

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Tuesday, May 7, 1974

[The House met at 2:30 o'clock.]

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to introduce to the members of this Legislature 77 students from the Grade 6 class of Altadore School in my constituency of Calgary Currie. The young ladies, gentlemen and parents are accompanied by their teachers Mrs. Dick, Mrs. Craig and Mrs. Nyrose. I would ask that they now rise and be recognized by this Assembly.

MR. ZANDER:

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure today to introduce to you and through you to the Assembly, 26 young men and ladies, Grade 12 students from the Frank Maddock High School of Drayton Valley in the constituency of Drayton Valley. They are accompanied by Mr. Mitchell and Mr. Hoekstra. They are seated in the public gallery. I would now ask them to rise and be recognized by the Assembly.

MR. McCRAE:

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure today to introduce to you and through you to the members of this Assembly 30 Grade 9 students from the Senator Patrick Burns School in Calgary. The students, Mr. Speaker, are accompanied by their teacher Mrs. Szulczyk. I would ask them to stand and be recognized.

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce to you and through you to the House, the Grade 4 class from Westbrook School in Edmonton Whitemud. There are 28 students visiting us today with their teacher Mrs. Rosenberg. They are sitting in the public gallery and I would ask them please to stand and be recognized by the Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, just a supplementary to that introduction. Perhaps if the members are interested in what the youngest member of the Getty family looks like, I would ask him to stand and we might identify him.

MR. LUDWIG:

Looks like his mother.

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce to you and to members of the Assembly three prominent executive members of the Fort Saskatchewan Golf and Country Club who are here negotiating with the hon. minister, Dr. Backus. They are Mr. Clark, Mr. Lupul and Mr. Hoffsteter. They are in the Speaker's gallery and I would like them to rise and be recognized by the House.

TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, in light of the interest of school building matters in Calgary, I'd like to file two documents. One sets out some background facts concerning school buildings provincially over the first four months of this year. The second is a list showing the disposition of the seven specific school-building applications forwarded to the School Buildings Board by the Calgary Board of Education over past months.

I have copies available for all Calgary members.

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table Motion for a Return No. 131.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Federal Budget

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question either to the Premier or to the Provincial Treasurer and ask if the government has had an opportunity to assess the effects of the federal budget which was brought down last evening, the effects it will have on the small Alberta-owned and Alberta-based petroleum companies?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I will refer the ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please.

With great respect, the hon. Leader of the Opposition appears to be asking for a statement of opinion as to what the opinion of the government might be on a budget of another government. Unless the hon. leader is able to bring the question within the scope of the duties of this particular government, the question would not appear to be suitable for the question period.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask a question of the Premier, then, [and ask] in light of your ruling, if the government has had an opportunity, from a policy position, to assess the federal budget which came down last evening and to ask the government, from a policy standpoint, what effects that budget will have on the small petroleum companies in Alberta?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member is perhaps having a little difficulty. If the question were directed to government policy resulting from the budget, then it would be in order. But it still is a question asking for an opinion.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, then can I ask it this way? After viewing the federal budget, has the government had the opportunity, from a policy standpoint, to assess the effects of that budget on the economy of Alberta?

MR. SPEAKER:

The opportunity to assess in itself is quite innocuous, but if the assessment is being made, that's a question of opinion.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Premier if he could advise the House as to the practical implications of the announced federal budget on the oil industry royalty rates in the province of Alberta?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, we haven't been able to complete our assessment of that situation, quite obviously. There is such a wide scope of companies - different sizes, different profit positions, different degrees of planned position and activity - it will take some time for us to do it. There are also a few obscure aspects of the budget speech itself in terms of treatment that would require clarification. I believe the Provincial Treasurer has responded publicly to this point, that we have some concern in terms of the smaller, independent companies which are active in Alberta and that's really about all we've been able to express at this time.

MR. HENDERSON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Premier could advise the House as to whether the impact of the budget on the royalty for conventional oil has the same implications for Syncrude, or does it look like it stands aside from the major ... [Inaudible]... .

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member is still asking for questions of opinion concerning the impact of the federal government on the province. If the questions can be related to government policy, they are in order. Otherwise, the rules of the question period do not permit the Speaker to allow that type of question unless hon. members wish to change the rules.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary ...

MR. HENDERSON:

On a point of order. Very obviously oil is a major factor in the province of Alberta and the federal government's policy changes have very significant economic implications in the province of Alberta. With all due respect to the Chair, I think the matter is of [such] significant importance that we shouldn't be getting bogged down in semantics as to the formulation of the wording used in addressing oneself to the question, because it is a major question of major concern to the province of Alberta. It has major economic implications. I would trust the Chair would grant some indulgence on this major issue without getting bogged down in the selection of words by the members asking questions.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

With great respect to the hon. member, there is no question of semantics involved. It's a matter of principle. When hon. members are seeking to elicit opinions from hon. ministers or from the government, they are clearly exceeding the bounds of the question period and it doesn't matter how the question is worded, if that's the substance of it, then under the rules that I am expected to apply, the question may not be put during the question period.

But as I mentioned previously, if the question can be related to what government policy might be as the result of the budget, then it would clearly be in order for the question period.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the question I wasn't able to answer. In light of the fact that the federal budget is now down, when might we expect the supplementary estimates to be presented in this Assembly? I believe the Premier referred - on the date of April 23, he indicated about two weeks. Are you in a position now to indicate when we'll have the supplementary estimates or is it going to be a mini-budget or what approach does the government plan to take?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I'm not in a position to comment on that, except to point out that the two matters are not related.

MR. TAYLOR:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker ...

MR. NOTLEY:

To the hon. Provincial Treasurer ...

MR. TAYLOR:

... will the federal budget have an adverse effect on the provincial government's program to develop the oil sands?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I think that would be premature until we've had an assessment. Perhaps the Provincial Treasurer might wish to respond.

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, I think we've had some difficulty with something on which we were quite prepared to advise the hon. members, by the way the questions were asked, as opposed to the subject.

Mr. Speaker, I think that preliminary examination of the federal budget, for the information of all hon. members - while Albertans might be disappointed that provincial royalties are not deductible, we should all keep this in perspective. In Alberta's case we are fortunate that we do have flexibility, that things have been designed in a manner, through the exploratory drilling incentive system in particular, to preserve the operations of the small independent company to ensure that we do have incentives for further drilling in the province of Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, there might be other comments I would like to make in a general way, but I would ask for the latitude of the House, if it so desires.

MR. SPEAKER:

If the House is unanimously agreed that the rules should not apply to this particular situation, the Speaker, as has been stated over and over again, is the servant of the House, and if this is the unanimous wish of the House then the Chair can have no objection at all.

Perhaps if I might be permitted I might ask, do hon. members wish the question period in this particular instance to be extended so that hon. ministers and the government may express their opinion and reaction concerning the federal budget?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might speak to that particular matter if I could. As far as the government is concerned, we're quite prepared to waive any strict technicality with regard to the questions, only responding in a way that it not create a precedent; secondly that it involve the initial answer I gave, that at this stage of the game, quite obviously with such a complicated document, the provincial government's assessment is one of a tentative preliminary nature.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of information, I'm sure that we are not at all certain as to which particular rule you feel is being pushed to the limit, in that you refuse to permit questions. Would the hon. Speaker please give us a citation, which rule we are dealing with so that we would know exactly what we are waiving?

MR. SPEAKER:

We are dealing with 171 of Beauchesne. I'm not able to quote the exact sub-portion of that rule, but it's a generally recognized principle that questions during the question period must relate to the responsibilities of the government. I know that there has been considerable latitude in the past, usually without objection, where we've had market information and market forecasts from ministers, but these are clearly not within the scope of the minister's duties and are really not within the scope of the question period.

I should also respectfully like to mention to hon. members that when questions involving opinions are answered, those opinions usually lead to debate and hon. members may wish to express contrary opinions. That is probably the reason why that kind of question is not ordinarily permitted during the question period.

But again, as I say, I'm the servant of the House and if the House unanimously agrees that it wishes to have expressions of opinion on this subject, I'll be the last one to stand in the way.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, with deference to the Chair, questions in this House respecting decisions in Ottawa as they affect Alberta have been asked on very numerous occasions, this year and in previous years, and it is my humble submission that this is the first time that a question of this type has been ruled out, notwithstanding that Beauchesne may have a technicality that would permit such a ruling, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, in view of the statement by the hon. Premier, I would suggest that we have that extended latitude tomorrow.

MR. LUDWIG:

Give them time to think up an answer.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, just rising on the point of order, may I say first of all that I suspect any questions dealing with the federal budget are wildly hypothetical. I suspect that probably the most prudent course would be to defer questions on it until Friday morning.

DR. BUCK:

Is that the official word?

Tuition Fees - Alberta Universities

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, a second question then. I would like to ask a question of the Minister of Advanced Education. Is the minister actively considering an increase in tuition fees for the students at Alberta universities?

MR. FOSTER:

Not this year, Mr. Speaker, no.

In fact I might go on to comment that at the time we announced our three-year university finance plan which really has about two years to go, we indicated at that point that there would not be any general increase in tuition fees for students in universities. There may well be shifts in fees internally that have to do with student services and other matters, but not with tuition fees generally.

MR. CLARK:

Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Is the minister aware of the increase of \$60 in fees at The University of Alberta for students in the Faculty of Library Science and does he consider this a portion of tuition?

MR. FOSTER:

I'm not specifically aware of the matter to which the hon. leader refers, Mr. Speaker, but I will be happy to enquire into it.

MR. CLARK:

Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, is the Minister of Advanced Education aware of an increase in student fees at The University of Alberta in the area of student health services?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Put it on the Order Paper.

MR. FOSTER:

I think, Mr. Speaker, I commented on the matter of student health services and that is a matter that is entirely within the jurisdiction of the institution involved.

MR. SPEAKER:

Supplementally to a comment which I made just a moment ago to the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View, I now have the specific citation of Beauchesne. If the hon. member would like to refer to 171, and the subclause is (bb) on page 148 which expressly covers this situation, although it is covered by implication in several other portions of 171.

It forbids asking the government's opinion on matters of policy.

MR. HENDERSON:

Point of order, Mr. Speaker. Where do the words, the question of impact on policy, come into that interpretation? I suggest to the Speaker that practically every question that is asked in this House relates to a matter of opinion, even if it is a matter of opinion on what is fact and what is fiction. I am at a complete loss to understand the ruling of the Chair in this particular matter.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Yes, agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Macleod followed by the hon. Member for Calgary McCall.

Floods - - - Disaster Evaluation

MR. BUCKWELL:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Agriculture and it deals with an ad by the Alberta Disaster Services in The Albertan this morning re spring storm damage. One is power outage and the other is in livestock losses. I would like if the hon. minister would give us some guidelines or criteria on just what is going to be paid, what constitutes a loss in a storm?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, essentially what we are trying to do is evaluate and see how much damage, in fact, was done, then give some consideration to compensation in the area of power outage. The question of livestock damage will be considered under The Livestock Disaster Fund, but would have to show that, in fact, it was not due to any management factors.

MR. BUCKWELL:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Then this is, say, for poultry or where the power went off. Where the power goes off, is this loss of calves, say, due to management?

DR. HOFNER:

Mr. Speaker, that would deal with where you have confined atmosphere livestock. Power outage then might be of a pretty serious nature too.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary McCall followed by the hon. Member for Lethbridge East.

Drugs - - - Calgary Schools

MR. HO LEM:

Mr. Speaker, my question today is addressed to the Minister of Education. In view of the recent reports coming out of Calgary regarding alleged drug activity in some Calgary schools, can the minister advise if some appropriate measures will be taken to cope with this growing problem, and is the problem getting out of hand?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I have read of news reports regarding allegations in connection with, I think it was the A. E. Cross School in Calgary. My understanding is that the appropriate Calgary school board and the city police in Calgary have been jointly involved in assessing the allegations made. In my view it would be important to see the school board and the local authorities assess the matter now. I gather they have agreed to do that and are doing that.

If I receive a request from the Calgary school board to look into the matter, I would do so. But at the moment I think we should give every opportunity to the local board to look into the matter to see if they can assess what the facts are and whether activity is needed.

MR. HO LEM:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Has the hon. minister received a report or information from the chairman of the Calgary school board regarding 50 calls from concerned parents relative to the drug problem in Calgary?

MR. HYNDMAN:

No, I have not, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HO LEM:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Has the hon. minister received any information concerning the incident in a Calgary school where a group of youths attacked and beat up another youth for not turning over moneys collected from the sale of drugs?

MR. HYNDMAN:

No, Mr. Speaker. That matter, certainly at this stage, would be within the internal jurisdiction of the Calgary school board. I have confidence that they will want to and will be able to handle the matter locally at this time.

