

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Title: Tuesday, April 29, 1980 2:30 p.m.

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

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill 227

The Farm Pension Act

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce a Bill, The Farm Pension Act.

Very briefly, Mr. Speaker, The Farm Pension Act would enable Alberta farmers to receive annuities indexed to the cost of living. It would be modelled somewhat on the public service pension plan, but would also be analogous to a recent pension scheme for farmers introduced in the Federal Republic of West Germany.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview has moved that Bill No. 226, An Act to Amend The Expropriation Act . . . Sorry — right idea, wrong script. [laughter]

The hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview has moved that Bill No. 227, The Farm Pension Act, be read a first time. Do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

[Bill 227 read a first time]

Bill 226

An Act to Amend
The Expropriation Act

MR. PURDY: Mr. Speaker, you had the right Bill, wrong constituency, and wrong member, but I beg leave to introduce Bill 226, An Act to Amend The Expropriation Act.

In 1974, the government introduced a new expropriation Act with the concept of a home for a home. The legislation has been successful in that concept, but my travel throughout the province tells me that people are not being fairly compensated land for land. Therefore the amendment to The Expropriation Act in this Bill sets forth the procedure for land for land. It will be determined in the Bill that "it shall be recognized that the owner should [receive] sufficient compensation to be able to acquire property of no less a quality and convenience to" that person.

[Leave granted; Bill 226 read a first time]

head: INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, today I'd like to introduce to you, and through you to members of the Assembly, some visitors from the constituency of Calgary Elbow.

They are the grade 5 and 6 classes of Bel-Aire elementary school in my constituency. The group leader is Mrs. Marion Pennell. They have with them their principal Mr. Welsh, and a couple of mothers Mrs. Swanson and Mrs. Bede. I wonder if our visitors would rise and receive the welcome of the Assembly.

MR. KUSHNER: Mr. Speaker, I take the greatest pleasure in introducing to you, and through you to members of the Assembly, 56 grades 5 and 6 students seated in both galleries. The students are from the Renfrew school situated in the heart of Calgary Mountain View. They are accompanied by two teachers — the group leader Mr. Gordon Hunter, and Mrs. Dora Ingelson — and a teacher's aide Mrs. Joyce Neis. Some of the students also brought their parents, who are, for your information, Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Kromm, Mrs. Magnus, Mrs. Sowatsky, Mrs. Petruic, Mr. Prime, and Mr. Prime Sr., a grandfather of one of the students; and Mrs. Nickolas, who is quite conveniently their bus driver. I would ask that they please rise and receive the cordial welcome of the Assembly.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of Dr. McCrimmon, the member of the Legislature for Ponoka, it is my pleasure to introduce to you, and through you to the members of the Legislature, 27 students who are visiting us from Bluffton, Alberta. They are the grade 6 class, and are accompanied by their group leader Mr. Ed Carriger. They are seated in the members gallery. I would ask at this time that they stand and be recognized by the Legislature.

MR. COOK: Mr. Speaker, it's with a great deal of pleasure that I'd like to introduce to you, and through you to members of the Assembly, 63 members of the grade 5 classes at Evansdale community school. Evansdale elementary school is a special school in the city of Edmonton because it is a community school, applying — I might note for the benefit of the Minister of Education — for extra funding this year. This is Education Week, and the students are here to observe the Legislature. I'd like to ask them to rise and receive the warm welcome of the Assembly.

head: MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Department of
Social Services and Community Health

MR. BOGLE: Early in 1978, my predecessor, the hon. Helen Hunley, announced in the Legislative Assembly major changes to the provincial day care policy, the primary policy announcement being that future provincial support would follow the child rather than flow directly to certain day care centres, thus allowing parents to choose the licensed day care centre, whether operated privately or publicly. Further, there was to be a five-year phase-in period whereby all licensed centres would be funded on this basis by 1983.

Last summer, I appointed a government caucus committee to examine the family subsidy program and the regulations. The committee, chaired by Dr. Charles Anderson, MLA for St. Paul, has made its report and recommendations to government caucus. I am pleased today to announce certain changes which will, in our

view, strengthen our primary policy that the subsidy follow the child:

1. Effective August 1, 1980, the province will provide 100 per cent of the basic family subsidy. Currently this component is cost-shared, 80 per cent by the province and 20 per cent by participating municipalities. This change will effect a \$2.5 million savings to the 32 municipalities currently participating in the program. Consequently, those municipalities wishing to maintain publicly funded centres at a level higher than the present provincial standards may redirect their savings as they see fit. The maximum family subsidy will be \$215 per child per month. A minimum of \$40 for one or more children will be provided by the family.
2. A three-year phase out of the deficit funding component, based upon the provincial grants during the 1979-80 fiscal year, will begin August 1, 1980, and flow through until July 1, 1983. The formula for this phase-out of funding to municipally operated centres with a deficit will be presented to the participating municipalities.
3. Effective August 1, 1980, all day care licensing will be handled by the province. At the present time, one municipality, Calgary, is administering this function to private and publicly funded centres in the city. Subsequently, all day care centres in Alberta will be licensed by the same authority.
4. As of August 1, 1980, the regulations will be reduced in number and simplified.
5. Between August 1, 1980, and August 1, 1982, meetings will be held with representatives from the day care operators from across the province to examine ways of improving the child/staff ratios and to discuss the implementation of a day care registry.
6. The 18-day absenteeism clause will be extended to 21 days immediately. In cases of sickness for 3 days or more where medical evidence may be provided, the absenteeism will not be deducted from the 21-day period. In addition to the extension to 21 days, an appeal mechanism will be provided to deal with exceptional cases of lengthy absenteeism.

The government recognizes there are unique circumstances regarding several municipally funded day care centres. In the 1980-81 fiscal year appeals may be made to the minister for special assistance on a once-only basis.

Mr. Speaker, these adjustments to the policy established by this government in the spring of 1978 strengthen our commitment to quality day care programs accessible across the province.

head: ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Prince Rupert Terminal

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, my first question is to the Minister of Economic Development. I'd like to know if the minister is in a position to make any comment on the announcement by Senator Perrault that the federal government would be completing arrangements for the Prince Rupert port facility. Is the minister in a position to enlighten the Assembly as to any changes that have taken place within the last two days?

MR. PLANCHE: Mr. Speaker, I haven't heard directly from any of the parties involved in that negotiation, but I expect to shortly.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Can the minister assure the Assembly that the start-up of the infrastructure will be on time, as the minister had announced previously?

MR. PLANCHE: Mr. Speaker, that would depend on the confirmation of the federal government's position to honor what we consider to be the agreement they made earlier.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, can the minister indicate if there have been any changes in the provincial government's commitment to the funding that will go toward infrastructure?

MR. PLANCHE: Mr. Speaker, we remain committed to both the grant and the debt funding commitments that we made earlier.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Agriculture. Can the minister indicate if the department or the minister has done any studies as to the cost that may occur to the farmers of the province? Is this going to be a user-pay facility, or is it going to be funded entirely by governments?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, I don't think we've reached the stage of finalizing agreements or a decision as to who pays. It would be understandable that the consortium would operate the function itself and, of course, because of its operating and providing a fee, there would be some involvement with regard to the producer himself.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. In light of the fact that the publicity that's gone out has not indicated to farmers — and most farmers are in support of the project — that they may be responsible for a part of that cost, has the minister or the Department of Agriculture not done any studies as to how this will affect the farmers?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, in recognizing the funding and the allocations on behalf of the province, of course — done so on behalf of the producers of this province. The decisions haven't been made nor have they been clarified as yet as to the total costs involved in both the infrastructure and the total facility.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Agriculture or the hon. Minister of Economic Development. With respect to the debt funding that the Alberta government has committed, has the government of Alberta been able to work out an interest rate at this stage that is acceptable to the consortium? If so, what is it?

MR. PLANCHE: Mr. Speaker, our initial commitment was that \$70 million would be at competitive commercial terms and the other 30 per cent would be negotiable in some form, either perhaps with no interest attached or some kind of interest rate that might take some of the bite out of the commercial terms on the 70 per cent.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to either hon. gentleman. What discussions have taken place with respect to the 30 per cent that the minister alluded to that would be negotiable? Has there been any further discussion with the consortium? Is either hon. minister able to advise the Assembly at this stage where things stand on the 30 per cent as opposed to the 70 per cent?

MR. PLANCHE: Mr. Speaker, I don't think those arrangements have been concluded. The negotiations have revolved around whether it would be a participating bond or some kind of blending of interest. There's still a discussion to be had on the inflationary cost overruns that may accrue. Those discussions will be subject to the reconfirmation of the federal government's position.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question again to the hon. Minister of Economic Development. Is the minister in a position to advise the Assembly that negotiations with respect to the debt funding — the 30 per cent that the minister alluded to — will in no way affect the start-up of the project?

MR. PLANCHE: That's a difficult undertaking to make, Mr. Speaker, because we won't commence those kinds of discussions until the federal position is clear. So the onus is on the federal government to get their ducks in a row in time for us to get this year's construction started.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Economic Development. Can the minister indicate if he has been in consultation with British Columbia and Saskatchewan to see if their share of the costs of the infrastructure has changed? Are those proportions and the amounts involved still the same as they were at the first negotiation?

MR. PLANCHE: Yes, we have been in conversation with them. British Columbia remains as it was, as does Saskatchewan. Saskatchewan's contribution, of course, was zero.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to supplement the answers because of some innuendo in the questions. I think I'd like to make it abundantly clear to Members of this Legislative Assembly that this project would never be going ahead if it wasn't for the commitment of the Alberta government that's involved.

DR. BUCK: That was a fine speech, Mr. Speaker. [interjections] There were no ... Mr. Speaker, the Premier's trying to tell us if you ask for anything, it's innuendo, or it's un-Albertan. Well, it's not un-Albertan to ask for ... [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The hon. member is entitled to respond in kind, if he wishes.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I guess the Premier's hang-up is that he didn't get enough publicity from Lethbridge. [interjections]

Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Economic Development. Can the minister indicate if the total figure is still in the vicinity of \$250 million for the facility at Prince Rupert?

MR. PLANCHE: Mr. Speaker, I'd need some clarification on what facility he's talking about. There's going to

be an elevator and a variety of facilities for other commodities to go through the [inaudible].

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. The total expenditures with the terminal and all the infrastructure — the total commitment by the provincial governments and the federal government.

MR. PLANCHE: Again, Mr. Speaker, it's not clear to me whether he's asking about the grain facility or the total Ridley Island facility.

MR. NOTLEY: The grain facility.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, the total figure that will be the consortium, the terminals, the infrastructure — the entire ball of wax, Mr. Minister.

MR. PLANCHE: Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't believe we ever aid discuss on the floor of this House the total cost of the facility. So I don't have a handle on that. I'd have to go to the same sources that I presume the hon. member would to develop the numbers.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question if I may to the hon. minister with respect to the terminal for grain itself. The minister indicated that there was some discussion on possible overruns. Is the minister in a position to advise the Assembly whether the government of Alberta is in fact concerned about significant overruns? What discussion has taken place with the consortium on that issue?

MR. PLANCHE: Mr. Speaker, I don't believe I said that we'd had discussions about an overrun. I said that we would consider the cost overruns when the government's funding is clear, if there were going to be any.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Agriculture on this subject. I wonder if the minister could indicate what the general economic benefit might be to Alberta farmers when this proceeds?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: With great respect to the hon. member, this kind of debate could be initiated by an appropriate motion on the Order Paper.

Housing Programs

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Housing and Public Works. It stems from the minister's announcement of the \$505 million injected into the housing market. Can the minister indicate if all those funds have presently been subscribed?

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, I think it would be fair to say that they have not; however, the demand is heavy in both programs. It's my understanding from talking currently with the Home Mortgage Corporation that the demand for both the family home purchase program and the core housing incentive program is very heavy indeed.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Can the minister indicate how long the funding will be available? Is there any cut-off time?

MR. CHAMBERS: No, Mr. Speaker.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, of the 4,500 projected units to be built under CHIP, can the minister indicate how extensive the starts have been in the program?

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, I'd be pleased to get an update on that for the member in terms of numbers at this point in time. Of course the modifications to the program are relatively recent, but at this point there are many, many applications in and pending for both programs.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, is the minister in a position to indicate if any of the starts will be available for the summer under CHIP? Are those starts on the way, and will they be available for the summer or fall?

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, there are of course a good number of program starts in all phases of CHIP, varying from coming on stream to the application. Under the amended rate, a number of applications are in motion, pending; and I'm sure construction will start on a good number of them before too long.

MR. SPEAKER: Might this be the last supplementary on this topic.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, is the minister in a position to indicate if the funds were allocated on a block basis, or were they first come, first served? The reason I ask is to find out from the minister if funding was allocated to areas that have a great shortage, such as Grande Prairie. Or was it just first come, first served?

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, the funding for the 10,000 units through CHIP and through the family home purchase program, the \$505 million, is of course our best estimate of what the take-up will be for the year. The core housing incentive program is applicable to every community of over 5,000 population in the province. We're having applications from communities all over Alberta.

Day Care

MRS. EMBURY: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Social Services and Community Health regarding his ministerial statement today on day care. Could the minister please indicate how the province will reimburse municipalities during the phase-out period of the deficit funding program?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, we're using as a base figure the total deficit for a municipality during the 1979-80 fiscal year. That's the total deficit minus the family subsidy program and other related costs. Using the city of Calgary as an example, after those other deductions are made, Calgary had a deficit of approximately \$65,000 for its publicly funded day care centres. For the four months between April 1 and August 1, 1980, we would provide the funding on the same 1979-80 basis. So approximately \$21,800 would flow to the city over the four-month period.

On August 1 of each of the three years during the phase-out, we will provide a cheque to the municipality to cover the entire 12-month period. So on August 1, 1980, the city of Calgary would receive an additional \$49,000, which represents three-quarters of the amount they re-

ceived during 1979-80. On August 1, 1981, that figure is about \$32,000, or half the figure; and by August 1, 1982, to cover the last of the installments, it would be about \$16,000.

MRS. EMBURY: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, on a point of clarification. Did the minister indicate earlier that the city of Calgary could use that money as they wish?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, in terms of savings for the city of Calgary, if we look at a different set of figures — that is, what the city is now investing as their 20 per cent portion of the family subsidy program minus their administrative costs — they have in excess of \$800,000. So the city of Calgary may redirect those funds, as other municipalities may, if they wish to provide more day care spaces through their own city-operated program. That's a decision which will have to be made in each municipality.

DR. PAPROSKI: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Recognizing that the government will be funding the 100 per cent subsidy for day care for children, as they do 100 per cent for hospitals and 100 per cent for social assistance, I wonder if the minister would indicate what the savings will be for Edmonton.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, without getting into a protracted discussion today — because we are participating with 32 municipalities — for the hon. members from Edmonton I'll be pleased to provide that information briefly, if I may. It depends on a number of factors. Whereas I mentioned that the deficit in Calgary is about \$65,000, because of a larger number of day care centres in Edmonton and because Edmonton has not moved during the past two years on decreasing the funding of those centres, as Calgary has, the deficit for the city of [Edmonton] is in excess of \$650,000. So there's a greater amount in the deficit funding program for the city of Edmonton. If we look concurrently at figures on what the city of Edmonton will save in terms of its overall program, after deducting their administration costs — which again are more than twice as high as Calgary's — the city of Edmonton should still come up with a very substantial saving of more than a quarter of a million dollars.

DR. PAPROSKI: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker, on that point regarding the city of Edmonton. I wonder if the minister would make it abundantly clear — and I'm not sure that it was clear in his statement — that the city of Edmonton or any municipality can use those funds for day care if they so wish, but that is optional; it's not a directive of the government of Alberta.

MR. BOGLE: Well, Mr. Speaker, for the four-month period covering April through the end of July this year, the municipalities are cost-sharing the family subsidy program with the province, 80 per cent of the cost provided by the province and 20 per cent by the municipalities. But as of August 1, 1980, the savings that will accrue to the city of Edmonton, as an example, may be redirected at the discretion of the city of Edmonton. There will be absolutely no pressure put on the city by the government as to how those funds should be used. But certainly they're funds that could be redirected into the kind of day care programming that the city of Edmonton has attempted to foster in the past.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. The minister has indicated that the department will be responsible for licensing the various day care centres. Does that indicate that standards will be changed with regard to supervisor/client ratio, also building standards?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is really asking two questions. I did deal with the first question, on staff ratios, in the ministerial statement. I indicated that between August 1, 1980, and August 1, 1982, it is our intention to have discussions with representatives from day care operations across the province, both privately and publicly operated, to work on the question of the staff/child ratios in the centres as well as the registry.

The second question the hon. member asked, Mr. Speaker, relates to regulations. As I indicated, it is our intention to reduce in number and to simplify the regulations by August 1 of this year.

DR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister would indicate to the House whether he has any information to indicate that the number of day care spaces will be increased as a result of this very significant program.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, that's certainly the intent of the program. Through you as MLAs and directly through my office, a number of Albertans have recommended that they would like to see more day care spaces made available in a variety of centres across the province. We're certainly hoping that one of the end results of the program will be that more spaces will be made available for young people across the province.

MR. COOK: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the minister can advise the House what role he anticipates the cities and municipalities will have in day care programming after August 1, 1980. Secondly, could he advise the House what kind of support there will be to municipalities that are administering the family subsidy program between now and the August 1 deadline?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, the announcement today is to provide ample opportunity, more than three months' opportunity, for adjustments to be made by the municipalities which currently administer their programs and, in some cases, to provide ongoing assistance to privately operated day care centres, so that by August 1, 1980 there will be a smooth transition.

The question of the role of the administrations currently working for the municipalities and their future role: that's something the municipalities will have to work out. For instance, in the city of Edmonton approximately 16 day care centres are operated by the city; if the city wishes to continue operating those on a direct basis and through its own administration, it's certainly able to do so. But the question of licensing, standards, and assistance that will be provided to all day care centres will be uniformly handled by the province.

MRS. FYFE: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. I wonder if he would outline to the Assembly the nature of the appeal procedure announced today.

MR. BOGLE: Yes, Mr. Speaker. We recognize that some municipalities face a number of unique circumstances with their day care centres. As an example, it has come to

my attention that some municipalities have already approved a family subsidy program in excess of the \$215 per month that we've announced. I want to ensure, and we as a government want to ensure, that every opportunity for a smooth transition is made available. Municipalities that feel they have a very unique or special case may appeal directly to the minister, and certainly consideration will be given to providing one-time-only grants to assist them with the transition to the next fiscal year.

MRS. FYFE: Further, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister ...

MR. SPEAKER: Followed by a final supplementary by the hon. Member for Edmonton Kingsway.

MRS. FYFE: ... the nature of the appeal as it affects the 21-day absentee, and how families might apply for an appeal.

MR. BOGLE: That's a valid point, Mr. Speaker. We have not yet named the appeal panel or gone into that in any detail. We will be doing so within the next very short period of time, so that we can communicate to the day care centres across the province where there are unique circumstances regarding absenteeism, so that those situations may be addressed in an adequate and fair way.

DR. PAPROSKI: A supplementary to the minister, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the minister would indicate to the House whether as a result of this policy there are any changes or restrictions on private day care centres — which in large part are doing as excellent a job as our public day care centres.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, the policy and the refinements we've announced today are not intended to be a restriction or retardation to either publicly or privately operated day care centres. By clarifying certain aspects which have caused concern, it's certainly our hope and intention that there will be a further expression of good will, that more day care spaces will be established across the province, and that there will be a clear understanding that there's a place in this province for both privately operated day care centres on one hand and, on the other, centres operated by municipalities, community organizations, or non-profit groups, so that they can operate side by side. The key point is that the parents have the right to choose the licensed day care centre for their children.

