

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Title: Thursday, May 19, 1983 2:30 p.m.

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

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill 56

Registered Dietitians Act

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill No. 56, the Registered Dietitians Act.

The purpose of the Bill is to provide a legislative structure or framework for the operation of registered dietitians in the province. The House would be interested to know that this does not provide for an exclusive field of practice, but rather for an exclusive use of name.

[Leave granted; Bill 56 read a first time]

head: INTRODUCTION OK SPECIAL GUESTS

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure today to introduce to all members of the House 90 grade 6 students from Barrhead elementary school. They are from three different classes and are accompanied by their excellent and very community-minded teachers Mr. Baldev Parmar, who is the vice-principal of Barrhead elementary school, Mrs. Florence Wallace, a grade 6 teacher — and I might just point out that 10 years ago, in 1973, Mrs. Wallace's eldest son was a member of the national *Reach for the Top* championship team, and this year, in 1983, Mrs. Wallace's youngest son is a member of that provincial championship team — and a third teacher, Mr. Don Roblin, who was here yesterday with two other grade 6 classes from Barrhead.

Quality education is very much stressed in Barrhead elementary school, Mr. Speaker, and I'm just delighted that one of the projects taken annually by the elementary school is a field trip to the Legislative Assembly. Mr. Speaker, the students are in both the public and members galleries, and I ask them to rise and receive the warm welcome of the House.

MR. PLANCHE: Mr. Speaker, sitting in the public gallery today are 35 children from grade 6 in the Eugene Coste school in Calgary Glenmore. Listening to the remarks by the Member for Barrhead, I think we're very fortunate to have any seats at all. In any event, we're holding our own in the grade 6 business, and they're up there. They came today to look through the Legislature Building and find out whether or not their member is earning his toast and beans. They're accompanied by their teacher Mr. Clapson and parent Mrs. Balleine. I ask them all to stand and receive the warm welcome of the Legislature.

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Mr. Speaker, once again I have the privilege of introducing to you and through you to the members of this Assembly, 17 students from the Alberta Vocational Centre. They are accompanied by their leader Debbie Payne, and they are seated in the public gallery. I ask that they rise and receive the warm welcome of this Assembly.

MR. APPLEBY: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased this afternoon to be able to introduce to you 12 grade 12 students from the Grassland school in the Athabasca constituency. I expect one or two of these students might be from the Lac La Biche-McMurray constituency, because the constituency boundary is only four miles east of Grassland. This afternoon they have with them their teacher Andy Gagnon and their bus driver Casey Hrycun. They're seated in the members gallery, and I ask them to stand and receive the warm welcome of the Assembly.

head: ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Government Purchasing Practices

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my first set of questions to the Premier. This concerns Alberta Government Services in 1979. Can the Premier advise why a firm by the name of ATC Consulting Limited was used as a middleman by the provincial government for the purchase of 21 cars from Crosstown Motors in 1979?

MR. SPEAKER: I have a little difficulty with this. If the hon. Acting Leader of the Official Opposition would refer to *Beauchesne*, I'm sure he'll find in several places that the question period is really not the time for a sort of reach back into history. If there is something the hon. acting leader considers to be important in that regard, perhaps he could put it on the Order Paper.

MR. MARTIN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I'm trying to deal with government policy in dealing with middlemen, in terms of purchasing government products. It's certainly policy, I would suggest, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: That certainly would be a valid topic if it were current. But to go back to 1979 ...

DR. BUCK: Nonsense.

MR. SPEAKER: I'm sorry about the distress of the hon. Member for Clover Bar, but I'm unable to share his point of view. It's so superabundantly clear that the question period, as I said, is not used for the purpose of a reach back into history. [interjections] Where is it going to end? Are we going to have questions relating to 1963, 1978?

DR. BUCK: Yes, yes.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Back to 1971 anyway.

MR. SPEAKER: Then I invite the hon. members of the opposition to initiate something which might lead to a change in the *Standing Orders* that would specifically provide for that kind of question, because it's clearly not in order.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I just don't understand the ruling at all. [interjections] You

can laugh and giggle all you want. But you tell me when the opposition prior to 1971 didn't ask about things back to 1935, and took licence to do it.

DR. BUCK: That's right.

MR. R. SPEAKER: I don't know of anything in our House rules at the present time, that I can recall, that says you can't go back into the history of an administration and ask about something they have done and taken, or not taken, a responsibility for at some point in time. I can't see the ruling being based on that assumption. If we can't question the government historically, I don't know how you do it at a moment of time, as of today, and still be able to question the matter fully.

What is the section? What should I be looking at in terms of the current House rules, in terms of *Beauchesne*, in terms of *Erskine May*? What is the citation? If it's there, I accept the ruling. But otherwise, I think that kind of restriction being placed on the question period by the decision just made by you, Mr. Speaker, would make it impossible for this little opposition to ask anything in this House. [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: The size of the opposition really has no connection with the quality of the questions or their admissibility.

I regret that my memory for numbers in *Beauchesne* is not better than it is. I'd like to respectfully suggest to the hon. leader of the Independents that he accept my very firm assurance that what I have stated to be the case is in fact the case. If I have an opportunity outside the question period to look up the reference, I'll be very glad to provide it. But there's no question about it, and we haven't been asking that kind of question in the question period. If it was done prior to 1972, then I respectfully suggest to the hon. Leader of the Opposition that his questions would have to be addressed to somebody else.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I can't believe what I'm hearing. The hon. Acting Leader of the Opposition is asking a question on something the government did before. Mr. Speaker, it's impossible to say — is it going to be one day, five minutes past, three days past, three weeks, three years? What kind of rule is that, that you're asking us to operate under? Are you going to say we can only ask questions one day past or two days past? What is the ruling? How many days, if you're going to be that arbitrary?

MR. SPEAKER: Order. The hon. member's last remark is quite out of order.

It has to be current. It's a matter of judgment, of course. I don't think that . . .

MR. R. SPEAKER: There are no statutes of limitation in this House.

MR. SPEAKER: There is, though, a practice of limitation in, as far as I know, practically all parliaments of the British tradition where there is an oral question period, that questions asked in the oral question period must be related to current matters of concern. That's a clear principle. And this is going back some four years. We haven't been dealing with that kind of question in the . . . [interjection] Now, I'm not going to debate the matter. I'm not supposed to do that, of course. I've made my statement on the point. I'm not able to change it. Even if I were able

to change it, however, I wouldn't, because it would be wrong.

MR. MARTIN: On the point of order, Mr. Speaker. How could you possibly . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. [interjections] Order please. [interjections] Would the hon. member . . . [interjections]

DR. BUCK: How did you know what the next question was?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. MARTIN: How could you know? [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Would the hon. member . . . Surely the hon. member knows something about chairing meetings.

MR. MARTIN: Surely I do. I wouldn't chair them the way you are; I'd find out what was going on.

[Mr. Martin continued to stand while Mr. Speaker was standing and continued to speak while Mr. Speaker was attempting to speak]

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Under the circumstances, I regret that I do not propose to recognize the acting leader for the next question. The hon. leader of the Independents.

MR. MARTIN: That's good enough, then. This whole thing is a charade.

[Mr. Martin left the Chamber]

DR. BUCK: On a point of clarification, Mr. Speaker. Am I going to be ruled out of order if I ask a question about the acquisition of PWA? Because from what you have said, I cannot ask that question. I can't believe what you're telling me, Mr. Speaker. It's unbelievable. It's absurd.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, that is . . .

DR. BUCK: Can I ask the question about PWA or not?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

There is a further consideration that arises in connection with that, and it's this: a Speaker does not answer hypothetical questions, otherwise he might have to write books about certain things. Questions that are actually before the House are all that a Speaker is permitted and supposed to deal with.

With regard to PWA, if it's a current matter, fine; if it's a matter that goes back into history, then the hon. member is entitled to put it on the Order Paper.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order . . .

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might just help to resolve the matter. On more than one occasion this afternoon, the statement has been made with respect to whether or not the currency or urgency of the matter was of some importance.

There are two citations in *Beauchesne*. One is No. 358, in the fifth edition, which describes the work of the special committee on procedure. The guidelines recommended, which were subsequently concurred in by the House — referring there to the House of Commons in Ottawa — are our normal guidelines, as all hon. members well know. And 358.(1)(a) indicates that such questions, referring to oral question period, should be asked

only in respect of matters of sufficient urgency and importance as to require an immediate answer . . .

Citation 359.(5) states:

The matter ought to be of some urgency. There must be some present value in seeking the information during the Question Period rather than through the *Order Paper* or through correspondence with the Minister or the department.

Mr. Speaker, I make these observations because I think the application of the rules on a consistent basis is very important to all hon. members. I just want to say to hon. members in the opposition, in an unheated way if I can, that the question period is very much an interest and concern to all hon. members of the Assembly. Of course, government members have rights in respect to question period as well, and it's a distinct interest of all hon. members to see that the rules which have been created over the years and have in them much wisdom should be followed in the question period.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order. I don't intend to ask any further questions today, until I review this matter as it is. My colleague and I have just conferred and agree on that position. I feel that my question today was one of current concern, but it relates back as well to a period of time between 1971 and 1977, relating to the contributions Act. I'm not going to go through a hassle as to whether or not I can ask the question when I think the matter I want to raise is of more important concern. But because of what has happened at this time, Mr. Speaker, I want to review it with my colleague and come back and act accordingly.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Agriculture would like to deal further with a question which was asked in a previous question period.

4-H Club Buttons

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, on May 16, 1983, the hon. Member for Little Bow raised a number of questions concerning 4-H Club buttons. I have checked into this matter, and hopefully my responses will lay the button question to rest.

First, the hon. member asked how many buttons were produced and why the colors were changed. The answer is that a supply of 20,000 buttons was ordered on December 7, 1981, and received on January 14, 1982. Distribution to regional 4-H offices occurred during the latter part of January. These buttons, along with other promotional materials, were used at 4-H events, shopping malls, and other activities where promotion occurred.

Mr. Speaker, the color of the buttons reflected youthfulness, warmth, and attractiveness . . .

DR. BUCK: They're PC colors too.

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: . . . and the colors are also complementary as they lie on opposite sides of the spectrum wheel of colors. They are not PC colors. Everyone

well knows that the orange color for the Conservative Party is a blaze orange, not a fluorescent orange.

Also, Mr. Speaker, he asked why the "Lougheed Conservative government", as he stated, and not the 4-H clubs of Alberta decided to make them orange and blue. The answer is that the buttons were recommended by an artist and the 4-H branch of the Department of Agriculture.

His third question was: how many buttons were printed and what was the disposition of the buttons since there was public reaction? I stated the answer to the first part earlier. As far as the disposition, approximately 7,500 unused buttons were recalled on June 1, 1982, and no buttons of that color have been issued since that date.

Another question he asked was whether I or any of my colleagues had anything to do with the selection. I can assure the hon. member that there was no political motivation or influence in the color selection and that it was strictly a color combination selection and design concept that would be complementary in its attractiveness.

Mr. Speaker, I'd also like to advise the Assembly that a new batch of the traditional green and white buttons were ordered in June 1982 and were used during the summer and fall for 4-H promotional activities. I'm sure the hon. member will appreciate that these were green and white buttons, the symbol of one political party in the province. They were issued by the 4-H branch in the fall, so the green and white ones were used during the November time frame the hon. member raised. I suppose we could show partisan leanings, and the next buttons that would be printed . . . [interjection]

DR. BUCK: He's been going on for the last 10 minutes. Why don't you get up?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The hon. Member for Clover Bar has . . .

DR. BUCK: You apply the rules differently to both sides of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. That is grossly out of order . . .

DR. BUCK: Well, that's a fact, though.

MR. SPEAKER: . . . and the hon. member should know that. He's been in the House long enough.

DR. BUCK: That's right. And I'm learning more.

MR. SPEAKER: I believe the hon. member has also played in sports, and he knows that referees make mistakes sometimes. I'm not suggesting I made one today, but I have made some. It's part of being a sport that one lives within the parameters of the game, including the virtues or shortcomings of the referee.

DR. BUCK: You also get rid of the incompetent people.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Before being diverted, I got up to say that I thought the hon. Minister of Agriculture had gone somewhat further than the question warranted. I suggest he has already completed his answer.

