



Province of Alberta

The 27th Legislature  
Fourth Session

# Alberta Hansard

Wednesday afternoon, April 20, 2011

Issue 26

The Honourable Kenneth R. Kowalski, Speaker

**Legislative Assembly of Alberta**  
**The 27th Legislature**  
 Fourth Session

Kowalski, Hon. Ken, Barrhead-Morinville-Westlock, Speaker  
 Cao, Wayne C.N., Calgary-Fort, Deputy Speaker and Chair of Committees  
 Mitzel, Len, Cypress-Medicine Hat, Deputy Chair of Committees

Ady, Hon. Cindy, Calgary-Shaw (PC)	Klimchuk, Hon. Heather, Edmonton-Glenora (PC)
Allred, Ken, St. Albert (PC)	Knight, Hon. Mel, Grande Prairie-Smoky (PC)
Amery, Moe, Calgary-East (PC)	Leskiw, Genia, Bonnyville-Cold Lake (PC)
Anderson, Rob, Airdrie-Chestermere (WA), WA Opposition House Leader	Liepert, Hon. Ron, Calgary-West (PC)
Benito, Carl, Edmonton-Mill Woods (PC)	Lindsay, Fred, Stony Plain (PC)
Berger, Evan, Livingstone-Macleod (PC)	Lukaszuk, Hon. Thomas A., Edmonton-Castle Downs (PC)
Bhardwaj, Naresh, Edmonton-Ellerslie (PC)	Lund, Ty, Rocky Mountain House (PC)
Bhullar, Manmeet Singh, Calgary-Montrose (PC)	MacDonald, Hugh, Edmonton-Gold Bar (AL)
Blackett, Hon. Lindsay, Calgary-North West (PC)	Marz, Richard, Olds-Didsbury-Three Hills (PC)
Blakeman, Laurie, Edmonton-Centre (AL), Official Opposition House Leader	Mason, Brian, Edmonton-Highlands-Norwood (ND), Leader of the ND Opposition
Boutilier, Guy C., Fort McMurray-Wood Buffalo (WA)	McFarland, Barry, Little Bow (PC)
Brown, Dr. Neil, QC, Calgary-Nose Hill (PC)	McQueen, Diana, Drayton Valley-Calmar (PC)
Calahasen, Pearl, Lesser Slave Lake (PC)	Morton, F.L., Foothills-Rocky View (PC)
Campbell, Robin, West Yellowhead (PC), Government Whip	Notley, Rachel, Edmonton-Strathcona (ND), ND Opposition House Leader
Chase, Harry B., Calgary-Varsity (AL), Official Opposition Whip	Oberle, Hon. Frank, Peace River (PC)
Dallas, Cal, Red Deer-South (PC)	Olson, Hon. Verlyn, QC, Wetaskiwin-Camrose (PC), Deputy Government House Leader
Danyluk, Hon. Ray, Lac La Biche-St. Paul (PC)	Ouellette, Hon. Luke, Innisfail-Sylvan Lake (PC)
DeLong, Alana, Calgary-Bow (PC)	Pastoor, Bridget Brennan, Lethbridge-East (AL), Official Opposition Deputy Whip, Official Opposition Deputy Leader
Denis, Hon. Jonathan, QC, Calgary-Egmont (PC), Deputy Government House Leader	Prins, Ray, Lacombe-Ponoka (PC)
Doerksen, Arno, Strathmore-Brooks (PC), Deputy Government Whip	Quest, Dave, Strathcona (PC)
Drysdale, Wayne, Grande Prairie-Wapiti (PC)	Redford, Alison M., QC, Calgary-Elbow (PC)
Elniski, Doug, Edmonton-Calder (PC)	Renner, Hon. Rob, Medicine Hat (PC), Deputy Government House Leader
Evans, Hon. Iris, Sherwood Park (PC)	Rodney, Dave, Calgary-Lougheed (PC)
Fawcett, Kyle, Calgary-North Hill (PC)	Rogers, George, Leduc-Beaumont-Devon (PC)
Forsyth, Heather, Calgary-Fish Creek (WA), WA Opposition Whip	Sandhu, Peter, Edmonton-Manning (PC)
Fritz, Hon. Yvonne, Calgary-Cross (PC)	Sarich, Janice, Edmonton-Decore (PC)
Goudreau, Hon. Hector G., Dunvegan-Central Peace (PC)	Sherman, Dr. Raj, Edmonton-Meadowlark (Ind)
Griffiths, Doug, Battle River-Wainwright (PC)	Snelgrove, Hon. Lloyd, Vermilion-Lloydminster (PC)
Groeneveld, George, Highwood (PC)	Stelmach, Hon. Ed, Fort Saskatchewan-Vegreville (PC), Premier
Hancock, Hon. Dave, QC, Edmonton-Whitemud (PC), Government House Leader	Swann, Dr. David, Calgary-Mountain View (AL), Leader of the Official Opposition
Hayden, Hon. Jack, Drumheller-Stettler (PC)	Taft, Dr. Kevin, Edmonton-Riverview (AL)
Hehr, Kent, Calgary-Buffalo (AL)	Tarchuk, Janis, Banff-Cochrane (PC)
Hinman, Paul, Calgary-Glenmore (WA), WA Opposition Deputy Leader	Taylor, Dave, Calgary-Currie (AB)
Horne, Fred, Edmonton-Rutherford (PC)	VanderBurg, George, Whitecourt-Ste. Anne (PC)
Horner, Doug, Spruce Grove-Sturgeon-St. Albert (PC)	Vandermeer, Tony, Edmonton-Beverly-Clareview (PC)
Jablonski, Hon. Mary Anne, Red Deer-North (PC)	Weadick, Hon. Greg, Lethbridge-West (PC)
Jacobs, Broyce, Cardston-Taber-Warner (PC)	Webber, Hon. Len, Calgary-Foothills (PC)
Johnson, Jeff, Athabasca-Redwater (PC)	Woo-Paw, Teresa, Calgary-Mackay (PC)
Johnston, Art, Calgary-Hays (PC)	Xiao, David H., Edmonton-McClung (PC)
Kang, Darshan S., Calgary-McCall (AL)	Zwozdesky, Hon. Gene, Edmonton-Mill Creek (PC), Deputy Government House Leader

**Officers and Officials of the Legislative Assembly**

Clerk	W.J. David McNeil	Committee Research Co-ordinator	Philip Massolin
Law Clerk/Director of Interparliamentary Relations	Robert H. Reynolds, QC	Sergeant-at-Arms	Brian G. Hodgson
Senior Parliamentary Counsel/ Director of House Services	Shannon Dean	Assistant Sergeant-at-Arms	Chris Caughell
Parliamentary Counsel	Stephanie LeBlanc	Assistant Sergeant-at-Arms	Gordon H. Munk
		Managing Editor of <i>Alberta Hansard</i>	Liz Sim

**Party standings:**

Progressive Conservative: 67    Alberta Liberal: 8    Wildrose Alliance: 4    New Democrat: 2    Alberta: 1    Independent: 1

### **Executive Council**

Ed Stelmach	Premier, President of Executive Council, Chair of Agenda and Priorities Committee, Vice-chair of Treasury Board, Liaison to the Canadian Armed Forces
Lloyd Snelgrove	President of the Treasury Board, Minister of Finance and Enterprise
Dave Hancock	Minister of Education, Political Minister for Edmonton
Iris Evans	Minister of International and Intergovernmental Relations
Mel Knight	Minister of Sustainable Resource Development
Luke Ouellette	Minister of Transportation
Rob Renner	Minister of Environment
Verlyn Olson	Minister of Justice and Attorney General
Yvonne Fritz	Minister of Children and Youth Services, Political Minister for Calgary
Jack Hayden	Minister of Agriculture and Rural Development, Political Minister for Rural Alberta
Ray Danyluk	Minister of Infrastructure
Gene Zwozdesky	Minister of Health and Wellness
Ron Liepert	Minister of Energy
Mary Anne Jablonski	Minister of Seniors and Community Supports
Len Webber	Minister of Aboriginal Relations
Heather Klimchuk	Minister of Service Alberta
Lindsay Blackett	Minister of Culture and Community Spirit
Cindy Ady	Minister of Tourism, Parks and Recreation
Hector Goudreau	Minister of Municipal Affairs
Frank Oberle	Solicitor General and Minister of Public Security
Jonathan Denis	Minister of Housing and Urban Affairs
Thomas Lukaszuk	Minister of Employment and Immigration
Greg Weadick	Minister of Advanced Education and Technology

### **Parliamentary Assistants**

Evan Berger	Sustainable Resource Development
Manmeet Singh Bhullar	Municipal Affairs
Cal Dallas	Finance and Enterprise
Fred Horne	Health and Wellness
Broyce Jacobs	Agriculture and Rural Development
Jeff Johnson	Treasury Board (Oil Sands Sustainable Development Secretariat)
Diana McQueen	Energy
Janice Sarich	Education
Teresa Woo-Paw	Employment and Immigration

**STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA**

**Standing Committee on the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund**

Chair: Ms Tarchuk  
Deputy Chair: Mr. Elniski

DeLong  
Forsyth  
Groeneveld  
Johnston  
MacDonald  
Quest  
Taft

**Standing Committee on Community Services**

Chair: Mr. Doerksen  
Deputy Chair: Mr. Hehr

Allred  
Anderson  
Benito  
Bhullar  
Chase  
Johnston  
Notley  
Rodney  
Sarich  
Taylor

**Standing Committee on the Economy**

Chair: Mr. Bhardwaj  
Deputy Chair: Mr. Chase

Amery  
Dallas  
Fawcett  
Hinman  
Johnson  
Lund  
Taft  
Tarchuk  
Taylor  
Woo-Paw

**Standing Committee on Health**

Chair: Mr. McFarland  
Deputy Chair: Ms Pastoor

Forsyth  
Griffiths  
Groeneveld  
Horne  
Lindsay  
Notley  
Quest  
Sherman  
Swann  
Vandermeer

**Standing Committee on Legislative Offices**

Chair: Mr. Mitzel  
Deputy Chair: Mr. Lund

Bhullar  
Blakeman  
Campbell  
Hinman  
Lindsay  
MacDonald  
Marz  
Notley  
Quest  
Rogers

**Special Standing Committee on Members' Services**

Chair: Mr. Kowalski  
Deputy Chair: Mr. Campbell

Amery  
Anderson  
Bhullar  
Elniski  
Hehr  
Leskiw  
Mason  
Pastoor  
Rogers  
VanderBurg

**Standing Committee on Private Bills**

Chair: Dr. Brown  
Deputy Chair: Ms Woo-Paw

Allred  
Benito  
Boutilier  
Calahasen  
Dallas  
Doerksen  
Drysdale  
Hinman  
Horner  
Jacobs

Kang  
Lindsay  
McQueen  
Morton  
Redford  
Sandhu  
Sarich  
Taft  
Xiao

**Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, Standing Orders and Printing**

Chair: Mr. Prins  
Deputy Chair: Mr. Hancock

Amery  
Berger  
Calahasen  
DeLong  
Doerksen  
Forsyth  
Groeneveld  
Hinman  
Jacobs  
Leskiw

Lindsay  
McFarland  
Mitzel  
Notley  
Pastoor  
Quest  
Sherman  
Tarchuk  
Taylor

**Standing Committee on Public Accounts**

Chair: Mr. MacDonald  
Deputy Chair: Mr. Rodney

Allred  
Anderson  
Benito  
Calahasen  
Chase  
Dallas  
Elniski  
Fawcett

Griffiths  
Groeneveld  
Kang  
Mason  
Sandhu  
Vandermeer  
Xiao

**Standing Committee on Public Safety and Services**

Chair: Mr. Drysdale  
Deputy Chair: Mr. Kang

Boutilier  
Brown  
Calahasen  
Cao  
Forsyth  
Johnson  
MacDonald  
Rogers  
Sandhu  
Xiao

**Standing Committee on Resources and Environment**

Chair: Mr. Prins  
Deputy Chair: Ms Blakeman

Anderson  
Berger  
Boutilier  
Hehr  
Jacobs  
Marz  
Mason  
McQueen  
Mitzel  
VanderBurg

**Select Special Ombudsman Search Committee**

Chair: Mr. Mitzel  
Deputy Chair: Mr. Lund

Blakeman  
Hinman  
Lindsay  
Marz  
Notley  
Quest  
Rogers

## Legislative Assembly of Alberta

1:30 p.m.

Wednesday, April 20, 2011

[The Speaker in the chair]

### Prayers

**The Speaker:** Good afternoon. Welcome.

Let us pray. Author of all wisdom, knowledge, and understanding, we ask for guidance in order that truth and justice may prevail in all of our judgments. Amen.

Please be seated.

### Introduction of Guests

**The Speaker:** The hon. Member for Edmonton-Beverly-Clareview.

**Mr. Vandermeer:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure to introduce to you and through you to members of this Assembly 66 energetic young students from the Delwood elementary school. They are accompanied by their teachers, Mme Dorota Maslowski, Mme Andrea Sloat, and Mr. Don Henderson. Their parent helpers are Mrs. Katrina Huhtala, Mr. Jeff Melnyk, and Mrs. Cheryl Teo. I'd ask them all to please rise and receive the traditional warm welcome of this Assembly.

**The Speaker:** The hon. Member for Stony Plain.

**Mr. Lindsay:** Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is my pleasure to introduce to you and through you to all members of the Assembly 58 bright and energetic students from Muir Lake school, which is situated in my constituency of Stony Plain. These students today are accompanied by teachers Mrs. Dodi McCann and Ms Debra Wayken and parent helpers Ms Joan Park, Ms Tammy Repchuk, Ms Tina Kostuik, Ms Edwina Baker, and Ms Pat Harrish. I would like to ask my guests to rise and receive the traditional welcome of the Assembly.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**The Speaker:** The hon. Member for Drayton Valley-Calmar.

**Mrs. McQueen:** Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure to rise today and welcome four outstanding students from Evergreen school in Drayton Valley. They are accompanied by teachers Mrs. Shelly Cloke, Mr. Jeff Crawford, and Mrs. Karen Haskell and parent helpers Mr. Pat English, Mrs. Chrystal Strocher, Mrs. Heather Nickle, and Mr. Steve Goodman. I would also like to congratulate Mrs. Cloke, their teacher, on having been recently recognized as a semifinalist for the excellence in teaching awards, a very deserving recognition for such an outstanding teacher. They'll be arriving at 2 p.m. I'll ask us to give them the traditional warm welcome of this Assembly.

**The Speaker:** The hon. Member for Calgary-Mackay.

**Ms Woo-Paw:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have two introductions to make this afternoon. It is my honour to rise today and introduce to you and through you to all members of this House three highly capable, fabulous people. They are the reason that I can focus on my work, whether I'm away from my constituency or when I'm not in the capital. First, Mr. Matt Pechey. He joined my office in Calgary last year. His past work experience includes working for the federal government and Mount Royal University. His experience and skill sets have greatly benefited my constituents, myself, and my office.

