to some federal tests, most of which, I believe, have been quite reasonable any time I have seen them, Mr. Chairman.

I see that my time is rapidly running out, so with that I'll cede the floor to any other speakers. I've been asked to continue notwithstanding that. They're falling out of their chairs laughing at that one. In any event, I end my comments with that, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for Drumheller.

MR. SCHUMACHER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to begin my comments this afternoon by joining with the hon. minister in congratulating and welcoming the new Deputy Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs to the service of this province in a more important role than she has heretofore played, although that has been a very, very important role. I know she is going to do an excellent job on behalf of our province. I know that because I've been privileged over the last year or two to be a member of the task force on Senate reform, and she has been a very good source of information and a good teacher and a good communicator in helping me, at least, understand the issues that are before our province.

I must say that I guess I have some sympathy with those people who say they oppose the Meech Lake accord because it will be the end of Senate reform, because when I knew nothing about the subject, I was feeling, before the meetings of 1987, that our Premier shouldn't come back with anything less than a Triple E Senate agreed to in what later became known as the Meech Lake accord. But of course that was a feeling that was based on complete ignorance of the real facts of constitutional life in this country. I guess I say that I have some sympathy for what has been put forward by the members of the New Democratic Party and the Liberal Party on that subject because it's quite obvious to me that they are proceeding on the basis of complete ignorance. I guess my plea would be that they try to learn something about the real situation, what we're really facing in the country, and get some understanding of what the Meech Lake accord really is. Over the last number of months and, I guess, years now, I have tried to discuss the pros and cons of the Meech Lake accord with many members of this Assembly, and I never really feel satisfied after those discussions that they do have an understanding of what's in the accord. So I hope that before I have to resume my seat, I'll be able to lay out for the record something about what the accord involves.

We tend to have people use catch phrases about unanimity. The hon. Member for Calgary-Buffalo, in what I would classify or characterize as some sophomoric comments on Senate reform, boiled it down and said, "Well, really it's going to be Ontario and Quebec that are going to hold up Senate reform." He could have equally added the government of Canada as well. I don't know why the government of Canada isn't mentioned in these questions of unanimity, because, of course, they have an absolute veto as well. So you could have three people at least.

In fact, what's happened in this country is that it's gone from zero support for a Triple E not so very long ago – maybe 1984; about that – to eight of 11 governments now supporting a Triple E model. Reference was made in question period today about the province of Ontario establishing a select committee of their Legislature to travel around the country to look into the question of Senate reform. So I don't know how anybody could

say that no progress has been made. Quite frankly, the largest leap in that progress was the accomplishment of the Meech Lake accord. Those are the facts of the situation.

There are too many people in this Chamber who are willing to go along with the idea that the distinct society is going to be bad for this province somehow. Then they play on the biases and the bigotry and the prejudices of the population to blame Quebec, that this is just going to kowtow to Quebec. I challenge any member of this Legislature to get up and show me how we are kowtowing to Quebec by recognizing a fact of historical and constitutional life that's been here for practically 200 years or more. If Quebec does not have a distinct society, I'd like someone to tell me what it has. [interjection] You can have your opportunity, hon. member. I am not answering any questions or listening to any more of your piffle.

Hon. members only have to look to the fact that Quebec has what is called a system of civil law. They don't have anything to do with the British common law, which governs the reality of law in the rest of the country. They don't have it. They have a different system of education and protection for language rights. They have a different language. If that does not make them distinct, I'd like to know what would make them distinct, and if they are distinct . . .

MR. CHUMIR: Why do they need . . .

MR. SCHUMACHER: Why do they need it, the hon. member says? The hon. Member for Calgary-Buffalo is going to refight the battle of the Plains of Abraham, I suppose. I always thought he was quite a peaceful person, wouldn't ever consider taking up arms. That kind of talk is just the exact kind of talk that creates the foundation for future strife in the country.

The distinct society clause does not add one bit of special status for Quebec or make any future special status possible. To make that abundantly clear, the agreement has to be interpreted so as not to add any special status or take away any rights or powers of any other province in the country. Now, why can't you get that through your noodle and understand it and remember it?