MR. HO LEM:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Has the minister received any information regarding intimidation exercised by drug users and pushers upon other students who wish not to be involved in drug activities?

MR. HYNDMAN:

No, I have not, Mr. Speaker. I think if the hon. member opposite has that information I would be happy, on receiving the specifics of names, dates, times and places from him, to take such action as is appropriate.

MP. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Lethbridge East followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Bow.

AGT - - Storm Damage

MR. ANDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Telephones and Utilities. Has the minister had any assessment of the damage to the Alberta government telephones in the recent spring storm in southern Alberta?

MR. FARPAN:

Mr. Speaker, the total extent of the damage is still being assessed by both the private utilities and Alberta Government Telephones and in respect to the REAs.

At the height of the storm there were 35,000 power connections cut off, and some 20,000 telephones. All the damage has now been repaired and an assessment is being made which can be passed on to the hon. Deputy Premier.

MR. DRAIN:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, on the same subject. Could the minister advise how successful the underground program was in weathering this storm?

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Speaker, it was extremely successful where the most modern cable was used, which is a cable containing petroleum jelly, and also in some of the other cable areas. But where it was not successful was where old-fashioned lead cable was being used within urban areas.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Bow followed by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview.

Saltpetre Fire Bombs - Calgary

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Solicitor General. Has the minister requested details of the police and fire department investigations of this year's rash of saltpetre fire bombs in Calgary?

MISS HUNLFY:

No, Mr. Speaker. I have not.

MR. WILSON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Minister of Education. Has the minister taken any action, as a result of the 11 fires in Calgary schools this year which investigators describe as being attributable to arson or unknown causes ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please.

MR. WILSON:

... [Inaudible] ... \$300,000 in damages?

[Interjections]

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I would have to say, I can't understand the opinion of the other party opposite of trying to destroy local school autonomy. This is a matter for the local school board. If they feel they should be abolished ... [Inaudible] ...

[Interjections]

MR. LUDWIG:

A supplementary to the hon. minister, dealing with the matter of local autonomy. Does restricting their spending improve local autonomy, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please.

MR. WILSON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Minister of Consumer Affairs. Has the minister been in contact with retail or wholesale saltpetre distributors regarding its distribution to youths?

MR. DOWLING:

Mr. Speaker, I have been in touch with one drug store and they are still selling it.

[Laughter]

AN HON. MEMBER:

Who else would ... [Inaudible]

MR. WILSON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Minister of Consumer Affairs. What action has the minister taken in regard to restricting the sale of saltpetre to youths who are using it for fire bombs?

MR. DOWLING:

We have no jurisdiction over that, of course, Mr. Speaker. But we do have some over the use for medical reasons.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the hon. Premier. Is it customary to have ministers laugh at questions that involve ... [Inaudible] ...

[Interjections]

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, it's a ...

[Interjections]

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please.

[Interjections]

There is no rule of privilege known to the Chair which constitutes laughter as a breach of privilege.

[Laughter]

MR. LUDWIG:

Contempt is offensive no matter how they do it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WILSON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Minister of Education. Has the minister's opinion been solicited in the recent resolution of the Calgary Public School Board to prosecute parents of juvenile vandals to the fullest legal extent?

MR. HYNDMAN:

No, Mr. Speaker, I don't believe I've received any communications from either Calgary school board on that matter. Again, I think the school boards can and should operate without receiving the minister's opinion. They should make decisions on the basis of being locally elected trustees [acting] within their powers under The School Act, and that's the way in which I prefer the decentralized local autonomy approach to work.

MR. WILSON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Premier. Does the hon. Premier concur with those responsible distributors who have voluntarily removed saltpetre from the shelves of their stores?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please.

Possibly we might have less difficulty with the rules and with the Chair if we would avoid questions of opinion of that kind.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview followed by the hon. Member for Camrose.

NEB--Exports

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Premier. Can the Premier advise whether the government has had any discussions with federal officials concerning the decision of the National Energy Board to increase export to the United States by 200,000 barrels a day during the month of May?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, to my knowledge the government has not, but I would have to check that with the Minister of Mines and Minerals.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to either the hon. Premier or to the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. Can the government advise the Assembly whether or not the NEB decision for May is a temporary decision to increase exports, or whether it is part of a pattern of larger exports over the duration of the year?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is very difficult to answer that question - certainly the last few months - because the rapid changes that have occurred have made it pretty well a month-by-month determination by the National Energy Board. I would have to surmise, and that is the best I can do, that it is on a month-to-month basis by way of decision-making.

MR. NOTLEY:

A further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Premier. Can the Premier advise the Assembly whether he's had an opportunity to evaluate, in the federal spending estimates tabled yesterday, the increase of \$400 million in the export tax, which can be due to only one of two reasons, either an increase in exports, or an increase in the export tax?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Well, Mr. Speaker, it also could be due to an error in calculation, but the answer to the question is that we have not.

Crude Oil Prices

MR. NOTLEY:

Just one final supplementary question to the hon. Premier, following on the one I just asked him. Has the government received any information from our international marketing specialists concerning a possible increase in crude oil prices?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, we have a collection of opinion and most of it is highly varied. There are those who think that crude oil prices will rise and others who think that they will decline. It's a very wide spectrum of information and opinion that we are receiving at the present time. I think it will be a matter of some months before we'll be able to make any reasonable evaluation of the short term. I think the general view in the longer term would be probably, to see some decline.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Camrose followed by the hon. Member for Lac La Biche-McMurray.

Peace River - Spring Breakup

MR. STROMBERG:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of the Environment. I was wondering if the spreading of sand and the trenching of the ice on the Peace River was successful?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, we have had ice jams on occasions, during spring breakup, on the Peace River which caused flooding difficulty. This year we attempted an experiment which I wish to report to the Assembly was very successful in preventing ice jams.

MR. STROMBERG:

A supplementary. Would consideration be given to using this spreading of sand and trenching on other rivers in Alberta?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, the success of the experiment indicates that where there is the formation of very thick ice, causing the possibility of ice jams, that this type of experiment, or this type of approach, can in fact be used on other rivers.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Lac La Biche-McMurray followed by the hon. Member for Drumheller.

Alberta Students - B.C. Office

DR. BOUVIER:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to address this question to the hon. Minister of Advanced Education and ask the minister if he is planning on opening an office in British Columbia to assist Alberta students to get loans?

MR. LUDWIG:

He didn't laugh at that one.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Drumheller followed by the hon. Member for Clover Bar.

Soft Drugs - High Schools

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Education. Has the Department of Education received information from the large city school boards that the use of the softer drugs - I refer to marijuana and LSD - is being gradually reduced in our large city high schools?

MR. HYNDMAN:

I haven't personally received that information lately, Mr. Speaker, but I think the question and the subject are important. I'd be happy to follow it up to see if we can make some assessment in those areas as to the rate, nature and quality of the change of that particular problem during the last six months. I'll write to the boards and endeavour to get the information for the hon. member.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that. I would also ask one further supplementary. Is there any indication from the school boards that the pushers of marijuana and LSD are now finding their way into the smaller high schools of the province? I've had some indication of that, but I think it should be pursued.

MR. HYNDMAN:

I'll do my best to get an assessment of that as well, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Clover Bar followed by the hon. Member for Sedgewick-Coronation.

Fort McMurray-Churchill Rail Line

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address my question to the hon. Minister of Industry and Commerce. I would like to know, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. minister can inform the House what negotiations the minister's department has had with the federal department in relation to the proposed Fort McMurray to Churchill rail line?

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, I'll take that under advisement. I'm not just aware of what communication we've had with the federal government on that particular issue.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Sedgewick-Coronation.

TV Rental Ads

MR. SORENSON:

My question is to the hon. Minister of Consumer Affairs. Does the hon. Minister of Consumer Affairs intend to institute a program of public education to warn people about such things as TV rentals - \$9 a month - which actually end up costing \$1,000 for a \$600 TV?

MR. DOWLING:

That matter is being investigated, Mr. Speaker, relative to some legislative measures that are being considered at the moment. We also do have, Mr. Speaker, a publication that comes out about five times a year, and matters such as these will be dealt with in detail in that publication.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview.

Capital City Park

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests. Can the minister advise the Assembly whether or not it's the government's intention to appoint a project coordinator or commissioner with respect to the new Edmonton provincial park?

DR. WARRACK:

We have made no final plans relative to that, Mr. Speaker, and intend to have some discussions with the City of Edmonton in seeking a mutually best way to handle it from both the point of view of the province and the city at the same time.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

WRITTEN QUESTIONS

171. Mr. Clark asked the government the following question:

Which organizations received portions of the \$135,322.14 made available by the provincial government in the fiscal year 1972-73 to ethno-cultural organizations and how much did each receive?

MR. SCHMID:

I accept the question, Mr. Speaker.

172. Mr. D. Miller asked the government the following question:

With respect to the development of the Alberta Athabasca sands; since January 1, 1973,

1. What are the names of the foreign governments that have expressed a written interest in participating:
 - (a) with an equity investment?
 - (b) with a nonequity investment?
2. Has the provincial government considered issuing a "request for proposals" to interested Canadian investor groups concerning the potential further development of the oil sands?
3. What Canadian provinces have expressed written interest in investing or participating in the development of the Athabasca tar sands?
4. Has the provincial government received a response from either the federal government or the United States government concerning a treaty with the United States for the sale of synthetic crude from the oil sands?
5. What is the name of the treaty?
6. What are the general terms proposed for the treaty?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, with regard to Question No. 172, we have no difficulty with the first three parts of the question, but we do with the last three parts, being 4, 5 and 6. Unless the hon. member can give us some greater clarity with regard to question 4, then we're obviously not going to be in a position to answer questions 5 and 6.

MR. D. MILLER:

I'll withdraw those last three questions, 4, 5 and 6 ...

AN HON. MEMBER:

And resubmit them.

MR. D. MILLER:

... and resubmit them. I'll withdraw those, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Does that dispose of the question? Is it the understanding then that the government is accepting the first three parts?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MOTIONS FOR A RETURN

173. Mr. Clark proposed the following motion to the Assembly:

That an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing:

The financial arrangements made with the firms of Richardson Securities of Canada, Midland-Osler Securities, Cochrane Murray and McLeod, Young and Weir Company, who will manage the marketing of shares of the Alberta Energy Company, and

- (a) the length of contract in each case.
- (b) copy of the agreement of service with each company.
- (c) location of head office of each of the four above mentioned firms.

[The motion was carried.]

MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

1. Moved by Mrs. Chichak:

Be it resolved that, the report of the Legislative Committee on Professions and Occupations be received and considered for implementation.

[Adjourned debate: Mr. Ludwig]

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware of how much time I have left on this.

AN HON. MEMBER:

You used it all up.

AN HON. MEMBER:

About 18 minutes.

MR. LUDWIG:

Time isn't running yet.

AN HON. MEMBER:

18 minutes.

MRS. CHICHAK:

Mr. Speaker, I think from the last information you had given me, the hon. member had used up 12 minutes of his time.

MR. LUDWIG:

I appreciate an honest response like that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood is very accurate - 12 minutes - 18 minutes to go, that is.

MR. LUDWIG:

I hope, she is as accurate about her observation of my time as I was about her time, Mr. Speaker.

In dealing with this motion, Mr. Speaker, it's regrettable that this is not a government motion, that an issue as important as this one - which, at least, the government realized was an important issue - could not be dealt with fully as a private

member's motion. At best it will get a cursory review. It will not be thoroughly debated. We will not know the views of the ministers on this issue, and I take the position that perhaps the government did not want to commit itself on a report of this nature.

Even though I don't agree with segments of this report, I believe it deserves a lot more consideration in this House than merely being passed through as a private member's motion. It can, at best, be dropped to the bottom of the Order Paper and may not be debated again until this session is over, Mr. Speaker. I think it is regrettable and I think the government was remiss in not treating this issue as being quite significant.

I feel, [since] they appointed a committee to study this, this is a major issue. We have spent a lot of money, and to then neglect giving it thorough debate - I just don't think they gave it the priority and the recognition it deserves and that the committee gave it. As I stated previously, there are parts of it that I don't believe were completed thoroughly, issues were not dealt with adequately. Nevertheless, it was a good effort and the government should recognize this.

In dealing with professions and occupations, and perhaps a possibility of reform by way of legislation, major reform that affects perhaps the lives of every person in this province, the government is treating this as something light and with indifference. I think to that extent it ought to be criticized in not having discharged its responsibility in keeping with the significance of the issue.