Then I have Mr. Ben Li, who has provided just excellent communications and research support to my office since 2008. He's about to embark on a new journey to Finland next week, where he will start his PhD in informatics. I'm also very pleased to have my legislative assistant here, Ms Shannon Greenfield-Emms, whom I share with my colleague here from Edmonton-Ellerslie. Shannon has been with the government of Alberta for almost 28 years, and she brings with her tremendous experience and support to our offices. I really, really appreciate the support I receive from these three individuals. I would like to ask them all to rise and receive the traditional warm welcome of this House.

It is my honour to rise today and introduce to you and through you to all members of the House some of the postsecondary student leaders that I had the privilege to meet with this morning to discuss my private member's motion on postsecondary student funding. I have Mr. Chris Skappak, MD, PhD student from the University of Alberta; Ms Carol Neuman, executive director of Alberta Students' Executive Council; Steven Kwasny, president, Students' Association of Red Deer College and chair of Alberta Students' Executive Council; and Mrs. Tamara Korassa, VP labour, Graduate Students' Association of Alberta. They have already risen. Please give them the traditional welcome of the House.

**The Speaker:** The hon. Member for Red Deer-South.

**Mr. Dallas:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Today it's my honour and pleasure to introduce to you and through you to all members of the Legislature my legislative assistant, Renee Reitsma, and a special guest visiting her this week, her mother, Teresa Reitsma. Mrs. Reitsma joins us today from Smithers, B.C. She is visiting our beautiful city with the Bulkley Valley Christian high school band and choir tour. The students attended the Edmonton Cantando Festival at the Winspear Centre and were privileged to participate in outstanding performances alongside professional musicians. Mrs. Reitsma has a keen interest in politics and is delighted to join us at the Legislature to learn more about the daily routine of the House and to visit our magnificent building. Renee and Teresa are seated in the members' gallery. I'd ask them to please rise and receive the traditional warm welcome of this Assembly.

**The Speaker:** The hon. Member for Edmonton-Mill Woods.

**Mr. Benito:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is my honour today to introduce to you and through you to all members of the Assembly officers and the board of directors of the Asian Christian Cultural Association of Alberta, or ACCAA centre: Reverend Dr. V. Singh; Mr. Sanjeev Singh, president; Mrs. Grace Burke, past president; Ms Roseline Richardson, treasurer; Mrs. Dorcas Singh, director. They are seated in the public gallery. I would ask that they rise and receive the warm traditional welcome of the Assembly.

**The Speaker:** The hon. Minister of Agriculture and Rural Development.

**Mr. Hayden:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my privilege today to introduce to you and through you to the Assembly three people from Prairie Land school division that were here for meetings today. These dedicated individuals work on behalf of our wonderful children out there day in and day out. Today we have with us Duane Roy, our chair of the board; Wes Neumeier, the superintendent of schools; and Sharon Orum. I wish that they would rise, please, and receive the traditional warm welcome of the Assembly.

**The Speaker:** The hon. Member for Calgary-McCall.

**Mr. Kang:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm honoured to introduce to you and through you to all members of the Assembly two special guests who join us in the public gallery. Wendy Proch and her nine-year-old daughter Ashton are here today to lend their support for the mandatory use of helmets when riding ATVs. Ashton was seriously injured in September of last year, when the ATV she was riding on flipped and pinned her and her older sister beneath it. Ashton suffered serious head injuries and spent eight days in PICU at the Stollery after being airlifted by STARS. Ashton's injuries could have been prevented had she been wearing a helmet. Ashton and her family are here today to watch this government legislate mandatory helmet laws to prevent injuries and save lives. Now I'll ask Wendy and Ashton to rise and receive the traditional warm welcome of the Assembly.

**The Speaker:** The hon. Member for Edmonton-Riverview.

**Dr. Taft:** Yes. Thanks, Mr. Speaker. It's a real honour for me to introduce to you and to all members of the Assembly a class from yet another remarkable school in Edmonton-Riverview, which is blessed with many of them. This school is Meadowlark, and there are 25 students here. They finished a tour this morning. They spent the morning over at McKay Avenue school, the original, one of the early places of this Legislature. They're joined by five adults: two parents, Tanya Jiang and Heather-Jane Au; two student teachers, Kayla Oslanski and Tobi Ma; and their teacher, Armelle Mayert. I believe they're in the members' gallery. I would ask them, please, to rise and receive the warm welcome.

Thank you.

1:40

### Members' Statements

**The Speaker:** The hon. Member for Edmonton-Manning.

#### Organ Donor Week

**Mr. Sandhu:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'm honoured to rise today to recognize Organ Donor Week, which is April 17 to 24 this year.

Organ donation has always been an important issue for me. That's why I brought forward Bill 201, the Health Insurance Premiums (Health Card Donor Declaration) Amendment Act, 2011. This legislation, which I'm happy to say passed in the House two days ago, is now awaiting royal assent. It gives Albertans the opportunity and encourages them to select yes, no, or undecided when obtaining their health care card. I'm proud to say that this Assembly is one of the first to support legislation on organ donation. I would like to thank all of you for your support on Bill 201.

Last night I was on Radio Punjab, 101.7 FM, speaking with host Jarnail Singh Basota about organ donation. Within minutes, Mr. Speaker, we had 10 callers wanting to donate and many more on hold. They were all excited about Bill 201. Albertans truly care about saving lives.

There was an article in the *Calgary Herald* today about organ and tissue donation. The article noted that there are approximately 440 people in Alberta waiting for transplants while there were only 34 eligible donors from Alberta last year. Such numbers highlight the need for and importance of organ donation. Too many Albertans, both young and old, have passed away because of too few donations.

Once we are no longer living, organ donation is the one last chance to help people. You can give continued life to someone in need. That's a very special gift.

I hope all members of the Assembly and all Albertans continue thinking and talking about organ donation all year long.

### Mental Health Treatment Services for Children

**Mr. Chase:** Losing children. Last night at the invitation of the father of a 15-year-old girl who escaped the custody of her Children and Youth Services caseworker over two weeks ago and has yet to be apprehended, I attended a parent support group which meets in different locations throughout the region each Tuesday night. The PEP group, Parents Empowering Parents, facilitated by a probation officer, included an RCMP officer, who is also volunteering his time and expertise, as well as a diverse group of over 40 individuals consisting of parents, grandparents, recovering youth addicts, some attending by choice, others by court order, and their supporters.

For some it was their first meeting. Others were regular attendees. During the break I was approached by a number of parents anxious to share their children's tragic stories. Common themes of concern emerged such as the inability to report their child as a missing person because they were over 12; the revolving-door effect of short-term PCHADs, which frequently didn't result in secure apprehension, never mind assessment or necessary treatment; the long waiting list for a secure treatment facility; the failure to include or pass along previous family history, psychological assessments, and court intervention orders not only across ministries but internally within a ministry; and the overriding of parental rights by a child regardless of mental illness or addiction, which led one parent to worry that his young daughter was being abandoned to pedophiles, pimps, and pushers.

Another parent stated: "Our system does not work. I know because we started looking for help when our daughter was 12. She is now 18 and has finally agreed to go for treatment." With regard to PCHADs a third parent noted: "The legislation has been changed to provide 10 days from the former five days rehab. However, the powers that be are not providing 10 days of support." A fourth parent recounted the downward spiral of his painkiller-addicted son following a car accident. Numerous uncoordinated health interventions failed to prevent his suicide.

Alberta's most vulnerable children and their parents are far too frequently losing the battle.

**The Speaker:** The hon. Member for Calgary-Mackay.

### Services for Chinese-Canadian Children

**Ms Woo-Paw:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The improving connections between the Chinese community and the Calgary and area child and family services authority steering committee was established by the Minister of Children and Youth Services to help address concerns raised by our Chinese parents whose children have disabilities.

The steering committee works hard to build relationships with the Chinese community and increase their capacity to work with family support for children with disabilities; to develop recommendations on policy, programs, and practices to improve service outcomes; and to remove barriers that limit the best possible support for children and their families. The overall outcome is increased cultural competency for staff and the Calgary child and family service authority. These successful approaches will be used in partnership with other cultural communities in the future.

The good news is that after months of foundational work a pilot project has begun with the hiring of a liaison worker from the Chinese community to work closely with FSCD staff and families in the community. Caseworkers are finding the community liaison worker helpful in helping them to increase their understanding of Chinese families and in assisting families with limited English as

they now have a clearer understanding of the services and resources that they would need to meet the needs of the children with disabilities. Outreach efforts resulted in recruiting volunteer interpreters and aides for families. As you know, Mr. Speaker, the necessary forms can be difficult, and that process has now been made much easier.

Mr. Speaker, it has been a privilege for me to be a member of this important committee. On behalf of the community I thank the Minister of Children and Youth Services, area management and staff, the support and dedication of the Chinese parents, the Chinese Christian Mission of Canada, the Calgary Chinese Community Services Association, the Calgary Chinese Elderly Citizens' Association, and the staff from the Ministry of Culture and Community Spirit.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**The Speaker:** The hon. Member for Calgary-Lougheed.

### Climb and Run for Wilderness

**Mr. Rodney:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Over 1,500 participants participated in the 20th annual AWA Climb and Run for Wilderness, which was held this past Saturday at the Calgary Tower. I was honoured to award the participants with the most climbs. Jane Ebbert recorded an impressive 23 ascents while Jonathan Heinz turned in a whopping 31 trips to the top.

The most experienced climbers were Nessie Hollicky, who will be a youthful 80 years of age on her next birthday, and Richard Guy, who is an energetic 94 years young, who won the Ward Neale memorial prize for the top fundraiser and has an award named after him. The prize for the most climbs by a senior 75 and over went to Bob McPherson, who's 81 years old and had three climbs, while the Phyllis Hart prize for a senior 75 and over, female, went to Val Scholefield, who celebrated seven summits.

Nuno Frago received the outstanding volunteer award, the best Wild Alberta Expo display went to the Ranchlands elementary school, and there were many winners in the mural painting competition. The Overends were named the top fundraising family. Sophia L'Heureux was the youngest climber, and Abigail Hadden was the Babe in a Backpack who raised the most funds.

Mr. Speaker, my wife, Jen, made the climb look easy, and our first-born son, Dawson, who just turned three, took every step of the 802 stairs by himself, and at the top he exclaimed: let's do it again, dad. Our youngest son, Evan, who's just 11 months old, hitched a ride with me this year, but I expect next year he'll be wanting to do the climb all by himself.

Mr. Speaker, I trust all members of the Assembly will join me in applauding all of the participants and organizers of the event.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**The Speaker:** The hon. Member for Grande Prairie-Wapiti.

### Alberta Land Stewardship Legislation

**Mr. Drysdale:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In the past decade our province has experienced extraordinary growth and prosperity. Between 2001 and 2006 we welcomed more than 315,000 new Albertans, and our population continues to increase by 60,000 each year. At this rate it is expected that within the next 15 to 20 years Alberta's population will reach 5 million. That is why it is important to establish a responsible plan to manage the future growth of our province.

Mr. Speaker, through regional plans we will be able to ensure that a balance is struck between economic growth, environmental responsibility, and community objectives. In drafting these plans,

government representatives will continue to conduct extensive consultations with both stakeholders and the public, giving Albertans an opportunity to provide valuable input throughout the process.

Over the course of these consultations we heard concerns regarding the legislation and how it affects private property rights. We also heard a number of requests for clarification, and in response a review of the Alberta Land Stewardship Act was conducted. Bill 10, the Alberta Land Stewardship Amendment Act, 2011, is the result of this review and aims to clarify the original intent of the legislation, which is to plan for the future needs of Albertans while managing growth, protecting the environment, and respecting property rights.

Mr. Speaker, Albertans have told us that they want to see us provide leadership in land-use planning, and the Alberta Land Stewardship Act achieves this goal. The proposed amendments take this legislation further by reaffirming this government's commitment to property rights, fair compensation, and public consultation. I am proud to see the government of Alberta taking these necessary steps to ensure that responsible land-use planning is done in a fair and transparent way.

Thank you.

1:50

### Oral Question Period

**The Speaker:** First Official Opposition main question. The hon. Leader of the Official Opposition.

### Patient Advocacy by Health Professionals

**Dr. Swann:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Dr. Mohammed Al-Ghamdi, an orthopaedic surgeon from Grande Prairie, is unfortunately the latest victim of this government's culture of fear and intimidation. Dr. Al-Ghamdi had his privileges limited, which put his patients at risk. In his legal statement against the former health region and Alberta Health Services he states, quote: the health authorities' failure to provide operating time was accompanied by harassment, intimidation, and discrimination. End quote. To the minister. Dr. Al-Ghamdi's lawsuit was filed February 2010. How can the minister deny a culture of fear and intimidation continues to exist under this government?

**Mr. Zwozdesky:** Mr. Speaker, a statement of claim to state the obvious is not a statement of fact. The hon. member should know that. However, I don't find it unusual that disagreements occur in the medical profession, just like they do in other professions. I don't find it somewhat surprising at all that occasionally there would be claims one way or the other, but I can assure the House that when someone has his or her privileges limited, there must be another side to that story.

**Dr. Swann:** Well, Mr. Speaker, does this minister see any connection between the thousands of physicians and other health professionals now calling for a public inquiry and speaking out against the government's culture of fear and intimidation? Any connection?

**Mr. Zwozdesky:** Mr. Speaker, let's keep this under some sort of a perspective balance here. There are approximately 1.9 million visits to emergency departments per year. There are approximately 37.3 million medical services provided by outstanding doctors in this province every year. Three million Albertans access those services. Of course there will be times when there are misunderstandings. There will be times when people get upset and it even leads to a statement of claim being filed, and that's what's being

talked about. That's not surprising at all. It's unfortunate, but it's not surprising given the volume.

**Dr. Swann:** Mr. Speaker, given that a public inquiry is the only way to demand accountability and open up the questions of a culture of fear and intimidation, how many health professionals is it going to take, Mr. Minister, to move you to a public inquiry? How many?

**Mr. Zwozdesky:** Mr. Speaker, it's not the only way, as the member is alleging. We have a very good and thorough way here with the Health Quality Council. In fact, the Alberta Medical Association fully agreed with the Health Quality Council review of emergency department wait times and of cancer services. They said that they will fully co-operate if this is the only venue available, and it is the only venue available, so let's let this venue complete itself. It will be good, it will be thorough, and it will be made fully public.