MR. CHUMIR: Question. Will he take a question?

MR. SCHUMACHER: No, I'm not taking any questions, because you guys need the answers without the questions. You've already raised innumerable ill-founded questions based on ignorance, and it is ignorance.

MR. TAYLOR: We've always been nice to you.

MR. SCHUMACHER: The hon. Member for Westlock-Sturgeon is very disarming.

That seems to be the hurdle. The people of Alberta get angry at the distinct society. They won't look at what else is in it.

The background of it is that Pierre Elliott Trudeau, who's word isn't worth a pinch of the proverbial I guess, made a commitment to the people of Quebec during the course of the referendum on separation in 1980 that there would be constitutional renewal, and of course there was no constitutional renewal at all in the 1982 Constitution. The old Constitution came back, and that mess of a Charter of Rights was grafted onto it. No one can tell me that that was constitutional renewal as far as the concerns of the province of Quebec were concerned. Therefore, it was left to somebody else to try to make up for the undertak-

ing which the people of Quebec acted on in 1980, and that was done over the course of a number of years. It wasn't all done in an all-night session at Meech Lake or at the Langevin Block. Many years of work went into coming up with the accord in 1987.

Where did they start? The then Premier of Quebec after 1982 had 23 points that he wanted to have discussed. In the course of the discussions leading up to Meech Lake, those were whittled down to five points. I've heard people in this Chamber say, "Well, Quebec should compromise." What do hon. members think was happening between 1983 and 1987 except that there was a big bunch of compromising done?

What are their other points? What's so special about these as far as Quebec? What are we giving Quebec? The hon. Member for Edmonton-Glenarry says that we're selling out to Quebec by going along with Meech Lake. I suppose he feels that we're selling out to Quebec by accepting the benefit of that agreement which gives us input to the appointment of Supreme Court judges. As I said, that abortion of a Charter of Rights in the present Constitution has lasting impact on this province. We should have some input in the people who are interpreting it. We've seen some interpretations already by some courts that we don't really think are maybe too beneficial for this province. Shouldn't we as a member of a federal state have something to say as to who is going to be sitting there interpreting that on our behalf? What's so terrible about having this province have something to say about who's going to be interpreting our Constitution? How do we sell out Alberta by trying to get some handle on the abuse of the federal spending power in areas of purely provincial jurisdiction? You people over there are supposed to be representing Albertans. I am absolutely ashamed of you as representatives of Albertans attacking this agreement, which is good for our province.

AN HON. MEMBER: Who loves Canada?

MR. SCHUMACHER: Well, are we here to represent Albertans, or are we here to represent Canadians? If you want to represent Canadians, you go to Ottawa; you get elected to the House of Commons. I speak for my constituents on a provincial basis, and I hope our government will continue to do that and not be sellout artists of our own province.

What about immigration? We hear that all the time. Are we selling out our province by asking for the same treatment that Quebec has under the Cullen-Couture agreement on a legislative basis or executive federalism basis? My constituency tells me that they feel they don't like the way the federal government has looked after immigration when they've had the sole jurisdiction. They feel that we should have something to say about it to make our province a better place. Are we selling out our province by getting the same treatment that Quebec has had over the last 12 or 13 years?

MR. CHUMIR: No, just the nation. Not the province, just the nation. [interjections]

MR. SCHUMACHER: Oh, yes, the great Trudeau vision of Canada: everything being run from Ottawa.

The last thing in the Meech Lake accord is the veto power that we want for ourselves. Are we not as good? Veto power is the question of unanimity. That is a sticking point with some people, particularly the hon. Member for Calgary-Buffalo, because he can't seem to get it through his noodle that they

have a veto already. Ontario and Quebec have effective vetos now. [interjections]

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order please. I think the dialogue back and forth is not forwarding debate very well.