Real Estate Company Bankruptcy

MR. OMAN: Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the hon. Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. By way of background, a major real estate company went bankrupt in Calgary in the past year or so, leaving some millions of dollars in real estate commissions that were never delivered because, under this condition, the banks got first claim. I believe that would not be true under an ordinary wage situation, and I wonder if the hon. minister has any comments to make on that situation and is contemplating any changes.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I believe this situation relates to several policy suggestions that have been brought to my attention by the Alberta Real Estate Association. As a matter of fact, just within the last two weeks, at their annual convention, I had the very pleasant opportunity of meeting with a number of people belonging to that association. Their executive has met with me in my office within about the last six weeks. I can tell the hon. Member for Calgary North Hill that I believe this relates to the same subject area. Through the superintendent of real estate, my department is reviewing those suggestions with the Real Estate Association, and then I'll have an opportunity to look at them further.

MR. OMAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is there any reason commissions would not be put on the same basis as wages?

MR. SPEAKER: With great respect to the hon. member, it would appear that he's asking for a legal opinion. Perhaps he might seek that otherwise.

MR. McPHERSON: A supplementary to the hon. minister, Mr. Speaker. In her deliberations with the Alberta association of real estate agents, is there any consideration of establishing a separate trust account for commission sales people, complete and separate from the trust account normally held for clients' deposit money?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, that relates to one of the policy areas that was raised by the Real Estate Association.

MR. OMAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Let me rephrase my question and ask the minister if it is her intention to put real estate commissions on the same basis as wages.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, it would be premature for me to make a comment on that at this time.

Transportation Funding for Students

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Education. Could the minister indicate if it's the policy of his department that funds given to local boards of education for the purpose of busing students should not be used for schools specifically providing services to gifted children? I refer in particular to the Dr. Oakley school in the constituency I represent.

MR. KING: The regulations and policy of the department do not place any such limitation on the practice of a local school board. Very simply, we provide financial assistance for the transportation in an urban centre, such

as Calgary, of any student who must travel more than a mile and a half to attend school. By "must", we mean that the child is directed to that school by the school authorities who are satisfied that the program necessary for that child is available in the school to which the child is directed.

MR. ANDERSON: Could the minister then confirm that the funds which are being provided from the province to the local board in fact could be used by the Calgary Board of Education for subsidizing the travel of students to Dr. Oakley centre, within the limits just identified by the minister?

MR. KING: They could be used for that purpose if the school jurisdiction were to direct the child to attend that school, such as the Dr. Oakley school. There are a number of situations in which children are attending school at their own or their parents' choice, rather than at the direction of the Calgary Board of Education. Our regulations don't contemplate providing financial assistance for children to attend schools of choice. In particular cases, depending upon the circumstances of the child, Dr. Oakley might or might not be a school of choice.

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, just so I'm clear on this particular question, is the determination as to whether or not it's a school of choice, or whether or not the board will direct a student to a given school, fully the responsibility of that local board of education?

MR. KING: In my view and at the present time, the answer to that would be yes.

Health Care Coverage for Psychologists

MRS. EMBURY: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care. Would the minister advise the Assembly if a formal presentation has been made by the Alberta Psychologists Association, urging payment by the Alberta health care plan for psychologists in private practice?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I'd have to take that question as notice, and check and report back to the member. I can say that I believe they have, because we do get suggestions of that nature from time to time. Of course, as I've said before, our concern this year has to be ways of somehow managing the costs of the program as it now exists and not finding things and new services to add to it.

MRS. EMBURY: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I wonder, though, if the minister would consider at least reviewing the policy. I realize that cost is an implication, but it's pretty hard to realize that you'd only deal with the physical concerns of people and not the mental concerns also.

MR. RUSSELL: I'm sure the hon. member is aware that the program of medical services paid for by the health care insurance plan is now the richest of any province in Canada. By rich, I mean in the array of services that are covered beyond the basic health services. We do have to consider that element as well as the desirability of even more services, Mr. Speaker.

Boating Safety — Bow River

DR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Associate Minister of Public Lands and Wildlife. Has the minister established a committee to study boating safety on the Bow River? If so, what are the parameters of the study?

MR. SPARROW: Mr. Speaker, a committee of my staff is looking at the safety and speed limits of boating in the Bow River. They were asked to hold several public meetings where the public was invited to participate, in mid-April, and I'm expecting a report from them in the fairly near future. I've also sent a memo to all MLAs in the area to get their concerns. I hope the memo got to everyone.

DR. CARTER: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister comment on the number of presentations that were made by interested people? Is there still opportunity for written submissions to the minister?

MR. SPARROW: I have no interim report from the committee as yet. Yes, additional input could very definitely be received by the committee or by me, and I would make sure it gets to the committee.

DR. CARTER: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. When the report is brought forward, can we look forward to having it filed with the Assembly? My last supplementary is: would the minister undertake to take special note of the inadequately danger-designated weir near the Calgary Zoo?

MR. SPARROW: Mr. Speaker, I will be receiving a report hopefully within the next 30 days. I will specifically ask them to look at that weir. It has not been brought to my attention until now, but we will definitely take a look at that weir.

MR. BRADLEY: If I could supplement the answer of my hon. colleague, with regard to a safety program relating to the weir in Calgary. The Department of the Environment operates a head-works structure there, which is a danger to any canoeist or boater on the river. There are warning signs along the river. We are aware of that. We have implemented a safety program, and there will be advertising in the Calgary area, particularly to advise citizens of Calgary with regard to the hazard of boating in that area.

Trucking Contracts — Transportation

MRS. FYFE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the Minister of Transportation. The minister recently announced a policy regarding the necessity of utilizing local truckers in contracts awarded by that department. How does this policy determine the geographic parameters of the term "local"?

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is referring to our policy which requires that companies that are successful bidders in contracts with Alberta Transportation, particularly for paving jobs, hire 50 per cent of the trucks from a local area.

All the gravel trucks in Alberta that wish to work on Alberta Transportation projects are registered with the department. Before calling a tender, we outline an area

that is referred to as local to that tender, based on the number of trucks that are in the area and the size of the job. For example, if the job is one that would entail the use of, say, 40 trucks, we may go as far as outlining an area that has some 60 trucks registered within its boundaries around that project, which would be three times what would normally be required by the company. This is done so that the company is assured of getting an adequate supply of trucks and so that people don't have to travel too far from their place of business or their home in order to gain work. It's flexible in every case. On some occasions after the contract is awarded, changes are made in the local area described in the contract, but that is not often the case.

MRS. FYFE: A supplementary question. After the contract has been awarded, is there flexibility on the part of the contractor to find subcontractors or truckers that live outside that area, or must they be within the area that's described by the department?

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, the way the situation operates is that when a contractor moves onto the site to begin trucking, he puts out a call for trucks from the local area, which information is provided to truckers through Transportation offices as well as directly by the contractor. In the event that a day or two goes by and insufficient trucks are available from the local area, the contractor is then free to obtain trucks from whatever source, anywhere in the province.

MR. WEISS: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister assure the Assembly that the Department of Transportation, within its own department, will follow those same guidelines, with local preference, to ensure that only Alberta trucks will be operating?

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, with the exception of the two major metropolitan areas in this province, it is not possible for someone from outside Alberta to come into this province with either a gravel truck or another kind of truck, without obtaining operating authority from the Alberta Motor Transport Board. Unless the rules are not being observed, it is therefore impossible for someone from outside Alberta to be working on one of our jobs hauling gravel, either for a contractor or directly for the department.

As hon. members know, when we're dealing with 4,000 or 5,000 truckers around the province, there is always the exception that may be created. There is a possibility that someone who doesn't live here but lives outside has a truck registered in Alberta in the name of a friend, a relative, or something. We try to control those things the very best we can, but it is sometimes difficult.

ORDERS OF THE DAY**head: MOTIONS FOR RETURNS**

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, with respect to the motions for returns, I wish to advise that motions for returns 170 and 176 are acceptable to the government. An amendment will be proposed to Motion 173, and I think it has been provided to the hon. member and to the Speaker. I move that Motion 174 stand and retain its place on the Order Paper.

[Motion carried]

170. Dr. Buck moved that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing copies, in each case:
- (1) The report of the Minister's Task Force on Gifted and Talented Students, dated 1983
 - (a) the cost and number printed,
 - (b) whether the report was distributed to all schools in Alberta, and
 - (2) The report Educating the Gifted, by Melvin Sillits and Warren D. Wilde, dated February 1983
 - (a) the cost and number printed,
 - (b) whether the report was distributed to all schools in Alberta.

[Motion carried]

173. Mr. R. Speaker moved that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing:
- (1) The cost to Mobile Communications, a division of Alberta Government Telephones, for the advertising campaign in April 1983 relating to the sale of mobile communications equipment;
 - (2) The number of individuals who have received information through the Mobile Communications advertising campaign.

MR. R. SPEAKER: I understand there is an amendment, which is acceptable.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, I move an amendment to Motion 173. I have delivered copies to the hon. Member for Little Bow, to Your Honour, and to the Clerk.

The amendment deletes part (2), which currently reads: the number of individuals who have received information through the Mobile Communications advertising campaign,

and replaces that statement with:

the target population which is the focus of the Mobile Communications advertising campaign for April 1983.

[Motion as amended carried]

176. Mr. R. Speaker moved that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing:
- (1) The total cost to government for the production of annual reports, including government departments, agencies, and Crown corporations;
 - (2) The cost to the government for the production of annual reports, itemized by department of government, government agencies, and Crown corporations.

[Motion carried]

head: MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

220. Moved by Mr. R. Speaker:

Be it resolved that the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, Standing Orders and Printing be directed to consider the advisability of striking a permanent board of internal economy, to be responsible for the funding of all members' offices other than Executive Council.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, in moving Motion 220, I would like to say that we feel . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I don't wish to interrupt the hon. member. I guess he saw a quizzical look in my eye.

It is possible that some of the discussion on this motion may in some way directly or indirectly affect the functions of the Speaker. Therefore, the Deputy Chairman of Committees has kindly agreed to take the Chair. I am not suggesting I have any apprehension about it. But there could be points of order arising, and I just don't want there to be any question at all about my being involved.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I give up. How do you know anything before it's said?

MR. SPEAKER: I'm sorry to add to the hon. member's puzzlement for today, but that's the position I think I should take.

[Mr. Purdy in the Chair]

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, to continue my debate with regard to this motion, our intent is that this motion would call for a change in the present make-up of the Members' Services Committee, and would call for a board of internal economy such as now exists in Ontario and British Columbia. The items of concern we have are, I would say, the same as those items listed as terms of reference for the Camp commission, that was established in Ontario to set up the board of internal management of the Ontario Legislature. In setting up the terms of reference for this board of internal economy, they recommended five goals that they would attempt to achieve.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to relate those five goals and make comments about them in support of this motion. The first objective was to establish without question the authority of the Speaker over the Legislature. The objective was to have the Speaker as an objective, neutral person who was able to hear both sides of the story and, in some of the cases elaborated on in other provinces, would be the judge in cases where there were ties between the opposition and government components of the internal board. We feel that under normal circumstances, this would certainly be the case in Alberta, and would support that the [Speaker] be the chairman of the board of internal economy.

The second objective that was established for the Camp commission was to separate the Legislature from the executive, enabling the Legislature to provide services free of partisan influence. Mr. Speaker, I would have to say that that particular objective has led us to bring this resolution before the Legislature at this time. In establishing the budgets for our offices, the budget of the Leader of the Official Opposition, the budget for government backbenchers, and the space allocated in the building, we observed that it was very obvious that a partisan decision was made outside the committee and then brought in and imposed upon the committee, and that free and open discussion did not exist. Through the establishment of this board of internal economy and by the injection of cabinet representation on that board, it would be our objective to have a cross section of viewpoints and, hopefully, a more objective rather than partisan viewpoint in determining the needs and privileges of members in this Assembly.

The third objective was to rationalize the internal administration of the Legislature, thereby improving serv-

ices for members, which in turn would make them more effective. I think the objective in itself stands on that basis. If members are satisfied with their working conditions and with the rights, privileges, and fairness with which they are treated within and without the Legislature, we would certainly have members contributing and being more effective in their responsibilities to the Legislature. Mr. Speaker, we certainly agree with that kind of objective and are trying to achieve that end through the suggestions we're making here today.

The fourth objective was to enable the Legislature to control cost services provided to members, without inviting criticism of government control. I would have to say that that again is one of the reasons I'm standing in my place at this time. We have felt that rather than the committee being objective and non-partisan, the government was making the decision and, in turn, we were living with that decision. We often find even in this Legislature — maybe the incident of today is representative of that kind of situation. That concerns us very much. We feel that the board that is structured should be able to maintain the best objectivity possible.