Hospital Workers — Salary Negotiations

MR. NOTLEY: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care. It's a follow-up to questions put in the Legislature yesterday with respect to the contracts that are coming due both for the registered nursing aides and the Canadian Union of Public Employees. Will it be the intention of the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care or any other member of the Alberta government to seek an early meeting with the Alberta Hospital Association to assure that organization that contract settlements that are now coming up for both support staff and paraprofessionals will in fact be funded by the province?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, we've had questions of that nature earlier through this session, and I'm rather

surprised at the position the hon. member is trying to put forward. On the one hand, they want us to respect the collective bargaining process; they want us to respect the autonomy of the 83 individual bargaining hospital boards representing a variety of hospital owners; yet they also want us to guarantee a final figure with respect to the collective bargaining with these units. I think it would be wrong to try to meet all those criteria. I've said many times in the House that the hospitals have not been left short as a result of any contractual arrangements they have made with their bargaining units, and I'd repeat that statement again today. Surely I can't be clearer than that.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. With respect to the registered nursing aides, whose salary has normally been based on 75 per cent parity with nurses, would it be the position of the Alberta government that negotiations would be exclusively the responsibility of the Alberta Hospital Association and the registered nursing aides, or would it be the view of the government that that ratio — which I believe also applies in other provinces — should be continued?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I think the majority conciliation report that I referred to in my answers yesterday dealt very specifically with the special circumstances surrounding the nurses' bargaining unit this year. I think it would be wrong to mislead anybody by saying that any member of the Alberta Hospital Association or the provincial government is committed to maintaining some kind of numerical ratio with respect to the differences among bargaining units.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Labour, if I may. The Minister of Labour indicated yesterday a research component of the Department of Labour advises the department in its mediation and conciliation efforts. Very directly to the minister: has the research component of the Department of Labour examined the difference between Alberta and British Columbia in the salaries for nursing attendants: \$1,038 in Alberta, compared with \$1,404 in British Columbia? Has that been specifically examined, in light of hopefully trying to avoid down the road a strike similar to that we've just recently gone through?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I think it quite irrelevant whether it's been examined or not, because the whole point offered is not very relevant to begin with. There are all kinds of comparisons of groups as between provinces. The hon. member refers to British Columbia. Undoubtedly he could also refer to Saskatchewan; he could also refer to Manitoba. I believe that leaves about six other provinces that could be used as reference points. So I fail to see the significance of picking out one province and suggesting there's a magic relationship between an occupational group's salary in that province and one in Alberta.

MR. NOTLEY: You could look at other provinces too. But my supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, is directly this: hopefully to avoid a strike, what research is the Department of Labour research component — which the minister alluded to yesterday — undertaking now, so that information can be made available to the department mediation and conciliation staff, who hopefully have to try to bring together both parties so we don't have another strike.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned yesterday and will re-enunciate for the hon. member's understanding again today, the preliminary, foremost responsibility rests on the parties to the bargaining process to develop their own information. Surely, each one of them will have in hand the kind of information to which the hon. member makes reference.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, the research component of the Department of Labour has indeed been reviewing all the information available to it in the health care sector across Canada, along with the construction industry — and I could go on with a number of industries and occupational groups; it's a long list. But we have been giving special attention to the health care field.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Has the government indicated at this stage that advice will be given to the mediation and conciliation personnel who have the problems of trying to mediate between the Alberta Hospital Association and the various components who are now negotiating new contracts, in light of the very just nurses' settlement — but a settlement that has clearly raised expectations. My question is: has there been any advice from the minister to the mediation and conciliation staff of the department?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, it is not necessary for me to give advice to the mediators on how to conduct their occupation and their responsibility. With respect to some other observations the hon. member has made — which again are quite irrelevant to his question, Mr. Speaker — I would only say, again for his benefit, that the settlement that was reached with the nurses and the hospital boards is a very unique situation according to the information we have. I think that should be underlined. The hon. member does an injustice to the rest of society to suggest that it is anything other than that.

MR. SPEAKER: Might this be the last supplementary on this topic.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to either the hon. Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care or the hon. Minister of Labour. Beyond the statement contained in the majority conciliation report, which really dealt with one issue, the nurses' strike, and was certainly not emphatic; it indicated "may appear". My question to either hon. gentleman: will there be any other investigation, in view of the fact that other components of the health system are strongly of the view that they require some catching up too?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I think it very important to recognize that the nurses were a very unique situation. I described yesterday some of the unique features and what contributed to creating that unique situation. Clearly, if the hon. member is making the case that every other occupational group in society is equally unique, then it seems that the whole identification of the nurses as having had a basis for an exceptional settlement falls, because they soon will be no better off in relation to others than they were before the settlement.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I reiterate again — and I hope the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview can get the message this time — that the settlement with the nurses is a very unique situation.

MR. MAGEE: Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Is it a supplementary?

MR. MAGEE: No.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I believe you recognized me to ask a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: Would the hon. member then proceed, followed by the question by the hon. Member for Red Deer.

Labor Legislation

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Premier is chairman of Executive Council. Several days ago I asked the Premier if there would be an amendment to the Labour Act that the Legislature rather than the Lieutenant Governor in Council would be invoking emergency powers. Is the Premier in a position to indicate if that amendment will be brought in or is being considered?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, it's certainly not being considered. We await the decision of the court dealing with the matter of the validity of the order. At the time that decision is reached, some consideration may or may not be given to the matter.

Day Care (continued)

MR. MAGEE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to go back and ask a question, if I may, through you to the Minister of Social Services and Community Health, relative to his ministerial statement today, which has about seven different segments and involves some 53 day care agreements with municipalities. My question is, if the minister could elaborate: how would a municipality commence the appeal process if it were felt that there were special circumstances?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, I thought I dealt with that question. I'll briefly go through it. Any municipality which feels it has a unique set of circumstances pertaining to the publicly funded day care centres within its jurisdiction, and where the deficit has either been high or the family subsidy rate has been set in excess of the \$215 per child per month that we've announced today, or any other very special and unique features — that municipality may appeal directly to the Minister of Social Services and Community Health. I in turn will personally review that appeal with senior officials in the department. We will determine whether some special assistance should be provided on a once-only basis to assist the municipality, in turn, to help the day care centre to operate between now and August 1, 1981. By that time, we would expect whatever unique circumstance there is to be adjusted, so that the municipality is being treated like all other municipalities that are participating in the day care program across the province.

75th Anniversary — Funding

MR. PAHL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is directed to the Minister of Municipal Affairs, in view of his 75th Anniversary responsibility for per capita grants to municipalities. At present it appears that the 30,000-

plus citizens of the Mill Woods community of Edmonton, because of their geographic separation from the rest of the city, will not benefit in an identifiable way from the \$20 per capita grant program. My question to the minister is: are there any checks in place to redress or correct this deviation from the intention that all Albertans would share in the 75th Anniversary programs?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member knows, there are a number of other programs going on throughout the province that I think benefit all Albertans. With regard to the specific question of the per capita grants, the very reason we went to a program of per capita grants to municipalities was so that we might be sure the benefits of the government's expenditures on the 75th Anniversary program were spread across the province, unlike the sort of single-project concept of previous celebrations. With respect to how a municipality expends those funds, they must abide by the guidelines that were issued at the time we made the announcement of the \$20 per capita grant.

But I would say that, within the spirit of those guidelines, I believe most municipalities are looking at all sections of their municipality and people in different walks of life and so on. I would only say to the hon. member that it would be our expectation that various parts of a municipality would benefit, but the matter rests entirely with the council of the municipality. I suppose, Mr. Speaker, that's where concerns should properly be expressed.

MR. PAHL: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the minister could advise whether the per capita grant funding has already been disbursed to the municipalities.

MR. MOORE: Sorry, I didn't catch the last part of the member's question.

MR. PAUL: Mr. Speaker, have the per capita grant moneys gone to the municipalities already?

MR. MOORE: Yes, indeed, Mr. Speaker. The per capita grant funds were mailed in the latter part of January, I believe.

Banff and Jasper — Municipal Status

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address my question to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs as well, but it's nothing to do with the 75th.

In view of the importance to the residents of Banff and Jasper, who are represented by the hon. Minister responsible for Personnel Administration and me, could the minister give any indication of the time of release of the studies that have been done by his department on the option of self-government for the towns of Banff and Jasper?

MR. MOORE: Yes, Mr. Speaker. The Department of Municipal Affairs has completed studies on the option of local government for the communities of both Jasper and Banff, and it would be my intention to have those reports released at the latest by Monday of next week. They will be accompanied by comments from me relative to both the report and the recent events that have occurred in Banff and Jasper with respect to the federal government's notification of very substantial lease increases for the year 1980 and ahead.

DR. REID: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In view of the change in the federal government during the course of those studies, is there any indication of discussions with the new federal minister responsible for national parks regarding the various options?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I have not had any discussions. My colleague the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs may wish to comment. The only thing I can say is that while the work done in the reports that we'll release shortly was a very comprehensive study of the cost of local government in those two communities, if they were to be able to receive the same provincial benefits that other communities in Alberta do, that was done without taking into consideration the kind of escalation in lease rates that has recently been apparent in those two communities. Frankly, it's a little appalling to spend some months developing those reports and a local government option in those two communities, then find in the middle of that, about the time we concluded the report, that a very substantial roadblock has been thrown in the way by the government of Canada.

MR. NOTLEY: Supplementary question to either the Minister of Municipal Affairs or the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. In view of the order in council passed by the Clark government — on February 16, I believe — on which these unfortunate escalations are based, has any representation been made by the government of Alberta to the new government of Canada to rescind that order in council so that we might have a renegotiation of the entire issue?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, just to be very clear, I have had a chance to discuss with Mr. Clark what did take place. I want the record to be clear that in fact they did not recommend the particular increases which took place. I think as a matter of fact that should be clarified.

But let me just go on to say that with the report we now have in place, and the possibilities for considering other options than that which is now available to the residents of Banff and Jasper, I think it's clear to say that this study will focus on the various options which are available, and will be a starting point for negotiations with the federal government. I am firmly convinced that we can offer to the people of Banff and Jasper a better option than they now have.

DR. REID: A supplementary to the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister be able to give some assurance to the people of Banff and Jasper that the Alberta government's part in the negotiations that he just mentioned would be with all haste, in view of the impending increase, now delayed until April 1, 1981?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I'm very happy to give the assurance that we will use our efforts and energies to bring this debate to a conclusion and, with the support of the people of Banff and Jasper, to attempt to effect a reasonable settlement in their interests.

Manpower Shortages

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower. It's with regard to economic development in Alberta and the shortage of engineers and other technical service profes-

sionals. The indications are that there are a thousand or so vacancies at the present time. I was wondering what program the minister has in place for training, and filling these positions in the next few years in Alberta.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, the development of new programs is the responsibility of boards of governors of the various institutions, and that of course is done on a co-operative basis with the Department of Advanced Education and Manpower. I think the system presently in place is very useful. I would say that hon. members are aware from the estimates of my department, which have been approved, that additional funding has been granted for new program development at several institutions in this current budget year, including an additional \$810,000 to the University of Alberta particularly designated for the development of professional faculties, but without specifying the professional faculties to be enhanced with those additional funds.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Economic Development. In February the minister indicated that there would be need for greater immigration of skilled labor into Canada to fill some of these needs. I was wondering if the minister could elaborate on that position. Is it the position of the Alberta government at the present time to bring the necessary professionals from outside Canada?

MR. PLANCHE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to refer that question to the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, of course the question is one which might require a fairly lengthy answer. It relates to discussions which I have held with the current minister and his predecessor at the federal government level with respect to opening up the opportunity of bringing to this province people with particular skills and training. At the same time I want to make it quite clear that Albertans who are seeking the opportunity to obtain training within our institutions in Alberta will be given every opportunity to obtain that training here. It is only when clearly identified shortages exist that the federal and provincial programs of seeking manpower outside the province of Alberta or outside Canada come into play.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question for clarification to the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower. The minister is saying at the present time that there is not a clear strategy by the government with regard to training personnel who will be needed in the next few years. Indications are that by 1985 an enormous number of professionals will be required in this province. Is it going to be left to the universities, or is the government taking some type of initiative?

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has posed his question by way of comment. It is certainly not the case that there is no strategy. We have a manpower development policy in this province. It is a policy which has been presented to this Assembly and approved. In addition, we have The Manpower Development Act, which is also very significant and, I would point out, an Act which is in the forefront of such legislation in Canada. In addition, we have a very active and aggressive policy of development of new programming on the part of the universities. There is a program co-ordination poli-

cy in effect in the Department of Advanced Education and Manpower, by which we make available new programming, in consultation with the institution in this province.

I might say that programs such as the most recently requested co-operative education proposal by the Faculty of Engineering are currently under review by my department. Of course, since that proposal came forward within the last few days to my department, it is not possible at this stage to indicate what might take place with that proposal. But certainly we are prepared to be adaptable and flexible. Of course, I think that is very important when the province is enjoying the type of economic development that we have seen over the past decade.

MR. SPEAKER: We've run out of time for the question period, but I have recognized the hon. Member for Edmonton Kingsway. If the Assembly agrees, perhaps we could deal with his question briefly. And I believe the hon. Minister of Agriculture would like to supplement some information previously given.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

DR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Speaker, I have one question and two supplementaries. I hope the Legislature will permit me to do that; otherwise I would rather defer.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Defer. [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: It appears the hon. Member for Edmonton Kingsway has frightened the Assembly somewhat. [laughter]

The hon. Minister of Agriculture.

Prince Rupert Terminal (continued)

MR. SCHMIDT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to supplement the answer given to the hon. Member for Clover Bar. I would hate for the question period to come to a close with any doubt in either the member's mind, or indeed any other member within this House, of certainly Rupert and its rapport and future for Alberta producers.

To supplement the answer in this way, Mr. Speaker: despite some unknown factors that exist for the future of Rupert, both in its operation and the extent, the Alberta producer of course imperative to Rupert from a distance factor — an opportunity for the type of throughput that Rupert can provide, and that throughput of course the availability to markets, to say nothing of the availability to an Alberta market which has been there, on which we have touched, perhaps provides a future for us in south-east Asia being exactly one sailing day closer to that market.

So Rupert and the benefits that would accrue to Alberta producers, not only from availability, throughput, and market concept, the indications we have at the present time — could perhaps save Alberta producers another 25 cents a bushel by shipping through Rupert. Hence, Mr. Speaker, the interest and indeed the government's response to Rupert, both in the infrastructure costs and the ongoing capital.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, if I may on a point of privilege

correct the record. It appears that the introduction of Bill 45 yesterday was more difficult than I thought it was. The amendments in The School Election Amendment Act are as a consequence of amendments to The Municipal Election Act, not to The Municipal Government Act, and the aim is to make the procedure with respect to school elections consistent with the operation of municipal elections.*

head: MOTIONS FOR RETURNS

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move that Motion for a Return No. 112 stand and retain its place on the Order Paper.

[Motion carried]

head: MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

209. Moved by Mr. Knaak:

Be it resolved that this Assembly urge the government to consider the introduction of legislation to formally establish the entrepreneurial profession, give it self-regulating powers, enable it to set its own standards of ethics and conduct, prescribe education or experience qualifications, and provide for training and practical experience by serving a period of articling.

MR. KNAAK: Mr. Speaker, before commencing my presentation on Motion 209, I would ask for unanimous leave of this House to make a very minor amendment. I won't be speaking very long to the amendment either. It's simply to change "entrepreneurial" to "business executive". It's only used one time. So the motion would read:

Be it resolved that this Assembly urge the government to consider the introduction of legislation to formally establish the business executive profession, give it self-regulating powers, enable it to set its own standards of ethics and conduct, prescribe education or experience qualifications, and provide for training and practical experience by serving a period of articling.

MR. SPEAKER: Of course the ordinary way to amend a motion is by an amendment formally moved, but with the unanimous consent of the Assembly there is no reason at all why the change in the text cannot be achieved. Does the Assembly agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: So ordered.

MR. KNAAK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The idea of professionalizing the business executive is somewhat novel. The purpose of introducing the motion is to stimulate debate within this Legislature and among the public to determine whether the concept is of practical application. At this point I have not had the benefit of sufficient discussion to be totally convinced of the practical application of the concept as I will outline it today. I think it has sufficient merit and possibilities, however, and I hope the concept will be adequately discussed both here in the House and by the public, particularly business executives.

Mr. Speaker, I am on record as strongly supporting

*See page 593, left column, paragraph 12

what I call the private enterprise/private capitalistic system. Although not perfect, I believe it is better than any other system in permitting individuals to reach their full potential and permitting them to grow. From the point of view of the public it is the best system, since it can provide an array of goods and services at minimum real cost. It is a system that permits the maximum individual freedom. However, over the last 10 years, and the last several years in particular, the integrity of businessmen and industrial leaders has been challenged by consumers, the media, environmentalists, and politicians.

I would like to quote a few lines from a well-known American businessman and author, Robert Townsend, who is best known for his best-selling book *Up the Organization*. This gentleman has been a director of Dun and Bradstreet, head of the investment and international banking division of the American Express company, president and chief executive officer of Avis Rent-a-Car, and chairman of an executive committee of a magazine and college textbook publishing company. I give that introduction to outline the kind of weight we can give to his comments. I now begin the quote:

My twenty years in organizations have given me great faith in individuals and absolutely no faith in large institutions. Because the leaders of large [institutions] are distracted and corrupted by luxuries and the trappings of corporate success, they have no time to consider fundamental values like honesty, truth, and justice. They have no time to listen to the voices of their own people who know what's right and what's wrong with their products and services. Not knowing what's wrong, the leaders speak . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. With great respect to the hon. member, he is reading an opinion of someone whom he has set up as an authority. Also with respect, the authorities in this Legislature are the members, and it is their debate, their opinion, rather than the opinions of people who are not elected to the Assembly, that is the purpose of the debates we hold in the Assembly.

I realize there are occasions when, because of the complexity of information such as statistics, it is necessary to rely either on written notes or quotations. But when a quotation is an out-and-out expression of opinion which may or may not be agreed with by other members of the Assembly, we could conceivably get ourselves into a debate where the participants on each side would simply be quoting other people's opinions rather than their own, which they were elected to express in the Assembly.

MR. KNAAK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think I've communicated enough of the quote to get the general idea of what this gentleman's views are. Since the article has some relevance to the presentation, I would like to file some copies of the article in the Assembly, rather than read the quote.

I'm not sure whether Mr. Townsend is as disenchanted with big business as he sounds. Nevertheless, he has had 20 years of experience in big business and big organizations, and his comments deserve some consideration. Much of the public criticism is probably based on misconceptions; nevertheless, some does have a valid basis. The result has been extreme pressure on governments to continue the ever-increasing proliferation of regulation and laws to restrain what, from the point of view of the public, might be undesirable business practices. As well, there seems to be a slow but ever-increasing public ac-

ceptance of government participation in business. The public appears to be accepting the principles of socialism and state capitalism even though the public does not embrace to a significant extent the socialistic parties. It is my personal view that the private enterprise/private capitalistic system is not only worth preserving, but worth expanding in relation to the economy as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, it appears in the North American context and in the context of our western industrial society that the business sector as a whole is fighting a losing battle. Public and government support for the type of private enterprise/private capitalistic system we know today is diminishing. I'm not speaking about the Alberta government. It is one of the few private enterprise governments left, and I'm proud to be part of this government.

The answer may lie in the restoration of confidence by the public in the business sector. In addition to keeping an eye on profits and growth of their companies, more business executives must also keep an eye on the public interest in general. Novel and innovative ideas must be considered if we are to stem the present tide against the private enterprise/private capitalistic system.

One aspect of the solution may lie in urging business executives to professionalize. When I speak about the professionalization of the business executive, I'm referring to the requirement of business executives to adhere to a self-imposed code of ethics and conduct enforced and regulated by a governing body of their peers through disciplinary procedures. I'm not suggesting that most businessmen and industrial leaders do not now abide by individually imposed standards of ethics and conduct. However, with respect to present professions such as lawyers, doctors, engineers, and dentists, it was found desirable for these professions to be bound by a code of ethics and conduct which is enforced in each case by the governing body of their profession through disciplinary procedures, notwithstanding that the majority of these professionals would also abide by their own self-imposed standards of ethics and conduct.

There may be some problem with the word "professionalization" since that has often referred to the provision of personal services by an identifiable group providing a service relating to a specific learned area of study such as law, engineering, or medicine. In the context of my discussion professionalization is only intended to suggest that a body of business executives, once professionalized, would conduct their business responsibilities within a self-imposed code of conduct and ethics and where such behavior is enforced by the governing body of peers through disciplinary procedures.

The meaning of the word "profession" is changing, and is now broader than merely describing the older professions. I think it is appropriate in this context. Nevertheless, I do not wish to debate the question of the appropriateness of the word, but hope that the debate will centre on the principle that business executives — as do doctors, lawyers, and engineers — conduct their responsibilities within a self-imposed code of ethics and conduct enforced through disciplinary procedures by the governing body consisting of their peers within the profession.

Included in such a profession should be all those businessmen who have responsibility for final decisions ultimately affecting the welfare of the public and the corporation. It would certainly include all senior executives of a corporation. The key element of this motion and the concept of professionalization are therefore: a self-imposed code of ethics and conduct, the establishment of a governing body consisting of peers within the business

community, enforcement of such a code of ethics and conduct by the governing body through disciplinary procedure, and possible expulsion from the profession, with the result that if an individual is expelled he can never again become a member of the profession or be employed in a senior capacity in a business establishment. It would involve a method of dealing with legitimate complaints by members of the public and government in an efficient manner through the disciplinary procedure, so that the governing body of the profession may cut through the corporate veil and get directly to the person who made the decision that is offensive to the member of the public or the government.