MR. SCHUMACHER: In any event, Mr. Chairman, I wanted to get in clear and concise terms what is in the Meech Lake accord as far as I can see. That's the most important issue that involves this minister at this time. I wanted to put those remarks on the record, and I'll resume my seat because I guess the minister would like to answer some of the questions that were raised by some people who are terribly in need of some facts.

MR. HORSMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the hon. Member for Drumheller for trying to put some sense into the head of the Member for Calgary-Buffalo. I don't suppose he succeeded, but at least he got it on the record. The Member for Calgary-Buffalo indicated that his dean of law used to say to him, "You couldn't be wronger." Well, I have to say it to him again today: you couldn't be wronger. I guess that just means he hasn't learned anything since law school about the Constitution of this country. He doesn't know anything about Meech Lake, and he doesn't want to know. Maybe he should check with the federal Liberal Party, which presumably he supports.

MS BARRETT: Or at least Paul Martin.

MR. HORSMAN: Or at least Paul Martin.

There was unanimous support for Meech Lake in the House of Commons, all parties. When the vote came in this House, it was unanimous. Unanimous. One can only ask: where was the hon. Member for Calgary-Buffalo? Hiding? Hiding in the closet? Where was he hiding? Well, Mr. Chairman, he's quite clearly appealing to a sentiment based upon a lack of understanding of what's really in the Meech Lake accord, and it's been fostered by this . . .

MR. PASHAK: Tell us what "distinct society" means.

MR. HORSMAN: Well, the hon. member voted for the Meech Lake accord in this Assembly.

MR. SIGURDSON: No, some abstained.

MR. HORSMAN: Oh, some abstained. Stayed away too. I thought it was only the Liberals who hid from the vote. Now it appears that there were some members of the ND Party who also hid from the vote. Well, that's interesting.

I want to try and deal with some of the issues raised by the hon. members for Edmonton-Highlands and Edmonton-Avonmore, however. I appreciate the comments both of them made with respect to matters relating to military issues. They hold sincerely to their beliefs, and I respect them for that. Nobody in this Assembly advocates war. Nobody. Nobody on this side of the Assembly; nobody in the ND; nobody, presumably, in the Liberals.

The fact of the matter is, however, that we have to have defence. Even the most socialist of countries have defensive mechanisms built into their arrangements. I cite Sweden, for example. But let me tell you something else about Sweden when it comes to the question of the cost of the defence to that

neutral country. The fact of the matter is that based upon their gross domestic product in 1982, Swedes spent 50 percent more of their gross domestic product on national defence than did Canada. Now, why is that? It is because in Canada we have allied ourselves in a military alliance called NATO and another one called NORAD. They're there for defensive purposes. Canada as a nation has never sought territorial expansion – has never done it; never will. Canada has never tried to interfere in the affairs of other nations. Canada is a peaceful nation, but at the same time Canada is prepared to defend its system and has done so valiantly in two world wars and in the Korean war, which was part of the United Nations peacekeeping effort. I support that policy, which has been the policy of successive governments throughout the history of this country.

Now, on the subject of Suffield, because it is particularly near to my constituency, obviously the people of Medicine Hat are very concerned about what has been taking place there. Over the years they have been supportive, though, of what is in fact taking place at the Defence Research Establishment at Suffield. Now after a number of years of buildup of these nasty weapons that are on that base, the federal government wants to destroy them. So they've gone out and advised the public in south-eastern Alberta of what they're proposing to do in probably the most extensive public awareness program that was ever undertaken by the military in southeastern Alberta. So they've told the people of Medicine Hat and southeastern Alberta what they're going to do.

Well, because I'm concerned about what is taking place, I sent out a questionnaire to my constituents recently, and hundreds of the questionnaires have now been returned to my office. One of the questions I asked, Mr. Chairman, was: do you approve of the Department of National Defence plan to eliminate these chemical and biological elements at Suffield? Eighty percent of the people say yes. But all the fuss and holler that's being generated by friends of the NDP – they're great at forming "friends" groups, this bunch.

MS BARRETT: We've got lots of them. [interjections]

MR. HORSMAN: Yeah. Friends of the earth, friends of the world, friends of the earth and sky: we're all in that category I would hope.