The fifth objective of the Camp commission was to improve the stature of the Legislature and its members in the eyes of the public, who perceive the Legislature as inefficient and ineffective, largely because of media concentration on the executive. I'm sure that in a committee structured with cabinet, government caucus, and opposition caucus membership, we could have more of a cross section of attitudes of the different authoritative groups that are represented in this Legislature. On that basis, the questions that deal with the rights and privileges of members could be dealt with in a way that would enhance the stature, image, and work of members in this Legislature — a work for the general public of Alberta.

I mentioned that we would like to see this board of internal economy modelled on the Ontario basis. I'd like to give the composition of the Ontario and B.C. boards of internal economy so that members here have that for their information, to show that other provinces are doing this and have successfully achieved some of the objectives I just mentioned very briefly.

For example, the Ontario board of internal economy has the Speaker as chairman, three cabinet ministers, and three backbenchers, one from government and two from the opposition. The B.C. board has the Speaker as chairman, the Government House Leader, a nomination of the Leader of the Opposition, a government caucus member, and an opposition caucus member. In cases where there is a tie vote, the Speaker acts as the mediator, hopefully in a very objective way, looking at the needs and privileges of members in and outside the Assembly. From our indication and research, we find that this method has worked very successfully and has achieved goals for members of the legislatures in British Columbia and Ontario.

The federal House of Commons has a board of internal review, only the structure is somewhat different. The federal cabinet ministers sit as a board, hear the input, and make a decision with regard to economic needs relative to space, research, the pay of the opposition leaders, office compensation for the Official Opposition House leader — the Conservative House leader at the present time — the NDP House leader, staff, and so on. When we reviewed the statistics — research done by the library here in this Legislature, for which we thank them very much — we saw that not only is the compensation in dollars for government research, backbenchers, the oppo-

sition, and second parties in the opposition relatively equal, but as well the staff components are allocated in a relatively equal manner. I think that indicates that the board of internal economy has achieved some goals that we would like to see achieved here in this Assembly.

In New Brunswick, for example, we find that the principle of equality of funding for both government and opposition, regardless of size, is recognized as well and fulfils the objective we have established. Mr. Speaker, I could go on and talk in terms of specifics with regard to the remuneration to government caucuses, third-party caucuses, and opposition, not only in Ontario but in the federal government. But I think the principles achieved under their administration are the ones that are significant. I think we in this Legislature should adopt some of the organizational structure they have adopted.

We would favor — and certainly I would favor — this board being composed of cabinet ministers, government backbenchers, and members of the opposition, and chaired by the Speaker of the Legislature. The ratio of one to the other is certainly flexible and negotiable. Our first examination and suggestion would be possibly two cabinet ministers; three backbenchers — two from the opposition; and the Speaker of the Legislature chairing that group. I think that would be a workable group and could certainly achieve the objectives that we see are necessary. That type of organization would be acceptable. However, we're open to suggestions as to the composition of that board.

I think one of the inadequacies of the present Members' Services Committee, which is attempting to fulfil the functions I've talked about, is the fact that they have not had cabinet representation. Before the government members can make a decision, they often go back to cabinet or caucus to get some kind of direction. Then we in the committee, or members who have served with me and have sat on that Members' Services Committee, must live with that decision, a decision in which members of the opposition have not had first-hand discussion. If members of the government caucus were given the flexibility or openness to come back to Members' Services and look at each item objectively, without the caucus partisan point of view or cabinet point of view, possibly the present Members' Services Committee could have worked. But it hasn't been that way. I have sat as an observer in one or two of the meetings in the last while ...

MRS. CRIPPS: One.

MR. R. SPEAKER: ... and observed a process that was unacceptable. Decisions were made prior to the meeting even being held. We might as well have not even had the meeting. I don't think that is the objectivity that was to be established in that Members' Services Committee. If we want to do it on a partisan basis — as we in the opposition have said, why should we even belong? I guess that's the position we have taken currently and the position we will continue to take during the present fiscal year of the Legislature. That's the first point that concerns us and that I think could be remedied by this other structured board of internal economy.

To make the point with regard to cabinet representation, we also feel that the cabinet ministers, because of a greater amount of experience and a greater access to more material, could certainly see first-hand some of the concerns members have. In making our presentations, our budgets, and our space requests to the Members'

Services Committee, we as opposition cannot receive a decision in that committee. The committee must always go back to a cabinet minister to ask about space in this building, go back to the Provincial Treasurer to ask about budgeting. We cannot make any kinds of decisions without checking back with cabinet. By putting cabinet ministers on this new committee, I think we could certainly have a more effective structure that would communicate with the executive arm of government. That would certainly be quite satisfactory to us.

Mr. Speaker, my first objective was to comment with regard to the reasons for the new structure, and hopefully it's a positive suggestion and one that could be considered by government as an improvement; and secondly, to indicate that this type of structure, if it maintains objectivity — and that's the key to it, as well as the Members' Services Committee — could accomplish more things for members of this Legislature, could enhance the rights and privileges that supposedly are necessary and must be improved, not only for the members of the opposition but certainly for the government members of this Assembly.

MRS. CRIPPS: Question.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, I think it would be a bit premature to call the question without having a further discussion on the merits of Motion 220, which was designated today and has been advanced by the Member for Little Bow. It essentially asks all members of the House to look at the

advisability of striking a permanent board of internal economy, to be responsible for the funding of all members' offices other than Executive Council.

Mr. Speaker, I've only been a member of Members' Services since the beginning of the spring of 1983, when the new Members' Services Committee was appointed, so that would only go back several months. However, I have been a member for only four years, since the fall of 1979. During those three or four years, on numerous occasions I as a member had the opportunity to discuss concerns with various members of the Members' Services Committee and, in many ways, developed a certain type of interest, a certain type of concern for seeing the role of members of the Assembly improved as much as could be, and in fact looked forward to being appointed to the Members' Services Committee. Since that time, I've had the unique experience of being able to attend a number of meetings of the Members' Services Committee and, in fact, to see a number of concerns raised by members on both sides of the House, government and opposition, with respect to a certain number of items.

At the outset, Mr. Speaker, I must say that when looking at the make-up of the Members' Services Committee, it did come as a surprise to me that of the nine members, two are opposition members. I guess they account for some 22 per cent of the representation of the committee; whereas I look in the House and see four opposition members out of 79 in the Assembly, representing a little more than 5 per cent of the total members in the House. One of my concerns at the outset was to look at the actual numbers of representation, two opposition members out of nine in Members' Services and four opposition members out of 79 in ...

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. The page shall not pass between the Chair and the speaker.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, opposition members have a very substantial representation in the Members' Services Committee, particularly when one looks at the number of members on the committee compared to the opposition numbers in the House. The current make-up of the Members' Services Committee is most fair in having representation from the opposition. In fact, Mr. Speaker, it is overly fair. In my view, a number of government members can justifiably question why there are as many opposition members on that committee, when one compares the number of opposition members in the Legislative Assembly itself.

A second point I would like to raise in participation on this motion is that I think it has to be noted that today the House has a representation of four opposition members; whereas prior to last November 2, the House had six opposition members. In other words, there has been a reduction of one-third in the number of members of the opposition.

One of the concerns the Member for Little Bow raised, in outlining five basic objectives, was to basically look at the internal economy that would be associated with looking at the Legislature and, in fact, looking at the various offices of the members of the opposition. When I look back at the opposition budget in 1982-83, the figure provided to me by the now absent Member for Edmonton Norwood was some \$668,000 provided to the six opposition members. Should the Assembly in its wisdom vote the dollars the Members' Services Committee has recommended, the total opposition funding will be some \$530,000 for the 1983-84 fiscal year. I think one can make the argument that the \$668,000 figure for 1982-83, might very well have been reduced by one-third in 1983-84 because of the reduction in opposition numbers. If that had happened, Mr. Speaker, the total funding to opposition members would have been just a bit over the \$400,000 mark, whereas in reality the recommendation that came forward from the Members' Services Committee was for global funding of some \$530,000 for the various opposition leaders and caucuses.

I think it's important that one should repeat that there are really one-third fewer opposition members this fiscal year than there were last year, and there certainly has not been a reduction in dollars allocated for opposition members, leaders, and caucuses anywhere near that proportionate reduction. I repeat, should the Assembly approve these dollars, the global funding provided for opposition leaders and caucuses this year will amount to \$530,000.

Mr. Speaker, I think it's also important to note that this year the Members' Services Committee addressed itself to a number of principles that might be looked at in dealing with funding for opposition members. Certainly, there was a question of the principle used in looking at a global approach to funding for the opposition. Of course, the decision was made that despite the fact that there was a one-third reduction in opposition members, the total amount of funding for the opposition should not be reduced by one-third over what it was last year.

The second very important principle we looked at was really the question of funding for the office of the Leader of the Opposition. It's my understanding that in years gone by various members of the Members' Services Committee and various committees looked at the question of perhaps providing a certain number of dollars to the Leader of the Opposition. In the past, the request was made to the Leader of the Opposition to, in fact, then determine by himself, in consultation with other members

of the opposition parties, the allocation to the various caucuses and leaders within the opposition. It's my understanding that that responsibility was not assumed by previous leaders of the opposition.

When the question was posed again this year in the Members' Services Committee, the reaction from the member representing the NDP caucus, the Member for Edmonton Norwood, was that the Leader of the Opposition would not want to accept that responsibility in the 1983-84 fiscal year. So the Members' Services Committee was left with the question of what principles should be addressed and looked at in determining the level of funding for the Leader of the Official Opposition.

After considerable good, positive debate the principle addressed was that the Leader of the Opposition should have an amount of funding for the office of the Leader of the Opposition equal to the average funding for a member of Executive Council. We looked at the estimates book for 1983-84 and totalled all the dollar figures allocated to various ministers of Executive Council. It was concluded that the Leader of the Opposition should receive some \$230,000 in funding. That was a kind of rough estimation. After the decision was made, I went home, totalled them all, and I came to about \$216,000. But there's really no sense quibbling about \$14,000. I had no difficulty adding my approval to a figure of \$230,000 for the office of the Leader of the Opposition. That was principle number two, Mr. Speaker, that was addressed and looked at.

The third principle deals with the funding for the NDP caucus. Needless to say, the absent Member for Edmonton Norwood — who was a member of the Members' Services Committee until he decided to resign, I guess — advanced a proposal. I'm sure he had worked very hard on it over the last several months. However, I as a member of the Members' Services Committee also advanced a principle. I basically took the view that all members of the Assembly are really equal. We all have a responsibility to our constituents, and we should all have an equal opportunity to provide a level of service that would not see one member of this Assembly in a position to provide a greater amount of service to his constituents than another member. So I advanced a motion that basically said that the fairest way of providing dollars for a caucus would be to look at what is being provided to the government caucus, something like \$860,000. There are some 44 members in the government caucus. If you divide 44 into \$860,000, it rounds off to about \$20,000 per member. I advanced a motion that basically said that the amount of funding provided to the NDP caucus should be equal, on a per capita basis, to that provided to the government caucus; in this case \$40,000, because there are two members in the NDP caucus.

Mr. Speaker, I worked pretty hard advancing that principle. Unfortunately, I got voted down in flames. Only one other government member on the Members' Services Committee agreed with me. That led to the introduction of a second concept, advanced by the Member for Cypress, that basically said: if you look at it on a per capita basis, the members of the government caucus get some \$20,000 per person, but an opposition member in the NDP caucus should receive funding in the amount of two and one-half times that provided to a member of the government. That amounted to \$50,000 per member. If you multiply it by two, because there are two members in the NDP caucus, you come up with \$100,000. That motion was presented to the Members' Services Committee, and the committee voted in favor of

it. I'd like the record to show that I voted against it. However, I lost. Fair game; you win some and you lose some.

The third principle that had to be addressed by the Members' Services Committee, was one dealing with what is known as the leader of the parliamentary coalition, or the leader of the Independents. After considerable debate again, the decision seemed to be that a number of members would accept a proposal that \$100,000 be made available to the office of the leader of the parliamentary coalition. We had to take a vote, Mr. Speaker. Four members of the Members' Services Committee voted in favor of that \$100,000 and two voted against it. I want all members to know that I voted against it, as did the Member for Innisfail. There were two abstentions. There were four in favor, two against, and the Member for Clover Bar and the Member for Edmonton Norwood abstained. If the Member for Clover Bar and the Member for Edmonton Norwood had voted against it with me and the Member for Innisfail, the motion would have been defeated. We would then have had to readjust, rethink, or relook at the whole concept. I'm not sure what might have happened in that case.