One of the interesting developments during the hearings was the concern about the handling of complaints. Almost every complaint [was] against professions. Almost every profession that made a representation agreed it would not object to some form of a better-known procedure, a central clearing house, as it were, or maybe a complaints ombudsman, although I did not appreciate the use of that word in that regard. But all the professions - when I say all, I mean most of them - agreed it would be preferable if individuals who deal with professions would have some knowledge as to where to lodge a complaint in the event of a grievance.

There are grievances in these matters. An individual who perhaps does not know where to turn goes from person to person, from doctor to doctor or lawyer to lawyer until someone advises him where to lodge his complaint. I think to that extent there should be some improvement perhaps in policy either by a directive to the profession, that would be preferable, or by legislation. The complaints procedure took up a lot of the time of the committee at least during the hearings. I believe all professions which appeared before the committee expressed a sincere desire to improve their own image, to improve their own PR, by letting those people who deal with them know exactly where to turn in the case of a complaint.

I believe it would be fair, at this time, to say the legal profession leads the way, virtually, with regard to most other professions, in setting up proper complaints procedures, well-known complaints procedures, including the handling of complaints of members of its own profession and the manner in which these are disposed. I believe the legislation governing the law society and the manner in which we handle these matters has been an example to many other professions which came into being subsequent to our legislation. Furthermore I believe the law society, the legal profession, is constantly looking for ways and means of improving its public relations, of improving its service to the people, and particularly in dealing with complaints against a lawyer with dispatch. I believe there has been tremendous improvement and progress in that regard.

One disappointment I have about the committee's procedure is that some professions and occupations which appeared before us were not given sufficient consideration to really voice their grievances, voice their complaints. Some were given adequate hearings and perhaps more than was necessary, although one cannot measure these things with any accuracy. But I thought the real estate profession - I call them a profession, they are quite expert in their field - came before us and they had a lot more to say, perhaps than they did. I would like to have seen the committee pursue their problems, not only with regard to a few voluntary individuals, but also to the problems which exist within the trade, occupation or profession, as you wish.

I believe there are concerns among agents, among salesmen which need to be resolved. There are concerns where the public needs to be protected in dealing with professional businessmen who are selling homes for a commission. This is one regret I have, that we did not come in with a specific recommendation as to how we might improve the relationship between the public and the real estate business, which is one of the greatest commercial businesses in this province. Many people deal with professional realtors, but they are themselves not professional. I mean the house buyer or the house vendor. They often get into agreements which would call for independent advice. I am quite certain that if lawyers handled real estate in the manner that real estate people do, most transactions would be challenged if there was not independent advice provided for a purchaser or vendor. A lawyer could not act for both parties. He can, but if there were a dispute, he

can act for neither. But the real estate salesman, the real estate agent - the firm can act for both people, act for them from beginning to end.

It appears you cannot question some of the transactions in which there may be grievances because of a conflict of interest. A professional realtor often advises both the vendor and the purchaser, often to the detriment of one of the parties. But the recourse is only by way of court proceedings to see if the transaction can be upset. And many are upset. But I think the committee had an obligation to pursue this issue a little further to see if something could not be done in the matter of safeguarding people who deal in this business.

As I've stated, many vendors and purchasers are expert, but the majority of home buyers - first home buyers or people who sell their houses for the first time - are under the influence of the salesman, the agent of the real estate firm which sells. They take his advice, they trust him and they enter into contracts which would perhaps call for some independent advice. Although independent advice could be had by either party to the transaction, people get excited. They will sign offers to purchase, sleep on the offer for one evening and then wake up the next morning realizing that they did not know entirely what they entered into. This happens over and over and over again. I think that there needs to be some close look at this matter, perhaps through the Department of Consumer Affairs, to see if anything can be done as a safeguard to people who sometimes lose their investment or make a bad investment.

We were adequately concerned about the relationship between a client and a professional advisor, be he lawyer or doctor or chartered accountant. We went through that very thoroughly and sufficient concern was had in this regard by the committee. Although it was evident from the legislation and the general conduct of the business of the professions that the professions themselves have done a great deal towards assuring the individual that he will be treated fairly and that he has an immediate means of complaint in the event that he has a grievance against a professional man, we did not pursue this further down the line in dealing with some of the occupations.

We had complaints about people who get licensed repairmen to come in to do television repairs with no recourse if something isn't done right. I believe that in many instances we have people who deal with mechanics, who have their automobiles fixed and if something goes wrong and the job is slipshod, then recourse has to be had through courts for a redress of grievance.

But everybody seems to be concerned with the fact that we ought to have the professions pegged, that there ought to be an immediate procedure for handling grievances without recourse to court. At least recourse to court can be had in the final instance if the aggrieved person is not satisfied with the decision he gets after filing a complaint, perhaps with the law society.

But there are many people plying their occupations and trades in the province who are not checked as closely, who are not controlled as closely as the professions are. Many people end up in grief because they have no recourse when something isn't done properly.

I believe that the committee did not recommend that we discontinue providing private charters, private bills, in other words, legislation for the incorporation of professional societies as has been the practice in the past. I still believe that what we did in the past by way of permitting incorporation of trade groups and professional groups has worked to the advantage of the public. It has been in the public interest.

Until we can come up with a better system, with an obvious recommendation that is an improvement, my view is that we should leave it alone. The committee has sought rather desperately at times to come up with some kind of plan where we would have more government surveillance, we would have more external involvement. By external involvement, I mean external interference by somebody in the government, someone who would be in charge of handling all professions to determine whether they are discharging their responsibilities in the public interest.

I'm of the opinion - I'm very much opposed to this at the present time, not that it would not work. It may work but it has not been established in all the committee deliberations or in their brief that we have a superior plan to that which is in effect today, Mr. Speaker. We have not. I'm saying that this committee has not come up with a plan which, if implemented, would be an obvious improvement. Merely to change something for the sake of change is not adequate. I believe that although the exercise was worth while, the whole exercise was educational, [and] many people learned quite a lot about how to deal with professions and occupations, I am of the opinion that this legislation would not support any major changes to the status of the professions and occupations in the province at the present day, Mr. Speaker.

DR. PAPROSKI:

Mr. Speaker, to speak on this motion, "Be it resolved that, the report of the Legislative Committee on Professions and Occupations be received and considered for implementation" is really a very important task, I feel. Because to speak on professions and occupations, in itself, is to speak on society, what makes it ring, what makes it tick, what makes our society, in fact. Surely, Mr. Speaker, the government of the day has received this report and will indeed consider it and, in all probability, implement some of the important features.

But, Mr. Speaker, getting back to the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View's point, to suggest that not enough consideration has been given to this very important item, indeed is almost ludicrous, because the committee, as he knows - and he was member of that committee - has sat for some two years and heard some 75 to 100 various agencies and groups, over countless hours, including evenings. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that this is really a truly open report based on the opinions, feelings and tone of a variety of professions and occupations. In addition to that, of course, Mr. Speaker, there were many reports that were written and the people did not appear at the hearing.

So, Mr. Speaker, getting back to my comments: as quickly as I have stated the importance of this particular item to our society, I want it to be clearly understood that I recognize from the outset that the members of the various occupations and professions in our province, and for that matter across Canada, are individuals serving our society and its needs. They recognize this and there is a wide variety of services provided. With this wide variety of services, Mr. Speaker, we have, of course, a wide variety of administrative set-ups for various occupations and professions.

Mr. Speaker, the honourable chairperson, Catherine Chichak, has made statements regarding the professions and occupations and how they have been categorized. I think it is important to relate to this because this is the way it is now. Very briefly the categories are one, professions and occupations which presently have powers of self-government to varying degrees - the individual must be registered and licensed and can use the appropriate title. There are some 25 in this category in Alberta. Another category is composed of professions and occupations under a government-operated licence for individuals only. Again there are about 33 here and they must be registered and licensed and then they can use the appropriate title. The other category, Mr. Speaker, is made up of professions and occupations under a government-operated licence system for individuals or partnerships or businesses. They should be registered and licensed under the appropriate title.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have no intention of giving a complete review of the report because it is well documented. I certainly recommend two or three evenings of reading of this report because, as I stated from the outset, the professions and occupations, in fact, involve almost every sphere of our daily life.

There are items of consideration which should be kept in mind and those are regarding, of course, self-government, rule-making bodies, admission, licensing, discipline procedures, continuing surveillance and voting at meetings and continuing surveillance of these items. And there are many others.

Mr. Speaker, the needs can be stated and have been stated in this report. I suggest the government will take this to heart when it is reviewing this report. The obvious need is for clarity to the members of the professions and occupations, and for clarity to the consumers. There is need for improved relationships and understanding between the various occupations and professions and the consumer. There is a need to simplify the administrative activity and the 'understandability'. Mr. Speaker, I consider these very important items in a complex society, with the variety of services which we have.

Mr. Speaker, we need to assure that our society is getting services of an acceptable standard, not on a presumptive basis, but of a standard we know is more or less the optimal level across-the-board in all professions and occupations.

So, Mr. Speaker, regarding self-government, we recognize professions and occupations are for the purpose of meeting societal needs. It should be also true that professions and occupations are responsible to the consumer as a result. The consumer has a right to play a role in the determination of this self-government because, after all, it is giving a responsibility to this profession or occupation. My conclusion, Mr. Speaker, in the very early part of the committee hearings was evident and I am sure most of the hon. members felt the same way. Self-government indeed should continue and there should be this local autonomy. But before self-government is provided to a particular group, a new group or any group, criteria must be laid down.

Another consideration, very early in the hearing, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, was that we felt that consumers should have representation on the boards, the councils or committees dealing with self-government. Again, I think this report covers that very well.

So, Mr. Speaker, regarding self-government per se and the responsibility inherent in that for professions and occupations, as far as I can see it, the most important items are the criteria before you accept a profession or occupational group. You must have the criteria before the group has that particular prerogative. These criteria must be clearly laid down.

Regarding rule-making bodies, Mr. Speaker, the important thing that we - or certainly I - sensed very quickly throughout the hearings, was that there is not a uniform terminology which should, indeed, be present throughout all professions and occupations. Uniform terminology, Mr. Speaker, because the members themselves must understand it. But even more important than a membership in the profession or occupation, that terminology will eventually be known by the individuals out in the community who are receiving the service. When they are dealing with them or sitting on their boards or committees, they'll also understand it. The rule-making body, Mr. Speaker, should be capable of review and control by courts. Rule changes, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, should be subject to the approval of the Lieutenant Governor in Council. One body should control this, Mr. Speaker.

Then we get on to the other item of importance, Mr. Speaker, regarding admission - again, clarity, simplicity and uniformity wherever possible; of course there are members in the House who would say this is not possible. The issues of admission and rule-making are so similar across the board. Yet for some reason or other there is a tendency by various professions and occupations to muddle up and change the wording and have a different system going for them. As a result, this causes confusion to the consumer and to those in the Legislature who have to make judgments regarding that from time to time.

So we need clear definition, Mr. Speaker, regarding education and the academic requirements regarding admission. We need the practical requirements. We need the character requirements. We need the age requirements, fees and any other factors that may be considered. But the important thing here, Mr. Speaker, is clarity, simplicity and uniformity.

Mr. Speaker, another item that I don't think has been emphasized strongly enough in the report is the need for reciprocity between the provinces and across Canada. All too often, Mr. Speaker, we have heard that teachers and/or various professional and occupational people, members of our society who are well trained and come to Alberta, but for some reason or another cannot practise their profession or occupation because there was no reciprocity. I suggest this should be clarified as quickly as possible.

Regarding refusal of applicants, Mr. Speaker, again, clarity, simplicity and uniformity. Notice to be given in writing. The reasons to be given in writing. There should be rights of appeal to a court and the procedure should be clearly delineated for all members.

Mr. Speaker, I have no intention of going on throughout the whole report, as I stated before. So I am going to skip over a few of the items and get to some of the other things I feel are important.

Mr. Speaker, as I stated initially, there are a number of highlights, but to me the most important highlight was that there should be a general committee for all professions and occupations. In the report we've called it a Professions and Occupations Council. Mr. Speaker, I think this is a vital item because of the multiplicity of professional and occupational groups which are proliferating across the province. Not that this proliferation has to be stifled in any way. In many cases this is necessary because of the variety of services, but this committee, I suggest, should be functioning at all times for all professions and occupations. It should be made up of government members, as is stated in the report, and these government members may be members who are elected, of course, from the Legislative Assembly, and government members who are not elected. They should be educators, representatives from the various professions and occupations, and lay people.

