

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA**

Title: **Tuesday, October 25, 1983 2:30 p.m.**

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

**PRAYERS**

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: **INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS**

MR. SCHMID: Mr. Speaker, I am especially pleased that once again, during export month, I can introduce to you someone who is here to do business with Alberta companies. He is engineer Ciro Jeanneau Gracey, director general of the central office for rural mapping of Peru. He is here to negotiate survey contracts with the North West Survey group. He is accompanied by Mr. Dennis Hosford, president of the North West Survey group; Mr. Jack Byrne, vice-president and general manager; and Mr. Michael Stewart, director.

Mr. Speaker, it is especially pleasing, because it once again proves the diversity of Alberta technology. The North West Survey group right now is engaged in surveying five major towns in Peru which were flooded last January, and they are trying to put together a group of Albertans looking into sewage, forestry, and planning, putting in water distribution for those cities and, of course, looking at additional contracts.

Mr. Speaker and Mr. Premier, first of all I have to say that South America has also become one of our major trading partners. Last year Peru alone purchased one helicopter rig, two service rigs, five Foremost vehicles, and other equipment for their oil industry. I would like to wish the director general every success and a safe journey home.

Maybe I should also state that they are accompanied by Mr. Greg Whyte, our international trade director, and Mr. Brian Westlund, also an international trade director. I ask them to rise and receive the welcome of this Assembly.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF BILLS****Bill 92****Environment Statutes Amendment Act, 1983**

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a Bill, being the Environment Statutes Amendment Act, 1983.

The purpose of this Bill is to clarify and provide for the release to the public of the results of corporate monitoring of air emissions and water discharges, as required by licences under the Clean Air Act and the Clean Water Act.

MR. NOTLEY: Better late than never, Fred.

DR. BUCK: Feeling a little heat, Fred?

[Leave granted, Bill 92 read a first time]

**Bill 93****Police Officers  
Collective Bargaining Act**

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I wish to introduce Bill No. 93, the Police Officers Collective Bargaining Act.

This Bill completes an undertaking given during the discussion on Bill 44 this past spring, to recognize the unique and

very special responsibilities of police officers. Bill 93 leaves unchanged the special discipline provisions relating to police officers. As well, it provides for a binding arbitration process similar to that now applicable to employees of hospitals and to firefighters.

[Leave granted; Bill 93 read a first time]

**Bill 87****Public Inquiries Amendment Act, 1983**

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to introduce Bill No. 87, the Public Inquiries Amendment Act, 1983.

This proposed amendment would clarify the entitlement of any person appearing before a commission of inquiry to be represented by counsel; further, that the report of a commission alleging misconduct by any person shall not be made until reasonable notice of the allegation has been given to that person and he has had an opportunity to be heard. If the person has already given evidence, the capacity would be there to have the person recalled to answer allegations.

Mr. Speaker, another aspect would provide that any witness who believed his interests might be adversely affected by testimony given, and any other person who satisfied a commission that the testimony may adversely affect his interests, would be given an opportunity during the inquiry to give evidence and to cross-examine witnesses, either personally or through his legal counsel.

[Leave granted; Bill 87 read a first time]

**Bill 94****Election Amendment Act, 1983**

MR. PAYNE: Mr. Speaker, I request leave today to introduce Bill No. 94, the Election Amendment Act, 1983.

One proposed amendment in this Bill was originally proposed by the Member for Calgary Egmont in Bill 210 and has now been incorporated in this new Bill. Under this provision, persons who are in custody awaiting a court appearance would be eligible to vote, using the absentee voter provisions. As well, the requirement to produce current proof of ordinary residence when taking the oath to vote, if the elector is not on the list of electors on polling day, is replaced by a simplified identification requirement.

[Leave granted; Bill 94 read a first time]

**Bill 86****Manpower Development Amendment Act, 1983**

MR. JONSON: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill No. 86, the Manpower Development Amendment Act, 1983.

The purpose of this Bill is to make changes to the Act, which will facilitate the movement of individuals through apprenticeship training.

[Leave granted; Bill 86 read a first time]

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill No. 86 be placed on the Order Paper under Government Bills and Orders.

[Motion carried]

head: **TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS**

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table excerpts from my remarks at the Canadian Pacific Rim Opportunities Conference in Calgary on October 7, which I mentioned in the Legislature.

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the Special Areas Act, I am tabling copies of the financial statements and the report of the Auditor General for the Special Areas Board.

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to file with the Legislature Library copies of two reports related to the home care program in Alberta. The first is by Resource Management Consultants and comes about as a result of public hearings during 1982. The second is a report, plus appendices, by Abt Associates, regarding entry criteria options for the co-ordinated home care program.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, as required by statute, I wish to table Sessional Paper No. 106B, the Gas Alberta Operating Fund financial statements for the year ended March 31, 1983, and the supplementary report of the Gas Alberta Operating Fund for the year ended March 31, 1983.

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table the 59th annual report of the Alberta Liquor Control Board, for the fiscal year ended December 31, 1982, and I wish to file with the Legislature Library the publication entitled Crime Prevention Programs in Alberta, which has been distributed to all MLAs.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

MR. JONSON: Mr. Speaker, I wish to introduce to you, and through you to the members of the Assembly, 26 grade 10 students from Ponoka composite high school. They are completing their study of Canadian government as part of the Social Studies 10 curriculum. Accompanying the class are their teacher Mr. Garry Anderson and their bus driver Mr. Merv Evans. They are seated in the members gallery. I would now ask them to stand and receive the traditional welcome of the House.

MR. PAYNE: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure and privilege today to introduce to you and the other members of the Assembly 29 grade 10 students from Dr. E.P. Scarlett high school in the constituency of Calgary Fish Creek. They are seated in the members gallery and are accompanied today by their social studies teacher, Bill McNamee. They are also accompanied by Mr. and Mrs. Ron Morris, who are representing the trip sponsors, the Rotary Club of south Calgary. I would ask them all to stand in the gallery and receive the traditional welcome of the Assembly.

MR. McPHERSON: Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure for me today to introduce to you, and through you to hon. members of the Assembly, 75 grade 8 students from Central junior high school in beautiful downtown Red Deer. Our students are accompanied today by their group leader, Mr. Phil Jensen, teachers Kelly Rainsforth and Lynn Huddleston, and bus drivers Wes Bailey and Larry Simmonds. Mr. Speaker, our students are seated in the public gallery, and I would ask that they rise and receive the warm welcome of the Assembly.

head: **ORAL QUESTION PERIOD****Olympic Facilities Development**

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the first question to either the Minister of Tourism and Small Business or the Minister of Recreation and Parks, with respect to the Winter Olympics, and ask either hon. gentleman whether or not the final approval by the International Olympic Committee of any site, the alpine site in particular, is contingent upon approval by the International Ski Federation, the FIS.

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that the Olympic committee, the Canadian Ski Association, and members of the interdepartmental team working on the site have the initial approval. When that design is completed for the hill itself, the final approval will come from them at that time.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Then is the minister telling the House that the final approval, after initial approvals have been made, will be made by the international sporting body, in this case the International Ski Federation?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, I can't respond as to whether that is the case. The Olympic committee will make the submission after the hill design has been completed, with their co-operation.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Can the minister tell the House whether or not he's had an opportunity to review the reports concerning the adequacy of the Mount Allan site given to the OCO, the Olympic Organizing Committee, by members of the International Ski Federation course approval committee in the spring of this year?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure I'm in a position to respond to a report made to the International Olympic Committee or the organizing committee of Calgary. I'm not sure exactly which report the member is relating to.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, by way of explanation, in the spring of this year at least several members of the International Ski Federation came to Alberta and looked at the Mount Allan site. It's my understanding that they found the site inadequate. My question is: in view of the importance of the FIS and its final approval influence, what assessment of these reports, if any, has been made by the government? Or has there been any effort to obtain this initial information — I underline "initial information" — given to the Calgary Olympic Organizing Committee?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, I should clear up what appears to be a bit of a misunderstanding, because I'm not aware of any report that identifies the particular hill as being inadequate. The Olympic committee, the Canadian Ski Association, and the committee working toward the construction of the recreation hill for the government of Alberta — that particular side of it — are working together and have been working together for quite a number of months to provide that particular facility for the 1988 Winter Olympics.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. I'm referring, sir, to representatives of the International Ski Federation, one of whom comes from the United States and another from British Columbia, and their initial

report. It's my understanding that the final report of the course selection committee will be of considerable importance to the final decision, but my question relates to the initial survey of Mount Allan by representatives of the International Ski Federation.

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, to the best of my knowledge, all of the information that was necessary for us to have and for the Olympic committee to have for the approval process for the FIS, the Fédération Internationale de Ski, or the Olympic committee, is already in place.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question, so there's no misunderstanding. Is the minister saying that the government of Alberta is not aware of the initial survey undertaken last spring by representatives of the International Ski Federation?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, I didn't say that, and if I left that impression, I would like to remove it. What I did say was that the FIS and the Olympic committee have provided us with the necessary approvals to proceed at this particular point in time, and until the actual design of the runs has been made, that final approval is pending.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister, again so there's no misunderstanding. Did that initial survey by representatives of the FIS indicate concern and caution?

MR. ADAIR: I can't respond to whether there was concern and caution. The concerns expressed by all the groups are well within the standards for the International Olympic Committee and the committee from Calgary.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, my question relates, however, to the concerns expressed by the representatives of the International Ski Federation. I understand that, as the minister indicated, the final course selection is a different process from an initial survey. The question is whether or not the initial survey contained expressions of concern about the adequacy of Mount Allan.

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, the concerns of the site for the Olympics, whether it be from the FIS, our own technical people, or whoever, are taken into consideration when the design of that particular facility is going to be made for the hosting of the downhill alpine events on Mount Allan.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Can the minister then advise the House whether he or officials of the government of Alberta have had an opportunity to discuss the initial views on the adequacy of Mount Allan with Messrs. Nelson Bennett and Lorne O'Connor of the International Ski Federation?

MR. ADAIR: I would have to take that particular question as notice, Mr. Speaker, because I'm not aware of the two names at this particular point in my recollection.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question.

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

MR. NOTLEY: Could the minister advise the House whether, in discussions with the organizing authorities in Calgary, any

contingency plans have been made with respect to the alpine events, should the FIS not approve Mount Allan?

MR. ADAIR: At this point in time, Mr. Speaker, that particular question is somewhat hypothetical.

MR. NOTLEY: Well, Mr. Speaker, maybe not for long.

### Women's Issues

MR. NOTLEY: I'll ask the second question of the hon. Premier, and I trust this won't be an argumentative question, Mr. Speaker. Given the presence of two highly competent women members of the cabinet, could the Premier advise what considerations led him to the appointment of a male cabinet minister to be responsible for the status of women in Alberta?

MR. LOUGHEED: Well, I would have thought the hon. Leader of the Opposition would have recognized that the response we make to these issues relates to a situation; not relative to whether the ministers in our cabinet are male or female but responsive to requests that have been made. That is the way we will function and continue to function. In this case, the minister responsible is the Minister of Advanced Education, and he will conduct that in relationship to his responsibilities. [Some applause]

MR. NOTLEY: Again a fairly weak response from the backbenchers, Mr. Speaker.

I'd like to direct a question to the hon. minister who has this responsibility, notwithstanding the ability of the female members of Executive Council. Could the minister advise the Assembly when the government anticipates that an Alberta advisory council on the status of women will be established?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I believe the hon. member asked this question during consideration of the Executive Council estimates sometime in the spring of 1983. Now that we have put in place a very important step, I think, by appointing a full-time minister responsible for the status of women over the next three-year period, I'm sure these initiatives and considerations will be fully discussed.

I'm not going to commit to a time frame, and I know the hon. member would like to see some specific date. However, I can commit to carrying forward the arguments, pro and con, for a status of women council in the province of Alberta. Once these are clearly evident to me, I intend to make this case with respect to the arguments to my colleagues. I think the next 12-month period would be a reasonable time to have a full examination as to how other models may evolve across Canada; to see the merits, weigh those carefully, and make a recommendation to my colleagues in caucus.

DR. BUCK: You should have been a lawyer, Dick.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, given the representation on this issue for so long, is the minister saying there still needs to be more research done on whether or not a status of women council is necessary in this province?

MR. JOHNSTON: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I think it fairly safe to say that various models have been adopted across Canada. For example, I would point to the B.C. model, where the status of women council has not in fact been adopted. I'm sure the people of B.C. would argue that there's some merit in how they are handling the issue.

I think the important thing is not so much the actual model that is adopted but to ensure that there's a sensitivity to the issues, in terms of how government operates. That will be my commitment.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Has the minister given any consideration to changing the mandate of the Alberta Women's Bureau? In particular, has any request been made of the Women's Bureau to compile crucial information on the average income of women, the number of single female parents, the number of working women, and the education levels of these women, as a data base on which to judge what policies would be appropriate in the future?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, it's difficult for me to give a specific comment as to whether or not that information has been gathered. But I do concur in the observation of the Leader of the Opposition that it is necessary for us to bring this data together. That's one of the reasons I think it's very important for the government to be aware of these issues, to be able to say with some certainty just what the statistics are, whether demographic, income levels, or education levels. As part of the responsibility, that would be one of the objectives I will pursue.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Given the minister's responsibility, what discussions will the minister undertake with appropriate provincial organizations regarding the government's decision to reduce funding for women's shelters in this province?

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure there might be some debate on that very observation. My colleague the minister to my right may have some observations.

None the less, I think it's fairly important to say that the obligation of the province of Alberta to funding women's shelters places it among the highest in Canada. I'd be prepared to provide that information to you as well, because it is in fact a priority of this government. I will ensure that the concern of battered women, or violence against women, is maintained as a point of debate within our own caucus and within allocation of resources.

#### Hospitality Expenditures

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is again with regard to the government's policy of living within its means. In my hand I have the *Alberta Gazette* of August 31, 1983. My question to the Premier is with regard to an expenditure of nearly a quarter of a million dollars on hospitality and entertainment by the government. In the current fiscal year, has the Premier given cabinet ministers a directive to significantly reduce the hospitality and entertainment expenses by this government?

MR. LOUGHEED: Certainly, Mr. Speaker, the direction to the minister is to be very much conscious of restraint in terms of hospitality, but at the same time to recognize that we have an ever-increasing number of visitors, from both the private and public sectors, coming to this province. We have an ever-increasing need for communication with groups that are involved. In many cases the question of hospitality isn't directly a matter of hospitality; it's a matter of communication.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Premier, and it relates to one I raised the other day. Within

that group of expenditures is the allotment of \$4,525.82 for a reception and luncheon swearing-in ceremony for the Conservative Party. Has the Premier reconsidered that specific expenditure, and will he ask the provincial Conservative Party to take on that assignment?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I believe I answered that question in the Legislature last week.

#### Fort Saskatchewan Correctional Centre

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the minister responsible for the Fort Saskatchewan correctional institute. Can the hon. Solicitor General indicate what discussion he or the department has had with the staff of the Fort Saskatchewan correctional institute as to the future of that facility?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, there have been ongoing discussions with the assistant deputy minister responsible for corrections and the deputy minister of the department. As well, of course, there have been discussions with officials in the Department of Public Works, Supply and Services.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, to the minister: have there been any direct discussions with the staff? The problem is that the people don't seem to know if they're going to have a job this year, next year, five years down the road. Have there been any direct discussions with the staff, either at the deputy minister's level or someone, just so these people know what's going to happen?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, I'd have to inquire as to whether or not there have been further discussions. I think, though, every citizen in this province is aware of the decisions with regard to the application to build a new facility in the northeast area of Edmonton.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, can the minister indicate what discussions have taken place between the minister's department and the town of Fort Saskatchewan as to what the future of the institution will be? Will it be partly used, fully used, or not used at all? What discussions has the minister had with the town of Fort Saskatchewan?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, I met with the mayor of the town of Fort Saskatchewan to discuss in general the feelings she may have with regard to the facility. But at this time no specific decisions have been reached, other than the original intention to replace that facility at some time.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. In light of the fact that we are in a time of restraint, can the minister indicate to the Assembly and the people of the province if the government has given any consideration to leaving that institution in place? Some of the buildings are relatively functional and relatively new. What discussion has the minister had with his department as to that?

MR. HARLE: That is very much a concern and, in fact, we have been looking at what expenditures might be needed in order to maintain the present plant for a further, extended period.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, can the minister indicate if there's been any consideration given in the department or by the minister to using that facility to house young offenders?

MR. HARLE: Not really, Mr. Speaker, because of the requirement of the federal legislation that young offenders be kept separate and apart from adult offenders. At the present time, a committee of officials in the Department of the Solicitor General and the Department of Social Services and Community Health has been working on potential planning in order to be able to provide for young offenders. But at this particular time, that would not involve the Fort Saskatchewan correctional facility.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, my final supplementary. This is to clarify a previous answer. Can the minister indicate what the department has decided to do with the land they have, close to the Edmonton maximum security centre? Is that land still in the hands of the government, and will it remain in the hands of the government?

MR. HARLE: Presently it is still in the hands of the government, of course. Until we make an actual decision as to where to locate the replacement for the Fort Saskatchewan correctional facility, I would not expect any change.

#### **Infection Control in Hospitals**

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care. In his attempts to curb growing costs in hospital services, what consideration has the minister given to the infection control guidelines manual developed by the joint committee on infection control, which suggests ways we could save some \$4 million a year by controlling infection generated in hospitals.

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I haven't read that document yet, so I'm not prepared to comment on it.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question. Has the minister received other submissions which would indicate procedures by which our hospitals might both save money and prevent the spreading of infections to hospital patients and workers?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I think it's fair to say that by the very nature of my job, throughout any working year I receive a continuing and ongoing supply of suggestions, comments, and criticisms with respect to the Alberta hospital system. We assess them and respond to them as best we can. The manual on control of infections was just recently delivered to my office, and I simply haven't had time to look at it yet.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question. Has the minister assessed the seriousness of the problem of inadequate hospital incinerators, which do not meet the emission requirements of the Department of the Environment? If so, what steps is the minister taking to solve this problem?

MR. RUSSELL: For some years now — I believe it's the past three or four years — we have had an ongoing program of incinerator replacement for most of the hospitals around the province. The two biggest ones recently were the Royal Alex and University hospitals here in Edmonton, but the smaller, rural hospitals are being supplied with premanufactured incinerator packages.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. When the minister reads the report, he will find that it's not occurring very well.

My other question directly to the minister: has the minister received indications of how much disease and infection is spread by way of hospital wastes of infectious materials which are dumped in landfill sites and carried into groundwater or carried from these sites by rodents?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, that's the kind of question that I tried to indicate, in the initial question on this subject, I wasn't prepared to answer. It sounds as if it's very technical, and I've said twice that I have not yet read the report.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the seriousness in terms of both cost and infection, when is the minister going to get around to reading the report?

MR. RUSSELL: The hon. member should be assured that the report is in the department. It's part of their duties, of course, to assess documents like that and make recommendations or take corrective actions, if such are necessary. That goes on notwithstanding the fact that several weeks may elapse before I get a chance to read such a document.

MR. SPEAKER: I should say that I had misgivings about that series of questions, because they were of such a nature that I think we could have saved a great deal of time if they'd been put on the Order Paper.

#### **Highway Twinning Projects**

MR. BATIUK: Mr. Speaker, my question will be directed to the Minister of Transportation. Could the minister advise the Assembly whether he's had representation from the Yellowhead Highway Association, expressing concern about the possibility of a slowdown in twinning the Yellowhead route?

MR. M. MOORE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have. A few weeks ago I met with representatives of the Yellowhead Highway Association on that matter.

MR. BATIUK: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister advise whether that 10-year time limit will be significantly reduced after the next federal election if the previous Transport Minister's commitment to fund the Yellowhead route comparably to the Trans-Canada Highway ...

MR. SPEAKER: It seems a rather interesting question. Perhaps the hon. member or the hon. minister might forward it to someone who knows the future and who might refer it to that new minister when he is appointed.

Mr. M. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I believe the hon. member was referring to a commitment that had previously been made with respect to twinning the Yellowhead Highway and Highway No. 1 from border to border over a 10-year period and that, I believe, would have seen both those highways twinned by 1991. I only want to say that there has yet been no decision not to meet that time frame. But in this period of deficit financing, I think we have to recognize that there are a number of projects that may not proceed at the previous pace. That is true with respect to both balancing our budget and the economic activity that is going on in the province relative to things like highways.