**The Speaker:** Second Official Opposition main question. The hon. Leader of the Official Opposition.

#### Nondisclosure Agreements with Physicians

**Dr. Swann:** Dr. Tim Winton, the former head of thoracic surgery and a key piece in the puzzle to finding out why Albertans suffer from the lowest survival rates of lung cancer in the country, has quietly come forward to say that legal protections offered by the Health Quality Council are inadequate. I quote: despite assurances advanced by the Health Quality Council, the Premier, and the health minister, I remain constrained. To the minister: why is the government intent on ignoring Dr. Winton, Dr. McNamee, the AMA, and now the Health Sciences Association, who have all said that they're bound by nondisclosure agreements? They cannot speak to the Health Quality Council.

**Mr. Zwozdesky:** Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member should be reminded that piercing or opening up a nondisclosure agreement is not something that a court or a judge can order either unless, if I understand it correctly, both parties who are subjects of that nondisclosure agreement agree. So it doesn't matter which process you might have in place. I would welcome the Minister of Justice to augment if he wishes.

**Dr. Swann:** It's very true, Mr. Speaker, and you represent one of the parties that can give permission for that.

Dr. Winton said that he cannot discuss his unexpected departure from clinical practice due to confidentiality obligations. End quote. When will the government stop hiding and admit that a public inquiry is the only way for people like Dr. Winton to give their story?

**Mr. Zwozdesky:** Mr. Speaker, quite the opposite. We're encouraging people to come forward with their stories. We're encouraging them to go to the Health Quality Council, where they will be quizzed and interviewed by people who actually know and understand the medical system extremely well and have credibility and reputations, world-renowned reputations. These are the people that are running the Health Quality Council review. Let's give them a chance to do that and to open it up at the end with their public report.

**Dr. Swann:** Well, this is a world-renowned surgeon we're talking about.

I quote: he would welcome the opportunity to provide evidence in an appropriate forum where the root causes of issues can be

evaluated. End quote. Will the government finally concede that a public inquiry is the only way to get at the truth?

**Mr. Zwozdesky:** Mr. Speaker, they have protection of the Alberta Evidence Act, and if they wish further confidentiality, if they want further nondisclosure, they can certainly request that through the process that's there. That's my understanding. The Health Quality Council is there to get to the bottom of some answers and at the same time put forward some recommendations, which we can work on, to improve health outcomes for Albertans today.

**The Speaker:** Third Official Opposition main question. The hon. Member for Calgary-Buffalo.

#### Education Funding

**Mr. Hehr:** Mr. Speaker, I opened the *Calgary Herald* today, and I nearly fell out of my wheelchair as I read that – get this – the Premier is urging the Calgary board of education trustees not to lay off people despite the fact that their budgets have been significantly cut. Really, if this isn't the height of hypocrisy, I don't know what is. To the Minister of Education: given that the CBE is facing a \$61.7 million shortfall because of this government's cuts to grants, where does the minister suggest the CBE find the additional money to fund the staff and teachers?

**Mr. Hancock:** Well, Mr. Speaker, it's not a given that they're facing a \$61.7 million deficit because of this government's budget. In fact, if we had provided simply a 4.54 per cent increase to operating grants to meet the increase in salary, if that's all we had done and not had to actually go and deal with some of the other grant reductions, the targeted grant reductions – I have explained to the House before that when we looked at those, we looked to see whether they were actually doing the job for which they were intended – the Calgary board of education would have been expected to receive about \$28 million. The rest is part of their operation, and they need to look in their operation to see where efficiencies can be made.

**Mr. Hehr:** Oh, efficiencies.

Given that the CBE stated that it will use its reserves and they will still have to lay off hundreds of teachers and support staff, will the minister commit to restoring funding to appropriate levels?

**Mr. Hancock:** Mr. Speaker, "appropriate" is a word that begs a lot of interpretation. What we see, though – and I don't want to get into the budgeting of any particular board – is that on an overarching basis we actually fund the education system in this province quite well. Could we use more resources? Always. But we do very well in Alberta in terms of funding education. What you find if you take a look historically at the Calgary board of education's budget is that each year they have projected that they were going to have a deficit, and each year their operating surplus has grown. This year they're projecting a deficit . . .

**The Speaker:** The hon. member, please.

**Mr. Hehr:** Well, Mr. Speaker, given that yesterday in estimates the minister admitted that we have a \$107 million shortfall in funding in this year's budget, money that we could essentially find in the hon. President of the Treasury Board's couch in his office, can we find that money and restore it to the board so that future generations of students will not be affected?

**Mr. Hancock:** Mr. Speaker, I would be the first to suggest that this is a very difficult fiscal exercise for school boards to go through, but



what they're going through is a process of, first of all, receiving the grant increases that they got for per-student operating grants and for class size initiative but then looking at some areas where, quite frankly, some of those targeted grants provided inequities across the system. There is no good reason, for example, that Calgary should get a \$6 million increase on a relative cost of purchasing grant on a basis that doesn't actually measure the relative costs that each board has. So there has been inequity in the process, and we could use this opportunity to try and fix that inequity.

**The Speaker:** The hon. Member for Fort McMurray-Wood Buffalo.

#### Physician Services in Fort McMurray

**Mr. Boutilier:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Dr. Michel Sauvé is a true champion for Fort McMurray. He's driven by one thing and one thing only, the well-being of patients. He is one of many Alberta doctors bullied by this government's intimidation. He showed great courage by standing up for me when the Premier Boutiliered me for fighting for seniors, and he does the same for his patients every day. How is his work rewarded? With threats and intimidation and obstruction. To the minister of health: will you apologize to my constituents, who depend on Dr. Sauvé's work, for your government's deliberate attempts to silence him?

2:00

**Mr. Zwozdesky:** Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware of any deliberate attempts. What I am aware of is that according to the last patient satisfaction survey that we have, from December, 83 per cent – 83 per cent – of the people who have been in our hospitals reported excellent service by excellent doctors. I will defend them to the best of my ability.

**Mr. Boutilier:** Given, Mr. Speaker, the health minister's refusal to apologize to my constituents for attempting to deprive them of Dr. Sauvé's exemplary care and given that Fort McMurray is still waiting for a long-term care facility, what does the health minister have to say for his government's continued failure to act to improve the community I represent?

**Mr. Zwozdesky:** Mr. Speaker, what I have to say is that we have a very aggressive five-year health action plan that is going to look after issues such as he's talking about regarding continuing care facilities. That's why we've accelerated our plan in that regard. We've built over 1,200 of those spaces in the last year, and we'll be building another 1,000, including some right there in Fort McMurray.

**The Speaker:** The hon. member.

**Mr. Boutilier:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Given Dr. Sauvé's disturbing but typical experience with this government and given that 6,500 Alberta doctors have prescribed a public inquiry to get to the bottom of this government's intimidation, why does the health minister keep refusing to fill their prescription?

**Mr. Zwozdesky:** Mr. Speaker, we fill a lot of prescriptions in this province, to the tune of \$1.2 billion every year, so don't talk to me about filling prescriptions. We have very capable people who do that, and they will continue doing that.

What we should be talking about here is public confidence and teamwork and primary care networking and collaborative decision-making to help build this system into the greatest, best performing health system in Canada. They may not be prepared to do that with those allegations, but we are.

**The Speaker:** The hon. Member for Edmonton-Highlands-Norwood.

#### Cancer Surgery Wait Times

**Mr. Mason:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. This PC government is leading a cover-up. They're withholding important evidence of their failure to listen to health professionals about dangerous wait times for lung cancer surgery. They may also be withholding evidence that patients died unnecessarily as a result. Will the health minister tell Albertans why he and his PC caucus are suppressing key evidence relating to cancer deaths in this province?

**Mr. Zwozdesky:** Mr. Speaker, no one is suppressing any evidence whatsoever. The member who brought this question forward under Motions for Returns did so on or about March 8. Guess what? Four days later we announced that there would be a Health Quality Council review, and it covers exactly what the member is talking about. However, what's not clear yet because no evidence has been provided is if such a list even exists, as is being referred to here, about people dying. We don't see any evidence of that yet. I'm still waiting for that member or some other colleague to provide it if, in fact, it exists at all.

**Mr. Mason:** Mr. Speaker, given that that's breathtaking, that he's got the evidence and won't release it, and given that the PC caucus has voted to deny Albertans access to key evidence and given that the Health Quality Council has no authority to require the government to release it, will the minister admit that the reason he has rejected a full public inquiry is to make sure this evidence never sees the light of day?

**Mr. Zwozdesky:** Mr. Speaker, I don't believe there is such evidence, but I'll leave the benefit of the doubt in the hon. member's hands to produce or to have the people who alleged that it could be produced to produce it.

What I can tell you is that with respect to thoracic surgery, a lot of which, obviously, is related to cancer, I suspect, we've just added three additional dedicated days of thoracic surgery per month in Calgary, and in Edmonton we've just started doing one extra day. That will result in over 1,000 additional thoracic surgeries. That's great news. Let's talk about that.

**Mr. Mason:** Well, given that the minister would love to change the subject and given that this government is suppressing key evidence relating to cancer surgery wait times and deaths of cancer patients and given that the entire Tory caucus was briefed about the situation as early as 1999, will the minister admit that he is covering up evidence to protect his own job and those of the Premier and the entire PC caucus?

**Mr. Zwozdesky:** Mr. Speaker, there's no attempt to cover up anything whatsoever. In fact, the opposite is true. We're trying to ensure that there's a process in place, which there is through the Health Quality Council, to uncover some additional information and to provide even this member with some of it. For example, he may not know that a brand new operating room was just opened in Calgary at Foothills solely for cancer surgery. It will do an extra 500 cancer procedures. Should I repeat that? Five hundred more cancer surgeries at that hospital alone. Fantastic news. Fantastic.

**The Speaker:** The hon. Member for Calgary-Currie.

#### Health Quality Council Review

**Mr. Taylor:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The minister of health's claims that the Health Quality Council can even pretend to properly investigate allegations that health care professionals have been

threatened and intimidated into not advocating for their patients over the last 10-plus years no longer hold water. Everyone from Dr. McNamee to Dr. Winton to the AMA to the Civil Liberties Association to the government's own refusal to release information on thoracic surgery wait-lists and deaths has made it clear that only a public inquiry will get to the bottom of this mess. Does the minister of health actually think that refusal is going to make this thing go away?

**Mr. Zwozdesky:** Mr. Speaker, we have a very thorough, a very independent review, self-designed by the Health Quality Council, under way right now. We don't know where that's going to lead. It may lead into all kinds of nooks and crannies. What we do know is that it deserves a chance to see its way through because it is led by some of the most credible people this province has to offer, including some from outside who are internationally respected for their skills and their abilities. Let's give them a chance to respond.

**Mr. Taylor:** Well, to the same minister: if we can even assume for a moment that his government already looks real bad in the eyes of the public even though none of these allegations are substantiated, why wouldn't he want the opportunity that only a public inquiry will now give for his government to clear its own name?

**Mr. Zwozdesky:** Mr. Speaker, this isn't about clearing anyone's name. This is about getting to the bottom of some allegations that were made in this very House, which the Health Quality Council will explore to the fullest. They're going to get to the bottom, I'm sure, of issues pertaining to cancer wait-lists and if there was an impact of any negative nature on people's health. They're going to get to the bottom of emergency room wait-lists, if any led to unfortunate consequences. Even the AMA has supported both of those. Let's give that a chance to conclude.

**Mr. Taylor:** Mr. Speaker, given this mounting body of circumstantial evidence how bad – how bad – does this have to smell before the minister admits it's fishy enough to call a public inquiry?

**Mr. Zwozdesky:** Mr. Speaker, I can assure you that there's no odour over here. What I can assure you, however, is that excellent care is being given, excellent outcomes are being received.

In response to the issue about lung cancer can I just remind people that Albertans today have the lowest risk of dying from lung cancer anywhere in Canada? Why? Because of outstanding care here, and more of it is on the way. More oncologists are coming, over 800 new doctors in the last three years alone. Fantastic.

**The Speaker:** The hon. Member for Calgary-Hays, followed by the hon. Member for Calgary-McCall.

#### Registry Service Fees for Municipalities

**Mr. Johnston:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My questions are all for the Minister of Service Alberta. Minister, I know that there have been some concerns from police chiefs across the province regarding the new search fee that will have to be paid by municipalities effective the 1st of April for parking tickets, photoradar, and red-light camera data. You met with the Calgary police chief today. Can you tell us the outcome of that meeting?

**The Speaker:** The hon. minister.

**Mrs. Klimchuk:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We had a very productive meeting today with Chief Hanson and members of the RCMP, as well, from across Alberta. We talked about some of the challenges that they are facing as police working with the

municipalities and also the challenges that we're facing in government and explained the reasons for the fee.

**Mr. Johnston:** To the same minister. There seems to be some misconception about this fee to municipalities. Can you explain how this fee will work and why municipalities now have to pay \$15 for these searches?

**The Speaker:** The hon. minister.

**Mrs. Klimchuk:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's really important to note that this is a municipal fee search, not a police fee search. It applies to parking, photoradar, and red-light tickets. At the end of the day we have a system that operates 24 hours a day, seven days a week, called the MOVES system. Police have access to that 24 hours a day. It's very important for us to keep that alive.

**Mr. Johnston:** My final question once again to the minister. You met with Calgary's police chief this morning and commented that it was a productive meeting. What do you see are the next steps for municipalities regarding this issue?

**The Speaker:** The hon. minister.

**Mrs. Klimchuk:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We talked about some of the ways that other municipalities are looking at absorbing some of the costs related to this search fee for the parking and photoradar and red-light cameras. As well, we're working with the Minister of Transportation and looking at ways that we can look at the other fees that are charged for the speeding tickets.

**The Speaker:** The hon. Member for Calgary-McCall, followed by the hon. Member for Whitecourt-Ste. Anne.

#### 2:10 All-terrain Vehicle Safety

**Mr. Kang:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As spring approaches, many Albertans head out to the foothills and other wilderness playgrounds to indulge in their passion, riding all-terrain vehicles. Every year too many Albertans are injured and face lifelong consequences of not wearing a helmet while driving their ATV. To the Minister of Transportation: when will this government do the right thing and require operators and passengers riding all-terrain vehicles to wear protective headgear?

**Mr. Ouellette:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I have to say that this hon. member is on the right track. He's worried about the protection of everyone that rides ATVs, and of course this ministry is the same. But I've got to tell you that before you pass provincial legislation, you have to make sure of all the unintended consequences that could come from the legislation, and that's what we're doing. Good legislation must be effective and enforceable, and we have to make sure we're there before we pass legislation.

**The Speaker:** The hon. member.

**Mr. Kang:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think I have been on the right track for the last three years, and I've been trying to bring the Minister of Transportation onto the right track.