The fact of the matter is that they're creating a fuss about it but people support the proposal that's been put forward. The people understand the issue. They support it. Let's get on with it. And I say let's get on with it. Nobody would be happier than myself if the current discussions under way between the governments of the United States and the U.S.S.R. were able to achieve the complete elimination of nuclear arms or the current international conferences that are under way toward the elimination of chemical weaponry were totally successful. I would stand and cheer. I hope that will happen. They are moving in that direction, and I applaud that movement supported by the government of Canada.

Now, the hon. Member for Edmonton-Highlands says that the Cold War is over. If it is, wonderful. But do you know why it is going to be over? It's because there has been a balance of power. It's been the balance of power that's brought the parties to the table to get rid of nuclear armaments, to change the system now in place behind the former Iron Curtain. I'm glad the Iron Curtain is gone. I'm glad the Berlin Wall is gone. You know, when they're taken down and free votes are held after years of communism and suppression, what are the people of

East Germany voting? How do they vote? They vote conservative, and so do the people of Hungary. They don't want the socialists any more. They don't want them there any more than the people of Alberta want socialists in this government, in this Legislative Assembly to fill the Treasury benches.

I would certainly suggest to the hon. Member for Edmonton-Highlands that we are in agreement about perestroika being a good word. I understand what it means. I did get some very good assistance from the people in the U.S.S.R. when I was there last October. What is really meant by perestroika? What's the fundamental feeling, the depth behind it? I was told by the prime minister of the Russian republic that perestroika means more than just restructuring the economy. It means restructuring the military. It means restructuring the political system. It means restructuring the spiritual life of the Soviet Union. It's a very deep word. It means a great deal, and I am thrilled that it is happening.

MS BARRETT: So can we get Getty glasnost?

MR. HORSMAN: Glasnost is openness. Of course, the opposition likes to put on that we do not have an open government in this province. Of course, we do. We make public the results of our decisions. Obviously, though, we have to, when we're considering options, not put out all the opinions that come to us, but we're prepared to be judged on the basis of our decisions.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have a number of other points of some specificity that have been raised, and I will respond to those in writing, particularly with regard to some of the questions raised by the Member for Calgary-Buffalo relative to the free trade agreement and such matters as FERC, the federal energy regulatory authority in the United States.

One point I do want to make, though, before I resume my seat is that the issue of interprovincial trade barriers, which he referred to as procurement issues, are really the responsibility of the Minister of Economic Development and Trade, but I'll make it absolutely clear that our government is strongly committed to free trade within Canada as well as liberalized trade outside

Canada. We want to tear down those interprovincial trade barriers that have been established, and we are trying to get further movement from all the other provinces in this country to do just that. That is a clear policy and commitment of our government.

Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee rise and report.

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

MR. JONSON: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has had under consideration certain resolutions of the Department of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs, reports progress thereon, and requests leave to sit again.

MR. SPEAKER: Those members in favour of the report, please say aye.

HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

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

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, this evening it is proposed to deal in Committee of the Whole with a number of Bills on the Order Paper and perhaps go to second readings. I would move that when the members assemble at 8 o'clock tonight, they do so in Committee of the Whole.

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

HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed, please say no. The motion carries.

[The House recessed at 5:28 p.m.]

Appendix: A Draft Constitutional Amendment to Reform the Senate of Canada

Whereas the Constitution Act, 1982, duly in force and effect throughout Canada provides that amendments may be initiated to the Constitution of Canada by resolutions of the Parliament of Canada and resolutions of the requisite number of legislative assemblies, depending on the nature of the subject matter;

And whereas the Senate of Canada was originally designed to bring to bear the provincial and regional interests in the law-making process at the national level and to provide an effective balance to representation by population in the House of Commons;

And whereas experience has shown that the Senate has not been able to perform its role effectively because the distribution of seats and the selection process of Senators have undermined its legitimacy;

And whereas a reformed Senate, if properly constituted, could perform the role originally intended for it and alleviate feelings of alienation and remoteness toward national affairs which exist, particularly in the less populous regions of Canada;