I suggest to the hon. members of the Assembly that this committee, call it what you wish - Professions and Occupations Council, as we have called it - would serve for a progressive change of all aspects of professions and occupations when and where needed. In other words, it would be a continuity of general surveillance and monitoring, but it would be primarily an advisory and recommending body for all the professions and occupations with appropriate consumer input. It would assist to assure this reciprocity, or national standards - and certainly Alberta standards - at an optimal level, and it would recommend, on an ongoing basis, very similar to the advisory committee that the Workers' Compensation Board has set up, regarding the main governing boards, regarding rule-making bodies, the admission, education, discipline, continuing education and public relations. Finally, Mr. Speaker, this committee would indeed increase the assurance that the professions and the occupations are maintaining a satisfactory equation between the self-interest profession and occupation group - not totally self-interest, but in part - but [that] the public interest is also protected. In other words, simply put, it would improve the accountability to society of professions and occupations.

Having served on this committee Mr. Speaker, with all the other members of the committee, and hearing the many and varied presentations by various professions and occupations, it makes one ask a very compelling question. How does the consumer ever sort all of this out, all of these varieties of services? How does the consumer who is, after all, the user, the average citizen, how does he make the judgment of who, when, where, what and how to use this multiplicity of services?

Well, Mr. Speaker, it becomes very obvious very quickly, without any in-depth reading, that the consumer, in fact, does not know and cannot know all of this. Therefore, the consumer, the average citizen whom we are here to serve, is depending upon some type of societal order and on the responsibility of the professions and the occupations to give assurance that certain standards of service, ethics and so forth, will be maintained.

Thank God, Mr. Speaker, that over the years this indeed has happened, as evidenced by the 'proof of the pudding', which is the service our society has received, exemplified by the excellent standards of the various professions we have in Alberta and in Canada.

But surely, Mr. Speaker, surely there is room for improvement. This is the reason this select committee was set up. And who would deny that? I challenge any member in the Assembly to stand up and say, I do not think there should be improvement.

So, Mr. Speaker, we now come to the nitty-gritty of the issue of professions and occupations and the consumer, the rights of the professionals and the occupational groups, and the consumer group on the other hand - a critical equation, Mr. Speaker, because to take away the rights of a large group which is providing the service and give it to the consumer, which in fact is a provider of the service on one hand also, is a complex situation.

So we are considering the self-government, the criteria and the various categorizations that must be carried out. In other words, very simply put, guidelines, flexible guidelines, must be established for the newer, and for that matter maybe the existing, professions that haven't fallen within these guidelines.

Mr. Speaker, I don't believe anyone would deny that the professions and occupational groups have served our society well, and a counterbalance has been maintained by the courts from time to time to be sure that the issues are resolved. They also have been maintained by the groups themselves, by their various disciplinary groups. So we can take a position very quickly and say, let's maintain the status quo, the hell with it, it's good enough the way it is, leave it alone. Well, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that this attitude of standing and not progressing, not improving because of fear of change, is a first sign of a society which is going to degenerate, unless, of course, all the goods and services are ideal.

So with this in mind, Mr. Speaker, an attempt was provided by the select committee to have a vigorous input, not only from the members - we had a variety of members indeed, serving from various areas of our society and this was good - but a vigorous input from various professional and occupational groups. We came to grips with the issues as best we could under the circumstances and the time frame allotted, recognizing that the time frame of two years - and I think the citizens should realize this, and it should be recorded in Hansard - not two years, eight hours or ten hours every day, because we had other responsibilities as everybody appreciates. But I feel very strongly, Mr. Speaker, that such guidelines as were established as a result of the input from the committee members and the various representations, could really shape the course for the next few generations, for a very rational way of dealing with the services provided by these various professional and occupational groups.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to note that the various members played a very important role. There were positive and negative ways of handling this [by] the committee members. I think this was healthy, because the negative offered something too, as well as the positive contribution.

So the question quickly is: do we do nothing, hear nothing, see nothing and feel nothing or, like responsible progressive members of our society, do we set new trends and improve? Mr. Speaker, I suggest that new trends and new directions are well established by the recommendations here in the report.

I challenge the government, Mr. Speaker, to come to grips with the various issues that are the recommendations in this report regarding self-government, the criteria, the responsibility regarding certification. In other words, what are the educational qualifications? Regarding licensing, who shall be allowed to practise after they are certified? What are the criteria?

One of the classic examples right now [involves] the case of the ambulance drivers. The variety of education which they receive across the province we know very quickly, and very well, is not uniform. And some are better trained than others. What about the updating, upgrading, mentioned so well by the hon. Member for Calgary McKnight, here on my

left? If no other words came out through that committee meeting from that hon. member, they were "updating", "upgrading" and "reviewing" and so forth regarding education, and I thought that was very healthy.

What about conduct and discipline, Mr. Speaker? Should we have consumer representation so that justice is not only done in fact, - and we had lawyers on the committee - but justice should actually appear to have been done. And then accountability, Mr. Speaker. We get back to that Professional and Occupational Council which should be ongoing, advisory; should be sensitive, should be monitoring, should be recommending. I highly recommend that type of committee or council.

So in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, if nothing else comes of this report but the establishment of a professional and occupational council or committee to ensure to the individual and the consumer that there is clarity and that there are guidelines regarding the establishment of new professions and occupations - and, for that matter, application of those guidelines for the existing ones - the committee, I feel, has served its purpose because the trend from that point on will be clarity and simplicity for the consumer and for other groups.

There is also much more, Mr. Speaker, regarding all the recommendations and the items mentioned in the report which, I feel, if adopted, in part if not in whole, or modified, will make our society and our professional and occupational groups happier and healthier, more understandable, more comprehensible and more [reassuring] to all concerned.

I support the motion, Mr. Speaker.

MR. LEE:

Mr. Speaker, before I enter into debate on this resolution, I want initially to express my congratulations to the Member for Edmonton Norwood for her most able chairmanship of the Legislative Committee on Professions and Occupations during the last two years. I'm sure I share the views of other members of the committee when I say that I found being involved in the deliberations of this committee a most stimulating and most educational experience.

Mr. Speaker, in my comments on this resolution and on the report of the professions and occupations committee, I want to direct my attention to various factors relating to the accessibility to admission within both the initial and continuing practice in various professions and occupations, and to relate to various aspects of the report as they pertain to this particular examination.

At the outset, I want, as the report has done, to make a distinction between two components which are relevant to this entrance accessibility, those factors or those processes of professional certification and licensing. I quote from page 6 of Report 2 on this distinction between certification and licensing:

Certification can be defined as a formal written declaration signed by the appropriate officials of a recognized educational or training jurisdiction that the person named has met the requirements for the class of certification indicated thereon.

And further,

Licensing can be defined as the granting of a document, properly authorized, evidencing that the person named therein has met the requirements set out in statute to be permitted to practise in a profession, occupation or business, usually for a specified period of time ...

Mr. Speaker, I think it's important that this distinction was made. Following from this distinction I'd like to identify four stages which an individual might encounter, and which may vary for various professions and occupations, in gaining admission to the practice of a profession or occupation. Of particular note, Mr. Speaker, I'd stress that accessibility is affected at each one of these four stages.

The first of these is the admission one gains to a training program, whether it be of a full-time or part-time nature, institutional or industry-based, an initial training or, stressing the words of Dr. Paproski, whether it be an upgrading, updating or retraining kind of experience.

Now this admission might be granted on a number of different criteria. Of course, we know the most common of these are educational requirements. As an example, if an individual wishes to enter a particular degree course he may be required to have completed satisfactorily, say, five matriculation courses. Having met these requirements he can then undertake his studies.

However, this may not prove to be the case in all cases of training. As an example, [in] medical training, where limited training places are available, some other criteria must be attached to the basic admission requirements. Consequently, accessibility will be limited beyond mere attainment of these basic educational requirements. Admission prerequisites may be artificially increased then, in fact to the point where an individual upon attaining entrance standards to a medical training course, through the sorting process, requirements may be escalated beyond the stated prerequisites to something like senior matriculation, plus a master's or even a doctoral degree prior to entrance to the course itself.

The second stage in admission to a professional occupation is in the granting of certification, indicating successful completion of the training course. Usually this is a very straightforward and relatively automatic process. However, in those cases where an individual comes from outside the province, some other extra-jurisdictional assessment must be applied to determine the equivalency of his particular certification to that applied within Alberta. In Alberta, for degree courses, most of these equivalent assessments are undertaken by the Universities Co-ordinating Council.

In other non-degree spheres such a process may not exist, and certification may be granted only after additional course work is undertaken, perhaps, not because it will enhance occupational performance, but maybe because some formal assessment of equivalent training just isn't available for that particular form of certification.

The third stage, Mr. Speaker, applicable to certain professions and occupations is the application of a period of internship or articles, wherein an individual, as in such courses as law, medicine and certain trade apprenticeship courses, is required to undertake training on the job in some kind of work experience for two to four years, added on to the actual certification process - all this prior to full acceptance into his professional occupation. Admission to this process, once again, may be limited by the number of available articling or internship positions within particular offices.

The fourth stage, finally, is that involving the licensing activity itself, in which the individual is granted the licence or the sanction to undertake his profession or his occupation. In Alberta, as we are aware, many professional acts have granted aspects of this privilege to various professional groups. The Institute of Chartered Accountants for instance, the Law Society, the Psychologists Association, the Dental Association and the College of Physicians and Surgeons have all been granted the right to issue licences to practise to their practitioners. In some cases there may be a re-licensing kind of activity also, where an individual is required to show proof of continuing education capability. Or it may involve that individual who has left his profession for some time and must then be re-licensed. In the latter case, the applicant may be required to undertake some kind of upgrading or retraining type of course prior to the re-licensing procedure.

Now, Mr. Speaker, having identified these stages relating to admission and consequently the accessibility of an individual's right to practise his chosen profession, I want to indicate some concerns that I have relating to this very accessibility, concerns over what I would identify as the potential for artificial hindrances to the right of an individual to enter the profession or occupation of his choice.

The first of these, Mr. Speaker, is the possibility of overly rigid links between formal education and total professional practice, [by] which the undertaking of a number of years of degree work becomes the only [entry] which an individual might have to any portion of the practise of his particular profession. Consequently the individual in high school or approaching professional training, is faced with anything from four to seven years in professional training with inadequate staging in between, which might allow for performance of a wide range of occupational activities by paraprofessional practitioners, assistant technicians and so on.

I was personally, I might add, encouraged by the remarks of the Minister of Advanced Education during subcommittee study of Advanced Education estimates and his remarks on this whole area of para-professional activity and the length of professional training. But I might add that these concerns which I have just now expressed were recognized in the Commission on Educational Planning, the Worth Report if you will. They have expressed much the same concerns which I share, and I quote:

Awarding an academic qualification is one thing. Admission into an occupation is another. The interlock between the two tends to be pervasive and unwholesome. Usually the demand for such licensing powers originates from the members of the very occupations to be licensed. Its effect is to raise the cost of entry into the licensed occupation, and to create prerequisite study requirements that are often unrelated to job performance.

Mr. Speaker, this then leads me into my second concern relating to accessibility to practise. This is the concern that artificially high standards might be established for entrance to particular courses. There seems to be a tendency in professional training

towards lengthier and lengthier programs, apparently, under the assumption, or the tendency - which is almost antithetical, I might add, to the current tendency within our society for specialization - that in our professional training we must make our professionals all things to all men within a chosen field. Even though particular potential roles will demand only portions of learning, we still undertake in our initial, basic degrees, to train our doctors, our lawyers, our social workers, our psychologists for all possible positions.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, it's my concern that in many cases there is an initially excessive or unrealistic entrance requirement, [whereby] an individual is not necessarily required to meet a certain prerequisite because it reflects on his capability to achieve in his professional studies, but because it's one which is utilized as part of the sorting process in admissions. It then becomes one of the hurdles which professional schools establish in their admission policies.

Mr. Speaker, I view the requirement, for instance, of two or three [years of] liberal arts training prior to consideration for entrance to certain professional schools, as just one example of what I would term an unrealistic obstacle, a luxury which we have granted to just certain professions such as law, medicine and dentistry.

My third concern is over the potential excessive influence of professional associations themselves upon this accessibility to practise. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I see the involvement of professional associations at all four stages, which I identified, of the certification and licensing process. Members of the professional associations are members of both the practice and the teaching function, members of university faculties and members of the advisory committees which establish courses and prerequisites for entrance to the courses of studies. In addition, professional associations have ultimate control over articling and internship activities, a control which could become an excessive limiting influence on professional accessibility. In much the same way professional examinations, when set by the professional association, could be utilized variably as a hurdle which the individual applicant must overcome. But in articles, in professional examinations, there is a discretionary application of standards by the professional association which could be utilized to limit admission to professional practice - to establish, perhaps, a form of professional closed shop.