As well, Mr. Speaker, I think it's important that I only raised the question of the four in favor, two against, and two abstentions vote when I came to dealing with the question of the leader of the parliamentary coalition. It must also be noted that that was exactly the same type of voting pattern that developed when we looked at the \$100,000 funding for the members of the NDP caucus. Four members of Members' Service voted in favor of it, two were against — the Member for Innisfail and I — and there were two abstentions. The Member for Edmonton Norwood and the Member for Clover Bar abstained.

DR. BUCK: We're not used to being rubber stamps. Ken.

MR. KOWALSKI: If they had voted with us, Mr. Speaker, the motion would have been defeated. If it had been defeated, that would have led to another discussion and perhaps another motion. I don't know what the resolution of that matter would have led to. So I repeat: two principles established, two principles approved by members of Members' Services; in both cases, the vote was four in favor, two against, and two abstentions.

Then we went on to a third item we had to deal with in Members' Services: the amount of funding that would have to be allocated to this caucus known as the caucus of the Independents. The motion was raised that there should be an amount of funding based on the same principle allocated to the members of the NDP caucus; that is, \$50,000 per member. There are two members in this new party known as the Independents. So you multiply \$50,000 by two and get \$100,000. The vote was on, Mr. Speaker. I love making decisions. Four voted in favor, two voted against — and I want the record to show I voted against it, as did the Member for Innisfail — and there were two abstentions. The two abstentions were, one, the Member for Edmonton Norwood and, secondly, the Member for Clover Bar. If those two members had voted with me and my colleague from Innisfail, the motion would have been defeated. On three occasions, the two members of the opposition refused to vote. They voted by abstaining.

Mr. Speaker, I don't win everything I want to win. In fact, I'm embarrassed to say that I very seldom win even 50 per cent of the arguments I get into. But one thing I do not do is abstain. I'm prepared to put my name next to

the decision, to have it in there, and to live with the results; I do not abstain and walk away from a problem. Mr. Speaker, it should not be forgotten that on three occasions the opportunity to vote was there, and the two hon. members — one for Edmonton Norwood, the other for Clover Bar — abstained on three vital motions which will affect the funding levels of, one, the leader of the parliamentary coalition; secondly, the NDP caucus; and, thirdly, the caucus of the Independents.

Principle is important, Mr. Speaker. As a member of Members' Services, I think the record shows that I argued on the basis of principle, logic, reasonableness, and fairness. The next point I want to raise really deals with fairness. I've heard various hon. colleagues of mine who sit in one of the two caucuses across the way, talk about the concept that a member is a member. In fact, I've heard the Member for Little Bow talk about that in this House on numerous occasions. Well, sir, I am a member of this Assembly in the same way that all other members of this Assembly are members. We are equal, and we should be treated equally.

The total number of dollars provided by Members' Services Committee to the government caucus amounts to approximately \$20,000 per member. That's my proportionate, per capita share as a member of the government caucus. If we're saying that a member is a member, if we're talking about fairness, equality, and logical argument, then I think it's only fair that members of the two opposition caucuses should have received \$40,000 in total. However, I lost the argument. I didn't run away; I'm still here. I continued to serve on the Members' Services Committee, and I will continue to serve on the Members' Services Committee and address the problems before us.

Mr. Speaker, one of the other items was addressed by the Members' Services Committee at the meeting on May 16. May 16 was a very interesting meeting because, of the original group of nine members on the Members' Services Committee, only seven were there. The Member for Clover Bar was absent; the Member for Edmonton Norwood was absent. One of the items looked at that morning at that meeting — an advertised meeting of Members' Services that all members of the committee received notice of — was what kind of recommendation the Members' Services Committee should make to this Legislative Assembly with respect to the remuneration that should be provided to the Leader of the Opposition. I think that's kind of important, and I think it's kind of important as well for the former opposition members of the Members' Services Committee to have addressed themselves to.

There was a recommendation made on the morning of May 16 that in fact the stipend for the Leader of the Opposition should be equal to that provided to a member of Executive Council. That recommendation went from the Members' Services meeting on the morning of May 16 to a committee of the Legislature looking at privileges and elections that evening. As I understand it, the Leader of the Opposition was there, and he thought it was a great idea.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it's too bad his colleague in his caucus wasn't there to advance the argument. It was government members who advanced the argument, as it was government members who advanced the argument for the next important recommendation that came forward on May 16, dealing with a stipend that could be provided to the leader of a minority party, provided they had 5 per cent of the votes in Alberta and four members in the House. We made a recommendation to this Legis-

lature on what that stipend should be. I would have thought that that would have been important, of some concern and interest to perhaps one of the other members on the Members' Services Committee who represents an opposition party. He wasn't there.

Government members advanced it, based it on principle, and recommended it. It came to this Assembly last Monday night, and was tabled before the committee that was meeting. As I understand it, the Leader of the Opposition and some other members from the opposition parties were here. They all thought it was a great idea, too. It's too bad they weren't present to participate in the committee.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Shame, shame.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, one can look at the arguments made by the Member for Little Bow; I think they're valid arguments. I'm not so sure the goals set out by the Camp commission are not already in place. In fact, the only difference I can really see in the remarks made by the Member for Little Bow as to how he would see a new system operate here in Alberta compared to the way the present system operates, is that in essence there should be several cabinet ministers on the board of internal economy.

We don't have any cabinet members present on the Members' Services Committee, and I'm glad we don't. It's not that I have any disrespect for my fellow colleagues in Executive Council; it's just that I believe that basically what we're looking at here are concerns that are brought forward to the Legislature by private members. They are not members of Executive Council. For the love of me, I have to repeat that, while I've only been a member of Members' Services since March 1983, I know of no occasion — and the Member for Little Bow has to look me straight in the eyes when I tell him this — when I had to run to some minister to find out where the space requirements were going to be. [interjections] I did not. And I know of no occasion when I had to run to the Provincial Treasurer.

The reality of it is, Mr. Speaker, that the Members' Services Committee makes the recommendation to the Legislature in terms of what the funding is. I know of no discussion with anyone saying that the global figure that the Members' Services Committee is recommending to the Legislature should be adjusted upwards, downwards, or anything else. There has not been one discussion in Members' Services Committee about having to worry about the Provincial Treasurer's guidelines — are we going above them or below them — or anything else. We have addressed the concerns of the members.

Frankly, if I were a member of this new committee of internal economy, I wouldn't know who I'm supposed to talk to and how a member of Executive Council would change the situation. What we need in Alberta is a committee that looks after the concerns of the members. I repeat, the only thing I can see the Member for Little Bow recommending in his motion is that there should be two cabinet ministers.

I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, he's recommending another thing too. He's recommending the number composition. Today the Members' Services Committee has nine members: two from the opposition and seven government backbenchers. What he's recommending is that there should be two cabinet ministers, three backbenchers, and two opposition members. That's an interesting proposal. If I were a member of the opposition, I would like to see

the members of the internal economy board or the Members' Services Committee reduced in numbers; that would enhance my participation as a member of the opposition. But I go back to what I said at the beginning. A little less than 5 per cent of the members of this Assembly are members of the opposition. On our Members' Services Committee today, two out of nine, or 22 per cent, are members of that committee. That is a very substantial proportionate representation compared to the actual percentage representation that exists in the Legislative Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, I'm very proud to be a member of the Members' Services Committee. In the past three months, I think the Members' Services Committee has addressed itself to a number of difficult subjects and questions. We've attempted to base it on principle, and we've attempted to make our decisions based on reason. I have no doubt at all that some members may be disappointed and unhappy with some of the decisions arrived at. But one of the things you don't do is pick up the ball and run away. You stay and fight and make your arguments, Mr. Speaker. I cannot support Motion 220.

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Speaker, I'm actually disappointed to be speaking on this motion. It really points out the immaturity of the opposition approach, even though the number of years in this Legislature are many. I guess if you don't win you sulk or throw a tantrum, and you resign from the committee, especially if the previous day's antics didn't make headlines.

Mr. Speaker, I want to point out — and the hon. member before me already has — that neither member of the opposition voted on the motions regarding their funding. I also want to point out that Mr. Appleby was in the Chair and indicated to the meeting that he'd been asked to take the Chair, but since he wasn't a member of the committee he could not vote. I want to reiterate what the Member for Barrhead said. That simply means that if they had voted, the vote would have been a tie, and a tie vote is lost. I don't know whether the members have a problem counting, but those are the facts.

One of the press indicated to me that the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood had suggested that the Members' Services Committee wanted a higher profile. Mr. Speaker, I remember the events of last Tuesday. It was not government members who wanted a higher profile or who staged a demonstration. I was asked by someone in the media if I wanted a higher profile. I can honestly say to all members that since I've been in the Assembly, I've never done anything to try to attract media attention. I did vote, though. I have co-operated with weekly newspapers in my constituency in order to ensure, to the best of my abilities, that my constituents get information pertaining to important government matters which affect them directly.

It's the responsibility of members of this Assembly to represent their constituents and the broader interests of the people of Alberta. I believe firmly and implicitly that that responsibility lies equally with all members. It's especially onerous for government members, because you are either flogging away at a caucus committee or spending hour after hour in the House seeing that the job gets done.

Mr. Speaker, in the meeting last Monday, the hon. Member for Clover Bar said that if there were a third more opposition members, he would have a third less work to do, and I'll quote:

But we should be looking at it the other way: when

the opposition gets smaller in number, the global budget ... should increase one-third. Those four members have the work of the previous six members.

I was really tempted to ask him if that meant that he'd have to work only four hours in the House instead of the five and a half he had the previous week. That would be a third less work. In fact, last week I wasn't sure he hadn't resigned from the House.

I find it totally unacceptable that in a democratic system anyone would suggest that if you elect fewer members, you hire somebody to take their place. That's not democracy. Democracy is government of the people, by the people, and for the people. That means each and every one of them. An MLA is a representative of his constituents, regardless of the way they voted in an election. During the campaign period we are candidates representing a party and a philosophy, but following the election we are members for our constituents and for the people in the province of Alberta. When a constituent comes to me with a problem, I never ask who he voted for in the last election.

I would like to talk about principles and reiterate some of the things the Member for Barrhead said. I want to make it perfectly clear that the decision, at least on my part, regarding opposition funding was based on principles. First is the principle, as in the British parliamentary system, that the Official Opposition has a role to play. For that reason, I support the concept that the office of the Leader of the Official Opposition be funded as an entity: in this case, \$230,000, which is a substantial fund.

I'd like to read into the record what the caucus Whip said when he was discussing the role of the opposition:

I'm very well aware historically of the function in parliament of the opposition and opposition groups

...

The situation is that our system of parliamentary democracy is based on a government and an opposition. That's usually taken as being the Official Opposition, and historically that's been the case. But there are other groups that can happen in our parliaments. There are, I think the usual term is "minority" parties, where in various parliaments the recognition varies according to the percentage of the vote received in a general election or the number that are elected to the House, or a combination of those two features. Those are minority parties, and they represent parties which do not achieve as much of a popular vote or the numbers of the Official Opposition. I don't think anybody argues about the funding of what one could call the "office" of the Leader of the Official Opposition. That's not just the physical office; that's the office as an entity.

The second principle we accepted is the premise that there could be a party coalition. Therefore we funded an office of a party coalition at \$100,000, which in anyone's book is a substantial sum. The coalition caucus is funded at \$200,000, or \$50,000 a member: two and a half times the government members'. That works out to a total or equivalent of \$100,000 for each of the Independents. At this time, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to register my position that such generous funding per member would not be continued should the caucuses become more evenly placed. In that case, I think the funding would then have to be equivalent, and I might even favor Ken's motion.

The other principle addressed in Mr. Hyland's proposal was that the leader of an official party with 5 per cent of the vote — he has two members; I have four members

written down. Personally, I would like to see that principle established. So the total funding for opposition members is over half a million dollars, and that's a substantial amount of money in anyone's book.