Given that the Minister of Transportation promised in July 2008 to introduce legislation on this subject by the fall of that year or in spring of 2009, how much longer do Albertans have to wait to see the legislation, Mr. Minister?

**Mr. Ouellette:** Mr. Speaker, I have to say that we have no plans to introduce legislation this spring, but as I said before, we're working very hard on being able to get everything done.

I want to also say that all of the different groups, the clubs that belong to off-highway vehicles and stuff, are all working very hard on the education factor, on educating people. Helmets are only one part of safety. There's a full gamut of safety clothing that people can wear.

Let me say one more thing. You must be 14 years of age to ride one of these vehicles by yourself. You need adult supervision, and adults should know . . .

**The Speaker:** The hon. member. [interjection] The hon. member.

**Mr. Kang:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't think that education is doing much to save lives and injuries. Given that of Albertans who died while riding ATVs, 68 per cent were not wearing helmets according to the statistics from the Alberta Centre for Injury Control & Research, why won't the minister do the right thing and introduce his much-promised legislation?

**Mr. Ouellette:** Mr. Speaker, when the time is right, when we have all of the proper stuff in place to be able to enforce it and be effective with it – remember, we can only enforce on public lands, so we also have to look at how we protect people on private lands. I think he's absolutely wrong when he says education doesn't work. Education works very well, and we're going to keep working at that.

**The Speaker:** The hon. Member for Whitecourt-St. Anne, followed by the hon. Member for Edmonton-Riverview.

### Highway 22

**Mr. VanderBurg:** Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Within Whitecourt-St. Anne is highway 22, located south of Mayerthorpe. It's a narrow stretch of highway. There has been lots of pavement damage over the years, and there have been a lot of accidents. My questions today are to the Minister of Transportation. When are you going to do something about this stretch? We've waited too long in our constituency for repairs and maintenance on that highway.

**Mr. Ouellette:** Mr. Speaker, this hon. member is going to be very, very happy to hear that my department plans to widen 9.5 kilometres of highway 22 just south of Mayerthorpe, from north of township road 563A to highway 43. In addition to this widening work, we're also going to repave the section of the roadway north of highway 43. We're going to add some illumination at the junction of highway 43 and complete intersection improvements at highway 647. The highway 22 widening and related upgrades . . .

**The Speaker:** Thank you, hon. minister. I know that I'm excited, too.

**Mr. VanderBurg:** Well, Mr. Speaker, if I had known that answer, I would have asked the question much earlier. Would the minister please tell me some more details? When can we expect all of this to happen?

**Mr. Ouellette:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to tell the hon. member that I'm pleased to say that work on highway 22 will begin this year. In fact, this project was advertised to construction contractors earlier this month. That means that we'll know the exact start and completion dates as well as construction costs as soon as the contact is finalized.

**Mr. VanderBurg:** Well, I think with that answer I'm going to leave my question and let the minister catch his breath.

### Municipal Zoning Exemption for Universities

**Dr. Taft:** Mr. Speaker, my questions are to the Minister of Advanced Education and Technology. In recent years there's been a boom of construction on the University of Alberta's south campus for non-university facilities, and some of these facilities, built with public funds on public lands, will become home venues for professional basketball and already are home venues for professional curling and professional soccer. None of these facilities were covered by municipal zoning. Will the minister agree that legislation should be amended to require facilities built on university campuses that house professional sports franchises to be covered by municipal zoning?

**The Speaker:** The hon. minister.

**Mr. Weadick:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The facility that the member is speaking of is a community facility. It'll be used to house a number of activities for the community and for the postsecondary institution, and ancillary to that, there may be some other agencies that will use that facility as part of what they do. The primary use, from my understanding, is for public uses.

**Dr. Taft:** Again to the same minister, Mr. Speaker: will this minister do the right thing and bring the universities of Alberta, Calgary, and Lethbridge into line with every other postsecondary institution in Alberta and into the 21st century by requiring them to meet municipal zoning standards?

**The Speaker:** The hon. minister.

**Mr. Weadick:** Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I had the privilege this week of meeting with the University of Alberta and their planning people, and they work very, very closely with the municipalities and, in fact, are working through their planning documents as we speak, working with the municipality to try to make sure that what they do meets with the needs of the municipality and the neighbourhoods. We're very confident that under the legislation they have, they're allowed the flexibility to do all of the things that they need to do to provide a good education and as well have the limitations, when doing commercial-type projects, to have to work with the municipality.

**Dr. Taft:** Well, Mr. Speaker, given that there's a double standard here, a real double standard – and I've asked this to the minister repeatedly – will this minister justify why three universities in Alberta are exempt from municipal zoning when every other postsecondary institution, every business, and every citizen in the province are not exempt? Why the double standard?

**The Speaker:** The hon. minister.

**Mr. Weadick:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. They are not exempt from all planning documents. They are exempt from a number of municipal requirements, but where they have commercial activities or commercial operations as part of their campuses, those fall under municipal planning. As I said, those schools do work very closely with their municipalities. They're a great benefit, but it also allows the maintenance of academic freedoms on their campuses.

### Renewable Diesel Fuel

**Mr. McFarland:** Mr. Speaker, on March 28 Alberta announced the implementation of a renewable fuel standard that requires an annual average of 2 per cent renewable diesel in diesel fuel and 5 per cent renewable alcohol in all gasoline sold in Alberta. The new standard

has caused some concern with many constituents who are farmers and truckers about the impact on vehicles and engines. To the Minister of Energy: has your department done any research into the potential impact of the use of these renewable fuels in the engines and equipment of our farm vehicles and trucks?

**Mr. Liepert:** Well, the use of biodiesel in Alberta, Mr. Speaker, is not new. As the member mentioned, our new standard requires an annual average of 2 per cent renewable diesel. The city of Calgary has been using in its fleet since about 2003 a 20 per cent biodiesel blend, and that includes operations in the winter. To my knowledge they haven't caused any issues. Other jurisdictions like Saskatchewan and Manitoba have required renewable fuels for a number of years, so I think that as long as the proper blending and storage practices are followed, there should be no damage to equipment.

**Mr. McFarland:** Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the same minister: what other studies, if any, have been undertaken relative to the consumers that'll be impacted here?

2:20

**Mr. Liepert:** Well, we have some research from the federal government, Mr. Speaker, that indicates the average consumer price will be about an additional \$30 to \$35 per year for gasoline for smaller vehicles. We know from the experience in our neighbouring jurisdictions, in Saskatchewan and Manitoba, that the increased costs have been rather negligible. I think that that has to be balanced off with the fact that a successful bioenergy industry can lead to rural development, economic development opportunities, and provide opportunities in the forestry and the agricultural sectors in the province.

**Mr. McFarland:** The final supplemental. Many of these same farmers, truckers, forestry people have large bulk storage, and they're wanting to know what the long-term effect is of having this bulk storage held for a relatively long period of time.

**Mr. Liepert:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm told that the long-term storage of any fuel creates the potential for deterioration. Other jurisdictions have experienced that as long as, as I mentioned earlier, the proper storage and blending practices are followed, very few problems seem to be encountered. Those include, as an example, minimizing water contamination and keeping storage tanks clean. Overall, I think implementation of the renewable fuel standard will proceed smoothly.

**The Speaker:** The hon. Member for Calgary-Fish Creek, followed by the hon. Member for Edmonton-Centre.

#### Seniors' Pharmaceutical Plan

**Mrs. Forsyth:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Last year the government proposed a seniors' drug plan that would have increased premiums for tens of thousands of Alberta seniors. Like a lot of this government's policy it wasn't thought through beforehand, and it was quickly pulled. While the Minister of Health and Wellness postponed the program indefinitely, seniors want to know if changes are coming soon. To the Minister of Health and Wellness: what is the current status of the seniors' drug plan?

**Mr. Zwozdesky:** It is under review, Mr. Speaker, as promised. It's pending the outcome of some additional work with the ministry of seniors and other ministries that are involved in providing care for seniors.

**The Speaker:** The hon. member.

**Mrs. Forsyth:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Given that seniors are on fixed incomes and are extremely vulnerable to changes in their expenses, does the minister understand the hardship that increased premiums will have on seniors if he moves forward on his proposed new seniors' drug plan?

**Mr. Zwozdesky:** Mr. Speaker, I understand quite well. I've been briefed by the seniors themselves on a few occasions, and I meet with a lot of them in my own constituency, so I understand the sensitivity to this point. That's why it's so important to take a very comprehensive and thorough look at it, and that's what we're doing.

**Mrs. Forsyth:** Well, given that the minister has met with seniors and given that the minister has talked to seniors in his riding, I'm sure as an MLA he'll listen to what they have said.

Given that Alberta seniors are dependent on the prescription drug plan and they need to plan years in advance for their retirement, will the minister end their limbo and maintain the current plan, where seniors pay 30 per cent of each prescription up to a maximum of \$25?

**Mr. Zwozdesky:** Mr. Speaker, we've actually reduced the costs of many drugs – some of the new generic drugs, some of the existing generic drugs – and that has reperculated very well in the community. I think the community has responded very well to that. There may be other things that we could still do to take a look at some of the burdens that seniors and elders might face. That's why we're doing the comprehensive study and review I indicated.

**The Speaker:** The hon. Member for Edmonton-Centre, followed by the hon. Member for Grande Prairie-Wapiti.

#### Artists and Education Program

**Ms Blakeman:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. The well-received, greatly valued artists and education program is once again or maybe still being reviewed. In this department the word has come to mean the same thing as being fitted for concrete shoes, not absolutely the end but looking pretty dire. To the minister of culture. First it was said that the program would be cut this April. Then it was April 2012. What exactly is the minister looking for when reviewing this program?

**Mr. Blakett:** Mr. Speaker, we look for the same thing we look for in any program within our department. Is it efficient? Is it meeting the needs of Albertans? Is it fulfilling the four key points of our cultural policy: creating access, building capacity, fostering excellence, or preserving our cultural industries?

**The Speaker:** The hon. member.

**Ms Blakeman:** Thank you. Back to the same minister: well, given that the minister said that he intended other ministers to fund initiatives of this kind out of their own budgets, can the minister tell us what evidence he has that in this case Alberta Education or perhaps school boards will fund any of the artists and education program?

**Mr. Blakett:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I haven't made a decision. We haven't announced any decision to cut this program last year or this year. The hon. member is making that assumption and creating confusion where there need not be because no decision has

been made. None has been proposed by me before, now, or in the near future.

**The Speaker:** The hon. member.

**Ms Blakeman:** Well, thanks. Actually, the department is creating the confusion. Let me give you an example. Given that inclusion on the artist roster seems to be a necessary part of the eligibility for this program, why has the roster completely disappeared from the website, and why have all references to it in the programming documents been deleted?

**Mr. Blackett:** Mr. Speaker, I can't answer that technical question. I'd have to ask somebody in my department. But what I can tell you is that just last week cheques went out to all the operating arts groups across this province with a 5 per cent increase over what they were expecting to get last year because we made a commitment. Even though there is a reduction of 16 per cent, we said that if we had money at the end of the year, we would rebate it back to them. So the effect is that, actually, cuts were only 11 per cent instead of 16 per cent. I think that's good news.

**The Speaker:** The hon. Member for Grande Prairie-Wapiti, followed by the hon. Member for Lethbridge-East.

#### L'École Parkside

**Mr. Drysdale:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I recently met with the parent advisory council for l'école Parkside school in Grande Prairie. This excellent school is attracting large numbers of students to their high-quality education. At this time the school is already overcrowded, and there are concerns as new enrolment for next fall is significantly higher. To the Minister of Education: what is the plan to provide necessary classroom space for l'école Parkside school?

**The Speaker:** The hon. minister.

**Mr. Hancock:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have appreciated the advocacy of this member with respect to the schools in Grande Prairie and this particular school, and I see he's continuing that. I can tell him that there was a value review process done in Grande Prairie in December. That's a process that we engage in in our department: going into an area, looking at all of the assets in the region, working with the school boards in the community to get a comprehensive view of what is needed in that community now and over the 10-year future horizon. That value review has been done, and we have a good understanding of not only the needs of that school but . . .

**The Speaker:** The hon. member, please.

**Mr. Drysdale:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the same minister: what is the plan for the short-term overcrowding of this school facility?

**Mr. Hancock:** Well, Mr. Speaker, as the Minister of Infrastructure constantly reminds me, we have relocatable modular classrooms, high-performance classrooms, that we have contracted for. We try to ensure that as there are high-pressure areas, we acquire these relocatable, high-performance modular classrooms. We don't have a specific budget for them this year, but we are working with jurisdictions that have space issues. We didn't have a request from Grande Prairie last year for classrooms. We anticipate that we will for this particular school receive that very shortly from them in this year's submission.

**Mr. Drysdale:** Mr. Speaker, what is the minister doing in the long term to address the needs of communities like Grande Prairie and others that are facing space crunches in schools?

**The Speaker:** The hon. minister.

**Mr. Hancock:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. An important question. We recognize that across the province 50 per cent of our schools are over 40 years of age. We expect a hundred thousand new students coming into the system over the next 10 years. Clearly, there has to be a logical, straightforward process both for new schools as well as modernizations of those schools that we're going to need into the future and an ongoing process to maintain the school buildings that we have. That's part of our 10-year plan, and we're working now with the Treasury Board and Infrastructure with respect to alternate financing processes, direct financing processes, and other methodologies to put that plan into effect.

**The Speaker:** The hon. Member for Lethbridge-East, followed by the hon. Member for Calgary-Montrose.

#### Residential Building Inspection Reports

**Ms Pastoor:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The biggest single problem for Albertan homeowners is finding their way through the bureaucratic maze to get reliable information about the home that will be the biggest purchase that they will make in their lives. To the Minister of Municipal Affairs: why has this government made it so convoluted?

**Mr. Goudreau:** Mr. Speaker, I think it's fairly straightforward. There are a series of inspectors that go about to make sure that new homes are constructed according to Alberta safety codes, so if you're buying a new home, it should have received all of the inspection certificates that went along with that. When it comes to buying a used home, then the inspection process falls under Service Alberta.

**The Speaker:** The hon. member.

**Ms Pastoor:** Thank you. Why can't the homeowner get access to records created at taxpayers' expense by safety codes and building codes inspectors? Wouldn't this give the buyer concrete information on which to base their decision?

**Mr. Goudreau:** Mr. Speaker, local municipalities, for the most part, across Alberta are the ones that are accredited to hire inspectors to go about making sure that new properties, new homes are built according to codes. Those reports are available through the municipalities, so individual homebuyers can access those particular reports through their local institutions.

2:30

**Ms Pastoor:** The other thing that happens is that homeowners have to pay for their own inspection reports from businesses that may be licensed but don't even have to be accredited and don't have access to the safety and building code inspection reports either. Buyer beware is really not a fair answer to this problem.