A legitimate question would be: why would I think professionalization would change the perceived need for government regulation, and why might it reduce the present onslaught of the general public? At present there are few forces, other than self-imposed ethical standards, that constrain business executive behavior. A difficult competitive environment or board of director pressure for improved performance can lead business executives to participate in undesirable behavior such as offering bribes, predatory pricing practices, conspiracy to fix prices or bids, permitting unsafe working conditions, conducting business outside environmental standards, producing unsafe products, false advertising, or breaking agreements entered into in good faith. Although there are several civil and in some cases criminal laws relating to such practices, the laws rarely penetrate the corporate veil and few executives are personally liable. In this regard I pulled out examples of laws relating to the Alberta government. One was The Coal Mines Safety Act, and I believe the other one was The Clean Air Act. In fact the person who's liable under those cases, if business is conducted by a corporation, is the corporation, and there is absolutely no sanction against the individuals who authorize or motivate the corporation to break the law.

Clearly it would be in the interest of business executives to weed out the few unscrupulous individuals among them. Self-regulation can be an effective means since the sanction is against the individual, imposed by his peers.

The purpose of self-regulation related to the public interest . . . Clearly, senior executives have as much or more impact on the welfare of society than does the individual lawyer, doctor, or other professional now operating under a code of ethics and conduct. Professions have been relatively immune to government regulation. In my view one of the reasons is that the code of conduct and ethics that guides their behavior requires them to keep one eye on the public interest and one eye on the interest of the profession as a whole.

Although a code of ethics would be developed and evolve over time, one of the fundamental underlying themes would be integrity. Integrity is the first rule for the Canadian Bar Association code of professional conduct. I'll quote from the Law Society: The lawyer must discharge his duties to his client, the court, members of the public, and his fellow members of the profession with integrity. This clause could be rewritten to read: The business executive must discharge his responsibilities to his company, the public, the consumers of his product or service, the employees, and his fellow members of the profession with integrity. "Integrity" is defined in the notes of this quote as soundness of moral principle, especially in relation to truth and fair dealing, uprightness, honesty, and sincerity.

Illustrations of conduct which may infringe the rule as set out would certainly include the behavior I've listed:

the offering of bribes, predatory pricing practice, conspiracy to fix prices or bids, permitting unsafe working conditions, conducting business outside environmental standards, producing unsafe products, false advertising, breaking agreements entered into in good faith. The ethic would also include and involve a person who assists, enables, or permits any other person to act fraudulently, dishonestly, or illegally toward a consumer of the product or service, the employee of the company, or who knowingly assists or enables another business executive to break the law. This rule would also include as a rule of conduct that any business executive who knows of a breach of the ethics by another business executive or member of the profession must report such a breach to the governing body, or himself be subject to disciplinary procedure.

I'm not suggesting that the professionalization concept is a cure-all. Yet I do think it's a better alternative than increased government regulation and government participation in the business sector.

The second aspect of this motion is a recommendation that entry into their profession require a one- or two-year period of articling. The purpose of this suggestion is to increase the speed of transfer of business skills and, to some extent, permit the transfer of an approach to business in a difficult, competitive environment, yet within the code of conduct and ethics of the profession.

Membership would initially be on a voluntary basis. The question of education with respect to the business executive profession is a matter on which I have no strong views, since some of the best business executives have had no formal education. Certainly from the point of view of initial membership, the grandfather clause approach would be necessary.

My hope would be that if this proposal is deemed to have merit, within 15 years most individuals groomed for top executive positions will be members of this new profession, and that within 40 years all executives of corporations with publicly traded shares and large private corporations would be required to be members of this profession. However, there would be no restriction on individuals conducting their own businesses. Such individuals would not be required to be members of this profession. This would then be consistent with the legal profession, medical profession, or other professions where an individual doing work on his own behalf would not need to belong to that profession. For instance, a person could do his own legal work, his own medical work, and his own engineering work if he had the skills and if it were for his own benefit only.

In substance, Mr. Speaker, the question is whether each individual business executive is prepared to give up a portion of his conceived freedom by imposing on himself a code of ethics and conduct, in order to eliminate or reduce the perceived need of governments throughout the western industrialized world to infringe further on the private business sector. That's creating a greater freedom and a more positive business climate for the business sector as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that this is a somewhat novel approach to maintaining the vitality and growth of the private enterprise/private capitalistic system. I shall listen with great interest to my colleagues in this debate.

Thank you.

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, I'm glad to rise on Motion 209, placed on the Order Paper by the hon. Member for Edmonton Whitemud. I recognize he belongs to a profes-

sion other than mine, and that we have somewhat of a reputation for having our differences. I'd like to reassure him that on this occasion I intend to support his concept, with one minor reservation.

Mr. Speaker, to consider the motion, I think we have to discuss the concept of what a profession is. It is to some extent delineated in the government's policy document on professions and occupations. But any profession — be it medical, legal, or otherwise — has to fulfil certain factors to be regarded as such.

Of course it has to be self-governing and largely self-regulating. It has to license its own members, usually under some Act of this Legislature. To go with that licensing, it has the responsibility for disciplining any members who indulge in infractions of the code of ethics, the regulations, or other professional requirements. In fact, in most professions the most serious offence you can commit is to indulge in unprofessional conduct. Also, a profession has to be there not only for the benefit of its own members but for the benefit of the general public. In fact, public benefit is to some extent the major responsibility of a profession, rather than its own members' benefit. Fifthly, any genuine, true profession has to be answerable to the public, either for complaints about what the member of the public may think is malfeasance on the part of the member of the profession, or for the general activities of the profession as a group.

I think that concept of professionalism fits in very well with my concept of what government should be doing. If you had a group of professions which were to a large extent self-governing and -regulating and answerable to the public, it would avoid the necessity for the government to get involved in regulating such occupations and activities. I'm not trying to do the hon. Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs out of an occupation; he has another profession to fall back on in any case. But it would in fact decrease the requirement for government intervention in the general operating of the free-market concept.

Mr. Speaker, many professions have two parallel organizations which, although they function in parallel, have completely different responsibilities. I'll stick with my own profession, where we have one entity called the College of Physicians and Surgeons and another called the Alberta Medical Association. The college, which has lay, non-medical members on its board of directors — which incidentally was a very novel concept when it was introduced, with some doubts by the professional members — is responsible for those five functions that I've already mentioned. On the other hand, the Alberta Medical Association corresponds approximately to a manufacturers' association, a trade association, the Alberta Construction Association, or somebody such as that. It essentially looks after the interests of the members of the profession. It may indulge in group insurance, it may negotiate with the government or attempt to, but it really looks after those interests that apply only to the members of the profession.

As I've said, those trade associations — and there are very many of them in both this province and this country — fulfil that role. But those trade associations, to be quite specific, do not license, regulate, discipline, or answer to the public for the activities of those associations or the various members of those associations. In fact, at the moment there is no self-governing body that does have any answerability to the general public for the activities of those occupations.

Maybe as a result of the fact that there is no public

answerability evident, there have been criticisms — sometimes justified and sometimes unjustified — of the activities of the business executive. As a result of those criticisms, there is a normal reactive function of government. When the criticisms reach a certain level, the government tends to step in and try to regulate the activities of the people who are being criticized, in order to cut down on the criticisms being expressed. Such regulations have been introduced in this Assembly by previous governments and this government, and have been introduced by most governments in western democratic societies where it is possible to criticize the activities of another person.

But such reactive legislation by its very nature has some problems. It is, of course, reactive. The problem has to become evident and has to be complained about before the legislation is normally put on the books. Therefore it always follows events and problems, sometimes with considerable delay because of the delays built into the legislative process.

The other problem with such regulation by legislation can often be that because it's introduced by legislators and with the assistance of bureaucrats who are not experts in that particular field, such legislation often tends to produce more problems than it gets rid of or even to introduce new problems that have never been thought of.

All one has to do to clarify that situation is to look at the effects of governmental regulation on emission from motor vehicles. Subsequently we now have the problem of the government's interfering in the mileage per gallon or per litre — I suppose nowadays I should be saying kilometres per litre — of the individual vehicles in the fleet produced by a manufacturer. Those regulations have brought one of the powerful corporate entities in the world, General Motors, down to the stage where they're scarcely making a profit. After all, in the free enterprise system if there is no profit, there is no system. We don't need to think about what it has done to lesser lights in the automotive industry, such as Ford and Chrysler Corporation. Those corporations, which were functioning on a strictly economic basis perfectly well, have been brought to their knees by government regulations that had nothing to do, apparently, with the fiscal and monetary policies of those companies.

Mr. Speaker, when I read the original motion, I was a bit concerned about the word "entrepreneur". I was going to tease the mover of the motion somewhat. Perhaps in his legal capacity he was willing to give us a definition. Of course he would have been responsible for his activities to his professional peers for that particular definition. I'm glad he changed it to "business executive".

Mr. Speaker, I think we have to look at the possibility for self-discipline in the business executive. If a doctor, an engineer, or a lawyer goes into business, they are still responsible to their own professional body for activities in that business which are strictly within the confines of their profession. If a doctor works as the medical director of a company, he is responsible for his medical decisions. If the engineer is responsible for designing a boiler, he is responsible as an engineer for that design. If a lawyer is drawing up contracts between one company or another or between the company and a union, he is responsible as a lawyer for those contracts he draws up. But as soon as those three individuals cross the fence and become the business executive or entrepreneur, they leave behind all that professional responsibility. There is no self-disciplining body to control their activities.

I would think that the motion of the hon. Member for Edmonton Whitemud is of extreme interest because it

does introduce the concept of such activities being controlled by the people who are performing them. Historically it has worked extremely well in the medical profession. It has also worked very well in the legal profession. Those are probably the outstanding examples. But it also functions in what may not appear on the surface to be self-governing professions, such as nursing and teaching. Those people tend to be employed by others, whereas lawyers and doctors tend to be self-employed. But even in the employed professions — and the business executive is to a large extent employed by the business he's working for — the concept of self-discipline has been shown to be very valid.

I can think of many activities within business and commerce where the concept of self-discipline applies, but at the moment I will stick to only three where I hope I have some knowledge that would enable me to make some valid remarks. I would like to start off with the concept of self-discipline for a safety director. Both in accident prevention and in the investigation of accidents, professionalism would mean that the safety director would have to obey not his own self-set rules and ethics but those of his profession. More noteworthy, in the occupational health and illness field, if a safety director had any initial evidence that there was a particular health problem developing within his industry, he would perforce, because of his professional responsibility, have to do something about it and report it to his professional body.

I can remember 25 years ago as a medical student, in fact almost 30 years ago, hearing about a disease called asbestosis and the problems that were showing up with the use of asbestos. It took approximately 20 years for that concern to get out of the narrow confines of the medical profession and into general public knowledge. But the medical knowledge devolved from findings in industry and in workers in particular industries. We've since had the problem with vinyl chloride and liver tumors, and many other instances. Coalminer's lung is an example. But the safety director who found such an entity occurring in his industry, if he belonged to a profession would perforce, because of his professional nature, have to do something about it.

The manager of a company would become directly responsible for the safety of his product. Hopefully he would become responsible for the labelling of the containers of any noxious chemicals that were produced by his company. He would have to label those to the satisfaction of his own profession, and his own profession might move considerably faster than government regulation in the requirements for labelling of such containers.

The environmental engineer, who at the moment only has to function within the regulations of the Minister of Environment — and, as I've said, those regulations sometimes tend to follow rather than precede events. Instead of following those regulations only, he would have a professional requirement and concern for making sure that labelling kept up with advancing knowledge, on a current basis as opposed to waiting for events to happen. Those three instances alone, within my own narrow field, indicate how important professionalism by the business executive could become.

I would like to mention a particular instance that came to our attention on the select committee's trip to Europe. We were not just involved as politicians in looking at the narrow confines of that select committee. In Germany we found that there is almost professionalism because of the co-operation tenet of their industry, that the regulations

for safety and pollution standards are set from within the industry and are then brought into legislation by the government. But they are initiated by the industry and by the executives of the industry. That was brought very much to our attention by the biochemical people at Leverkusen.

Mr. Speaker, I mentioned at the beginning of my remarks that I had one concern about professionalism for the business executive. Being a general practitioner, it may be that I'm a [jack] of all trades, but I'm certainly not a complete master of one. Specialization has been defined as knowing more and more about less and less until one knows absolutely everything about nothing. The concern I have is that most professions tend to become more and more rigid in the educational requirements for the profession. Originally a specialist in medicine was somebody who limited his practice. Following that was the introduction of certification in the speciality, and subsequently the introduction of fellowship in the speciality. I'm not sure that a specialist with a fellowship is any better than a specialist who has learned by experience, by a preceptorship, and who describes himself as limiting himself to that speciality.

My concern is that a profession of business executives might gradually begin to regard a university degree or some other commerce training as being the *sine qua non* of belonging to that profession. I think we all know, and the member mentioned the problem, of very good, ethical business executives whose only knowledge of postsecondary education is driving by the doors of the particular educational facility on their way to work. These are people who have got ethics and morals within their business occupation which are often better within that occupation than those of people who have got degrees in commerce.

With the one proviso that restrictions be placed on the ability to develop purely educational requirements, I would like to urge that this House consider favorably the motion put forward by the member.

Thank you.

MR. BORSTAD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise and give a few comments, from a small businessman's point of view, on Motion 209 brought forward by the Member for Edmonton Whitemud, which is to establish a profession known as the business executive profession — and I'm glad he changed that word, because I don't know whether I could have said it before — to regulate and to control the standards pertaining to the profession, and to protect the public against incompetence and fraud. This could endanger the health and/or life of an individual.

We can look back in time to when the professions were formed in the 15th century in response to petitions by local justices. I suppose we could go back even further than that to the stonemasons working on the temple of King Solomon. They were professionals and their work, of which they were very proud, was good. They were a tight-knit group who guarded their profession. So I suppose we can say that the professions have been around for a long time. In fact some of our lodges today symbolize those ancient stonemasons, who practice honor and virtue among their fellow men. Therefore there is a long record of groups forming professions to aid their neighbors and themselves.

Self-government is a privilege delegated to the professional or occupation by a legislature. Only when it is clear that the public can be better served by delegating this authority — and the matter is not to be too lightly taken.

As in other professions, there is an assumption that unethical, undesirable, and sometimes illegal practices would be greatly reduced by the establishment of this profession being discussed here today. I strongly believe that they would. I only have to recall — and I speak as a small businessman — my experience with some purchasing agents who expect you to pay them off before your bids are even recognized. So the thing is around. And there are many more examples I might be able to cite.

The integrity of the businessman and industrial leaders has been challenged by consumers and media groups alike. Most of the criticism is probably based on misconception, though no doubt some is valid. This is why we have Ralph Nader's group and other groups springing up to help and protect the public. Professionalism would mean a code of ethics, enforceable through a disciplinary body, and expulsion from that profession on some privilege or right being offended. It would be in the business of the business executives to get rid of unscrupulous individuals amongst them. The establishment of the business executive profession would not be a perfect remedy to some of the practices that go on in private industry, such as offering of bribes, false advertising, unsafe products, permitting unsafe working conditions, and many others, but it would go a long way to improve a much more desirable alternative than increased regulations and controls by government.

Self-regulation does not preclude government intervention, because governments that created them can still intervene and prevent abuse to those powers. Therefore I support Motion 209 as a small businessman, and I urge the members of the Assembly to support this motion.

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, I welcome as well the opportunity to enter this debate on a very important question put before the Assembly by the hon. Member for Edmonton Whitemud. For that he is to be commended. I believe he is addressing our attention to a couple of very major concerns in society today, and certainly on the part of members of this Assembly: namely, the status and continued prosperity and health of the private enterprise system as we understand it; a concern about the ever-increasing degree of government regulation, which of course extends not only into the enterprise system but into our daily lives; and, as well, the increasing awareness of the need for public responsibility on the part of all citizens in society.

I believe the hon. Member for Edmonton Whitemud has very effectively explained the erosion of public acceptance of pure and uncontrolled private enterprise. He has talked effectively about the perception on the part of the public for government regulation and the need for government regulation. At the bottom line, he suggests a cure — if not an entire cure, at least some sort of substantial remedy that would help to preserve the system of private enterprise which I believe we all support.

I must say, Mr. Speaker, that I certainly share his concern about the erosion of the private enterprise system. I appreciate his suggestion of a possible remedy, but I cannot say with candor that I believe we have struck upon that solution. I rather think that we are perhaps trying to put a square peg in a round hole. I too look with great interest for subsequent remarks in this House, and I'm certainly prepared to be convinced. But as much as I accept and share the concern of the member, I really have a number of concerns.

The first of these, of course, relates to one of the essential ingredients for the establishment of a true pro-

fession; that is, a commonalty, an identifiable group that has a common interest. I have some difficulty, Mr. Speaker, in discovering in my own mind how the manager of Frank's welding shop has very much in common with the division manager for IBM. Of course this highlights the question: who is a business executive? How do you define such a person?

The Member for Edmonton Whitemud has very fairly recognized the right — and surely it must be a fundamental right of an individual — to start and operate a business. But that really avoids the question of who, then, a business executive is. Because according to definitions that have been advanced, the fellow who's hired by Frank to manage his welding shop is really a business executive and subject to the same kinds of requirements as the division manager for a large corporation. Do you draw the line based on the size of the organization, or do you do it on the basis of the responsibility of the individual in the work place? I think that's a very major problem.

Of course related to that, surely the member's not suggesting that in this country of ours, in this province of ours, one wouldn't be allowed the opportunity to climb the corporate ladder without some special degree. I think such a concept would be open to the very real criticism of being somewhat elitist and, in fact, a disincentive to highly motivated and capable people in our society who just don't happen to have had the opportunity to obtain this special university degree or other training.

As a matter of fact, without reverting to a direct quotation, Mr. Speaker, in the preparation of my remarks I happened to come across an old text that I studied in commerce at university when I was engaged in the bachelor of commerce program. Mr. Peter Drucker talked about ways in which the business sector must seek to avoid breeding public opinion which is hostile. One of the things he talked about in particular was the exclusive hiring of college graduates for management positions, thus cutting off chances for men inside the company and narrowing promotional opportunities, which is one of the most important rungs in the traditional ladder of success, as he termed it. With all due respect for the good intentions of the member, I think that would be a very damning criticism of the proposed profession — that it would in fact have that effect which, of course, I'm sure is not intended. This was alluded to by the hon. Member for Edson when he spoke. He referred to it as one of the provisos to his complete approval of the notion of a separate profession. I must say, Mr. Speaker, that I find it more than simply a proviso; I find it a very major stumbling block.

There is an additional concern that I'd like to bring to the members of the Assembly: I would bring that concern forward in this way: surely what is really at issue and what is needed is not the establishment of some profession, but rather one looking at the conduct one might normally expect of a person engaged in business with an attitude toward public responsibility and the public interest. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that while the traditional professions are established by legislation, as was mentioned by a previous speaker, the spirit of professionalism is in fact conferred by society. It's conferred by society on the basis of society's assessment of the conduct of an occupational group, if you will, within society, and in particular in terms of the sense of responsibility to society that that group is displaying. I'm saying that what we need, Mr. Speaker, is not a formal structure that will create the trappings of so-called professionalism, but rather a sincere demonstration by the business sector of a

sense of real social responsibility in its conduct. That's part and parcel of the goals and objectives of a business. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it really is more a question of attitude than anything else.

As was pointed out by previous speakers, the modern use of the term "professional" has extended far beyond the traditional notions of doctors, lawyers, engineers, and others. I think this is due in large measure to the heightened awareness of the responsibility of all citizens to recognize a duty to society in the conduct of their occupational affairs. In other words, professionalism is not the exclusive domain of the traditional professions. I must take some issue with the remarks of the hon. Member for Edson when he suggested in his example that when one goes behind the corporate veil one leaves behind his professional responsibilities. That's certainly not my concept of professionalism, Mr. Speaker. I think the extension of that term beyond application to the traditional professions bears some witness to the fact that that is not the general public's view of the explanation and definition of the professional.

With perhaps too much of a critical look, I've suggested that while the member has raised a very critical issue, the solution offered may not in fact be the one that is going to lead us out of the wilderness. What then can be offered by way of solution? Mr. Speaker, with the greatest of respect, I don't purport to have a precise solution, except to suggest this: what is required is a continued and accelerated focus by the business executives in both advocating and practising business with the public interest as a clear objective of corporate business. I think that's a tall but attainable goal. It's a tall order, but I think it certainly is one that is being addressed more and more by the business community. I certainly don't mean by my remarks to suggest that there is no focus on this critical area. But I do think there is a particular dilemma the business corporation finds itself in, and that is that one of its foremost objects must be to maximize the return to the investor.

