

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Title: **Tuesday, October 21, 1980 2:30 p.m.**

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

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

MR. SPEAKER: May I ask you to join me in a few moments of silent reflection out of respect for the memory and life of Richard Gavin Reid, a former premier of this province.

[In tribute to the late Mr. Reid, members of the Assembly remained standing for a few moments of silence.]

head: **TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS**

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the following reports: the second annual report of the Alberta Library Board and the annual reports of the Glenbow-Alberta Institute and the Alberta Art Foundation.

head: **ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**

Utility Rates — Calgary Power

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the first question today to the Minister of Utilities and Telephones. It deals with the question of power in this province. In light of the attempts, one, to take over Calgary Power and now, more recently, an attempt to acquire a very sizable share of Calgary Power, what assurance can the minister give the Assembly and the people of Alberta that as a result of the most recent offer from Nu-West to obtain 48 per cent of the shares of Calgary Power, Alberta consumers will face no rate increase as a result of that possible action?

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, first of all, the latest information I have is that the Nu-West offer has not yet been officially put to the Calgary Power shareholders.

With respect to the second part of the hon. leader's question, the regulation of utility rates in the province is a responsibility of the Public Utilities Board. The Public Utilities Board takes into consideration all matters when determining the rates consumers are charged for utilities. I think it would be useful for members to review past decisions of the Public Utilities Board with respect to acquisitions of one utility by another utility. The Attorney General may wish to supplement my comments, but generally it would be useful, I think, for members to review previous decisions made by the PUB.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. In light of the answer, I take it that the assurance the minister has given the Assembly is that the Public Utilities Board will monitor what is taking place, and that if the Public Utilities Board feels that

offer by Nu-West is not in the public interest, the Public Utilities Board will become involved.

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, I can't go to the stage where I can advise the hon. members what the Public Utilities Board may or may not do. I am simply advising all hon. members that a responsibility of the Public Utilities Board is to determine rates charged to consumers of utilities in the province. There are a number of other procedures that the hon. leader is aware of that have occurred in the past when there have been takeover attempts. Those include responsibilities for approval by various securities commissions in Canada, as well as following a body of corporate law that exists in our country and in our province.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, then to the minister. If the minister is not in a position to assure the Assembly that the Public Utilities Board will intervene if it feels that this offer put forward by Nu-West is not in the best interests of Alberta consumers, will the minister give an assurance to the Assembly that, in his responsibility as minister, he will intervene if it does not appear to be in the best interests of Alberta consumers?

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, there's no doubt that as minister responsible for utilities and telephones, there is a responsibility to assure that Albertans are fairly treated in terms of delivery of essential utilities and that they are delivered in the best method. It's not possible for me to direct that board, since the Public Utilities Board does not report to me but to the Attorney General.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. In light of no assurance there either, can the minister indicate to the Assembly if he has met with the officials of Nu-West and Calgary Power with regard to the proposition in the process of being put forward to Calgary Power shareholders? In the interests of protecting Alberta consumers, can we have at least the assurance that that meeting has already taken place?

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, I meet with the utility companies on a regular basis. I have met regularly with senior officials of Calgary Power, but have not as yet met with Nu-West, although they have called me and those arrangements are being made.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister. Is the minister in a position to indicate to the Assembly if that meeting with the officials of Nu-West will take place prior to Nu-West's proposition being put to the Calgary Power shareholders? Can the minister give us at least that assurance?

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, since the date of that meeting has not yet been determined, it's impossible for me to give that assurance.

MR. R. CLARK: No assurance at all.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Is the minister in a position to advise the Assembly whether any discussions have taken place with officials of the Public Utilities Board with respect to the normal operating rule of the board, which is rates based on 15 per cent of the equity investment, and concerning any premium Nu-West may in fact pay to the

shareholders of Calgary Power and the impact of that premium on the rate structure?

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, in responding to the first question from the Leader of the Opposition, I made reference to the fact that it would be useful for hon. members to review previous decisions of the Public Utilities Board with respect to the premium paid in the acquisition of utilities by another utility. I think that review would be helpful to the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview.

Replying directly to the question: no, I have not had discussions either with the chairman of the Public Utilities Board, unless — because they report through the Attorney General, since it is a quasi-judicial body — the Attorney General may wish to supplement my answer.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, having listened to the questions of the hon. Leader of the Opposition and those of the Member for Spirit River-Fairview, I would like to add something which I think is very important in the conduct of the operations of the board. Naturally, they take into account what a board of that type should take into account; that is, the case put before them by either of the parties proposing or opposing a rate increase at any time, with respect to any of the areas under their jurisdiction. What matters would be put forward by people making the presentations to the board is something that isn't known until it is done. The question the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview raises, as to whether or not something like a premium paid for shares could be included, is something the parties would have to take to the board and argue there.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I think it would also be important to note that it would not be the intention of government to intervene in the corporate struggle that may be the background to some of the questions that have been asked and which has been going on, with different players, for many months. They are the ones who are making certain proposals and offers to shareholders and causing things to be done that come before the Public Utilities Board for rulings.

I think it's important to be explicit and careful, in regard to the role of the Public Utilities Board, to say that it's their duty and responsibility to hear all the arguments made to them. But the idea that they or the parties come to me or to any of my colleagues for guidance with respect to what likely would happen with respect to an application of the board is quite foreign to their method of operation. For example, I would not discuss with the chairman, or indeed with any member of the Public Utilities Board, what might be the outcome of a pending application.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Attorney General for clarification. Can the Assembly take from the hon. gentleman's answer that the question of a premium paid by Nu-West for Calgary Power shareholders, should that effort be successful, would then be totally up to the Public Utilities Board, in the absence of any government position as to whether or not that should be computed in the rate base? Or is it the position of the government that in fact the PUB would follow past efforts that the minister alluded to, where there wasn't an automatic assumption of a share premium being rolled into the rate base?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I think all the answers given by my hon. colleague and the answer given by me just a moment ago are consistent in responding fully to what the hon. member asks; that is, whatever argument is put to the Public Utilities Board will be put by the parties. The decision made in regard to what goes into a rate base is clearly a decision within the statutory responsibilities of the board. As my colleague pointed out, the way in which the board has made decisions in the past is clearly a matter that they will determine, as to the guidance that should give them at present, if the situation is similar in any way.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. From the hon. minister's answer, the government is not able to give consumers in the Calgary Power franchise area the assurance, should Nu-West be successful with a substantial premium over existing share values of Calgary Power, that that will not in fact be rolled into the rate base. It will be something that will have to be determined by the Public Utilities Board at some future date. At this point, there is not the ability on the part of the government to give the assurance, clearly and unequivocally, that that will not be rolled into the rate base.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member's question invites me, if I might suggest for his political reasons, to say that at some point we will interfere with the operation of the board — and interfere in anticipation of the arguments to be made by the parties — and determine ahead of time the result with respect to some part of the application. I don't anticipate that sort of interference, Mr. Speaker. I think the hon. member would concur in the view that if that is to be done, it would call on us to have a different attitude toward the future role of the Public Utilities Board, and a different attitude toward the matters that are within their statutory responsibility.

Terminal Facilities — Vancouver

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the second question to the Minister of Economic Development. It pertains to the announcement the minister made outside the House today concerning the \$13.5 million guaranteed loan going to the purchase of Neptune Terminals. Is that \$13.5 million guaranteed loan the total involvement the provincial government will have in the purchase of Neptune Terminals?

MR. PLANCHE: Mr. Speaker, I'm delighted to answer that question today, because I think it's important. We have made one of the most important bench marks of economic development to improve the materials handling system for our products out of western Canada, and out of Alberta specifically, and to do all we can to support and encourage secondary agricultural processing. Our view is that this guarantee of a loan to a consortium to purchase Neptune Terminals accomplishes both those things. As of this date, the \$13.5 million is the extent of the involvement, in terms of a guarantee, that we intend to make in that facility.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. I note with considerable interest the minister's statement, "as of this date". At this time, does

the government have under consideration any plans for direct loans to the purchasers?

MR. PLANCHE: No, Mr. Speaker, we do not. But I wouldn't rule out the possibility in the future of further assistance for our agricultural processors of capital expenses necessary at that facility. I might very well take that problem to my colleagues.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a further question to the minister. Is the Alberta government considering assuming an equity position in the new Neptune Bulk Terminals (Canada) Ltd.?

MR. PLANCHE: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. In leading up to making a decision to make this assistance available — and I have no problem supporting the loan — has either the minister or the consortium been successful in getting a commitment from the federal government to improve the rail access to Neptune Terminals? It seems to me that if the rail access is not greatly improved, the terminal is going to have the same kinds of problems in the future, even under the new ownership, that it had in the past because of the rail problem.

MR. PLANCHE: Mr. Speaker, when our Premier met with the Prime Minister on July 25, part of the energy package offer was a \$2 billion unconditional grant to do such things as improve the port/rail infrastructure at Vancouver. That was summarily rejected. Because it was rejected at that time, though, doesn't mean that segments of that may well be considered on their own merit, in conjunction with the government of British Columbia, at some future date.

[A page tripped and fell against the desk of the Member for Calgary Buffalo]

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, before I pose a supplementary question, I might make the observation to the Independent Conservative Member for Calgary Buffalo that his position nearly wasn't so lonely.

A supplementary question to the minister, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, I take from that answer that we've been able to get no commitment from the federal government to enable an assurance to be given to the new owners of Neptune Terminals that the rail snarl in the Vancouver area will quickly be improved for access to Neptune Terminals.

MR. PLANCHE: Unfortunately no, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question to the hon. minister. Is the minister in a position to advise the House that the consortium includes Imperial Oil, McIntyre Porcupine, and Consolidated Coal of Pittsburg, none of which are having any noticeable cash flow problems? Even though the project is a good one, why is it necessary for us to guarantee the loan?

MR. PLANCHE: Well, Mr. Speaker, it's important to understand that we didn't guarantee loans to those companies; we guaranteed a loan to the consortium, of which those companies are members. That consortium is an umbrella that includes our agricultural processors, neither

sector of which was capable of the kind of financial commitment that would have been necessary. So in order to incorporate them and to give them security of terminal facilities over a longer period, it was necessary to put them under the umbrella of the consortium and guarantee the loan of the whole unit.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Is the minister saying that it was not possible to negotiate with the three major companies I mentioned — three members of the consortium, which I believe includes 10 or 12 different companies, many of them smaller — which have credit as strong as our heritage trust fund, and that these companies would not be in a position to cover?

MR. PLANCHE: The companies named are not philanthropic, Mr. Speaker; they have an obligation to their shareholders. It was outside the realm of business possibility to ask them . . .

DR. BUCK: You're saying the Alberta government isn't?

MR. PLANCHE: Walter, you can ask in a minute, if you like. It would be outside the realm of business possibility to ask them to include . . .

DR. BUCK: It's our money you're giving away.

MR. PLANCHE: Mr. Speaker, to help the hon. Member for Clover Bar, who doesn't seem to grasp the situation, no money is being given away; we're guaranteeing a loan.

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question to the hon. minister. Is the minister in a position to advise the Assembly on the viability of the project? I think it's a good project conceptually, but what concerns me is its viability, if we're not able to get those three companies in particular to guarantee the loan. All members realize (inaudible) not philanthropic organizations, me most of all. But it would seem to me that if it's a good business investment, a guarantee from those three companies would be quite possible.