**Mr. Goudreau:** Mr. Speaker, the businesses themselves might not be accredited or the municipalities might not be, but the inspectors have to be accredited. We do give permission to individual municipalities to hire individual accredited inspectors, and they follow the rules accordingly.

**The Speaker:** The hon. Member for Calgary-Montrose, followed by the hon. Member for Edmonton-Gold Bar.

### Education Relative Cost of Purchasing Adjustment

**Mr. Bhullar:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. One of the areas facing a reduction in funding to the Calgary board of education is the relative cost of purchasing adjustment, which is being reduced by almost \$6 million. This funding appears to be meant for the purchasing of goods and services in inflationary times. That \$6 million reduction should not have any impact on the classroom. What can the minister do to ensure that this reduction is limited to purchasing goods and services and not to the classroom?

**Mr. Hancock:** Well, Mr. Speaker, in actual fact most of our funding to school boards is an allocation formula. We don't audit against that allocation formula. So once it gets into the school board's hands, what they do with it is entirely in their purview, and that's as it should be. They should have the flexibility to utilize the funds that they get in the way that is most effective for their schools.

But the hon. member is right. The relative cost of purchasing is an adjustment based on the cost of goods and services and market-basket measures across the province, differentiating from one community to the other based on I think last year it was Red Deer as one. In theory that \$6 million ought to have been given to the board so that they could pay for . . .

**The Speaker:** The hon. member, please.

**Mr. Bhullar:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Given that the ministry does provide caps or guidelines on how much money can be spent on administration or headquarter costs, would the minister consider moving forward and reducing that from 4 per cent to 3 per cent so that more money can be spent on the classroom?

**Mr. Hancock:** Well, again, Mr. Speaker, we can put guidelines in place. We do have a guideline of between 4 to 6 per cent, the 4 per cent for urban boards and up to 6 per cent for rural boards in the event there are higher costs involved. Those are guidelines. We try to work with school boards to ensure that they are within the guidelines. I can tell the House that all school boards complied with that guideline last year. Again, to the greatest extent possible we want to leave in the hands of school boards the decisions about the appropriate allocation of resources and the accountability and transparency to their publics with respect to how . . .

**The Speaker:** The hon. member, please.

**Mr. Bhullar:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My last question to the same minister: Minister, why is it possible for some school jurisdictions like Red Deer to meet the province's class size ratios while others such as Calgary have not?

**Mr. Hancock:** Mr. Speaker, that's an excellent question. It has to do with the differences between the boards in terms of the complexities of the student populations. In some cases it has to do with the configurations of the schools, in some cases it's a matter of how you design a school program within the school, and in some cases it's a question of how many support staff you have, how many people you employ to support teachers in the classrooms as opposed to being directly in the classrooms.

Again, programming decisions have to be made at the local level by the local board. They all get equivalent resources, particularly now that we are doing away with the relative cost of purchasing adjustment, so they should be able to achieve similar guidelines.

**The Speaker:** The hon. Member for Edmonton-Gold Bar, followed by the hon. Member for Calgary-Bow.

### Provincial Budget Projections

**Mr. MacDonald:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Since the provincial budget for this year was finalized, we've seen increases in the price of oil, we've seen a dramatic change in the value of the Canadian dollar in relation to the American dollar, and we also are now experiencing the threat of inflation. I would like to ask the minister in charge, the President of the Treasury Board, for an update on how the provincial budget would be changed if the \$18 increase in the price of oil that we are now experiencing remains for the entire year. How will that change the provincial budget?

**Mr. Snelgrove:** It's a good question, Mr. Speaker, but it's a little too early to start to project what might be if the price of oil stays on a year-long basis. You know, in July of 2008 oil was at \$147 a barrel, by December that had dropped to \$34, and now it's back up to \$110. So it's a constantly moving price. Based on a year, a dollar a barrel would be \$141 million, so if it were up \$10 a barrel for the whole year, it would be \$1.4 billion with regard to the oil.

**The Speaker:** The hon. member.

**Mr. MacDonald:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again to the same minister: how will the change in the value of the Canadian dollar – if we are to remain at 6 cents over what the government had estimated, what will the financial implications for the budget be for the entire year?

**Mr. Snelgrove:** Once again, that's one of the risks we have when our currency fluctuates. In March of 2009, Mr. Speaker, the dollar was at about 78 cents. It has climbed steadily now. I think today it is around \$1.05. For every 1 cent it's \$154 million, so if that were to continue through the entire year at 6 cents, it would be very close to a billion-dollar effect on our budget.

**The Speaker:** The hon. member.

**Mr. MacDonald:** Thank you. Again to the same minister: given that the fiscal plan for the budget indicates that the government anticipates consumer inflation to remain subdued, is the government taking any efforts now? That prediction, I think, is obviously not accurate. What steps is the government taking to protect against the rise in inflation?

**Mr. Snelgrove:** Mr. Speaker, we're a part of the economy; we're certainly not the whole economy. We do see areas in North America and Canada that are showing signs of increased activity. Unfortunately, it will be difficult for the federal government to monitor inflation when we have areas in central Canada lagging and Alberta's very heated economy. You know, we work with our federal ministers to try and make sure that we can handle it. One of the tools they have used is interest rate increases, and I think that would be very dangerous for our economy, too.

**The Speaker:** The hon. Member for Calgary-Bow, followed by the hon. Member for Edmonton-Ellerslie.

### Homelessness Initiative

**Ms DeLong:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Today the Salvation Army in Calgary announced that the Booth Centre shelter will be closing permanently. My questions are for the Minister of Housing and Urban Affairs. How could the minister allow the

closure of a shelter in Calgary when Calgary still struggles with a large homeless population?

**The Speaker:** The hon. minister.

**Mr. Denis:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'm very happy actually to get this question today because this is a very good news story, not just for homeless Albertans but for all Albertans. Over the last two years the homeless population in Calgary has gone down by about 16 per cent, and as demand goes down, we will look at closing these facilities in favour of more Housing First or permanent housing operations, which is the difference between managing the problem and ending it.

**The Speaker:** The hon. member.

**Ms DeLong:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. My next question to the same minister: with a large homeless population and hundreds of vulnerable Albertans needing a home, how does this minister rationalize the reduction of shelter beds as a good deal for the homeless and homeless providers?

**The Speaker:** The hon. minister.

**Mr. Denis:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. As I mentioned, the reduction in shelter spaces simply reflects a reduced need for them. The funding can be redirected to what we refer to as outreach supports. Outreach supports don't go to a bureaucrat or a paper pusher; they go to an actual local facility who helps an individual homeless person with the issues that he or she may be encountering. These issues are as diverse as the people themselves.

Our ultimate goal is for emergency shelters to be used just for short-term assistance only. In fact, our goal is that within 21 days of someone presenting themselves to a shelter, we can transition them into permanent housing. This is part of the 10-year plan to end homelessness, Mr. Speaker.

**The Speaker:** The hon. member.

**Ms DeLong:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. With fewer shelter beds what plans are in place should the homeless numbers spike, as they did a few years ago?

**The Speaker:** The hon. minister.

**Mr. Denis:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It's my belief – and it's the belief of the entire department – that there should always be a place for someone in need of shelter. I've actually met with some people who have been through Alberta who have experienced homeless programs, the pluses and minuses. The best simply is the Housing First approach, providing permanent housing for those who are in need as opposed to Band-Aid solutions and constructing more shelters.

I remember that years ago the city of Calgary, very well intentioned, constructed a temporary homeless shelter on 16th and Centre Street. That was temporary, Mr. Speaker. This is a permanent solution.

**The Speaker:** The hon. Member for Edmonton-Ellerslie.

#### 2:40 Online Access to Historical Resources

**Mr. Bhardwaj:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. School children need to learn the lessons of our past, of our history. Unfortunately, not all of them live in a big city where there are museums for them to go to. Can the Minister of Culture and

Community Spirit please tell us how school children across the province can access information on our history and the world's history even when they are in small communities?

**The Speaker:** The hon. minister.

**Mr. Blackett:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thankfully, because Alberta has the SuperNet with 20 gigabit connectivity, our museums and historic sites can provide online learning resources for children of all ages all across the province. For example, the Royal Alberta Museum, Head-Smashed-In Buffalo Jump, Royal Tyrrell Museum, and Frank Slide Interpretive Centre use that technology to make themselves available.

Since 2006 the Royal Tyrrell Museum has provided more than 24,000 students that participate in over 850 programs. This is not only for students in Alberta, Mr. Speaker, but for Canada and across the world.

**The Speaker:** The hon. member.

**Mr. Bhardwaj:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. My next question to the same minister: how does your ministry support the use of technology to reach Albertans?

**Mr. Blackett:** Well, other than using the SuperNet, that I mentioned, Mr. Speaker, we also use social media such as Facebook and Twitter. We use that in our museums and historic sites to reach out to Albertans and provide educational and informational resources. We also have designated a co-ordinator with the priority of expanding content on historic sites and museum websites, working to enhance our presence and our content. We have Culture in High Gear, which is at [www.culture.alberta.ca/highgear](http://www.culture.alberta.ca/highgear).

**The Speaker:** Hon. members, 19 members were recognized today. There were 111 questions and responses.

In two seconds from now we'll continue with the Routine.

### Members' Statements

*(continued)*

**The Speaker:** The hon. Member for Calgary-Glenmore.

### Integrity in Government

**Mr. Hinman:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Throughout this health care crisis and the government's continued refusal to call a public inquiry, it has become clear that after 40 years this PC Party has developed a sense of entitlement, an attitude that permeates almost every aspect of public life in Alberta. Whether you're in business, the nonprofit sector, health care, or municipal government, you know that this government demands support or uses intimidation if necessary. Small businesses hope that there's not another royalty review, regulatory barrier, fee increase, or land-use framework around the corner that may threaten everything they have worked for. When these things do happen, businesses and people who were not affected fail to speak up partly because they know that this government is vindictive.

Health care professionals have been facing the same culture of intimidation. Our party and others have been bringing forward shocking evidence of intimidation in our health care system. The government continues to discount stories of world-class practitioners being silenced or run out of the province and refuses to allow a public inquiry despite everyone else, including the AMA, demanding it. When a minister of this government says, "There is

no proof," they sound like gangsters, confident that they'll get off because no one is willing to testify.

If you're a municipal politician or a nonprofit association, you know that this government does not give out grants solely on the basis of merit but that you need to honour the PC monarchs with gifts and praise in order to be in their good graces. So when a minister's tour comes to visit your council, bow and smile, and don't tell them what you really think. When the Premier or local MLA invites you to a fundraiser, it's really more of a summons than an invitation.

Well, Albertans are realizing that this is out of control. Fortunately, unlike monarchies and dictatorships, Albertans will have their chance soon to vote for a party that respects them and truly understands that people aren't supposed to honour the government but that the government must honour and respect the people and the law.

### Tabling Returns and Reports

**The Speaker:** The hon. Member for Edmonton-Decore.

**Mrs. Sarich:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This afternoon I have two tablings. I would like to table in my first one the requisite number of copies of the program for the 2011 excellence in teaching awards for April 12 held in Edmonton.

Mr. Speaker, my second tabling is the 2011 excellence in teaching awards program for April 14, 2011, held in Calgary.

Mr. Speaker, a heartfelt special thank you to all of the semifinalist recipients this year for the hard work that they're doing to make a difference in the lives of children and youth and their learning.

**The Speaker:** The hon. Member for Calgary-Buffalo.

**Mr. Hehr:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am tabling e-mails from the following individuals who are concerned with funding cuts to education and the negative impact it will have on teachers and students: Susan Ridley, Colleen Brooks, Brenda England, Jim Clay, and Beth Riley.

Thank you very much.

**The Speaker:** The hon. Member for Calgary-Varsity.

**Mr. Chase:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am tabling three sets today.

The first comes from individuals opposed to the devastation about to be brought upon the Castle-Crown wilderness area through clear-cutting. These individuals consist of Kathleen Cordeiro, Randall Anderson, Jaclyn Williams, Stuart Neal, Rosemary Fuller, Foster Mah, Victoria Lee, Tim Bloomfield, Isaiah Archer, Rita Wong, Mary Day, Peggy Wendzina, Robert Eagleson, Alison Luco, Georgina Pina, Ruth Gentry, Jennifer Froese, Evelyn Arnett, Barb Walker, Kata Jhukoutaiy, Chris Sandstra, Deb Lake, Carl Anderson, Magda Kok, and Maira Mayen.

The next tabling is on behalf of the hon. Leader of the Opposition and is an article in today's *Edmonton Journal* by Sheila Pratt indicating that Dr. Tim Winton will not appear before the Health Quality Council because of concerns about repercussions.

My second set of tablings on behalf of the leader is a statement of claim from Dr. Al-Ghamdi related to the threats of intimidation.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

### Tablings to the Clerk

**The Clerk:** I wish to advise the House that the following documents were deposited with the office of Clerk. On behalf of the

hon. Mr. Snelgrove, Minister of Finance and Enterprise, the Credit Union Deposit Guarantee Corporation 2010 annual report.

On behalf of the hon. Mr. Ouellette, Minister of Transportation, responses to questions raised by Mr. Kang, hon. Member for Calgary-McCall; Mr. Lund, hon. Member for Rocky Mountain House; and Mr. Anderson, hon. Member for Airdrie-Chestermere, on March 23, 2011, Department of Transportation main estimates debate.

On behalf of Mr. VanderBurg, hon. Member for Whitecourt-St. Anne, a letter dated April 15, 2011, from Bernard Lord, president and CEO, Canadian Wireless Telecommunications Association, to Mr. VanderBurg, hon. Member for Whitecourt-St. Anne, regarding Bill 8, the Missing Persons Act.

On behalf of Dr. Sherman, the hon. Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark, e-mail correspondence sent and received by Dr. Sherman, hon. Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark, between February 22 and 23, 2010, regarding agendas for health care related meetings on February 24, 2010; e-mail correspondence sent and received by Dr. Sherman, hon. Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark, between October 8 and 12, 2010, regarding the state of emergency medical services; e-mail correspondence sent and received by Dr. Sherman, hon. Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark, between October 16 and 17, 2010, regarding the need to address the state of emergency medical services; e-mail correspondence sent and received by Dr. Sherman, hon. Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark, between October 17 and 18, 2010, regarding the issue of patients blocking acute-care beds; an e-mail message dated October 25, 2010, from Dr. John Cowell to hon. Mr. Zwodzesky, Minister of Health and Wellness, and Dr. Sherman, hon. Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark, regarding patients blocking acute-care beds with attached related charts prepared by the Health Quality Council of Alberta; a document dated October 12, 2010, entitled TIP2 ED Wait Time Drivers, prepared by Alberta Health Services; an undated document entitled Improving Quality and Outcomes, the Next Steps with an attached presentation dated September 22, 2010, entitled Proposal for Emergency Care Quality & Outcomes, both prepared by the Department of Health, England.