When I was a student of commerce it was suggested there was a complimentary goal in terms of our social obligations, and I think those goals are mutually attainable. It's a fair comment, that it does pose a continuing and constant dilemma to the business executive, when faced with critical decisions that are going to affect the profitability of a corporation, to keep in mind the need for that social responsibility and that public interest. So on that basis, while I too am concerned about the amount of red tape that business experiences — and there's no question about it; as the son of a small business man and having worked for many years in the small business and shared the frustrations of my father as he endured what he felt was very needless government regulation and red tape — I must say that government has a responsibility and a proper role. I see government as working hand in hand with the business community in helping to ensure that our society operates on the basis that society as a whole feels is appropriate and fair.

So I feel that the goal is certainly an attainable one. I would like to commend the Member for Edmonton Whitemud for his encouragement of the self-discipline and sense of public responsibility and accountability that is implicit in his motion. That certainly is desirable. The hon. member and this member certainly agree on that principle. We both share a belief in the value of the private enterprise system, which I think has undeniably provided and continues to provide the greatest opportunity for individual achievement and encourages excellence

through the provision of the incentive technique, which I don't think has a comparable approach in terms of excellence and in meeting the economic needs of society. Surely the best proof of that is the standard of living and the quality of life that we enjoy in both this country and this province.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would simply say I believe we have an obligation to maintain and improve that quality of life. I think that is the challenge to this Legislature, and I believe the members of this Legislature on both sides of the House are up to the challenge. I rest very comfortably in the assurance that government, working hand in hand with business and with organized labor, will be well able to serve the needs of the people.

Thank you.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to take the opportunity of saying a few words with regard to this resolution. I think one of the points of view we all have in common — certainly in this Legislature, with the exception of maybe one member — is our support and our commitment to the capitalist system or the free enterprise system to operate not only the province of Alberta, but the private economy and Canada as a whole.

I think the question raised in this resolution is with regard to that free enterprise system and where it's taking us at the present time. Many of us are very concerned with regard to the regulations and controls that become imposed on the free market system and cause delays, cause difficulties for business and entrepreneurs to fulfill some of the objectives they may have in society and in playing a very important role in the economic development of a private community or a province as a whole. That's the first thing.

I think the second thing that has evolved that is raised in this resolution and is a concern, and the solution suggested is sort of because of the symptom, is the mistrust the general public has at the present time for the free enterprise system, and generally at the corporate level — the mistrust and the misunderstanding of what is happening. I believe the hon. mover of the resolution put his finger on it in saying that you don't know who to put the finger on in the corporate system with regard to responsibility. Through this resolution the hon. member is attempting, through some mechanism, to set up a business executive professional organization that says you are responsible for your actions, responsible not only to yourself but to your fellow men who are in the free enterprise system and in the system you are serving so well.

But when we examine the resolution, I think we should go back to some of the original goals of the free enterprise system to understand how we've arrived at where we are today, at a point where we must seek to clear the air — I think that's what we're doing in our discussion at the present time — about the morality in business and morality of business people in making them professionals.

Capitalism, as we all recognize and have understood during our period of time in life, is a system that we feel committed to. We feel that it does work and will fulfil our needs, first of all economically in our province and in our own lives. But our social goals can also be fulfilled by the free enterprise system.

If we look back in history, when our forefathers came to this continent and our country, they conceived a system of liberty and a great deal of freedom: freedom to make choices about where they live, what type of enterprise they are involved in, and a way of life for their

families. Rather than a social economy centred around religious or aristocratic orders, we brought the old domestic values of prudence, diligence, trustworthiness, and ambition right to the front of our system of economy. Channelled through a healthy drive to better oneself rather than one's master, we built this economic system, a free economic system based on the liberty and the freedom in our society.

We have seen, though, Mr. Speaker, since that industrial revolution something that those early free-enterprisers like Adam Smith and others had not foreseen at that time: the growth of large bureaucratic corporations. I can say that I suppose there is nothing wrong with the growth of these large companies. I think we've all welcomed the collective research capabilities, the large capital resources, new products and, most of all, the job security they have brought with them. But, Mr. Speaker, within certain limits, mistrust and dislike of bigness is that healthy democratic instinct; because as corporations grow larger and more powerful, each of us loses a certain measure of sovereignty, a certain measure of freedom, and certainly a certain measure of identity within our system.

Mr. Speaker, I maintain that this is the source of the mistrust the public feels toward corporate executives. It is a natural, democratic reaction to bigness, not a direct attack on the executives as individuals. In our system the ultimate reaction of mistrust is to nationalize an industry, with all the waste and inefficiency that results from that particular process. Under that system, we are able and can direct the motives of that industry. But to me, and I'm sure to others in this Legislature, that is unacceptable.

Mr. Speaker, it was the pioneers who built this great province of ours; risk-takers who left the relative security of the east and came west. It was the risk-takers who drilled the first oil well at Leduc and went on to develop our economy to a level that we enjoy today. We did not regulate Alberta into being; we did not pass a lot of laws. The only reason our province of Alberta works as well as it does is that free men are able and were able to make free choices and exercise a freedom in taking the risks and earning the benefits. That is the basic premise of the market place economy that has caused this province to grow to the place where it is today.

The motion that we have before us seeks to remedy the problem of public mistrust of businessmen by establishing a semiprivate type of bureaucracy. While a profession for business executives might improve the public's trust of them as individuals and give a feeling of false security, we will still be left with the public's healthy distrust of bigness as represented by the big corporations.

Mr. Speaker, no one could ever establish the criteria for an entrepreneur. Some hon. members in this Legislature have referred to that matter at this point in time. I feel no one should be able to do just that type of thing, because the beauty of our free enterprise system is that anyone with skill, foresight, or perseverance — even a bit of luck — can generate economic excitement in our system. They can create wealth, jobs, new products, new innovations, and continue to build a new and exciting type of economy in our province and throughout all of Canada and North America. In this country, I feel the public loves its freedom and has a dislike for anything big, powerful, and secretive. That is the perception of most corporations, so the public does not really trust them.

I don't see how the establishment of a profession for businessmen will help this particular concern out in the

system at the present time. In any case, Mr. Speaker, a professional is by definition dedicated to a standard of service to others, to his clients. Entrepreneurial endeavor, whether at the corner store or at the head of Exxon, is motivated by healthy self-interest. That's how the free enterprise system works. I don't see how entrepreneurs fit the definition of a professional. I don't see why they really should fit into any mould. The secret to our success and the system we have supported over the years is that it has flexibility; it has the opportunity for people to use the energies or abilities they have to direct their lives and to assist and work with others in their communities.

The intent of the mover of this motion was to build ethics and standards of conduct into business people. I'm sure that's commendable. However, our market place is based upon a certain level of trust and honesty in those who operate it. It has been said many times in this Legislature and other legislatures that you can't legislate honesty, ethics, and values. I don't think at this point in time we should try to, Mr. Speaker. For this reason, and my concern that we should not limit anyone's freedom, I don't feel that I could wholeheartedly support the concept of this professional type of organization. At this point in time I think that if a group of business people feel it is worth their while, or feel it is to their advantage, to form some type of organization on a volunteer basis or on their own initiative and those people who join the organization have to meet certain criteria, our society, legislation, rules, or whatever, allow people the freedom to do just that. There's freedom of association and freedom of organization — we should allow that to happen. But really, Mr. Speaker, I feel even that isn't necessary, and wouldn't be supportive of that kind of organization. Each of us as individuals, entrepreneurs, business executives, or people attempting to earn a living for ourselves or to provide a service for our fellow men in the communities should know that the ground rules of honesty, integrity, and respect for others are high priority items and should not be violated. If they are violated by us as business people or persons earning a way of life in the community, then we should not have a place in the market place. Consumers as such should ignore whatever product we're selling, whether it's physical or non-physical, and at that point in time our control over our actions is certainly controlled. There is a governor on us in that manner.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that's the kind of system we can work under, as people in the province of Alberta and as Canadians. I'm sure that in the long run there may be a few pitfalls, there may be people in the system who do not take all their responsibilities, but there are controls in place at the present time. I have confidence that they will continue to work.

MR. MUSGREAVE: Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak to this motion, I must confess I'm a little confused. I don't want my colleagues to agree with me. I'd like to go back to the word "entrepreneur", but first of all I would like to comment on some of the remarks by the hon. Member for Little Bow. I agree with what he was saying. However, I hope the member who introduced this motion brings it back again, because there are some points the Member for Little Bow made that I would like to take exception to. Unfortunately, I don't have my research prepared enough so that I can debate it intelligently — and I heard one hon. member agree with me.

I would like to go back to the idea of the entrepreneur, though. There are four main factors of production. These are land, capital, labor, and entrepreneurship. The entre-

preneur is usually the idea person. Quite often it's not his idea, but he is the one who takes the idea, puts these factors of production together, and creates a new product or in some way satisfies the wants of people. He must combine these factors of production to produce goods or services, and they have to make a profit. If they guess wrong, the market place is going to penalize them. All we need to do is think of the Edsel. We know what the market place did to that automobile, and we know what the market place is doing to the large cars being produced by the Chrysler Corporation today.

Mr. Speaker, although I find difficulty with the concept of an entrepreneurial profession subject to rules and regulations of conduct, I agree that it is necessary. Several years ago some senior executives of General Electric were sent to jail because they were collaborating on keeping up the prices of generating equipment to various power companies throughout the United States. In Canada we are all familiar with the recent dredging scandal. Many people have been given prison terms, and I would suggest to you that many members of the boards of directors are probably former chartered accountants, engineers, or lawyers. Obviously the courts have to move against these people. The Atlantic Acceptance Corporation is another example of an organization involving many millions of dollars and people with wide professional backgrounds. Unfortunately greed for wealth or power frequently dissolves any integrity these people may have had.

Mr. Speaker, let's get back to an entrepreneur. What is this person whom we want to organize and control, even though it is by themselves? I would like to go back in history and look at the example of an entrepreneur and how important it was in both private industry and government. When the old trade routes of the spice lands were cut off, European countries decided they would have to find access to these countries by sea routes. It was an entrepreneur by the name of Prince Henry of Portugal who set up a school for navigators and finally found trade routes around Africa. Another example is Spain, which financed the trip of Columbus to North America.

In old Egyptian civilizations, there are many examples of business transactions where business people put together various projects to satisfy the Pharaohs of those times. This is one of the difficulties in our emerging nations today. One of the problems in the developing countries is not that they don't have land or people, but they don't have the enterprisers who can put the factors of production together. To give you another example from history, let's look at Venice, a city of great wealth. It had no arable land, yet they built a rich empire using the capital resources available to them. Similarly, in Japan today they have little in the way of land, forests, oil, or gas, yet they are one of the most wealthy countries in the world. Why? Because they have entrepreneurs who wanted to satisfy people's wants, develop industries to serve them and the world, and they have grown rich in the process.

One of the tragedies in the American auto industry — and I know some hon. members have said that the reason the auto industry of the United States is in such trouble is government regulations. I suggest to you the reason the industry is in trouble is because of lousy management. While they have been designing bigger fins and fancier grills, the Germans and Japanese have been designing automobiles that are safe, efficient, strong, and small. Most important of all, they use less gasoline. That's why in the United States today more automobiles that have

been manufactured abroad are being sold in that country than those manufactured in the United States.

I would like to suggest that one of the reasons I support the idea of an entrepreneurial profession as such, but for different reasons than the mover, is that entrepreneurs can be in government or in private industry. I would like to remind you of the CBC in Canada. Many of my colleagues can't stand the CBC, but I would like to suggest that it's one of the important links that has held our country together. Air Canada is another example of a transportation vehicle that was set up by a Conservative government way back when, but it served the purpose of helping to keep our country together. Another example is the rescue of the bankrupt railroads, which we now know as the CNR.

In Alberta we have our own examples of government enterprise. We have the provincial Treasury Branch system, the Alberta Government Telephones, the Alberta Energy Company in which this government placed \$75 million. In Calgary they have the largest co-op grocery association in Canada. I think it's rather ironic. Calgary is supposed to be the red neck, free enterprise city of Alberta, yet it has the largest grocery co-op in the country.

Mr. Speaker, one way we could encourage entrepreneurs in Canada is to put more money into our universities. Right now, according to the latest report of the Bachelor of Commerce program in the University of Alberta, 640 students were denied admission to the B.Com. program last year for lack of funds. Yet at the same time we all know that Canada is short of management people. I would suggest that any encouragement we can give to our citizens to engage in productive activities should be supportive.

Going back to Mr. T.J. Johnson's *Professions in Power*, the question is raised: do the lawyers really guard our liberties? I know I am surrounded by these honored gentlemen. But according to Mr. Johnson, if you were a black power militant or a women's liberation supporter, you would probably look on a lawyer as an upholder of an exploitive system. Another example, covering all professions in England, the monopolies commission report on professional services, 1970, led one writer to the *London Times* to suggest that a number of restrictive practices carried on by professional groups and justified on the basis of community welfare looked in fact rather like arrangements for making life easier for practitioners at the expense of their clients one way or another.

The hon. Member for Edmonton Whitemud mentioned that laws rarely penetrate the corporate veil, and I must confess that I have to agree with him. Again going back to the United States, many people there feel that corporations are national institutions and should be protected as such. And they should be protected from their board of directors. They feel that many of the boards of directors of many large organizations are incompetent. Unfortunately they feed on one another's greed and are prey to nepotism in the worst form. Obviously they have problems. Would the code of ethics, for example, stop Gulf Oil? Back in the early '50s this company was producing oil from shut-in oil wells in the province of Alberta. If it hadn't been for the perseverance of an inspector of the conservation board, as it was known in those days, this company would not have been found guilty and taken into courts as it was.

When the hon. member introduced this motion, he mentioned the fact of integrity as suggested by the Bar Association. I would point out that every one of Presi-

dent Nixon's cabinet were lawyers. I would suggest that something happened to their integrity.

AN HON. MEMBER: They're looking for work.

MR. MUSGREAVE: Yes, they're looking for work, once they get out of jail. This is the irony of our situation. They get out of jail, write a book, and become millionaires.

When one looks at the available material on professionalism, a lot has been written. From what little reading I have been able to do, I would say that there is a lot of concern by a lot of people who feel a professional is a person who carves out from society his own area of concern and opportunity. If he hides behind a facade of doing public good, so be it. This is why I cannot support the idea of improving standards of competence in the business world by suggesting that we set up the profession, as suggested by the hon. member. If we want to improve the business world, I suggest we put more money into our universities, SAIT, and NAIT and more encouragement of in-house training programs such as the RIA and CGA in accounting.

Another reason I cannot support this, Mr. Speaker, is that in the year 1900 in Ontario, 4.6 per cent of the labor force were professional; in 1971 it had risen to 12.7. In Ontario there are 22 occupations with some measure of self-government. Under the profession code in Quebec there are 38 self-governing agencies. Secondly, we live in an age of consumerism, and when we as consumers look at all these people who have all these little organizations to look after themselves — we're the people who pay for their services. We have no way to turn if we don't like the quality of their services. Quite often it's an essential service, and we have no one else to turn to. We live in a democratic age, and in this Legislature we should be concerned about any powers we give to any people to run their own profession.

Another reason I cannot support this is that young people today see the high incomes of professions, and once again they're concerned about the lack of opportunity of entrance to universities, to participate in this obvious improvement in the economic status of professions. The public is aware of the high incomes, and the old law of supply and demand does not seem to apply to these people, whereas it does to the rest of us.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the public has to pay for the educational facilities. We already have a high bill for medicine: we pay a lot for legal aid. I wonder if we now want to increase this bill on the public purse.

MR. PAHL: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member for Edmonton Whitemud is to be commended for bringing forth this motion, which is in fact a complex issue. Listening to the debate thus far is perhaps a question of confidence rather than fact. However, I must also add that in amending his motion the hon. member has to a large extent deflected my contribution to the debate. But he's going to get it anyway.

The possibility of just how you get into the business executive profession is an interesting one. Self-regulation, training, and experience in themselves won't buy it. Of course once a person gets into the category of business executive, particularly if he owns his own business, how are you going to make him become a professional? What I think we're really talking about here, Mr. Speaker, is perhaps a government-nurtured technocracy.

Before going to my main remarks. I would add, as

others have, that I hope this is not an implied slander or slur at the producers or the doers of this society. With respect, it is the private sector producer, not the professional service sector, that makes it happen in this society. The suggestion and implication that the business sector has done all that badly in North America is certainly refuted by the material well-being and quality of life we enjoy. I would also submit that the public-spirited nature of our many, many businessmen and their achievements over the 75 years of our province supports that as well, and I would include farmers in the category of businessmen.

Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the motion proposed by the hon. Member for Edmonton Whitemud regarding the establishment of what I will call a managerial profession with self-regulating powers, my approach will be first to test it against my own conservative bias, that governments first and foremost have a role in regulating and arbitrating among competing self-interest groups; secondly, to stimulate where necessary and appropriate; and thirdly, where unavoidable, to operate. I'm sure the hon. Member for Edmonton Whitemud will be pleased to hear that his motion has so far passed my first test.

Mr. Speaker, the next important question is one of need. The question of need is one that this Assembly should ask itself very seriously before any legislation is passed, because when it comes to laws more is not necessarily better. The good Lord started us out with 10 laws for all of mankind; immediately behind me there are six volumes, or nearly 400 chapters, of the statutes of Alberta. I think that might be termed questionable progress. Moving from the Ten Commandments, the first law regulating commerce that comes to mind is from ancient Rome. The history lesson won't be quite that long; that law was *caveat emptor*, let the buyer beware. Surprisingly enough, that laissez-faire approach to the market place — which was simply that, a market place where the seller, who was usually also the producer, had a direct, face-to-face communication with the buyer, who was also the consumer of the product. This market place contact worked very well for a long, long time.

Mr. Speaker, the age of mass production of products and mass marketing through distant and impersonal channels of marketing and distribution led to the impracticability of *caveat emptor*. The first response was government regulation, and it's interesting to note that that was largely brought on in the meat packing business at the turn of the century through an expose by a chap by the name of Upton Sinclair. In this case of, in effect, consumer abuse from mass-produced products, the first response was government regulation, which has become more sophisticated, responsive and, I guess to some, burdensome, a result in part of the consumerism movement. By and large the result is that when you buy a can of Canada fancy grade government-inspected peas you know what you're getting. By implication, if we take Motion 209 to its logical conclusion, we as a society will be assured of government-mandated, self-regulated, guaranteed ethical, management professionals, consistent in quality from mould to mould. We can then be happily assured of having the same high quality consistent with the standard of managerial decision-making we currently enjoy within our medical, legal, engineering, architectural, and accounting professions.

Knowing that they're both members of the legal profession, I also commend my hon. colleagues, the Member for Edmonton Whitemud and the Member for Calgary Forest Lawn, for putting aside all self-interest in propos-

ing this motion. For once managers become professionals, all hope of contentious litigation in commerce will go out the window. Mr. Speaker, perhaps even more laudable is the state of redundancy that such a coterie of management professionals will place upon this Assembly. I'm sure we can all appreciate the need that could be filled within the ranks of our public service by a group of men and women — I quote from the motion — self-regulated by their "own standards of ethics and conduct", for the need for ministers of the Crown would surely disappear, because management professionals with the prescribed mix of education and experience will have no problem whatever coming up with government policies. The next step of course: the Legislature would surely disappear, because management professionals with ethics, education, and practical experience going for them would have no trouble at all in fitting existing statutes to any regulations they may deem necessary; hence, the need for lawmakers disappears.

Mr. Speaker, I'm not without bias on this latter point, notwithstanding the fact that I am a registered member of the association of professional economists of British Columbia. The message . . . [interjection] What I'm saying is that I'm out of my depth. The message that I would repeatedly and respectfully like the Assembly to bear in mind when considering the modest proposal that I think is almost hidden within Motion 209 is that professionals, once their own self-interest is at stake, cannot always be counted on to be fully professional.

Thank you.

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the opportunity to participate in this motion today, in particular when I read that the purpose in submitting the motion for debate was to facilitate discussion. There certainly has been discussion today.

The integrity of businessmen and industrial leaders has always been challenged by consumers, the media, environmentalists, and politicians. The result has been an increasing pressure on politicians to pass regulations and controls over businesses, and an increasing demand by the public for governments to become further involved in the private sector.

I had a little difficulty with this motion using the word "entrepreneurial", because a rancher told me once that those fellows use words like marmalade and they don't even know what jam is.

Businessmen and industrial leaders in private industry have built a strong economy. We have to thank them for their ingenuity and taking the risks to go out and do things. Governments haven't created anything. We really don't produce anything; it's business that does that. They provide the funds we have for the good life.

However, I do support the motion. But I'd hate to see the government put controls on all professions. I'm against government intervention, but I guess there are times when intervention must take place. Where risk to the consumer is very high, I think that's a judgment call on whether regulations or something should be put in. I think industry at most times takes care of its own. The unscrupulous businessman loses business in a hurry. As the Member for Little Bow said, we can't legislate morals. I'm convinced that self-regulation is what's desirable in the motion we have before us today. I think calling people "professional" doesn't necessarily make them professional or moral. I've been given to understand there are a few professions around that aren't too moral.