MR. PLANCHE: Mr. Speaker, the major companies involved that are shipping through and receiving from the terminal all have an equity investment in this project and . . . What did you ask me? [laughter]

MR. NOTLEY: It's a good project, but we hope it's also a good financial venture. I'd put the question to the hon. minister: surely if it's a good financial venture, these three companies would be jumping at the chance to guarantee it.

MR. PLANCHE: I'm sorry I forgot in midstream. As they're presently written, the contracts for throughput don't afford a reserve of capital to upgrade and maintain the terminal properly. As those contracts expire and the new owners get their own cost of service contracts in place, there will be that capital accumulation that will allow it to become a contemporary, ongoing operation. There will be a transition for the first two years, I think. The loss will be large in the first year, substantially less in the second, and in the third year I think it passes into a profit position, as the new contracts take effect.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, one final supplementary question to the hon. minister. Is the minister in a position to advise the Assembly whether FIRA was involved in assessing this project, and whether or not the government of Alberta made representation to the Foreign Investment Review Agency?

MR. PLANCHE: I'll answer them quickly, so I don't forget the second part. Yes, FIRA was involved; and yes, we did make representations to the federal government.

Alberta Exports

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. As preamble, during the summer the minister spent a lot of time at the constitutional meetings and, following that, travelled the world and, as noted in some meetings in his constituency, wasn't present. Out of this time, the minister was able to enunciate some policy with regard to the constitution. One of those areas was the question — and I'd like the minister to elaborate on this area — that there should be provincial jurisdiction over exports from the province of Alberta. I wonder if the minister could clarify that particular proposal. Secondly, is that the position of the government at the present time?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I am puzzled by the question. I don't recall that being one of the 12 items discussed over the summer. But if he wants to bring it forward, I'd be glad to debate it. I'm lost, in terms of the context.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, to refresh the minister's memory, the announcement was made from Sapporo, Japan, so most likely at that time the minister forgot he was making a pronouncement on behalf of the Alberta government. It indicated that there should be "provincial jurisdiction over exports", and that this should be written into future constitutions. Would the minister either accept that statement as is, or deny it at this time?

MR. SPEAKER: If I might just interject briefly. I'm sure the hon. member is aware that the Assembly is not the place to check press reports.

DR. BUCK: How do you know it's a press report?

MR. SPEAKER: Regardless of what sort, it's got to be some kind of report to come here from Sapporo, Japan.

MR. R. SPEAKER: I certainly accept that, Mr. Speaker, with regard to press reports, although I felt this was general information in the province of Alberta and was brought to my attention. I would like the government, through the minister, at this time to clarify the policy with regard to provincial exports and the constitution.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I'd be glad to comment. I was responding after speaking to the Canadian Club in Sapporo, Japan, on the constitutional issues facing Canada, simply in response to the question: do you think there's a conflict between the role the provincial government is playing and the federal government is playing, in terms of selling commodities which are important to us in Alberta?

They were well aware of the efforts of Alberta in

bringing forward the economic priorities of the province. We've already seen them in terms of the Neptune Terminal being developed by my colleague to my right. We are well aware of the efforts of the Minister of State for Economic Development — International Trade.

The question was: what is the province of Alberta doing in the area of economic trade? I simply reacted by saying that, clearly, we believe we do have a major role to play, and that we have the opportunity to sell the economic objectives of this province and to protect the economic objectives of this province in terms of the Pacific Rim countries. In particular, we are very proud to be able to thank our customers in China, who are receiving in the order of \$200 million worth of our wheat. We're anxious to find opportunities for expansion in Japan, and we feel very importantly that this is a very important trading partner to Canada. In that sense, I said that we were not conflicting with the federal government.

I see external affairs being divided into three specific areas: one, the area of trade, which is clearly a provincial jurisdiction; secondly, the area of foreign aid, in which the province of Alberta in fact is playing a role; and thirdly, the area of defence, which is not a provincial jurisdiction.

So, in terms of clarification, that was my reaction to the question.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. Is it the minister's intention to make representation to the federal government for any kind of amendments or changes within the constitution, or does he not see that necessary?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I don't know how the constitution got involved in this. That was my reaction. In terms of constitutional debate, we're already operating within our own jurisdiction. There's no need to clarify the opportunities Alberta is pursuing — aggressively, I might note — to sell the economic imperatives and the economic objectives of this province for the people of Alberta, and we'll continue to do that.

Referendum Legislation

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the hon. Premier, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. It doesn't deal with the text of Bill 60, but rather the public policy behind it. In view of the ambiguity flowing from some of the reports of the introduction of the Bill yesterday, is the minister in a position to assure this Legislature, Alberta, and Canada that under no circumstances is it the government's intention to use Bill 60 to poll Albertans on the possibility of separatism, sovereignty association, or any variation thereof?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Notwithstanding the rather skilful manner in which the question has been put, I would have to revert to the position taken yesterday that a debate on the purposes or use intended with regard to this Bill would have to await debate of the Bill in the ordinary way.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Normally, I accept your judgments without question. [laughter] I'm one of the few members who does.

We really are dealing with a Bill of very, very great significance. In order to have proper discussion of the

Bill, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that it would be proper to ask questions relating to the public policy motivating the Bill — not in terms of the technical features of the Bill, but the public policy motivating the Bill. With that in mind, Mr. Speaker, I would ask for your agreement to questions in that narrowly defined area. Before we get into second reading of the Bill, I think it is important that the public policy be fully questioned and examined, and that information be made available to both members and the people.

MR. SPEAKER: With great respect to the hon. member, I would say that questions relating to public policy are very much in order for the question period. I would be apprehensive if they were too closely related to the Bill and, while agreeing with the hon. member concerning the great importance of the Bill, it would seem to me that the more important the Bill, the more essential it would be that proper procedure be followed in regard to it.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order again, and I ask for your judgment on this matter. It would seem to me . . . [interjections] Just calm down.

Mr. Speaker, it would seem to me that asking questions relating to the public policy motivating the Bill would be in order, I take it from your ruling. I have no intention of raising any question that deals with the mechanics or specifics of the Bill. But the public policy behind it: Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that as members of the Legislature we have to be able to pose those questions. Of course, under the rules of our House, the government has the right not to answer if they choose, but surely we have a right. In addressing this question, it seems to me that it would then be up to the Speaker, respectfully, sir, to judge each question as to whether or not it is a matter of public policy or deals with something that should come under second reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: It would be impossible for me to anticipate and to prepare an exact and carefully worded code as to where these questions may lead. As I mentioned before, if they deal with public policy of the government, surely they should be in order in the question period. However, if they deal with the purposes of the Bill — even with what lies behind it — it would seem to me that the proper forum for that is the debate on second reading.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, then perhaps I can rephrase the question so it would be totally in order. Is the minister in a position to advise the Assembly why the government chose to introduce the Bill this fall, in view of the fact that a federal referendum is as much as three years away?

MR. SPEAKER: With great respect to the hon. member, this is certainly going to lead to a debate of the Bill during the question period.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I can once again rephrase the question and ask the hon. minister what consideration was given by the government to the examination of other referendum legislation before Bill 60 was introduced, as a basis for the introduction of that legislation. Was there a specific survey and assessment of both the Quebec referendum legislation and Bill C-9, and was that conducted by the minister's department?

MR. SPEAKER: I really must reiterate that we're getting into the sort of thing that is properly done on second reading. I think we should revert to the ordinary purposes of the question period.

Hazardous Materials

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the hon. Minister of Environment. My question has to do with dangerous chemicals used in the agricultural and horticultural industries in this province. Can the minister indicate what monitoring is going on in his department as to the use of some of these potentially dangerous chemicals in these two sectors of our economy?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, we in the department have two basic pieces of legislation under which we operate: The Agricultural Chemicals Act and The Hazardous Chemicals Act. Under The Agricultural Chemicals Act, we have a particular schedule of chemicals which we monitor. For example, we lay down requirements for sale and handling, et cetera.

Under The Hazardous Chemicals Act, we have just recently established another schedule, and we are hoping to broaden the terms of the legislation. At the present time, we are confined to certain specifics. We're hoping that we'll be able to broaden the terms of reference under that legislation. Other than that, we rely very heavily on the good judgment of the federal government in terms of chemicals of this nature.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Can the minister indicate if any monitoring, direction, or concerns have been expressed to the federal Department of the Environment as to the labelling of the chemicals — the hazards and how the chemicals should be used? Specifically, in many cases these agricultural chemicals are used without masks, when in the fine, fine print at the bottom, someplace in the middle of the sentence, it says that this must be used with masks. What monitoring is the provincial Department of Environment doing in matters such as this?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, other than the general monitoring done under the legislation, we haven't as yet really addressed ourselves to the labelling part. I would simply take the question as notice. I am hoping, though, that in the process of broadening the terms of the legislation under The Hazardous Chemicals Act, we will look more closely at the process of labelling. However, I would suggest to the member that the labelling, although it's fine print, generally is readable. I can't underline the caution and importance of reading very clearly what it spells out in terms of handling.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Can the minister indicate if there is any equivalent centre, such as the Poison Centre, where people who have been adversely affected can report, so there can be some monitoring throughout the province as to some of the effects of these chemicals? Is there any such centre where this information can be collected?

MR. COOKSON: In the directories across the province, we have an environmental number which can be called in cases of emergencies. Disaster Services — the Minister of Municipal Affairs may want to comment — has a tele-

phone number. I'm not sure; I can't comment on Workers' Health, Safety and Compensation. Perhaps the minister might like to add to that. In terms of Environment specifically, we have an emergency number that should be called in instances such as this.

MR. ZAOZIRNY: A supplementary question to the minister, Mr. Speaker, still relating to the subject of hazardous chemicals and, specifically, hazardous wastes. My question arises from the recent disclosure in the minister's management committee report from Reid, Crowther that some 37 tons of PCBs, polychlorinated biphenyls, are dumped at the Forest Lawn landfill site in Calgary, and that some 6,000 tons of hazardous wastes are being dumped there on an annual basis. In light of these revelations of early last summer, can the minister advise as to what specific measures he has taken since that time to ensure public safety?

MR. COOKSON: The Member for Calgary Forest Lawn asks a good question. It's a kind of broad question. Perhaps I could answer it in this way, Mr. Speaker: we do all the licensing and permitting in terms of private industry. As part of that process, we determine where, in terms of environmental concerns, we think will be the safest place to dispose wastes. In conjunction with the hope to broaden The Hazardous Chemicals Act and in terms of the definition, I anticipate that we will have to tighten up more — providing the legislation is accepted — in terms of handling spills. That is an area we have to explore very carefully. Again, we work closely with Disaster Services on spills.

Other than that, when we're dealing with areas outside the industries themselves — and I'm speaking specifically about sanitary landfills — we work closely with Health to locate landfills, and then under Environment we do the assessment as to the relative safety of those landfills in terms of the water table. Because we fund sanitary landfills, particularly regional ones, we are monitoring as closely as we can the kinds of materials being placed in the landfills. There are some areas, for example, where we will not permit certain types of waste chemicals to be located.