In my concluding comments on this subject, Mr. Speaker, I hasten to add that the present traffic count on Highway 16 — the number of vehicles per day on average — is some 27 per cent less than had been projected for mid-1983. I think hon. members would appreciate our reviewing financial com-

mitments in light of that factor and the present deficit financing situation.

MR. BATIUK: A supplementary question. Could the minister advise whether there has been a commitment from the former federal Transport Minister to financially support the Yellow-head route?

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, in 1974, I believe, the federal government put in place a program of highway strengthening, wherein they provided funds to provinces to strengthen paved highways so that they might carry heavier load limits. Over the period '74 to '79, Alberta chose to spread those dollars over several highways. I don't presently have the exact figures with me, but they are only a fraction of what the province of Alberta has spent on highway development. That program ended in 1979 and, to my knowledge, there's been no federal funding available since that time.

#### Thermal Coal Development

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, my question to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources is related to coal, thermal coal production in particular. Has the government received any requests to reconsider its coal policies, to encourage thermal coal production and use within the province?

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, the policy of this government in respect of thermal coal development really dates to 1972, at which time the government made the conscious decision to give coal the first opportunity to serve as the fuel for our electric energy generating facilities in this province. As a result of that policy, of the 20 million tons per year of coal production in this province, some 13.5 million tons is in respect of thermal coal used primarily for electric energy generation. That has been the consistent policy of this government: government seeing itself in the role of a catalyst, with the private sector being the engine that creates the economic activity.

DR. REID: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Is there any consideration being given to any policies that may assist in the use of thermal coal for heat generation for purposes other than electrical generation within the province?

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, that is of course the primary utilization of thermal coal in this province. I should hasten to add that, again early in the 1970s — and I stand to be corrected on the specific date; I believe it was 1973 or 1974 — the Premier enunciated a policy of encouraging greater utilization of Alberta coal elsewhere in Canada. As a result of that policy, in the mid-1970s agreement was reached with Ontario Hydro for the use of coal for their power generating facilities in Ontario. The result of that policy has been that some 23 per cent, I believe, of the coal used by Ontario Hydro is now western Canadian coal, with the largest proportion of that coal coming from the province of Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, I will be meeting with my Ontario counterpart, the Minister of Energy, on November 8 in Toronto. We will be discussing a number of energy matters, one of which will be greater utilization of western Canadian coal in Ontario.

DR. REID: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. With regard to the meetings with the Ontario minister, has the minister any input he might give the House with regard to the encouragement of the use of low-sulphur bituminous coal from Alberta for the other 77 per cent of Ontario's needs?

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, there's certainly no question that western Canadian coal has the significant advantage of approximately eight times less sulphur content than coal presently being utilized. At the same time, we have to recognize that the plans of Ontario Hydro, I'm advised, are that within the next 12 months they will be mothballing approximately one-half of the power generating facilities in Ontario that utilize coal at the present time. That's a conscious policy decision that they have made. So if they continue with that policy, of course, it would limit the potential for greater utilization of western Canadian coal. Nevertheless we're going to be meeting with them to discuss what potential there is and to determine if there are additional ways in which western Canadian coal can be utilized in central Canada and elsewhere in Canada.

#### Degree Granting — Private Colleges

MR. STROMBERG: Mr. Speaker, I am wondering if the Minister of Advanced Education could explain to the people of the Camrose constituency, the students of my area, and me, the foot-dragging in proclamation of the amendments to the Universities Act?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to deal with the question of the amendment to the Universities Act, which, by the way, was brought forth by the Member for Camrose.

Before the Act can be proclaimed — and that was the direction left with this Assembly when the House rose this spring. One of the major components of the Universities Amendment Act, which provides degree-granting status to private colleges across our province, is that an accreditation board has to be formed before the degree-granting status can be achieved. I'm now in the process of seeking names for that accreditation board. Once that board is formed, of course, it will then set about to establish these guidelines to deal with the curriculum and to deal with requests from colleges to be able to grant degrees themselves.

In terms of Camrose Lutheran College, for their information, it would be my rough estimation that I would see that Act proclaimed sometime early in 1984.

MR. STROMBERG: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I gather, by the minister's reply, that there will still be a delay. I am wondering if that future delay is caused in part by the concerns raised by the senate of the U of A and the strong objections of the Leader of the Official Opposition in the reading of that Bill?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to attribute a lot of things to the Leader of the Official Opposition . . .

MR. NOTLEY: You can't blame me for this one.

MR. JOHNSTON: . . . but I won't cast that criticism on him.

No, Mr. Speaker, that is behind us. That debate took place when the Bill was passed this spring. The issue now is whether or not the colleges themselves are prepared to commit funds, to hire staff, and to grant degrees to the students that go through the system.

Of the four colleges that would be eligible, one college — Camrose Lutheran College — has now advised me that they're ready and are preparing themselves to be able to grant degrees with the intake of students in September of 1984. So in terms of that critical path, I think the timing I suggested, in terms of

proclamation of that Act by early 1984, would in fact be in line with their own scheduling.

#### **Bus and Truck Regulations**

MR. NELSON: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Transportation. Considering the mess the airline industry is in, in the United States, due to deregulation of the industry, I'm wondering if it's still the intention of the minister to pursue the examination of deregulation of the charter bus and trucking industry in this province.

MR. M. MOORE: The short answer, Mr. Speaker, is yes. During the throne speech earlier this year, we indicated our intention to move with an examination of the regulatory control that presently exists within the charter bus and trucking industry in Alberta and to other points in Canada. I would hasten to add for the hon. member's information that that review is being undertaken with the utmost degree of concern for those who are operating in the industry, including those who are involved in operating as bus drivers and truck drivers and also with regard to the citizens that industry serves in our province.

MR. NELSON: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Considering that the provinces of Saskatchewan and B.C. regulate ingoing transport traffic to a great degree, can the minister give this House some assurances that a trilateral government agreement will be in place prior to any deregulation being considered in this province?

MR. M. MOORE: No, Mr. Speaker, I cannot give those exact assurances, but I can say that we're involved in several different aspects of bus and trucking regulation.

First of all, I have proposed publicly that we consider a policy whereby we would remove the geographic restrictions from Alberta-based charter bus operating authorities, which would permit charter bus operators in this province to meet what we refer to as "fit, willing, and able standards", and then be able to operate from any point in Alberta to any other point in Alberta, as opposed to the previous situation of having to prove there's a need for the service. That issue deals only with charter bus operations within the boundaries of Alberta and really has no connection with any other province.

It's our intention to deal with that issue separately from the other aspects of interprovincial truck and busing operations which, as the hon. member suggested, do indeed involve co-operation not only with Saskatchewan and British Columbia but with other provinces, the Territories, and the United States. I would only add that I am presently in the process of negotiating an agreement with the province of Saskatchewan relative to a free trade area, if I can use the term, along our borders, which I hope will be about 20 kilometres in width. I'm hopeful that that can be negotiated separately from negotiations with any other province, so we might stop this ridiculous practice of having to unload trucks in the middle of Lloydminster because they don't have an operating authority to get to the packing plant or the crushing plant. That particular negotiation, which I instituted some two or three months ago, is proceeding well and might well be acted upon in the absence of any overall Canadian agreement for a look at removing some of the regulatory control that exists in the trucking industry.

MR. NELSON: Mr. Speaker, one further supplementary. I think the minister is aware of the difficulties experienced by union members of the bus and trucking industry. Is it the intention of any deregulating Act to ensure the job security of these

union people, should this deregulation proposal be confirmed in the House?

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I can only say this: we believe there is a very significant degree of untapped charter bus business in Alberta. We would not knowingly make any changes in the regulations involving charter bus operations that would decrease that business. It's my view that whatever we do would in all likelihood mean a significant number of additional jobs in the charter bus industry. There is no way I or anyone else would be able to guarantee who might get those jobs — whether they would be union or non-union people or what kind of drivers — except to say that the standards with respect to driver education and qualifications that are laid down by the Solicitor General's Department will be maintained with certainty, no matter what.

#### **Abacus Cities Investigation**

MR. SHRAKE: Mr. Speaker, could the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs please advise when the 1979 \$3.5 million investigation by the Alberta Securities Commission into the affairs of the bankrupt Abacus Cities Ltd. will be completed and what the final cost will be?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, that report as a result of the investigation is in the hands of the Securities Commission, and it is my understanding that the approximately \$3.5 million represents the final cost of that report.

MR. SHRAKE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. What benefits to the people of Alberta will accrue from this expenditure?

MR. SPEAKER: We're in a little difficult area here, because that's obviously a matter of debate. One person's benefit may be another's detriment.

#### **Cultural Diversity**

MR. WOO: My question to the hon. Premier has reference to the cultural policy for this province. Could the hon. Premier confirm to the House his recent remarks to the Alberta Heritage Council which, amongst other things, constituted the establishment of a special committee to address itself to the concerns of that council?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, the way the hon. member raised the question indicates that perhaps there was a misunderstanding. I thought I made it clear that we do have a permanent committee of Executive Council with regard to the issue of cultural diversity, not an *ad hoc* committee. That committee will be considering the representations for cultural diversity from the Alberta Heritage Council.

MR. WOO: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the Premier indicate to the Assembly the membership of that committee?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, the chairman will be the Minister of Culture, and the members of the committee are the Attorney General, the ministers of Advanced Education, Education, Manpower, and Labour, the chairman of the Edmonton government caucus, and the chairman of the Calgary government caucus.

MR. WOO: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the hon. Premier assure the House that this committee will indeed

meet with this council? If such assurance is forthcoming, to what extent will this occur?

MR. LOUGHEED: Yes, I'm prepared to make the assurance that the committee I've referred to will meet with the Heritage Council in the very near future and review their submissions on cultural diversity.

#### **Daylight Saving Time**

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Premier. I'm not sure who to address the question to. It has to do with daylight saving time. Can the Premier or the minister responsible indicate if any studies have been done as to the feasibility of leaving daylight saving time year-round? I know the Minister of Economic Development knows the effect it has when you have to phone central Canada three hours earlier than here to do business. What studies have been done to give consideration to leaving daylight saving time year-round?

MR. LOUGHEED: Well, Mr. Speaker, I have to admit I haven't had a question on that subject since possibly 1972, and I would be somewhat concerned to ask the Minister of Agriculture or the Minister of Economic Development. So the question is quite properly directed to me. I'll have to take consideration and decide who will be the fortunate person to whom I delegate the answer. [laughter]

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, to the Premier. There are a lot of them there who haven't got anything to do, so I'm sure somebody would like it.

#### **ORDERS OF THE DAY**

MR. SPEAKER: May the hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury revert to Introduction of Special Guests?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

#### **head: INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS** (reversion)

MR. STILES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have the pleasure of introducing to you and to members of the Assembly a group of visitors from Australia and New Zealand who are presently touring North America. Our visitors are all either farmers or interested in agriculture and, prior to coming to Alberta, they visited agricultural installations in California. On Thursday of this week, they will be in the constituency I have the privilege to represent, visiting two rather extensive cattle operations down there, in addition to Olds Agricultural College. They are seated in the public gallery, Mr. Speaker, and I would ask them to rise and receive the welcome of the Assembly.

#### **head: WRITTEN QUESTIONS**

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, with respect to the questions on the Order Paper, I move that questions 203, 205, and 206 stand and retain their places on the Order Paper.

[Motion carried]

202. Mr. Notley asked the government the following question:

(a) What are the government's most recent estimates of premium arrears which remain outstanding since the Alberta health care insurance plan premiums were first collected, and the government's best estimates of what percentage of that figure may be attributed to:

- (1) individuals and families who no longer reside in Alberta,
- (2) individuals whose coverage has been subsumed by another's, and
- (3) individuals whose death (and premium arrears where applicable) have not been recorded by the government, and whose "arrears" have subsequently continued to accumulate.

(b) What is the government's best estimate of the projected administrative costs of implementing the new health care card system, which became effective October 1, 1983?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: I believe I heard an hon. minister say the question was agreed to, but I'm not sure which one.

MR. RUSSELL: Agreed.

204. Mr. Martin asked the government the following question:  
What company or companies have been chosen to develop the hotel and/or ski facilities at Mount Allan in preparation for the 1988 Winter Olympics?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, I agreed to accept the question, and the answer to Question No. 204 is: none.

#### **head: MOTIONS FOR RETURNS**

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, with respect to motions for returns, I move that motions for returns 195, 196, and 197 stand and retain their places on the Order Paper.

[Motion carried]

194. Mr. R. Speaker moved that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing:  
What figures did the Provincial Treasurer use to calculate his statement that "Government operating expenditure growth rates are cut by 50% in the current budget" in his October 18, 1983, news release?

What was the source of this information?

[Motion carried]

198. Mr. Martin moved that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing a copy of Open Heart and Cardio-Vascular Services in Alberta, dated May 1983, a study prepared for the Department of Hospitals and Medical Care.

[Motion carried]

199. Mr. Notley moved that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing a copy of the letter dated June 30, 1983, from the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs addressed to federal Justice Minister Mark MacGuigan, regarding confidentiality of information from Alberta.

[Motion carried]



MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to table Motion for a Return 199, together with the reply from the Minister of Justice to me, dated July 22, 1983.

200. Mr. Notley moved that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing:

- (1) An itemized statement of the expenses incurred by or on behalf of Premier Peter Lougheed and payable by the government or any of its departments or agencies, arising from the Premier's 1983 visit to Asia;
- (2) A list of those individuals who accompanied Premier Lougheed and an itemized statement of the expenditures incurred in each case by or on behalf of those individuals and payable by the government or any of its departments and agencies.

[Motion carried]

201. Mr. Martin moved that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing a copy of the report that has been referred to as "working papers", prepared by the Department of Public Works, Supply and Services, that culminated in the conclusions and recommendations presented to the Calgary Olympic Coliseum Society on August 26, 1983, concerning cost overruns and related matters on the construction of the Calgary Olympic Saddledome.

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, in June 1983 the Department of Public Works, Supply and Services was requested by the Calgary Olympic Saddledome society to do a review. As I indicated yesterday during question period, that review was carried out and recommendations were given to the Saddledome society.

The review was carried out by members of the staff of my department and, during the course of the review, staff members made certain notes which were intended to be used for their own information. I feel that these notes should be given the same privilege as is given to internal correspondence and should be treated with that same degree of confidentiality. I also do not feel it would be fair to the staff members involved to release these working papers.

The Saddledome society appointed a performance audit review committee to conduct an audit. Members of the committee have met with Public Works, Supply and Services staff who were involved in the review, and all background information has been verbally related to the committee. I understand it is the society's intention to release the report of the audit committee to the public once it's completed.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I recommend that members defeat Motion 201.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, once again we have this government attempting to justify in this Legislature the indefensible position of maintaining closed doors on information that ought to be made public, with respect to what in fact is going to end up being the expenditure of public funds. The minister tells us that we don't need to worry, because there's an audit committee of the Saddledome society, and they're going to have access to all this information and will release a report. Obviously they're going to release a report on what they consider to be advisable to release. But the question is: do we as representatives of the people and, more important, do the people of Alberta, have an opportunity to know why that overrun occurred?

I would say to members of this government that if we are not to tread down the same dangerous path Montreal took,

where the first time there was an overrun people looked the other way, then we have to be clear on why there was an overrun on the Saddledome in Calgary. We have to have all the information made public, so that all other investments that are in any way, shape, or form related to the major capital investments required for the Winter Olympics — so we have tight control over those expenditures.

Mr. Speaker, we have all kinds of rumors that are circulating about the reasons for the overrun. The summary report that we've had an opportunity to review is so general as to be of little importance to meaningful and useful public debate on why that overrun occurred. It is just not good enough. However much members of this Assembly may enjoy the Saddledome in the future, it is just not good enough to have a minister stand in his place and say: this information will be shared with a group of private people but is not going to be shared with the taxpayers of this province, through their elected representatives. That is the kind of practice we've had all too often from this government. It is typical of an obsession with secrecy, which is just wrong in principle. But I would say, Mr. Speaker, that it's not only wrong in principle but is a very dangerous precedent, in view of the projects facing us as we prepare for the Winter Olympics.

So I hope members in this Assembly today will reconsider the efforts on the part of Executive Council to close the door, and will recognize that if we are to set a good example for future investments, we need this kind of information. It's a proper request, and it's information that should be made available to the public domain.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, hopefully not to repeat the concern with regard to the principles that are violated in terms of this motion, in that information is not made available to this Legislature, there's a very basic question we must address in terms of this motion. It's a question that should be addressed to a number of other expenditures and grant programs of the Conservative government. The question is this: in this specific case, has the Department of Public Works, Supply and Services done its job or not? That's the very clear question that's there.

If I were the minister, sitting on that side of the House, I'd want to be able to stand in my place and say to this Legislature: I have done my job; here's the case we presented to them, and here's the information we gave that society so that they would do their job; I knew that when we did this, this, and this, whatever it is — and here it is documented — I could present it to this Legislature; I know that the public funds were protected and, as well, that we as a government have done our job. To me, that is the first principle that's violated by the act the government is taking part in at the present time in denying this information to the Legislature, denying the people of Alberta a clear message that the government is doing its job. They often say, maybe rather indirectly, that the government is more in bed with the society than it is with the people of Alberta. It has more concern with regard to the society's action and protecting whatever they're doing in terms of a cost overrun or possibly some mismanagement than they are with the people's dollar that's being allocated to a function such as this.

Mr. Speaker, I think we as legislators are here to lay it on the table. Who cares? I think one principle that should go into government — and the few cabinet ministers that are in this Legislature at the present time should think about it — is that any group, any individual, in this province that gets public funds should be ready to have their soul bared in the Legislature, because this was the source of the funds. If they're not prepared to do that, then we'd better ask what's going on. And it's not happening in this case.

It's easy for government to say no, we're not going to do it. It's easy to send a missive to Ottawa and say: Ottawa, don't release any Alberta papers; you could embarrass us. You know, a big red letter is headed off to Ottawa, saying: you release a letter and we're going to do something to you. I don't know how Goliath would feel, getting kicked in the shins by Alberta. But anyway, Alberta is attempting to partake of that kind of act at the present time, to shut Ottawa tip even though they don't want to give information here in Alberta.

But there is a violation of a very basic principle in the administrative responsibility of government. If the minister stood up and said, here are the papers, I've done my best job for everybody, he'd be a hero. But he's backing off. Openness to the people of Alberta will get a lot more Brownie points than trying to hide some of the details. At that time people make assumptions that there's something wrong, something has gone on. The political issue continues to boil; it just adds to the pot. What's happening today just adds to the suspicion. I think it's incumbent upon a minister to try to eliminate that kind of suspicion.

What does it hurt to give the material to the Legislature and whatever happens to it in public debate, happens? I don't feel sorry for the society or for any other group in this province that gets public funds. If they make a mistake, expose it; tell what it's all about. That's our job: to be open to the public and lay it on the table. But the way this government's mentality has changed from its first concept of open government in 1971, to one of self-indulgence and centralized authority — hold our business close to the chest; we don't have to tell the public about it — is a drastic change that is a deficiency in the government of Alberta at the present time. Today's incident is a specific incident that symbolizes that kind of act.

If some of these retreats that are in Banff, where very special ministers are appointed to the responsibility of the economic determination of this province — I would think that one of the discussions in those retreats should be with regard to the original concept of open government and how they could lay their government open at this time and be responsible, even in economic development. But here we are, going to sit in this Legislature — the people in Alberta without jobs will wait until next spring before some pronouncement comes forward. It's the same principle that we're talking about here with regard to not releasing information to the people of Alberta, only the implications with regard to the hidden information about the economic development plan of this government are even worse than this one here. But it's the same kind of mentality that carries on from one portfolio to another.

Mr. Speaker, I think the government should review that kind of approach. That's being very open, when I say that.

On the other side, buddies, keep it up, because in the next election I think the people will respond accordingly to that kind of act.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member for Little Bow has made reference to a fair number of topics not directly related to the motion, including the document which I just filed as Motion for a Return No. 199, relative to the federal government's Access to Information Act and privacy Act, which have been passed. In all fairness I think he should read that correspondence with care before he makes the types of comments he did relative to that particular information, which has been supplied to him and is available to all members of the Assembly, and has been made available to the public.