AN HON. MEMBER: Is that right?

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: I don't think there's any way to monitor and police regulation, if we put it in. When we don't want government interference, I think the only way we can do it is by self-regulation. By far, it's the cheapest way to control that. We realize there are only a few business leaders who are dishonest and only a few who might be unscrupulous or that you can't trust. However, that's the way it is with all laws we put in. It isn't for the majority; it's for the minority. What kind of legislation or regulation would it take? I think it would take pages and pages of regulation to try to put controls on all businessmen.

The Member for Edmonton Mill Woods brought up the Ten Commandments. I don't know. The Ten Commandments are very short and all-encompassing, and I don't think Moses was a lawyer — at least not a real lawyer.

AN HON. MEMBER: That's why we understand them.

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Or else it wouldn't have been that way; it would have been a lot longer.

On efficiency: I don't think governments should ever become too efficient. The other day I noted that you don't find the word "efficiency" anywhere in the constitution of the United States. But you can read Marx, Engels, Stalin, and all that and you won't find the word "love" either. I don't know if you can match the two. But I'd hate to see us become so efficient that private enterprise principles that built this country into what it is today are lost.

I would support a systematic approach of standards for professions and occupations. As I've stated, the primary reason for such standards and regulations would be to protect the public against incompetence and fraud or something that would endanger life, health, welfare, or the safety of the citizens' property. Self-government or self-regulation is a privilege to be given to the professions. The Legislature should do it only when it's clear that the public can be best served by delegating this authority.

Thank you.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, it gives me pleasure for a few moments at least to make some comments about this particular motion. As usual, my colleagues to the side are being very helpful. I don't think I'd better reiterate their comments.

In reading the motion, without first having discussed it with the hon. member who proposed it, I thought to myself: why would we need such a profession? Would it be mainly to give the public some confidence in business? And is this the route to go to give that confidence? It seems to me that the motion has been addressed today in a very broad-ranging way.

If I reflect briefly on some of the comments of the hon. Member for Little Bow, he talked about the freedom of association. He talked about the people who came to this country, the ideals they had, how and possibly why they went into business. It occurs to me that our society obviously has changed a lot since that time. One of the problems we have — if indeed it is a problem — is that the people in the large corporate bodies who now run big business have become nameless and faceless. Possibly behind that mask that's developed, through no particular fault of anybody, you become immune to the feeling of responsibility that you should have in making decisions.

And because so many people are a part of that decision-making process, no one person really takes on the responsibility for having made that decision.

It occurs to me that the idea is good. I have no idea how it could be made fact, unless we had, as we have in many areas of our life right now, a free association of people who offer to the public some sort of promise whereby they accept responsibility for a certain standard and are willing to put their money where their mouth is, so to speak. I wonder if we couldn't have a dry run in that line. The fact that the hon. member has raised this today, Mr. Speaker, might give somebody out there the idea that maybe they could form a free association and give to the public a feeling of responsibility that business would have in dealing with the public.

In getting back to the attitude in society nowadays, as I would perceive it at least, I think we have an attitude that what is legal is moral. That creates a lot of problems. I'm not sure again — a lot of ideas have been tossed out today — how we get around that, except that government's certainly been put in a position where, in order to balance what big business does, we seem to be making rules and regulations, hopefully to protect the public. I think it's pretty obvious; the hon. Member for Edmonton Mill Woods alluded to all the volumes behind him. I'm not sure whether they'll eventually go right around this House, and whether that's desirable. I think it's not desirable.

What we need is the public business, all of us, to take some responsibility for our actions in a way that doesn't become a government regulation; it doesn't become necessary that we should continue our attitude that government should regulate every bit of our lives. It also occurs to me that in taking this responsibility and this attitude, if we could do this turnaround we wouldn't really feel, as so many of our young people do now — at least I believe they do — that if the government hasn't said it's okay or it's not okay, that legitimizes it. In other words, if there isn't a law against it, it must be all right.

So I think I would be against initially enshrining any kind of profession of this nature. But I certainly would be very interested in the public, possibly through the inspiration of our own members who would be in favor of something like this, hopefully grabbing hold of this idea, maybe even going to our postsecondary educational institutions with it and offering some courses, some ideas that could be put into courses — that if people had taken them would give them an extra shot in the arm when it came to dealing with and offering their services to the public, and maybe being recognized as some very special people who have put themselves on the line in terms of offering superior services to the public.

I think that's all I have to offer today, Mr. Speaker.

MRS. CHICHAK: Mr. Speaker, it certainly gives me pleasure to participate in the debate on the motion this afternoon. I have only one regret, and that is that I missed the opportunity, unavoidably, to hear all the speakers who participated in the debate. I'm sure they had a good deal of thought and consideration to offer, which might go into directing our minds and perhaps that group in the public that primarily might become what we identify as the business executive professional.

I did have the opportunity to hear at least the opening remarks of the hon. mover of the motion, the hon. Member for Edmonton Whitemud. I recognize that he has raised some very cogent thoughts and suggestions or views that would perhaps be an extensive part of the

considerations of forming an organization which might be recognized as a professional group.

When we speak of a professional group, we ought always to ask the question: what is a profession? I do not think I could stand in my place here and propose to the hon. members with clarity and uniqueness any one interpretation or definition of what a profession is. Indeed the recognition, understanding, and thought may be different from whatever perspective one views and attempts to have an understanding or definition of a profession. But let me say that from time to time different suggestions, points, or elements are proposed for consideration of what might be a profession.

There is that school of thought that might describe a profession as an esoteric body of knowledge which provides the basis for a particular expertise: a professional occupation of a group which is enabled to perform certain skills after having achieved or developed a highly complicated, sophisticated knowledge that is mastered by one who then offers to provide a special skill or service, the activities of whom cannot be carried out without such a specific attainment or achievement of knowledge, skill, and education; the recognition on the part of the broader community of approval of such an authority; and the acceptance or need for and the effective practice of a code of ethics, a standard that is not normally considered or applied by those outside this unique group. Further, a profession might be described or recognized by some as an organization which represents an occupational group as a whole which has aspired to come together in recognition of a standard of service, and a particular ethic that would determine the actions of those who are a part of the larger membership of that particular group.

Those are some of the arguments or debate that may be presented with respect to recognition of a profession. That by no means lends itself to certifying that a group that meets in its aspirations and in developing its goals in its practice necessarily then may call itself or be recognized as a profession.

I think that from its early times history has suggested or recorded that before a professional group has been recognized or might be given consideration by the larger public — in fact given a registered status, so to speak — it had first of all certain functions to perform. To begin with, those functions, by necessity, had to be that a development and a recognition of a basic standard of quality had to be set in format, practiced, and achieved. A certain code of conduct was established and developed: the recognition to adhere to levels of standard beyond that of the normal citizen with respect to his brother or sister in the larger society, and the recognition of having put in place, by expertise or type of service, a body that without all this knowledge and achievement, without all the practice and recognition and adhering to by the group, could not fairly provide a service without the higher level and larger control — primarily self-control by the particular interest group being provided the kinds of privileges that can only be set by legislation.

Although the need is there to set in motion a standard of organization and training in competence, a code of conduct and practice, it seems to me that it must surely come not by first setting the ground rules and the standards in a piece of legislation and then directing that particular group of service to adhere to them. I think it is necessary to go about it in the other way, from the point of view of the business executives, if this is in fact the group we are aspiring to give some recognition to. It is a commendable motion with respect to the need to recog-

nize certain standards and an overall development program for this expertise in the area of the business executive.

I would like to just briefly say today that perhaps the recognition or placement of the desire of such a group to be established, to receive recognition, needs first to organize itself, to join together, to set the basis, the groundwork, then to show the need and the aspiration. A need can only be filled by providing such other directives and standards by legislation, in order to give not only service to the membership participating in the group but the protection intended for the public at large and the business community, or the community that such membership and recognition would hold.

Mr. Speaker, because I did not have the opportunity to hear remarks of other hon. members this afternoon, I don't think I want to repeat many of the comments that have been made. I just wished to put this aspect of my contribution to this motion.

Thank you very much for the opportunity.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, in rising to participate for the few moments left in the afternoon, I would like to compliment the Member for Edmonton Whitemud for the motion before the Assembly today, and all the members who have participated in the debate, for some very thoughtful remarks.

Since I have a particular responsibility for dealing with the subject of professions and occupations as outlined in the government policy on professions and occupations, I think it is useful that I add a word or two to what has already been said.

First of all, may I say, Mr. Speaker, that just the use of the word "professional" — and I think that was touched upon quite recently by the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood — is indeed a matter which could be debated at length. It seems to me that it is a word that has come under some suspicion in the minds of many people in society today, as a result of a proliferation of the use of the word. At one time I think there were five learned professions recognized, and some others. [interjections] Amongst the learned professions, of course, certainly was and is the law. Then there were the professions of medicine, divinity, philosophy . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: Politics. [laughter]

MR. HORSMAN: I don't think I can include accounting in that category, because it is a relatively recent phenomenon. However, since I've mentioned accounting, I think it would be useful to point out that indeed there is one of the very real difficulties of determining professional status. It is quite clear that in our own province and Legislature we have two acts which incorporate accounting bodies. There is, of course, the Institute of Chartered Accountants and the Society of Management Accountants. We recognize them as professions. But it is also equally true — and this is one of the very real dilemmas facing us as legislators, facing the public — that though the Institute of Chartered Accountants has established an extremely lengthy, involved, and highly skilled training system for its members, at the same time anyone can go out and hang up a sign which says "accountant". I think it is fair to say that the public can be misled by the fact that that sign is there when there is no real back-up in terms of education, training, experience, qualification, and self-regulation on the part of the profession. Certainly that is one of the very real dilemmas facing all of us in

our Legislature and in society.

I just point that out, Mr. Speaker, as we try to wrestle with the policy governing future legislation for the professions and occupations. Just a word of history on this. The hon. Member for Clover Bar will recall that while he was a member of the previous government, a move was made to start a comprehensive study in this province of the professions. When the government changed in 1971, the effort was renewed, and a select committee of the Legislature was established under the chairmanship of the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood. That committee met extensively, held hearings, and heard representations from groups which are well established as professions, groups which had aspirations to become professions, and groups which must rightly be considered as occupational groups. Following that — and I had some participation with the special committee under the chairmanship of my predecessor, the hon. Dr. Hohol — this paper, A Policy Governing Future Legislation for the Professions and Occupations, was put before this Assembly as official government policy.

We then proceeded to draft legislation based upon this policy. One of those professions waiting patiently for a revisal or changes to their existing legislation was certainly the well-recognized profession of architecture. All hon. members are aware of what took place once that Act was put before this Assembly. Despite the best efforts on the part of my colleague the hon. Minister of Housing and Public Works and others, it was not possible to bring the architects together with the professional engineers so that the legislation could be clearly defined and worded. We did not proceed with those bills. Now we are revising those bills to take into consideration additional representations that have been made to government by both professions. In addition, I think it's fair to say that all hon. members are aware that we are prepared to look again, and are looking again, at this whole policy paper.

I say this, Mr. Speaker, to underline the very real difficulties that exist on the part of those of us in government to come to grips with the question of defining a profession, and then legislating that profession. One of the things a profession does, Mr. Speaker, is exclude other people from its membership. Because of that, I think it would be very difficult indeed to be able to properly define the profession. Certainly the entrepreneurial profession that had been originally proposed in the Motion would have been almost impossible, if not impossible, to define. I would suggest that I must add the same caution and qualification to the profession proposed in the motion after the amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on at some further length on that subject. I thank the hon. member for having put the subject of professions and occupations before the Assembly in a meaningful way. By encouraging the debate that has occurred, I hope all hon. members will have a better understanding of the very real concerns we in government must have in dealing with the professions and occupations in this province.

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

MR. SPEAKER. Does the Assembly agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, this evening the House will sit in Committee of Supply, dealing with the departments of Recreation and Parks, Government Services,

and Tourism and Small Business. I move the House do now adjourn until the Committee of Supply rises and reports progress.

MR. SPEAKER: Having heard the motion by the hon. Deputy Government House Leader, do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

[The House recessed at 5:28 p.m. and the Committee of Supply met at 8 p.m.]

head: GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

head: (Committee of Supply)

[Mr. Appleby in the Chair]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Will the Committee of Supply please come to order. We will continue consideration of the '80-81 estimates.

Department of Recreation and Parks

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does the hon. minister wish to make any remarks?

MR. TRYNCHY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I do wish to make a few brief remarks. This past year has been interesting and challenging. First of all, I want to say that we work with a positive department. All we do is try to provide people programs. We want to make people aware that programs are available, and that we're willing to share our desire along with their initiation.

Before we move on, Mr. Chairman, I want to express appreciation and thanks to my department for working closely with me. We've come a long way together the last year. Possibly we had some apprehension when I moved into the department, but we worked that all out. It has worked really well.

In explaining some of our culture programs, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to go through the multicultural recreation facilities development program; a 10-year program initiated in 1975, \$100 per capita, which provided some \$200 million. The first year, we had 88 projects approved; the second year, 98 programs; the third year, 252 programs or projects; the fourth year, 243; and last year we had 358 projects approved, for a total of 1,039 projects at year five for a total cost of \$91.7 million. So we're not yet at the halfway mark in funding, but we are as far as the term of the project. The funding has covered a number of areas. The smallest one is \$350 to the town of Provost for a master plan. The largest is for a village square complex in Calgary McCall for \$3.7 million. So there's quite a variation.

The next program I'd like to touch on is [Project] Co-operation. That provides \$3.1 million a year, and we receive approximately 1,300 applications. That provides basic assistance of \$500 per municipality, and 50 cents of non-matching grants, 50 cents of matching grants, and one or two of the last programs at 65 cents matching. I think the one we're probably concerned with more than the others is program assistance. That's your operational grants. They're based on \$1 per capita for the first 20,000 people, and 20 cents thereafter.

Mr. Chairman, we have in Recreation an athlete assistance program. This year we're providing some 560 Alberta athletes with \$330 per year, which represents \$185,000. The goal of this program is to try to achieve at least 10 per cent of our athletes to be carded athletes, to qualify for Olympics and other games. Currently, we are producing anywhere from 20 to 25 athletes. We'd like to raise that goal to 10 per cent, which would give us around 60.

The other program I want to touch on briefly is our associations. We fund some 100 sport associations. We provide funds to a maximum of \$30,000, of which \$5,000 is for administration; \$20,000 is for programming, which has to be matched; and \$5,000 is for leadership. The total budget is approximately \$1,245,000. These associations range anywhere from the \$30,000 for the Alberta Soccer Association to the smallest one, \$2,000 for the Federation of Silent Sports.

A first in Canada this year, is our senior citizens' games at Camrose. We will be providing funds through the Alberta Games Council. The games will be held in Camrose on August 21, 22, and 23. There'll be some 17 sports. We expect anywhere from 800 to 900 participants, and we expect that some 30,000, or better, senior citizens will be competing in playoffs and competitions at the local level before going to Camrose. I passed out brochures on the Camrose games to each member. I'm sure you'll find them very interesting.

Moving over to Parks, Mr. Chairman, I want to say that we intend to open the Strathcona Science Park sometime this summer. It should be completed by the end of June, and of course we're looking forward to that date. Dinosaur Park, which was nominated and chosen as a world heritage site last year, will be opened and unveiled sometime this summer, with the federal government and a number of dignitaries present. This year we are initiating one new provincial park, and are planning for two others. Carson-Pegasus will be the new park developed. Whitney-Ross-Laurier will have some planning funds, and so will Buck Lake.

Again we are initiating Veto Vandalism and Park Watch through some of our provincial parks. In meeting with the RCMP some months ago, I expressed my appreciation to them for the work they have done in co-operation with our people throughout the parks. We will be passing out to each visitor to the parks a yellow brochure outlining the number they can phone — not giving their name — to assist us in trying to keep the park system under good watch and good care.

Mr. Chairman, I outlined briefly some of the things we're doing; there are many more. I'd now like to leave it up to you and take questions.

Thank you.

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Firstly, I'd like to commend the minister for his very helpful elaboration on the types of programming being handled through his department. I think it's certainly a fair comment, that would be shared by all colleagues, that the work his department is doing is of extreme importance in terms of the province as a whole, and is certainly most appreciated by the citizenry and by individual members representing various constituencies throughout the province.

I'd like to direct a couple of comments to the minister through you, Mr. Chairman, to do specifically with the major cultural recreational grant program. I think it is clear that this program has been very widely accepted and well received throughout the province from its time of

inception in 1975. As the minister may recall from a few questions addressed to him earlier this spring sitting, however, it appears that we're running into some difficulties at this time. These stem largely from two factors: number one, the rapid growth rate that has been experienced throughout the province — in particular, to this member's knowledge, in the city of Calgary, as well as other centres throughout the province; and number two, the rather ravaging effects inflation has had on the value of the program.

The fact is that back in 1977 and 1978, there were appeals from certain municipalities in the province for an increased per capita grant, given the fact that the dollars which had been sufficient in 1975 had been diminished in their total value because of inflation and because of an accelerated population growth throughout the province. That appeal, to this member's knowledge, was not met at that time. The fact is that now, in 1980, we find ourselves in an even more difficult position where, in the city of Calgary in particular, requests in the total amount of approximately \$1.8 million had to be turned away by the city of Calgary because its allotment of funds, approximately \$5.4 million, simply didn't allow for these projects, which otherwise would have been approved as falling within the guidelines established for projects of this nature. The funds simply weren't available.

I would appreciate hearing from the minister with respect to his plans to ensure that in this period of rapid growth in the province of Alberta, support will be made available in those regions where additional support is required, so we do not see any holdback in the establishment of needed community recreational facilities. In particular, Mr. Chairman, this member is thinking not only of perhaps making more funds available on an annual basis — in other words, in this instance making more than the \$10 per capita allowance available, and drawing out of the total fund that has been established — but rather the minister giving an assurance to the Assembly that if in fact more funds are required for worth-while projects through to and including the conclusion of the program in 1984, those dollars will be available.

I would also appreciate the minister's comments with respect to the intention of the government to continue this important program beyond 1984, which is the expiration of the 10-year term of the program. I look forward to the minister's comments in that regard, and would simply close by again affirming my very strong support for the program, and my sincere hope that it will not be diminished in value throughout the next number of years.

MR. GOGO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to make some observations to the minister and also ask a couple of questions. First of all, with many other members of the Assembly, I have been very impressed with the enthusiasm of the Minister of Recreation and Parks in his approach to his new portfolio. I have found him particularly helpful in dealing with matters that relate to the constituency of Lethbridge West, and Lethbridge generally. Certainly Project Co-operation has been, I think, an extremely successful program, where all the big, populated centres did not end up with all the money. I think it was a well-designed program where every municipality got the minimum \$500.

With regard to the assistance to athletes, the minister mentioned that our goal would be perhaps about 10 per cent of the 560 athletes who now qualify for Olympic assistance. I understand the expenditure is about \$185,000. I've always been intrigued about where the

proceeds from lotteries went. I understood that a great percentage of the lotteries, at least the propaganda we watch on our television and are persuaded to buy these worthless tickets — the proceeds go to help amateur sport. As I recall, just a year ago, of \$230 million from Loto Canada, about \$3.5 million reached the athletes. So I'd be interested if the minister could comment, recognizing that perhaps it's not within his portfolio, but it does deal with athletic assistance. I think we in Alberta, recognizing the tremendous amount of time and effort spent by all ages in athletic events, should try where possible to assist these athletes.

Certainly the news that the first senior citizens' games are going to Camrose is pleasant, although not surprising. Those members of the Assembly who have been here for five years know we always start new programs with Camrose. I think that says a tremendous amount for the Member for Camrose. It doesn't indicate they have the highest percentage of senior citizens, but they can sure attract them. I congratulate the member for convincing the minister that that's where they should go.

Mr. Chairman, an event is held each year in southern California that, when we look at the consumption of alcohol in Alberta, we should consider here; that is, the alcoholic games. It's particularly invigorating to see some of these people who have suffered through alcoholism and recovered. Each year they have an Olympic event of their own, and I think it's something the government, through the minister's department, could perhaps encourage, and encourage other parts of government to participate in.

Mr. Chairman, a question with regard to the parks in Alberta. As we all know, Capital City Park and Fish Creek Park have been tremendously successful in the implementation of a provincial policy within municipal boundaries. I would like the minister to comment about what he sees ahead in terms of assistance to the other nine cities with regard to funding for municipal parks within their boundaries.