**The Speaker:** Well, hon. members, it's now April 20, and we've arrived at the last department estimate to be reviewed, the department you've all waited for, Infrastructure. You should be out of here by 10 to 6 this afternoon. You'll reconvene at 7:30, not 6:30.

2:50

### Orders of the Day

#### Committee of Supply

[Mr. Cao in the chair]

**The Chair:** The chair would like to call the Committee of Supply to order.

### Main Estimates 2011-12

#### Infrastructure

**The Chair:** Before I call on the hon. minister, I would like just to remind us about the procedure here. The minister will have 10 minutes for introductions and statements, and then one hour for the Official Opposition with the minister. The next 20 minutes would be for the third party and the minister, and the next 20 minutes would be for the fourth party and the minister. Then the following 20 minutes would be for any other party in the Assembly, including independent members. From there, we have 20 minutes each for any other member with the minister.

Now I would like to call on the minister for 10 minutes. The hon. Minister of Infrastructure.



**Mr. Danyluk:** Well, thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I'm indeed pleased to be here this afternoon to discuss the 2011-2012 estimates for the Ministry of Infrastructure. With me here today are my deputy minister, Barry Day, who is seated on my left, and Diane Dalgleish, the assistant deputy minister of capital programs. I also have John Enns, the assistant deputy minister of properties. I have Alan Humphries, who is the assistant deputy minister of policy and corporate support, as well as Rod Skura, the executive director of the finance branch, and also Ethan Bayne, my executive assistant.

Mr. Chairman, I'd also like to acknowledge members that we have in the gallery: first of all, Christine Henry, who is the deputy minister's job shadower today – and what a perfect opportunity to see the ministry at work – and also Arthur Arruda, Nicole Lerner, Irene Lui, Cheryl Mackenzie, Donan Carrier, and Mary-Anne Young. I'd just like to acknowledge all of you in the gallery.

Mr. Chairman, our government will invest \$17.6 billion in capital projects across Alberta over the next three years, including \$6.6 billion this year. This investment is vital to address Alberta's needs today and to prepare our province for continuing growth and prosperity in the future. This is the right time to invest in infrastructure. It is not the time to delay or defer. It enables us to keep our skilled workforce employed here in Alberta. It enables us to take advantage of lower costs and avoid competing with the private sector for scarce resources. Most importantly, it ensures that we have facilities in place to provide services for our growing population. We have a responsibility to Albertans to have the necessary public infrastructure in place and to be prepared for the next economic boom.

We also have an opportunity, Mr. Chairman. We all know that infrastructure is an economic enabler. It promotes investment and attracts skilled labour to our province. It is also an enabler for innovation and research, the foundation of our future prosperity. Infrastructure is crucial for our quality of life and for the sustainability of our communities. Can I say that again? Infrastructure is crucial for our quality of life and for the sustainability of our communities. That is why our Premier's vision for Alberta to have the most advanced infrastructure in North America. Having the most advanced infrastructure means infrastructure that is innovative and cost-effective, designs that are adaptable and flexible to incorporate changing technology and changing needs, buildings that are sustainable because they are well maintained and energy efficient, facilities that are multipurpose and designed to meet the needs of the whole community.

3:00

Mr. Chairman, advanced infrastructure is all about designing, constructing, and maintaining buildings that work for health professionals, for teachers, for students, for those who work in them and the Albertans who depend on them every day. In support of this vision Budget 2011 allocates \$1.4 billion to the Ministry of Infrastructure for program expense and over \$390 million for capital investment. The ministry is responsible for managing, operating, and maintaining the inventory of government facilities across the province. This includes over 1,500 owned buildings and more than 6 million square feet of leased space. The ministry also manages land acquisition for major projects and the Calgary-Edmonton transportation utility corridor. Infrastructure is responsible for delivering major health capital projects as well as government-owned facilities such as courthouses, remand centres, and museums. We also work closely with our partners to help build schools, post-secondary facilities, and seniors' accommodations.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to highlight some of the major capital projects currently under way in the ministry. The total

budget for health facilities infrastructure and maintenance is over \$870 million. This includes major facilities currently under construction such as the south Calgary health centre and the Edmonton clinic. It also includes new and expanded facilities under way across the province such as the Red Deer cancer centre and the Strathcona community hospital. We are moving forward with design and site preparation for recently announced new hospitals in Grande Prairie, High Prairie, and Edson as well as major redevelopments and expansions in Medicine Hat and Lethbridge. We have also begun planning and design work for major expansions to the cancer treatment facilities in Calgary and Edmonton. I want to emphasize that all of these health projects are on track and moving forward.

We also have major projects under way to help promote safe communities in Alberta. The new Edmonton Remand Centre will be the largest correctional facility in Canada. It has state-of-the-art safety and security features as well as environmentally friendly design. The Solicitor General's staff will begin training at a facility late this year, and it will be fully operational by 2012. We are moving ahead with construction of the public safety and law enforcement training centre in Fort Macleod. It will include a driving track, indoor and outdoor shooting ranges, scenario training rooms as well as classroom and residential space. The facility will provide training to law enforcement, corrections, and public security personnel from across the province and beyond. An important part of building strong communities in Alberta is having public facilities and public spaces that all Albertans can be proud of.

September 3, 2012, will mark the 100th anniversary of the Alberta Legislature Building. Over the next 18 months many enhancements will be made to the interior and exterior of the Legislature Building and grounds in preparation for the centennial.

The redevelopment of the historic federal building will be completed, including a new public plaza with fountains, green space, a skating rink, and a public art area. The public parkade and plaza will be completed by the fall of 2012.

Recently Premier Stelmach announced that a new comprehensive Royal Alberta Museum will be constructed in downtown Edmonton. By taking advantage of this opportunity, we will be able to deliver a larger, more accessible museum on a single site. This resolves the challenges of building on an existing constrained site or constructing two separate and costly museums. The new Royal Alberta Museum will feature expanded art gallery space to house both the natural and human history collections. [A timer sounded]

**The Chair:** Hon. minister . . .

**Mr. Danyluk:** Would you like me to finish? Okay. I can finish? Okay.

**The Chair:** Hon. minister, you have 10 minutes according to the rules, and then you can have 20 minutes with the hon. member.

**Mr. Danyluk:** The hon. member said that I could continue.

**The Chair:** Hon. member, now we have the opposition.

**Mr. Kang:** Well, not to continue for the next two hours. I know you like to talk.

**The Chair:** Hon. member, there's a process here.

**Mr. Kang:** Okay. Sure. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** The next hour is for the Official Opposition, and it's in chunks of 20 minutes each. My question to you is: do you wish

to combine the 20 minutes back and forth with the minister or have 10 minutes?

**Mr. Kang:** We will go back and forth.

**The Chair:** Back and forth?

**Mr. Kang:** Yeah.

**The Chair:** All right. Then go ahead. The first 20 minutes.

**Mr. Kang:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'd like to thank the minister. As always, he tries to be very informative, trying to paint rosy pictures about all of those things. As we know, we are going through a recession. The Canadian economy is supposed to grow by about 2.9 per cent, and our economy this year probably will grow by 3.6 per cent, I think. Let's pray to God that, you know, the next boom is on the horizon and we are going to see population growth. Today a gentleman said that, you know, we will be growing by 60,000 a year. That's going to be big growth for the coming years.

The 1993 cutbacks: we keep going back to those because we haven't recovered from them yet. We are already way, way behind, and we have lots of catching up to do. The next boom with the population growth is going to put lots of strain on our infrastructure. We're going to need more bridges, we're going to need more roads, and we're going to need more schools and more hospitals as our population ages. You know, the question we should be asking ourselves is: how are we going to keep up? With all the money we are putting into infrastructure, I think we are just staying flat here. When I look at the detailed capital plan, sure, expense and equipment is up 80 per cent, \$630 million higher than last year's forecast. It shows an increase in health facilities support and capital expenses of 5 per cent, or \$18 million, higher than last year's forecast amount.

When I look at the capital plan detail by category, it is not bad for municipal infrastructure support. It's pretty level, you know, going up a little bit in the provincial highways network. It's going down and going up. Health facilities and equipment funding is going down. Schools: going down. When I look at all the details about postsecondary facilities, community facilities, it's pretty level. Waste-water management: the funding is going down. Housing is going down, and government facilities and other capital is going down.

When we look at that – and the minister was talking about, you know, having the best infrastructure in the province – when the funding is going down, I don't know how we're going to keep up with the demand, with the population growth and all that. The issue here is that it doesn't look like we will be able to catch up, you know, before the next time we have another downturn. You were saying, sir, that the contracts are coming in 40 per cent cheaper. This is the time that we should have everything in place. We shouldn't have this funding on a sliding scale; we should have the funding on a rising scale so that we could catch up.

**3:10**

I will start with the significant challenges: economic climate, aging infrastructure, demographic shifts. That's in the business plan, pages 173, 174. Those are last year's challenges, sir. My question is: why were the significant challenges not listed in this year's budget? Is aging infrastructure still considered a significant challenge? What would this year's significant challenges be? These are last year's challenges.

**The Chair:** The hon. minister.

**Mr. Danyluk:** Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I'm just going to try to answer the questions or the comments as presented. I very much acknowledge the hon. member's comments that I paint a rosy picture of things. I want to say to you that we are very fortunate to be Albertans. We are very fortunate to live in Alberta. Living in Alberta, you know, being part of this government and being part of this House I would say to you, has afforded Albertans many opportunities.

You talk about this province growing by 3.6 per cent, of course, the population growth. The comments made were "catch up" and "build now" and "we are building". Well, Mr. Chairman, that's exactly what's happening. That's why we have the sustainability fund, so that we can take out some of the valleys and cut off some of the hills so that we have some sustainability over an extended period of time. We are building for the future. We are investing \$17.6 billion over three years. The time to build is now because the costs are less and we need to ensure that the people that are here are employed.

In fact, when we talk about building today, we are building to be prepared for the future, if we go to the discussion of the Edmonton clinic, so that we have some shelf space. That shelf space is not just building a space with nothing to be put in it. It is about space that will be necessary in the future. It's all about planning, hon. member. That's important because we need to plan not only for today; we need to plan for the future.

Mr. Chairman, there were comments also about the economic climate and the aging infrastructure. That's why we are building today. That's why we are investing. These are buildings that Albertans use every day. They represent an investment of Albertans' tax dollars. They need to be maintained to protect our investment. Deferred maintenance for '10-11 was \$340 million, and we will continue to increase that with current funding levels.

Mr. Chairman, we have already put additional maintenance into schools, into health care facilities, and into colleges. The current funding levels, the comment about them not being enough. Well, this is the time to increase some of the funding to maintain buildings and our investment into the future. You talked about and I think the question very much pertained to the aging facilities that we have, that it is not enough funding and is a significant challenge. Well, you know, I want to say to you, hon. member, that it is a challenge. As you heard me say earlier, we have over 1,500 buildings in this province, and this government has been very responsible for future needs. In building today and investing in infrastructure today, the construction costs are less, the skilled labour is still available, and it keeps Albertans working.

Mr. Chairman, it is very imperative that we're building for tomorrow with buildings that adapt to community needs and spaces that can adapt easily to changing technology. Let me give you a little bit of an example. In Grande Prairie we are building a hospital. That hospital has 200 acute-care beds, but we also have a cancer institute that is placed in that hospital to serve all of the northern Alberta region. This is critical to addressing the needs of that community.

Also, it is very important that we have a postsecondary institution attached to that hospital so that not only do we have an opportunity for youth to be able to go to the college, which is just across the road, and take advantage of being able to get an education in a medical field; across the road is the practicum side. That is about planning. That is about opportunity for that area, and it is a building, a facility, that is not for today but is for today and into the future. We don't build a hospital in rural Alberta every second year. This facility needs to meet the needs of the future.

Mr. Chairman, I can also say to you that for the buildings we are building, the cancer institute in Calgary, we need to look at

meeting today's needs, but when we had discussions with the oncologists, it was critical to meet today's needs but to look into the future and try to adapt to the changing technology and be able to be flexible into the future. That is critical as well. That is using some of the facilities that need to be, if I can call it, upgraded or modernized. That's exactly what's taking place at the Foothills and the Tom Baker facilities.

Also, it is about building new facilities. The south Calgary campus is a facility that is going to address the needs of a very strong, growing population. Sometimes when you talk about maintenance, the maintenance of older buildings is one thing, but sometimes building new very much addresses some of the needs that we have in the old.

My ministry is very cognizant of the needs, the demands of the increasing population that we have in this province and is trying to address the growth that you're experiencing in your area, in your city as well as some of the increasingly populated areas like Airdrie, Chestermere, Fort McMurray, Beaumont. Mr. Chairman, we need to provide the services that are necessary for communities, and that's what we're trying to do.

I think I sort of answered the questions that you had, but if you wanted me to go on, I could. Or maybe you have another question that you would like to ask.

3:20

**The Chair:** The hon. member.

**Mr. Kang:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. How did you know that I live in Chestermere? That was just a good guess on your part.

You talked about the south Calgary hospital. You know, if we hadn't waited that long, when we imploded the General, we could have built another brand new hospital there for \$118 million at that time, but we waited that long, and that's why it's costing us \$1.4 billion. I don't call that very good planning, sir.

Okay. Coming back to the 2009-12 business plan, page 182, to increase capacity for evaluation and analysis of public-private partnership opportunities. It goes on to say:

Albertans look to government for direction and innovative ways to provide the best possible and most cost effective public infrastructure. The government has a high level of interest in developing infrastructure through partnerships to provide Albertans with much needed facilities. Where feasible and cost effective, the Ministry will continue to pursue alternative procurement options for new facilities in partnership with Treasury Board and other ministries.

My question. There is still no action on strategic priority 2 regarding P3s and action to increase capacity for evaluation and analysis of public-private partnerships. How are we to know that they are saving money?

**Mr. Danyluk:** First of all, if I can, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member has suggested that we have waited too long, that we have not done things in a hurry or in a method that would be conducive to getting things done right away for the populations that we have. Well, I want to say to you that this province spends more money per capita on investment in infrastructure than any other province.

Also, what happens is that there's criticism coming from individuals that sit very close to you that would suggest we're spending too much money, that would suggest we should lengthen things out, that we should hold back a substantive amount of money.

I want to say to you that we have to look at things in Infrastructure and as government so that we are prepared not only for the immediate future but for projects in the distant future. I also want to say that, I mean, sometimes to take a global ball or a futuristic approach is much easier from your side of the House because you know what happens? The same substantiation doesn't have to happen.