The point at issue today is a fairly narrow one, Mr. Speaker. It is related only in a very minor way to the broader subject of freedom of information, which the hon. member has introduced

and, I think, was made the subject of legislation which he himself and other members have brought forward in the Assembly. What is really at issue here is whether working papers within a department of government, made available to the minister, on which he prepares reports — in this case, to an association building the Saddledome in Calgary — should be made available. In all the freedom of information legislation that has been passed in this country by the federal government, it is quite clear that that legislation excludes confidential working documents and papers, information, and advice made available by members of governmental departments to the minister. That particular issue has been clearly dealt with on a number of occasions.

It's all well and good to get up in the Assembly and make broad interjections, as the Member for Little Bow has just done. The fact of the matter is that what is being called for in the motion for a return are intradepartmental working papers, advice given by staff of a department to a minister. It is widely accepted that that type of information is not appropriately the subject for a motion for a return. Therefore, the effort on the part of opposition members to broaden the question into one of a different nature does not do service to the debate on that whole issue itself and certainly does not effectively address the motion before the Assembly today.

MR. SPEAKER: May the hon. member conclude the debate?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I think a couple of things have to be said to put this thing in perspective. First of all, I heard the Minister of Public Works, Supply and Services say: in fairness to staff members. That's not the issue. Staff members are paid out of public money. Our job is to protect the taxpayers of Alberta. There is \$6 million on an overrun that is gone from the taxpayers of Alberta, plus another \$12 million, so far, from the taxpayers of Calgary, although \$6 million of that may come back. It's not our job or the minister's job to protect staff; it's his job to protect the taxpayers of Alberta. I am amazed by a statement like that.

The other point we make is that certain people have had access to these working papers. It is my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that they've been shared with private people. The only conclusion that people can come to, unless we come clean and know what's going on — because one of the roles of this Legislature, a very important role, is supposed to be the guardian of taxpayers' money. When we sort of hide behind protecting staff and private people, the only conclusion people can come to is that there is something to hide. If the minister watched what happened in the civic election in Calgary, he knows that that was a very big issue with people. If there is nothing to hide, then why the charade? Just bring it out and let's take a look at the working papers.

The other point that I think has to be made, besides the freedom of information aspect — the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs says it's a very narrow issue. Mr. Speaker, I suggest in all fairness that it's much more than a narrow issue, even in terms of the freedom of information which I've alluded to. But the other important thing is that this was the first step in Olympic development. People all across North America are looking at it. They are wondering if Calgary is going to be another Montreal Olympics. The same thing happened in Montreal: the first building went up, there was an overrun, it was sort of hidden, and people said, we've got it under control. We know what happened after the Montreal Olympics: it wasn't under control.

An advantage of opening up working papers to find out what happened on the Saddledome — there's not a lot we can do about saving taxpayers' money with the Saddledome at this particular point. But surely if it's open and public, one of the things with open access of information is that it's not likely we'd make those mistakes with any of the other buildings that go up for the Calgary Olympics. So it is much more than a narrow issue, Mr. Speaker. If we know what happened there, perhaps we can save the taxpayers millions of dollars. The last thing anybody in this province wants — we want Olympics in Calgary that all of Alberta will be proud of. We don't want a white elephant, which occurred in the Olympics.

Many people, and many Calgarians, that I've talked to are very nervous because they're not getting the information. I don't think it's up to the government to protect people in the private sector. If something went wrong, it's not their job to protect them. It's not their job to worry about the staff being embarrassed. Staff are paid by the taxpayers' money. It's clearly their job to protect the taxpayers of Alberta so we know what's going on. That's our job; it's what we were elected for as legislators. That argument just doesn't wash. In this motion I hope that somewhere down the line — I hope that I'm wrong — and there are overruns all over the Olympics, we'll think back and say, gee, I wish we had done something about the Saddledome right at the start, instead of paying and paying in the future. That's why it's much bigger than a narrow issue, as the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs says.

In conclusion, I hope that all serious legislators, people that were elected by their constituents to do a job — one of those jobs being to protect taxpayers' money — would say, yes, we want these working papers; we want it opened and we want to see what happened, so we can protect what happens in the future.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

[Eight minutes having elapsed, the House divided]

[Mr. Appleby in the Chair]

For the motion:

Buck	Martin	Notley
Speaker, R.		

Against the motion:

Adair	Horsman	Paproski
Alexander	Hyland	Payne
Anderson	Isley	Pengelly
Batiuk	Johnston	Planche
Bogle	Jonson	Purdy
Bradley	King	Reid
Campbell	Koper	Russell
Chambers	Kowalski	Shrake
Clark	Koziak	Sparrow
Crawford	Lee	Stevens
Cripps	Lysons	Stromberg
Diachuk	McPherson	Szwender
Drobot	Miller	Thompson
Elliott	Moore, M.	Topolnisky
Embury	Moore, R.	Trynchy
Fischer	Musgreave	Webber

Fyfe	Oman	Weiss
Gogo	Osterman	Woo
Harle	Pahl	Zip
Totals:	Ayes — 57	Noes — 4

## head: MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

215. Moved by Mr. Paproski:

Be it resolved that the Assembly urge the government to consider a proposal that would make available to junior high school and senior high school students a computer-assisted career counselling program.

MR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Speaker, it is an honor and a pleasure for me to move Motion No. 215. In both human and economic terms, employment is one of life's most rewarding experiences. A good job offers the pride of achievement, an opportunity for individual growth, and a sense of personal usefulness. It also provides the welcome security of an adequate income.

But Mr. Speaker, satisfying employment cannot be achieved without wise and informed career planning. Young people today are faced with the difficult task of making sound career choices from among thousands of alternatives. The changing occupational structure within our increasingly complex and technological society makes the planning process even more difficult. In addition there are over 1 million Canadians out of work today, and a very large number of those are youth and young adults. The difficulties facing these job seekers is compounded because of their youth.

In my experience as a counsellor, as an educational consultant, and as a program co-ordinator specifically in the areas of career information, work experience, and career education, students, parents, and employers have given me many reasons why people select a particular occupation or choose a particular postsecondary institution. Among these reasons are the following: because my father is a carpenter, so too I will be a carpenter; I guess it is what I want; I can make good money at it; I can't work in that area because I am a male; I can't work in that area because I am a female; my family thinks it would be good for me; my friend is going to the Northern Alberta Institute of Technology, and so too will I; I have a feeling it's for me; going to the university is the thing to do from this particular school. Well, Mr. Speaker, if you couple these reasons with possible false or incorrect information from parents, teachers, counsellors, school administrators, or perhaps a student has utilized out-of-date information, you can see that the possibility of making a correct decision is indeed weak or perhaps, at best, chancy.

Mr. Speaker, there are all kinds of additional facts pertaining to young people and their future with respect to work that I would like to mention in order to build the case that something has to be done at all levels of the educational continuum, from kindergarten to postsecondary institutions. First of all, for too many young people career exploration begins after leaving school instead of during their early learning years, when there is ample time to develop areas of work interest and work competence. It is unfortunate that the majority of students do not test these skills while they are still enrolled in school.

Secondly, youth unemployment is consistently three and four times greater than adult unemployment in Canada, and the turnover is extremely high. Most university graduates, for example, stay with their first employer less than three years, while high school graduates often have several jobs their first year out of high school.

Thirdly, most students are not provided with the skill and knowledge to help them adjust to changes in job opportunities. The result here is frequently tragic with respect to a human's future, for the schools do little to assist students in adapting to changes in job opportunities, job skills, and job trends. The result that frequently occurs is, the young adult has the opportunity for a career change but rather than do this, is very fearful and maintains the status quo.

Another reason why young people have difficulty in career planning, and indeed in career choice, is that there has steadily developed in our schools an increased emphasis on schooling for schooling's sake. The second grade teacher seems intent and content to ready students for the third grade, the ninth grade teacher to ready students for the 10th grade, and the grade 12 teacher to ready students for postsecondary institutions. Instead of preparing for something, education for many students has become simply preparation for more education.

A fifth difficulty occurs when much of what happens in the classroom has too little to do with what is happening outside the classroom. There seems to be an attempt to prepare our young people for the community by isolating them from the community.

A sixth concern is that the majority of high school students are still enrolled in an academic pattern that leads to the University of Alberta, even though statistics show that all jobs in the future will not require a university degree. Now, I'm not suggesting to members of this Assembly that all students should be channelled into apprenticeship careers, into technical institutions, and into areas other than university. I am simply suggesting that these are facts, and these facts should be shared with parents and with students.

Mr. Speaker, another concern is the large drop-out and failure rate at our postsecondary institutions. The resulting adjustments can be extremely costly to students and their parents, in terms of money and psychological damage from their inability to plan a meaningful future. Over 50 per cent of postsecondary students across this country never complete their undergraduate degrees. What a waste.

Let's look further into some specific areas of the world of work to show the need for utilizing the world of work in our schools and classrooms — specifically, computer-assisted career counselling programs. First is the complexity of the world of work in Canada. The federal manpower and immigration department has classified not 100, not 500, not 2,000, but 6,700 occupations in Canada for students and people to select — some 20,000 specific kinds of jobs. Mr. Speaker, where is a student to find out about these? Perhaps in May of grade 12, their graduating year? Perhaps in a few Guidance 9 courses or in three or four social studies classes?

With these thousands of opportunities available to students, the counsellor has historically been the person in the school — if indeed there is a counsellor in the school — that is supposed to be that individual who is all-knowledgeable, all-perfect, all-knowing about 6,700 occupations. Of course, it is impossible for one person to know all about the world of work. Surely the science teacher, the mathematics teacher, the art teacher, and the industrial arts teacher should be more versed in his or her career area with respect to the world of work and share that information. Even then, a computer-based career counselling program will still be required to present current, accurate, and detailed information so school counsellors, students, and parents can work together.

A second major area is the complexity of occupational preparation. More and more training is required by the population today. The training of human beings in their specific career areas seems to be getting more complex as time progresses. In

Canada alone, some 300-plus formal postsecondary educational institutions exist. In Alberta the number is about 30. If one is to look just at Edmonton, Alberta, there are four large postsecondary institutions in Edmonton alone — NAIT, where students can choose from about 60 different career areas; the University of Alberta, with over 100 different career areas; Grant MacEwan, with over 50 career areas; and Concordia College, which offers a wide range of choices as well. In turn, Edmonton has five nursing schools, the Canadian petroleum training institute, apprenticeship programs, private schools, colleges, and on and on it goes. Mr. Speaker, the number here boggles the mind, but where do students learn about these particular areas? Again, is it in May of grade 12?

Mr. Speaker, there is also a need to develop broader career concepts in our young people. I believe it is necessary to burst some bubbles for kids, to break some stereotypes about certain career areas, and to broaden horizons. I think the tunnel vision of students has to be curtailed. To typify, why is it that so many matriculation students never enter university? Do students really have a realistic concept of what full-time employment is all about? Are students aware that it may take them some time in order to achieve the salaries they believe are open to them upon school graduation?

A fourth area is motivational effects. Although the elementary school student is frequently feeling it, the junior and senior high school level students are asking, why do I have to learn math, social studies, or French, and on and on? Many students are lethargic. They lack a desire to succeed. They show little enthusiasm. Although not a panacea, Mr. Speaker, it has been shown that applying subject matter to something that is important and relevant to students, like the world of work, will indeed motivate students to want to learn.

Another point that I believe is very important, Mr. Speaker, is that career development is important in a student's total development. Career development does not begin in a Guidance 9 class because a teacher says, we shall start talking about guidance or about the world of work. It does not begin in grade 11 or in grade 12, graduation year. It starts when a child realizes that mom and dad leave home with a lunch bucket or a brief case and go somewhere for the whole day. Career development commences when they know that certain people are offering services to them, whether they be the milk delivery person, the mail delivery person, the doctor, et cetera. Career development occurs when children know that their father and mother are different from others because they work on weekends or because they go somewhere and do their job in the evenings, et cetera.

The concept of interests, personality characteristics, aptitudes, attitudes, and intelligence all play a role in a human's career development. Unfortunately, little discussion occurs with respect to these areas and succeeding or failing in one's future: their work. Career development is a part of a human's total development from birth to death, and I know a computer-assisted counselling program would indeed aid students in their particular career development.

Another need, Mr. Speaker, is to assist the "disadvantaged" in our society. We have to start at the junior high school level with many of these students, because working with high school youth from disadvantaged environments is too little too late. They just don't stay around. They pack their bags, and they drop out of school. If we talk of equalizing career opportunities, we cannot wait until high school for many students. In addition, those students who are educably mentally handicapped, learning disabled, or mentally and physically handicapped require extra help to assist them to benefit from and succeed in the world of work.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, if implemented, this program would assist the young woman as well to become more cognizant of the opportunities open to her. The facts speak for themselves when we know that a woman, if she decides to marry and raise a family, will spend, on the average, 25 years of her life working outside the home. If she decides to marry and not to have a family or to work while she has children, the fact is that, on average, an individual will work 40 years or more. Surely we have to do more to assist young women to break the sexual stereotyping that is occurring in our society and the many myths related to women and the world of work.

Mr. Speaker, many studies have been performed to clearly illustrate the desire by students and parents to include career planning and career education to a greater extent in the schools at all levels of the continuum. The Edmonton Separate School Board and the Edmonton Public School Board have presented evidence from students and parents that career planning and career education should become more prevalent in schools today. A Gallup poll, performed by the Phi Delta Kappa as late as 1976 throughout the United States, underscored that there is a need at all levels to bring the world of work into the classroom. Our Alberta Education Department, in a major study on guidance and counselling approximately a year and a half ago, gathered the concerns of many Albertans about career planning. One of the recommendations I'd like to quote is No. 19:

Alberta Education explore ways to assist Alberta high schools to provide computer assisted career and educational counselling for students.

Because of the importance associated with this service at the high school level, the task force recommends that full advantage be taken of computer capability in this [particular] area.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the time is now to introduce computer-assisted counselling programs in junior and senior high schools throughout this province. Programs, which have been researched and implemented in many of the provinces across Canada, exist to show the impact of this. I could just mention British Columbia and Nova Scotia, which have extensive provincial implementation strategies of various career-assisted counselling programs.

These programs, Mr. Speaker — and there many, many, many — are simply phenomenal. They're current, they're utilitarian, they're exciting, and are a tremendous asset to students in their life career planning.

I know others in this Assembly want to enter this debate. I think it's important, though, that I spend a few more minutes talking about this new technology. Mr. Speaker, the CHOICES program is probably the best known throughout Canada. Its data base was formulated over a number of years through the Employment and Immigration Commission in Ottawa. I would like to allude to, and make all members of this Assembly aware of, what this new technology can do to assist students.

The system does not have information on every conceivable type of work, but it will store information on nearly 700 primary occupations, which represents approximately 90 per cent of Canada's labor force and roughly 3,000 related occupations. It allows for much more than a simple print-out of the information it contains. People can relate to occupations through any or all of the following exploration routes. By the way, this is in French and English.

1. Occupational Titles
2. Occupational Fields
3. Interests
4. Aptitudes
5. Temperamental Factors

6. The Education Level required for that occupation.
7. The Environmental Conditions which are associated with occupations.
8. The Future Occupational Outlook of that occupation.
9. The Earnings associated with that occupation.
10. The Hours of Work and Travel Preferences of a particular person.
11. The Physical Demands required or wanted by that individual.
12. The Physical Activities associated with that occupation.
13. Indoor/Outdoor Preferences.

A person may say, for example, "I am only interested in occupations that suit my interests and aptitudes, provide work indoors, involve no stress and/or risk situations, pay at least \$15,000 per year, and require not more than grade 12 education". CHOICES will instantly respond with a list of occupations that meet these criteria. It will then provide, on demand, detailed information about any of the occupations, comparisons of up to three of the occupations at a time, and [give a list of] related occupations.

But that's not the end of this program, Mr. Speaker.

CHOICES will also explain to users why specific occupations do not appear on their list. For instance, if prior to the interaction, a user was considering becoming a Computer Operator, and CHOICES did not list this as a suitable occupation, the user can ask "Why not?" CHOICES will immediately respond with something like, "Because you want too much money and your educational level is insufficient."

That program has been available in Canada since 1976. It is available on microcomputer and on the main-frame computer.

A second of many, many recently devised computer programs is one developed right in Alberta by a Mr. Bruce Akitt of Chautaugua Computer Systems in Rocky Mountain House, Alberta. It was especially developed to provide career guidance services to schools in the rural areas, where the cost of tying into a main-frame computer was definitely prohibitive. It is a blend of the CHOICES main-frame and micro-CHOICES program, which I've just talked about. It has two major files, an occupational file and an educational link file. Four floppy diskettes are supplied, and I'm sure everyone in this room has seen these: (a) one is called a system boot, which prepares the hardware for use; (b) a provincial file, which contains all of the occupational information for each provincial area; (c) an investigative program; and (d) intersect, which allows users to search for occupations which share some of the same characteristics.

Mr. Speaker, I praise and I thank the Minister of Education and members of his department for initiating a kindergarten to grade 6 life careers curriculum. It is exciting, it is in many schools, and it is going to be a tremendous asset to the career development of elementary school students. I praise all those schools in Alberta, and there are many, who have taken the initiative on their own to obtain various computer-assisted career counselling programs. I also want to praise Alberta Education for piloting and studying these programs at length, in an attempt to arrive at some formal conclusions on what direction we should be going.

I now ask the members of this Assembly for their support in approving Motion 215. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure today to participate in the debate on Motion 215, presented by the hon. Member for Edmonton Kingsway. At the outset, I must congratulate the hon. member for the eloquence, delivery, and

substance of the remarks he's given with respect to the motion that he currently has before the Assembly. Unfortunately, I cannot agree with the position taken by the Member for Edmonton Kingsway. I believe that this Assembly has to hear some arguments with respect to the reasons why a computer-assisted career counselling program is a bit premature at this point in time.

The Member for Edmonton Kingsway, in giving his overview comments, did not really isolate this particular concept in terms of all of the priorities currently facing us in the area of education in the province of Alberta. My first reservation, Mr. Speaker, deals exactly with the context in which the priority for a computer-assisted career counselling program would really fit. On this very day that we sit here in this Assembly, part of the constituency that I represent is in a strike situation, and the whole concept of education. In dealing with the teachers who are professionals within the jurisdiction known as the county of Lac Ste. Anne, they're rather concerned, and they tell me quite repeatedly that the amount of funding currently being provided to education in terms of teachers' salaries is really not quite sufficient to meet the demands and their needs. That's just one example of a priority in terms of attention that we as legislators and the people of Alberta have to face in the whole question of education.

On September 15, 1983, the final report of the minister's task force on school finance was released. It made a series of recommendations to the Minister of Education and to the government of Alberta. It included such recommendations as: the province should be picking up 85 per cent of the total expenditures that should be provided to school boards in this province; it indicated that we needed additional special education funding; we needed more funding for industrial and business educational funding, funding for small schools and small jurisdictions, and declining enrollment grants. For anyone who represents a rural constituency, one of the major concerns that we all face is busing and transportation costs. When we take a look at bringing in more programs, I think it's extremely important despite the merits of the program, we have to really fit it in with the complete context of what the priorities are in terms of educational funding today in the province of Alberta.

The second major concern that I have really deals with what in my view has been, until recent years, an underutilization of counselling facilities in both the junior and senior high schools. I don't want to date myself, and I don't want to go back to the time when I was in high school. But certainly at that time very, very competent professional people who were guidance counsellors in the schools seemed to spend a great deal of their time simply filling in timetable cards for the students in the school. When it came right down to spending their time and effort dealing with the problems of young people, they simply didn't have the amount of time that they perhaps required.

I know that in recent years, there has been a tremendous improvement in terms of the amount of time available by guidance counsellors to assist their students at both the junior and senior high schools. But it would seem to me that there is still a great need for improvement and attention by guidance counsellors, to really focus on the personal problems of students, the social concerns of students, family related concerns if they're there and part of it, and academic concerns of students. Really, if there was a priority at this time, in the Alberta of 1983, it would seem to me that we still have a great deal of good effort and good work that has to be done in those four areas.

I'm reminded, Mr. Speaker, when looking at you, that you were a guidance counsellor by profession at some time in the past. Perhaps some of the things I'm saying may have reflected in your time when you were involved in the academic world.

But I want to repeat: the personal problems of young people have to be paramount. I think the guidance counsellors we have today are totally competent, professional people, who have to have as much opportunity to be released from some of the mundane, bureaucratic nonsense that goes on in schools, with timetables and the like — I'm sure the Member for Edmonton Norwood relates; he smiles; he knows exactly what I'm talking about — that perhaps too many principals are inflicting upon guidance counsellors in the schools. They have to be released to concentrate on the most important person in the school system — the client, the student — and to be there for personal attention.