I believe the government recently announced an increase in user fees in our provincial parks system. No doubt it was due; we have to protect the private sector, I guess, and keep things up so that people don't go broke. The only way to do that is to make our parks expensive enough that no one will go to them, and they go to the private sector. Mr. Chairman, I would be interested if the minister would comment on whether senior citizens can still enter these parks and stay free of charge. I understand we had a policy in that regard at one time.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I notice that in other jurisdictions, particularly Manitoba, they have a system with their provincial parks whereby they lease out lots. When we look at the trend of increased energy costs — I hope the Stamp Around Alberta campaign doesn't falter — many young families won't be able to continue travelling the way they have in the past. I would think that in those provincial parks we have, consideration could be given to some lease arrangement whereby people could lease a pad for a nominal fee of \$100 or \$50 a year. We might even see our way clear to putting asphalt pads on there. These young families could go within 50, 25, or 100 miles of their homes in the summer and park a trailer or tent for a two- or three-week holiday, but they could actually lease a piece of land. I think it's an area that looks encouraging to me, on the surface anyway.

Let me conclude, Mr. Chairman, by saying again how impressed I am at the enthusiasm with which the minister has entered his portfolio, and his helpfulness, which has

helped the Member for Lethbridge West.

Thanks very much.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make remarks to the minister on two subjects. The first one is the Southern Alberta Games, or games that are held regionally across the province. I think they culminate in the Alberta Summer Games, or also the Winter Games, but I'd like to comment more on the, Southern Alberta Games or Summer Games. The participation in those games over the last five or six years — I've been directly involved, and also actively observing what's going on — has been very, very high. We have had a good cross section of people through southern Alberta, involved in the slow pitch, the track and field and other events — good participation. First of all, I'd like to give credit to two people who have added a lot to that dimension and made it so successful in southern Alberta: Max Gibb and Morley Roloff. Morley was a former employee of the department, and did an excellent job working with major facility grants in southern Alberta. I have to say that many of our communities wouldn't have gotten through some of the difficulties if we hadn't had his personal touch to many of the programs.

I'd like to impress on the minister that the type of recreation occurring because of those games is involving people who normally are not involved in heavy, competitive types of sporting activities. They are not involved in demonstrating excellence in athletic abilities. They are average people who are able to get out and have some fun for a few days, and practice and play together. I think it embodies the real feeling and concept of recreation as I see it. I think one of the reasons we build major facilities across the province is to get this broad base of people involved.

In the minister's remarks, he indicated that the whole purpose of the department is, first, to support and fund these local communities and districts. I hope the minister takes that objective as a very sincere one, because that objective will bring about a lot of recreation participation across this province. If the department — and I read into the estimates here, in some of the descriptions — feels it must have control and supervision and too close contact with many of these communities, and have to decide and determine a lot of athletic activities, that will stifle recreation development in this province. I think that would be the wrong objective. So I hope the minister, in his responsibility, continually monitors the fact that the department gives supportive help, financial help, but doesn't stay in the role of being directive in any way in these communities.

I have had very brief discussions with these two gentlemen, and the feeling I got is that the department's willing to support them, but these games are pretty well on their own. That's good. But I'd certainly urge the minister, if more financial help is required by these organizations, that it be made available. Because it is one of the best ways I see of creating involvement in communities across the province at the present time. I really support what is happening there, and I hope they evolve into other areas across the province.

The second thing I want to comment on is with regard to the minister's announcement a couple of years back about recreation areas. The concept of having a park that doesn't have all the facilities, but may have a caretaker — as I remember those remarks, I said a fellow with maybe a half-ton truck, a few shovels, a few other tools, maybe a small tractor, minimal things, who is able to help people

enjoy the natural state of areas in various parts of the province. We can put many of these areas together on a low-cost budget, have a place for people to go and be out of the city, and be together with their family and enjoy the countryside of Alberta. I know the minister knows of one area at least that I have been pressing to come under this program, and that is the area at Milo on McGregor Lake. Hopefully, that can eventually evolve to a more sophisticated type of park later on, but we're satisfied with starting at that point.

There are other areas around the province that are the very same way. People that come out to the country. We have a little park in my community. People drive from Calgary, Lethbridge, Medicine Hat, and down in the States just to spend a week at this little park that has a few trees and a few facilities. It isn't costing us anything locally; it isn't costing those people anything to stay there. It's out on the prairie, and they enjoy the facility. I think we've got to look at recreational areas that have minimal supervision and equipment. I certainly hope the minister is pursuing that idea, and not letting, if I can say, departmental officials or people that like to sophisticate things, misdirect his good intentions that were earlier expressed in this Assembly.

MR. OMAN: Mr. Chairman, I want to make a couple of comments with regard to the development taking place in Kananaskis Country, west of the city. I think it has great potential, and that it is and will be one of the great drawing cards for all Alberta. I want to commend the minister and his department for the kind of plans they have in that area. Certainly it's not just going to be for Calgary, although Calgary will be adjacent and the people of Calgary will be pleased to get out of the city and enjoy that area, as they already do.

One of the things I would like the minister to comment on is the kinds of developments that have been planned for the area, particularly commercial developments. I've talked previously with the minister on this, and I think we're aware that the city of Calgary is making bids for the winter Olympic Games in '88. Does the minister foresee that it's likely that private industry is going to get in and develop the ski slopes particularly? One of the things that concerns me a little bit about our Canadian scene is that we don't have anything that really compares with sites such as Jackson Hole or Aspen, and so on, which I think are real tourist attractions. I'd like to see perhaps something of a balanced nature in that area, because I think it has great potential for development. I wonder if the minister would like to comment on that. Along with that, I commend the department for what they are doing and the many millions of dollars they are going to be spending in that area.

Just one more question to finish off with very shortly: in the upcoming games against the media, to be held on May 21, I believe, is the minister planning to hit a home run again this year?

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Chairman, I'm very pleased that the minister has announced the planning for Calhoun Bay on Buck Lake. It's been a long time.

I'd like to know if there's an avenue for public participation in the planning. Secondly, with the recreational facility capital financial assistance grants, I understand the matching grants are 50:50 if you have a regional agreement in place. But if you don't, the grants are on a 40:60 basis. This is very, very detrimental to rural areas which are not adjacent to another municipal government

and are unable to have regional agreements.

The last question I'd like to ask: recognizing that small parks near lakes have essentially been created in many cases by local recreation boards, but no longer serve the community at large but the residents of major cities and towns adjacent on weekends, is there any planning to have more additional funding for these recreational parks?

MR. BATIUK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I thought I should participate in these estimates, particularly when I look at the comparisons and see a few minuses in comparison with the previous year. I thought I just had to express my views. Nevertheless, I think that recreation plays a very important part in the lives of all Albertans, and I think we have to show a real concern.

I think back about 15 or so years ago, when there was an administrators' seminar. One gentleman who was addressing us told us that at the turn of the century only 2 per cent of the population will be working. The rest will have to learn how to get by without destroying themselves. I hardly believed that at the time, and I still hardly believe that only 2 per cent of the population will be working. No doubt there may be a low percentage who never work anytime, but I still think they will have to. Nevertheless, it seems that through negotiations and everything, hours of work are becoming shorter and shorter. So there is more time for recreation.

I believe that the rural-to-urban shift in the last 15 to 20 years was not for the fact that the incomes of the people were lower, but that there was less opportunity for recreation. Even at that time, people saw the need for recreation. Their children did not have the opportunities to participate, whether it's fancy skating, tap dancing, or anything else, and the people were going. I think it was an obligation and a commitment of our government to see this trend reversed, and I think it has. And I think recreation did play an important part, particularly when we look at the agricultural arenas that have come in the last number of years. They too have to be financed through the Department of Recreation and Parks, through multipurpose grants.

I personally have spoken to a number of town councils in my constituency, and they have assured me that when these areas of recreation are used, particularly during the winter, vandalism drops almost to nil. Once summer comes, I guess the energy in the young people builds up. They have no place to use it, and that's when vandalism starts again. So maybe we'll have to take a strong look to use these facilities year round.

I think the biggest problem now is the operating costs. Whether you have a swimming pool, an arena, or anything else, in a community with 500 or 1,000 the cost of operating these facilities is the same as in the cities, where there is a population of 50,000 or 500,000. So I think we will have to be looking for more assistance from the Minister of Recreation and Parks for operating expenses in the future.

Also, I hope that as time goes by these application forms become more simplified. Often some of the people who are working, helping, or actually doing work gratis, find it difficult to go about those application forms. I know myself that when you look at some of them, you'd think you need a Philadelphia lawyer to be able to fill them out. I think that will have to be looked at; instead of having dozens of programs, maybe make less of them.

I am indeed glad at the stand the minister is taking on parks. It seems that over a good number of years we were

looking at provincial parks. I have nothing against the provincial parks: I gave my full support to Capital City Park in Edmonton and Fish Creek in Calgary. Half the people of the province live in these two cities. I feel they need some recreation areas. True enough, on Friday evening many people sit in their cars and are out to the rural area. But many people — in particular our senior citizens, the handicapped, and so on — do not have a chance or any way to get out into the rural areas. I think this is an ideal place for those people to spend their weekends, or whatever.

As I mentioned, I was glad the minister has been looking at areas other than provincial parks. I know I have one in my own constituency, Lac Sante, which the local people take a lot of pride in. They've done most of the work, and they just about never receive any grant, very little. When you look at what they've done — they've built a road, they've provided wells and water, and all the other things. But it's hard for a community of a thousand or so to look after a place. Yet every Friday when you come out, the places are packed with people from the cities. So I'm glad the minister is taking a strong look at that, and will probably give bigger support now.

Someone else mentioned providing lots at these parks, which are not provincial parks. I have quite a number of requests. And even though it's probably more in line of the associate minister of energy, I think you'll have to take a strong look at that. Many people don't care for a commercialized park. They'd like to be able to take their family out to a place where there are a few trees, water, and so forth. As I say, Mr. Minister, I'm glad you're taking a look at some of those areas we need very badly. I hope that in the future there'll be less minuses in the estimates.

Thank you.

MR. KOWALSKI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just a few general comments with respect to my colleague the Minister of Recreation and Parks. In the four, five, or six months I've been fortunate enough to be here, I've found him to be a most approachable gentleman, and certainly one with a lot of empathy for some of the recreational concerns in northwestern Alberta. I have four questions that I'd like to address to him, and I'd like him to comment when it's time for him to do so.

The first deals with the major multicultural recreation facilities grant program. I recognize we are well into the program now, but I have one concern with respect to the percentage component of dollars that have to be spent on cultural facilities and recreation facilities. I understand and appreciate why the formula was set up several years ago, that a certain per cent had to be addressed to each of those components. But over the years a number of communities in rural Alberta have found they've been able to expend their dollars on the recreational side of things, but have not been quite as successful investing their dollar component on the cultural side wisely. I wonder if the minister has given thought himself — and I'm sure he would have to deal with this with other ministers as well — to in fact reducing the cultural side, if requested by a particular municipality or recreation area, and allowing that particular group to increase its recreational side.

The second question I have deals with the relationship and interrelationship his department would have with Education. Several weeks ago the Minister of Education presented us with some information on the community school concept. I think that's a very positive one, consid-

ering the very significant dollar infrastructure we have in educational facilities in the province, and further considering that for at least three months of each year, many of those school buildings are really not opened and used by the public, those times of course being Christmas, Easter, and surely the summer period. It appears to me that in some communities there may very well be a duplication of buildings and facilities. If at all possible, if we can continue to use our schools to the maximum days available during the year, and certainly as many evenings per week, and weekends, for public use from a recreational point of view, it would be a great advantage to us when it comes to fiscal responsibility. So my question in that area really is the co-ordination with his colleague the Minister of Education.

Just an extension of that basic question. We have, of course, hundreds of thousands of high school students and junior high school students in this province. The sport side of their activity is very important. I personally feel we've got a lot more to do in the province of Alberta in encouraging interscholastic competition and travelling, one school meeting with another school in various parts of the province. I wonder if his department is in fact taking any initiative in increasing interscholastic competitions with respect to our school children and our young people, particularly at the junior high and senior high school levels.

The third area, just briefly, deals with roadside campsites or campsites throughout Alberta. It's my understanding that three different departments administer campsites; one of course being Alberta Transportation, the second being the minister's department, and the third being the Department of Energy and Natural Resources. I understand there has been some discussion that perhaps one department should take over the supervision and administration of these various campsites throughout the province. From a personal point of view, I encourage the minister to pursue that particular objective. There was a time when at least one department I have some familiarity with — that being Transportation — had upward of 240-odd campsites around the province. Two other departments also had campsites. My simple comment to the minister on that is: perhaps it is time to have one department co-ordinate the activities on behalf of all three.

The last item deals with a park, announced in the throne speech a month or so ago, that is known as Carson-Pegasus Lakes provincial park. Interestingly enough, the throne speech indicated that the park was to be located north of Whitecourt. Of course it's on the boundary between the minister's constituency and mine. I would have preferred seeing the statement read "south of Swan Hills", rather than "north of Whitecourt". Be that as it may, I'd simply like the minister to comment on the status of that particular park, with respect to what will be initiated and developed this year. What will be the timing for the conclusion and the opening of that particular provincial park?

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate the opportunity to speak tonight. I'm very pleased with the response the minister has given to me in the concerns raised relative to parks in the Macleod constituency.

I'd like to say one thing about Willow Creek Provincial Park at Stavely. It is a very important park for the area, considering there isn't another park for quite some dis-

tance. It has fallen into some disrepair over the last couple of years, and concerns are being raised in that area. I'm sure the minister will be responsive to those requests also.

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask the minister about the concept he had about miniparks. What happened to that concept? I thought it was one of the finest ideas ever brought up relative to parks, and it's very important in many areas of the province. The Member for Little Bow alluded to that in his remarks. It's particularly important in the area the Member for Little Bow and I represent, because miniparks would really get used by people in those areas.

Also, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to have the minister respond to what can be done with the municipal parks in our areas right now. With a little bit of help, those municipal parks could be turned into a kind of maxi-minipark, if you'll excuse the pun.

Thank you very much.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Chairman, I was quite interested to hear Max Gibb's name brought up tonight. I've known Max Gibb for over 22 years. I've run into him many times through my participation in competitive sports in the province. I've never met anyone who is more eager, enthusiastic, or effective in organizing amateur sport in the province. I consider Mr. Gibb one of the finest resource assets that amateur sport enthusiasts have in Alberta. The last time I spoke to him, he asked me how I was doing in the Legislature, and asked me to pass his greetings on to the hon. Member for Edmonton Mill Woods, who he competed against many times in the Golden Gloves boxing championships for Alberta. He often reminds me of how he whumped him all the time. So I'll pass that on.

Mr. Chairman, to the minister. I have in front of me a copy of a report called Sport in Alberta. It's the final report of the *ad hoc* committee on sport co-ordination in Alberta. It is in part sponsored and supported by the Alberta Recreation and Parks Department. It was published in April 1980. Some of the major recommendations of the study are: that a single agency should be established to co-ordinate and to act as a common voice for sport at the provincial level; that it should be structured as a Crown corporation; and that once such a Crown corporation is set up, Sport Alberta and the Alberta Games Council should be dissolved.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we could have the hon. minister make some comments with regard to this report, and perhaps elaborate in a brief way on his department's position with regard to the report.

MR. MACK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to make one or two observations reflecting my appreciation of the Department of Recreation and Parks, and more particularly the hon. minister and his staff.

I view that particular aspect and the effects it has or could have on our life styles, as one single department that can and must and, in many respects, is today having a profound effect on the life styles of our various communities, particularly our urban centres, where we have a large concentration of Albertans. I look at my own constituency of Edmonton Belmont and those areas which are expanding and growing, and new citizens coming in, and how important it is to have a department that is responsive to the needs of the communities, that themselves would have extreme difficulty marshalling enough funds to build viable recreational centres to pro-

vide those kinds of activities within those communities. I know for a fact that this department has done that very thing, assisting, through the minister's office and staff, and making it possible for communities in brand-new areas to establish facilities that young people can use.

But more importantly, I believe it mobilizes and motivates parents, and they become involved with their children. I think that's extremely important. Quite often that prerequisite is lost because of the lack of a facility to participate with children. Instead of sending them out with somebody in an automobile, more and more, particularly in Edmonton Belmont, I find our communities are working as teams: parents getting to know their children, and children appreciating their parents. They see parents in a much different perspective than as someone who continually makes rules and enforces the house rules on the children. I think that's important. It's certainly been my experience, as we visit the various communities in the constituency, that it is important to have that kind of sensitivity, but more important to provide and make those communities viable and give them an opportunity to grow.

Certainly the Department of Recreation and Parks has provided and discharged those responsibilities in a way that it has assisted the communities to take advantage of those dimensions that I think are so often lost. Not only do they have a profound effect on the family unit when they are lost, but I think the community, and ultimately all of us, society, is poorer. I think it's in these communities, Mr. Chairman, that the strength and fibre of our communities are built. I think it's important that we emphasize that. Often we think of parks as something for people to vandalize. I don't view it in that light. I believe that for one vandal there are hundreds of young people who benefit. Not only that, but they take pride in their community, because they must physically work in that community to build the recreation centres. They take pride because they assist in painting, cutting the grass, mowing the lawns, and that causes them to feel they are part-owners of those communities as they grow within those communities. I personally am just delighted.

I would look to the plans for the future of the minister and his department. I encourage the department to pursue vigorously on an ongoing basis and place a very high priority on these areas, because I believe they build the kind of society, and the kind of people within a society who leave a very strong heritage and a very strong community. They bring families together in a sense of strength, as opposed to a sense of tearing apart.

In that regard, Mr. Chairman, with these few words I certainly echo to the minister and his staff my support for the fine work they've been doing. We look forward to a very much expanded program in these areas.

Thank you.

MR. BORSTAD: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few comments on this vote. Grande Prairie just held a very successful Winter Games at the end of February. There were 2,300 participants who participated for three days, along with 3,000 volunteers from the community, who really went all out to put on some of the best Winter Games the province will see. I have to thank the minister for his total support, and Max Gibb, who really helped us pull off that event. He's a tremendous person and assisted us greatly. He was in Grande Prairie two weeks ago to hand out some honors to the volunteers who helped and worked in those games.

I would ask the minister to look seriously at further

improvements to some of the parks in the north, and development for new campsites to relieve areas that are now very much overpopulated on the weekends. I strongly support the two major parks in Edmonton and Calgary, but I would ask the minister to consider some of the smaller cities in the province.

MR. LITTLE: Mr. Chairman, a very brief question to the minister. A good number of Calgary residents are concerned about the opening of the Kananaskis golf course. Would the minister be prepared to give a progress report to the committee and, if appropriate, an opening date for that golf course?

MR. WOLSTENHOLME: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. When I indicated I wanted to speak, it was my intention to thank the minister profusely. But I'm beginning to wonder if possibly, with all the accolades he's gotten here tonight, he and his staff are liable to get carried away too far. Anyway, I'm going to thank him for coming down to view the Chain Lakes. I know the staff really enjoyed meeting him and were appreciative of the fact that he would take the time to come down.

I have a couple of questions for the minister. Does he have any allocation in the budget, or any ideas about upgrading roads to parks? I understand that at one time a kind of committee was set up to look at that, and I was wondering how that was coming along. Also, does he have any swat with his colleagues to get any more fish in the Chain Lakes?

Thank you.

DR. CARTER: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the minister might offer a few comments with regard to a portion of Kananaskis Country, the forestry site, which is presently used by the environmental research section of the University of Calgary. Has he any update with regard to the possible use of the main log building on the site as a prisoner-of-war museum?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would the hon. minister perhaps care to respond now?

MR. TRYNCHY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. First of all, I'd like to thank all the members for participating, and for their kind words. I appreciate it, and I really don't think they've overdone it. We're just trying to do our job, and if we've helped you, fine; if we haven't, I'm sure I'll hear from you.

The Member for Calgary Forest Lawn asked me a question on funding of MCR. I look at the question he asked me on April 18, when he suggested that approximately \$1.8 million worth of projects had to be turned down. I suggested at the time that I would be talking to Edmonton and Calgary to see if we could come up with a more equitable position. Mr. Chairman, I find we have done that now. Calgary and Edmonton were allowed to receive \$10 per capita over the course of the program. We've changed that so they can receive \$20 per capita in any given year. So they could draw this year's and next year's funding, which would give them \$10 million. So Calgary will now be able to have an extra \$5 million, which would allow them to do the project they wanted to do last year and then some.

I appreciate his concern with the population growth. I'm sure all members are aware that as the population grows, you can update your MCR programs and pick up the funds each year. So if you started off with, say, 1,000

population and you grew to 5,000, you would collect on 5,000 population at the end of the 10-year program. I can't assure the member that we're going to continue the program. It's my hope that we do something better. But that's down the road, and I can't discuss that now.