The discussion centred around the role of the opposition. Mr. Speaker, the government also has a role to play, and government members have a special responsibility to bring in legislation which has already been carefully scrutinized by caucus committees. The Attorney General tells me it takes 30 hours of drafting to review and revise legislation, and no doubt the odd point is missed. Then, of course, there's the line-by-line scrutiny, and the white paper that was brought in exemplifies that fact. The government has the responsibility to maintain the business of the House; carry on debates in the absence of opposition members, which is often; maintain quorums; bring in a responsible budget; and assure the maintenance of the integrity of the Assembly as a whole.

The leader of the Independents proposes a board of internal economy. The Member for Barrhead indicated that he is suggesting two cabinet ministers, two opposition members, and three backbenchers. I would just like to point out that two of the six boards of internal [economy] I have listed here have no opposition members. The House of Commons in Ottawa is made up of the Speaker and four cabinet ministers, and there are no opposition members. By the way, they hold their meetings in camera and only the decisions are made public.

The United Kingdom has the Speaker, the Government House Leader, a member nominated by opposition, and three other members — one from each party. In Ontario there are six members: the Speaker, three members of the cabinet, and three backbenchers — one from the government and two from opposition. In Manitoba there are the Speaker, two cabinet ministers appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council. There are no opposition members on the board of internal economy. In Saskatchewan, six members: two cabinet ministers, two from government caucus, and one from each opposition party. In Quebec, again no opposition: the Speaker and three cabinet ministers. It would seem to me that if this government decided to appoint a board of internal [economy] such as Ottawa, Manitoba, or Quebec, the opposition would be the first people to cry foul.

I listened with interest to the points raised by the leader of the unofficial coalition, and he discussed the role of chairman. In every case, the leader of the board of internal [economy] is the Speaker of the House, and that compares with our Members' Services Committee, where the Speaker is the chairman. I can't see any difference between the two. Number two, "separate the Legislature from the executive". He is suggesting that we appoint two cabinet ministers to this board of internal [economy]. I am not exactly sure how that would separate the Legislature from the executive. It seems to me it would be adding the executive to the Legislative Assembly.

Thirdly, rationalize the internal workings of the Legislature. I'm not even sure what he meant by that, and I didn't get it from the explanation. The fourth point I missed totally. The fifth point: "improve the stature of the Legislature", enhance the image of the Legislature. If there's one thing that could enhance the image of this Legislature, I think it would be to have the opposition act in a manner which is befitting elected people. I think the Legislature can only work successfully if the members work at their respective jobs with some dignity.

I'd just like to point out that we were asked a number of times in Members' Services Committee to rationalize

our reasoning for opposition budgets. In 1978-79 the opposition budget was \$291,100, of which they expended \$266,457, or 91 per cent. So they weren't short in 1978-79. In 1979-80 their budget was \$348,512, of which they expended \$306,109, or 88 per cent of the budget. Again, it would appear to me that they weren't short of funding. In 1980-81 the budget was \$440,082. The expenditures were \$399,969, or 91 per cent of the total budget. In 1981-82 the budget was \$528,507, of which \$494,756, or 94 per cent, was spent. Again, it would appear there was no shortage of funding. Since a full year wasn't used in 1982, I don't have the figures for that. I would say that the increase from \$610,742 last year to the budget request of over a million dollars this year simply can't be substantiated by the fact that in the last four years the budgets that were allocated weren't used.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to reiterate that the principle of the position and the responsibility of the opposition is addressed by the funding of the Leader of the Official Opposition as an entity. I believe that's important. This funding recognized the importance and traditional role of the member and that function. I believe the Members' Services Committee has worked to provide services for all members of the Legislature, regardless of their party affiliation. I don't see that a board of internal economy would in any way enhance the role of the members of this Legislature. For that reason, I oppose the motion.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, in speaking to Motion 220, sponsored by the hon. Member for Little Bow, I would first of all like to say that in listening to the debate, I have some concern as to the spirit and mood within the Assembly. I think the Member for Little Bow should be commended for bringing this motion before the House. Any member — and there aren't many around; as a matter of fact, to my knowledge there's only one who's been a member of this House for 20 years — who shows the interest and dedication toward members of the Assembly, should be commended. I wish to do that in this Chamber.

I then address my mind to what prompted the hon. member to bring it here. We've heard his reasons; we've heard other reasons as to what the speakers perceive to be the motivation of the Member for Little Bow. I have some difficulty believing it's on the basis of the funding of the opposition, although that could well be. Could it be that the Member for Little Bow occupied a different position in the 19th Legislature than the 20th? There could be some of that. I don't want to make that judgment. Could it be, as members have suggested, that the perception of members of the Assembly with regard to part of the opposition in this Chamber, related to either the research funding capability, the quality of the questions we hear in this House, the quality of debate or the amount of research — I think there could be all kinds of reasons that motivated the Member for Little Bow to bring it here. Mr. Speaker, I want to be gracious and believe that it was brought here solely to assist members of this Chamber to be able to do a better job as members of the Assembly than he perceives in the present system.

One should not be naive, Mr. Speaker, to recognize the principle that he who controls the government controls the parliament. To me that is as old as the parliamentary system itself. The caucus system is an integral part of that, and surely one who has been in this House even a short time recognizes that those decisions are made by caucus groups, as part of the government and opposition

systems. When they come into the Chamber, they've generally developed a position with regard to how things are done. I don't think anybody should be naive not to accept that. I am sure that's not the issue. The hon. Member for Little Bow recognizes that.

What concerns me, Mr. Speaker — and I'd like to just take a moment to speak on it. I think I have the privilege not many members of this Chamber have — certainly not members of the front bench — of having been a member of Members' Services for eight years. I think I can speak a little of the role that I perceive the committee functions in, limited to the 18th and 19th legislatures. We heard two members who are on that committee in the 20th Legislature speak about how they perceive it should be done. Perhaps it may be helpful to members of the House to hear my view on how I perceive that committee should function, based on how it did function. Then it's up to members to make the judgment as to whether we should look favorably to Motion 220.

I vividly recall the Member for Bow Valley in the 19th Legislature, Mr. Fred Mandeville, as a very integral and important member of that committee. We dealt with some very important matters affecting all members of this Assembly. But I think the most important thing was that we worked as a team, and we discussed many issues.

I recall members of this House who didn't have a dental program. They had one before they were elected. They got here and, as happens so often, when they woke up to the reality, some things had disappeared. I recall that the Member for Edmonton Mill Woods had a dental program before he got here. He was surprised that he didn't have one when he got here. I remember that Members' Services Committee working hard to convince through a system of recommendations to Executive Council, to which the hon. Speaker reports, and we got that through. We didn't get it through as the result of an adversarial system. We didn't get it through as a result of fighting or bickering. Members pulled together and worked as a team. As I recall, Mr. Speaker — and you were part of that system — it was only by agreement and consensus that we got that recommendation through. To me that is a very positive role of that committee. Some might think that if that's all the committee is going to do, why do they function? I happen to think that's pretty important; it's very important to those people who don't have very good teeth.

Mr. Speaker, another issue may not be important to many people. A member of the House receives an indemnity. When you look at what Calgary and Edmonton do in terms of airports, they recognize a captive market. It's almost as cheap to rent a hotel room as to park your car. As a matter of fact, a fellow landed at Calgary airport. He was going downtown in a cab, and he asked the cab driver why the airport was so far from the city. The cabbie said, I don't know, but I understand that's the only place the aircraft can land. The point is that to park at these airports is expensive.

[Mr. Appleby in the Chair]

If one cares to look at the minutes of Members' Services — and that's a public committee — I recall participating in at least half a dozen committee meetings attempting to resolve that. Surely that's a very positive thing. All members of the committee agreed; we just couldn't work out the mechanics. Again, people may not think that's important. They tend to think of all committees of this House as dealing with the fact that this is the

highest court in the province, it's primacy legislation, and on and on. That's not the purpose of that committee. The purpose of that committee is to get in order those plans that are beneficial to members, whether it's research funds or such a minor thing, in some people's view, as parking your car at the airport.

Mr. Speaker, I recall a member saying that there's a certain empathy and fellowship between members, that we should do whatever we can to make life as pleasant as possible when new members are elected and away from home for eight, 12, or 14 weeks. I recall very well a suggestion — because let's remember that in the 19th Legislature, I don't think members were paid that well, although it was only 5 per cent less than they are now I guess. I remember a member saying, could we make some provision whereby perhaps a spouse could come to the opening of the Legislature? We're talking about some people with a couple of children, the cost of getting a baby-sitter, you have to fly to Edmonton, stay in a hotel. Surely there is something that Members' Services could do in perhaps assisting with the travel. I recall we agreed on that, and we put it forward as a recommendation. Frankly, I'm not on the committee; I don't know where it's at. But I have confidence that the present committee is probably going to deal with it successfully.

We tend to forget those things. To me they are the positive things. It appears to me that we get into bickering about the amount of opposition funding. Surely the record is clear. By picking up a telephone, any member of the Assembly can determine what the funding is in all jurisdictions across Canada. Alberta is second to none in terms of funding. Let's not get off on that tangent, because I think as a result of that, we then tend to — well, I'm not a lawyer, but I understand that the adversarial system seems to be the way. The Matrimonial Property Act proves that: one-third to the husband, one-third to the wife, and one-third to the lawyer.

Mr. Speaker, as a member who participated for two terms on the Members' Services Committee — which I think was successful in some of the matters that were resolved in an affirmative way to assist members of the House — I look back at how well it worked. The fact that two members have resigned — maybe in their minds they are justified in resigning. Frankly, I have great difficulty understanding how you can participate in anything if you're not in attendance. I have great trouble understanding that.

I would hate to think that as a result of a new type of opposition, we are getting a new type of system going here. That's why I would appreciate it if the Member for Edmonton Norwood were in the House. I'd like to hear his views on this. The only views I have heard so far are that he has resigned from this and he has trouble finding his way to this Chamber. That bothers me, because I think that's a very negative attitude if you're going to be expected to serve on a committee in this House where the interests of your fellow members are at stake.

Mr. Speaker, it may appear that I haven't dealt in any great detail with regard to the concept of internal economy, with restructuring the committee. Frankly I haven't heard any arguments to change my mind. Surely the government has a responsibility on behalf of the taxpayers of the province to allocate funds in a way that's appropriate and in the best interest of those people. I have no quarrel with how that's been done. I can't support the motion, but I would ask members to bear in mind that when a member of 20-years standing brings a resolution before this House dealing with members of this

Assembly, one should listen very, very carefully before they make a hasty judgment.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, in taking part in the debate this afternoon, I think I will be rather a disappointment to members of the Tory caucus and members of the Assembly that belong to that party, because I am not going to answer any of their cheap shots. [interjections]

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, Walt.

DR. BUCK: I wouldn't dignify some of those statements.

Mr. Speaker, the reason I want to get involved in the debate this afternoon is that I feel I've been used.

AN HON. MEMBER: It hasn't done much good.

DR. BUCK: I want to say that I requested to serve on the Members' Services Committee. I thought that with the personnel they had on the Members' Services Committee previously, there was maybe some hope that we would have an impartial committee. I want to say in all sincerity that probably the two greatest disappointments as members on that committee are people who were supposedly members of the teaching profession, the hon. Member for Barrhead and the hon. Member for Drayton Valley. I feel very, very badly. If the hon. members for Drayton Valley and Barrhead have taught their pupils that democracy doesn't matter and they can't understand how democracy operates, I think those two members have done a great injustice to the people they've served as teachers in their schools.

Mr. Speaker, what we're talking about is the democratic process. I would like to give a little homework to the hon. members who have just spoken. The hon. Member for Barrhead and the hon. Member for Drayton Valley cannot seem to understand that we're talking about the role of the opposition. It is basically that simple. What is the role of the opposition? The hon. Member for Barrhead keeps talking about all members being equal. There's no argument about that. But the roles they have to play are completely different. So I guess what I'm really talking about today is, is democracy going to survive in this province or is it not? When we look at the patronage role — the Premier stands in his place and he's not ashamed of the patronage in this province. We hear members say that once something has been done on election day, it doesn't matter how you rule for another four years.

Mr. Speaker, democracy is a very fragile flower. It has to be cultivated, looked after, and guarded very, very carefully, otherwise that flower withers and dies. That is what is happening in this province. Democracy is dying one day at a time, because members do not seem to understand that there's the need for government and there's the need for opposition.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on at great length about what is done in other jurisdictions. But that's not important. As the hon. Member for Lethbridge West said, we can all pick up a telephone or go to some of the materials in the library and find out what they do in other jurisdictions. But I will not serve on a committee where I think I'm being used as a rubber stamp. As I said to the former Premier of this province when I sat in that caucus, I answer to no one except my conscience and my constituents. If I think a decision by my leader, my former Premier, is wrong, I will tell him. If I think decisions in

this Legislature are wrong, I will tell the Premier of this province. No one rubber stamps me, and no one is going to use me. When I sit on a committee, I expect that that committee can at least have the dignity of making it appear that they are really listening. I don't think that's asking too much of fellow members.