So it's really within the context of the priorities of where we are going to be spending money today. Do we have to spend money to improve a system that will allow children, young adults, to in fact have someone they can talk to, someone to resolve their basic concerns with? Or are we going to be redirecting dollars, an unlimited, unquantitative amount of money, that has not been described today by the Member for Edmonton Kingsway — as to how much money will be necessary to implement a computer-assisted career counselling program. From the perspective of the Member for Barrhead, if it is a priority, the dollars should be allocated to the upgrading of the talents of the people who are guidance counsellors, to assist them to be in a much better position to provide a direct, person-to-person relationship with students.

I'm not alone, Mr. Speaker, in putting forward that idea. I've discussed the concept that the Member for Edmonton Kingsway has brought forward today with members of my executive, and I also spent time over the weekend talking to some very highly respected educators in the constituency I represent. In particular, I spent a very, very interesting time Saturday morning talking to the president of the Alberta Teachers' Association local in the county of Barrhead, and a principal of J. R. Harris junior high school, Mr. Basahti. We tossed around these ideas considerably, and he thought it was paramount that the competent people he has on his staff as guidance counsellors should have a greater opportunity to be released from some of these mundane things I was talking about a little earlier, to have an opportunity to concentrate on dealing with young people.

Mr. Speaker, it's also very important when we're talking about the computer age — there are some people who believe that where we're at today is simply a technological kick; it's a momentary thing. Perhaps the best example I could give of the whole concept of computers and the utilization of computers — and I don't want to be accused by anybody of being a Neanderthal, so I want to relate to something that perhaps all of us really have in our homes. There was one time when most of us who listen to music used to have a record called a 78 rpm. Years went by before somebody invented the 45 rpm. Then we moved to a 33 long playing record. Then we went to something called 8-tracks. Now we're into the cassette age, and one step up into something called the laser digital disk. We've made quantum leaps in terms of delivery of musical facilities over the last number of years, but it has taken quite a period of time to move from the 78 rpm to where we're at today.

There is a theory of tough thought in North America that what we are facing today in the schools in a large variety of places in our consumer purchasing habits is just a super, outstanding public relations job by a number of new, high-tech growth computer groups and organizations. It's almost embarrassing for me as a parent to tell my five-year old son, well, I'm not sure we really should buy that particular computer at this time. Then somebody comes along who sells them and

says, you know, if you don't buy that now, your little kid is going to be years behind everybody else. I think we've really got to rethink — and I know there are a number of jurisdictions in the United States where that's happening: the rethinking of [what] the impact of computer utilization and usage should be.

In doing some research with respect to the state of the art of computers in our schools in the province of Alberta, I'm flabbergasted to read a document called Computer Technology, which is put out by Alberta Education, dated October 1983. It contains a graph. When it surveyed a number of states in the United States and then the province of Alberta — do you know, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure most members in this Assembly don't appreciate that in terms of the number of computers we have in our schools the province of Alberta ranks 10th in all state and provincial jurisdictions in North America. Yet we consistently are bombarded by amounts of paper coming in here saying we have to spend more and more money. Do you know, Mr. Speaker, that we are third in North America as a percentage in terms of the number of computers in our schools? Only the state of Minnesota, in which 79.6 of the schools have computers, and the state of New York, with 58.4 per cent of the schools having computers, are ahead of Alberta. Of provincial jurisdictions and state jurisdictions in the United States, 51 per cent of our school jurisdictions today have computers. Yet we're told that we have to go out and spend this enormous sum of new money to get into the computer age.

I think we've done just a super job. One of the best kept secrets in the province of Alberta is a lack of aggressiveness by the current Minister of Education with respect to telling the people exactly how much money has been spent on computers in the school system. Well, perhaps he is a shy kind of fellow. But with a little encouragement in that regard, I'm sure he will want to proudly and boastfully tell the world exactly what is happening.

Mr. Speaker, I had better get back to the motion at hand, and that really is dealing with computer-assisted career counselling programs. My concern at this point in time is what the priority is. Is that our priority? From the point of view of the constituents I represent, I get more concerns addressed to me about the busing situation — how many miles a young person has to go to school, how much time it is — the size of classrooms, educational materials, and the like. It's really on the level of those priorities that I have to say that I think we have other priorities.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, in the past I think we have underutilized guidance counsellors in our schools. I think we have downgraded them and relegated them to less than the most important performance they should have. Part of that criticism should be addressed to school administrators at whatever level, from the principal up to the superintendent. And I think that basically we have to remember that young people need somebody to talk to. They can't talk to a machine.

Thank you.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I will probably put the hex on the motion for the hon. Member for Edmonton Kingsway, but we do come from a similar background. I think there's some confusion by the hon. Member for Barrhead about exactly what is being proposed.

I think the Member for Edmonton Kingsway laid it out well, but I would like to come back to a point. There have been surveys taken across Canada — and I did them in my own classes in my previous job — asking students if they have any idea what they might want to do when they're through school. These were kids in grade 11. I'm not suggesting that at grade 11 everybody should have an absolute idea. But they found,

for example, that somewhere — depending on where — in Canada, a third to a half of the students had no idea whatsoever what they wanted to do. When they followed through in this particular study and asked them more specific questions, they found that a lot of their responses were inappropriate. To use an extreme example, people who had failed grade 9 were still going to be nuclear physicists. There was not an awareness of what they could or could not do. The Member for Edmonton Kingsway pointed that out.

The other thing we have to remember is that if you were to take a survey — and I have had my students do this as an assignment — go out and talk to friends and neighbors, parents and cousins, whatever, and ask a simple question, are you generally satisfied with your job? I think most people would be shocked by the number of people who are existing in their jobs simply to bring the pay cheque home. When we start to look into that we find that this is in fact the case, that many, many people are in the position of hating their jobs but they go through every day — Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday — and wait for the weekends, and then a lot of them get drunk all weekend because they're worried about going back to their jobs.

Then we know what we're dealing with, if people get into a job that is totally unsatisfactory to them. We can talk about stress, alcoholism, and many of the other social problems that occur. It's not to say that career education — many people misunderstand it. They think it's the counsellor's job to say, we've taken a test and this is what you're going to be, because we have the answers. Career education is not that. Career education is an attempt to work with the students, first of all, to look at their aptitudes, through discussions, through tests, if you like — taking many different vehicles for doing it; taking a look at their interests and being realistic with their interests; taking a look at life styles. For example, what type of life style do you want to have in the future? Many kids haven't even thought about it.

[Mr. Purdy in the Chair]

When you have these three broad areas brought together, then you'll find that there are perhaps a number of different types of jobs a person could do, and do well. It's a matter of a student, if you like, or a person trying to get into the right category. But if you haven't put any thought to it, or haven't had any real reason to look into it, all we do is see television, see certain glamorous jobs, and that's what people want to do. I could predict that in grade 11 half the girls would want to be stewardesses or nurses — and that comes into sexual stereotyping, as the member was talking about — and other people would want to be lawyers and doctors; even the odd teacher, believe it or not. But as the Member for Edmonton Kingsway pointed out, we are into a very complex, technical society. I believe well over 6,000 jobs are documented in Canada at this specific time, and growing.

Now to come back, if I may, to what the Member for Barrhead was saying. It's not an either/or. I think the impression might be that we're going to stick a person in front of a computer. The computer is the CHOICES program. If you've had a chance to deal with them, as I have on a trial basis at our school, it's a means of making the counsellor more effective; in other words, if you like, going back to what the Member for Barrhead was talking about, making sure the person is working well with the student. Nobody would suggest that you go to a computer and the computer is going to give you all the answers. That's not the way the CHOICES program is set up. In fact there's a lot of precounselling that goes on with it before

the person should even go to the computer, and there is counselling after. I see that he has the book over there. So it's a carry-on with the counsellor. It's an attempt — another tool, if you like — to make the counsellor more effective; that's what the purpose of it is.

The point we're making is that with jobs growing — and we've talked in this Legislature, Mr. Speaker, about the fact that we are into a much more advanced technical society. We know now that more and more jobs are changing because of computers and will change at a faster rate as we go along. How is one person going to know 6,000 different jobs each day of each year to give the accurate information? It seems to me that if we're going to do this, we need the tools to do the job properly. We could even argue that perhaps the whole concept of career education even starts — I won't go into that — much earlier than junior high, back in elementary. It's not a matter of simply choosing a job, but the whole concept of decision-making. The most important decision we will make in our life is the type of work we will choose to do.

In terms of money, I think you would be pleasantly surprised that even out of a school budget, we were able to do it at my high school. There are a number of schools in Edmonton that I'm sure the Member for Edmonton Kingsway could fill you in on much better than me. But our particular school at Salisbury was able to bring it in out of our own school budget because we thought it was a worth-while priority.

In terms of the counsellor's time, in the past there have been bureaucratic details, but I would suggest that they're trying to work that out. As the member said, it may be getting better, and I believe it is. But I will tell you this: with all the counselling in the world, if you have super counsellors ... Of the ratios in Alberta, the high school in Calgary which I know best is still the best in the province in terms of ratio. Ours was not bad in the county of Strathcona, but there were 450 students to every counsellor there. I don't care if you are Superman or Superwoman; you cannot do an adequate job with each one of those 450 kids. It is absolutely impossible. And I do not see us moving in the direction — the Minister of Education is here — that we're going to press for more counsellors, because of restraint. So what we can do in a much cheaper way is at least bring in this model of a computer, on which you can work with groups of students at the same time — one counsellor. This has been done, where you can have adequacy with a number of students at the same time. It makes the counsellor more cost efficient, if we can put it that way. This is being done in many of the high schools in Edmonton at this particular time.

The point I am making is that these students are going out. We are now especially having problems with the recession. We see now, for example, that NAIT, the university, and the colleges all have more people than they need at this specific time. If students are not making good decisions, that is costing us a lot of money in the long run, because if we have students going to NAIT, if I can use that as an example, and they haven't made those decisions and there is a 50 per cent drop-out rate, then we are in difficulty. That's going to cost a lot more.

Now I'm not suggesting that a computer can solve everything; I'm saying it's another valuable tool that we need. I really would advise the members, now that this motion has been brought up — and I commend the Member for Edmonton Kingsway for bringing it in — that they take a look at what the CHOICES program is. As the hon. member said, it's been developed, it's across Canada. I think it's a very good program. You can ask the computer various questions. When we brought it into our school, there was a lot of interest in it, for example. That's part of education, to create an interest in things. That's true whether it's mathematics or whatever, but it's certainly

true in career education. After, you ask the students: was it worth while? We took some of our better students to give us constructive criticism before we spent the money, because our school budget was going to be spending a lot of money. Was it worth while or was it just a little game? I don't know what the computer games are now — I'm not into them — but were they seeing it in that way? They said to us that it was absolutely worth while; it got them thinking, and that's the key thing. It will not make all the decisions, but it got them thinking.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, again I would support the motion. I don't see that the motion is saying we have to run out ... Maybe we can go to the warehouse and trade some of them in for the CHOICES machines; I think we could save some money. But it is saying: be it resolved that we urge the government to consider a proposal. So nowhere in this motion do I see that they have to rush out and spend millions of dollars. Through this motion, we're just asking the Minister of Education to take a look at it, for other hon. members to take a look at what is out there. I believe it is important. One of the more important things that we could do in the school system is offer decent career education. With those few comments, I would urge the members to support Motion 215.

MRS. KOPER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few brief words about this motion. I believe there's no question that computer-assisted career education can provide an extensive informational system with which, both economically and physically, a counsellor cannot compete. The computer has an infallible memory, a highly efficient information retrieval and transmission system. But there is considerable evidence that career maturity is not enhanced by this program alone — that there must be considerable help from a counsellor and some use of further activities outlined in the manual and that sort of thing — and I believe [this] further points to the fact that none of these programs can happen to their maximum effectiveness without total co-operation of the student and teacher in understanding our environment.

I would like to emphasize a little bit about education by computer. I feel this is a good example of it, and Canadians have done a great deal and are very good at preparing programs like this. It's going to take some time, however, before we can judge their complete effectiveness. Computer-aided learning is going to be a tremendous opportunity, as pointed out by the previous speaker, to finally break away from a lock-step kind of presentation where, as teachers, we are forced to focus on one point at a time. This way, if we don't use the computer as it has been and avoid the mistakes we have made in the past in automation, there is tremendous potential for people to learn things at their own pace and according to their own needs. I support this motion in view of the fact that it will free the counsellors to do some of the more human things they are trained to do.

I want to point to the second use of the computer. We are talking about educating "by" the computer when we talk about these programs, and I would like to briefly mention education "for" computers. We are behind in the production of electronically sophisticated engineers and technologists. The country does not have training and retraining programs for the workers, some of whom will be displaced by industries. In our high schools, girls are opting out of science and mathematics programs at a rate four times faster than boys. As a consequence of this stereotyped behavior, half the brains in our country are putting themselves at a serious risk of not being available for the kinds of advanced jobs that will exist in the future. I feel strongly that our counsellors, our teachers, and our minister must work to solve that problem.



Mr. Speaker, I would ask that in view of the time, we call the question.

[Motion carried]

216. Moved by Mr. Cook:

Be it resolved that the Assembly urge the government to adopt the policy:

- (1) that every Bill that would establish a program involving the expenditure of public funds, would contain a termination date after which the program would cease to be in effect unless extended by new legislation,
- (2) that the termination date for such statutory programs should not be more than 10 years after commencement,
- (3) that existing statutory programs be referred to a standing committee of the Legislative Assembly, created for the purpose, to review and recommend a suggested amendment to establish a term of years that the program should remain in force before requiring legislation to extend its life,
- (4) that legislation with such a "sunset" provision should not be extended by legislation without prior review and recommendation by the committee.

MR. COOK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to kick off the debate on Motion 216 by outlining what I think the motion is trying to accomplish. It's a motion that essentially sets up an automatic termination schedule for all government programs and agencies. I think in a period of budgetary restraint, there are several models to look at. We can look at the British Columbia experience, with the Bennett government now cutting 25 per cent off the budgets of all departments. That's certainly one approach in a time of economic restraint. Another way is of a more even-handed nature, to go through all government programs on a regular basis, not just when there is economic difficulty, and try to keep government lean and trim in times of prosperity as well as adversity.

I would like to lead hon. members through the resolution. It has four main points that are outlined in the Order Paper. It has a termination date for all programs, Mr. Speaker. Secondly, unless formally renewed by the Legislature, all programs would die. The third point is that the resolution contemplates a 10-year cycle. It's not so onerous that the Legislative Assembly would be inundated or overwhelmed by the workload involved, but it would require the Legislature to set up a cycle where all legislation and regulations are reviewed.

Finally, the resolution would call for the creation of a standing committee that would review legislation and programs. This feature would allow the committee work to go on without impeding the progress of the Assembly. Normal business could be conducted by the Assembly, and the standing committee would meet independently.

Mr. Speaker, I think there are some questions about this that ought to be asked. Why is there a need for a periodic program review or sunset legislation? First of all, I think it would strengthen the Assembly's control over spending. It would bring a lot of decision-making back into this Chamber. It would force the Assembly to assess the effectiveness of both old programs and contemplated programs on a regular basis. It would end the notion as well that all programs have a life in civil service of their own, that they just keep rolling along and continue; after one government is defeated, they will simply be continued by the next government. That's a notion I think all of us here would like to end.

As well, it would encourage regulatory reform. I would like to commend the hon. Member for Edmonton Whitemud, who

has been contacting a number of interest groups in the community, asking if they would like to point out regulations that need reform. That's the sort of activity that needs to be done. In fact nothing like that has been done in Alberta since we began to regulate the province in 1935. As I understand it, most regulatory activity before that was done by legislation.

Mr. Speaker, another question hon. members should ask is: how would the program review take place? What is contemplated in this resolution? First of all, as I mentioned, a standing committee would be created. I anticipate that the committee would ask for background reports from departments as to their activities. It would also contact interest groups affected. We could take trucking regulations as an example. It would be an opportunity for the regulatory agency inside the Department of Transportation to prepare a working paper outlining why they think regulations should be continued, what those regulations are and what they do. It would be an opportunity for interest groups, both the trucking industry and consumer groups in the province, to outline what they think about the activities.

Finally, I would anticipate that public hearings would be held. Those public hearings would allow those kinds of views to be aired in public, and at the end of that the committee would decide that the regulations should be maintained, adopted, amended, or completely curtailed. With that kind of draconian axe, Mr. Speaker, I think there would be a great deal of interest in the activities of the committee. The committee would find that its work would be very important, and in a comprehensive way, all government programs would be treated this way over the 10-year cycle.

Mr. Speaker, the problem now is that we are somewhat haphazard in our approach. A particular program will have some sex appeal one year and maybe fall out of favor two or three years later and not be re-examined. So this way I think we will be comprehensive in our approach to looking at reform.

Mr. Speaker, another question is: who should do the review? There have been suggestions that perhaps it should be a committee of deputy ministers, civil servants, the Treasury Department, or the Ombudsman, that do these kinds of reviews. I hold that all those groups probably should be doing that kind of review, but in the final analysis the Legislative Assembly has a responsibility to the taxpayers. We are elected, and we should be doing that program review to bring some of the control back into the Legislative Assembly.

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

I think hon. members, if they reflect a little bit, will agree with me that there is virtually no control left in this Assembly over budgetary matters. The expenditures in most Canadian parliaments are developed by civil servants, transmitted by their ministers to a committee, a treasury board or a priorities committee. That committee of a very small number of people with the treasury department will prepare a working document. That document will then be communicated to the ministers involved, and they will be informed as to the budgets they have. That budget will be wrapped up by the provincial treasurer or the minister of finance in a way that balances expenditures and revenues. It will be presented, clouded in secrecy, on budget night.

It won't be varied, Mr. Speaker. The assembly or the parliament will not change a single line in the budget document, because to do so would constitute a vote of non-confidence in the government. So rather than precipitate an election, legislative assemblies throughout Canada simply rubber-stamp whatever the civil servants, who have prepared the background material — sending it to the ministers, sending it to the priorities

committee, and sending it back — have done. The net result is that the legislative assembly has lost control over the budgeting process. I think the proposal before us would bring a great deal of that program expenditure control back into the Assembly, because we would have to review government expenditure on an ongoing basis.

I want to close by saying that the proposal before you today is not a panacea. It's no quick cure for budgetary largesse or expenditure by governments. I am not going to suggest at all that passage of this motion or enabling legislation would solve all of our problems. There are going to be a lot of start-up problems if we adopt this kind of approach. It will mean that we will have to do an extensive review of government programs. We will probably have to hire some staff for the Legislative Assembly to assess government programs and to help the legislators make intelligent decisions.

I can imagine that in the first few years until the skills are in place in the Assembly, it will be very difficult to assess those kinds of programs reasonably. But having said that, I think it's fair to say that we can go several routes. We can look at the B.C. experience, and we can simply slash government right across the board; all departments get a 25 per cent reduction. That's not very sensitive; some programs need extra funding in a time of restraint like this. The Minister of Advanced Education's department might be a good one, where you probably need to put more money into retraining people and getting our support for universities, colleges, and technical schools boosted in a time like this. There may be other departments which need a much more severe look; perhaps total abolition of whole programs. That's the kind of approach we're contemplating in this resolution, and not just at a time when there is budgetary restraint on. It would be a continual program review with an automatic termination for those programs that are found wanting by the Legislature.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to listen to other members who want to comment during debate. I'd ask hon. members to give favorable consideration to Motion 216 on the Order Paper.

MR. ALEXANDER: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make a very brief and, hopefully, specific contribution to the motion raised by the hon. Member for Edmonton Glengarry, No. 216 regarding sunset legislation.

He has already betrayed my prime interest, and that is regulatory reform. As chairman of the subcommittee on regulatory reform, I have gained some additional insight into the magnitude of that problem. At the present time, I am looking for any tools whatever that may come to hand to assist us to reduce the impact of regulation on our lives.

Our attempt in regulatory reform is to reduce the economic burden, particularly as it impacts on the private sector, in an attempt to increase the efficiency, the effectiveness and, therefore, the job creation potential of businesses in the private sector. Much has been said about the matter of regulation; a lot has been said about the matter of legislation and how much of it we have. A recent submission from the Alberta Chamber of Commerce noted that for each dollar spent by government in the development and implementation of regulations, \$20 is spent by the regulated parties to comply.