The Member for Lethbridge West showed his appreciation for Project Co-operation. I think it is a good program. It gives us government funding, and also provides room for the communities to get involved. I think you have to have a cost-sharing program in a number of things. In this way, the communities take a little more pride in what they're doing. I guess I'm from the old school. I've said this before, and I guess it's not unwise to repeat it: when I was a young boy and we wanted to go skating and there was a pond to clean off, we didn't wait for somebody to do it; we did it ourselves. I think we've got to instil in the people's minds that if there's a job to do, let's do it. We want to assist, but I don't think government should be doing it; I think we should help ourselves.

He spoke of athlete assistance. I too have some concerns with that. I'm working on it. Right now we're about sixth in Canada in our funding. I'd like to raise that. There are a number of ways we can do it. We're sixth in funding, but we're number one by far in our assistance to buildings, projects, and programming for coaches and leadership. So we're not that far behind except, if you want to say, in a dollar sense in the assistance we provide.

Loto funds are something we're all concerned about. I have to tell you that in General Revenue is some \$1 million of Loto funds up to this year. In the near future, those funds will be allocated between Recreation and Parks and the Minister responsible for Culture. We don't yet have plans as to how we will distribute the funds, but I can assure members of the House that the funds for Recreation and Parks will be distributed in an equitable way. And we hope to come forward with that shortly.

What bothers me, members and Mr. Chairman, is the commitment we took on when we got Loto Canada. It's disturbing that we were one of the provinces that didn't really want it. We took it with the obligation of \$3.5 million for a coliseum in Edmonton and \$2.2 million for Olds. That means that at the rate we're going, it'll be five years before any Loto funds are available to anybody else. That might cause some concern to some of us.

Alcoholic games: I'm not so sure what they're all about. I've participated in some of those. [laughter] We'll have to have a look at what that's all about and see where they fit in.

The member asked a question on urban parks. I'd like to say at this time that I am looking at some type of program. I hope we might be able to come forward later on. As you know, the last urban parks were a heritage fund project. The heritage fund is up for debate in the fall. We might have something then, and we might not. But I am working on it, and I appreciate your concern for the eight or nine cities in Alberta.

I'd just like to touch on fee increases in parks. We've increased our fees to \$3 for a basic campsite, \$4 for semi-serviced, and \$5 for a campsite that has washrooms and power close by. On checking the records across Canada, that gives us some of the best parks in Canada at the lowest fees. We've also included, for the first time, no charge to Albertans 65 years and over in all our provincial parks.

In some of our parks we have started to pave some of our sites. We'll continue upgrading in a number of ways. The member asked for sites that could be rented out on a

long-term basis. I have some difficulty with that. We now have a 14-day stay at provincial parks. In some cases a person moves out on Wednesday morning because his 14 days are up, drives out of the park, comes back in, and gets another 14 days. I think we have some difficulties in how we can regulate that. I believe parks are for people. I don't think we'd want to get involved in having someone stay for a month or two. It's a thought I'll look at, but I wouldn't want to hold too much encouragement for it.

The Member for Little Bow expressed his concern about the Alberta Games. I want to point out that in 1981, the Summer Games will be held in Lethbridge. In 1982, the Winter Games will be held in Lloydminster. This was the first year we announced that we would let communities band together — four or five smaller communities get together and bid for the games. We hope the communities will become involved. I'm sure when the Leader of the Opposition was in Grande Prairie — and I met some of his people from all the communities there. Four or five communities were anxious to put in a bid. I welcome that, because I think that's what it's all about. Let's not make it so big that nobody can participate. Let's make it small, let's make it attractive, and let's make it fun.

I must say that my association with Max Gibb, along with everybody else who knows him, has been very, very pleasant. He is a man of great talent, great ability, and a real pusher. I wish we had many more Albertans like him, because a lot of things could be done in a great way.

We have now moved with our Alberta Games to provide games for seniors. We've also involved a cultural portion. The member spoke about little or less government involvement. I think that's great, because it's exactly the way I feel. We provide the funds to the Alberta Games Council. I think that's the way it should be. We shouldn't provide funds in such a great quantity that the people themselves don't go to work, because they should.

I just want to touch on Grande Prairie; the Member for Grande Prairie mentioned it. The games there were quite a thrill. We had some 2,300 or 2,500 athletes, but we had 3,000 volunteers. That's something you have to look at: people who want to work come out and do it for the sake of helping their community.

He spoke about recreation areas, and mentioned that I talked about it two years ago. Possibly I did. That was before I was involved as the minister of this department. But last year I brought that forward, and I want to assure the member that we now have over 80 such requests. I'm moving with planning for recreation areas this summer. I hope I can work out an agreement with some communities where we could start construction next year. But we have to remember that what I have in mind is that they'd have to be run by local people. We'll provide some operational funding. It will consist of a boat dock, if there's a water body, picnic tables, shelter, camp stoves, and the like.

I think it's going to be a great program. I'd like to start slowly with 10 or so sites and see how they work out. We're going to try to put them into spots in the province where there is a need for them. We're not going to pick out one spot. If we go with 10, or whatever the figure is, we'll spread them across the province. Then we'll have a variety of places, and we can check back a year from now and see how they are operating.

The Member for Calgary North Hill wanted me to give him a report on Kananaskis Country. I'd just like to say that Kananaskis Country will be debated in the fall. I want to assure members that by this fall I will give a full

report, from the day it started to the fall — the total costs, where we're at, where we're going, how we got there: the whole works. I think it's time we had that on the table, and I plan to do that. I want to assure members that some of the costs have risen, and of course we expect that. But I think the members should be apprized and told where it's at, so there is an understanding that the money is spent, but it's spent wisely.

In regards to commercial developments, we are assessing all developments at Kananaskis Country with a cabinet committee which I chair, the ski hill and all. I'm not privileged to say where we're at now, because we're negotiating in a number of areas. By fall, when we have our report, we should have some of the loose ends tied up and then we should have a pretty full idea of what's going on.

In regards to the MLA games, I hope we will participate come May 21, I think. I'll do my darnedest to be there in full force and do my best.

The Member for Drayton Valley asked about planning for Buck Lake. Yes, we are providing some \$50,000 for the planning of Buck Lake park. A second concern was that the 60:40 grants are somewhat of a burden, and I share that view with the hon. member. I'm asking my committee to look at the grant structure, and we expect to come forward to cabinet with some changes in regulations so it would be on a 50:50 basis, because I think that's the fairest way to go.

Small parks throughout the constituencies: if they are municipal parks and a number of public tourists or travellers through that park, you can apply and we do have a program for \$2,000 per park. I know it's not much, but it's certainly a help. So if you have a park that you believe is more than just a community park, and can show us it is used by the travelling public, send a letter and we'll make sure you get the application form for the \$2,000 or \$1,000, whatever the case may be. If the parks get in such a way that they become larger than that, then we should look at them as a recreation area — not a minipark. I don't use that term; we call them recreation areas. That's the route we should go.

The Member for Vegreville talks about the minuses in my budget. I guess the first one he looked at was the minister's office, at 55.8 per cent. We just run a very efficient ship. That's why it's there. Really, members, the decrease is the \$200,000 we had as a special warrant for the Calgary Olympic Development Association, and that's been taken away. In reality our budget has not gone down. It's gone up somewhat, but not as much as we would hope.

He talked about more leisure time and providing more funding for operation. I'm sure the member is aware — I've had a caucus report done by the Member for Vegreville. I have it now and I'll be reviewing it and taking it back to my colleagues to see if we can increase the funding. But that of course is a budgetary item over the next year.

I expect to have a number of changes done on the regulation forms for MCR programs. I'd like to eliminate all the unnecessary red tape. We want to make them easier to complete, simpler, but still effective, because the funds come from the public purse. I visited Lac Sante in his area, and last year they received their grant of \$2,000. I understand that I just signed a cheque the other day for another \$2,000. So we are trying to do what we can where the public uses the areas the local community is involved in. Of course that's another program or another site we might consider as a recreation area.

The Member for Barrhead expressed his concern about

the multicultural recreation program, in that 30 per cent for culture and 70 per cent for recreation funds was too severe. I've discussed this with the Minister responsible for Culture. I can't give any assurance that we'd change that, though I'd like to say to members of the House that if they have some concerns that the 30 per cent or the 70 per cent is not right, would they get it to us. We'd like to sit down and review that on an individual basis. If there are concerns throughout the constituencies that 30 per cent is too high and the culture people can use the recreation facility, that's fine with us. But we cannot, and I don't think we should, eliminate the cultural portion. But if they can get together and use recreation sites, I see no reason why we can't work out a program where we can share in the 30 and the 70 per cent.

He went on to say we should make better use of our schools and, yes, I agree. With the Minister of Education, I'm one of the members on the committee on the community school program. I've always said there's just no way we should accept community schools that sit idle for, I think, around 55 per cent of the time — that's after hours, holidays, and all that. I think we have to talk to our school boards and teachers, and get them more involved in recreation, because that's part of living. So I feel the same as some members do, that we should make better use of our schools, and hopefully that's the kind of program we will work with.

Interschool sports: we have one program called Discover Alberta, where schools can visit other schools. That's the only program we have, and I hope they make use of that.

He talked about campsites on the roadside. There are three types of campsites: forestry has some 50 campsites throughout the province, Environment has some 20, and highways has some 250. Yes, I'd like to see something done so we could co-ordinate all the campsites. Maybe Recreation and Parks is not the department that should be in charge of parks and campsites. But we should co-ordinate the campsites throughout the province.

There is some difficulty. I know of one forestry campsite that's 40 or 50 miles away from the closest settlement. To have a person there would be quite costly. So in some areas we might have to work out an agreement where forestry could look after some, Environment after some, highways after some, but be co-ordinated from one department.

On Carson-Pegasus, which is our park, I'd like to say that we have \$640,000 in the budget. This will provide us with road construction into it and all the planning funds for this year. We hope to complete it within my term of office. The project will cost some \$5.5 million, and we hope it should be completed by the spring of '83.

The Member for Macleod talked about Willow Creek. I'd like to point out to the member that I'll have to look at where we are with Willow Creek park. We have some \$1.2 million for park upgrading in our program, and I'll take that question as notice and report back to him. He talked about where our recreation areas are. As I mentioned before, we are looking at a number of them. We have some 80 requests. We hope to go with a small number, and we should come forward sometime in the future with sites and agreements with the local governments. Municipal parks: as I mentioned before, funds are available, either \$1,000 or \$2,000 if the travelling public is using it. So you can write me a letter on that, and I'd be pleased to help you.

The Member for Calgary Buffalo first of all praised Max Gibb. Of course, I have to second that motion; he's

a fine gentleman. I've looked once at the Sport Alberta report which he had. It's being presented to a conference on May 2, 3, and 4, I believe. That is not the final report; it's a report for discussion. I do not want to comment on whether I accept it. I think the conference will discuss that and come back to us with a final report. I hope that I and other people involved will take a look at it and see where we go from there.

The Member for Edmonton Belmont said we must expand recreation projects in growing areas. I agree that we must, and we're doing it as quickly as we can. I guess we don't really have that much control in the cities. The simple reason is that we fund the city on their application forms. They apply for \$5 million in a given year. They set the priorities of where the funding should go. It's something that was done some years ago, and it's worked well. I believe that members who have some concern should talk to their city aldermen, because that's where the problem lies, if there is a problem. He expressed some concern, and I share it, that government should only assist, and not do the job. I second that motion. I feel very strongly that there has to be some personal desire, some personal pride, some personal participation. We cannot ignore the volunteers, and there are so many of them — the family unit, that's really what makes communities work.

The Member for Grande Prairie talked about the Winter Games. As I mentioned, we had some 2,300 or 2,500 athletes, with 3,000 volunteers. I want to thank him personally for the way he took care of me and my wife when we were there. He made sure that we saw just about all the venues. I must say it was a very, very exciting time to be in Grande Prairie, with so many young athletes participating and doing such a fine performance.

He talked about improving the parks in the north. When I took on the responsibility of this job, I said I would visit all my provincial parks within a year. I didn't do that. I worked as hard as I could last year, and I got to see most of them. I only have a few parks left, and they're in the north. I expect to go out, I believe in the early part of June, to see the rest. That's really given me a pretty good idea of what's out there. It's pretty nice to be able to sit down with an MLA, regardless of where he's from, and if he says we have some problems in a park, I can visualize it. That's why I'm doing it. And I want to meet the people, because that's what it's all about.

He also mentioned that we should be looking at urban parks. I guess the answer to that question is the same: I will be looking at them; and seeing as they'll be funded from the heritage fund, if there are any urban parks, that should come closer to fall.

The Member for Calgary McCall asked about the Kananaskis golf course and its opening. I will have a full report this fall on the whole Kananaskis Country. But the golf course is on its way. We will be seeding 27 holes this spring, and we are on target as far as opening for 1982.

I'd just like to thank the Member for Highwood for his help when I was down to see his park. He showed me all the things I should see. That's what's great about seeing the parks with the MLAs and local people; they show you what you probably wouldn't see if you went yourself. You get to see some of the things that need to be improved, and I really appreciate that.

He talked about upgrading roads to parks. I'm not sure where we stand on that. I guess if it's within the park boundary, that's park upgrading; if it's not, then if it's a government road you have to talk to your MLA, if it's a municipal road you have to talk to your municipal coun-

cillor. But let us know your concerns. We might be able to help by getting some of our people to talk to the municipalities involved, because we certainly want to see the roads to our parks improved.

Fish stocking in Chain Lakes and other parks: I'm sure the Associate Minister of Public Lands and Wildlife has taken note of that, and I'm sure we'll have that done.

The Member for Calgary Millican asked about the forestry site in Kananaskis, and the prisoner-of-war camp. I'd like to suggest to the member that I will be visiting that area for two days sometime this summer. I'd like to take the member with me, and we could discuss that. I can't give him a definite report on where we're at, but we're working on it. If he'll come with me, I'm sure we can resolve that to the betterment of both him and the department.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I think I've answered all the questions.

MRS. CHICHAK: Mr. Chairman, I want to make just a few remarks in addition to all the members who have raised their concerns or lauded the minister with respect to his parks program. Perhaps he could just add to some of the information he's provided to us. There are probably three areas that I would like the minister to touch on, and I hope that while I was necessarily absent from the House he didn't deal with them. If he did, I suppose I will read it in *Hansard*, and he wouldn't need to repeat his remarks.

The first point I would like to raise is with respect to Capital City provincial park. It appears that there is an unclarity insofar as responsibility in the maintenance of the park; the extent of facility that's available in the total park area. There appears to be a lack of knowledge or understanding, particularly with respect to Capital City provincial park. The kind of recognition there appears to be amongst the citizens of Edmonton is that there is a park on the eastern boundary of the city, which is a city park or a facility provided by the city in its plan, and really not an understanding or recognition of the total concept of this particular park. I think that's regrettable.

I wonder if the minister might consider a sort of public relations information, or perhaps put out some sort of informational pamphlet from the provincial aspect, as to the magnitude of the park, the facility that's available and usable, not only at the eastern end of the city, or eastern end of the park, but throughout the areas.

The other thing I would like the hon. minister to consider for his future planning — perhaps looking towards next year's plan that he might include in the budget after this one, because it would involve a long-range kind of direction — is linking the present Capital City provincial park with Fort Edmonton. In a total package that in fact would complement the two extremities of tourist facilities or interest facilities that exist in the city of Edmonton. I think it would be very important to put forward the information in a provincial parks and recreation facility pamphlet for the public.

The other area I would like the minister to elaborate on is with respect to revenues from Loto Canada and the Western lotteries: the total revenues received from ticket sales, if this is within his information; the percentage we as province get. What is the total amount the province receives, the breakdown of the distribution for sports and for other applications, and the administration costs? I think it would be important for citizens to know how much of the dollars they are spending in what they understand or recognize to be support of amateur sport,

is really available back in this province for sport development.

Another area I would like the hon. minister to examine is with respect to competitive adult sports associations. The minister has indicated the kind of grant funding that is made available for amateur sports. The majority of the funding is directed to junior sports or competitions.

MR. TRYNCHY: I lost it. What sport?

MRS. CHICHAK: Competitive adult sports associations. I might use as an example, lacrosse, which is a national game. It has not been getting very much funding or support on the senior level. It's my understanding that at the senior level, they are attempting to expand knowledge or involvement to the lower age categories. But the amount of funding the adult associations are able to raise to embark on such a program is really not adequate, because they are also competitive on a national level and require whatever funds they are able to raise from private sources to cover the costs of their competitions.

Another area I suppose the minister dealt with is with regard to problems in approval of funding for recreational and cultural facilities. There appears to be some inconsistency in the manner in which some of the approvals or disapprovals are determined by the municipality. It might be helpful — some time has passed — if the criteria used to determine whether an application meets the requirements for funding might again be put out and made available to community leagues and various major organizations.

When he deals with these few matters, the minister might consider outlining what is included in the Strathcona Science Park. If he would do this on record, it is more for the information of the general public that reads *Hansard* or inquires from whatever media reporting may be made on the minister's remarks with respect to his activities and programs. Would he consider outlining that, so there's a better understanding of the concept of Strathcona Science Park, and what in total is included in it?

I'd like to commend the minister on his real interest and sincere approach to his responsibility for recreation and parks, and the expansion he has initiated or convinced his caucus to give approval for, so that he could carry out a broadening of many programs and facilities. I think the minister ought to be commended for all that. I know that citizens of this province have been able to enjoy that much more, not only the activities and the involvement of sports, but various cultural programs and other recreational activities.

Thank you.

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Chairman, with regard to the question from the Member for Edmonton Norwood on Capital City Park and the lack of co-ordination and upkeep by the city, I must point out at this time that the park was constructed by the provincial government. We funded it 100 per cent, and we funded 100 per cent of operations for the first year. The second year, it was funded on a 75:25 basis. In the third year of operation and thereafter — I think I'm right — it will be funded 50:50. Now, they do all the controlling, the policing, the upkeep, the patrolling, and the maintenance. All that is in their jurisdiction, and it's in our contract. If you have some concerns with Capital City Park — it's not a provincial park as such, because we don't involve our people; it's called Capital City Park — I would hope you

would talk to some of your aldermen and express that concern to them. If they don't give you the answers and you have some specifics, I'd sure be pleased to hear about them.

The member asked if we could join Capital City Park with Fort Edmonton. I know that's quite a way, and it would be a nice park. My present understanding is that the city is contemplating asking the government to extend it west, to complete it west from the High Level Bridge. I haven't had that application or submission from them yet, but I understand it's coming. I guess it would have to be up to the city with regard to which way they want to go before we'd move. I'm not saying we don't want to do it, but there are other cities and other urban parks that we should be considering. Until we get some of these under way, I would not hold out much hope that we would continue really quickly.

The member also asked that I explain the Loto Canada funds, which I did. You can read it in *Hansard*. Very briefly, there's about \$1 million in Loto funds in General Revenue, which will be divided equally between Culture and myself. I am working on a program where my portion of funds will go to the sporting associations through the province, and hopefully we'll come up with some type of equitable position in the near future. As far as the provincial lotteries are concerned, they're a Crown corporation, under the Minister responsible for Culture. But very briefly, 30 per cent of the funds go to the Calgary Exhibition board, 30 per cent to the Edmonton Exhibition board, 20 per cent to Culture, and 20 per cent to Recreation and Parks, and we split it up in a number of ways. On an annual report, if you get that, I understand that agreement is in effect until 1982, at which time it'll be reviewed again.

The member asked for funding for adult sports. I guess I'd have to say this: we had the seniors' group come in to see me. Just a few days ago, we gave them a special grant to help them. We also provided them with some \$75,000 for their Seniors Games in Camrose. But if they are a lacrosse association, I would ask that they become involved with this association, because we fund those. I wouldn't want to see us, say, fund one group separately from another. Let's take the baseball association: let's involve all of them, whether they're 6-year-olds, 9-year-olds, 40-year-olds, or 50-year-olds and better, like myself, who still want to play. We should all belong to the same association, and funds are available to these associations. If they're interested in a specific game, I suppose they should talk to that association and see where they fit in. That's the way we'd like to see it funded, to make sure that everybody's involved regardless of age and, of course, sex.

The question on approval of MCR projects, application forms: I've spoken on that. We want to streamline the application forms, make sure we eliminate as much red tape as we can, but also have as much control as we can, because they are public funds. Again, we instruct our people on the regional board and the recreation people to do these kinds of things, and we're not having that much difficulty.

I guess the question was: where do they go as far as sites? Who gets to locate where the community hall or skating rink should be built? In Edmonton and Calgary, we fund it to the city council, and they have full jurisdiction in picking the sites for every community. So again, if there's displeasure with sites in the city, that should be directed at the aldermen, because we do not have any jurisdiction in picking the sites. We just fund it. If the

application is done right, we process it and the funds go out to the city.