To summarize the concerns I am expressing on accessibility, I would like to quote from the report of the Commission on Post-secondary Education in Ontario, from their document, The Learning Society. In this quote, I think, they have expressed very much the same kinds of concerns I share and have expressed. I would like to quote this from this document:

In recent years, broadened access to post-secondary learning has increased the number of qualified individuals seeking admission to professional careers. But many professional associations, often in the name of preservation of standards, have responded not by increasing their membership but by stiffening the educational requirements needed for admission to the profession. They have frequently stipulated the need for additional diplomas, degrees, or years of schooling, often in any field of university study. Similarly, as the range of professional services needed by society has expanded, certain professions have replied, not by diversifying their structure through the development of appropriate paraprofessions, but by having all tasks performed within the profession.

These restrictive practices may result in very high costs to individuals, institutions, and society: to individuals, in the denial of access to useful and self-fulfilling occupations; to institutions, in strong pressures to shape professional learning programs, not according to public needs for skills and service, but according to the requirements of professional bodies; and to the public, in higher costs for professional education and in deficient as well as costly professional services.

These were the concerns of the Ontario commission. And Mr. Speaker, although, I might say, I don't share the intensity of suspicion of professional bodies demonstrated in this quote, I think I might say it does indicate the potential dangers to accessibility to professional practice which may develop by an excessive delegation of authority to these professional groups.

Having expressed these concerns, Mr. Speaker, having identified certain stages in the certification and licensing process, I want, at this point, to put forth for the consideration of the Assembly, certain positive developments which can occur - positive developments which I feel must occur if we are, in fact, to make professional and occupational practice available to all our citizens who are eligible, who are capable, and who can contribute to a professional and occupational field.

Mr. Speaker, the first development must be the establishment of reasonable admission standards and training requirements, requirements which tend to encourage rather than discourage entrance to professional study. I feel that in this development of reasonable standards recommendation No. 12 in the committee report which calls for:

... a comprehensive review and evaluation of standards for admission into the various professions and occupations be undertaken, including standards of admission into educational facilities. ...

I feel this particular recommendation responds to this particular need, an independent assessment of professional standards for admission to both initial training and for the final licence to practise.

Further, Mr. Speaker, I have stated that I personally feel we must look very carefully at the elimination of liberal arts training as a prerequisite for entrance to our various professional training schools. It simply adds one more admission hurdle which could be better integrated with the degree studies themselves, as is now done, for instance, in such studies as commerce, education, engineering, agriculture and so on.

A second development which I look to is the establishment of a wide range of occupational and para-professional roles within various fields of study and practice. Mr. Speaker, after we have reconciled the whole area of public protection, there's no doubt that there are many tasks which are now undertaken by professionals which could be delegated, either independently or under the direction of a degree-holding professional, to a paraprofessional or assistant practitioner. This would consequently open up a field of study and practice which is not now available to individuals, but which is imposed instead on our already overworked professionals. As a further result of this restriction, professional services could become either unavailable or limited, to Alberta citizens, particularly in the rural parts of our province.

A third development, Mr. Speaker, which I see as important, is the acceptance of a career ladder approach to professional training - a career ladder approach in which we undertake, right from the initial short-unit certificate course, through to professional training, a transferability from course to course and from level to level - in which the individual is not required, after having taken a number of years at one stage, to then go right back to the start, to go right to the beginning, in undertaking further training even in that same occupational sphere. Training should be transferrable from one stage to the other within all our areas of professional training, from the certificate to the diploma to the degree stages of training. In addition, we must develop alternatives to the present rigid internship and articling arrangements which we now apply. Many graduates coming out of university, because they may not be able to obtain an internship or an articling placement, can potentially have closed to them the practise of their profession even though they may be capable, simply because they cannot obtain the opportunity to prove this capability in a specific internship or articling position.

As I have stated, I think internships and articles are critical, essential to professional training, but we must not limit accessibility by the fact that we cannot obtain an internship or an articling placement. Consequently, we must make available alternative avenues in the public service, related functions within professional offices, which will give the experience and consequently the assessment we need of professional suitability which is required prior to full licence to practise.

Mr. Speaker, I think it's important too, that we see the development of parallel avenues of admission to our various professions. As it stands now, students are required to undertake full long-term commitments prior to any licensing eligibility. In addition to the career ladder emphasis which I just mentioned, and described, individuals should also be able to, by my contention, challenge professional examinations, even though they may not have undertaken a full course of institutional study and degree work, and tie this into an internship and an articling experience.

I think it's important that we allow a staged preparation to practise a profession such as was available, I might add, previously in law, engineering and chartered accountancy. Mr. Speaker, I view it as a regressive practice when these kinds of accessibilities are eliminated, when the individual cannot enter chartered accountancy, law or engineering without first completing the complete university degree studies. By allowing this we not only limit accessibility to prospective practitioners but we also decrease the number of professionals available to provide services to the public in that particular sphere.

I think it's going to become more and more important, Mr. Speaker, as our society, and consequently our professional practice, becomes more complex, that more and more of the skills that we now allocate to our initial professional training must be allocated to a continuing-education type of learning; that specialties within various fields, in fact, become specialties. I think we're going to see new societal concepts of what a career is, Mr. Speaker, where an individual will move, in a career ladder sense, from one kind of work experience, through the availability of continuing education mechanisms, training on the job, sabbatical arrangements, and can then move from one level to another without having to postpone employment in his particular field.

As I have said earlier, I think it's important that we integrate liberal arts preparation into the program proper, instead of utilizing it as a prerequisite and thus a postponement, a hurdle to professional training.

Mr. Speaker, finally, I think it's important that admission standards for all professional licensing be placed in the statutes themselves, to assure that the people of Alberta, not the professional associations, maintain control over entrance to a professional practice. If changes in standards are required down the road, then these changes should be undertaken by the elected members who represent the larger societal concern.

Mr. Speaker, to facilitate all of these developments, in closing I want to endorse, as my colleague from Edmonton Kingsway has, those proposals in the professions and occupations report - and I believe they are Recommendations 23 and 24 - which recommend a council on professions and occupations be established, an advisory council which will assist both government and professional groups in the establishment of high standards of professional and occupational practice.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, my emphasis on accessibility does not imply a lowering of standards. Quality control - excellence in professional and occupational preparation and activity - will and must remain a prime concern of all institutions, both governmental and professional. But Mr. Speaker, it's a removal of those barriers which many of our citizens now face in admission to a particular vocation and the development and fulfillment of their total life vocational plans, which we must undertake. Many standards, at present, can be imposed, not by the requirements for effectiveness in a vocational role, but by the influence of associations which proceed to enhance their own professional societal role. These are the kinds of barriers I feel, as a Legislature and as a government, we must eliminate to make available to all our students, all our potential practitioners, the kind of professional training, the kind of professional practice, which will lead to their maximum productive participation in our society.

MR. COOKSON:

Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to say a few words about the work that the committee did on professions and occupations. I'd first of all like very much to congratulate the committee. I think you'll agree with me that a great deal of work and research went into preparing the final document as we see it before us. I hope that in some of the deliberations this afternoon we might flush out some of those members who weren't on the committee and in particular, Opposition members who are supposed to be the critics in the Assembly ...

MR. HENDERSON:

We're just waiting for you to sit down.

MR. COOKSON:

... and that we might get some kind of reaction from them ...

MR. LUDWIG:

The reactionaries are on your side. You're the reactionaries.

MR. COOKSON:

... as to the report.

I think it's vitally important that we have this long period of time for debate this afternoon. I hope that following the debate we might get some direction through our government to make some of the changes that have been suggested in the report. However, if we don't get some kind of positive reaction from the people across the way, Mr. Speaker, it's very doubtful that the province will want to initiate some of the recommendations in the report. I hear a lot of them mumbling over on the other side right now. The Member for Clover Bar, who is a member of a profession, ...

DR. BUCK:

Let's debate the bill.

MR. COOKSON:

... surely he's going to rise in his place and make some constructive comments ...

DR. BUCK:

It's okay for you to say.

MR. COOKSON:

... about the report. I'm looking forward in great anticipation to some of the things that he's going to say before the mike.

DR. BUCK:

I'm waiting till I hear your speech.

MR. COOKSON:

There are a number of areas of difficulty, I noticed in the report - in trying to define really what a profession is or what an occupation is, and where one leaves off and the other takes over. I ask myself the question as I read through the report, why so many groups seem to be clamouring to become a part of a profession? Certainly in the two books I have read there seems to be a considerable desire to become part of a profession. It seems that a lot of them want to escape the classification of an occupation and creep into the area of professions.

AN HON. MEMBER:

It's the money.

MR. COOKSON:

Someone suggests that perhaps this might be money and I suppose if you look over the part of the report on the annual incomes of some of our well-known, well-established and respected professions, that certainly income has a favourable influence, I suppose, on the direction and the request to become a profession.

It may go just a little bit deeper than that and I'd like to touch on some of the problems, as I see them, through reading in the report.

The government in the past, and probably to some extent the new government, has in fact sanctioned certain things done in order for one to become a part of a profession. One of the things that they have permitted is [the setting of] licensing standards. The Member for Calgary McKnight spoke to some degree in this area. The other important fact about a profession is the right to self-government.

Finally, the third area and right which they have been given is the right to discipline. I contend that perhaps it is not totally good wages, high income which most of the major professions enjoy, it may be a part of that and a part of these three major areas, which I consider pretty important areas to discuss.

The authority given under these three specific points, if respected by the professions in general, gives them an opportunity to either look outward or inward in their profession. If by default over the years, and due to pressures within, they take these rights and use them to support their own internal power over the rest of society, then I would say at that point a profession tends to be treading on pretty thin ice. If in fact they use these freedoms, not only for their own benefit, but for the benefit of the masses of people whom they serve in an outward approach, then I would say that would be the true measure of what I would consider a profession. So I try to make that distinction.

For example in one of the reports - I can't touch on all the areas that were covered - but there is an area which the Member for Calgary McKnight touched on with regard to licensing, the power of a profession to license. Now this can be used in an inward fashion to quietly, and in a subtle way, restrict the number of people entering that particular profession. Or, in the case of one profession, they have to be a member of the profession in order to practise.

The Alberta Teachers' Association requires that you be a member of the profession to practise teaching. It's not simply that you have to have a licence, but you have to be a member of the organization. Once you become a member of the organization, there are all sorts of gimmicks initiated to constrict you to the by-laws of the organization. Now there are some teachers who are able to practise teaching without being a part of the organization. It's to that group I speak and that group which I'm concerned about. I think they are entitled, once they acquire their certificate, to practise the profession of teaching in the classroom, whether or not they are members of this organization.

I don't dispute the fact that they should be required to pay a fee into the organization, I don't think it is a matter of money, it's simply a matter of principle. Once you get your certificate and qualify for a particular profession, you should have the freedom to practise under reasonable constraints. You see, when you get into this area you tend to look inward. If you carry that to the extreme you end up with what is termed a closed shop, which says in fact that if you aren't a part of this organization, you don't have the right to practise. Then there are further constraints. If you speak out

against the organization, then you are disciplined. You know we don't even allow that kind of restriction, fortunately, in this Assembly. You can just imagine how long the public would tolerate that sort of thing in the Legislature of the Province of Alberta, if we put certain constrictions on such that you had to belong to a certain organization or a certain profession before you could stand up in this Assembly and speak. It is to that point that I express my concern.

Another area which I will just briefly touch on is the matter of discipline. Quite often, and I think it was touched on in the report, the public is not aware of the procedures for complaints against a profession or complaints against an individual in the profession. Certainly from talking to people and their communication to me, they have no knowledge of the kind of procedure they might follow to complain of the malpractice of a particular group. In fact, I have had on occasion referred reports to a professional group for some kind of action and report. That is the last thing I hear about it. You know, if as a member of the Legislature for my constituency I didn't respond to correspondence, in one way or another, likely what would happen within four years of office would be what should happen.

Somewhere along the way with this inward protection of their particular groups they have forgotten to be accountable. I think that is a serious concern and I will touch on it a little further on.

It was interesting about setting of rates. The general public have no knowledge, until they get the bill, what the rates are. I remember a case where an attempt was made to collect \$1,600. I think \$10 was collected and the bill was \$300. I notice that the NFU made a presentation to the committee and suggested - had the audacity to suggest - that they should have the right to bargain the prices for farm products. I thought that was a pretty bold step. You know, when you think about it, we seem to have given some of these rights to a lot of other groups and organizations. But this kind of presentation, I suppose, wouldn't be acceptable. It certainly wouldn't be acceptable to the consumer.

The policy of secrecy - it wasn't very long ago that I listened to a leading person of a profession who was talking about the number of asphyxiations in, I think, Ontario. I think there were some ten involved over a period of years. He made the remark that ten years ago this would never have been public knowledge. When I heard that remark it really shocked me because it indicates to me that we have had some pretty inward-looking people within some of these organizations. Those are essentially the words he used. Fortunately he clarified and added that today this wouldn't happen. I hope he is right because it's very easy to masquerade under the importance of confidentiality - and I've heard it all in this Assembly - and secrecy and I don't dispute that. But there has to be a line drawn where the public is aware, in an outward fashion, of what takes place within professions and occupations.