Mr. Speaker, I think that's an average figure. It applies to large companies such as General Motors as well as the corner grocery store, but it is a rather appalling figure if it bears any relationship whatsoever to the truth in Alberta. We must be very careful if we are spending a dollar to create a regulation which someone else has to spend \$20 to comply with. We can also see from those numbers the tremendous leverage attached to deregulation, and that's why I have an interest in this subject.

We're all aware that laws and regulations tend to accumulate. They all start out with a rationale, and they grow rapidly and perhaps with somewhat less scrutiny, certainly careful scrutiny, than they ought to have by legislators. Regulations, it seems to me, grow almost like reefs grow in the ocean, just by a steady accretion. Eventually they get to the size where they threaten passing ships, and we mustn't allow that to happen to the growth of regulation if we can avoid it.

There are some very dramatic illustrations. One of those which struck me recently was an observation made by the Justice Minister of Canada who said that Canada has far too many laws, and he wants to clean them up. He said:

Federal laws create 97,000 separate offences while regulations add another half a million to the list . . .

"I find the massiveness of these figures disturbing" which must at least rank as the understatement of the year.

"In some cases even minor transgressions against these provisions lead directly to the institution of criminal proceedings . . ."

The federal government has [also] decided that from now on "no imprisonable offence shall be created by regulation".

Perhaps like hon. members, it came as somewhat of a shock to me to learn that in fact criminal charges can be laid, even out of regulation, and that such regulations could grow to the size of half a million. I don't think that was by intent, and perhaps that helps to illustrate the dimensions of the problem we're in at the moment. I am sure no one here intends to overregulate. It seems to grow like Topsy, so we have to devise an intent to stop it.

In 1980 it was suggested to the government of Alberta that government establish a review mechanism to scrutinize all present government departments in their programs to determine that there still exists a demonstrated need for the program and/or the department. The government's reply was, I think, a reasonable one. It pointed out at the time that the sunset approach, when applied, is best applied to regulatory legislation.

These programs are often overlooked in the budget process, and other program costs are borne by the private sector. The rent decontrol and decontrol boards are excellent examples where sunset mechanism could be applied. I offer my personal opinion that the sunset on rent control was probably the best thing that ever happened to rent control.

Recently we have seen examples of the expiry date attached to the interest rate subsidy programs, both for home mortgages and small business. I think that's another good example where sunset provisions can be built into the regulatory and legislative process.

This government has had a selective approach to program evaluation and has a number of other instruments available such as royal commissions, caucus special committees, select legislative committees, advisory task forces, conferences, and so on. Most of these instruments provide some opportunity for public participation. With respect to internal efforts, the establishment of the office of the Auditor General, the growth of some departmental audit and evaluation offices, use of zero-base budgeting in some departments, and development of program budgeting reflect the province's awareness of the need to continually review its operations. I think those things are commendable. I just think we need to do a little more of them, because the problem we're confronting is massive.

The government of Saskatchewan has been very active in regulatory reform since the fall of 1982, just as our own committee has. A regulatory reform group was established within their executive council, and so far in that province they have uncovered 539 obsolete and confusing regulations that have

been repealed, and a great many more are expected to be abolished this year. Alberta, of course, does not have obsolete and confusing regulations. However, we expect to streamline and consolidate those that we do have.

I think it's important to note that the whole approach is not just deregulation but a rationalization of the regulatory process to continue to clarify the ground rules and to build some accountability and make regulatory requirements far more clearly understood, far less time-consuming, and far less expensive.

Sunset legislation may have limited scope. Perhaps it's most effective when it does. Sunset legislation may be either regulatory, selective, or comprehensive. It strikes me that the American experience indicates that the comprehensive type is less successful, because in some jurisdictions it seems to create as many problems as it solves. But surely we're intelligent and ingenious enough to be able to adopt that which is useful and leave out that which is not.

Regulatory sunset legislation should affect only those provincial agencies that license or otherwise regulate the entry into a profession, occupation, business, industry, or other endeavor, or which control, or direct regulation on a continuing basis, the performance of the profession, the occupation, business, industry or other endeavor. Selective sunset legislation and regulation, as the name implies, can cover certain specified agencies and programs and do it effectively.

What, after all, is the harm in asking such questions as the following: would the absence of this particular regulation significantly harm or endanger public health, safety, or welfare? It's a valid question, and we have to ask it. Is there a reasonable relationship between the exercise of the state's police power and the protection of the public health, safety, or welfare? Is there another less restrictive method of regulation available that could adequately protect the public? Does the presently existing regulation have the effect of directly or indirectly increasing the costs of goods and services involved and, if so, to what degree? Mr. Speaker, one of the attachments we're asking the public sector for with their submissions to us on regulation is: if possible, tell us how much you think this particular regulation is costing your business and your industry, and let us see if we can't find a more cost-effective alternative. Is the increase in costs more harmful to the public than the harm that could result from removing the regulation? — a question not often asked, but I've seen examples where I think it could be very applicable. Are all facets of the regulatory process designed solely for the purpose of, and do they have as their primary effect, the protection of the public?

I know, Mr. Speaker, there are well-meaning and effective reviews already being done. Some have taken place; one or two have already been mentioned. The Solicitor General has reviewed the process for the issuance of licence plates. The Minister of Transportation is into various deregulation matters, including bus operations and others. Consumer and Corporate Affairs recently eliminated some duplications in corporate reporting. The inventory of regulations, however, is still far too large, far too expensive, and far too intrusive into the lives of our citizens. And while I have no illusions about sunset laws as a comprehensive solution to our legislative problem, we know that a constructive adaptation of sunset as a consistent process of review would help us control the accumulation of regulations.

Mr. Speaker, that would be helpful, and that's why I support the concept in Motion 216.

MR. ZIP: Mr. Speaker, I also wish to rise to speak on Motion 216 which, to put it very mildly, is a very important one in

light of what has happened in this country over the past 50 years. As a matter of fact, the problems Motion 216 proposes to deal with are best appreciated over the perspective of time, and those of us who have seen the growth of government and regulation in this country on a first-hand basis appreciate this problem best of all. Previous speakers — and they've spoken very well on this subject — have dealt with the numerous problems that have appeared over the past 50 years within a single jurisdiction, especially a provincial jurisdiction, and they've dealt with the problems of removing some of the unnecessary legislation.

In Canada, a federal state, we have the additional serious problem of duplication of regulations and services by different levels of government, which causes us to be one of the most overgoverned people in the world. This area needs to be addressed as well with growing urgency, as we see more rather than less overlapping and duplication of government regulations and services with the passage of time. After giving very careful consideration to the problems created by government to the subjects governed, and after reading the excellent treatise prepared on the subject by our legislative researcher Miss Sheila Williams, I wish to make my own humble suggestions.

First of all, my long experience with government in the public service has made it clear to me that asking government ministers through their bureaucrats to make necessary changes within their respective empires is somewhat akin to asking unions to remove feather-bedding within their workers' organizations. There's too much of a tendency on the part of bureaucrats and their respective ministers to defend their own turf. This is a well-known fact. As recommended reading on the subject, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that members of this Assembly read that excellent book published earlier this year called *Sorcerer's Apprentices*, as it related recent manipulation of senior government ministers by Ottawa mandarins with respect to the taxation and regulation of the energy industry.

Secondly, departmental review would not provide scrutiny of a department's programs by the Legislature, since it would not be directly involved with conducting the review. Thirdly, well-known problems of overlapping of problems between government departments does not begin to be tackled by ministerial reviews, since everyone in government wants to hang on to his empire, not lose stature in the governmental pyramid.

An even greater issue and problem with respect to review are the boards and the Crown corporations that are even further removed from legislative scrutiny and which carry regulations, many of which affect people on a daily basis and, in many instances, are redundant. We don't have to go any further than the liquor boards of this and other provinces as a good example of this type of abuse.

By far, the best application of sunset provisions to unnecessary government regulations and spending programs can be provided by a legislative standing committee on sunset legislation. Standing committees of the Legislature have been effective in the past in dealing with other problems of government in Alberta and would be an excellent vehicle with which to attack this problem of program review. It would provide an excellent opportunity to give greater responsibilities to members of the Legislature, who at the same time — and this is very important, Mr. Speaker — are responsible to the electorate. It would involve them with government to a much greater extent and provide them with important knowledge of the working of government. The committee would have to be large enough to enable the members to specialize in their areas of interest and to spread the heavy workload involved in such a review.

To carry this idea further, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest taking the problems of legislative review to the parliamentary

association, to which we as parliamentarians belong, and implement an interparliamentary standing committee that would deal with this problem on a national level and begin to deal with the growing problem of intergovernmental duplication to which I alluded earlier.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I urge this Assembly to accept this motion. Thank you.

MR. McPHERSON: Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure for me today to rise and participate in this important motion.

At the outset, I'd like to extend my congratulations to the Member for Edmonton Glengarry for bringing forth this resolution. In my research on this subject, I found it almost incredible that the subject of sunset clauses has never been debated in the Legislature in Alberta.

I'd like to commence my remarks, Mr. Speaker, with a quotation by William E. Simon: State intervention in the private sector and public lives of the citizenry must be presumed to be negative, uncreative, and a dangerous act.

While my philosophical bent leans somewhat toward that statement, I must confess that in my short time in this Legislature I have been finding there are an awfully lot of people in the general public who don't feel that way, if one recognizes the demands and wants placed on government. Certainly this whole area of legislative oversight, which this motion addresses, is an important and timely one. It's an indisputable fact that government activities in this increasingly complex society are expanding with a corresponding impact on our lives. In this time of restraint, it's time we begin to look at ways and means of reviewing government programs with a mind to protecting our constituents from excess government involvement or overregulation.

I also want to make a very brief reference to some comments that were made that I think should be dispelled, whether or not we do find ourselves in need of restraint. It was interesting for me to read in some of the media reports that our budgetary expenditures and sources of revenue would, if one considers the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, in fact about meet. Nothing could be further from the truth.

I have the quarterly investment report of the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund in front of me. It's interesting to note that during the first quarter the heritage fund earned a net income of \$384.7 million, all of which was transferred to the general revenue account. The Alberta investment division accounts for the largest portion of the new investments made by the fund during the first quarter. New investments were made in the debentures of several Alberta Crown corporations: \$100 million in the Alberta Home Mortgage Corporation, \$45 million in the Alberta Housing Corporation, \$23 million in the Alberta Agricultural Development Corporation, \$15 million in the Alberta Government Telephones Commission, and \$7 million in the Alberta Opportunity Company. Again, during the first quarter the Heritage Savings Trust Fund loaned \$45.9 million to the Ridley Grain company, which of course is our consortium grain company on the Pacific coast. If you add those up, Mr. Speaker, you arrive at an amount of \$190 million. Coupled with the capital projects division, which found disbursements of \$32.1 million for irrigation rehabilitation and expansion, \$23 million for the Walter C. Mackenzie Health Sciences Centre, and \$7.9 million for irrigation headworks and main irrigation systems, I think it's conclusive that a great deal of the funds going into the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund are in fact used up and providing services for Albertans.

Back to this area of sunset clauses. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to comment that government legislation is certainly designed and put in place by us for a host of very, very positive reasons: to

alleviate inequities, protect society, and bring about good law and order. Programs created by legislation are aimed at solving perceived problems, but accompanying those programs are the inevitable regulations to administer and enforce them. Then we have the regulatory agencies — the boards and commissions — that come into being to oversee the whole process. Too often the people who run these regulatory bodies cannot resist the temptation to build empires. I call it "unenlightened incrementalism". To some, bigger means better, which means a proliferation of regulations. Not only are new regulations required and created but existing regulations are continuously being changed, placing a costly burden on the public that is trying to keep up to date with all the necessary forms produced by these various agencies.

Mr. Speaker, excess regulation translates to excess control over our lives and our personal freedoms. Certainly few would argue that to do anything today, whether it be building an addition to one's home or starting a business, the applications for the appropriate licences, permits, and other forms of bureaucratic approval cause one a great deal of consternation. As one wanders through this maze of regulatory red tape, it's easy to begin to wonder where on earth all these government forms come from. Then the attendant question that has arisen, of course, is whether all these forms and regulations survive simply because no one has bothered to demand that they justify their existence. In my view, it is time for all government programs to be reviewed on a regular basis simply to ensure they are needed, effective, and cost efficient. The inclusion of sunset clauses or the establishment of automatic termination dates — particularly legislation involving programs that spend public money — and the requirement of a full review for each program before it's reinstated would enable us to fulfill this goal.

Mr. Speaker, a number of members have already mentioned that government departments do assess their programs and regulations. I was interested to note that not three days ago the hon. Member for Lacombe introduced Bill 78, the Names of Homes Repeal Act. It was an old Act that was found unnecessary. It was costing the government between two and three man-years in direct cost to the bureaucracy. It was not providing any particular service, and it was repealed. On the same day, the hon. Member for St. Paul introduced Bill 77, the Farm Home Improvements Repeal Act. This, as well, was repealed. The benefits under this Act are contained in the legislation that affects the Alberta Agricultural Development Corporation. So we are making headway.

The hon. Member for Edmonton Whitemud has given us a very good description of the excellent work he is doing in relation to regulatory reform. My understanding is that they are having a number of meetings with selected industry groups to determine what regulations impact on them directly and, indeed, provide an economic burden. Another example that was mentioned, and I'll mention it again briefly because I think it's worth noting, was that in the spring of 1982 the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs announced that regulatory business licences required by the province would no longer be necessary. Approximately 55,000 businesses in Alberta were thus spared the time and expense of applying for these licences, which the department found basically duplicated a process administered at the local level.

This is the kind of thing government as a whole has to be striving for: the abolition of unnecessary programs and regulatory procedures. Sunset clauses provide a formal mechanism where that type of review can be undertaken government-wide and on a sustained basis. Sunset legislation would reverse the assumption that money spent for a particular program one year must be continued and increased the next year. The burden of

proof would be placed on those who want to continue a program rather than those who wish to terminate it.

As I mentioned, sunset clauses dictate that a program will terminate on a specific date. Prior to this date, a full review of it must be undertaken to determine whether the program should continue. The review process is the most important aspect of sunset clauses. At this point, as envisioned in the hon. member's motion, a thorough review, free of departmental biases, can be determined. Among other things, an assessment as to whether the program is fulfilling its mandate on a cost-efficient basis, avoiding waste and preventing the overuse of bureaucratic authority, can be undertaken. If the program is found to be valid and reasonable, of course it can be relegislated. If it is found in need of improvement, if it can be altered, or if indeed its usefulness is no longer apparent, it can be discontinued.

Mr. Speaker, no one would suggest that this motion would contemplate the abolition of very necessary programs such as child welfare, senior citizens' benefits, road construction, or court facilities operations. Such important programs would not be seriously considered for termination. In my view, however, there is no reason why these programs shouldn't at least be given a thorough investigation from time to time, which sunset clauses could facilitate. Some wasteful aspects of these programs may in fact be identified through this review process, with savings to all Albertans as a result of that effort.

Mr. Speaker, I feel there is ample justification for the introduction of sunset legislation. It is our responsibility as legislators to periodically review the legislation we pass in this House to ensure it is meeting its purpose and to ward off the possibility of overburdening our constituents with excess government involvement and undue costs.

Mr. Speaker, I have a few more comments to make. However, in light of the time, I beg leave to adjourn debate.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, when the Assembly convenes again at eight o'clock, I understand the members will be in Committee of Supply. I therefore move that the House now adjourn until the Committee of Supply rises and reports.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

[The House recessed at 5:30 p.m.]

[The Committee of Supply met at 8 p.m.]

#### head: COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

[Mr. Appleby in the Chair]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would the Committee of Supply please come to order.

#### ALBERTA HERITAGE SAVINGS TRUST FUND CAPITAL PROJECTS DIVISION 1984-85 ESTIMATES OF PROPOSED INVESTMENTS

#### Department of Recreation and Parks

#### 2 — Kananaskis Country Recreation Development

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, at the end of the last day's session, I wanted to ask the Minister of Recreation and Parks a question with regard to the policy that was enunciated by the hon. Member for Edmonton Whitemud. The question is: could the minister confirm that that is the minister's position, as well the government's position, with regard to the use of the Kananaskis golf course by the public of Alberta? There were certain terminologies used in describing that golf course, in terms of a world class course and, as well, certain restrictions with regard to who could use the course and the kinds of clothing that would be acceptable and not acceptable. I would appreciate the minister confirming that that is the government's position and that the minister whole-heartedly supports the position of the hon. Member for Edmonton Whitemud.

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Chairman, at the close yesterday, the hon. Member for Little Bow raised a number of questions which I'd like to respond to. He asked me if I could tell him the people on the management committee, and he made reference to a person by the name of Don Getty. I would like to correct the hon. member's assumption. The directors of the company are Brian C. Bygrave, Norm H. Kimball, Jackie Parker, Wayne Bygrave, and Elmer J. Kraft; there's no Don Getty anywhere in that corporation.

The question that he raises today, Mr. Chairman, is one that I addressed some time ago. I believe I was quoted on October 12, and I replied that if it comes to us too many times as a complaint, in the future we will reassess, and I hold to that tonight. Over the next few months, I hope to have the management committee into the office to see us and meet with the Kananaskis committee. I hope that the people from the hon. member's constituency that were turned down for golfing would write to me. I'd like to know that, because in talking to the management at Kananaskis, they haven't done that. As I said yesterday, I've only had one lady who approached Kananaskis golf course with blue jeans on and was allowed to play through, write to me. I wonder why they would let one play through and not another. I hope the hon. member would get those people to write to me.

MR. R. SPEAKER: A supplementary to the minister with regard to the question I asked today. As a matter of correction, I didn't say Don Getty in my earlier remarks. I said a person by the name Getty, and I understand that someone on staff there has the name of Getty. I raise that ... [interjections] No way, no way. You read it in the Hansard [Blues]. I did not infer Don Getty. Look at it in the Hansard [Blues]. The minister raised that; I didn't.

DR. BUCK: He's a little twitchy.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. In his remarks of the last few moments, the minister confirms that the government's position is to support the policy as enunciated by the hon. Member for Edmonton Whitemud. That is the policy, and that policy will continue until there are other criteria or an outcry from the public to have that policy changed. I

want it clearly stated in the Legislature at this time that that is the policy of the government; the government now supports that policy as enunciated. Is that correct? From the minister's remarks a few moments ago, I saw no change from that policy as enunciated by the hon. Member for Edmonton Whitemud.

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Chairman, maybe I could put it this way. Over the course of the last few weeks, I've had representations, and I guess I might say that 50 per cent of the calls I've received from Albertans were to retain the dress code and 50 per cent were to remove the dress code. I just want to assure the hon. gentleman that I'm with those Albertans.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, is the hon. minister saying that in his official position as minister responsible for the policy of Kananaskis golf club and park, he is not in favor of the current policy prohibiting jeans on that golf course? Is that what the minister has just said — not in favor of it?

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Chairman, I just explained to the hon. member that I would reassess the position of the dress code sometime this winter. I might also add that it's not my decision in total. We have a Kananaskis cabinet committee which I will call in to meet with the management group. As I said in the article, if we have too many complaints, we will reassess it. I hold to the theory that we will reassess the position of the dress code between now and next spring when golf season starts.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, the minister is saying "reassess"; I accept that. But at the present time, the policy as enunciated by the Member for Edmonton Whitemud continues; is that correct?

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member can take it any way he wants. There is no golf season between now and next spring. I said I would reassess it, and that's what I intend to do.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Chairman, I would like to take up this weighty subject and allow the backbenchers something to do. I was a little taken aback. I always respect my colleague from Edmonton Whitemud. He always says things clearly, concisely, and says what he believes. I was a little taken aback, mainly because I thought it was public money that paid for this golf course. I checked the Hansard [Blues] to make sure I wasn't somehow misquoting the Member for Edmonton Whitemud, and that's why we're following up on this. He says that

dress standards will in fact be maintained while this populism . . .

And populism is a bad word I understand.

. . . if that's a word for it — that everyone in the world somehow or other has acquired a right of some kind or other to show up wherever or whenever they like in blue jeans . . .

He goes on:

. . . the dress standards are maintained so that one doesn't have the feeling that he's out playing on a field somewhere.

Then to touch it off, in this economic crisis, where we have 12 per cent unemployment across Edmonton and Calgary, he says, if people don't like the dress code,

the people in the pro shop have available, at very reasonable rates, rental shoes, rental clothes, and very inexpensive replacements for their torn up jeans if they're required.