Within Strathcona park, we have a science centre, which will be operated by the Minister responsible for Culture. We have a ski hill, walking trails, and everything else you would see in a park. We are in the process of negotiating an operating contract with the county of Strathcona. We'd like to see them operate the park on our behalf, and that's why it's called Strathcona Science Park. If that comes about, it would probably be a duplicate way of funding as we have with the Capital City park, where we would pay 75 per cent of the cost for a year and 50:50 thereafter. We're now negotiating with Strathcona, and we hope that comes about by opening day sometime in July.

I think I've answered all the questions. If you read through *Hansard*, and you don't have all the answers, just give me a note, and I'll get back to you.

Thank you.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Minister, I'd like to ask some questions about four areas. I should perhaps preface my remarks by saying that these are likely concerns from a former physical education teacher, as opposed to being totally the concerns of the Olds-Didsbury constituency.

Before I become involved in those four areas, Mr. Minister, let me say that I look forward with a great deal of interest to your accounting in the fall of what has gone on at Kananaskis. I think you've tried to pave the way for that already this evening, when you rather skilfully, if I might put it that way, warned us about what's happening to the costs. It'll be very interesting to hear the gory details in that area this fall, Mr. Minister.

The first of the four areas I'd like to comment on, Mr. Minister, deals with what I'd regard as one of the really forgotten groups, the high school athletic association. I personally know a number of the people involved there, and they do a very, very fine job as far as junior and senior high school athletics are concerned in the province. The support they get, not only from the government but frankly from a number of school boards across the province, is pretty minimal.

That leads into a larger concern I have, Mr. Minister; that is, the whole question of where we're going as far as our recreation programs are concerned. I say this with the greatest sympathy for the people up in the gallery. Too often I hear that we're going to spend more of our money available for athletics to be darned sure Alberta gets its 10 per cent of the people who go to the Olympics or the next Commonwealth Games. I won't get involved in commenting on what I think of the future of the Olympics. As much as I'd like to see the Olympics come to the Calgary-Banff area, when we look at the international scene today, I don't really think we should spend a great deal of our time in the department pondering that singular issue. I'd like to see the Olympics come, but that's another issue.

Frankly, Mr. Minister, I become concerned when we start pondering whether Alberta's getting its 10 per cent of the athletes going to the Commonwealth Games or the Olympics. Because that points out to me that some people in the department someplace or you, sir — and I don't lay the responsibility on your shoulders — are, I think, missing the point of what we should be attempting to do as far as the recreation side of Recreation and Parks is concerned; that is, really preparing people to live for a lifetime. I would oversimplify it, I suppose, but go at it from a standpoint of emphasizing lifetime sports.

It's very gratifying for us as Albertans to have people who do as well as the Smith family has in swimming events around the world. But to a very great degree, that was done because of the kind of commitment that family had to the family itself and to the sport. I don't know of any politicians who could, or should want to, take credit for the contributions the Smith family has made in the area of swimming, to be very explicit.

Mr. Minister, the point I want to make is this: it seems to me that we should be endeavoring to channel a very sizable portion of our resources into the area of what I would call lifetime sports, providing the opportunity for people to prepare themselves for activities in that area. That's why I come back to this high school athletic association again. To a very great degree, that's where this preparation can start. I look forward to an assurance from you, Mr. Minister, that a very, very major priority within athletic expenditures would be to lifetime endeavors, as opposed to trying to be sure Alberta gets its one in every 10 athletes who go to the Olympics or Commonwealth Games. I want to make very clear that I commend the people who are that successful. But those people often get there not because of the money the province makes available, but because of the commitment of their families and obviously their own talents. I think it would be a mistake, Mr. Minister, if we were to adhere very rigidly to the kind of quota you talked about this evening.

The third point I'd like to comment on, Mr. Minister, was really raised by the Member for Calgary Buffalo tonight; that is, the question of the co-ordination of sport governing bodies in the province. I took from the comments of the minister in reaction to the question from the Member for Calgary Buffalo, that the minister is really not going to take any particular position on this report that has come to the minister until after this get-together of the sport governing bodies in the province early in May. I then take it from that comment, Mr. Minister, that the minister and the department have no strong feeling, and the minister will be guided to a very great degree by the recommendations which come from the sport governing bodies. If that's the case, all well and good. But if it isn't the case, Mr. Minister, I think a very appropriate time to say that and to make that point clear would be here this evening.

The fourth point I want to make deals with comments made by a number of members. I don't make this comment in a disparaging reference at all, but I think all too often all of us in the Assembly talk about recreation as being something for kids in high school. With the kind of province we live in, with the kind of future we see in the '80s and '90s, I think it's a serious mistake to talk about recreation as something only for youngsters in high school, people with delinquent problems, and so on. It has to be something far broader than that. Mr. Minister, the responsibility rests with you to — I was going to say package and sell that idea. Certainly the responsibility rests with you to give leadership within the province as far as that idea is concerned. If you don't share that view, Mr. Minister, I'd appreciate your indicating that that isn't your view as far as recreation is concerned, and perhaps we'd have time this evening to continue the discussion.

Mr. Chairman, those are the four points I wanted to raise.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, I just want to convey an attitude that has been given to me by a number of parents. It's with regard to hockey and the rules and regulations that have been set down by the Alberta

Amateur Hockey Association, specifically the rule that was in force during the past season, the fall of 1979 and spring of 1980. One of the rules implemented was that body checking or body contact was eliminated in the play up to the age of 12. There was also a limitation on the slapshot. I'd like to say to the minister that that change in rules has been very acceptable to many of the parents I've talked to, standing alongside the boards, in the coach's box, as well with the players. At first the young players said, they're taking something out of the game; we can't rough somebody up. But we found that as the season progressed and the young fellows learned to carry the puck and skate, the rule became very acceptable. We saw better play, better competition, and better sportsmanship. It was just a good change in the hockey rules. Number one, I'd like you to convey that to the Alberta Amateur Hockey Association.

Secondly, I'd like to make the submission that the rules should again be changed at this point in time to take in the group to age 14; I believe they're called bantams. We should have the rule in effect for that age group. I'd like to say again that if you listen to the informal politics that go on in the many arenas in southern Alberta that I've been in this last winter, that would be a very acceptable change. I know that whatever you can do from your office to impress that on the Alberta Amateur Hockey Association, would be much appreciated by many parents and certainly the players.

MR. TRYNCHY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

On the questions by the Leader of the Opposition. First of all, on Kananaskis Country: I didn't think I was skillful; I was just bringing down the facts. I hope that when I present the facts again in the fall, it will be done in that way. I have never been one to evade the issue, and I don't intend to start today or tomorrow. [interjection] So I hope the hon. member will understand that when the facts come down on Kananaskis Country, they'll be just that.

On high school athletics: yes, I have some concerns on that too. They're presently receiving well over \$100,000 from our department, plus the Western Express. I'm not so sure — and I've said this to some of my school friends — that they're using it to the best advantage. A number of programs are available to the counties and school boards, and to local recreation boards, that they don't even pick up. And I don't know the reasons. As a matter of fact, I'm going to relate something to you: YMCA came to me and talked about Shape up Alberta. I thought, that's fine. But I said, where do you go? So they picked out the bigger centres. I said, where have you been in the rural areas? Well, not that many places. So I suggested they go out in a certain area. We phoned the recreation director out there, and he wasn't even too concerned about it.

What I'm trying to say is: I agree that we should have more help at the school level. But as I've said before, government cannot do it for you. We've got to have the teachers . . . Let's start from the beginning. First of all, we have to have the student who wants to do it. Then we have to have the parent who wants to help, and that's where we fall down so many, many times. You're all aware that they say, send the boy to the skating rink; and we all say, go with your boy. And then we have to have the teacher and the leaders in that community. So we have four areas of concern.

I want to help, because I know what it's all about — I guess the same as the Leader of the Opposition; we came up the hard way. But you can't do it unless you have

those four ingredients. You have to have the student who wants to do it, the parent, the teacher, and so on. We'll help, and I'll improve the program if somebody has some great ideas, because I welcome them.

With regard to spending more money on athlete assistance, I'm not saying that 10 per cent is the magic number. We have 20 athletes, and I'd like to increase that. If we do that, we're not just helping one or two; we're helping the whole system. If everybody gets a chance to go someplace, whether it's the Pan Am Games or the Western Canada Games, they'll all work a little harder. I'm trying to see this rub off on some of the athletes. I don't want to see 50 athletes in Alberta who are tops and the rest not doing anything. Not at all. And it's not happening that way. Everybody gets a chance to be picked, and we take the top 560. It's broken down into a number of sports; it's not all from one sport. I can go through that; I have a list. But they all compete for that, and they should.

We talk about lifetime sports. I don't really know what that is. What is a lifetime sport? I guess if I go through my days . . . [interjections] There are some ideas on what a lifetime sport is, but I'm talking about . . .

MR. R. CLARK: If I could just elaborate on that, Mr. Minister, I'm talking about the kind of sports you got involved in when you were in your teens, that you can do now, that you can do when you leave politics, and that you can be involved in when you're 75, too. I suppose one can talk about . . . [interjections] . . . golfing and curling, as opposed to such things — and having been a former basketball coach, I can say this — as basketball, where you have to get a gymnasium, you have to have a bunch of people, you have to be in a league, and all those kinds of things.

AN HON. MEMBER: Team sports.

MR. R. CLARK: The point is made: team sports. It seems to me that the kinds of things we want to be emphasizing, not only from the standpoint of recreation but from the standpoint of the overall health of society, are — one can talk about hiking, the whole bit, as opposed to competitive team sports, where we have to have very specific, very sophisticated facilities that we don't always have, and are able to get those facilities when we want them. That's the kind of thing I have in mind, Mr. Minister.

MR. TRYNCHY: Thank you. I have the understanding now. I totally agree that we should have a lifetime sport. I guess that a lifetime sport to me is not a lifetime sport to the Chairman and not a lifetime sport to somebody else, but I understand what he's getting at.

Mr. Chairman, that's why we fund some 100 associations. I look through this: ski association, horsemen's federation, canoeing, chess, Red Cross, bowling, golf, curling, ski patrol. You know, we're doing just that. There's an old saying: you can lead a horse to water, but you can't make him drink. That's the issue here. We want to see people involved, but surely they have to have the desire, the ability, and — well, there's an old saying that I don't want to use. But if you don't have the desire to do it, you won't do it. Helping them along without them wanting to help themselves is going to be very difficult. But I totally agree that sports should be for all, and that's the kind of programs I try to initiate.

The Sport Alberta report: the member says I have no strong feelings. I want to correct that: I have some pretty

strong feelings. As a matter of fact they're pretty darn strong. I want to see that report when it's finished, and I want to take that report and do with it what's best for Albertans, not for myself, not for the department, and not for the sports people out there or anybody else. It has to involve everybody, and that's the type of program I'm going to initiate, with the help of my colleagues of course. So I have some pretty strong feelings on that. Maybe my feelings are going to be somewhat different from somebody else's, but hopefully I'll have the good sense to work out a program that's beneficial to the biggest percentage. That's the route I want to go.

We want to have recreation for young people only; well, that's not right. I think we have to give leadership, and when we talk about association grants, the funds are there for leadership. They start off as young adults, and work their way up to older people. They should be involved and learn the sports as they go along.

I just want to point out that when I was down at a little place called Altario, close to the Saskatchewan border, I took in a discing competition, the first time I'd ever seen it in my life. Young people were doing it, and senior citizens. That's the kind of sport I want to see involved, and I'm going to promote these kinds of activities and fund them if I can. So when we talk about lifetime sports, we have no disagreement: my ideas and those of the Leader of the Opposition are pretty well the same.

The Member for Little Bow talked about hockey rules. I'm sorry I can't take any credit for the rule changes, because that's not my jurisdiction. But I'm sure they'll appreciate it, and I do too. I've seen the changes back home in my arena, and it's great. Let's all do more than just stand up in the House and tell me about it; let's write a letter to the Alberta Amateur Hockey Association and say, we as parents agree that the rules should be changed for no body contact, slap shots up to 14, and wearing masks, because all you have to do is lose one eye, or a death. It's happened so many times, you know, and it's not worth it.

So I appreciate the comments from the Member for Little Bow, and I guess we have what we call teamwork. Let's get together, and we'll do these kinds of things.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Minister, would it be fair for me to summarize the comment you made as far as the high school athletic association is concerned, by saying that you are not really convinced they are putting their effort in the right direction, but that you'd be open to suggestions from them, and that the important thing is that money has been appropriated and isn't being spent. I hope that's an accurate reflection of what you've said, Mr. Minister. Because if it is, I will rather enjoy going back to people who have raised the matter with me and put it to them about that bluntly.

Secondly, on the question of lifetime sports, Mr. Minister, I take it you're really saying that you're committed rather firmly in that direction, but you see a lack of desire on behalf of many people to become actively involved. Is that a fair assessment?

Then, Mr. Minister, if I could open up a new area, I'm very interested to know what procedure is being used between your, sir, and the minister who used to be responsible for Calgary, on the possibility of some sort of NHL facility for the city of Calgary.

MR. TRYNCHY: Just to answer briefly. No, I did not make the statement that the money was not spent. Over \$100,000 is available to them, but I don't think they're

spending it as wisely as they could. Other funds could be made available that they're not receiving because they're not making an effort to. I think they could improve themselves in a lot of ways. Those are the words I want to get out to them. They can do better, and I hope they will.

The next one was involvement in Sport Alberta. Of course, I'll have to wait for the report and, like I said before, I do have some strong feelings on where we go. We will get involved after the report is final and I have a chance to look at it along with my colleagues.

As far as the NHL in Calgary, I don't know if anybody's selling any shares in it. But I can assure hon. members in the House that if there is a need for a coliseum, we'll treat Calgary the same as we would treat anybody else, fairly and equitably. That's about all I can say. I haven't seen their proposal. It's not come near me yet, and when it comes I want to assess it and go from there.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. Perhaps a more appropriate time will be the Premier's estimates, or those of the former minister responsible for Calgary. What support did the government give Edmonton as far as building the Coliseum here?

MR. TRYNCHY: If my memory serves me right, Mr. Chairman, funding was done on a one-third basis: one-third provincial government, one-third the federal government, and the city of Edmonton. I believe it was around \$11 million by provincial funding for the Commonwealth Games. Whether that's exactly the figure for the Coliseum . . . That's about the figure I recall.

MR. R. CLARK: Thank you, Mr. Minister. So the one-third fractional breakdown is somewhat in the ballpark. I guess the second phase of that question would be that Edmonton's support was contingent on getting the Commonwealth Games — I shouldn't say the support was contingent on the Commonwealth Games, but a lot of money was made available there as far as Edmonton was concerned. Has the government gotten to a point yet where they would tie any support for a hockey facility in Calgary to Calgary's being successful in getting the Olympic Games in the latter part of the '80s, or is that a totally separate thing?

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Chairman, I think that would probably be a totally different thing. I haven't seen any request from them, but I would be receptive to a one-third basis, as we did with Edmonton, regardless of what happens with the Olympics or the NHL. We've done it here, and I think it's only fair that we do it again. I've said that before, and I'd like to say it again. I'm not so sure Calgary might be able to get the one-third federal funding, but I'd be receptive to it right now. I'm asking the Calgary people to come forward as quickly as possible, and let's have a look at their proposal. I hope that would have some bearing on the NHL team and also on the Calgary Olympics. Whether in fact that happens, I can't assure the members. But I'm willing to look at any proposal they have.

Agreed to:

1.01 — Minister's Office	\$154,661
1.02 — Deputy Minister's Office	\$145,948

MR. CHAIRMAN: I can hear more conversation in the background than I can hear response to my requests for replies.

Agreed to:

1.03 — Administrative Support	\$187,464
1.04 — Financial Administration	\$529,913
1.05 — Personnel Services	\$224,574
1.06 — Research and Systems	\$466,062
1.07 — Public Communications	\$292,376
1.08 — Special Projects	\$68,200
1.09 — Library Services	\$53,914
Total Vote 1 — Departmental Support Services	\$2,123,112

2.1 — Program Support	\$489,549
2.2 — Financial Assistance	\$29,575,950
2.3 — Recreation Planning	\$466,171
2.4 — Recreation Program Development	\$2,109,717
2.5 — Regional Recreation Consultation	\$1,338,660
Total Vote 2 — Recreation Development	\$33,980,047

Vote 3 — Provincial Parks:

3.1 — Program Support	\$1,842,353
3.2 — Operations and Maintenance	\$17,214,563

3.3 — Park Design and Implementation

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few comments on this particular vote. I would like to get into a position where I could commend the minister on behalf of the people of Brooks and area. Kinbrook park down there is a beautiful park, but it is so small that it's not able to accommodate the number of people we have coming in there. We have 25 miles of lakefront around the park, but we're only able to use a very small portion of this, which is the Kinbrook park. I know the people from my area and I have made recommendations, and have approached the minister with regard to making some changes down there; that is, to use the park we now have, the island, for day use, then go to the south end of the lake — I know the minister's acquainted with this particular situation. The people of the area and I would like to see that south end of the lake used, start a development in phases.

Mr. Chairman, it wouldn't take a lot of money for the first few years to get it started. They could start trees down there. I'm sure they could negotiate with the Eastern Irrigation District to get some land. It wouldn't be very costly to put the facility down there, and put some trees in. For the last two or three years, campers have come down there and tried to get into the park, but they're not able to and are turned away. If we were able to refer them to the south end of the lake, which is only two or three miles, it would certainly help in accommodating people travelling through Alberta who want to stop at a park like Kinbrook.

The question I'd like to put to the minister: are there any funds in this vote for giving consideration to designing the particular area I'm talking about? We discussed this with the minister at a previous time.

While I'm on my feet, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to commend the people from the Parks Department. The health inspector came out and was going to close down the concession booth at Kinbrook park, but staff from

the minister's department stepped in and kept our concession booth open for this year. We're certainly pleased with that move.

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Chairman, in response to the hon. member, I'd like to point out that there are no funds in this year's budget for Kinbrook Island. We have some \$470,000 for Tillebrook. I guess I should outline the reasons I haven't moved at the Kinbrook site yet. I have some difficulties, in that some of the people want us to move, and some of the people don't. I have to go back to the year the government invested some \$235,000 to riprap the shore for a park. We've done that, and I think we took those funds from the public purse. We should really consider whether we shouldn't do some development at the back of the cottages. I know the cottage owners don't like it, yet I've had a number of letters from that area that they would like to do it.

I would like to say that I'm going to give that some consideration. As a matter of fact, I might even consider going down there and holding a public meeting where I can get the views personally, then try to assess the pros and cons of what we should do. I know the area well. I've travelled there, and to Newell Lake. I also understand we have some problems with the federal government with regard to the pelicans that nest there. So it's not that easy to resolve. But I will give an undertaking that I'll take a further look into it. If I have to go there to have a public meeting I will, to see if we can come up with an answer that will satisfy the majority of people.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Chairman, I certainly appreciate the offer the minister's made to come down there and meet with the people themselves. I'm sure that when he looks at the situation down there, the \$275,000 that was spent on the riprapping was certainly a big expenditure that had to be put in there. But that is to save the island for day use. As the island is now set up, it is certainly too small for camping. They're turning the campers away. I'm sure if the minister comes down and takes a look at the situation — it's not going to be costly; it'll be a matter of exchanging some land with the Eastern Irrigation District, and then possibly planting some trees. To start with, we don't need to have organized camping down there. We can just set it up so we can send the campers down there, and have an area fenced in. The only maintenance that would be involved is cleaning up the garbage, and such.

I appreciate the minister's offer to come down and meet with the people there. I'll certainly do what I can to arrange something so the minister can come down and help us solve our problems.

Agreed to:

3.3 — Park Design and Implementation	\$2,170,167
3.4 — Outdoor Recreation Planning	\$1,624,488
Total Vote 3 — Provincial Parks	\$22,851,571

Department Total	\$58,954,730
------------------	--------------

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Chairman, I move the vote be reported.

[Motion carried]

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I move the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

[Motion carried]

HON: MEMBERS: Agreed

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

MR. APPLEBY: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has had under consideration certain resolutions, reports as follows, and requests leave to sit again:

Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1981, sums not exceeding the following for the department and purposes indicated:

Department of Recreation and Parks: \$2,123,112 for departmental support services; \$33,980,047 for recreation development; \$22,851,571 for provincial parks.

MR. SPEAKER: Having heard the report and the request for leave to sit again, do you all agree?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I should mention that tomorrow afternoon it's proposed to do third reading and Royal Assent of Bill 30, The Hospital Debt Retirement Act. For the bulk of the afternoon, it's proposed that we begin the Committee of Supply with the Department of Social Services and Community Health. If there's additional time before the end of the afternoon, we'll begin Government Services. I might add at this time, too, Mr. Speaker, that it's not proposed that the House sit Thursday evening.

[At 10:10 p.m., on motion, the House adjourned to Wednesday at 2:30 p.m.]