The right to self-government carries with it a great responsibility. Some of the professions have written their own by-laws. Most of them have for that matter. There is an interesting one before me that I would just like to refer to briefly and quote in parts. It says the council, and this refers to an elected group of an organization,

Council may make by-laws governing elections of members to council, and those by-laws may provide the procedure for the nomination of candidates.

Secondly, those by-laws may prescribe the circumstances under which a registered person is not entitled to vote.

Well, if I were a despot and a member of that council, and the balance of the council were despots, it wouldn't be very difficult to settle elections under those two clauses. Finally, one of the clauses says:

The council may make by-laws and those by-laws may prescribe the term of office of members of council.

If I liked my job as a member of the council, I could soon extend that for 20 or 30 years. Now these are the kinds of rights written into some of the by-laws that someone gave to somebody presumably under self-governing rights. I know what would happen in this Assembly if the government on this side of the House, and I've heard some of it, with all respect - the reaction from members of the Opposition.

Now I just touch on those few points. The committee has endeavoured to sort out some of the problems on page 19 of, I think, the second report. One of the recommendations that the committee made is government control of certification. I think we had better address ourselves to that and look pretty carefully at that kind of recommendation and consider it very seriously. In fact, it means, some of these recommendations, that some of our more established professions may have to backtrack a little on some of the present functions under which they operate.

On page 20, No. 14, there should be a greater degree used in informing public. That's one of the recommendations. Number 25 asks for an umbrella act for clusters of professions.

I think the government should address itself through a council, as has been mentioned by the hon. Member for Calgary McKnight, to set up some kinds of standards and categories under which various professions and occupations may fall and carefully lay out the legislative rights within the scope of which they may function. I don't think it's good enough for a profession to come to the Assembly one year and ask for changes and we approve them. The second profession comes a second year and says, you let the first one have it, so we're going to let the second one have it. This goes on ad infinitum with some 30, 40 or 50 professions and occupations. I think they reach higher than that.

One other comment or two. The recommendation of tabling a report in this Assembly, so it is not misunderstood, the Province of Alberta and the government is a final authority. In other words, the buck stops here. Professions and occupations must understand the terms of reference. They must be carefully laid out so that they understand clearly what position they represent in terms of the total population of Alberta.

I think we should have more lay people. You know this is quite an argument. There is no use having a lay person on the board because what does a lay person know about medicine or law or any one of a number of professions? I just simply draw this analogy and I think the members across the way will agree with me. If you look at the front row of this Assembly, we have a great number of ...

MR. LUDWIG:

There's nobody there.

MR. BARTON:

You're wasting your time.

MR. COOKSON:

They can read it in Hansard. There are a great number of professions represented, ...

MR. LUDWIG:

Scores of them.

MR. COOKSON:

... a good many of those professions are in fields and areas for which they weren't trained. Dr. Hugh Horner is probably a good example of a person who has become very adept ...

AN HON. MEMBER:

The worst one ever.

MR. LUDWIG:

Pick a good one. Pick Clarence, for instance.

MR. COOKSON:

... at handling the problems in his department. I have no doubt in my mind that the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View could probably handle some of these areas which are normally out of his depth ...

MR. LUDWIG:

Beware of Greeks bearing gifts.

MR. COOKSON:

... if he were to practise at it, Mr. Speaker.

I would suggest, if you look at pages 52, 53 and 54 in the report, that these three pages represent some 36 professions and occupations. On not one of these boards is there provision for lay people. I simply make the point that if we are going to make the public more aware of what goes on within - and they can argue confidentiality and all the subtle arguments that are brought in, even red herrings - that if they really want to become respected professions and occupations they should give lay people an opportunity to sit on these boards and to communicate to the people they serve.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I think it important that we, as a province and as a government, coordinate, either yearly or through periods of time, any changes that might be required because there will be changes. We'll have, and always will have, pressures from professions and occupations to broaden or expand this so-called umbrella, as I have suggested, or make changes through the council in some kind of act which would cover all or most of the wants that they wish. I would suggest that we leave the door open to this, that we address ourselves to the problem, and that somewhere, not too far along the way, we come up with some kind of acceptable act which will, in effect, reduce some of the pressures and conflicts that occur in professions and occupations at the present time.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc followed by the hon. Member for Cardston.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, my comments on the report will be brief. I must confess, Mr. Speaker, on reading the report that it was with some disappointment. The issue is a complex one but I don't think the report really dealt with the basic issues that were referred to the committee. It seems to me the committee just drafted out the problems in a little different wording and referred it back to the House as the report. I don't wish to be critical of any members of the report but I still repeat, I must confess some disappointment in the report. I don't really feel the committee has come to grips with and dealt in very positive terms with some of the publications concerning the matter of professions.

I have the feeling, Mr. Speaker, that there is a growing sense of disenchantment with professional bodies insofar as the public is concerned. All too often, in the public's eye today, a professional association is viewed as either a device to instigate a closed shop, to keep people out of the business, or it's a monopoly situation wherein a group of people can sit down and decide amongst themselves what price they are going to charge for the services and then this is dictated to the public.

I'm sure, as MLAs, at one time or another we all hear complaints of this sort. Complaints about lawyers, complaints about engineers or practically anyone who practises in a professional group on a fee-for-service basis. And there is no question in some cases the complaints are justified. Some bodies have varying methods of dealing with such complaints. I would have to say that probably the legal profession is the best one and, of course, in the medical profession the issue is irrelevant because the government is paying the bill anyhow.

But I think one of the committee's recommendations is well taken. Recommendation 26, "That the fee schedule adopted by professional and occupational groups be by way of guideline rather than minimum tariff" - that should probably be pretty rigidly spelled out in the regulations. I think most of the people who operate with a conscience don't follow the fee schedule. They let their conscience be their guide. I think in some professions those members leave themselves open to prosecution by their own professional body because it is unethical, unprofessional, to charge a lesser fee because it's undue competition against their peers. And of course, some of this boils down to hogwash.

In my mind, Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that the public has a growing sense of disenchantment with the whole issue of professionalism in general. There are others, of course, Mr. Speaker, who are bent upon the question of improvement of standards of service to the public.

The thing that bothers me, Mr. Speaker, about the report is that one of the major issues that led to the establishment of the committee under the previous government of the Legislature preceding the election, was the problem in the field of health care. I must say that I was probably the main instigator in recommending to the government of the day that such a committee be set up, because of the fact that, first, all areas of health care with the introduction of Medicare, then and now, come completely within the purview of public responsibility, it's a responsibility of the Legislature.

There are some very, I think, serious moves, and moves about which the Legislature could be concerned, in the field of health services as to the fragmentation that exists, the growing fragmentation and the pressures in that direction resulting from pleas for professional status from within the various groups in the health services. I think some of the problem stems from the desire of the established professional groups in that field to protect the vested interests they now have. And I think that's one of the terms that's become synonymous with the public's mind as far as professions are concerned.

In my experience, all too often, the professional body when it speaks as a voice representing the profession, presents the least innocuous position on some social issue. It comes down to the lowest common denominator because as a body the view has to represent - in some professions, you know, if there is a small percentage objecting to it, 10 per cent is too much, so they've got to have something that 97 per cent will support. I think, unless some of the professions are prepared to recognize that they have to face up

and face the social issues in which they have a vested interest, an area of responsibility, and they do it on the percentage of a 51 per cent vote, just like we settle issues here, that public respect for the professions is going to continue to decline. Obviously if the professional group is going to fulfil its public responsibilities a policy of taking stands on public issues in which they have a vested interest, which boils down to one which is least offensive to the significant majority of the members of that profession, I don't think that is a completely publicly responsible position to take.

To come back again to the question of health services, this is Recommendation 3, clause f,

"Evidence that the services to be provided by the members of the association are not merely fragmentations or duplications of more comprehensive service programs of associations already recognized."

I have to say quite frankly that it's my experience in the field of nursing that the Alberta Registered Nurses Association is bound and determined it is going to dominate all the fields within the health care purview with the exception of the doctors. There's been a real battle in that regard. The psychiatric nurses want separate representation. The nurses for the mentally retarded want separate certification and there's a growing list of them. Many classify as technicians now.

I feel very strongly that the Legislature should not be moving to prepare an issue - grant professional status by statute of this Legislature in this area - until some of these areas of conflict are rationalized. In some cases instead of certifying more professional groups in the health field it's probably a case where the Legislature should be reeling-in and withdrawing some of the privileges that possibly have been extended in the past.

I think that the major thrust of the whole issue of professionalism has got to be that of Clause h in Recommendation 3, "Evidence that the granting of recognized status under legislation is clearly in the public interest." I suggest many of the applications that are coming to government with a view to coming to the Legislature, are recommendations for professional status, not necessarily because they are in the public interest, but because they are in the interest of that particular group. I suggest that the Legislature has got to be very cautious about examining these things, notwithstanding some of the tremendous pressures that come out in the Legislature for this particular type of legislation. I repeat, in the field of health services we should be extremely cautious about granting professional status to additional groups until the question of fragmentation is rationalized.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, about Recommendation No. - well it's partly under 23 - it's the question of an advisory Council for Professions and Occupations. While it sounds good, I must confess that I don't think it would be worth much in practice. From my experience again, in dealing with the professional groups, when you ask them for their official opinion, as a professional body, on another group which is asking for professional status, they are loath to express any public opinion on it unless it's something that is interfering with what they consider to be their vested jurisdiction. And of course, then they'll defend it tooth and nail. I find one can approach in a given problem area, members of a given profession and you will find unanimously amongst the individual members they'll tell you no, that such and such should not be granted professional status. And then when you get the official recommendation from that body they waffle on the thing. In effect, they go along with it because they feel they are in the position that if they try to deny it they are protecting their own interests, and in many cases they don't want to face up to the heat that goes with taking a stand on the issue.

I have some strong reservations about the extent to which such a council would be worth while - at least to the extent that if the council has any recognized status where members on the council are nominated or elected or appointed, or suggested, whatever you want to call it, by the professional bodies themselves - because such a council is not going to be of much value unless it has some pretty high calibre outstanding men on it with a strong degree of social conscience, a pretty thick hide and a determination to see that the public interest is protected. The professions themselves are most reluctant to get on record as publicly refusing something to another vested interest group, or be critical of them unless it happens to infringe upon their own protected territory.

One recommendation I concur with - but once again it requires some specific action, is if the question of fragmentation in the health services can't be rationalized, maybe the other question is Recommendation No. 25, "That there be developed for consideration by the Legislature umbrella Acts for clusters of professions and occupations or one umbrella Act to cover professions and occupations."

I close simply by repeating that I think this is highly relevant to the field of health services. It's an issue which the Legislature is not going to be able to avoid,

because all the funding for health services comes out of the taxpayers' purse directly now. It isn't a case of listening to the complaint of every private citizen whose lawyer has done him in, or his doctor has done a poor job - this type of thing - because it's a matter of taxpayers' dollars. And if the Legislature does not take a pretty firm, realistic stand on this and clearly recognizes what's in the public interest and, in many cases, that granting certification to a pressure group, as a professional group, is not in the public interest, it's going to simply add some very significant pressures to the cost of health services in the province.

On the question of lay representation on the boards as they exist now, I think in principle it's something that is desirable. I think if a professional body can't convince a layman who isn't knowledgeable on the subject of the merits of their proposition, if he's reasonably intelligent, I don't know how on earth they expect to carry the public's judgment on the merits of their proposition. And so the argument that a layman doesn't know anything about it, I think, in itself, is not relevant. That's one of the best reasons for having him on there because he doesn't go in there with any biased preconceived notions. He's not ... [Inaudible] ... to protecting a vested interest and he's on there to make the professional body convince him that what they are doing is clearly in the public interest. So I think an intelligent individual who's generally ignorant of the problems is probably the type of person who should go on the professions. I can understand why some of the professions wouldn't want him on there because they may have some difficulty in justifying some of their present actions that they shroud, as the Member for Lacombe said, in a cloak of secrecy and confidentiality and so forth.

I simply close by reiterating what I said at the outset, Mr. Speaker, that I think - in my view at least - the Legislature should be extremely cautious. It should be convinced beyond the 50 per cent point that certification of another body as a professional group and granting special status by legislation is clearly in the public interest before they make any move in the directions to grant that particular status.

MR. HINMAN:

Mr. Speaker, being on that committee, I think I am going to start out by saying that I got some very distinct impressions as this committee proceeded.