And whereas the amendment proposed in the schedule hereto recognizes the principle of the equality of all provinces and provides new institutional arrangements to assure all regions of Canada an equitable role in national decision-making, thereby fostering greater harmony and co-operation between the governments and people of Canada;

And whereas section 42 of the Constitution Act, 1982, provides that the subject matter of this amendment may be made by proclamation issued by the Governor General under the Great Seal of Canada where so authorized by resolutions of the Parliament of Canada and of the legislative assemblies of seven provinces having 50 percent of the population of Canada;

Now therefore the Legislative Assembly of Alberta resolves that an amendment to the Constitution of Canada be authorized to be made by proclamation issued by His Excellency the Governor General under the Great Seal of Canada in accordance with the schedule hereto.

Schedule

1. Sections 21 to 36 inclusive and sections 51A and 53 of the Constitution Act, 1867, are repealed¹ and the following substituted therefore:

The Senate

21. The Upper House, styled the Senate, constituted by section 17 of this Act, shall be composed of members called Senators, who shall be drawn from throughout Canada and elected in accordance with the provisions of sections 22 and 23.

22. (1) Each of the provinces of Canada is at all times entitled to be represented in the Senate by six Senators.²

(2) Any province which may be created, pursuant to the provisions of the Constitution, after this section comes into force, shall on and after its creation be entitled to be represented in the Senate by six Senators.³

23. (1) Senators shall be chosen by the people of Canada through popular election in accordance with the provisions of this section.

(2) Except as otherwise provided in (5), Senators shall be elected for a term of six years, and Senators shall be eligible for re-election.

(3) Senate elections shall be held throughout Canada on the last Monday of October every three years.⁴

(4) The first election, hereinafter referred to as "the initial election," will be held on the last Monday of October not less than one year nor more than two years after this provision comes into force.

(5) One-half of the Senators elected from each province at the initial election shall be elected for a term of three years, and the balance of the Senators elected at the initial election shall be elected for a term of six years.

(6) The Parliament of Canada may make laws in relation to the method of election, the creation of senatorial districts, and procedures for the election of Senators, including laws in relation to the financing of elections, the funding of election campaigns, and the nomination of candidates.

24. Any person is eligible to be elected as a Senator for a province if that person

- (a) is a Canadian citizen,
- (b) is of the full age of 18 years at the date of the election,
- (c) has been ordinarily resident within that province for an aggregate period of at least five years during the 10 years immediately preceding the election and is resident within that province at the date of the election, and
- (d) is not a member of the House of Commons or a legislative assembly at the date of the election.

25. A Senator shall not be eligible to be a minister.⁵

26. If a vacancy occurs in the Senate through the death or resignation of a Senator at any time before the final year of the term, then such a vacancy shall be filled by a by-election to be held within 90 days. The Senator to be elected to fill the vacancy shall be elected for the balance of the term of the Senator who vacated the seat.

27. The Senate is empowered to establish its own procedures for the election of the Speaker of the Senate and the conduct of its business.⁶

28. (1) Bills proposed to Parliament, other than Bills for appropriating money solely for the ordinary annual essential services of the government⁷ or for imposing any tax or impost, may originate in the Senate equally as in the House of Commons.

(2) A Bill shall not be taken to impose taxation by reason only of its containing provisions for the imposition or appropriation of fines or other pecuniary penalties or for the demand or payment or appropriation of fees for licences or services.

29. (1) A Bill certified by the Speaker of the House of Commons as being a Bill to appropriate money solely for the ordinary annual essential services of the government shall not be required to be passed by the Senate if the Senate has not within 45 sitting days either passed the Bill as presented or amended it in a manner agreeable to the House of Commons.

(2) A Bill which appropriates revenue or money for the ordinary annual essential services of the government shall deal only with such appropriation.⁸

30. Neither a defeat of a government sponsored Bill, motion, or resolution in the Senate nor a specific confidence motion in the Senate shall constitute a vote of nonconfidence in the government so as to require the government's resignation.