As a member of the committee on privileges and elections, I felt very badly used when we talked about the allocation of space. That committee did not dignify that committee sufficiently to go down and look at what we were proposing. I felt that I was used when I sat on that kind of committee and the decision had already been made. I know there is government and government caucus, oppositions and opposition caucuses, but a committee is supposed to genuinely look at what we're trying to resolve.

I was used; and I'm not going to be used by this government again, Mr. Speaker. That's why I resigned. My conscience is completely clear. The Members' Services Committee did not fulfil its role to look at the entire picture. If I wanted to look at motives, I would say that the government caucus was trying to do nothing but put it to the NDP. It was just that plain and simple. We got caught in the undertow.

If we really believe in democracy, Mr. Speaker, committees have a very important role to play. The reason we are asking for cabinet ministers to be on this committee is that we feel members of Executive Council have more experience than backbenchers. You don't have to go through the charade of running back and forth saying, we'll take it to caucus and bring it back. I'm not trying to belittle the government backbenchers by asking that two members of Executive Council be on this committee. All I'm trying to do is support a motion which will make this a non-partisan committee. The government has the ultimate voting power to bring it back to the Assembly, to make that decision in caucus or the Assembly. But at least let us treat it as equal members of a committee. Let us try to make it objective. That's what we're asking.

Mr. Speaker, I am disillusioned and disappointed that we don't have that kind of committee. If we can't have it in a supposedly non-partisan committee, where can we have it? Where is the honor among members of this Assembly when we indicate genuine needs? As a former member of the Members' Services Committee, I said — and it is on record — that only government members know what their needs are. That's why I supported and voted for their budget. The reason I abstained twice — and the hon. Member for Barrhead is chastising me for abstaining.

MRS. CRIPPS: Three times.

DR. BUCK: Three times, the hon. Member for Drayton Valley says. The reason I abstained is that I saw it as a charade, and I was not going to be party to a charade. I asked the hon. Member for Cypress where he got his figures? Were they just pulled from the air? Did he look at the previous record of what was required to fund opposition offices? Where did he come up with his figures? Could he defend them? We haven't received an answer to that. So the committee was not functioning. The committee was a rubber stamp.

Mr. Speaker, I am distressed and disillusioned. I just want to say to this government that the voters are the ultimate judges, and history is the most ultimate judge. When history judges the performance of the former Social Credit government and records and compares the

performance of the present government, the Tory blue and orange colors will have faded worse than they are fading on some of those fence posts they're now standing on. I think history will indicate that this government didn't really care about the preservation of democracy in this province, didn't really care about people, and didn't really care about patronage, except to encourage it and look after their friends. That's why I am so disillusioned at what is going on in our Assembly, the Assembly of the people of this province.

I think it's just about time that the people of this province woke up to the kind of government they have. Mr. Speaker, when I go to other parliamentarians, I don't talk about the Alberta government, I can tell you. I tell them that I am a member of the opposition, because I do not want to be identified with that government.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Speaker, as I take part for a few minutes on this subject, I'd like to make some quick comments. We've heard much discussion this afternoon about the association and the removal of the association of the executive part of government from the services provided to members. I suggest the outline given by the Member for Little Bow does just the opposite of that. The board he recommends, as it exists in other jurisdictions, indeed brings it closer. Because you have two or more members of cabinet on the board. In the system we employ in Alberta, we just have ordinary members, government and opposition, of the Legislature.

I've been to parliamentary meetings where we talk about supremacy of the Legislature. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that to put cabinet ministers on the purely legislative committee and the committee supplying services to those members would be a step in closing that gap.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I regret interrupting the hon. member, but the time for today's debate on this motion has now expired.

head: **PUBLIC BILLS AND ORDERS
OTHER THAN
GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS
(Second Reading)**

**Bill 216
Department of Science
and Technology Act**

MR. WOO: Mr. Speaker, when I introduced Bill 216 for first reading, I stated that it had two basic objectives: firstly, to co-ordinate scientific and technological research conducted by and on behalf of government and, secondly, to develop a provincial science policy and technological strategy for Alberta.

I had two specific reasons for introducing Bill 216, the first one being to achieve and maintain Alberta's position as a world competitor in the international market place and, secondly, through this objective to see benefits returned to all Albertans and Canadians. Whether these benefits are of an economic, social, cultural, or environmental nature, they will certainly give a higher standard of living to Albertans. In terms of young adults in our educational systems, our efforts will do much to ensure a better and more secure future for them.

It is apparent there is a wide gap between Bill 216 and the statements I've just made. But I hope that what I have

to say this afternoon, and what other hon. members will speak to, will serve to bridge that gap to some extent. I would like to begin by briefly reviewing a bit of recent history. From both the floor of this Assembly and in his many speeches to the public and industrial sectors of Canada, the hon. Premier has often been quoted within the context of his personal interest in subjects of scientific research and high technology, and certainly their benefits to Albertans and Canadians. He has often referred to the fact that the province could become the brain centre of Canada.

In his recent Budget Address, the hon. Provincial Treasurer said:

In September 1982 the province announced its intention to establish a new venture capital corporation which would provide financing to entrepreneurs seeking to develop innovative or high-technology businesses. The newly created corporation, Vencap Equities Alberta Ltd., will aid job creation and further diversification of our economic base.

The hon. Minister of Economic Development and the Minister of International Trade have certainly spoken at length on this subject in a variety of ways. On May 11, 1981, my colleague the hon. Member for Calgary McKnight, in his capacity as chairman of the Alberta Research Council, said in *Hansard*:

In my last two years as chairman of this committee, it has become clear to me that research co-ordination and development cannot be left without more support staff. We could possibly have a permanent secretariat or a flexible committee system operating on an *ad hoc* basis with the power to draw from various departments.

Further on, he states:

Another area that a central agency of science could develop would be a mandate to develop a scientific press. We could consider aid for information projects on scientific manpower and grants to science organizations.

Without question, Mr. Speaker, on a number of occasions the hon. Member for Edmonton Glengarry has spoken at length on this subject. In my view, these statements reflect the keen interest of this government in the tremendous potential that science technology research and development holds for the province of Alberta. In turn, this interest has led to the creation of a number of significant agencies and research departments, such as the Alberta Research Council, the Alberta Oil Sands Technology and Research Authority and, more recently, the Alberta Heritage Foundation for Medical Research.

It would seem to me that the creation of a ministry of science and technology would be the next logical step. Perhaps I could best demonstrate my reasons for this by talking about what happened in the Pacific Rim countries of Japan, Korea, Singapore, Taiwan, and Hong Kong, and how they became world leaders in scientific research and high technology, particularly Japan and Korea. Certainly both of these countries are considered to be world leaders in technological innovation and invention.

I think all of us can appreciate the situation faced by countries that have been directly affected by wars. Certainly it was no different for Japan and Korea. Both countries suffered varying degrees of destruction of major factories, and many of their other industries were crippled. At the end of their respective wars, the Korean and Japanese governments were faced with some very massive problems. The problem of civilian unemployment and what to do with over a million returned servicemen

was temporarily resolved because of postwar reconstruction programs, but certainly the question remained in the aftermath of those programs. Even then, both governments recognized the massive task ahead in rebuilding and converting a military industrial complex to peacetime production. They recognized the need to look beyond in terms of sustained and productive employment on a massive scale.

Added to this was the fact that both countries had to import — and still do — almost 100 per cent of their raw materials and energy requirements. It was quite evident that in order to survive, in order to regain and hold their positions in the international economic and marketing community, the Japanese and Korean governments had to dramatically alter their traditional systems. Historically, Pacific Rim countries have been referred to as copycat countries. They could copy anything we could produce in the west, producing more of it cheaper, but not necessarily better. This situation would shortly come to an end because of one thing. The Americans had a word for it: "quality". So what did Japan and Korea do, and how is it that they are where they are today? They copied American quality, but they took it one step further and improved upon it.

That single word "quality" set the course for Japan and Korea to become world leaders in quality production in a number of areas. They accomplished this through research and development, technological innovation and invention, and a high degree of engineering skills.

At this point I think it is important to remember that until recently Japan made no major effort in terms of innovation and invention, simply because they were able to obtain such requirements from the United States or Europe. But recognizing that simply copying and improving was no longer sufficient to meet their expressed objectives, Japan began fostering the growth of basic research over a broad range of interests. In the area of production techniques, Japan has certainly demonstrated its ability to utilize technological innovation, invention, and engineering skills, particularly in the fields of robotics and articulated production systems based upon almost total and complete automation.

It is a well-known fact, Mr. Speaker, that today Japanese industries employ a total number of robots which exceeds the combined total number of robots in both the United States and Europe. The truth of the matter is that in Japan today, they have robots making robots. To the uninitiated, this is probably sort of scary. But I understand that one particular area where robots will never replace people is politics. It appears that every attempt to program a robot as a politician resulted in a complete burnout of his circuitry.

This morning, at the official opening of Canada Packers' poultry processing plant in my constituency, my colleague the hon. Minister of Agriculture, in a speech befitting a Minister of Agriculture — it was a barnburner — mentioned the future use of robotics in their operations. Of course he was referring to robots as chicken pluckers on their processing lines. This is not so far-fetched. Certainly it's expensive. I suppose we would have to produce chickens the size of ostriches to make it pay off. But I agree with the minister's own assessment that, in his case, a more appropriate robot line would be one that plucked Crow.

Having consideration for the federal study which suggests that possibly 2 million jobs could be lost as a result of high technology, I think it is significant to note that, on the surface at least, the Japanese and Korean ex-

periences do not support this line of thinking. I believe there is a degree of justification in the study, to the extent that certainly some jobs will be lost. However, even in Japan, the answer to the whole question of job losses as a result of technological advancement has never been fully resolved.

In a recent study of a number of firms involved in toolmaking, electronics, automobile manufacture, and a number of others engaged in specialty production, in which all used robots, it was found that of an approximately 15 to 20 per cent displacement, 90 per cent of these workers were retrained and re-employed and, in many respects, [went] to higher or professional ranks to manufacture, design, repair, and service robots. I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, that insofar as Alberta and Canada are concerned, specifically in relation to industry, that is an immediate problem. Certainly in anticipation of high-tech impact on our future, I think we should be actively pursuing and seeking solutions to what could become a very major problem. Certainly Japan did not arrive at its current level of technology overnight. Consequently there was the opportunity to make adjustments in a very methodical way by anticipating changing manpower requirements.

Mr. Speaker, in terms of job displacements, new job creation, and the impact of accelerated technological application in relation to population, I think we can learn much in this field by looking at some of the Pacific Rim countries. It is interesting to note that the tech revolution in some of these densely populated countries did not in fact result in massive unemployment. I think it is all the more interesting when you consider that any one of a dozen cities in Japan or Korea has a population greater than that of the province of Alberta, and any one province alone would have a population greater than that of Canada as a whole.

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

I suppose, Mr. Speaker, it is always very well to talk about the Pacific Rim experiences, but in relation to Bill 216, a number of observations emerge which I think are important to us. My purpose in talking about the Pacific Rim countries is not to demonstrate a negative/positive relationship, or to say that one is further ahead or one is further behind. I am saying that I do not think we are too old or too young, or too smart or too dumb, that we can't learn something new from someone else. I don't think we should be trying to copy the Pacific Rim models, but certainly we can employ some of their more successful principles of technological advancement and adapt them to suit our own requirements. In many respects, we have some very different circumstances, and certainly we have greater potential in terms of resources. Depending upon who you speak to and who you compare us to, we are always told that we are anywhere from four to 10 years behind in high technology. I'm not going to argue that statement, Mr. Speaker, but certainly I think we are deficient in terms of an overall provincial science policy and development strategy. I believe the cause is that we as a government have not made a total commitment in that direction.

When I say that, Mr. Speaker, possibly a number of hon. members in this Assembly and people outside the House will jump up and down, point to this and that and say, what are you talking about? Look at the wonderful things we're doing. But in my view, we are 'ad hocking' it. Having said that, I will be the first to admit that we are

doing some wonderful and significant things out there. That is evidenced most by the fact that Alberta technology is rapidly becoming a much sought after and exportable commodity.