MR. ZAOZIRNY: A further supplementary on that point. Could the minister advise the House as to whether it is the case that presently all that is required in order to remove and store hazardous waste is a simple order under The Public Health Act, and that in fact at the Forest Lawn landfill site in particular, no regular monitoring whatsoever on the part of the Department of Environment is taking place?

MR. SPEAKER: With great respect to the honourable and learned member, it seems he's asking for a legal opinion.

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, if I could rephrase the question. I think I'm simply asking for a statement as to the state of affairs that exists, as opposed to a legal opinion. I'll try to rephrase the question in this way: could the minister advise the House whether any regular monitoring is presently taking place at the Forest Lawn landfill site, conducted by the Department of Environment, in respect of hazardous wastes?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, perhaps the Minister of Social Services and Community Health may want to add

to this, because we work jointly on this type of thing. I guess it's fair to say that although we fund sanitary landfills, particularly regional landfills, at the present time we work closely with those who are operating them to ensure that certain types of products and chemicals are not dumped in those areas. We also rely heavily on the procedures laid down by the municipal authority. In other words, as part of their by-law to establish the landfill, they define specific materials that can or cannot be located in the landfills. Unless something can be added to it, that's really the position Environment is in.

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, on this subject, could the minister advise the House whether he has taken any specific steps to have the 37 tons of PCBs removed from the Forest Lawn landfill site?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, just recently the United States, since it was a location for a large amount of polychlorinated biphenyls, decided in their wisdom that they would no longer be receptive to receiving any more of the PCB material. We thought that since it was generated there in the first place, it was only proper that the waste product should go back to the country it came from. However, they have decided to close the borders in terms of handling polychlorinated biphenyls.

Since then, we do not have a facility in western Canada, as I know it, and certainly not in Alberta. Polychlorinated biphenyl material is presently simply being stored until a facility or location is made available, or until we have in place some method by which we can neutralize the dangers of that particular chemical.

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Simply arising from the response of the minister, could the minister advise what plans his department has made with respect to a central disposal facility which will properly deal with these types of wastes, which are not presently being treated in any particular fashion? Could the minister advise on that point?

MR. COOKSON: Just to update the members: as you probably know, the Environment Council of Alberta has held public hearings across the province dealing with the problem of these hazardous waste products. They are at the stage of completing a report on their recommendations. That report should be forthcoming sometime later this fall. I hope we'll be able to pursue the matter more intensely and arrive at some solution to some of those waste products out there right now.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, just a short question to the minister. Can the minister indicate if Kinetic Contaminants has started moving some of these PCBs to Ontario in special trucks? Is there not some effort to move them to a disposal site in Ontario?

MR. COOKSON: If there is, I'm not aware of it, Mr. Speaker. I can't keep track of these drums floating around.

DR. BUCK: That's your job. You get paid 60 grand for it.

MR. COOKSON: I do know that . . . I wonder what the Member for Clover Bar is getting paid for. There has to be a reason.

We do know that some of the polychlorinated biphenyl is stored in some parts of the province under safe condi-

tions. We know that.

I hope the Member for Clover Bar will throw his support behind a facility once the ECA report is completed and approved. [interjections] I know the Member for Clover Bar would certainly be generous enough to locate the facility in his constituency.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, is that a threat or a recommendation?

Mr. Speaker, will the hon. minister please answer the question? Are the PCBs being moved to Ontario by Kinetic Contaminants or are they not? The minister should surely know that, or else resign. [interjections]

MR. COOKSON: I'd like to ask the hon. member if he knows where his kids are today.

I'll check on that, Mr. Speaker, but at the present time I have no knowledge of movement.

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, on that subject of transportation of PCBs, could the minister advise whether he has made any special licensing arrangements for transporters of hazardous chemicals such as PCBs?

MR. COOKSON: As I've said, Mr. Speaker, we are looking at broadening the terms of reference of The Hazardous Chemicals Act. In view of the recent federal legislation on the transportation of dangerous goods, we would like to move concurrently with the federal government to deal specifically with the problem within the province. We would like to be able to conform with the regulations laid down at the federal level and, if necessary, exceed those. That is in the offing. The only thing I can add to that is that the Minister of Transportation may want to make a comment with regard to transportation. From my point of view, we're waiting patiently for the completion of the regulations so that we can clearly draft our own legislation on that matter.

MR. SPEAKER: The time for the question period has expired. I apologize to those members who have not been reached. Perhaps we had more supplementaries than we would ordinarily have. I would hope that if those members still wish to ask their questions, they can be reached tomorrow.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I wish to rise on a point of order pursuant to Standing Order No. 42.

I request unanimous consent of the Assembly to withdraw Motion No. 4 standing in my name on the Order Paper. I should say, Mr. Speaker, that my office has checked the matter out with the Government House Leader's office. I believe the Government House Leader is agreeable, and I've advised the Member for Spirit River-Fairview.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: So ordered.

head: MOTIONS FOR RETURNS

121. Mr. R. Clark moved that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing copies of all correspondence

between the Minister of Labour and Robert Lundrigan, Chairman of the Human Rights Commission, since February 5, 1980, regarding the proposed amendments to The Individual's Rights Protection Act.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to give a bit of background to the request before us. The request itself is for correspondence for a specific period of time between the Minister of Labour and the chairman of the Alberta Human Rights Commission, Mr. Robert Lundrigan.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to refresh the memories of hon. members. When The Individual's Rights Protection Act was under review last year and this year, the Alberta Human Rights Commission did advance and make public a statement of its position. That occurred in late January or early February. Subsequently on May 14, after the tabling of the legislation in the House, the Alberta Human Rights Commission, through its chairman, Mr. Lundrigan, again made public a statement of its position vis-a-vis the proposals which had been advanced in the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I should also add that during the preparation and review of policy at that time, I personally had a number of meetings with staff of the commission, a good number with the chairman and senior staff, and some with the commission itself. Now what is asked of the Legislature in this motion is . . . If I may refer hon. members to the fourth edition of *Beauchesne*, and advise hon. members to check Section 390(2). Clearly, Subsection (o) says: "Internal departmental memoranda" are exempt from production.

Mr. Speaker, there's a reason why internal departmental memoranda are exempt. The reason is to assure that officials who are either appointed or employed will feel free and will have the ability to reflect to government in confidence with respect to policy and other matters. If one makes the argument that the commission is not a department — I think that's a tough argument to make, and I'd be prepared to debate that one — but if one were to make that argument, then I direct hon. members' attention to the next citation: "Papers requested, submitted, or received in confidence by the Government from sources outside the Government" are also exempt from production. I would submit, especially having regard to the fact that the commission itself advanced, first, its original position of requests, and second, its reflection upon what was produced by government for amendments to the statute, that it voluntarily made its position very well known at that time. So we in fact have had material submitted, or at least the hon. leader thinks we've had material submitted, that was submitted in confidence, given that situation.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would point to (a) of Section 390, page 138 of the fifth edition: "Legal opinions or advice provided for the use of government" are also exempt from production. I would point out to hon. members that the chairman is a lawyer, and that he may indeed have provided what was, in his opinion, some reflection upon the legality and interpretation of certain proposals.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I think there are three good reasons why the documentation should not be produced. I would submit that any one of them, let alone a combination of them, is sufficient to undermine this motion in a fatal way. Accordingly, I ask the hon. members to reject the motion.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, in rising to support Motion for a Return No. 121, it seems to me that the three arguments for not accepting Motion No. 121 that the hon. minister has presented to the Assembly are strained in the extreme. First of all, as I recall the debate in 1972 when we established the Human Rights Commission and passed The Individual's Rights Protection Act, there was really little question at that time that we were not just establishing a department; we were establishing a human rights commission which would have a degree of independence that is not normally associated with any department of government. So I would say that you cannot compare the commission with a department. If we were talking about a department, the Motion would fail. But we are talking about a commission which has its life, if you like, set out in Bill No. 2, and as a consequence has a degree of independence, or is supposed to. Therefore, the suggestion to equate the Human Rights Commission with a department of government is just not correct. The government may want to do for political reasons, but it's just not correct from a parliamentary point of view.

The second question, Mr. Speaker, is this issue of correspondence given to the hon. minister in confidence. Now over the years I've been a member of this Assembly, we have always passed motions for returns where, if people from outside the government have given information to the government in the form of a letter, we would have to get their consent. I suspect the problem is not getting the consent of Mr. Lundrigan. I suspect the problem is getting the consent of the government. Because it's not just a case of the information coming from the commission to the government; we're asking for the correspondence of the Minister of Labour as well. Frankly, when it deals with a commission established by one of the pieces of legislation in this province that's supposed to have primacy, I find that very difficult to understand.

The third reason, the most strained of all, is the legal opinion argument. Now the fact of the matter is that the current chairman of the Human Rights Commission happens to be a lawyer. So be it. But that hardly means that any letter he writes to the minister is a legal opinion. Really, Mr. Speaker, what in heaven's name are we doing when we have to stretch credulity to this level, to come in with arguments that say: well, because the chairman is a lawyer, therefore it's a legal opinion, and therefore we can't accept it.

Mr. Speaker, the rules are not to make the entire legislative process look completely ridiculous. When one stretches the rules out of all proportion — and I say with great respect to the minister that's what he's doing in this case. If the government doesn't want to give the information, let them accept the political responsibility for closing the door, as they often do, as they usually do, as a matter of fact. But let's not try to dress it up as some kind of reasonable explanation, because frankly, it isn't. This is a motion requesting information that the people of Alberta have a right to receive, and in my judgment this Assembly has a duty to pass it.

MR. SPEAKER: Before the debate continues, might I perhaps clarify the position of the Chair. It seems to me that a considerable portion of the remarks made thus far might be taken to relate to a point of order, and I'm not sure whether I'm being invited to rule on whether the question is in order. If I am, it's an invitation I obviously can't accept because I'm not aware of the nature of the correspondence. Therefore I am unable to relate it to any of the precedents in *Beauchesne* or the *Standing Orders*

of the Assembly. So I'm assuming that we're in an ordinary debate on a motion for a return.

MR. HORSMAN: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker, I want to deal with the arguments advanced by the Member for Spirit River-Fairview in his presentation when he waxed bombastic, in his usual manner. It seems to me that the case made by the Minister of Labour is quite reasonable. Members opposite who are in the opposition benches who have had experience as members of government, realize quite clearly that there must be a free flow of information between ministers and either people in the departments of the minister or commissions and boards for which the minister bears some responsibility.

With respect to this particular exchange of correspondence, it is quite clear that nothing has been done which has impeded the commission's making its views public. That has been pointed out very clearly by the Minister of Labour. But it goes beyond the realm of reason to accept the arguments put by the Member for Spirit River-Fairview that any exchange of correspondence between the minister and the chairman of the commission must be made public. That's what is being advanced. Mr. Speaker, that just couldn't work. Surely in the relationship between the chairman of any commission or board there has to be an opportunity to exchange views of a legal nature, a legal opinion or advice which offer alternatives that can be taken under consideration by the minister. It would be impossible for a proper relationship to exist without that exchange of alternative opinions and views.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it is quite in order to defeat this motion, and I would urge hon. members of the Assembly to do so. Then let us get on with the business of the House for the remainder of the day.