One is the danger of thinking that you will be able to judge public thinking and attitudes by asking for briefs and holding hearings. The hon. Member for Leduc has just told you that he doesn't think this is a report at all. We had hearings and we would have been very happy if he had been there to give us all this good advice, but he wasn't there.

MR. HENDERSON:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I didn't have to be there.

MR. HINMAN:

To continue: we had a sort of interim report which he could have read - and we didn't hear anything in between - but nevertheless, I appreciate what he has said today because I think it points up some of the important issues.

Another thing I learned is that on such a issue as this it would be impossible for you to get a totally unprejudiced group of men and women. It became evident right from the beginning that each of us had certain 'bends' in our thinking with regard to professions and occupations and what ought to be done about it.

I became aware, too, that most of the people who are concerned, who you might call the consumer group, are not going to give you the benefit of their thinking because they are afraid; they're timid. And I was rather shocked when I talked to some members of professions to find that they were very much in disagreement with the operation of their own profession. When I asked, do you get out there and complain, they said, what's the use? I pinned them down a little further and they were just like the man in the street, pretty reticent to get up before a group of people and say what they think because people don't have practice doing that thing.

I found, too, that while individuals trust individual professionals - many of them have every confidence in their dentist, their doctor, their lawyer or their chiropractor - in general, they're suspicious of professions and professional organizations. I found a sense of futility among the people of speaking out against the establishment, and that was not just the layman. We found people who had complaints within the profession and who were of the opinion that it wouldn't do any good to try to seek justice. Now, these are just things that you have to accept.

I found, too, that unless you have a particularly sensitive committee, or at least somebody on that committee who is very sensitive, you are never going to get at what the people are thinking. In this regard, I want to pay a well-earned tribute to our chairman. Many people who wouldn't come to the rest of us would call her. They had a point of view,

and because she was pretty sensitive, they gave her their point of view and she, in turn, passed it on. She had the courage that it sometimes takes to make a point for those people who were not able to speak for themselves.

Now, up until this committee, I had always recognized that ladies could give great leadership in matters of romance, and that sometimes they were pretty good at driving from the back seat, but in this particular case we got good leadership in what I hope was an exercise in intelligence and the art of listening, too.

Another impression I couldn't avoid - and I hope everybody will be introspective when I say it - is that while the professional organizations were loud in saying that their almost total objective was to look after public interest, the public interest was always me, the people. What I'm saying is that first, last and all the time, there was a feeling that they were on the defensive and that what they really were doing was to sell the people on the idea that the people were most important as long as they were not neglected in the business.

Because of that, on page 16 or 17 of the report, there is a section where the committee attempted to set out what is in the public interest. I hope some of you will take the time to read it because it didn't pay any attention to what's good for a professional. It was an attempt to say what are the elements of the public interest that ought to be preserved by any act, or any action of government which comes out of this.

Right from the beginning, the presentations that were made to us were full of irrational and definitely slanted things. That was all right too. We found a disregard of the principle of equal pay for equal service. We found a great fragmentation. I was amused, as we went through, to get the humour of some of these situations. I was reminded of the gentleman who was introduced to a lady as a naval surgeon. And she said, my, how you doctors do specialize!

I was reminded, too, of Uncle Zeke who had oil found on his land and consequently commissioned an architect to build him a fine home. He went to see it and went back to report to his wife. He said, you just ought to see it. There's a room there just for cookin', and there's rooms just for sleepin', and there's rooms just for the family, and there's rooms just for sittin'. But, he said, there's one room you just ought to see. He said, there's a place in there where you just wash your hands. And there's a place where you can bath all over, and a place where you can wash your feet. He said, that one had two lids. I took one off. We can use that for a breadboard, and I think we ought to frame grandpa's picture in the other one.

[Laughter]

This business of fragmentation - if you want to call it that - can go a very long way and so can the business of specialization.

The necessity and the difficulty of definition faces every committee. We found certain people were pretty jealous that certain other people not be called professionals. It was called to our attention that we have professional boxers and professional tennis players and professional preachers and professional speech writers, and we accept that. But when it comes to professional acts, the older professions who already had their acts just felt a little bit let down that you should consider other people as professionals too.

And so there is an attempt on page 5 to set out the feelings of the various people as to what is a profession. Maybe it's worth reading if I can find it quickly enough. It doesn't say that this is a definition. Our feeling was that the professionals themselves would say that the interpretation is that a profession is,

... a branch or field of endeavour which, for ideal performance, requires an advanced degree of aptitude, ability, specialized training, responsibility, conscientiousness, self-discipline and ethical maturity.

That left everybody else who didn't have all those qualities to be occupation people. So, if you want to sum it up, the term [occupation] means,

... the fields of human endeavour in which an individual may occupy his time, energy and talent and render service after having acquired, through practice, observation, study, direction and/or training, such competence as is desirable to assure service of acceptable quality.

The thing is, that in the representations which were made to us by those who wanted professional status, whether it happened to be the old professions or the new ones, there was a desire that they have some special privilege. The idea that they should be self-governing took many facets. Self-governing - how do you mean? Are we going to have laws just for them? Well, they wanted by-laws. But in the main, what they wanted was the

control of those who performed the service each of them felt he was best qualified to perform. This jealousy covered a very broad field.

How far can a government go in this field? Is it necessary that everybody who thinks he has specialized in some little activity or some broad field of action should have an act, and that that act should give him the right to say how others, who perform this service, must behave in all particulars?

Out of that I think grew Recommendation 25, and also 24 and 23, that maybe we shouldn't give these people the total right of self-regulation and self-government. We asked repeatedly - perhaps I have to say I did - everybody who came before us, have you any great opposition to an umbrella act? They invariably said, well, no, as long as it doesn't neglect our profession. Some of them thought that each profession would have to have a paragraph or two or a page or two. Repeatedly I asked them, are there any particular ethics in your profession which are not ethical for everybody who is giving service to the public, professionally or occupationally. I didn't get any answers. In other words, there is a code of ethics which can apply very well to all of us whatever endeavours we're in. It seems a little abstract to me to say you couldn't have an umbrella act which you might call the professions and occupations registration act. Within it you could embody all the ethics that anybody needs and all the controls.

When I talked about the monopoly aspect, some of you may recall what others have said today - and I'm not going to overplay that particular part. But I did say that in almost every instance what they really want is a monopoly. They want to say only people who have certain training, who have certain - shall I call them aptitudes - but largely who will sign up and belong to their profession shall have the right to do these jobs.

I sat in the House when we argued for days and had public hearings on whether anybody could make a set of dentures except a dentist. We discovered that dentists, in the main, didn't make dentures anyway. We discovered too that when you brought the people in to ask about it that there were just as many complaints against the dentist who made dentures as there were [against] the guy who was making them illegally at that time.

But the interesting thing to me was that once we decided that we would let denturists made dentures, one of their arguments went out the window. One of them was that, as I recall, they were required to make sets of teeth for the dentist for about \$26 and the dentist was charging - we heard great stories - up to \$200. But I notice that as soon as we permitted them to make dentures, their price went up too. And now they are not very anxious that we let somebody else go into this field. I am only using this as an illustration, but I do think we have to keep these things in mind.

The committee recognized that there is a need for criteria - that's always important if you want to be logical. Who then shall be given special recognition, either under an umbrella act or under a separate act which gives their particular profession some self-government?. This report has the criteria which they thought were important. I think if you take time to read it, you can't deny it is a pretty well done part of it.

Occupations - of course we have to recognize that there are differences. We have to recognize, too, that there are elements - and I was most happy to hear the Member for Calgary McKnight talk about the ladder, the idea that you can start somewhere, your past training will be recognized and you can qualify, because I think this will serve one of the most important aspects of training there is.

As a school superintendent my heart used to be broken when I'd go into a school and find a fellow with a masters degree just coming out to teach and, by the end of September, he knew and I knew and the kids knew he'd never be a teacher. But he is married by now and has two kids and he can't afford to retrain. Some of them became reasonably good teachers, but if somewhere down the line these people had trained first as assistants, if they had done some articling if you want to call it that, many of them who found teaching disagreeable and [an area] for which they had no aptitude, would not have been there. On the other hand, many of those who displayed the native talent and the interest, might have been encouraged to go on and be trained.

I am not arguing that training isn't good. But I am going to say what the hon. Member for Calgary McKnight said before, that all the way through the presentations and the studies we made, we found the professions trying to justify blocks of training which were very little related to what they do. Having a family mixed up in the drug business, I have said many times that you could take a good, conscientious high school student or somebody a little past that age - and I said conscientious - and in a very few months you could give them enough training and experience to fill prescriptions forever and no doctor would ever know the difference. All the background and all the training they have has little to do with the service they give.

And so we go on to the other professions. We find in the law offices, law secretaries who are so good that they do a great lot of the work of the lawyer. They are so good that

after a while he doesn't even check their work. Many lawyers told me that is right. They have confidence in these people. What does it mean? Well, it means the idea of a career ladder is pretty valid after all and that we ought to be taking a look at it.

I am not going to belabour you with a lot more, but I am going to say this is a good report, even if it doesn't receive the full approbation of the hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc. If you compare it with other reports, you will find nothing is neglected. There are definitions. There are criteria which you can accept. There are all the presentations which people made. There is the input of members who were sensitive and who went out and asked the people what they thought and got reactions which were not forthcoming in the ordinary way of hearing. And out of it grew some very good recommendations.

You will recognize, when you read the recommendations, that you can't implement them all, but some are sort of alternatives. But I would certainly concur in the resolution - and I would urge the government to study the report, to go through those recommendations and find those which are perhaps most valuable. Particularly I would recommend that they look at No. 12 which says there needs to be an independent re-evaluation of what training is essential to practise in a certain field.

Having been a professional teacher and having been in the educational field a long time, I was one of those who always argued in the House that I could not go for the necessity of four years of training to teach Grade 3. Many times I challenged people who came into the House, in committees, to tell me whether they could go with me out in the field and watch teachers, to tell me who had a degree and who didn't. That certainly doesn't mean that I am against training for teachers. But I am saying that along the way there has been a great overtraining of people who are then going to limit their practice to a very narrow field.

I can remember when you couldn't go into law or medicine or pharmacy unless you had three years of Latin. But it was discovered after a while that neither lawyers, doctors nor druggists could read any Latin anyway after a couple of years, so it came down to a vocabulary, which is pretty good. I am not objecting to that because most of them find that their own handwriting is Greek, they should have had a course in Greek.

At any rate, I am going to sum up by saying that if you compare this report with any I have ever read, you'll find it is the freest from padding, it's the most realistic, it has the greatest guidance for you who want to study it. In the end, if the government will seriously look at the recommendations, we can hope for some great improvements in this whole field of professions and occupations.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Good try, kid.

MR. BENOIT:

That was quite a speech, Mr. Speaker, which was just made and pretty nearly sold me on the report. I guess it is a good enough report. The fact that I am not a professional report reader probably indicates the reason why I don't find as much meat in it as I seem to be informed there is.

I am not complaining about the report, really. What I do want to say at the very outset is that I am not opposed to professions and occupations or their right to organize and band together in any other way. I am opposed, as has been expressed on several occasions here today and previously when this report was discussed, to them monopolizing the right or the privilege of practising in a certain area or field of endeavour. I am also objecting to their claim to the right to eliminate competition by other persons in any way. If there is some way that anyone can train or prepare himself to practise in that particular field of endeavour without necessarily going through all the formality of the type of training usually considered necessary, then I say if that person qualifies, then he should have it.

I believe there are many, many people in our society today who could qualify for dozens of different professions if they had the time and experience to do it in a lifetime. There are many who do, even though they haven't become professionally trained and haven't gone through the formal training field. They have become as proficient - and in many cases more proficient than many others.

The thing which concerns me a great deal about the professions and occupations - and probably this is as good a place to say it as any - I don't know why when once we went beyond the professions, we limited it to professions and occupations. We could have gone to trades, the guilds, unions and other groups which are organized as well, probably. A lot of these organizations have many facets in common and one of them, as the hon. Member for Cardston pointed out, is the attempt to monopolize that particular area in which they function and to keep other people out of the area and out of the competition, so to speak.

As the hon. Member for Edmonton Kingsway pointed out, there are so many of them, it's difficult for society to determine which one is which. I have every sympathy with the ordinary man who is trying to seek professional help and guidance because, if a person is a member of a particular profession, that doesn't mean he is competent in that profession. I see this every day when I hear people complaining about how many lawyers have not been able to win their case for them, so they have gone to another lawyer and tried another go-round with another court. That doesn't mean the lawyer wasn't competent, but it's the person's inability to understand that he may not be on the right side of the track to start with.

[Interjections]

Yes, it may have been another profession which was confusing the issue.

DR. BUCK:

Maybe he is just guilty, Ed.