I think that in all areas of scientific research, technological research, human resources and, to some degree, innovation, we are at the very least equal to and, in a number of areas such as oil and gas technology and transportation, indeed superior to any other country. Where we possibly fall down, Mr. Speaker, is in the area of application and development of much of what we hold as a result of research. Surely this has to be a very important consideration when we talk about diversification of our industrial base.

We are blessed with one of the best provincial frameworks in Canada, whereby the interests of science and technology can best be served. Our universities — and in this instance I single out the faculties of science, because they are relevant to my debate — are staffed with knowledgeable and dedicated people, as are the Alberta Research Council, the Alberta Heritage Foundation for Medical Research, the Alberta Oil Sands Technology and Research Authority, our experimental stations in various government departments, and certainly private industry. These are not only knowledgeable and dedicated people, Mr. Speaker; they are professional and committed people. But somehow or other, I can't help but feel that maybe our provincial framework is getting to look like patchwork, notwithstanding the excellent calibre of the patches.

In terms of mounting a concerted effort to work towards Alberta's economic diversification, I perceive our greatest deficiency to be in the area of co-operative effort. I firmly believe that we must create and maintain greater dialogue amongst all our scientific and technological communities. If we don't, there is a tendency for each to drift off and work in isolation.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, I recognize a concern of the respective members that make up our scientific community. Certainly each group or agency has a vested interest in terms of what they do. They see a need to protect the integrity of their own respective programs. I have no problems with this, particularly with those agencies in the private sector. Because that is what their companies are paying them for. Neither do I have any problems with agencies doing highly specialized work, such as the Alberta Research Council and the Alberta Heritage Foundation for Medical Research. But I'm interested in terms of all other governmental agencies, because public funds are being expended. My interest in this case is more the what and why of it, and what are the returns to the people of Alberta?

Mr. Speaker, I want to make a number of general observations and conclude, because a number of hon. members wish to speak and certainly I want to hear what they have to say. Firstly, the creation of a ministry of state for science and technology will demonstrate a political commitment to all sectors that we are indeed serious about our interests in the area of scientific and technological research and applied technology and development. If we expect progress in this area, government must take a leadership role in order that the broader interests of all our communities are properly represented in terms of technological advancement, whether those interests are of a social, economic, industrial, educational, cultural, or environmental nature.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the development of a provincial science policy and strategy is necessary if

we are to provide a vehicle or framework that will reflect such interests as the natural philosophical consequence of public policy. In effect, government leadership in close co-operation with industry, labor, and education will give stature, integrity, and direction to the development of the necessary technological base for this province. It will not happen overnight and it will be costly, but I think it will be necessary to create an environment which will continue to attract the private sector and risk and venture capital to enhance our present levels of scientific excellence. We need to enlarge our capacity in the field of applied technology if we are sincere in terms of diversifying our industrial base. Certainly we have strength upon which to build, both vertically and horizontally, of an integrated individual nature.

In terms of Bill 216, Mr. Speaker, a ministry such as the one I propose will have as its important features the role of co-ordination, promotion, and fostering of activities in the scientific community. It will act as a resource and intelligence unit, and ensure the day-to-day management of initiatives that will encourage scientific and technological excellence and industrial initiative. It will be concerned primarily with three major areas of importance: the co-ordination and support of government activities in the area of in-house or extramural scientific research and technological development activities; the development and assessment of provincial government science and technology policies relating to research and development, and the use of science and technology in the development or enhancement of new or existing initiatives in the province's resource, manufacturing, and service industries — included in this area would be both intramural and provincial, national, and international interface of existing, new, or proposed programs — and finally, co-ordination with our educational institutions, particularly the universities, in terms of expanded programs which will produce educationally qualified people and assist in the process of acquiring and allocating necessary human resources and obtaining equipment necessary to develop the much-needed computer assisted programming activity.

Mr. Speaker, in my debate on Bill 215, which was proposed by my hon. colleague for Edmonton Glengarry, I mentioned an area of interest that was related to the application of technological innovation and invention in ways that would benefit our disabled citizens: the hearing handicapped, the sightless, and other disadvantaged groups. I raise it again, because I think these examples are important in terms of assessing the question of relevancy in our scientific and research activities. I would like to see that field broadened as a balance to building upon our strengths, which certainly take in those interests of an agricultural and food processing, energy-related, forestry, and minerals nature. In this regard, I firmly believe that institutes or corporations of applied science and technology should be encouraged to establish in this province. Certainly I would prefer that this occur in the private sector, although there may be occasion to initiate such an institute which is tied directly to our university systems.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to touch on one other matter, the acquisition and control of technological and scientific intelligence. The major question here is ownership. Who should that owner be? This is not a problem when we talk about private-sector funded activities. Certainly the product there belongs to them. But how is ownership and control determined for that type of activity totally funded by public funds? In the case of what I call in-house activity — those that are totally funded and

conducted by government — scientific and technological intelligence remains in the domain of government. But how is that information to be shared so that we might benefit from that sharing? Possibly there are already mechanisms in place to handle such situations, but certainly a ministry will give force to these concerns.

This in turn raises the further question of the protection of high-tech information. We are all aware of the advantages to a competitive country in acquiring high-tech information through clandestine operations. I think there is a need to examine that question in terms of our activities in this province and the high level of intelligence information we presently hold. It will interest hon. members to know that in this respect there is now a Bill before the United States Congress that will spell out laws and regulations to protect that country's national interests, not only in military know-how but, more importantly, in terms of industrial high-tech know-how.

I spoke at the start about Pacific Rim models, and I would like to close on this note, Mr. Speaker. I believe the significant lessons we learn are lessons of government commitment, co-operative effort, leadership, co-ordination, planning, manpower allocation and, very importantly, a partnership of government, industry, education, and labor. These are necessary for the building of a technological base which will benefit Albertans.

Mr. Speaker, I have a strong conviction in the statements I have made. I believe an argument can be made in supporting the need for a ministry of science and technology. The challenges in the field of science and technology are there, but we can meet those challenges only if we are decisive. I don't think we can ever hope to scale mountains if we keep on tripping over molehills.

Thank you.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure today to participate in the debate on Bill 216, the Department of Science and Technology Act. While I want to support the intent of the Bill and appreciate the rather impassioned plea the hon. Member for Edmonton Sherwood Park has presented this afternoon in suggesting that Alberta needs a new department of science and technology, I have some concerns. My participation in the debate this afternoon will raise those concerns. I hope that as ensuing speakers participate in this debate, particularly those who support the Member for Edmonton Sherwood Park and the principles and concepts put forward, perhaps they might be able to answer some of the questions I have. If not, I will wait until adjournment of the debate by the hon. member. Perhaps at that time he would be able to get back to me with some of my concerns.

Mr. Speaker, in looking at Bill 216, two sections of this Act have caught my eye and caused me some consternation. The first is section 2(2), which says:

The Department shall be responsible for the co-ordination and direction of all scientific and technological research carried out by or for the Government and for the development and implementation of a policy to assist scientific and technological research in the private sector.

It covers everything.

The second section that causes me to raise a concern is section 5(2)(1). It says: "directing the co-ordination of research projects funded wholly or partly by public funds". Mr. Speaker, I have five concerns. The major concern is: what is the basic definition of "research" that the Member for Edmonton Sherwood Park is concerned about? The Bill itself talks about just about everything. I

wonder if we really want to take all the public and private funds in the province of Alberta currently allocated to research and say that there now must be some new type of super agency, or super ministry, that is somehow going to get in by rules, regulations, co-ordination, implementation, and dictates from above, and this is what they're going to be doing. There are a number of different types of research. I want to know specifically what the direct type of research is that the Member for Edmonton Sherwood Park is advocating in Bill 216. I'd like to identify some different types of research, give him some definitions, and ask him to get back to me with respect to those definitions. That will certainly enhance my ability to understand.

First of all, we have what is known in the business as basic research. I've used a definition of basic research provided by the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development. It reads:

... original investigation undertaken in order to gain new scientific knowledge and understanding. It is not primarily directed towards any specific practical aim or application.

I suppose it's a complete brain-trust approach to research: dollars allocated and no bottom line asked at the end of the year, at the end of a five-year term, or at the end of a 10-year term. Is that the type of research the Member for Edmonton Sherwood Park is advocating?

The second type of research we might be looking at is called applied research: research investigation primarily directed toward a specific practical aim or objective. Would the Member for Edmonton Sherwood Park like to see Alberta direct itself towards research in something specific, something that has a bottom line we can judge at the end of the year to see if there is any accomplishment?

A third type of research is known as experimental development: the use of scientific knowledge in order to produce new or substantially improved materials, devices, products, processes, or systems. I suppose to a substantial degree that would be the type of research undertaken at the new agricultural lab facility now under construction in Leduc: basically taking something, trying to improve it substantially to make it marketable, and seeing a basic return.

A fourth type of research is known as free basic research, undertaken without relationship to a practical mission or problem. It's a think-tank approach. I wonder if that's part of the research it's being advocated should be funded publicly under Bill 216.

The fifth type of research is known in the business as oriented basic research, undertaken because of an apparent lack of basic knowledge in some field which is holding up, or may hold up, the pursuit of some mission. I look forward to some kind of response on that.

Three other types of research have definitions attached to them. One is known as innovation: the introduction of technological changes allowing creation of new products or new ways of producing. A sixth type is intramural research carried on "within the walls" of government; that is, by government itself in government laboratories. Is the member advocating that this research, basically undertaken by government agencies, be solely for the use of government? How would the question of patents and the selling of that research ability be dealt with? Those items are not spelled out in the Act and new kind of ministry being advocated by the member.

Mr. Speaker, the last definition of research is extramural research, commissioned by government but carried on by an external body, either a university or a private

research foundation. I would like to reiterate section 5(2) (1), which indicated that under the rules and guidelines being advocated here the new Department of Science and Technology Act would basically see that department direct the co-ordination of research projects funded wholly or partly by public funds. That leads me to my second major concern.

I really wonder if politicians are in any position to understand exactly what type of research we should be advocating and providing public dollars for. I'm not one to suggest that politicians are not far-sighted, Mr. Speaker, but in the area of direct scientific knowledge, I wonder how we would make those decisions, unless of course we were to hire and add a whole series of new types of advisers who might acquaint us with the various aspects of scientific research.

A third item that has to be raised is that basically Bill 216 advocates the creation of a new department. We currently have a number of departments in our government involved in a variety of aspects of scientific and industrial research. But I think it has to be mentioned that the creation of a department of science and technology would in fact be providing another government bureaucracy in the lives of all of us in this province. When you look at some of the guidelines, in addition to providing grants, the ones dealing particularly with co-ordination, regulation, — I wonder if that's what's really intended by the Member for Edmonton Sherwood Park. I would certainly like his response in that regard.

A fourth item I would like to raise is that from my understanding of the whole question of scientific research in the province of Alberta, the scientific community appears to be doing quite well without government control. I take a look at some of the statistics I've been able to ascertain, going back to the 1980-81 fiscal year. In that year approximately \$377 million was addressed to research in our province, basically from four sources. Twenty-one per cent, or \$80 million, was provided by the Alberta government; 18 per cent, or \$68 million, by the federal government; 39 per cent, or \$146 million, by private industry; and 19 per cent, or about \$71 million, from Alberta universities.

I think it also has to be pointed out that in 1980-81 the total amount of research in Alberta accounted for approximately 10 per cent of all research and development expenditures in Canada. On a per capita basis, that R and D expenditure level was slightly greater in Alberta than for Canada as a whole, and amounted to an expenditure level of approximately \$175 per capita in Alberta compared to \$161 per capita in Canada. Again, there seems to be a pronounced amount of attention provided to science and research in both the public and private sectors in this province, and I have to raise the question: do we have to go even farther?

The last point I want to raise, Mr. Speaker, deals with the whole question of a science policy for the province of Alberta. Bill 216 is advocating that we should have in place a department of science and technology. It seems to me that the first thing we have to develop, and have to have developed into a completely defensible position, is a science policy for the province of Alberta. In my understanding, that policy has still not been developed. Surely a lot of attention has been provided to it in recent years. I know that one member of this Assembly, the Member for Calgary McKnight, has been very active in that regard and in fact is active today in working towards a science policy for Alberta. It may very well be that once the policy is determined and developed, the recommendation

will be that there is no need for a department of science and technology. If that is the case, it seems to me we have the old chicken and egg scenario: should we have a policy first and a department second, or a department first and a policy second?