My point is — and it's a simple one — that people have the right, if they want to play golf, tennis, or cricket, as the hon. members says, to join private clubs and set their own rules. But the fact is that the taxpayer's money is paying for this golf course — every dollar. If there are tournaments that come in there, they can set certain rules as those tournaments come in; they do that in public golf courses. But it is the taxpayer's money, and whenever we set up rules and regulations to prevent Albertans from playing on their own golf course, the one they own — it's not the Member for Edmonton Whitemud's or the minister's golf course, Mr. Chairman; it is the people of Alberta's golf course. If we want private clubs, private money pays for that; they set their own rules. That's why, when we spend this type of money — first of all the money is spent. I would suggest that perhaps in a time of recession, it wasn't the most important investment we had to make. But saying it's there, then it should be the people of Alberta's golf course. That's the whole point.

As the minister is reassessing it, if he is serious about reassessing some of the rules, then I think he should take that into consideration and take this as one more voice — if I can — towards reassessing the rules, to make that park, now that we have it, accessible to all the people. I would suggest that most people, even if they like to golf, would not be able to afford the green fees. I know other people will say that it's more at Jasper Park Lodge, but again that's a private course. If we want to use public funds, then those facilities should be open to the public. It should not be an elitist golf course; it's that simple. I know it's a beautiful golf course; I'm told that. Great. But all people like beautiful golf courses, not just the rich and the powerful and the elitist. Call it populism if you like; if it's a dirty word, so be it. But it is public money. I would say honestly to the minister, now that we have the course, if he is serious about reassessing it, I think that he should, taking into consideration the public money paid for it.

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Chairman, I've never been more serious in my life than what I just said. Just to answer the question of being accessible to Albertans, I have yet to receive a letter from anyone that was refused entry to Kananaskis Country. I have yet to receive a letter from anyone that was refused participation in a round of golf. I'm saying to the hon. gentleman, if you have all these people, get them to write to me. I've got some letters. When they say, let Albertans golf, let me just put this on the record: since July 22, 1983, there have been 17,500 rounds of golf played in Kananaskis, and I'm sure they were played by Albertans, all kinds of Albertans. As a matter of fact, I have people from my own constituency that played there. They come back with praise about the golf course. I invite the hon. gentlemen, if they haven't been there, to go and see it, because it's the greatest golf course I've ever seen.

When somebody says we've turned Albertans away from that golf course, I would like to have at least one bit of proof. I'm prepared to reassess it. As I've said before, there are a number of people in Alberta that wear blue jeans that voted for this government; I intend to keep them voting for this government.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Chairman, I don't want the minister to be defensive about people in blue jeans that voted for him. The point that I'm trying to make — first of all, it's ridiculous. The minister knows people are busy. Every time they go to a golf course and get turned away, they don't automatically sit down and write a thousand letters over an issue like that. What we are saying, in terms of policy of the government — it's just that simple. The only point I'm trying to make to the minister

— and he said he's reassessing it; I take him on his word for that — is that it is public money, and we should not be setting obstacles to facilities that are owned by the public with their own money. Private golf courses, private clubs, are a different matter altogether. That's the only point I'm trying to make.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. I would like to know on what precedent the minister has said that this public course is different from any other public course, in that Albertans must dress differently and be different to come to that course. Now, I can certainly see why the hon. Member from Edmonton Whitemud would set that kind of ground rule. I can see why the people that have gained this contract would recommend that kind of rule. I can understand why the people that were on the committee would recommend that kind of a rule in terms of dress. I can understand that. But I can't understand when one hundred per cent public dollars are put into a course, and it becomes described as the best, a world-class course. It's going to be for a certain kind of elite. When you go there, you're not the duffer. That's Albertans; 90 per cent of Alberta's golfers are duffers. I don't know what that score is, but there are only 10 per cent that are in this category of rather unique and gifted ability and have time to go out to golf once or twice a week or more — very few.

Maybe the person that spends one week a year in the Kananaskis to have a holiday and has to work under — he walks in there, and when he sees these rules and regulations, it immediately creates a certain kind of environment. Certainly it may create that environment where you're going to enjoy the beauty of the surroundings. You're going to walk out there with your expensive golf shoes, golf pants, shirt, and everything, and you may feel at home. But the majority of Albertans are a little more humble than that.

I would compare that to this building over the years. I have seen people stand out in front of this building and say: that place is not for me; it's too elite; look at the marble, look at the riches; I guess it's not for me; it's for someone else. And they're frightened to come into the building. I don't know how many times in my 20 years I've said to people out there: this is your building; you can either reject the people that are in there or accept that they're there; it's your building; go in and walk around and see what's there.

It's the same kind of environment that is being established with regard to this. I talk about my own constituents. I hadn't even heard about these rules, about the golf course, until I was visiting my constituency within about 15 miles of Calgary and had a group meeting in that area. One of the first items they raised, they said: I was up to the Kananaskis, and I couldn't golf on the golf course; they have this dress restriction. We had about a half hour discussion on that dress restriction. And they said: who's that course for; I thought I had part of the heritage fund; isn't it equally mine, as well as some people that may be able to have a lot of time to golf and golf in the low 60s or 70s or whatever?

You know, it's for everybody. I think about the one fellow that raised it, that was concerned. He came to my meeting and had jeans on, an inexpensive pair of jeans, and he said: that's what I wear all the time; when I go on a holiday, I certainly wear them.

I thought about it today as well, and I talked to some of the people here in Alberta, where they manufacture GWG jeans — one of our major industries in this province, where there are many people employed. When I was Minister of Social Development, I can recall that they were one of the first industries to help take people off welfare. They took them into employment to work on their assembly line in terms of sewing

jeans and building that industry in this province. And here we have government money saying a product of Alberta cannot be worn on our golf courses.

Now, the hon. member from Whitemud and, I'm sure, the minister describe anybody with jeans — when you think of a pair of jeans, you think of the kind with holes in the knees, ragged, cut off. Well, with the economy and what I see around this province, there are going to be more people in that state of affairs, and maybe they should have a right to wear them on the course.

But you look at the various kinds of jean products. This happens to be pink, and that's for my hon. friend over here from Norwood. You know, and he goes . . . They're excellent jeans, GWG — the Great Western Garment Company right here in Edmonton, producing an excellent product. What would be wrong with wearing a pair of those on the golf course out at Kananaskis?

The word "blue" is often thrown into the discussion here. Here is an excellent pair of GWG, made-in-Edmonton jeans, gentlemen jeans. That could apply to some of the people that golf once in a while. They are of a nice quality and have a nice design. All we would have to do is pull the white stripe out, and they'd be totally blue. What's wrong with them? I'm sure they'd look just as dressy as some of our suit pants after we sit around here for two or three days. There's nothing wrong with them.

This government is saying that somebody that wears an Alberta-made product can't go out and golf on the golf course. I think that's how ridiculous that kind of policy is. Anybody that would be turned down when they have a pair of jeans like that on is really looking down their nose at Albertans. That's unacceptable. I think the minister should stand up in his place and say, we judge the person on the kind of jeans. If you say, no cut-offs; fine. If you make reference to the kind of T-shirt, no T-shirt, or the sight of whatever it was, the person there could make a judgment with regard to that. You'll say: look, we're just not letting everybody wear anything that's indecent in terms of exposure, et cetera. But in terms of the quality of clothes, that may be what the person is able to afford.

It costs \$20 to play on that course. That doesn't sound like much, but if you take your wife and, say, you have one or two children, that's \$80. I'll tell you, to the average working Albertan that wants to go out and have a reasonable holiday — that's only for one day for his family — that's 80 bucks to be on the golf course. That's not that reasonable either in terms of green fees. When it's that way, we're not giving away any gift to Albertans. Then all of a sudden we say, well, you've got to be a certain class to be there. Well, maybe for that class, \$20 is acceptable. That's another way of eliminating the ordinary, average Albertan, the guy that's working for a wage or the guy that may not have a job and wants to go out to Kananaskis and just spend a few days enjoying some of the scenery we have.

Mr. Minister, I think you should reassess what you're doing. I think that committee should reassess the population for which it is making policy. It isn't making policy — maybe the question is: who are the 17,000 people that went around the course; what income group do they come from? Supposedly they could afford what they saw. The whole policy and attitude doesn't talk about average Albertans, common-day Albertans, the guy that's just going out there to enjoy the beauty of Alberta. It is talking about a select group of Albertans. I think that should be looked at very closely.

MRS. EMBURY: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to start my brief remarks tonight regarding the appropriation of Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund moneys to Kananaskis Country by alluding

to the opening of the golf course, which occurred this summer. For the people that were at this opening, it was truly an outstanding event and one that was enjoyed by all.

Calgary North West is in the enviable position of being very close to the facilities in Kananaskis Country. Many of my constituents have enjoyed the use of these facilities and will continue to do so. I think one of the outstanding qualities in the development of Kananaskis Country was the fact that so many people could enjoy many of the facilities on an ongoing basis at the time the facilities were being developed, be it in the summertime or wintertime. Of course, cross-country skiing was one of the winter sports that many of my constituents enjoyed.

Returning to the opening of the golf course, all I can say is that this was indeed a momentous occasion for the citizens of Alberta. It was a treat that the weather co-operated, and the people that were involved in the opening ceremony could truly understand this great development we have.

We've had many questions asked about the sand that was used. If anybody would take the time to listen to the explanations . . . I think one of the unique things that happened with regard to Kananaskis Country, whether it was the sand used for the golf course — even before that, there was a question raised once about where the loam would come from for this golf course. Throughout the process, you see very unique developments, innovative means used to develop the resources in this area.

I'm sure most people find it very difficult to listen to many of the comments tonight, or in previous days in this Legislature, which have centred on merely one aspect of the rules and regulations that have been developed. I'm quite sure these rules and regulations would be accepted by most Albertans, particularly anybody in the golfing community, that has always been an example of disciplined people who enjoy a sport such as golfing and are only too proud and pleased to abide by some basic rules and regulations.

I actually find it a little distressing to hear the Member for Little Bow refer to the citizens of Alberta as "duffers". I just cannot accept that comment. I really feel that tonight I'll go beyond the bounds of speaking for the constituents of Calgary North West. I do feel I can speak for them, but I really feel I can comment on the rest of Albertans. I find it totally unacceptable that the member would call Albertans duffers.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Shame.

MRS. EMBURY: The Oxford dictionary refers to a duffer as being an "inefficient, useless, or stupid person". Frankly, I have to take the member to task for this misuse of a word in referring to Albertans that would come to Kananaskis Country as duffers.

MR. NELSON: Mr. Chairman, just a couple of very brief remarks. Certainly the constituents of Calgary McCall are not duffers either. I hope they're not duffers in Little Bow, but I'll leave that to the member to determine with his constituents. With the large economic consideration before us tonight, it seems odd that we spend nearly half an hour talking about blue jeans, especially those pink ones for his friend on the left.

I'd just like to ask the members a couple of questions. I've had some comments about Kananaskis from various constituents, not necessarily related to whether or not they can wear blue jeans; generally speaking, today blue jeans are a little more expensive than other types of attire. I wonder if some of the moneys used in the park can possibly be used to better identify trails in the area, maybe even educate some of the

rangers and what have you. The reason I bring that before the minister is that I've had a number of complaints from people that have used the trails for various activities and found that they haven't been marked sufficiently or that the rangers on duty have not been able to give them factual information. They've used the wrong trail for something and ultimately been pulled up by somebody else. I'm just wondering if we could possibly better identify some of these activities to give people better direction.

I'd also like to know what number of people are actually employed in Kananaskis Country. How many Albertans are enjoying the fruits of the beauty of Kananaskis and enjoying working in an environment that is probably one of the most beautiful environments we could ever have to be working under? I'm sure that the many millions of dollars being spent by the government offers many employment opportunities for Albertans, which has not been identified here this evening as far as I can remember. I'd also like to dwell on the area of supplies and services — a general background of this information — for \$20 million, if you'll fill us in on that a little.

I will conclude with those remarks. I think Kananaskis Country is there for the benefit of Albertans, employs people and offers some pleasure to most of us that wish to use it. I think we should commend the government, and the Minister of Recreation and Parks and his department, of course, for the job they are doing administering activities there. Hopefully we will continue with the great heritage that we're providing for our citizens today and tomorrow.

MR. ALEXANDER: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I might have the permission of the minister to play through here for a minute, since it appears that I have become a bit of a handicap to him. I have rarely in my life — and certainly never when I entered this House — seen such an awe-inspiring and amusing example of ignorance. I'm afraid there's a certain amount of deliberate stirring up here in an attempt to take some of the shine of what turned out to be an excellent investment. I'd like to just illustrate that.

It has been said here that there are rules to prevent people from playing on their own golf course. What patent nonsense, and the members well know that. There is no rule to prevent anyone from playing on this golf course, and members know full well that anyone in this country who owns a set of golf clubs is more than likely in possession of a pair of slacks, other than a pair of jeans, whether they're blue, or brown, or pink, or whatever the color may be. People who own golf clubs, who play golf, and who go to Kananaskis to play golf, know what golf standards are. Whether you think they do or not, hon. members, they understand. Golfers are not confused by that issue at all.

There is not a matter of elitism, as has been mentioned about three times, and as I see it, that proceeds from a confusion of what we mean by class. I would just like to take a sentence I suppose would do it, to disabuse hon. members about the matter of class. When we speak of world-class golf course, we are speaking of class in the sense of quality, not as in the sense of class struggle.

I guess I understand the member from Norwood being confused about that. I think the Member for Little Bow has much less excuse about perpetuating the idea of class struggle when he full well knows that there is no such thing in Kananaskis Country or on Kananaskis golf course. He further asked — I can't believe he asked seriously — what is the precedent for this rule? Well, as a matter of fact, the precedent for the rule comes from almost every world-class — not in the sense of class struggle — world quality golf course, wherever one goes



around the world. I have played on many of them, incidentally, which are publicly funded. Because a golf course is publicly funded does not, in and of itself, say that it should not have some standards.

As a matter of fact, over the construction of the golf course, and in recent times as it was reaching completion, we have had some difficulty with people who went down to have picnics in the sand traps. We have had people fishing in the water reservoirs on the golf course, and they had to be advised, I regret to inform you, that it was unsafe to do so while golf balls were flying around. Therefore, these terribly elitist and rigidly defined standards henceforth prohibit picnics in the sand traps and fishing in the water hazards.

I suppose that a case can be made that because public money has been spent, one ought to be allowed to go and have a picnic in the sand trap. Why not, it's public money. I suppose a person should be allowed to fish in the water reservoir because, after all, the water reservoir was built with public money. The normal operations of golf courses simply do not permit those kinds of things because there's a conflict of interest. And yes, somebody has to resolve it, so they resolve it with standards.

The member also raised the matter of the \$20 cost. That's not cheap, as has been pointed out. It is a fact of life, however, and a matter of policy that the price of a round of golf on Kananaskis should be below comparable prices for other facilities in the general area. So the people are getting a bargain vis-a-vis what it is they're getting; that is, a round of golf on a world-quality golf course. I wonder whether there's a serious question here or not. I can't believe it is serious, in that the \$20 cost is projected depending on the season: how many playing days and how many rounds of golf there are. It's a rough equivalent to the cost of maintaining the golf course. I can't believe that it would be seriously suggested that the government should subsidize Albertans' golf. Or is that being suggested? It would not be any more ridiculous than many of the other things that have been suggested. But I'd like to simply point out that the \$20 cost is below the level that you can buy that kind of a round of golf for virtually anywhere else. And it will support the maintenance level, the standards of maintenance on the golf course, if there are enough playing days in the season. That's how the price was arrived at. Thus, if you like, we have created another rigid, elitist standard, user-pay.

We think the people of Alberta who wish to play golf will be more than happy to pay that price. So far they have shown not only their happiness and their willingness, but as a matter of fact, they overwhelmed the place, in that it was almost impossible to get a booking there after the season was three weeks old. Albertans have endorsed the idea with tremendous enthusiasm and great vigor, and the issues raised are phony as far as I'm concerned.

Mr. Chairman, I apologize for taking up so much time in this committee, inadvertently creating the problem for the minister, by having to explain what ought to be reasonably simple and obvious matters which are well understood by the golfers of the province, will be accepted with enthusiasm by the golfers of the province, and by the time the spring golf season starts next year, will be totally forgotten, as they richly deserve to be.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, I'd just like to make a comment or two, especially to my learned friend from the constituency of Edmonton Whitemud. I realize that the hon. member means well, but I guess he's just been in that narrow circle of rich friends for so long that he doesn't seem to know what goes on in the camp of the ordinary working person of this province. I want to look at the picture in just a little broader terms. What

we are really seeing here is a symptom of the sickness that has afflicted this government; that is, if you want to build anything to be a monument to yourself or to your government, money is no object. That is really the thing that is bothering Albertans.

When we started out, if I remember right, Kananaskis was going to be around \$42 million. Then the Premier decided that maybe he couldn't really do what he wanted to do with \$42 million. The figure has escalated and escalated to where we're really looking at well over \$200 million, and that's before the Minister of Tourism and Small Business and the Minister of Recreation and Parks install snow-making equipment so that we can put snow on a mountain that very rarely has snow. What we're really looking at is going to be a larger figure than we ever envisioned for Kananaskis Country.

What I want to bring to the attention of the committee is that when this government decides to do something, it blows the money. Money does not seem to be any object to this government. I have said many times in this Assembly that the government knows how to spend the taxpayer's money, but they do not know how to manage it. So what we're really doing is looking at this monument that the government has built. I agree with the hon. Member for Edmonton Whitemud; from all reports — and I have not had the opportunity to play the course — it is an excellent golf course. And it should be for \$10 million. But I would like to say to my learned friend from Whitemud that golf courses don't have to be built for that many dollars, unless you are trying to attract people from outside the country to say that this is one of the 10 wonders of the golf world.

But even then we don't have any consistency from this government. We hear so much about all these great decisions being bandied around in caucus: we reach a consensus and then we make a decision. How about the hon. Member for Lethbridge West who says that it's just for Albertans? Then the hon. Member for Edmonton Whitemud says that it's for all the great golfers of the world to come and see what a great job we've done. So who is it for? Is it for Albertans exclusively, which is very parochial and very narrow-minded, or is it to generate tourist dollars?

Maybe, just maybe, if we'd taken \$50 million dollars from the funds that were spent in Kananaskis Country, we could have built 50 million dollar golf courses throughout this province.

MR. ADAIR: In the mountains?

DR. BUCK: They don't have to be in the mountains; there are other people, hon. Minister of Tourism and Small Business, in this country. We're not just catering to the elitists from Calgary or from across the border. We could have built 50 million dollar golf courses so all Albertans could have played the great game of golf. Have we given any thought to that? Now what's going to happen is that someday the Minister for Recreation and Parks is going to have to come up with \$4 million or \$5 million to do something in the Edmonton area.

Mr. Chairman, it is a symptom of this government's fiscal irresponsibility. We're trying to justify the white sand. We saw reports that said they had to bring this special sand in because there's so much wind up there that with fine-grained sand like we have in good old Alberta, it would blow out of their sand traps. I looked at some of the white sand, and it's plain, white, fine sand, except that it's three or four times as much as you'd have to pay for Alberta-born sand. Now the hon. Member for Edmonton Whitemud is shaking his head. As I said to the hon. member, I know it's been a long time since he's had to walk in the working man's shoes.

What I am trying to tell the committee, Mr. Chairman, is that people are looking at this as a monument to this government's ineptitude in wisely spending the taxpayer's dollar, and that's really what they're upset about. All of us who love to play the game of golf think it's great to have that kind of facility when the taxpayer will put up that kind of money to build a great golf course. When we look at this government's record — when we look at Kananaskis, that was supposed to have been \$42 million ending up well over \$200 million; when we look at the Walter Mackenzie hospital, that was supposed to be \$80 million maximum and we're moving into the \$300 million range; when we look at the Legislature Building, that was supposed to be done way under cost; when we look at the Saddledome — that is what the people of this province are starting to complain about to their members. If any members on the government back benches can stand in their places tonight and say that they — this government — are spending the taxpayers' money wisely, they're not listening to the same people I'm listening to.