MR. BENOIT:

Mr. Speaker, there are some recommendations which are a bit of a concern to me and I want to just make reference to them at this point. Then I want to go back to some general comments.

Recommendation 8, and also again in No. 13, with regard to the setting up of a council for professions and occupations, seems to me a duplication of what I would like to have seen abolished in the first place. And that is the type of bureaucracy professions constitute. Every time we have a report, it seems we recommend at least one committee or council or organization to oversee and sort of discipline these people we are reporting about. There have been many like that and I suppose there will be in the future. It just seems to be a proliferation of committees and councils and organizations trying to govern one another, guide one another, direct one another, or in some way interfere with one another. So, for that reason, I am not very keen about this recommendation to set up another council to oversee the situation. I think probably there are other aspects I would like to talk about, but I will just leave it at that.

Mr. Speaker, Recommendation No. 1 says,

That there be no action on the part of government designed to prevent the logical and desirable development of professions and occupations which may emerge in response to the needs of society.

I have really no objection to that recommendation. I think that now we are overloaded with them, more will only create more competition, hopefully. But it might have been a short report, if it had ended with the first clause, "That there be no action on the part of government" period, because already government has been sufficiently involved to a certain degree in this matter. If we are talking about government involvement I think it would be enough, dealing with another recommendation with regard to an umbrella act, to have one act covering all of the professions and occupations, an umbrella act.

Recommendation 25 suggests there might be "umbrella Acts," plural, "for clusters of professions and occupations, or one umbrella Act." As the hon. Member for Cardston so ably pointed out, I see no reason why there should be more than one act to cover all these professions and occupations. We might go further, and even reach out to, as I suggested before, to some guilds and so on.

Before I make another one, I would like to draw attention to another Recommendation, No. 2. Recommendation 2 says:

That there be developed clearly-articulated criteria to be used in determining the eligibility of a professional or occupational association for recognition under specific or general legislation granting some measure of self-governing power.

And I couple that with another aspect of this which is brought out on page 18, No. 12, talking about the general public's attitude toward this matter:

That there be such levels of remuneration, facilities and prestige as are necessary to attract desirable candidates and practitioners in each field of endeavour ...

If this is referring only to professions and occupations, Mr. Speaker, then I think it's too narrow. I don't think there is any field of endeavour be it considered a profession or an occupation or guild or union or whatever, that is any better or worse than any other field of endeavour in which we are to be occupied.

Just as important in the city are the sewer rats, as they call them, in fact more important than the doctor and the lawyer under certain circumstances, those who look after

the ditches and the sewers of a city. Regardless of where he stands in the area of service to his fellow man, he has a right to a certain prestige and a certain recognition and a certain respect and certain remuneration for the services he renders. Just because a person is required by these professional laws to put in a certain number of years of formal training in order to accomplish his degree and get into this field of endeavour does not mean that he, in my estimation, Mr. Speaker, has any right to any more remuneration than others who have chosen another field of endeavour by their own choice, who could easily have been in that same field if they had been looking at it from the remuneration standpoint, but who rather chose some simpler or humbler task, as we class it, and yet are serving their fellow man with equal dedication and consecration.

I think that of those to whom I listened today, all of whom made contributions which I thoroughly enjoyed, the one I enjoyed the most was the presentation made by the hon. Member for Calgary McKnight. Probably it's because he was on the same wavelength as I was. Those are the people you usually like the best or whose speeches you like the best because they think the same as you do. I thought it was an excellent presentation. The ideas that he made, referred to again by the hon. Member for Cardston, particularly this idea of being able to reach certain professional status or ability in life by going in steps according to your ability, according to your ability in a number of areas, financial ability, mental ability or your desirability, or abilities as the result of the need for looking after ...

MR. LUDWIG:

Mobility.

MR. BENOIT:

... yes, mobility - according to the needs of the home situation and so on. But if there is anything that I deplore amongst the professions, it is this tendency in one way or another to monopolize the situation, close the shop and in a bureaucratic way or some underhanded way, attempt to prevent others from entering into that particular profession for whatever reason it might be, and there are lots of reasons why they do, which have already been enumerated.

Membership in an association should not be compulsory. I think the hon. Member for Lacombe was talking about that and I really agree with him. I don't think that anyone should be compelled to be a member of any particular professional association or occupational organization. I think that people ought to be free in a free country to practise their chosen field of endeavour without having to be associated with an organization which becomes dictatorial or in some way overshadows or overrides his individuality in his field.

I really appreciate the idea that has been brought forth today that in times of emergency, when there is need for crash programs to prepare people for undertaking some of these efforts in life which the professionals usually do, we have found that we can train doctors in a fraction of the time that it normally is considered necessary to take in order to prepare them. We can do the same thing, as was pointed out so capably by the hon. Member for Cardston, with lawyers, with plumbers, with electricians, with any number of areas that you want to mention. The formal training is a matter of selectivity by the professions themselves in a good many instances, again by the education system if you please, because somehow we've gotten this idea that you have to go to school for 12 years before you can pass out into the world, into a university, and then you have to go into university for so many years.

AN HON. MEMBER:

What are the preachers' excuses?

MR. BENOIT:

It's the same thing, same thing. Only that I should inform the hon. members, Mr. Speaker, that preaching is usually considered a calling and not a profession, for two reasons: number one, because of the religious aspect, but number two, because very few preachers ever become professional in their field. They are tending to dabble in too many other things, like a lot of professionals do.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think that what I would like to suggest is that this possibility of many paraprofessionals working on a step level is an excellent idea. We ought to give consideration to more of that and not let the professionals wind it up.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that while the 28 recommendations, as has been pointed out, are valid, they are not all that consistent with one another and I think one member of the committee pointed out that they are not intended necessarily to be, but that they may be alternatives to one another.

The portion that I like best of all and which appeals to me most out of the whole report was that on pages 17 and 18 in which is considered the elements of public interest or general good which have guided the committee's deliberations, and the formulating of recommendations which are restated in their entirety later on. Here, Mr. Speaker, in a nutshell, is really what I think we ought to be concerned with so far as the professionals are concerned, those 13 points that were raised there and particularly No. 11, "That competition not be eliminated by limiting the numbers of those permitted to qualify and be licensed ..." in the various professions.

If I had any exceptions to those, it would be as I already mentioned, to points 12 and 13. Number 13 says, "That those qualified, licensed and practicing have an ample voice in matters of qualifications, competence, performance, ethics and discipline." That is fine because the term "ample voice" is subject to opinion and hopefully they wouldn't have too much voice in it, but others should have a voice in it as well.

Mr. Speaker, with those few remarks, which may not have done any more than muddy the water, I wanted to express my opinion that I am not opposed to professions and occupations, but I am opposed to them having a monopoly in the field or in any way preventing competition.

MR. KING:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I am always willing to follow the lead of the hon. member opposite and muddy the water some more.

[Interjections]

Coming from the hon. member opposite, that's a high compliment. He probably knows better than anybody else in the House what's involved. Since I was neither a member of the committee nor am I a professional, I feel that I'm someone to whom the old adage definitely applies, that fools rush in where angels fear to tread.

MR. WILSON:

Agreed.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Again?

MR. KING:

You have no idea how much I appreciate the constant support that I receive from my colleagues on this side of the House.

I wanted to speak this afternoon for a few minutes on the report and I'm serious in saying that my comments are obviously the result of the fact that I was not a member of the committee, did not go through the very extensive process that has been described by a number of members of the committee, and neither are my remarks those of a person with a professional background. In fact, as will become apparent in a few minutes, my remarks are in some cases those of a person who has been concerned by some of the rights and responsibilities which have been taken on by the professional organizations themselves.

One of the things which a number of members have alluded to is the proliferation in organizations of people who describe themselves as professional or paraprofessional or who say that they are deserving of this designation, and who say that in addition to being called professionals they should have some of the rights and responsibilities which have been the rights and responsibilities of lawyers, doctors, engineers and some other professions for a considerable number of years in our society.

With the increasing proliferation of those groups who want to call themselves professionals, there is an increasing compartmentalization of responsibility, an increasing segmentation of responsibility that takes place. I don't think, Mr. Speaker, that we have anyway near seen the end of it because, as many people have described, we in North America are entering a post-industrial society, a post-industrial technology.

One of the keystone features of this society, which has been described by John Kenneth Galbraith and others, is going to be the increasing importance of the service function in our society at the expense, relatively, of manufacturing, resource extraction, this kind of thing.

What is being suggested is that if you take what are described as the four components of development: land, labour, resources and experience or entrepreneurship, in our society the one component which is going to be increasingly important at the expense of the other three is knowledge or technique. It is obvious today that right now knowledge and technique are extremely important in our society and at an accelerating rate that is going

to continue. It is in the areas of knowledge and technique that the professions are strongest, and the people with professional inclinations are most desirous of carving out a professional situation for themselves.

It creates a real pressure on government to consider the role of the professional or the paraprofessional in society. There are a number of extremely important areas that haven't been alluded to in the debate and I think should be considered. I would mention three with whom I have had some experience; librarians, computer programmers or systems analysts, community development workers of one kind or another, social workers, social psychologists, and the people who do community development and community animation work.

It hasn't often been thought - not commonly in our community - that these people are, or should be, designated as professionals in the same sense we mean when we use that term with respect to doctors, lawyers, and engineers. Yet these people, who have knowledge and whose position in society is a reflection of the importance of knowledge in our society, are exactly the kinds of people about whom we should be thinking when we consider a government policy impacting the professions.

The delegation of authority by the provincial government to a body of people is an aspect of decentralization. In my view, it is a desirable thing. The delegation of authority, whether it is to a municipality or to a school board or to a body of people who share a common vocation - doctors, lawyers or engineers - the problem seems to me to be that in our relationship with the municipality, with the school board or the hospital board, we have over a long number of years thought out pretty carefully what should be the nature of our relationship. And from one school board to another that relationship is consistent. From one municipality to another that relationship is pretty consistent. We have some variations, depending on the population that they serve or the area that they serve, but generally speaking, when we talk about geographic decentralization, we have worked out a pretty specific set of guidelines governing the relationship between the provincial government and this other body to whom we have delegated authority.

The problem which I think exists and to which I think the committee has very carefully addressed itself, is that when we get into the area of the government having delegated authority to bodies which exist throughout the geographic area of the province but have responsibility for only a very narrow field of interest, we just haven't developed the same kinds of guidelines. If we continue to let that be the case, then I think we have abrogated our responsibility.

The committee considered five general fields of responsibility and I would like to mention only two of them because I have particular concerns about them. In the field of certification and licensing, one of the things that has concerned me for a long time is that we practise education in isolation from the real world. All of us have been through it. We have 12 years of primary and secondary education, and then we have post-secondary education in The University of Alberta - over there across the river. The education we receive is often largely, maybe entirely, unrelated to the experience we are going to face when we get out in the real world. Frankly, as a layman, and I would welcome the views of some of the professional people here. I think that we may have had better lawyers when they received some of their education as apprentices to lawyers who were practising in the community. I think we may have had better engineers, in a practical sense, when we had engineers who received some of their training in conjunction with engineers who were already working in the community. In terms of the activities of professionals, I would really like to see a serious consideration of more of what is called "work education experience".

The other thing that I think must seriously be considered is the sense of ethics or morality that exists in a community. It seems to be that with increasing population, or with increasing population density, or with increasing sophistication in our technology, there is less personal relationship with other people. There is less development within the individual of a stable sense of social responsibility or of ethics, or, perhaps, of morality. If that's going to continue to be the case, then I think inevitably we are going to be drawn to the position of having to institutionalize, either in the government or by a delegation of authority to professional groups, certain criteria for ethical behaviour within those professional groups.

To cite only one example very quickly, society must consider the ethical framework within which computer programmers and systems analysts are going to operate, when that extremely small number of people is increasingly coming into access to information which is vital and can make or break almost any individual in the society.

Mr. Speaker, those are the only comments I wanted to make. I think the work of the committee was well done and I hope and expect it will be carefully considered.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. GRUENWALD:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER:

May the hon. member adjourn the debate?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, tonight we will be moving into further consideration of the Estimates, beginning at 8:00 o'clock with the consideration of Estimates under Legislation on page 112, most of which, I understand, will be piloted through the House by the Members' Services Committee. We will then continue with consideration of the Department of Public Works estimates followed by the Department of Advanced Education.

In order to simplify matters at 8:00 o'clock, Mr. Speaker, and not require Your Honour to be in the Chair for 30 seconds before we go into committee, I would now move that the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

[The motion was carried.]

[Mr. Speaker left the Chair.]

* * * * *

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

[Mr. Diachuk in the Chair.]

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee adjourn until 8:00 o'clock tonight.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Is it agreed?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

[Mr. Diachuk left the Chair at 5:30 o'clock.]