Mr. Speaker, I don't want to dampen the enthusiasm the Member for Edmonton Sherwood Park has provided for Bill 216. I think that in the long run he's on the right track, but I thought it was my responsibility to raise concerns in the Assembly and, before I can provide support to Bill 216, I would need answers to those.

Thank you.

MR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Speaker, I'm very pleased to enter the debate on Bill 216, the Department of Science and Technology Act. First of all, I want to congratulate the hon. member representing the constituency of Edmonton Sherwood Park for showing insight and foresight in bringing this to this Assembly. As well, I hope my comments will answer some of the questions of the hon. Member for Barrhead.

Mr. Speaker, I want to speak in favor of an Act that, when implemented, will lend even more credence to the fact and to the many people who say that Alberta is indeed a leader in Canada. I say "when implemented" instead of "if implemented", because as I read it, this Act is needed, required, and long overdue. I'm sure all Canadians have waited long and hard for a Canadian science policy. Well, Mr. Speaker, we are still waiting.

Federal inaction has resulted in a Canada that lags tragically behind in many aspects of science and technology. Of course the occasional flicker of hope for a science policy becomes evident and, on occasion, we have shown some leadership in these valuable 20th- and 21st-century areas of endeavor. In the main, when one compares the inroads of other countries such as Japan, the United States, Britain, and Germany, we definitely lag behind. We lag behind in scientific and technological areas.

Alberta should be congratulated, however. The Alberta Research Council and other areas such as the Department of Economic Development have had a concerted, in-depth, and well thought-out plan. However, Mr. Speaker, some of the areas I will allude to are only part of what should be done in a more concerted effort. I refer members to the Alberta Research Council annual report of 1982. And through my discussions with the member responsible for the Alberta Research Council, a number of exciting ventures are ahead for 1983-84. The oil sands program will continue, and there will be an injection of funds in the area of computing and biotechnology. There will be further extensive research in the area of coal. Further moneys will be injected into the frontier sciences research program, the area of biotechnology, surface chemistry, and catalysis. Another major area that will be looked at in 1983-84 is industrial and engineering research and, of course, the natural resources research program will continue.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure dynamic, exciting developments by the Research Council will continue. But so much more needs to be done. We have the human resources throughout Alberta. We have been blessed with an abundance of natural resources. But we need to mesh these two, and we have to be a bit more daring. We have to be more courageous in future gazing. A multitude of studies, reports, and ideas have been written — volumes in fact — to illustrate the points that have been made with respect to the need for a department of science and technology.

The whole concept of computers, for example, and their multifaceted impact on our lives is one example only that if we had a firm policy established, and one major department responsible, this would have resulted in a better Alberta and perhaps even a Canada that would not have to be embarrassed by its lack of development. I would like to read to you an interesting article from *Labour Newsline*, dated April 1983. I quote from this article entitled *A Revolution in Computers: Ignoring computers won't make the micro-technology revolution go away*. The revolution is well under way, and every aspect of our lives has been and will continue to be affected by it. At the heart of this information revolution is a tiny chip of silicon and the capabilities of a computer that once would have filled a whole room. This chip or micro-processor, when added to a product, makes it a memory device.

These man-made thinking machines are now being used in the production of our most basic needs. The food we eat may have come from a farm that uses micro-processing equipment to control the environment of the barn and to decide when to spray pesticides, when to plant and harvest, and when to run the actual farm equipment and feeding machines. The clothes we wear were probably sewn by machines that use micro-processors to guide the cutting. Homes and office buildings are being designed by computers. For example, Edmonton architect Douglas Cardinal uses a \$250,000 computer graphic system to create impressive and complicated designs.

Computers have put us in the middle of an information arms race, and according to the president of an education and consulting company, it is a race Canada must get involved in. Art Benjamin, the president of On-Line People Incorporated of Toronto, noted in a recent *Globe and Mail* report on computers that a country which is information technology poor in the 1990s will be as bad off as oil poor countries in the 1970s.

Mr. Speaker, I refer anyone interested to Alvin Toffler's recent book called *The Third Wave*. As members may know, he is the author of *Future Shock*. In his most recent book he talks about a society in the 21st century that is run by computers, word processors, all aspects of the chip. Indeed, although it is a futuristic type of book, many, many things he alludes to are real today. He talks about robotics as an example. Here is another area that the Member for Edmonton Sherwood Park referred to. We are definitely following in the wake of so many countries in this area alone. For example, in 1983 Japan had 17,000 industrial robots; in the United States, only 4,000. Canada doesn't even make the list, because it's in the area of 100. Japan leads the world in the development of "intelligent robots, super chips, and fibre optics". Japan currently produces over 150 different models of robots from specialized to general purpose.

To illustrate what impact robotics may have, Japanese auto assembly plants start with sheet steel and process it into finished automobiles at the rate of two per minute. That's two per minute with one-half of the work force of plants in the United States. The power of the computer today has increased 10,000 times in the last 14 years, while the price has decreased 100,000 times.

Mr. Speaker, we lead much of the world in the petrochemical industry. Surely this technology could benefit this industry tremendously. On a recent tour to the United States, the Minister of International Trade brought back to this member an example of some robotics that perhaps could have an impact on the petrochemical industry. A robot drill has been invented. It is a

continuous, non-rotating, flexible steel stem to provide drilling fluid, power, and central signals to a down-hole tool allowing highly deviated and horizontal drilling. Surely Alberta can become a leader in Canada in the development of robots dealing with this particular area.

In 1982 the Science Council of Canada published a major study entitled *Planning now for an Information Society — Tomorrow is too late*. This study is not a threat, but a warning to Canadians if they don't act. If Canada's present failure to act continues, Canadians face a bleak prospect and the country will be left vulnerable. Many sectors of our manufacturing industry would be rendered obsolete virtually overnight. Our trade balance, already precarious, might never recover. Structural unemployment could lead to permanent joblessness for many Canadians, a decline in living standards, and for some, emigration. The personal privacy and integrity of Canadian citizens could be compromised in ways on a scale never before seen in an independent, democratic country. Indeed our cultural and political sovereignty would be permanently jeopardized. Failure to respond could lead to a condition of pastoral servitude.

Another Canadian author, Heather Menzies, in her book *Computers on the Job*, points out that Canada is lagging behind its competitors in the race to exploit all new technologies. If we do not stay abreast of developments, jobs may disappear, unautomated companies that become uncompetitive will reduce their operations or simply go under.

We need an umbrella department in Alberta to truly prevent the re-invention of the wheel, to prevent overlap and costly duplication of research in the scientific and technological areas, to provide confidence to the public taxpayer that something is being done. We need this new department to co-ordinate all scientific and technological research and development in all aspects and sectors of Alberta, be it in the area of agriculture, machining, fabricating, or processing, whether it is dealing with the research and scientific areas responsible for new energy sources, whether it is dealing with the science associated with new and improved modes of transportation, new technologies, or research that is occurring at the universities. Hon. members are referred to an in-depth report by the president of the University of Calgary dated April 13, 1983, called *Mission or Mediocrity*, the state of the university address, which deals specifically with research at the universities in this province.

Perhaps this umbrella should deal also with the whole concept of what is going on at the technical institutions in the area of science. Mr. Speaker, there are some 70 different technologies at NAIT alone. With the minds that are there, the interest in areas they would like to delve into, there is a need for improved leadership. This Act would also develop a department that could deal more with people in industry and business, the private entrepreneur, who is so important and who is working in his basement, his backyard, and his garage on new scientific developments.

Let us show more initiative and leadership. I ask members of this Assembly to support Bill 216, the Department of Science and Technology Act. Mr. Speaker, it is simply not good enough to flow with the tide anymore. Either we lead in science and technology or we fall behind more and more and more.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MRS. EMBURY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make a few comments on Bill 216, the Department of Science and

Technology Act. I would like to commend the Member for Sherwood Park for bringing this Bill before the Assembly. It is quite easy to support the two main purposes stated in this Bill. The Alberta government already has a very strong commitment to supporting research and development, which is evident not only by the financial contribution made in this province but by the institutions we already have in place.

Of course one of the problems in this field — and it was referred to by the Member for Sherwood Park — is what a highly competitive area this is throughout the world. No doubt it's very tough for us to be a leader in this area, because many other countries have had a head start on what we are doing. Many other countries have had a large degree of subsidization with regard to this area.

I think it's worth looking at what is being spent in Alberta. In 1980-81, \$377 million was spent. On a per capita basis, this amount is slightly greater than that for the whole of Canada. In natural sciences alone, an amount of \$339 million was spent in that same year, and in the social sciences and humanities, a total of \$38 million.

When one is deciding whether to support this type of legislation, another point to consider is the sources of the funding. Twenty-one per cent of the funding in Alberta, which is approximately \$80 million, comes from the government of Alberta; 18 per cent, or \$68 million, from the federal government; 39 per cent, or \$146 million, from industry; and lastly, 19 per cent, or \$71 million, through the universities.

Another point to consider is who carries out this research. As most of us know, this is primarily through industry, the universities, and the federal government. I think one of the best examples of unique research, which we should all be proud of — and I can't help but wonder how many Albertans really know how significant it is — is the research done on the Alberta tar sands through the Alberta Oil Sands Technology and Research Authority. This was established in 1975, with research funds of \$100 million for the first five-year commitment. A large amount of additional money has also been spent, which now brings the total amount to approximately \$25 billion. It is, therefore, the largest single research and development program ever launched in Canada. I think that is one example that speaks very well for the role of the Alberta government.

Other members have spoken at length with regard to the role of the Alberta Research Council. It's interesting to note that this was established 60 years ago. It's a Crown corporation dedicated to actively promoting responsible economic development in the province.

The Member for Sherwood Park made a very interesting point when he enlightened us on what is happening in the Pacific Rim countries and the strategies carried out in those countries. While a lot of us are not aware of the details of what those countries have done, particularly since World War II, I think it is good for us to see what has happened. But we have to remember that he was referring to countries and not states or provinces within a country. It does make a difference when we are looking at legislation today to establish a department of science and technology within the government of Alberta.

One of the strongest points the member made in supporting this legislation was that this is of great consideration to Albertans in the way we diversify our economy. I suppose some people might debate, are there other means of diversifying our economy without setting up

another department, or is this the only way we can diversify? We already have a strong commitment in this regard, as has been mentioned before, because of the research money we have put in place through not only what I've mentioned already but also the Alberta medical research foundation. Very unique also, the Alberta government has committed \$1 million over a five-year period for nursing research. This is the first time this has been undertaken by a government.

The Member for Sherwood Park referred to what we probably have in Alberta, a patchwork approach, with regard to the structure we have to deal with science and technology. I might ask him if, instead, he really feels it's a band-aid approach. I'd like to see how he would suggest some of the changes, particularly with regard to the points raised by the member for Barrwood. [interjections]

AN HON. MEMBER: That's Woodhead.

MRS. EMBURY: Well, without creating any animosity or upsetting the member, I'd like to apologize for referring to his constituency as Barrwood.

AN HON. MEMBER: It sounds better.

MRS. EMBURY: I do apologize. I meant to say Barrhead.

One point that all speakers agreed on today is that we certainly need a well-defined policy. I notice that member — and I'm certainly not going to refer to where he's from again — was talking about the chicken-and-egg approach. I felt that he did spend a lot of time running around in circles.

The Member for Edmonton Kingsway stated that we're still waiting for a Canadian science policy. This may well be true, but possibly we might want to consider and wait a bit longer. The way the government at this time is spending our money, the direction they're talking, and the way they're controlling the policies as such, maybe it's just as well we haven't got a solid policy in place. I'm afraid it would have a total government commitment or direction. As has been stated before, we certainly want to see that the private sector continues to be involved in this area.

The member also referred to the computer and robot development in the 21st century. I must admit that it's certainly going to be very dull if, at that time, men are run by computers and robots instead of their wives. [interjections]

In view of the hour, Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

[Motion carried]

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, the business for tomorrow will be Committee of Supply: Public Works, Supply and Services, the Department of the Solicitor General and, if there is time, the special warrants beginning on page 421 of the estimates book.

As there is no sitting this evening, Mr. Speaker, I move that we call it 5:30 and the House adjourn until tomorrow morning at ten o'clock.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

[At 5:29 p.m., the House adjourned to Friday at 10 a.m.]