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the comments of my colleagues. I have not yet heard arguments from the hon. Leader of the Opposition as to the reason he has put forward this motion for a return, but I would expect that, having heard the lucid remarks of my colleague, the Minister of Labour, he would probably follow the precedent he put forward earlier this afternoon by withdrawing the motion. I'm sure all hon. members would be prepared to provide unanimous consent for that.

MR. R. CLARK: Don't hold your breath, Julian.

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, with respect to the arguments put forward by the Member for Spirit River-Fairview, I think the hon. member neglects to appreciate the distinction that exists within the word "independence" when we deal with bodies of this nature. The independence characteristic we attribute to a commission such as this is its independence in making decisions that affect those who come before that board, in the same sense that the Securities Commission, which reports to me, is independent in the decisions it makes. The same with the Automobile Insurance Board; it is independent in the decisions it makes. That's the way we would want it. We set up these boards and commissions by our legislation so that the decisions they make for the benefit of the public are arrived at on an independent basis without the hand of government directing them. When it comes to other matters, the commissions themselves would hope that the advice that such commissions, boards, and agencies might provide to government could be provided with all due

candor and frankness.

If, by the acceptance of this motion, we were to serve notice on all commissions, boards, and agencies in the province that the only way they might be candid and frank is verbally, when providing their advice to the minister, we would defeat the entire process of efficient government. For that reason, the motion, while it speaks specifically to the Human Rights Commission, would act as a precedent with respect to all boards and commissions and would create difficulties I'm sure the hon. Leader of the Opposition probably did not perceive when he first drafted the motion and would now be in a better position to withdraw it.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, just a couple of comments. I felt that as a former member of the commission I should rise. I realize we're talking here about a larger principle in terms of all those types of bodies that happen to fit under the umbrella of the Legislature in terms of having Acts and so on that support them. As a member of the commission at that time — and I don't see any reason why circumstances would have changed — I must say that all of us who were members felt that when we offered comments, either written or verbal, they were held in confidence. We deal with some very, very sensitive issues and some very, very sensitive people. I feel you would place members of such bodies, in particular the Human Rights Commission, in an absolutely untenable position in terms of the kind of comments that they should and must make in trying to advise and assist the minister, especially when framing legislation that has to do with the commission.

MR. SPEAKER: May the hon. Leader of the Opposition conclude the debate?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, in rising to conclude the debate, let me first assure the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs that despite [his] generous suggestion I have no intention at all of withdrawing the motion for a return.

MR. NOTLEY: Better luck next time, Julian.

MR. R. CLARK: When one considers the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs somewhat of an advocate for the consumer, one wonders which consumer the minister is talking about on this occasion: is it the government or the public?

I remind the Member for Three Hills also that, with the kind of attitude just mentioned in the House, all members in the Assembly should stop and do some pausing as to who the Human Rights Commission is serving: is it serving the government or the public of Alberta? This question is designed specifically to look at the very controversial legislation which came before the Assembly last year.

MR. YOUNG: What about *Beauchesne*?

MR. R. CLARK: What about *Beauchesne*? I'll come to *Beauchesne* in just a moment.

I say to members of the government, who obviously decided some time ago that they're going to turn down this resolution ... I note today they're somewhat more sensitive though on this question of making public information public or not. Had we had this debate during the

last part of the last session, likely we would only have had one member speak from the government side, rather than the four or five today.

With regard to the citation from *Beauchesne* the Minister of Labour mentioned, let's deal with the third one first, the legal opinions. If the minister wanted to express that kind of logic to its logical conclusion, members of the Assembly wouldn't be able to see the report from the former Attorney General, the expert on hogs, because he's chairman of the board, he's chairman of the group, and he's a lawyer. So it just might be some legal advice to the government. I admit that is stretching the point, but that's the same kind of logic that the Minister of Labour is using today. I would hope the chairman of the Human Rights Commission is far better equipped.

On the second point, correspondence in confidence. If the Minister of Labour had come to the Assembly today and said, I've talked the matter over with the chairman of the Human Rights Commission, and in the interest of the Human Rights Commission for this or that reason, the chairman doesn't feel it's in the best interests of the commission to make that correspondence public, I would have been prepared to accept that. But from what the minister said I got no indication at all that any concern was expressed by the chairman of the Human Rights Commission about having this information made public.

The third and last point I want to make, Mr. Speaker, is with regard to the three citations the Minister of Labour used. The minister used that citation from *Beauchesne* that talked about government departments and agencies. I well recall, and so should the Minister of Labour, in 1972 when The Individual's Rights Protection Act and the Human Rights Commission legislation came in, there was great talk about independence of the commission and supremacy of the legislation dealing with the individual. We've seen very clearly here today that this government, some seven or eight years later, now sees the Human Rights Commission as an arm of the Department of Labour, and it has lost its independence.

We had that suspicion — in fact, more than a suspicion — during the spring session when we debated the amendments dealing with the legislation. Regrettably, that suspicion has been confirmed today by the Minister of Labour trying to hide behind the citations in *Beauchesne* in a matter that seems to me, not being a lawyer, to stretch to the most ridiculous point in an attempt to keep information that should be public if we're really interested in human rights legislation and human rights in this province. The government is choosing not to do that. It's choosing to keep the information to itself and just add to the suspicions which are already there about the commitment it has to the commission.

[Mr. Speaker declared the motion lost. Several members rose calling for a division. The division bell was rung]

[Three minutes having elapsed, the House divided]

For the motion:

Buck	Mandeville	Sindlinger
Clark, R.	Notley	Speaker, R.

Against the motion:

Anderson, C.	Harle	Musgreave
Anderson, D.	Hiebert	Oman
Batiuk	Horsman	Osterman
Bogle	Hyland	Pahl
Borstad	Hyndman	Paproski

Bradley	Isley	Pengelly
Campbell	Johnston	Purdy
Carter	King	Reid
Chambers	Knaak	Russell
Chichak	Kowalski	Schmidt
Clark, L.	Koziak	Shaben
Cook	Kroeger	Stewart
Cookson	Kushner	Thompson
Crawford	Lysons	Topolnisky
Cripps	Mack	Webber
Diachuk	Magee	Weiss
Embury	McCrae	Wolstenholme
Fjordbotten	McCrimmon	Woo
Fyfe	Miller	Young
Gogo		

Totals: Ayes – 6 Noes – 58

122. Dr. Buck moved that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing:

- (1) the total number of full-time permanent female employees of the government of Alberta as at March 31, 1980;
- (2) the average salary for all employees referred to in (1);
- (3) the total number of full-time permanent male employees of the government of Alberta as at March 31, 1980;
- (4) the average salary of all employees referred to in (3).

[Motion Carried]

123. Dr. Buck moved that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing:

- (1) the number of parcels of land within the boundaries of the Edmonton restricted development area purchased or optioned during the period between April 1, 1979, and March 31, 1980, by or on behalf of the government of Alberta;
- (2) the legal description of land enumerated in (1), and the names of the vendors of such parcels;
- (3) the amount paid for each parcel of land enumerated in (1).

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, I have no problem with a large part of the motion proposed by the Member for Clover Bar, but I would like to produce a minor amendment in the first part. After "purchased" I would like to have "or optioned" deleted from the request. There are some copies of the amendment here.

The main reason for asking for this deletion, Mr. Speaker, is that in this case sometimes options would be established but not completed until after, the time frame of March 31, 1980, for example. This would tend to give out information which could be used to disadvantage in terms of purchase. I wouldn't think it would be in the public interest to do this.

[Motion as amended carried]

124. Dr. Buck moved that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing:

- (1) the total number of full-time permanent female employees of the government of Alberta as at March 31, 1979;
- (2) the average salary for all employees referred to in (1);
- (3) the total number of full-time permanent male em-

ployees of the government of Alberta as at March 31, 1979;

- (4) the average salary of all employees referred to in (3).

[Motion carried]

head: MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

202. Moved by Mr. Sindlinger:

Be it resolved that the Legislative Assembly urge the government to establish a scholarship fund for students playing a sport for any university or college intercollegiate team, in order to encourage highly skilled young athletes to remain in Alberta, to develop a high level of recreational competence and expertise, and to provide a rich resource of skills and leadership for Alberta's recreation and leisure industry.

[Adjourned debate March 25: Mr. Trynchy]

DR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, it has indeed been a few days since we last dealt with this particular motion. In the absence of the hon. Mr. Trynchy, who is at a conference, in speaking on this motion I would like to offer a few comments of my own. As I look at the motion, from my point of view there are a few items that need clarification. The motion reads:

... a scholarship fund for students playing a sport for any university or college intercollegiate team, in order to encourage highly skilled young athletes to remain in Alberta, to develop a high level of recreational competence and expertise, and to provide a rich resource of skills and leadership for Alberta's recreation and leisure industry.

One of the questions I have with respect to the motion — and perhaps the Member for Calgary Buffalo would be able to respond to it — is whether we are speaking purely in terms of team sports or individual sports, or whether there would be room for both individual sports and team sports. Because it could perhaps be construed from the wording of the motion that we're dealing simply in terms of the team activity.

One of the other concerns I have with regard to clarification with respect to the motion deals with the whole matter of young athletes. If a scholarship program is to be put in place in terms of training and all the rest of it, perhaps the mover of the motion could see fit to think in terms of extending this kind of scholarship program to senior citizens as well, because there's no sense in having a cutoff simply for young people. The way things seem to be going with retirement programs these days, the whole matter of young may soon overlap with the age of retirement. In any respect, in the course of this last year the senior citizens' games held in Camrose were a great success. I know that a tremendous number of senior citizens endeavour to keep themselves fit, alert, and very active by participating in both individual and team sports. A tremendous number of them are also involved in going back to universities and colleges to further their education.

One other aspect of the wording of the motion causes me a certain amount of concern. The motion contains the words 'to remain in Alberta'. I think this raises a certain difficulty. It is somewhat Utopian and overly idealistic to assume that if scholarships are awarded to persons for either athletic or academic reasons, they are going to stay in the province of Alberta. There's a real sense in which

we would hope they would not all want to stay within the province of Alberta for the rest of their days. I state that not from a lack of desire to have them remain in our province, but from an understanding that various individuals — in fact, I believe all individuals — benefit by a great breadth of experience by going to other places within the country, other places in North America or the world for that matter, to gain in the wholeness of their own personal development, their whole experiential wealth. In turn, when they come back to Canada, when they come back to Alberta, we as a province would stand to benefit even more, not only because of their athletic prowess or their scholastic achievement but because they have also been very much involved in other social milieux. They would come back with understandings of other cultural pressures that exist throughout the world. So I think there is somewhat of a narrow interpretation here within the wording of the motion, to encourage people to remain within the province. We would hope they would have sufficient experience and maturity that they could benefit greatly from contact in other areas of the world.

For a fair number of us as individuals, I think that when it comes to the matter of sports expertise most of us have been subjected to the poor theory which has sometimes been used with regard to teaching people how to swim: throw them in the deep end and hope they survive. When I look back in terms of my own personal experience, especially with regard to such team sports as basketball or hockey, it usually was a matter of trying to find enough bodies to put on the sheet of ice or other playing surface, and then somehow you were expected to survive. I find that that type of development of individualization in sport, while not usually fatal, is one that really lacks a certain amount of positive input with regard to the development of individuals in terms of their own particular sports expertise.