We have to look at what's taking place in Fort McMurray, the growth that's happening in Fort McMurray, the growth that's happening in subdivisions, and we have to be ready, and we have to try to do the best that we can. But I will also tell you that we cannot have buildings built all over without the support for operation. I don't think it would be prudent as government and opposition to support an increase in taxation. This government does not believe in that. This government is a representation of the people, and we build infrastructure for the people.

The other question came about P3s and innovative ways to build infrastructure. Well, first of all, Mr. Chairman, I think it's very important to bring to the member's attention that we just don't wake up in the morning and say: "You know what? I think what we should do is build a P3." It doesn't work that way. Every project that we have we analyze, and we analyze it to the degree that we look at: what is the best way to build a project? What is the most cost-efficient way to build that project? Would it fit into a P3 program? Would it fit into a design-build? Would it fit into a traditional form of building? We need to provide schools, hospitals in the best deliverable that we possibly can. That is why we very much take an intricate look at what we need to do.

Mr. Chairman, when we look at P3s, as was mentioned, it's very important that we also look at, if we have decided to go into a partnership program, what it will offer to the people of Alberta or the people of the area.

**The Chair:** The first 20 minutes have been checked. You can continue in the second 20 minutes, please.

**Mr. Danyluk:** Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. The question was asked: why would you consider a partnership? Well, we'd consider a partnership for a number of reasons, but one of the reasons is, of course, that there is a fixed cost. There's a schedule. We have a 30-year warranty on the facility itself. It is a value for money that was confirmed, in fact, by the Auditor General. It was clearly stated that a P3, whether it be in Transportation – and the Minister of Transportation is here today. When we look at partnerships and transportation, there is value for money. That's exactly how we look at it for buildings.

I want to say also, if I can, Mr. Chairman, that this province has received awards for the way we deliver partnership programs. In fact, we received the gold award for procurement in 2010 from the Canadian Council for Public-Private Partnerships for successful implementation of a project, and that is: ahead of time and on budget. The Institute of Public Administration of Canada: innovation management. I could go on and on because as I look down, we've received many awards for our accomplishments.

I will let you continue.

**The Chair:** The hon. member.

**Mr. Kang:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. Okay. I'm coming back to the same question again. Increase capacity for evaluation and analysis of public-private partnership, P3, opportunities is no longer one of the minister's priorities. Why not? I'm coming back to that strategic priority 2, business plan 2009-12, page 182. This year's strategic plan, page 78, says:

Integrate design excellence principles, including value management, standard facility designs, procurement best practices, such as public-private partnerships where appropriate, to ensure that Albertans receive cost effective, innovative, sustainable and well designed infrastructure.

Are any of those projects planned for this year? What exactly makes a P3 appropriate? You talk about P3s quite a lot, you know.

I've got more questions on P3s.

**Mr. Danyluk:** Could you just repeat the last one, please?

**Mr. Kang:** What exactly makes P3s appropriate? You know, if you've got a P3 project, what makes it so favourable instead of doing it outright by the government?

3:30

**Mr. Danyluk:** Mr. Chairman, I'm going to answer the question again for the hon. member. I want to say to you – and I think it has to be extremely clear – as I said before, that we just don't come to work one day and say: "You know what? We don't have a P3 project. We don't have any." We analyze them on a regular basis. Okay? Any time that we're doing a project, we'll analyze them.

I'm going to say to you again that when we look at projects, we choose the method that makes the most sense for each project. Partnerships are well suited for certain types of large capital projects. I want to say to you that we have individuals and companies that come to us and say: you know, I just wanted you to know that if you did this just a little bit different, I think we can make P3s better. You know what? We listen to people because we work very closely with industry. Presently, if I can tell you, hon. member, we are exploring ways of using them on smaller projects.

How can we implement a partnership on a smaller project? One of the points that was brought forward to us on winning the last gold award was that we were so innovative and flexible in order to have the delivery that accommodates not only the people or the individuals that use the facility at the end but makes sure that we, again, have the economics of scale. So we're doing that. The benefits are being on time – that's your question – on budget, and the private sector carries the financial risk. There's also, as I said to you before, the 30-year warranty, the private-sector guarantees that are put in place for maintenance and capital renewal for 30 years.

Mr. Chairman, the private partners are rigorously evaluated to ensure value for money. I need to stress at the end that partnerships are still a priority in our business plan, and our goal is to use them when necessary or when it's favourable. But at the end of the day, hon. member, we need to build buildings that work. We need to build buildings that work for the clients, whether they be the students or whether they be the patients or whether they be the doctors and the nurses or whether they be the teachers and, most importantly, for the communities. We need to build buildings that work, that are able to adapt to the community's needs.

With that, if I can, hon. member, that is why we have to look at different ways of building them as well.

**The Chair:** The hon. member.

**Mr. Kang:** Thank you, sir. You talked a bit about the criteria, but you didn't really say much about what criteria you used to evaluate these projects. You know, is one of the criteria just to save money? A 30-year grant: what kinds of protections do we have if the company was to walk away from the project? Can we expect to see P3 debt for schools, hospitals? What is the minister anticipating that P3 debt to be? You keep on talking about it. What ongoing measures are used to evaluate the cost-effectiveness and feasibility of P3 financing compared with public financing?

I think I'll stop there.

**The Chair:** The hon. minister.

**Mr. Danyluk:** Well, I can say to the hon. member that the value-for-money reports are available online on the Education website. That demonstrates the value for money in, let's say, the ASAP 1 and 2 projects. You can look those up and do the comparisons.

Your question about ensuring that they don't walk away from the project, I think, is one of them. You have to remember that they

have paid for the project. They have built the project. They have invested in the project. They have signed the criteria for the project. We pay them back on a yearly basis. So we sort of have the upper hand because if those conditions aren't met, we don't pay.

The last question, if I can bother you again? Sorry.

**Mr. Kang:** What ongoing measures are used to evaluate cost-effectiveness and feasibility of P3 financing compared with public financing?

**Mr. Danyluk:** The ongoing measures are the value-for-money reports, that are available online. That's the project. What do we do on an ongoing basis? We have the criteria in place. We have the contract in place. We have all of the specifications in place that are necessary. Is there some flexibility? We had a little bit of a challenge in interpretation, and the groups got together and said: you know, I think we need to have more flexibility in this particular area. There was no problem with that. We did it. We assigned it. The question, of course, was: is this going to cost more money for the person who built it? Is it going to be economically of need? Really, it wasn't, and we just needed to get that formulated. We do that consultation on a regular basis.

I want to say that the office of the Attorney General has examined all the agreements of the partnerships. We've also done a value-for-money. That not only gives you an indication for the immediate, but it also gives you an indication into the future that we are getting the best value for Albertans for the money.

**Mr. Kang:** What proposals, if any, have been submitted by Transportation for this method of financing for the future? That was one question.

As the recession has effectively lowered construction costs – you brag about that, too, that we are building now 40 per cent cheaper – and labour demand has relatively subsided, what implications do these changes have on current P3 contracts that have been signed or contracts that are still being negotiated?

One more?

**Mr. Danyluk:** Sure.

**Mr. Kang:** Will the ministry still pursue P3 contracts in this low-interest environment? What is the interest rate you are currently paying for the P3 projects? Can you give a few examples, please?

**Mr. Danyluk:** First of all, Mr. Chairman, we choose the method that makes the most sense. I want to also tell you that that is one of the criteria. That is one of the marks, if I can say that, in regard to making the right choice. But I also want to say to you that we do a comparison, a legitimate comparison that is held with Justice. We do a comparison, a conventional build that is held in Justice, to make sure that what we're doing does make sense and has value. Do you understand what I'm saying?

You just don't say: "Okay. You know what? A partnership is the way we're going to go. We're saying that it's the best way to build it, and we're saying that it has value for money." Well, you know, we can say it, and it really doesn't mean anything. This is the partnership over here, and on this side we have the conventional build. In a conventional build we have to work alongside the partnership. It's given to Justice. It's opened up at the same time so that there's a comparison to make sure that there is value.

That's how we arrived at the value, if I can say, when we looked at ASAP 2, where we had over \$90 million in savings because we looked at one aspect and then looked at the other aspect, which we turned in. Justice opened up the conventional build, and we basically said: "You know what? We've saved \$90 million on this."

3:40

**The Chair:** Hon. minister, continue.

**Mr. Danyluk:** Sorry. I didn't answer when you asked about the interest rate. I need to say to you that the partnership proponent carries, really, its own interest rate because what it is is the value of the project. It is the cost of the project. It is the value of the project to the end of its life, and we do the same thing as well for the conventional build. Right? So it's the cost. You know, whoever the investor is says: "Well, you know what? I need so much percentage or so many dollars in investment." That could be one. That could be two. That could be three. But at the same time what does take place is that at the end of the day it works out to: who's got the best bid? So whatever their calculations are inside, it's really their business. It's to deliver.

I need to say as well that partnerships are also reviewed by an independent committee outside of government, and that's the advisory committee on alternate financing, that reviews and advises. I guess the best way to describe it is that if you go to a store to buy a product and if you buy a grapefruit, for instance, does it matter what the cost of the interest is for building that store? What you want to make sure is that you're getting the most value from the cost of that grapefruit and what it's going to give you. No differently than if you go and compare it to different stores, it's the value of the product.

**Mr. Kang:** I'm just asking you to give me some examples of what interest rate we are paying on any P3 projects, but you're not coming clear on that. You know, you can say: "Okay. On Stoney Trail this is what it is, and we are paying 3 or 4 per cent interest over 30 years or 40 years or 50 years." That's what I was getting at. I was not looking at the end product.

**Mr. Danyluk:** Well, I'm sure the hon. Minister of Transportation had his estimates a little while ago. I'm not sure exactly how to message it, and you're saying: come clean. I tried to come clean with the grapefruit. It didn't work, right? So let me try to come clean with a service that might be provided for you. I'm going a different way. It's a service to provide your children with an education. Just take that as a kind of a global comment.

Really, what you want to make sure is that your child is provided education, provided the best possible education that you can have. There are all kinds of details in all of the contracts that take place, whether it's the teachers' contracts, whether it's the interest on the building, on what it cost, whether it's the pavement coming up, whether it's the books. At the end of the day you care about the education of your child. Well, we want to make sure that we have value for the money for the project, whether it be a building or whether it be a school.

I want to say that partners submit bids that have a life expectancy or a lifespan or a life of 30 years. That includes interest. What happens is that they may go to the bank of Hong Kong, or they may go to the Toronto-Dominion Bank, or wherever they get the money. At the end of the day interest is only one component. We know that the Auditor General agrees that we get value for money, and that's what it's all about. It's making sure that you get the product.

**Mr. Kang:** Sure, we need value for the money, but I'm saying: how much is it going to cost us? We are passing this debt on to future generations.

There are always costs. You know, if I send my kid for education, there's a cost involved, and I know how much it's going to cost me. Here we are not knowing the cost, you know, what inter-

est we are paying on those P3 projects, and how much the bill will be at the end of the day. That's where I'm coming from. So far we haven't heard anywhere and we haven't read what interest we are paying and how much the end cost will be.

**Mr. Danyluk:** Well, thank you very much, hon. member, but I will say to you that we know exactly what it's going to cost. We know exactly. That's one of the beauties of the partnership. We know what the cost is going to be. In fact, the 30-year warranty of the building gives us a more secure cost than if we had an independent build, if I can call it that, because we build, and we can estimate. We know we have a guarantee.

I don't want to say it in this way, but when we build a building, it sort of comes without a guarantee. Building a building in a partnership comes with a guarantee that they'll maintain it for 30 years. So you know the cost. You know what the warranty is going to be. You know what that building is going to cost you for 30 years. You know the shape that that building is going to be in in 30 years.

**Mr. Kang:** You haven't said how much that costs. You are saying: "We know the cost. We know the cost." I want to know the cost, okay?

Anyway, I'll move on.

**Mr. Danyluk:** Which building? I can tell you the cost.

**Mr. Kang:** Give me the cost on Stoney Trail.

**Mr. Danyluk:** We don't do highways. Which building? ASAP 1 with 18 schools . . .

**Mr. Kang:** Okay. We will get back to that. What interest are we paying?

**Mr. Danyluk:** ASAP 1 with 18 schools: I can tell you exactly what that costs, what it costs per year and what it costs to build.

**The Chair:** Hon. member, we are on the last 20 minutes now.

**Mr. Kang:** Okay. We want to have fun.

You touched on the Auditor General's April 2010 recommendation on page 24, recommendation 2, that the Department of Infrastructure follow their own guidance to publish a value-for-money report upon entering into public-private partnership agreements. Will this ministry make public the value-for-money reports for the previous P3s that this government has committed to, and if not, why not? Will this minister commit to conducting value-for-money reports for all future P3s and publicly disclose the reports, increasing transparency? You touched on that a little bit.

**Mr. Danyluk:** I just want to say to you that we have. In fact, it is on the Education website. It is online. We have shown what that is. If I can, hon. member, I want to say to you that we saved between \$90 million and \$100 million. I want to stress to you that when we did the comparison that we had to hand in, it showed that we saved \$100 million on ASAP 1, which was 18 schools.

I'm just trying to find the exact number of what we saved on ASAP 2. Forty million dollars in savings on ASAP 2, which really was four high schools and 10 regular schools.

**The Chair:** The hon. member.

**Mr. Kang:** Thank you. Infrastructure quality: when we are comparing the performance measures here . . .

**Mr. Sandhu:** This is the right guy to ask for a tunnel.

3:50

**Mr. Kang:** I'll get to that. By the end of the day he will be having the cheque for the airport tunnel.

Okay. So here, performance measures, when we compare them, the performance measure for goal 1 of the business plan, page 78, related to the quality of public infrastructure in Alberta hospitals, schools, and postsecondary institutions, there has only been a small improvement in the number of hospitals and schools that are in poor condition. The definitions of good, fair, and poor haven't been included in the 2010-13 business plan. In previous years that information has been included, and taken from the last year's business plan is the following definition of poor condition infrastructure: poor condition "means upgrading is required to comply with minimum codes or standards and deterioration has reached the point where major repairs or replacement are necessary." That was a footnote on page 184 of the 2009-12 business plan. And . . .

**Mr. Danyluk:** While you're looking, I can just tell you that the health facilities' physical condition, yes, we have included them. The ministry is targeting an increase in the health facilities in good condition as many new health projects are nearing completion and the investments in maintenance will have an impact. Also, in school facilities the percentage of school facilities in good condition is targeted to increase with the completion of the 32 ASAP 1 and ASAP 2 schools and other school projects. Lastly, Mr. Chairman, the percentage of facilities space in poor condition is targeted to continue to decrease due to the government's continued investment in maintenance in postsecondary education.