31. (1) A joint standing committee known as the reconciliation committee, which shall be composed of 10 Senators and 10 members of the House of Commons, is hereby established for the purpose of this section.

(2) The Senate and the House of Commons shall elect from among its members persons to be appointed to the reconciliation committee established pursuant to this section.

(3) Where any Bill that has been passed by one House and presented to the second House

- (a) has been refused passage by the second House,
- (b) has not been finally dealt with by the second House and not less than 45 sitting days have elapsed since the Bill was presented to the second House, or
- (c) has been amended by the second House and the first House has duly advised the second House that it does not concur in all or some of the amendments made by the second House,

the Bill, in the form in which it was presented to the second House but with such amendments made by the second House as may be concurred in by the first House in the case of a Bill to which (c) applies, may be referred by the Speaker of either House to the reconciliation committee for the purpose of seeking to reconcile the differences and seek a mutually acceptable compromise.

32. (1) No appointment of a person to be a chairman, president, chief executive officer, or director of any of the Crown corporations, boards, or commissions subject to the application of the federal Financial Administration Act shall have effect until such time as the appointment of that person has been affirmed by the Senate.

(2) If no decision is taken by the Senate within 60 sitting days of a nomination being referred to it, then the appointment shall be deemed to have been affirmed by the Senate.

2. Section 47 of the Constitution Act, 1982, is repealed.⁹

End Notes

¹ All the existing provisions of the Constitution Act, 1867, to do with the Senate except section 17 are repealed. Section 17 states, "There shall be One Parliament for Canada, consisting of the Queen, an Upper House styled the Senate, and the House of Commons."

² Six Senators for each province will result in a smaller Senate compared to the current 100-member Senate. The government believes that a 60-member Senate – 72 if the territories become provinces – will be sufficient to ensure an adequate pool of talent and expertise, which is essential for an effective, well-functioning Senate. However, consideration would be

given to maintaining the size of the Senate by requiring 10 members for each province.

³ As the second chamber is designed to provide an equal voice for each constituent part of a federation, representation in the Senate should be an incident of provincehood. Accordingly, no provision is made for Senators from the territories until one or both of the territories achieves provincehood. Whether or not a territory becomes a province should, however, be a matter for that territory and the federal government alone and should not be subject to the approval of seven of the 10 provinces under the general amending formula. Instead it should be subject to the section 43 amendment procedure, with appropriate adjustment for the approval of the territories.

It is acknowledged that an argument can be made for having some means to ensure that the views of the territories on issues and legislation can be made known to the Senate. This perhaps could be accommodated by having one Senator from each of the territories.

⁴ Senate elections on the last Monday of October are purely arbitrary. Any other fixed date could be chosen.

⁵ In order to retain the independence of the Senate from the House of Commons and the office of the Prime Minister, a Senator should not be able to hold office in the cabinet.

⁶ This section would permit, for example, the establishment of a nonpartisan Senate executive council made up of the chairpersons of the 10 provincial delegations, as proposed by the Alberta task force on Senate reform. It would also permit the adoption of such procedures as the following:

- Senators sitting in provincial blocks instead of party groups
- all votes in the elected Senate being free votes
- the political parties of the Senate caucusing separately from their party colleagues in the Commons
- Senators in the elected Senate caucusing regularly on a cross-party, regional basis

⁷ The words "ordinary annual services of the government" are drawn from the Constitution of Australia, where a considerable body of experience and precedent has been established with respect to defining this term.

⁸ The purpose of this subsection is to prevent the government from bypassing the Senate on an important matter by "tacking" provisions for dealing with that matter onto a Bill for appropriating revenue for the ordinary annual essential services of the government.

⁹ This repeals a section of the current constitutional amending formula which allows the Senate to be bypassed on certain constitutional amendments. Its repeal is essential in order to ensure an effective vote by the linguistic divisions. Otherwise such votes could be overridden by the House of Commons after six months.

Note: This proposal for Senate reform draws on the ideas of a draft prepared by a nonpartisan and nonprofit research organization active in economic and public policy studies.