I would just like to say that at this time many Albertans are having a very difficult time. So to make their load a little tougher, we bring in a 13 per cent tax. I'm sure they're all ecstatic about that. We're telling them that this is their golf course, but unless they're properly attired — and I have thought long about dress codes. I would like to say to my learned friend, the hon. Member for Edmonton Whitemud, that I play the working man's golf course, the Highlands, in blue jeans any time I want to. I haven't tried it at the Mayfair, and I have been invited there, hon. member, many times. I don't think they would appreciate my blue jeans, but I'm not sure they'd throw me off; they might not let me back a second time. The point is that it's a public facility. Certainly there have to be dress codes, certainly we don't want people fishing in the par 3s where there are golfers hitting; certainly we're not going to have picnics in the sand traps. That's just being facetious, and the hon. member knows that.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say to the hon. Member for Calgary North West that "duffer" is a term that is commonly used for people who play the great game of golf. I'd like to say to the member that "duffer" is not really a derogatory term. It means to me, having played the game a bit, a person who loves the game of golf but has never become too proficient at it; it's not a derogatory term. My more learned friend from the constituency of Edmonton Whitemud could back me up on this thing, I believe; of all the people who play the game, I think only 5 or 7 per cent ever break 100; therefore, 95 per cent of people are duffers. I believe that statistic would probably apply to Alberta golfers.

I think that what Albertans are really questioning is the fact that there has been a lot of money spent on this facility, the fact that there has been a lot of money poured into Kananaskis Country. Does this government spend our money wisely, or does it not? I'd have to say that Albertans are now questioning more and more that this government can spend but it can't manage their money.

MRS. KOPER: I too would like to tee off on this issue. It's par for the course that I find that many of the things have been said by the time my turn arises. At any rate, I feel that if there's one thing the people of Alberta in my riding, and as I have travelled this summer, have let me know, it is that Kananaskis Country is a place for them. We were talking about the golf course; I don't think there was anyone that has visited it. I do hope that the hon. members that have been discussing it tonight will take the opportunity to visit it before they go much further in their diatribe.

I am really concerned that a small issue that could perhaps have been brought about, is escalating to a very serious issue when it doesn't need to, when the hon. minister has assured us that it will be reviewed and certainly looked after. If there are problems arising from the dress codes and regulations, I must say that in my constituency I haven't heard one comment. I can't believe that anyone would pick up golf clubs, make sure they have balls, clubs, and everything else, and not be properly attired for the occasion.

Mr. Minister, you mentioned that over 17,000 golfers visited the course. I wonder if you could perhaps inform the Assembly what the general traffic was in the whole park, the attendance generally, the use of the park. Could you please tell me just how many man-years of employment opportunities are provided in the projects that are under discussion tonight?

[Mr. Purdy in the Chair]

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Chairman, we can almost wrap this up, but there are just a couple of comments that seem to have escaped hon. members. I am always interested in my hon. friend from Edmonton Whitemud with the new Right views. I appreciate it when he gets into talking about the class struggle. I am never sure what he means, but I appreciate his concerns.

Surely what we are missing here — and the hon. Member for Clover Bar alluded to it. First of all, we have Kananaskis park; nobody is saying that it isn't a beautiful park and that it isn't a beautiful golf course. The point is that the park started off at \$40 million, and it's up to \$212 million; the golf course is \$10 million. What the people of Alberta are saying to us — not specifically about the golf course — is that there is waste in this government. They want an end to it before we start cutting into other programs like medicare, user fees, and income tax hikes. That's the whole point, and that's why it's important that we talk about the golf course. I am sure hon. members know that we're talking about symbolism. That's what the people are discussing out there, and if this government is not listening, it's too bad for them. That's the message I'm getting, and I'm sure some of them are getting it. That's why we're talking about this golf course.

The second part of this ties in. After we have a golf course that's paid for by tax dollars, then we set up little programs to keep people away. That's the whole point of it. Twenty dollars is still a lot of money. I know it compares favorably with Banff National Park, if that's what you're talking about. But the point we're trying to make is that we've spent a lot of taxpayers' money. Every taxpayer's dollar went into that, not just a chosen group of people that happen to be great golfers. After we have the golf course there, we immediately set up little obstacles to keep people away. That's the whole point of the golf course, and it's a point of government waste. That's the symbolism, and that's why we're talking about it here publicly.

The point that I am making is that if hon. members really don't believe that people are talking about white sand, trips to Hawaii, and government waste all over, then they're not listening. That's precisely what they're talking about, and this government had better start to listen. That's the point of it. It's not so much the blue jeans; what we're talking about is the symbolism of government waste and then setting up obstacles so that Albertans can't even enjoy their own money. That's the point, Mr. Chairman.

MR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Chairman, my points will be brief, and I hope to the point. First of all, I want to praise the Kananaskis Country golf facilities and their value to Albertans now and indeed for many generations to come. As a government mem-

ber, I too am very concerned about the perceptions that all Albertans, or perhaps many Albertans, have now or perhaps will have toward these regulations we have been discussing here tonight.

Mr. Chairman, this course is indeed for all Albertans. It is my tax dollars and the dollars of all Albertans who have contributed, and therefore there should be a right of access to all Albertans. I am very concerned about these standards that have been established, but I am also very pleased that the Minister of Recreation and Parks will be re-evaluating these standards or codes of what people can or cannot wear on the course and, indeed, I would suggest, in any of the facilities in the area that have been built with public funds. Thank you for expressing to us in this House that you will be looking into this serious matter. Mr. Chairman, it is a serious matter.

MR. FISCHER: Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend our minister on the parks in my area. We have a nice new mini-park down there, and we have a park ...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order please. The member must discuss Kananaskis Country; he cannot discuss any other item.

MR. FISCHER: Okay, I was going to get to that.

I was at the opening of Kananaskis park. Quite a number of people from my area were at the opening, and they were exceptionally proud of it. I come from a rural constituency, and when we do something out in the country, whether we're building a barn, a house, or whatever, we can do it cheaply or we can do it in a way that it will last for awhile. If you do it cheaply, the upkeep and the upgrading will two-bit you to death. I think I would have to connect that with our Kananaskis course. We have done a first-class job on it, and it's going to last for a long while. I have talked to people that would be willing to wear their tuxedos on that golf course.

Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Small Business and Tourism.

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Chairman, the department is Tourism and Small Business. That's for the hon. Member for Clover Bar and for the Chairman.

I have sat for a moment and listened to a number of comments being made by a number of people about Kananaskis Country, and there is some clarification that is necessary. The hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood talked about "the park". Kananaskis Country is a 2,000 square-mile area, in which is a 190 square-mile park. If you take the chance to go down there and look at it, I think you'll enjoy every moment that you are in that particular area. There are two areas. There is the ... [interjection] You had your say. Will you let me have mine?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. minister address his remarks through the Chair?

MR. ADAIR: I will. To the Chairman: will you ask that gentleman to let me have my say? He had his say.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, the dollars that went into Kananaskis Country were public dollars. They were public dollars that went into the Commonwealth facilities in Edmonton. They were public dollars that went into the urban parks, the Capital City Park in Edmonton and the Fish Creek park in Calgary. They are not necessarily that easily acceptable or accessible to me as a northerner. I know that constituents of the Peace River constituency have golfed at Kananaskis Country, have enjoyed

every minute of it, and are prepared to go back down there. I said the Peace River constituency. There is a distance involved, but there is still the opportunity for that world-quality facility — and I like the term that the hon. Member for Edmonton Whitemud used, so that it doesn't mix up some members as to what in fact it is.

I think it's important to recognize, Mr. Chairman, what happens when you put together a facility like that. That facility was started back in 1977, some six years ago, and is basically very close to completion. There are still some things that are not quite finished as far as construction. I would ask the hon. minister if he might just indicate when we might consider the Kananaskis project basically complete for the various users as far as trail development and the likes of that.

In response to who in fact can use that particular facility — anybody. By word of mouth — and there are some pretty good-sized ones around — that word will get around to the good people not only of Alberta but of Canada, western Canada, and of all the countries in the world. As the Minister of Tourism, I'm aware of a good number of people from many, many countries in the world who have come to Kananaskis Country to photograph it, to go back and tell their people that there is something there. As Minister of Tourism, I hope that the day will come when that project is completed, and we in the Department of Tourism can promote it as a tourism facility, as a gem for this province of ours. While it's still under construction, you can't really do that particular point.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I think I'll sit down.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Would the minister like to respond?

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Chairman, the Member for Little Bow started off by saying that Kananaskis is not a people park; it's not a park for Albertans. I would just like to have all members go back to *Hansard* of November 6, 1981, where I spent some considerable time talking about a park for Albertans. As you read through this speech, which is quite lengthy, I mention that a number of times. Kananaskis Country is for Albertans: it's for young Albertans, it's for older Albertans, it's for the handicapped.

I just received a letter, and I thought I would share part of it with you. It's from the Lethbridge Senior Citizens Organization, seniors that went to William Watson Lodge, spent a week there, and found it just magnificent. So what are they doing? They're now saying, please accept this \$100 donation towards Kananaskis Country. Another couple, in wheelchairs, sent a cheque for \$70. It's because Albertans are proud of what's in Kananaskis Country. Kananaskis Country isn't a golf course; there are a number of things there. I'm sure if the hon. member has been there — and if he hasn't I invite him to go and have a look — because there are trails, there's camping, there's the William Watson Lodge. There are so many things in Kananaskis Country, and it's for Albertans.

Mr. Chairman, there were over 500,000 visitors to Kananaskis Country this past year. So when somebody says that we're setting up programs to keep Albertans out, I'll tell you that's not what I hear. And I say again, I have never received one letter contradicting Kananaskis Country or one letter where they wouldn't let me golf because I had blue jeans on. I have a note here from Kimball, and he even let some people golf with blue jeans. So why drag this red herring across this nice red floor? Let's have some facts.

The Member for Calgary McCall said we should improve the trail signage; I take that as notice. I wasn't aware that we had some difficulties. I know the signage is a little behind

schedule, and it's my understanding that all the cross-country ski signs will be up this fall. I know what it's like if you get on the wrong trail and can't get back, so we'll do that.

I was asked how many people are employed within Kananaskis Country. It's my understanding, I don't have the exact figures, that it's around 200 employees. Of course, in addition, there are wildlife people, transportation people, and forestry service people. The member asked about supplies and services. To the hon. member: it's not \$20,000; it's \$20 million, and that takes in all the items on here. All our trail development roads and all that are classed as supplies and services. The only thing outside that is manpower costs.

The Member for Clover Bar said there's a sickness within this government. I don't see it. I recall that I stood on the platform in a number of forums in my constituency. Kananaskis Country was raised, and I mailed out a few *Hansards* of November 6. I would invite the members to mail them out again, especially the Member for Edmonton Norwood, who wasn't here on November 6, 1981. I think it would do him and his constituents well if he would read it.

MR. MARTIN: I'll look forward to it.

MR. TRYNCHY: Kananaskis Country was a dream for Albertans. It started out as a very small project. [interjections] In 1981 I explained step by step why the figure of \$44 million increased to what it is now. Step by step, project by project, the completion date, what was done: the whole thing is there, so nobody should leave this House and not know what Kananaskis Country is all about.

As I said before, Mr. Chairman, we're dwelling on the golf course. There are so many other items there that Albertans go to and visit: 3,000 campsites for Albertans; recreation vehicle group camps; hiking trails; bicycle trails; equestrian trails; fishing for the handicapped, where we have paved runways so they can go down with their wheelchairs. I know the Member for Spirit River-Fairview was there, and I think he accepts that as something that Albertans will agree with. They talk about extra costs for the sand for the traps. I thought I explained that well the other day. The sand that we have there is no more costly than what we could have got from Edmonton, with transportation added to it. [interjections] Mr. Chairman, I guess they can believe what they want, but I have the figures.

Mr. MARTIN: Conservative math.

MR. TRYNCHY: The Member for Calgary Foothills asked about the visitation to Kananaskis, and I've just said that there were over 500,000 this last year. She also wanted to know the employment opportunities for Albertans. When you look at the total budget, the request this year is for \$23 million. Of that, \$20 million is for contracts; contracts and projects for Albertans, jobs for Albertans, every one of these. And they're all done by Albertan companies, Alberta people. So those are the opportunities that are available.

The Member for Edmonton Norwood said that we develop programs to keep Albertans away. I don't know which programs they are. I would hope the hon. member would come forward and list on a piece of paper the programs that keep Albertans away, and I'll make sure that they're done. Let the member write it down; he can point all he wants.

MR. MARTIN: Don't get excited.

MR. TRYNCHY: I'm not excited. But if it takes a little time to write it down, please do.

He says that \$20 to golf is too much. I don't know. You can go down here and golf for \$9; you can go down here and golf for \$15; and you can go to Jasper and golf for \$24, or Banff at \$26. So I guess it's all in one person's mind whether it's too much or not enough or just right. And one thing that's really disturbing is that we talk about people being turned away. I've yet to hear from anyone the name of a person that was turned away from Kananaskis.

Mr. Chairman, I was asked to reassess the dress code. I've already made the commitment that we'd look at it. I join with the Member for Wainwright, that Albertans are indeed very proud of Kananaskis Country. I've had letter, after letter, after letter, suggesting that it was the right thing to do. Let's not talk about spending the money today for the golf course; it was spent over the last three, four, five years. It opened on July 22, and I have some difficulty understanding the theory of some of the members.

The Member for Peace River wanted to know when Kananaskis would be completed, and I might say that the budget request for 1984-85 for \$23 million would pretty well complete the project. The only request we would have in 1985-86 is a \$10 million request to complete the road system within Kananaskis. There might be some other requests. I don't foresee them at the present time, but there could be.

Mr. Chairman, I believe those are all the questions that were raised. I just want to say that I'm proud to be involved in Kananaskis Country, and I'm sure that the majority of Albertans are indeed as proud as we are.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, before we go to the final question, I think a few other remarks are necessary in terms of assessing this particular issue by this Legislature. That's one body that can assess it. We can live within this controlled environment and say, yes, we are right, and we're going to stick to certain kinds of codes. I can understand that. We can go to the Mayfair golf club here in Edmonton, and within that environment, we can discuss what the terms of reference are for Kananaskis. We can go into the constituency of Little Bow and talk to people there — and they are talking on the street, just as they are in Calgary and other places in Alberta — about the terms of reference and the guidelines by which people can or cannot golf in Kananaskis and the type of personality that is being developed for the Kananaskis golf course as such.

Under those terms of reference, you can have different points of view. The hon. Member for Edmonton Whitemud has one point of view; he thinks that Albertans and other members of this Legislature are rather silly in their attitudes to be concerned over such an issue as this. But you should turn around and walk on the street, and ask people what they think and what they hear that has come out as the public personality of the Kananaskis golf course. That public personality at the present time is one of being rather elite, exclusive, and people are feeling they're not really part of that golf course. That's a perceived image by people in Alberta. I didn't create it. I didn't start the issue. When it was brought to my attention, I understand it had already been sent by someone that set out this set of rules that was turned over to the public press and said that this is the way Kananaskis is going to be run.

The people that have been given the responsibility to run that golf course were listed in press reports and other public reports. People said, why them? Again, it sent an image through to the public that it was a certain elite class that was going to manage the golf course; it was partly buddies of the government that were going to run the golf course, and the people were not really included in what was happening.

It wasn't their Minister of Recreation and Parks that said: here are the rules for the golf course; here is what we want to do for the people of Alberta. Tonight he has taken a stand on the side of the people. In 1981 he said that the park was going to be for the people of Alberta; I accept that. But all of a sudden, when the golf course is open, made available, a message is sent to the public that it's not really for everybody unless you meet certain standards. So, the hon. Member for Edmonton Whitemud can say all he wants about how the people have perceived it. It was the hon. Member for Edmonton Whitemud and his committee that sent out the image of this golf course that is perceived in a way by the public of Alberta, and they're not happy about it.

When they raised that issue with me, I said I will raise that issue in this Legislature, and I will press that issue. It is not only the issue of the jeans itself; it is the whole broader issue of how this government takes public funds. The Conservative Party starts to think that it's their fund, that the funds are to be for a few people. They list in this same category the big oil companies that develop northern Alberta — Gulf, Esso, and a number of others — that get into the heritage fund. In the last election, they were promised \$5.4 billion would be handed out. They say, look at how all these people are getting it. They even say to me as a farmer on an irrigated farm: look, you got some of the heritage fund. This is in the area of my constituency that has only dry land. They say, why you and not me? They're raising that question. It's all part of a whole.

But then we get a committee that is appointed by the minister, that sends out this message that I've talked about. And they're not happy about it — disgruntled. The only way that that unhappiness and that perceived interpretation, right or wrong — wrong in the mind of the Member for Edmonton Whitemud, right in my mind — is transmitted back to the people in public responsibility is right here, through this Legislature. And any time they raise it with me, I'm going to say it, the way they want it said.

The Member for Edmonton Whitemud can judge how it's said. He can say it's bad interpretation; they don't understand. They might understand the issue better than the Member for Edmonton Whitemud, because they understand it from an individual point of view, from their own personal circumstances. I think that's the way it has to be. So the hon. Member for Edmonton Whitemud should assess who he is representing, and if he's representing a certain group in this Legislature, fine. But there are other people that represent the broad base of the Alberta population; we speak for them. We'll represent them as they see it, as they perceive it, and as they want to say it in this Legislature.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, I wasn't going to get into this debate because parts of it are rather ridiculous to start with. But I've sat here all night, and I'm tempted to get into it.

I must apologize to the House because I have never been to Kananaskis Country, at least since it's been called Kananaskis Country. At one time I used to be a hunter. I used to go hunting every year, and I used to hunt in what they now call Kananaskis Country. At that time, I found that it was a very beautiful area, whether we got one of those sheep that they now are worrying about. And by the way, I've found those sheep can take pretty good care of themselves. I believe that what this government has done is open up that area, not just for hunters like myself that used to pack up in there on horses and make a two- or three-week stay to chase the different game around in the mountains, but to all Albertans.

Out in Kananaskis they have something now that I believe all Albertans can be proud of. Anybody can go out there and

find something they like to do: skiing; the hunting is still there; if you want to go cross-country skiing, you can go cross-country skiing; and now we have, as our friend from Whitemud said, a world-class golf course. And why wouldn't you put a world-class golf course in an area that's so beautiful? I don't think there are many places in this whole country of Canada that are as beautiful as Kananaskis Country. I've seen it before they pushed the roads and everything else into it. I hope that we don't spoil it too much. When they built this golf course in here, if it took a few dollars more to use white sand to match the environment, I'm glad they did it, because it's a very, very beautiful area.

I have a lot of constituents that have gone through the Kananaskis golf course, and I will say that they have come back very impressed, like most of the other people who have been there. They went out to Kananaskis in the middle of the week, and they were very well received. They didn't have a time to tee off, but the people that were running it said: just stick around awhile; there might be a cancellation; we'll work you in. And they did that. They came back with nothing but the very highest regards for the management and everything else. Nobody said anything about dress code. I guess maybe they wore their red jeans. I don't know what they wore, but they said it was like any other golf course. They went out there, and they got on the golf course. They were well treated by the management, and they came back with nothing but praise for that golf course.

As far as I am concerned, I would like to compliment the minister on the job he has done. I think all Albertans should be proud of what we have in Kananaskis today.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I certainly welcome the opportunity to enter this debate for a minute or two this evening. At the outset, I'd like to say that I visited Kananaskis two years ago with other members of the heritage trust fund committee, and I would have to say ... [interjection]

MR. MARTIN: Settle down, Boomer. You're going to have a heart attack.

MR. ADAIR: Not me, Ray.

MR. NOTLEY: We'll all be very calm and take our time. We have lots of time tonight — twelve o'clock; that's fair enough. I'm not going to be rushed Mr. Minister. Don't you be rushed.

In any event, when I went there in 1981, Mr. Chairman, I must confess that I thought the William Watson Lodge was excellent. No question about that; first rate. It was the sort of thing that, as an Albertan, I was proud to be able to see as an investment from the Heritage Savings Trust Fund.

But let me tell you that while I thought the William Watson Lodge was first class, there were certain things about that visit, as I look back, that I thought were frills that could have waited for a while. For example, as we helicoptered over much of the territory, we also had occasion to drive on the roads. There isn't a road in the Minister of Tourism and Small Business's constituency, the constituency of Spirit River-Fairview, the constituency of Little Bow, or any of the rural ridings in the province, that would compare to that magnificent superhighway into Kananaskis. And as a person who drove down the old Kananaskis road years ago, as the Member for Drumheller did, I say that maybe we wanted to upgrade the road but did we need to upgrade the road to a standard which would make it almost tumpike quality?