One thing that is sadly lacking and has been lacking in the past is the whole matter of proper coaching at all levels, whether it be in a high school program or a university program. In recent years I think there has been tremendous development with regard to volunteers in community associations. Many volunteers have put in extensive hours with regard to coaching various sports activities, and of course we owe a great vote of thanks to those dedicated personnel. Nevertheless, it's such a situation that it should be encouraged. So there is an aspect of being able to give financial support to those kinds of organizations which really are serious and have expertise with regard to training young male or female athletes.

An experience for a number of people is that often when you are put onto the playing surface and you do not have that kind of coaching background, it becomes very evident that if you have the type of physique, coordination, and some kind of natural bent for sports, in all likelihood you will rise to the surface of that particular sport, at least within the local team's area. But there are other personnel who are not naturally gifted with athletic prowess. Some of us grew up with a childhood image that we were short, fat, and always very clumsy. We made less-than-adequate defensemen in hockey. We made less than adequate guards in basketball. Nevertheless, we got out there and tried. I think there's a great deal of merit in those kinds of examples. I realize that when I went to college, an awfully long time ago now, I went to a small college where we participated as a college in a number of sports. The only reason I was involved in most of those sports was that we were short of bodies, and I was sort of

warm, alive, and able to stand up and not get fouled off the court before the end of the game. But again, what happened there was a feeling of awareness within a college and an awareness of participation within a university that no matter how great or how not-so-great your particular athletic expertise was, you were part of that whole system and were allowed to grow as an individual. After a length of time in terms of some of those sports, you were able to increase not only your self-awareness, to build up your interest, but to build up your self-confidence in some measure.

In effect, what I'm saying here is that sports are not just for superstars. I'm afraid that, given some of the difficulties with regard to scholarship funds as they have been evidenced in the United States, it has moved more and more in the direction of trying to cultivate the superstar kind of complex. Many of us today are very much concerned about the whole matter of participation in sports and that the more sports participated in, whether it even be walking or running, so much the better. The difficult aspect with regard to any kind of scholarship fund exclusively for athletics is that it leads towards that kind of semi-elitism.

Again, there are those other kinds of drawbacks mentioned before with respect to team sports and scholarships in the United States. Often recruitment is done on the basis of sports expertise alone, and a tremendous temptation exists for some degrees to be awarded because you're a great rushing fullback and also happened to take an elective course in basket weaving or something like that.

I think that within the province of Alberta brief mention should be made of a very fine existing program. I realize that perhaps the proper terminology has shifted slightly, but I think that most persons here realize that when I talk about tier 2 hockey, or what used to be known as junior B hockey within the province, such teams as the Calgary Canucks or the Fort Saskatchewan Traders — teams that participate in that league have been well known over the years. In the owners, the management, and the coaching there, the youngsters have not only been coached and trained in that particular sport but have also been given every encouragement with regard to furthering their education. Often, some private individuals involved as fans or as owners have contributed financially towards the education of those hockey players.

My final remarks, Mr. Speaker, deal with a very interesting, a very commendable press release issued on September 30 by the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower dealing with the Alberta Heritage Scholarship Fund. I, for one, very much appreciate the fact that the fund has been announced and that it will be funded in the amount of \$5.275 million for the launching of the fund in 1981-82. I'm very appreciative of the fact that because of the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund funds being used for this particular fund, various sections of this program will acknowledge the fine heritage of this province by having various sections named after some of our notable historic figures. And again, I would applaud the minister on naming the first prize in this program after Sir Frederick Haultain. I would hope that at some later date Colonel MacLeod would be considered as one of the historic persons to be memorialized in this fashion.

I believe the announcement of September 30 is a well-balanced approach in its many components. It is not just focussed primarily on sports, although that is part of the component package. But in the first announced section, the prize includes reference to the arts, the fine arts, the

social and physical sciences, education, and the humanities. One of the statements, the fundamental principles underlying these awards, is:

that the accomplishments must be of benefit to Albertans, are as a result of work that took place primarily in this province, and are of significance to the particular discipline . . . [But] as much as possible, individuals of the highest talent [are also encouraged] to stay in Alberta to continue their work.

That part is commendable, because we have some very outstanding performers within this province, persons who have been involved in research, persons who have been involved in writing and in fine arts. Hopefully they will be encouraged to remain in this province, for many of them have trained in other places, many have trained both here and in other places, and many have come back from fairly lucrative enticements in other provinces and in other parts of the world to be part of our Alberta mosaic.

In the announcement made earlier in September, I find that that cognizance has been made with regard to high school achievement awards. That moves it down from the motion's focus on colleges and universities. I believe that this is to be commended. Again there will be undergraduate achievement awards and graduate programs. In the announcement with the respect to graduate programs, a comment is made that Albertans will be encouraged to study anywhere in the world. That relates again to my earlier comments that this will help broaden the whole development of the individual towards maturity by studying in places in addition to this interesting province of Alberta. There is yet the other aspect of the encouragement of career-development scholarships, a very significant new aspect with regard to the whole issue of scholarships, prizes, and awards.

Then we come to the \$1 million, a very significant amount being put forward with regard to athletic and recreational scholarships, and that a three-person advisory committee has already been approached, or at least the chairman has already been approached in that regard, to give advice to the minister. It's here that there is this rather interesting development, that encouragement will be given to community volunteers at all levels with respect to furthering their own expertise as they seek to coach the development of young athletes within this province. Thank you.

MRS. CHICHAK: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity today to participate in this debate on Motion 202. During the spring debate on this motion, I recollect that a number of objects were cited as effects of a scholarship fund which might be supported by the government for students playing sports from any Alberta university or college intercollegiate team. Some of the objects cited, as I recollect, were that this would assist in the development of competitiveness. However, depending on the structure of such a scholarship program, it would perhaps simply serve a limited number of young Albertans.

Another object stated was that it would provide a rich resource of leadership skills for Alberta's recreation and leisure industry. Here again, depending on the breadth or scope of such a program, this would perhaps be very minimal, because a scholarship for a student playing in any particular sport wouldn't necessarily provide those other attributes we wish to achieve. I think another object that was stated was the encouragement for highly skilled young athletes to remain in Alberta, and that it would help to develop professionalism in sport. I think that

from day to day, as we listen to our sporting newscasts, we find that it appears that today professionalism more and more is generally denoted by a high-cost contract.

I would hope that if this motion is to pass, and we as a government develop in the direction that it appears we are moving, that we look very carefully at the manner in which such a program is established. Recognizing the need to prepare ourselves effectively as a society to cope with the increasing leisure time and the shorter work week, it has become necessary, of course, to approach new planning directives at an earlier age level. I think it's well recognized that government support on both a national and provincial level, in co-operation with numerous sporting and community associations over the last decade, has served to direct the attention of the whole country to physical health, sport, and sport achievements more than ever before in our history. I believe the Olympic Games of 1976 in Montreal and the Commonwealth Games of 1978 in Edmonton provided a capstone to this decade of achievement in support for athletes, not only from our universities and colleges, but from other systems as well.

However, perhaps even more important is the means by which such achievements and programs have been reached in sports. There should be no doubt that testimony must be paid not only to the work of the athletes, but to the many agencies and associations, both private and public, and the professionals and the thousands of volunteers. All of these agencies working together created a most favorable environment for the high levels of individual and team performance. To continue the high level of success and growth in sports, our programs and support must have flexibility, adaptation, and ability for change. Perhaps the role of the universities may be greater than it has been to date. I believe Canadian universities can play a decisive part in the pursuit of athletic excellence. I believe they have the capacity to relate advanced research to sport situations and where research can be applied. They can be translators of research and its application.

The universities could enhance athletic potential by their acceptance of the principle of athletic scholarships with academic achievement. I think the hon. Member for Calgary Millican made some very good points relevant to this particular concern that many have had with respect to government-funded sport scholarships.

Perhaps it is timely in this debate, in discussion, and in the planning and preparation of the sporting scholarship program — a number of questions need to be considered in the development of the scholarship fund for students in sports. For the hon. Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower and for all of us, in our participation in the development of a program, I would perhaps put a number of points that we should have in mind and examine, in order that we might come forward with what could be the most excellent program that can be achieved to serve the purpose, not only for a limited number of skilled individuals in the pursuit of sporting activities, but for others.

With substantive government funding for a scholarship program, I think one needs to ask whether such extensive government involvement in funding scholarships will limit or turn away any such participation by the private sector, which has been there to this point. Will it serve to turn away and negate any success that one might have in soliciting the increased participation from the private sector? Will the program continue to involve the volunteer in building an expansion of support for recreational activi-

ties at the community level? Or will such a program enhance and encourage them to give even more of their time and effort to develop better and stronger programs?

Would such a scholarship be available to develop first-rate coaches? Or will this be a program for individual athletes, without directing some portion of the funds towards the broader base that is necessary in a wholesome program? Will such a program tend to build a sports pyramid at the expense of the development of a broad base? How will the program include the handicapped and other citizens not necessarily involved in our postsecondary educational systems? Rather than embarking on a scholarship program available through limited systems, it might be developed to where the numbers of the sources from which one can participate is broadened. I think that is important. I think that sports governing bodies desire or seek to produce excellent athletes from a broad base, rather than from a limited position.

Other considerations and decisions must be made, of course, for successful programs toward the creation of a first-class sports and recreation scholarship system. We have numerous programs now that have public funding support, as well as from the private sector, but perhaps at this time we need to look at what comes first in the pecking order. Or is there a pecking order? Do the athletes come first? Is it the extent and nature of the sporting facilities, or is it the coaches? It is important to have the pieces of this puzzle put together in the proper order, or concurrently, for the most successful results.

If we look at the international scene in this whole area, we find some of the weaknesses in programs that have been developed in other countries. I would perhaps just make reference to two or three. The scholarship program in France has first-rate coaching and facilities, but it lacks a strongly supportive school physical education feeder system, developing few top-notch athletes. I think that is important. At what level do you begin your support programs and scholarships? Do we need a feeder system?

I think from the record that Britain over many decades apparently held steadfast to the view that sport is a noble hobby. Of course the result of such a view is evident today, although they have been making improvements in that area and changing from their previous point of view. The United States has perhaps the world's most extensive school and professional/commercial sporting system, and it's funded in large measure by the free enterprise sector. I think all of us have been concerned over a period of time at the many weaknesses in that particular system. I'm not going to elaborate them at this time. So I think when we're considering and developing such a program, it would do us well to examine all the pitfalls in these other areas and ensure that we don't include them in our program.

Perhaps the Minister of Education will have an opportunity to lend to this debate his remarks with respect to his thoughts on some of the questions I raised, and with respect to his announcement of a few weeks ago with regard to the scholarship fund from the heritage fund, which has now been announced and is planned to be put in place. I suppose he has had the opportunity to put together for our consideration the full breadth of the program as we might want to have it recognized in this province.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have had the opportunity at least to put forward a few of these questions for consideration, and hope that in our future considerations these questions will have brought to mind some of the areas that are often overlooked and are a hindsight rather

than a foresight.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. OMAN: Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to participate in debate today on what I think is a very relevant and important topic. I think the Member for Calgary Buffalo has introduced into this Assembly a matter which is of concern and certainly of import to all Albertans.

