

There is no question that we have many excellent coaches in some sports, but there are usually, at the most, only one or two international-calibre coaches in any one sport. To show significant improvement in the standard of coaching in Canada, we must have an infusion of knowledge and experience into our system. Where do we get it and how? There are many arguments for and against importing coaches. In my opinion we have little choice but to import coaches if we want to turn our system around and start showing some results.

● (1610)

Foreign coaches can provide several immediate benefits which would take us many years to build into our system, and even then it would be difficult without outside help. Most foreign coaches have superior knowledge because they have an education system designed to teach coaches—

That is the important point; they have an education system which is designed to teach their coaches. He goes on to say:

—we have a few scattered courses, but no over-all system at present. In Europe, for example, it is possible to study for a Ph.D. in sport coaching.

In Canada, our attitude toward athletics in the educational process is simply not adequate. Simon Fraser University stands as the only post-secondary institution in this country which offers athletic scholarships. Many hundreds of our best athletes annually make the trek south to United States universities. These are not aspiring athletes necessarily, but aspiring scholars as well. Because of our inane attitude here in Canada, we have many students going to the United States who never return.

There is a program which has just been started at a few progressive universities in this country which gives people a bachelor's degree in recreation administration. But there are only three universities involved in the program—the University of Alberta, Simon Fraser and Waterloo. Even in respect of this program the administrations must fight for money because this is not a faculty in itself but part of another faculty. This is an area in which I think the federal government should give some encouragement to award either athletic scholarships or to encourage recreational programs in our universities.

Our lack of planning in the past, and perhaps our lack of planning in the future—I hope that will not be the case—puts serious restrictions on the full enjoyment of our leisure time even for the most affluent members of Canadian society. Let me give a few examples. First, space reservations for recreation are generally inadequate for our present population and there is bound to be a serious shortage of space in the more heavily populated regions of Canada. Second, there is no effective, co-ordinated joint federal-provincial regional planning to ensure a concerted and systematic attempt to remedy these problems. Third, it is reasonable to expect that by 1980 the average work time will be 10 per cent less than now—and we have not accepted that possibility. Fourth, in the early 1960s the urban area available for public recreational use such as parks, golf courses, swimming pools and playgrounds ranged below 10 per cent. Looking ahead to the 1980s, it appears that in spite of increased numbers of residences and the possibility of higher population densities in our cities, the land use ratio will be altered little, if at all.

Finally, there is the old problem of a government caught within a jungle of legal and administrative machinery of great complexity, and this is worsened by lack of national appreciation of the real need for a federal recreation

National Recreation Policy

policy. The shortage of adequate parks and recreational resources within urban areas continues to be a serious concern to most urban municipalities. The planner lacks an adequate system with which to justify the acquisition, preservation and retention of recreational areas in face of the pressures from the diverse urban forces seeking and competing for open space. The best use for land is too often dependent upon economics and not on the intangible values of space for the sake of space.

Lands for recreational use are in ever-increasing demand. Probably the best indicator is the tremendous increase shown in all forms of outdoor recreation in the past seven or eight years, along with the great increase in attendance at national and provincial parks. Statistics indicate that in 1952 there were 2.5 million visitors to our parks. In 1962 the figure had more than doubled, to 7.5 million; and the latest figures for 1974 indicate more than 14 million visitors.

The BNA Act gives control of natural resources, hence land, to the provincial governments. At both the provincial and federal levels, legislation has tended to promote a split between park and recreation, thereby interrupting acceptance of the similarities existing among programs, services, planning and development. During the debate on Bill S-4 many members, including myself, made reference to national parks for recreation, or national recreational parks. The hon. member for Brandon-Souris (Mr. Dinsdale) said in his speech:

I had hoped that long before now there might have been an attempt to implement a definite policy in respect of recreational parks.

I think this is important. This is the way the federal and provincial governments could organize recreational parks close to urban centres, with recreational directors, in order that people could get out and find some breathing space, rather than having to fly to another country or drive hundreds of miles to a national park.

The goals and objectives of leisure and recreation go far beyond the interest and authority of the federal government's Recreation Canada program. Participation in any effective program of recreation will include not only the National Council on Fitness and Amateur Sport and other offices of the Department of National Health and Welfare, but also such agencies as the Canada Council, the CBC, the National Film Board and government departments such as the Department of the Secretary of State, the Department of Urban Affairs, and the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

I am convinced that at the administration level much of the frustration, the lack of direction and the inability to obtain adequate tax dollars for recreational programs and physical fitness development are linked directly to a serious lack of understanding of the role and function of leisure time and recreation. For a start, I would propose two very inexpensive projects. The first would be that all government departments simply "think recreation". If an attitude of this type were adopted, I am sure we would all be surprised at the number of beneficial changes that would result from small and inexpensive measures. Secondly, I would like to see a recreation co-ordinator appointed to advise and direct a government "think recreation" program. He could consult with the provinces, municipalities, towns and cities in order to co-ordinate