I wonder, Mr. Chairman. Remember, this is a government that is piously telling us every day that we have to tighten our belts, that the health system is out of control, that education is

squandering the public dollar, that there are all kinds of cuts we have to make in people services: user fees in hospitals, cutbacks in shelter allowances for people on social assistance. We have to cut our cloth, say the members of this government. As I look back on that visit, one of the places we could have cut our cloth is in the excesses I saw in Kananaskis park — not the William Watson Lodge, which was excellent, but in some of the frills that frankly we could have done without, or perhaps incorporated in the planning process, literally, down the road.

I have to say that I sat in absolute amazement yesterday when I heard the Member for Edmonton Whitemud. The Member for Edmonton Whitemud is one of the most eloquent members of this Legislative Assembly. He represents the soul of the Conservative Party. He represents the essence of the Conservative Party, and he enunciates that essence more honestly than any other member in this House. There's no question about that. When the Member for Edmonton Whitemud speaks, I know he speaks for the Conservative Party. I don't agree with him, but I know that he represents the Conservative Party.

What I find intriguing is all the other members who basically agree with the Member for Edmonton Whitemud but don't want to admit it to their constituents. Can you imagine what the constituents in Whitecourt or Peace River think about a dress code in Kananaskis park? We get calls from Calgary from people in the oil industry who tell us what they think about the dress code. Let me tell you that what the farmers in the Peace River country think about the dress code in Kananaskis park is the sort of thing — if I were the Minister of Tourism and Small Business, I would not be running for re-election on the platform of the dress code in Kananaskis park, nor would I want to be running on that issue in any of the rural ridings in this province. Small wonder that the government is going to reassess its position; they're getting enough backlash from Albertans who are outraged.

Mr. Chairman, I want to sort of pick on another aspect of this issue. I believe it was the Minister of Transportation from Smoky River — and people from Smoky River would be equally annoyed at the dress code — who suggested that he had golfed when he was in blue jeans and nobody threw out the Minister of Transportation. I'm not surprised that the people who run the golf course wouldn't throw out the Minister of Transportation, regardless of what he was dressed in or whether he was dressed at all. Knowing the people who are running Kananaskis park, they wouldn't throw him out. But I say to members of this committee, fine, we can say that we're not going to apply that dress code absolutely rigidly. If the Member for Little Bow shows up in blue jeans, we won't throw him out because we don't want to create a fuss. Or if the Member for Edmonton Norwood comes in blue jeans, we won't throw him out because we don't want to create a fuss. Or perhaps we won't throw out the Member for Edmonton Belmont, wherever it is.

But what kind of message do we send out to the average person when we say there is a dress code? Just a moment ago we were chatting about the way in which the average person relates to some of these major projects. How many of us in this House can say, without any hesitation, that our constituents are free to walk in without any inhibitions at all. Sure, they'll come and see us if we invite them, but how many are just a little concerned about coming into this building because there's a certain something about this building itself. There's a certain something about dress codes that is a thinly disguised sign to little people that they're not welcome. Oh, you can go if you're dressed in blue jeans and make a fuss about it. If you say: I'm going to phone Peter Trynchy; he's my MLA; and if you don't

let me in, Norm Kimball, I'm going to get Peter down your neck. If you're prepared to do that — no problem; walk right in. Or maybe you'll even be able to say: I've got the Member for Edmonton Belmont, whoever he is; I'm not sure whether Norm Kimball knows who he is. Maybe we can get him to stand up.

What happens to the many, many thousands of little people in this province who aren't in that kind of situation, where dress codes convey a message. They are symbolic of a first-class, Cadillac service open to people who are high-income Albertans at a golf course that is paid for by all Albertans and that has been expanded in scope from the original plans when the Premier announced the \$40 million project in 1977 or '78, whatever the year was. The Member for Edmonton Whitemud put those arguments in a very elegant way for the kind of society he envisages. I fundamentally disagree with his position, but I respect it because at least I know that's where the heart and soul of this government really rests.

But what I think is important, Mr. Chairman, is that members in this House from rural Alberta had better be able to go back when we vote on these estimates and say proudly where they stand on dress codes, on color-oriented sand to match the mountains, on all the other excesses in Kananaskis park. Let them go back and justify that to the local chamber of commerce. Let them go back and justify that to Unifarm, the National Farmers Union, the Cattle Commission members, or to the various other people who are going to be coming forward with requests of one kind or another. Let them go back and say, we've got to tighten our belts with respect to school board grants — no increase at all next year — because there are other things that are more important, frills in Kananaskis park.

No, Mr. Chairman, I think the government has a lot of explaining to do about the style, the messages, and the symbolism all this furor over the golf course has generated. It's not artificial generation of a furor. It's the sort of thing that's not coming from this tiny little opposition. It is coming to us, and to other people, from the people of Alberta who just resent this kind of status-oriented approach that this government instinctively takes, at a time when we have to make some hard choices in public investments. Before we start blaming other people for the deficit of the province of Alberta, it might well be advisable for members of this government caucus to collectively look in the mirror, because they will find the major culprit for our overruns right there.

MR. BATIUK: Mr. Chairman, I've been listening to this debate for the second day, and I'm getting tired of it, particularly on such an important issue, when dress is of such concern. I think that that is one area where we shouldn't be concerned as much as maybe costs in everything else. But every place has its own code of dress and I think that the people should dress according to the place. I know that in many places in Edmonton and across the country, you see signs: no shirt, no shoes, no service. If you went into the Westin Hotel in tatters, I'm sure the page wouldn't let you take a step into the building. Yet maybe at the Cecil Hotel they'd roll out the red carpet for you.

What I really want to mention — and I'm surprised that the Member for Little Bow has stressed it so much. It just brings back to me memories of when he was the Minister of Health and Social Development, and I was the reeve of the county of Lamont. The day that we were having the official opening of the Beaver Hills senior citizens' lodge, there was a gathering of maybe 125 people waiting and waiting for the minister to come. A car drives up, and a fellow jumps out with khaki trousers and an open shirt collar. Somebody says: how much longer are we going to wait for him; maybe we should go on

without him. Somebody says: there he is; he just came. Somebody says: my God, you mean that's the minister, dressed like that, without a tie? And I can see it, he was golfing with his friend that time. That's why he came late; at least, that's what he told us. For an official opening of a senior citizens' lodge with 100 people dressed in ties and white shirts and so forth, the minister should have been dressed a little more appropriately, and the same with this. Nobody expects a person to go to Kananaskis to golf in a tuxedo, but whoever can afford to go there for holidays, pay \$20 to golf, I'm sure can have a decent pair of pants and a shirt.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Before the vote, there were a couple of items that I asked about. Could the minister table the contents of the contract between the government and the group that is managing the golf course, Kan-Alta? As well, there is one other item; I forget what the other item was. If the minister could table that contract, I'd appreciate it very much, so that it is public knowledge. Could the minister table that dress code that we have talked about in the Legislature, so that is public information and we know all of the details of both of those items?

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Chairman, I don't have a dress code. I guess that's on the golf course clubhouse. I'm not so sure I can table the contract; I'll have to check with legal advisers. If I can, I will.

DR. BUCK: You can't table a public contract? You've got to be kidding.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, I certainly wasn't intending to prolong this debate in any way, but — again, not to rehearse the whole argument — it's a public golf course, public money. We've made some contracts between government and this group. In his own words, and they're in *Hansard*, the minister indicated that a return would come to government, in terms of a percentage. That means that we're a partner to that contract, and as far as I'm concerned, that should be a public contract. If it isn't, and if the minister can say tonight that it is not, I intend to stand here and keep this debate going until midnight, because that would be totally unacceptable. I'll find things to say between now and midnight and on again. The public people that are involved in that contract are as answerable to this Legislature as any of the ministers here, because they're part of a public expenditure. They're part of revenue that's going to come to this province, and I see no reason why that contract can't be set on the table of this Legislature; that's number one.

Number two, the dress code is for the public of Alberta. We've already established that in the debate in this Legislature. I see no reason that the minister cannot make a commitment to say, I will assure the hon. Member for Little Bow that that dress code will be tabled in this Legislature, for all members' use, and specifically my use, and the public's use. I see no reason why that can't be done. Mr. Chairman, it's not a threat; it's because I think these issues are important enough that this debate will be delayed until I have a commitment from the minister that those two items will be placed on the table in this Legislature.

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Chairman, I can assure the member that if I can get the dress code from the clubhouse, I will table it.

I will check with legal counsel, and if the contract is such that it's public and can be tabled, it shall be tabled.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, I seem to be missing something here. [interjections]

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member back there made a derogatory comment about my colleague, and I ask that that be withdrawn immediately. It was unparliamentary. If the hon. Member for Edmonton Belmont wishes to stand in his place and repeat it, fine; otherwise those kinds of comments should be withdrawn; they're unacceptable.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, I wouldn't want to get in an argument, or give any credence to the remark which I didn't hear; I just presume that it wasn't said. But I do want to say, as plainly as I can to the minister, a minister of the Crown, responsible for administering a Crown department, that when we go to public tender, that is public information. The minister well knows that when you open tenders to any government contract, they are opened in front of the people who are participating, and that is public information. I realize that the Attorney General says that this province especially doesn't need a freedom of information Act, because everything is done above board. Well, when we go to public tender that's about as plain an example of that contract being tabled in this committee as anything can be. As soon as he gets some advice from the Government House Leader, I'm sure that the minister will be able to find that contract for us.

Mr. Chairman, public business must be done in public. That way nobody ever gets into trouble; no minister ever gets into trouble when that is done. So I'm sure that the minister will give us that information.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I may have missed the minister's response to the Member for Clover Bar, but as I recollect his last statement, it was "i f" — "i f", with respect to a public contract? We should surely have a little better answer than that from the minister. We have the Attorney General with us tonight; legal assurance can be given. There's no reason under the sun why we cannot have a completely clear, unequivocal commitment to have this information released. Surely they are not going to try to hide that kind of information. That's not a working paper; that's not a document. That's the sort of thing that I would think the Attorney General or the minister would get together and in five seconds, would say: for heaven's sake, let's make this public. If not, it may well be that some of us will have some additional comments about these appropriations. I don't say that in a threatening way, but I say that because I think it is clear that we do need this information; the public of Alberta requires it. It's a reasonable request that the Member for Little Bow has made. It wasn't made in any other than a public spirited sense, and therefore I think it should be complied with, and not complied with on an equivocal basis, but complied with by a clear assertion from the government that the information will be tabled in the House.

It may not be possible for the minister ... I'm not suggesting that he hop on a plane — we don't want him to do that — and fly to Kananaskis and get the thing from the clubhouse door. If the minister gives his word that this will be tabled, we'll trust his word; the minister is an honorable man. If he says he'll table it, it will be tabled; we know that. What we want tonight is a clear commitment from the minister that this information will be made available to the committee before we pass his estimates; that's all.

MR. TRYNCHY: The hon. member is right that I'm an honorable man; I'll have to agree with him there. As I have said, if it can be tabled, I will table it. I'll have to check that out, and if it's allowed to be tabled in the House. I don't know if a contract between private-sector people and the government is public information. If it is, it will be tendered. I don't see anything wrong with that. If you can't take my word for that, then I'm prepared — there's a lot of information in this book; if you want to get at it, I happen to have a little time.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Chairman, we all have lots of time. I think the minister wants to give us this information; I believe that's what he is saying. I would just ask the minister why he thinks he cannot give us this information. What is the problem?

MR. TRYNCHY: I can't make it much plainer than this: I don't know if there is anything against tabling it. But will they allow me the time to find out if I can? If they want to do that, fine; I'll table it if I can. If I can't, let's continue.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, the minister indicated, either through questioning or by remarks yesterday, I believe, that some 127 groups responded to the request for proposal, I think it was. The other part of the question that I had first thought about asking was a list of those 127 persons that had made proposals and possibly some information with regard to them. My request this evening, however, has been for the final proposal and its contents, and the signed agreement between the government and Kan-Alta. It's very difficult for me to understand why a finalized agreement cannot be presented.

The Premier in this Legislature has said that discussion leading up to agreements often is private and confidential, and is between government and the private investors or the contractors. We have had to accept that for a number of years in this Legislature. I don't accept that guideline. But as well, he has always said that once an agreement has been concluded, that agreement would be submitted to the Legislature and the public and the members of the Legislature could judge accordingly on that specific agreement. I guess that's one of the reasons I feel that there should be no question about it being presented. I appreciate that the Attorney General is in the Assembly, and I'm certain could give an opinion with regard to this matter. If the Attorney General, through the Minister of Recreation and Parks, could give us that assurance that the contract could be tabled, I'm happy with that.

The dress code: I'm certain there are no legal restrictions there. It's just a matter of time, and the minister will table that. I accept that; I know the minister will do that, and there's no problem there. But certainly let's clarify this first matter, and then we can get on to something else.

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Chairman, I can keep getting up and down all night. My legal knowledge is quite limited when it comes to what you can table and what you can't.

DR. BUCK: Ask your House leader; he's sitting there mute.

MR. TRYNCHY: If the hon. members can't take the word of the minister who says that if it can be tabled, it shall be tabled — we can debate that another time if they want to. I don't know if we can table it. You might have to find out from the people who signed the contract if it's legal to table it. I don't know how many contracts we have for road construction with the Minister of Transportation that are tabled in the House. Is that something we've done before?

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Chairman, may I make a suggestion. Obviously we are not going to get a decision on this right now. I thought the Attorney General would have leapt to his feet and waved and said yes, go ahead. We don't have a problem here with freedom of information; we want to get this information out. But if there seems to be a problem, I would suggest let's not vote on these estimates then. We'll go on to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, and come back when the minister can give us a decision about it. I for one do not want to vote on something ahead of knowing whether we're getting information.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Is it agreed that the vote be held?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. TRYNCHY: If you have some questions in regard to the contract, maybe I can answer them. Maybe that would make them happier.

MR. NOTLEY: I'm sure we could sort of stab away in the dark, but there are only two possible reasons why this would not be made available, Mr. Chairman. One is that there is some legal barrier that none of us are aware of. We've asked in the House that if there is some legal barrier, then perhaps the Attorney General could let us know. The other is whether there's a political barrier; that's the other possible reason for this information not being made available. I would hate to think that we would have anything other than an unequivocal commitment from the government. I'm trying to search in my mind what possible legal barrier there would be for the tabling of this kind of information. The Member for Little Bow is quite right. No one is suggesting that whatever the process of negotiation was — if they had consultants come in to help them choose the people to run the golf course, or this company to run the golf course, no one is asking for that; we're asking for the contract. I'm just amazed that anyone would see that as some kind of legal barrier.

If somewhere in the dead of night, the federal government brought in a sneaky 1984 George Orwellian law that stopped our public information loving government here from making this information available, then I think we'd like to know. We're understanding. I'm sure the four of us here would be quite prepared to reason together on how it might be handled. But I don't know of any possible legal impediment. Therefore I find it difficult to understand why we can't have a strong assertion from the minister, who just stands up and says: I'm prepared to table the information. We are not saying that it should be tabled tonight. It would be better if we had it tonight, but we're not demanding that. We're demanding, or requesting, a simple commitment on the part of the government, in the largest sense. Unless there is some specific legal reason that the Attorney General, in his capacity as chief legal honcho of the government, can identify — or at least some plausible reason that he can identify — then it seems to me that we are just voting blindly, without getting a commitment from the government to do what the minister tells us he wants to do, which is a release of information.

I put directly to the Attorney General: is the Attorney General aware of any legal impediment to the release of this? Obviously, since it's on the club house door, I presume that the information on the question of dress code could be tabled. I doubt if there's any legal impediment there. But if there is some legal impediment on the question of the contract, we would appreciate hearing that, and perhaps we can reassess our position,



MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I have surely been waiting for the opportunity to make a few remarks.

DR. BUCK: Great, we've been waiting, too.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I must say that it troubled me just a little bit, when I came into the Assembly after a brief absence to my office a few minutes ago, to realize that some remarks had been made and some issues raised, and I missed the beginnings of that. I am therefore not entirely sure at the outset of everything that was said. However, I had all understandable faith that if I sat for a few minutes longer, I would hear it all again. What happened then was that I perceived that the hon. members were in fact raising two separate questions.

I think I should thank all hon. members for such instruction as I've had this evening in respect of golf. It's a game that I don't play, and I suppose that could be said even if I did play it.

MR. MARTIN: You'd be classified as a duffer.

MR. CRAWFORD: I should note that unlike the hon. Member for Edmonton Whitemud, I have won a few other types of prizes at golf in my day. I have never owned a set of clubs. There was a time when I used to play a game every two years and won a number of prizes, which for the first little while I thought were probably quite a tribute to me, because they said on each occasion that I had received the highest score. I thought that was probably a good thing, until we had some further explanation of the real rudiments of this game.

Mr. Chairman, I think the only thing my hon. colleague is raising in respect of producing any document, is a matter of some concern with respect to who actually possesses the document. May I make maybe two or three points? I'll return to address the point I just raised about the documents in a moment. We have under discussion, of course, the estimates for the period commencing April 1, 1984. Questions should relate to those estimates.

It may be that the minister has answered questions which, because of his detailed knowledge, he knows are represented in the estimates as being relevant to the golf course. However, little, if anything, appears in the estimates themselves relative to that. My understanding is that, in particular, issues such as the dress code, extended as it is from the daily question period to this occasion, are not really matters of estimates that are under consideration. I might note that questions that are raised with respect to the wrong year are normally answered by a minister in estimates. The estimates relate to the period April 1, 1984, to March 31, 1985, and are for capital only. [interjections] Actually, I made this argument once before. I am referring to the custom that since fiscal years probably can't be taken totally in isolation, of course, when they are in a position to do so, ministers have often answered questions with respect to a year other than the year in respect of which the estimates are actually before the Assembly. I gather that's been done.

If I can define what the issue may well be, the contracting party with respect to any of the contracts may indeed be the government of Alberta. I am going to be frank enough with my hon. friends to say to them that when you have the advisory council and potentially an agreement between one of the departments of government and an operator who may be operating the golf course, there is a question in my colleague's mind as to whether that is a government document or whether it belongs to two parties who are operating under a contract in which the government may well have given over to another party the right to operate. The only difficulty with questions like that is that

my hon. colleague and I don't carry these particular documents with us at all times. As I said, I have had to be frank enough with my hon. friends to indicate that I'm not sure what the situation may be there. Subject to the documents actually being the property of a party other than the government, then of course they would produced. I think that's the import of what my colleague has outlined already.

One of the hon. opposition members made the useful statement that the dress code, if there is dress code, being available to any person who goes there, is perhaps not something which need be produced in the Assembly since it is available elsewhere; yet my colleague has given a reasonable undertaking with respect to that.

In order to sum up, Mr. Chairman, all I would say is that I have no objection to seeing this particular item held. It would be on the basis that whatever exists in respect of a published dress code and whatever exists in respect of a contract that may have been tendered — I think that was the point made by one of the hon. members — would surely be produced. The only qualification was the one I gave, that if it appears that any document is not in fact the property of the government, as one of the parties to it, then we would have to seek the necessary permissions.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Agreed.

MR. NOTLEY: Agreed.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is agreed then that the vote will be held until further information.

Agreed to:

Total Vote 3 — Urban Parks	\$22,175,000
----------------------------	--------------

#### **Department of Energy and Natural Resources**

Agreed to:

Total Vote 1 — Alberta Oil Sands	
Technology and Research Authority	\$50,000,000
Total Vote 2 — Alberta Reforestation	
Nursery	\$190,000
Total Vote 3 — Grazing Reserves	
Development	\$6,608,000
Total Vote 4 — Maintaining Our Forests	\$4,180,000

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would the minister like to move the report?

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

[Motion carried]

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

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

MR. PURDY: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has had under consideration the following resolutions and reports as follows:

Resolved that from the Alberta Heritage Saving Trust Fund, sums not exceeding the following be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1985, for the purpose of

making investments in the following projects to be administered by the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources: \$50,000,000 for the Alberta Oil Sands Technology and Research Authority, \$190,000 for Alberta Reforestation Nursery, \$6,608,000 for Grazing Reserves Development, and \$4,180,000 for Maintaining Our Forests.

The Committee of Supply has under consideration certain other resolutions, reports progress thereon, and requests leave to sit again.

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, tomorrow afternoon the Assembly will be in Committee of Supply again. Subject to the checking that we've agreed be done to with respect to Recreation and Parks, that estimate will be called again, as well as the one under Executive Council for Workers' Health, Safety and Compensation, and the two items under Public Works, Supply and Services.

Mr. Speaker, I'm not able to indicate yet whether or not the Assembly will sit Thursday night, but I will be in a position to deal with that tomorrow.

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