For a moment I'd like to call the attention of the Assembly to one area in which I think the province has done very well as far as athletics and recreation are concerned. Rather than zeroing in simply on the professionals — and I'm not sure that the mover of this motion wanted to zero in totally on that or the superstar idea — I think the government has proceeded with its matching recreational and cultural grants to make sure that not just the super attainers but all Albertans of all levels of achievement have the opportunity to develop and hone their skills in the fine recreational facilities that can be found throughout the length and breadth of this land. Not that we have all we might have or have attained perfection here, but I think we're well on the way.

Aside from the many millions of dollars flowing out to the many communities across Alberta, there have also been some specific celebrations, if you will, or competitions of worldwide stature that have added to the facilities we have. I refer specifically now to the Commonwealth Games held here in the city of Edmonton in 1978. I don't know how many millions of dollars were spent by the city and province. What stands out in people's minds tends to be Commonwealth Stadium, which is indeed a fine stadium. We in Calgary envy you that here, along with your football team, of course. Also, many auxiliary facilities — swimming facilities, track and field, field houses, and so on — exist in your fine city and as a result of the Commonwealth Games, have developed.

As you know, in Calgary at the moment we are in the process of making what we hope will be a successful bid for the Winter Olympics in 1988, and we're much encouraged at this point. As you know, the bid will be made in 1981, in Germany. Facilities are already beginning to flow from that. As you know, we have decided to build what is to be known I think as the Olympic Coliseum in Calgary. Not only will that facility be built but also ski facilities, skating ovals, many facilities of one of a kind in the country, if not in North America, which will bring skilled athletes of world calibre from all over the world to Alberta, which will in turn rub off — and that's part of the point of the Olympics and other sporting events — and give incentive, momentum, if you will, to professional, to well-trained athletes in our province.

The construction team of the coliseum in Calgary has been very busy laying out plans for that building. One of the unique aspects of that building and of the total hockey program in Calgary is that we expect Hockey Canada and the Olympic team will be centred there. In that facility we are putting in a facility for hockey research which will be unique in some sense in Canada, if not in the world, and which we hope will restore Canada to its position of prominence in hockey, which in a sense is our native game here in Canada, centred in the province of Alberta.

Along with these real and potential facilities, as I mentioned before, the matching grant systems are still going on throughout our communities. So if I may pat ourselves a little bit on the back, I think we are providing a facility for all Albertans, which I think is in the spirit of the motion here and even goes beyond that.

My colleagues have mentioned, and I'm sure the minister will want to comment more specifically on the scholarship programs he introduced here a few weeks ago, which I think are of great encouragement and a great step forward, and take care, to a great extent, of some of the concerns the Member for Calgary Buffalo mentions. The \$1 million for athletic and recreational scholarships was mentioned by the Member for Calgary Millican. I remind the Assembly this is only for one year, the season of '81-82. I don't know what the ongoing effect here will be, but I'm sure there will also be ongoing scholarships for each succeeding year as time goes on.

I'm reminded of an incident that supposedly took place somewhere, sometime, at a particular baseball stadium. A fan in the stands just above the third base area was extremely critical of the home team's third base player. There wasn't anything that man could do but that the gentleman from the stands would criticize it, saying and yelling out loud, you could have done that one; or, you sure blew that one, didn't you. Finally in utter frustration and disgust, the player threw his hat and glove into the stands in the direction of this critic and said, "Here, my friend, you take the hat and glove and come down and see if you can do any better". To which the man acceded and said, "Sure, I'll come down and play". When he got in position, a ball was bounding toward him and, of course, it tied him up and he missed it. He got up to bat and couldn't hit. Finally, the man who had originally played the position chuckled away and said, "Now see, you're not doing so hot yourself. The man replied, "Say, after you've messed up this position, there isn't anybody that could play it".

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that when you look at it, we've got a pretty good system going here. With the new introduction of scholarships this fall, with the facilities program we have, I suggest we allow this program to proceed. I think we'll find that in the future, as in the present, we will attract and develop in Alberta the calibre of athlete which will be the envy of many places in Canada and the world.

We met as a Calgary caucus with Dr. Wagner and the board of governors of the University of Alberta. We know some of the concerns he has, the programs he has in mind, and the great plans. Recently he brought in a swimming coach of worldwide acclaim and ability. I see some great things happening in that particular university, and I'm sure that's true of other facilities and universities in our province. I think we have provided these people with the means with which to go ahead and develop these programs. I think Alberta will be a province in Canada and a place in the world where we will see great developments.

Thank you.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, in rising to participate in this debate, I want to say how timely it is that this motion is before the Assembly on the second day of our fall sitting. I recall very well the discussion which took place when the motion was introduced by the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo. I think it's fair to say that participation in that debate by several members, when the matter first came before the Assembly, had a great deal to do with the decisions subsequently reached by government with respect to the recommendations which will be placed before the Assembly within a matter of days under the capital projects division of the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund.

I want to emphasize to all members of the Assembly

and to the public that what I have proposed in my press announcement, alluded to earlier by the Member for Calgary Millican, is a recommendation to this Assembly. Of course, the program is not yet in place, but dealing specifically with the recommendations of my department and the government, I want to touch on the subject of athletic scholarships and that particular component of the scholarship fund.

First of all, I want to say that we were very pleased to receive an indication from a very distinguished Albertan that he would serve in the role of chairman of the advisory committee. Part of the difficulty we have as legislators, of course, is in seeking out proper advice on matters of this nature from experts in the field. In this particular case, for a number of reasons I intend to touch on, we felt it very important to obtain the advice of experts. Therefore, Dr. Maury Van Vliet, the former head of the department of physical education at the University of Alberta and the chairman of the Commonwealth Games, which were recently very successfully held in this city of Edmonton, has agreed to assume the chairmanship of that advisory committee.

Today I want to announce for the members of the Assembly the other members who will make up that committee. I'm very pleased that with regard to the recreational aspect of the scholarship proposal, Mr. Clarence Venance of Kitscoty, Alberta, will be serving on that committee, and to advise members of the Assembly that Mr. Venance, who is 52 years of age, a vice-principal of the Kitscoty school and teacher for 32 years, has been very active in sports and has been participating in a voluntary way as a coach for many types of athletic activities. Working with young people in a volunteer capacity, I'm sure Mr. Venance will bring to this committee a wealth of experience to enable him to advise us further.

The other member I wish to announce to the Assembly today, Mr. Lou Goodwin, comes from Calgary and is a retired dean of physical education at the University of Calgary. No doubt he is familiar to many members of this Assembly. He is a native Albertan. He is presently semi-retired, while still actively involved in recreational sports and instructional skiing. Amongst a number of publications, he recently completed a book on the history of a football team operating out of Calgary, by the name of the Stampeders. Some of you may be familiar with and indeed may be fans of that particular club, although I can't say that I am myself — unless they get to the Grey Cup of course, and then I become a very loyal western Canadian. I say that in a light vein, because I know that subject is near and dear to the hearts of the members of the Calgary caucus. Mr. Goodwin, in addition to his other qualifications, was the first dean of the Faculty of Physical Education at the University of Calgary, and indeed is known as the father of that faculty. Amongst a number of additional awards, he was awarded the Canada medal by the government of Canada, and he has an extensive involvement with sports associations. He served for many years on the Calgary Board of Education and as a city alderman as well.

Mr. Speaker, I believe these three very distinguished Albertans will be able to provide my department and, through my department, the members of this Assembly with advice on how to implement the scholarships relating to athletics and recreation that I announced in the program.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I should outline as well the terms of reference of that advisory committee. They will

be charged with the responsibility for, first, examining existing recreation and athletic funding programs both here and elsewhere, if it is deemed appropriate to do so. I want to emphasize "recreation and athletic funding", because several members emphasized that point today and in the previous debate. Secondly, to identify needs that are not being met under existing programs; and finally, the establishment of priorities and recommendations of the athletic and recreation scholarship programs which will flow from this funding.

A number of questions must come to mind on the part of Albertans as we enter a very important new phase of a scholarship for Canada. I think I should pose them and then answer them for members of the Assembly. First of all, why are athletic scholarships being established? Primarily, of course, to encourage the development of Albertans in the field of recreation and athletics in recognition of the benefits which accrue through an active and healthy citizenry. In order to achieve this objective, ways and means will be examined to accomplish the following: first, to assist Alberta athletes to develop their skills to their fullest potential; secondly, to retain Alberta's best athletes within the province to the extent that is desirable. I'm adding that qualification to that particular point, Mr. Speaker, because it is important that we not be too parochial in our approach to this funding. Indeed, many athletes developed in Alberta should have the opportunity to go beyond the borders and take their talents, if they are in the field of professional sports, to the place where they are wanted. We should not want to stand in the way of that happening. Furthermore, I think it's a good thing for young Albertans, and perhaps some not so young who will be affected by this, to serve as good ambassadors for Alberta and Canada.

Thirdly, to encourage participation in competitive sports at the community level as well as at the educational institution level. That is very important — once again addressed by several members today and earlier. Finally, to provide a rich resource of skills and leadership for Alberta's recreation and leisure industry. And members will recognize those words.

I think the second question which has been posed is that the issue of athletic scholarships has been the subject of controversial discussion within the Canadian interuniversity athletic union; how will the establishment of athletic scholarships be viewed by that body? It's my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that that body is primarily opposed to the direct funding of athletes by educational institutions. I think it is evident from recent studies in the United States of America, where athletic scholarships and awards have been in vogue for some years, that that is indeed one of the real difficulties associated with those programs. Therefore, our scholarships will be implemented by the government as third-party scholarships and not directly funded or routed through the institutions. We believe that will remove any serious opposition to this form of support. I've asked that the recent announcement by the government of the province of British Columbia with regard to their program be reviewed as to its possible implementation or adoption by this government. I think we should not be bound by their particular approach, but we will examine it.

The third question which has been raised quite often, and again today, is: will athletic scholarships be based strictly on athletic achievement, or will consideration be given to a student's academic performance? The answer to that question is, quite simply, that it is indeed anticipated that a student's academic ability will be considered

in the selection of scholarship recipients.

Fourthly, what funding is currently available in Canada and in Alberta in the athletic area? The government of Canada established the athletic assistance program in 1975 to assist top-level athletes with expenses incurred through training and competition. Athletes assisted include those involved in Olympic individual sports, team sports, international individual sports, and international team sports. I won't go into the classification that is accorded, but there is a good deal of information on that subject.

I want to point out as well that the Department of Recreation and Parks has allocated an amount of \$185,000 to the Alberta athlete development program. This program is committed to providing financial assistance to help high-performance athletes in the province develop sports skills to become nationally ranked athletes. Both able-bodied and disabled athletes are funded under this program.

I appreciate the comments today on the subject of ensuring that these programs are made accessible to people who may be suffering from physical disabilities. We are all aware of the marvelous work that is being carried on in the various sporting events for people suffering disabilities, and we want to encourage that to continue. The hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood, as well as other members, has touched on that in her remarks to the Assembly today. We want to assure the Assembly that that is a matter of concern to us, not just in the new program we are considering, but indeed in the program already in place through the Department of Recreation and Parks. There is a limitation of funding on that program, but I want to emphasize that the athletic and recreational scholarships under the Alberta Heritage Scholarship Fund will complement, not replace the program under the Department of Recreation and Parks.

Of course, the final question that has been asked of me on so many occasions is: why has \$1 million been allocated? I want to say, Mr. Speaker, in making the decision to use \$100 million — more details will be given on this later, in the course of discussion of the capital projects division, and of course I expect legislation will flow as well in the spring sitting next year — that the proceeds from that investment, similar to the proceeds from the investment of the medical research foundation, will hopefully be in excess of \$10 million per year. In the first year of operation we have allocated what we anticipate will be the maximum amount that can be accommodated in the various elements of the fund, about \$5.3 million.

I should say I was rather amused to read in a letter to the editor in one of the student newspapers, that the government was being accused of serious mismanagement of this \$100 million fund in only receiving an income of \$5.3 million. That was unfortunate, I guess, but that's one of the difficulties of communication to the public. It is obvious that the individual who wrote that letter did not clearly read or understand that by not spending all of the income from the fund in the first year, we are contributing to its eventual growth, so that we may in some way, at least, keep abreast of the effects of inflation and other cost increases; and to permit an expansion of the program, of the number of awards which can be accommodated under the various headings of the program.

But why has \$1 million been allocated to this particular area? That's about 20 per cent, or just a little under. I think it is a significant amount, particularly for a program which is entirely new in its concept. We intend to take a highly innovative approach to support in the areas

of recreation — and I emphasize that again — as well as athletics at the educational institution level. It is our view that the provision of funding to community volunteers in the recreational area, in addition to athletes in the institutions, will necessitate this level of expenditure.

Mr. Speaker, those are some of the questions that have been raised since the program was first announced. There have been a number of others from various speakers which have been addressed today. I think it is fair to say that I will try to have some answers to some of those questions available when this matter comes up for debate in the capital projects division of the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund.

I want to thank those who have participated in the debate, and those who have given me advice over the last several months since this matter came under active consideration by my department. I want to say how much I appreciate the views which have been put forward to me by people such as the Faculty of Physical Education at the University of Calgary. I want to say how much I appreciate the advice which has been given to me with respect to this matter by the four presidents of the universities in Alberta, who came forward with an excellent presentation following a meeting I held with them shortly after assuming the portfolio just over a year ago. I'm indebted to the members of the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund select committee for their views and advice by way of support for this particular approach and the global way with respect to the entire fund and, indeed, with respect to the subject under debate today.

I want to thank the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo for having placed this motion on the Order Paper so that it gave an ample opportunity for the members of the Assembly to participate in the debate and bring their views forward. In addition, I must say that this motion and the recommendations of the select committee have resulted in a fair number of letters from interested parties throughout the province, and many members of the Assembly have taken the time to express their views to me as well. I think we are making a very significant step forward on behalf of young and not-so-young athletes and people involved in recreation in this province, by the implementation of the program.

I am concerned, and I call on all members of the Assembly to make sure that the exciting and dynamic provisions of this proposal are properly communicated throughout the width and breadth of this province. It is important for the people of Alberta to know and understand that the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund is being put to work for the benefit, not just of today's generation but tomorrow's. I am convinced this new proposal will go in large measure towards achieving that end.

With regard to the postsecondary level, I want to say that I expect these awards, these scholarships will not be isolated or solely limited to universities and colleges. I'm sure the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo didn't intend that aspect in this motion, because we must take into consideration the impact this can have upon technical institutions, vocational centres, private colleges, and so on, that receive funding as part of the regular budgeting process of this government. Therefore, I look forward to further discussion of this matter in the capital projects division debate, and to continued advice and consultation with members of the Assembly and the people of Alberta.

MRS. EMBURY: Mr. Speaker, I have been most anxious to participate in the debate on this motion, particu-

larly when it was introduced in the spring, and now finally to have the opportunity this fall to speak on this issue. Like so many in the Assembly, it's a very important area, one I've thought about a lot. I'm always willing to support any endeavors to improve not only the minds of Albertans but also our bodies. I think it takes a lot of concerted effort at all levels to develop the expertise in any type of recreation, or in just utilizing our leisure time, so I'd like to make a few remarks.

Primarily, I could well support the end part of Motion 202, the reasons stated there for the introduction of this motion. I'm afraid I wouldn't support the motion because of the way it's narrowly directed primarily at the universities and colleges. Even in the spring when I considered this matter very seriously, I thought it would probably be best if it could be widened a little more.

Calgary North West, the area I represent, is a very rapidly growing constituency as most of you know, and we have a lot of new communities. I'm very proud of the efforts of the members of the community associations in those areas. They're very aware in their family units of trying to provide the best opportunities for their children. They also need qualified people to help them in this regard.

I'm seeing all kinds of new facilities in Calgary North West. We've moved a long way from the board-fenced hockey rink we had when I was growing up in Calgary. I think the new facilities will be very, very exciting. The community of Edgemont, which is partly in my riding and partly in the riding of Calgary Foothills, is now looking at plans that will be some new type or concept of recreational facility or a leisure centre. I'm sure that just west of my riding, on the boundary, where there is further development, actually in the constituency of Banff-Cochrane, we're going to see some interesting concepts for sports facilities. In fact, I understand that members of my communities, jointly with the members of those new communities like Scenic Acres, are looking at probably putting in some type of recreation facility there. We have found that we also have to move into having a lot more covered facilities, in our climate particularly, so we can develop expertise in our athletes.

Generally I'm very supportive of any measure that will encourage our young people, and probably our older people too, always to be involved in recreational activities. I think there's a high degree of emphasis in this area, probably as much by our television media, but when we have the opportunity to view international sports right in our own homes as these sports are happening, it's quite a thrill, whether it's a hockey event or skating, to sit there and see these things as they happen. There has been a lot more emphasis and enjoyment. More and more people in Canada can participate and really feel very close to some of our prime athletes who bring home many honors to our country. I think anything we can do to help these people . . . Because many of them overcome great odds to excel in their sports endeavors, we should be supportive of them.

Another reason this is a very important area right now is that we are very excited about the 1988 Olympic bid for Calgary. I was very privileged to be in Montreal last November when this decision was awarded to Calgary over Vancouver. I think from now right up until the time the decision is made on where the Olympics will be held, we will find a lot more general interest by the citizens of Alberta.

One other very interesting aspect happened to me this summer on a visit to Hong Kong. When one really

understands that small island, one soon appreciates very much the significance of any form of recreation in Hong Kong. Space is extremely limited. You see all kinds of people out enjoying the parks made available to them. One of the most interesting things I saw — and I know most of you are aware of this — was an elderly lady standing on the cement sidewalk right in downtown Hong Kong early in the morning doing what they call *tai-chi*. It shows a very significant philosophy. They emphasize the importance of movement. *Tai-chi* is very simple, or what appears to us to be very, very simple but very, very fluid movements. Again I think it's interesting to realize the general influence in this area.

I hope that whatever the participation will be, we will try to encourage more people in Alberta to participate in leisure activity like those exercises. Of course to do this we are certainly going to need people who are well-educated and well-skilled in helping to develop — not only develop but to continue to maintain — the health of our citizens.

One aspect I have some concern about in regard to the government sponsoring a lot of scholarships is that I certainly hope it doesn't interfere with the private sector continuing to be approached and be encouraged also to contribute many, many scholarships in this area. I think they have a responsibility, and I believe would be willing to participate in this program too.

I am very pleased with the announcement made by the hon. Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower, and I fully support all aspects of that program. One reason I'm extremely supportive of that program, although it doesn't outline specifically what groups of people can apply: I was very pleased when the minister did say he was willing to receive input.

I think I must take the opportunity right now to comment on one group of people in our Alberta society I feel very, very strongly about. I think sometime we have to pay more attention to the group — I'm speaking primarily of women. We have to look at some of the problems most of us share in our constituencies, such as single-parent families. A lot of these people are really caught in the bind of trying to work to support themselves and their family, yet have very little opportunity to advance themselves through either formal or informal courses. Therefore, they are continually caught in the economic bind; they only can make a maintenance or subsistence salary. Somehow, when the terms of reference are drafted, I hope that a lot of attention will be given to women in our society. Many people have tried to look at how we can actually help our single parents. It's a very difficult concept to look at how communities can actually participate in this, but I've always felt very, very strongly that this is one way, if we would only supply these people with some form of scholarship so that they could actually go on to further their education, then I think they would have a much happier way of life with their children.

Lastly in this regard, I'd also like to speak of a group that I tend to bring up quite often in this Assembly. It's also a women's group. I refer to the profession of nursing. We all know we have a shortage of nurses in this province. [interjection] I think if the minister checked the record you'd find that I've spoken quite frequently on this matter. Excuse me. The member for Clover Bar.

DR. BUCK: You weren't there when the chips were down. Sheila.

MRS. EMBURY: I would like to comment that I think this is an extremely important program for nurses. As we know, we are in a period of an extreme shortage in nursing. I think that now it is a time of not just a cyclical shortage of nurses, it's a very serious shortage across Canada and in the United States, particularly in the western United States. I think we need to have more nurses take more education. We are extremely short of nurses at the graduate level, particularly nurses with PhDs and masters. Also a lot more nurses today are working in public health and in the hospital setting who realize they would have an advantage of a baccalaureate degree. So I hope there will be some emphasis put on the program for this group of people.

One of the last comments I would like to make in regard to the money designated for athletic scholarships is to commend the minister for setting up the committee. Concerns are expressed with respect to athletic scholarships, and I think this is a very nice way to have the committee look at all the implications. No doubt they will receive input from all citizens in the province of Alberta. I think it will reassure many of us who had some concerns with straight athletic scholarships.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree with the motion to adjourn the debate?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

210. Moved by Mr. Hiebert:

Be it resolved that this Assembly urge the government to undertake a study to determine the feasibility of establishing a science centre for Alberta.

MR. HIEBERT: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise, propose, and speak to Motion No. 210. In debating the motion, it's one aspect to do a feasibility study, but I think it's important that we clarify what was envisaged by a science centre. A science centre similar to the Ontario science centre located in suburban Don Mills in Metro Toronto is contemplated. Now I'm not suggesting that we should be emulating everything that happens in Toronto. All we have to do is take a look at the Toronto Argonauts, and we realize fully that we possibly have other alternatives here.

As a recent visitor to the Toronto area, I had the opportunity actually to visit the centre. It was a most worth-while experience for all ages. It's a Disney World type of approach to making science and technology come alive. From what I can gather in my reading, there is nothing quite comparable to it on the North American continent. It is a hands-on, participation, demonstration type of facility. Now I realize we have such facilities as planetaria, museums, Muttart centres, and so on in our large metropolitan areas, Calgary, Edmonton, and other major centres in the province. But this centre is not a museum. It is more than that in that it is dynamic and activity-oriented.

There is a threefold purpose in the centre: one is to develop an appreciation for the contribution science and technology has made; it is also an educational experience for all ages, namely school-age youngsters; and it serves as a motivation for our young people who probably will be pursuing or entering a field related to research and technology.

I would like to share with the members of the Assembly a brief history of this particular centre. It was built as

a centennial project in 1967 and cost \$14 million in 1965 dollars. Its operational cost is about \$6 million annually, and this is offset by about \$1 million revenue in admissions. The centre has various lecture theatres, small auditoria, a reception area, and a restaurant. It also has a number of exhibit areas dealing with life, environment, energy, earth, transportation, communication, a science arcade, space, molecule, the atom, engineering, and so on. Within the main areas there are demonstrations and active exhibits going on related to computers, transportation, printing; the traditional disciplines of physics, chemistry, biology; lasers, electricity, the ocean world, the plant world, the human body, medicine, fitness, and so on. Maybe we could even see if solar energy could be incorporated so that we could engage our Member for Edmonton Glengarry in a project of his own. Mr. Speaker, this is augmented by regular films and lectures in addition to the exhibits and demonstrations.

One of the unique features of this particular centre that has potential for the province of Alberta would be what they call the outreach program, whereby the science centre staff take workshops, activities, exhibits, demonstrations, films, or whatever to various communities outside the major centre. The thrust is basically to stimulate, vitalize, and educate our young people with regard to science and technology. As I said before, Mr. Speaker, it is a hands-on approach, it gets people involved, and there is a continuous updating of the activity to ensure that it has relevance, is effective, and is of scientific integrity in terms of content.

Besides an educational purpose, the centre also has a very vital role to play as a tourist visitor centre. After 10 years of operation, it has travelled to about a hundred communities within the province and has received over 13 million people who have paid admission to enter the facility. For its programs it has reached a variety of nations, and it has been awarded international acclaim in terms of the program it offers. It has retained its popularity throughout for both tourists and local residents in presenting science and technology to the public in a very real, live way.

A survey was done in 1978, Mr. Speaker. This survey has shown that about 49 per cent of the visitors came from outside Canada, 17 per cent from the local area, and visitors throughout the province made up the remaining portion. School children attending this particular facility have continued to increase in numbers, and over 1,600 programs have been offered in relation to their specific needs and special interests. Therefore, members of the Assembly should note that this venture has had a sustaining interest. It is not just a one-shot effort and then a decline in popularity.

As I mentioned before, Mr. Speaker, it does have certain potential as a major tourist attraction in the Toronto area. If we project into the future for Alberta, where certain initiatives have been taken with regard to the tourist convention trade. I think there is a definite need in our major metropolitan areas to have places to complement this particular commitment toward getting a number of tourists and a number of trade conventions here. Also, if we look at the thrust for Alberta with regard to research and development, it would be a very motivating activity for our younger generation to be stimulated with regard to careers related to science and technology. Also, we've all seen how the oil and gas exploration technology has developed over the years within our province. Certainly this would be an effective way to demonstrate to the public its impact not only in terms of Alberta but the

rest of the world.

I realize we may not have the population or the tourist flow to warrant such a centre, but of course that could be determined by the feasibility study to see if in fact we would have that potential in the future. Places like Disneyland started with a vision or an idea in the open fields of Anaheim, and I'm sure that at this time in our history we should possibly look at a venture such as this for Alberta and western Canada. I realize the operational costs are high. I also recognize that many times we give funding for programs for young people who have special needs. But I think it's important that we also recognize that normal, average youngsters should benefit from programs that are relevant to them.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would like to urge all members of the Assembly to support the resolution to study further the feasibility of such a centre for Alberta.

MR. MAGEE: Mr. Speaker, I rise today to engage in the debate on Motion 210, proposed by the hon. Member for Edmonton Gold Bar. As presented, this motion urges this government to undertake to finance a study that, while being of somewhat limited merit in my judgment, is premature in its timing, for the establishment of a [science] centre in this province. While asking only for a study, it could be argued that it is not a commitment to continue into the construction phase. Again, in my opinion it is lending tacit approval to this project. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, we should tread with care and examine all aspects of the project to determine whether even a study should be embarked upon, as oftentimes these studies have price tags attached to them in the sum of many thousands of dollars, which is wasted if the project does not go forward in the foreseeable future.

Hon. members should be aware that a quick perusal of the history of existing science museums informs one that the construction and operating costs are very high indeed. A relatively recent Canadian experience in this field is a case in point in Ontario, a centennial project in 1967 when such a science centre was established to commemorate Canada's 100th birthday. As the hon. Member for Edmonton Gold Bar has stated, its original budget, as proposed by a study, was to have been \$14 million without any land costs being considered. Of this estimated cost, the federal government was to donate \$2.5 million as its share of the centennial project in the celebrations. I would suggest that there's very little chance now, when one considers the cutbacks that are going forward from the federal government into the provinces, particularly Alberta.

When this science centre was completed three years after it was contemplated, its cost had mushroomed to \$28 million, just double what had been estimated. But more to the point, it is now estimated that to build a facility of similar size, the cost would be a \$98 million ticket. While some might argue that we do not need a facility of that size. I question the reality, as it always seems that we want to build the biggest and the best. I would suggest that with the recent history of cost overruns in facilities of this nature, we could be looking at that figure of \$98 million being considerably increased. Heaven forbid that it would double to some \$190 million, but I think it would if the proposal were ever approved during these years of tremendous inflation increases in the building of institutional facilities.

To go back to my comment about smaller facilities, Mr. Speaker, we would like to remind hon. members that we now have other smaller facilities that for the most part

provide for the needs of our province, such as the Strathcona Science Park, with four buildings officially opened this spring, which cost some \$5 million to construct. An estimated \$7.5 million is being spent now to provide a space science centre with 47,000 square feet of floor space, which will provide very creditable space for exhibits, many of which would be duplicated in the proposed science centre. So we would not only be faced with a larger price tag in developing a science centre, but we would be in many ways duplicating the exhibits now on display or being developed at this time.

While I have dwelled on the construction costs to this stage in my discourse, Mr. Speaker, there are other costs which would go on for as long as the building is in operation, possibly 100 to 150 years. The Ontario Science Centre is experiencing operating deficits in the order of \$5 million for each of the last five years. I would suggest their [science] centre is located in the heart of the development of the space age and scientific development in this country, which makes it a most economical area in which to operate, and it is in very close proximity to the same type of expertise in the United States, for liaison purposes.

I might add, Mr. Speaker, that these deficits are occurring after revenues of about \$1 million per year are considered in the balance sheets. The income from admission fees is about all the traffic will bear, notwithstanding a population to draw from that is many times larger than that which is available, or is likely to be available, within 25 years in this area. Toronto itself has a population larger than all of Alberta. In fact, there are at least 10 to 12 million persons living within an easy day's drive from the science centre located in Toronto, when one considers the easy accessibility of people living in New York state, Ohio, and very large cities such as Montreal and Detroit, Michigan. The revenue of the Ontario Science Centre comes from a visitors' attendance of over a million people a year. As alluded to by the hon. Member for Edmonton Gold Bar, a survey was completed in the summer of '78 which indicated that more of the science centre's summer visitors come from the United States than from Ontario, which includes Toronto. Of the centre's visitors, 48.7 per cent came from outside Canada, 17.4 from Toronto, 23.9 from other parts of the province, and 10.1 from other provinces in Canada. So, in effect, almost 60 per cent came from outside of Ontario. Now, I ask, how could we hope for an attendance to compete when we consider that the great majority of our visitors to this province come to spend their time and money in our world-renowned Rocky Mountains?

We would not only be competing with that great attraction, Mr. Speaker, but we should also advise hon. members that we could not expect many U.S. visitors to such facilities, because the states adjacent to Alberta are relatively sparsely populated. And when one reaches out farther afield, they have their own very creditable science centres located in San Francisco and Chicago. In fact, I understand the Chicago Museum of Science and Industry occupies some 600,000 square feet of floor space, the largest on the continent, and is considered to be of world-scale renown in the excellence of its exhibitions and scientific displays. So why come to Alberta to visit a similar attraction and travel much farther?

While it is true that there is some impact on every group in society, it is interesting now to look at the actual participation by the public in its attendance patterns. In the analysis of 25 centres in the U.S. and Ontario, the breakdown is as follows: adults, 34 per cent; elementary

school children, 28 per cent; secondary school children 17 per cent; preschool children, 10 per cent; the college-age group, 8 per cent; the senior citizens, 3 per cent. Are not these figures interesting, when only 17 per cent secondary school and 8 per cent college youths attend? One can conclude also from these figures that the adults listed are generally those with preschool and elementary school children who, in fact, take their parents in tow. Otherwise, why such a low attendance pattern, 3 per cent in the senior citizens' group, if interest by adults was high? You know, Mr. Speaker, it must be said that a science centre really is a tourist attraction, and its contribution as a study facility for our students ready to launch into lifetime careers, is limited in value.

As a little footnote, Mr. Speaker, the hon. members might be interested to know that I was raised on a farm within half a mile of the present location of the [science] centre, located in Toronto, on Don Mills Road. I have visited this centre, as well as others in the United States, not for the purpose of a compelling thirst for scientific knowledge, but as a very interesting exhibit of sophisticated gadgetry; taken there by nephews, nieces, and grandchildren. In fact, these young people do have a great time playing with the hands-on displays that they have all seen many times on television and at last have the opportunity physically to see, touch, and play with these sophisticated toys.

While I do not want to give the impression, Mr. Speaker, that there is no educational merit in this type of display, let us not be trapped into thinking that it is much more than an entertaining tourist attraction and as such does detract from and as well provides a good deal of competition to other, more passive museums and space centres, of which Albertans are presently well endowed by the Strathcona Science Park, the space science centre, and our Provincial Museum.

MR. SPEAKER: I hesitate to interrupt the hon. member. Perhaps this is somewhat late in the course of his remarks, but there is a sort of awareness creeping over the Chair that possibly the hon. member is reading his speech. [interjections]

MR. MAGEE: In any case, I have mentioned the three centres in the Edmonton area that are presently available, or will be on stream very shortly, Mr. Speaker. It might be interesting to note that we have developed or are developing displays and exhibits in the areas of lands and forests, water and air, environment, energy, geology, astronomy, and archeology. In Calgary, we have the world-renowned Glenbow museum — nationally for Canada, internationally in the United States and other parts of this world — which contains social, historical displays and also has a section on geology, as well as the centennial planetarium that has the beginnings of an aerospace museum.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am sure, as we all should be aware, that our medical research foundation, which has been stimulated by \$300 million of Alberta funds . . . When the medical and the pharmaceutical fraternity and community get under way, they will also want to develop a facility that is particular to their industries because they will want to show the developments that they are contributing to this province and to Canada. They will also want to show that they have a place that is of specific importance to them. So really, Mr. Speaker, what more could a population of two million people want in the way of facilities of this nature?

Mr. Speaker, we have so much to build and develop in this province in this period of our new-found wealth, which could be very short lived. As we all know, that money is going to peter out in a short time when our high-profit crude oil reserves are depleted. Sir, we would go on to say that even that income is in jeopardy if the federal government would have its way in the next few months.

So I say again, Mr. Speaker, the time is not opportune. Enough has been done in this area. With the completion of the Strathcona Science Park and the development of the new space [science] centre, this province has already made significant contributions to the development of public science facilities which have both educational and entertainment capabilities.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, in light of the time, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, it is not proposed that the House sit this evening. By way of business tomorrow, we will continue after the question period with debate on Motion 15 on the Order Paper. I move that we adjourn until tomorrow afternoon at 2:30.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

[At 5:29 p.m., on motion, the House adjourned to Wednesday at 2:30 p.m.]