**Mr. Kang:** Okay. So getting back to that, infrastructure that doesn't meet minimum codes poses potential risks to people's health and safety. What specific risks has the minister identified for infrastructure that is in poor condition? By letting infrastructure deteriorate to a poor condition, how much more money does it cost to bring the buildings up to good condition?

**Mr. Danyluk:** Well, first of all, Mr. Chairman, I'm not exactly sure of the question: how much more it costs to bring them into condition? I guess I can say that when we talk about the overall averages, there are less in poor condition and more in the higher end condition because we've built new schools. I think I said that at the beginning, you know, that when we look at buildings, when we have an increase of new buildings, that changes some of the values. But buildings needing maintenance aren't necessarily unsafe. It basically is a discussion – the lower rating could simply mean a boiler or a roof that is due for replacement.

We have a maintenance schedule. If the life expectancy of a roof is 25 years and we haven't had to change that roof and it's not leaking and maybe we don't change it because it looks in good shape, it does bring it into a different category because that roof has been there a longer time. It doesn't necessarily mean it's leaking. It doesn't necessarily mean it's unsafe. It means that the average life expectancy is probably now shorter because it's had a longer period.

I want to stress to you also, hon. member, that we haven't changed anything in regard to how we assess the buildings themselves. I can tell you that what we have done, if I can call it a change in the process, is we are now on a more regulated schedule, you know, as to when we're looking. So that might be part of what you're asking.

**Mr. Kang:** So when we are not maintaining buildings and, you know, they become in poor condition in the first place – right? – it would be more cost-effective to keep them maintained properly so

that they don't become poor. Health care facilities in poor condition: that is expected to go from 6 to 5 per cent. It's going to go down 1 per cent, health facilities, from 6 to 5, in poor condition. How much would it cost to replace this 1 per cent loss? The target reflects the anticipated condition of facilities assuming current funding levels. How much more would it cost to start improving facilities? What would it take in terms of time and money to get to only 4 per cent of poor quality infrastructure across the board?

**Mr. Danyluk:** Let me just maybe answer in this way. I believe that we should spend approximately 1 per cent of our inventory on maintenance. Just a hypothetical figure. That's how we think we should do it. The challenge is that we can't necessarily do that every year. I'm going to say two things to you as well. Sometimes we have buildings that are in good condition, but they may not have the value.

Let me use this building as an example – okay? – if I can. I think this building is in good condition.

**An Hon. Member:** Minus the two light bulbs.

**Mr. Danyluk:** Minus the two light bulbs.

But I want to say to you that the roof, the terracotta, is ending its lifespan, so we're going to have to change that terracotta. All of a sudden when we do an analysis, what happens is that the roof on this facility can make this building be in a less advantaged position. It still is very functional. I think the maintenance staff do a terrific job. We're sitting here. It's a good building – two light bulbs burnt, but we did replace them – but the roof may bring that down, right?

At the same time what happens is that we do have buildings that have exceeded their lifespans, buildings that when we look at them and we look at the condition of the buildings, even though they're safe, they do not enter into the criteria of spending money to ensure that they stay on our inventory. That happens, and it should happen because if we have a building that's going to cost more than 75 per cent, if I can use the general rule of thumb, to fix it, then sometimes it might be more beneficial to build a new building because we can address some of the LEED issues. We can do the efficiencies of the power and the efficiencies of the heating system and the air exchange and what it provides.

So at the end of the day we don't have buildings that I would consider unsafe. We have buildings that may need a scheduled – and let me repeat that – a scheduled maintenance.

**Mr. Kang:** So in your opinion there are no more leaky roofs in schools and other buildings. That's what you're getting at?

Okay. My second question – we have those leaky roofs – given the extraordinary amount of money we've spent on capital in recent years, isn't it concerning that we are only just staying flat on these measures? Shouldn't there be dramatic improvements on these measures? Why hasn't it happened? Why isn't the ministry being more ambitious on this?

**Mr. Danyluk:** Well, I would suggest to you that if you look at the number of buildings that the province owns – and I earlier stated that we own over 1,500 buildings, and we try to continue to maintain them on what I would consider a needs basis. When you do that, yes, in the particular situation of schools, when you have new schools coming into play, coming into the inventory, if you have 18 schools or 34 schools that come into that spectrum, you know, it does make a difference. But it's not going to make a dramatic difference.

4:00

We don't replace 10 buildings in our inventory in one year. We're doing work on the federal building, which is, basically, one major building in our inventory of buildings. I mean, it doesn't have a dramatic effect. It does have a dramatic effect when you're comparing building number one, which is the federal building, against a building where the staff may be. That is a major impact. But if you look at all of the buildings we have, it's not so many.

I hope I've made myself clear. I think that the more buildings that we do have, if you do replace and modernize and fix up those individual buildings, it doesn't dramatically increase the numbers, but it does increase them.

**Mr. Kang:** I think you answered the question somewhat.

Seeing as it isn't projected to happen over the next three years, when can Albertans expect to see these dollars paying off in a shrinking proportion of poor infrastructure?

**Mr. Danyluk:** Well, when we do a projection into the coming future, if I can call it that, there is the condition – and let me use roofs because we've been using roofs – that if we have a number of roofs that have gone from the 24- to the 25- and the 26-year state, then what ends up happening is that we know that's going to be an increase. We also know some of the buildings that we're replacing or we're modernizing will lift that percentage up. At the end of the day where we are is: that's how our projections are made, and that's how we also look at budgets for the future.

**The Chair:** The hon. member.

**Mr. Kang:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. The \$1.56 billion budgeted for health facilities, schools, and postsecondary education for 2011-12, capital plan 2011 to '14, page 91. In last year's business plan, strategy line 1.10, page 176, there would be a new delivery model for major health facilities. What exactly was the change in the delivery model? What led to the change? What benefits will there be with this change in how these facilities are designed, procured, constructed, and commissioned? Will this new delivery model be expanded to include other types of facilities such as schools, post-secondary education?

Is that too many? Should I stop?

**Mr. Danyluk:** Well, no. It's not that it's too many. I think the question is a good question because exactly what did happen is that Alberta Health Services maintained the responsibility of the infrastructure part of health delivery. What did take place is that we in Infrastructure got the major health facilities. That's what is expressed as a different delivery model. Infrastructure is now delivering those projects.

What is the delivery model difference? I can go on with that if you want. I would just lightly say that previously when the government gave money for new hospitals, hospitals were delivered using a construction management approach, and the contractor and the designer were hired at the same time. When they figured out what that cost was going to be, that's really what the government delivered. Now under Infrastructure we basically look at the design, and because it's within our own department, not in Alberta Health Services, which is arm's length away, we kind of pay as we build, to the contractors.

In simplistic terms previously we used to pay for the project. They managed it. They built it. They took care of it. Now we build it, and we allocate so much funding every year for the building of that building, and we pay according to how it's built.

**The Chair:** Hon. member, you have two minutes.

**Mr. Kang:** Oh, okay.

Will this new delivery model be expanded to include everything?

**Mr. Danyluk:** Well, I mean, it's not my decision whether I will take over the responsibility of schools and postsecondary education, but it will be by cabinet and caucus and Treasury Board. That decision will be made, and that decision will be made in the future. I can't comment on what's going to happen. I can just tell you right now that we are in charge of the major facility builds in health care.

I'm very disappointed that you only have a couple minutes left because I sure wanted to address that tunnel.

**Mr. Kang:** Thank you. Okay. Well, I'll come back. Thank you.

**The Chair:** You still have a minute.

**Mr. Kang:** Okay. What new facilities will this health facilities support provide?

**Mr. Danyluk:** Well, I think I mentioned some of the new facilities that are being built and are going to be built. There's, of course, the \$520 million facility in Grande Prairie, the \$108 million facility in Edson, the some \$90 million facility in High Prairie. We also have the upgrades to facilities. We're spending, I think, some \$300 million on the south Calgary campus. We're also doing the cancer treatment at the Foothills and the Tom Baker. We're building the cancer treatment in Lethbridge, the cancer treatment in Red Deer, and adding cancer treatment in Grande Prairie.

**The Chair:** Thank you, hon. minister. The first hour has been completed.

Now we are going to the third-party opposition, with 20 minutes. Hon. Member for Calgary-Glenmore, do you wish to combine or have 10 minutes?

**Mr. Hinman:** Yes. We'll go back and forth.

**The Chair:** Back and forth.

**Mr. Hinman:** Well, thank you, Mr. Chair. Yeah, this is a fast three-hour marathon, and it goes by like that, but we need a triathlon that goes all day.

**Mr. Danyluk:** I'm ready.

**Mr. Hinman:** Anyway, it's disappointing that the government gets so much time and the opposition so little. That's my big complaint. I appreciate the time here. [interjections] Yes, it's so critical that you need it.

I listened to the minister speak so eloquently at the start, talking about the importance of infrastructure buildings. I totally agree with him. What has made this province so great is the infrastructure that we have: buildings, transportation, pipelines. We all know and understand that it's critical, but I have to take exception when the minister goes on to say that someone sitting close to this colleague says that we need to slow it down. I want to talk a little bit about that and get the minister's reaction. Seventeen point six billion dollars in three years is more than anywhere else in the country, which the minister stated. We need infrastructure.

There are lots of arguments on what our infrastructure deficit is, but the question is: how are we going to go forward to do this? To just look at three years and spend all of our sustainability savings, spend everything, and then all of a sudden hit the wall again is a real problem for us in the Wildrose. We think that it needs to be measured. We need to realize that we've got 10 years and 20 years

down the road, not just three. Then where are we going to get the funding to carry on?

There's no question that this is like the tortoise and the hare. This government has been behaving like the hare, and the tortoise is going to win, or might I say that the taxpayers are going to lose because of the incredible amount of money that is being spent and not being spent wisely. We can look at some of the situations in the south Calgary hospital and those areas. Billions-plus are being spent, and again there's no plan or capability to manage or staff those hospitals to come on stream.

**An Hon. Member:** How do you know?

**Mr. Hinman:** I've asked them, and they said that. I've met with them. [interjection] Well, that's the problem with this government. They deny, duck, dodge, but the truth is still out there. I kind of get a kick out of the comments that they make, that there's no proof. There's no proof when there's lots. There's the truth. It isn't necessary if you can prove it or not. It can take great minds like Einstein years and years to have proof to demonstrate the truth. This government is running into a brick wall. The definition of insanity is to do the same things over and over again and expect a different outcome, and this is what they're guilty of, Mr. Chair.

4:10

To sum up, the problem that's going on with the bidding is that this government continues – and I'd like to ask the question: how many construction management fees are in place for all of the billions that you're spending versus lump-sum bids or full bids? You put the bids out, but they're always management fee bids, and we don't know what the costs are. The south Calgary hospital is a classic example, where we've gone from \$700 million to, I've been told, \$1.3 billion.

P3s. You talk about those, and you say how much you save, and that's great, but I want to point out to the minister that you were actually told by the Auditor General that you misstated and overstated the amount being saved by \$20 million on some schools, and he said that you needed to correct that. I could pull the article because you look a little bit dazed about that one.

I want to go back to the analogy and your answer. Most people I know that lease a car, whether it's three years or five years, lease it with the intent of turning it back and walking away from it and entering a new lease. The only people I know who end up buying those leases out buy them because they broke the contract and there's going to be a high penalty. I appreciate what you're doing with those P3s, but the parameters that you put out in the bids are looking for a 30-year. It's ours after we've leased it, but we take it back. It's in our ownership, is my understanding, after 30 years. Then what's the cost? We want 50- or 60- or 100-year buildings, not 30 years, and then it's gone. It's much like a vehicle, in my mind, that after three years isn't worthless. We're paying a premium price when you look at it over the full life cycle, which perhaps is 60 years on these buildings.

A few other questions that you can look up as you go. Major concerns on the amount of announcements on what goes forward. You've reannounced the Fort Macleod police college. We're very concerned on whether or not you're really going to go ahead and whether you have the money. And a specific question, because you've referred to these, on the number of schools that you're building, again, where the Auditor General has said that you've overstated the savings. Could you please explain how areas like Airdrie, Fort McMurray, and Beaumont got bumped out of the priority infrastructure list? They're at the top now, but you've built over 20 schools in areas when, by all estimates that we look

at, they were far more necessary in those areas, and they weren't built. Again, the south Calgary hospital is a classic example of delay, delay, delay coming in there.

I also have a question on the Fort McMurray truck stop. I mean, in the oil and gas industry they put requests for proposals to the government on where they want to buy leases and whatnot. That request went in. Why was the land 10 miles away put up for bid when the developer, again looking at where it's most economically based, was picked? Maybe this is under Transportation, but I thought it might be Infrastructure. Why was that land not released for that truck stop that was needed up there and asked for?

Again, I have to comment, you know, on the Grande Prairie hospital. That was announced so many times. I mean, it's like the boy who cries wolf, but finally it's coming to fruition. Why do you make so many announcements and not follow through and then break these promises?

I'm just going to ask about the spending sprees. Why do you really think that spending this huge amount of money – in three years from now we're going to be out of money. Are we going to stop building infrastructure because we have it all done? It's not even comprehensible to think that this \$18 billion over three years is going to build our infrastructure. What's the plan then?

In 2003 when Infrastructure and Transportation were cut back, it was devastating to the industry. You cut the spending in half, we built up the capacity, it was reduced, and then when you started spending a lot again, all of a sudden the bids came in at an exorbitant amount because there wasn't the capacity in the industry to match the bids that were going out. I would like to see a 10-year projection that states which ones are first, prioritized, and if there's more money each year because the bids are good, this just slides in and the bids go on.

Why do you not have a public list of the infrastructure, whether it's schools, hospitals, courthouses, remand centres? Why aren't they prioritized for Albertans to see and say, "Yeah, that is a good point"? When there's no list, we kind of forget. When it's in front of us, we're focused and say: "Oh, oh. We've got to do this. We've got to do that." But when the list is there to say: "Well, no. Airdrie school, we need to do it. The remand centre in Edmonton, we need to do it" – why do you continue to refuse to put out that prioritized list and show industry that we're going to have this sustainable funding of \$4 billion or \$5 billion for 10 years that they can count on?

[Mr. Mitzel in the chair]

Prior to 2003 industry people looked at it, and they had a life cycle of five years for lots of their equipment. After 2006 a lot of the industry people I talked to put the life cycle of one year into the bids because they don't know whether this government is going to continue on next year. If they're going to buy equipment, they've got to pay for it this year. That hasn't been in taxpayers' best interests.

I'll let you answer a few of those, and then we'll go on.

**The Deputy Chair:** The hon. minister.

**Mr. Danyluk:** Thank you very much. Let me just say to you that I truly cannot even believe what I'm hearing. You know, I've got to work backwards on you a little bit. I'm not sure what developers or contractors or construction companies you're talking to that said that they don't have security. Well, let me say to you, hon. member, that they do have security. That's what the sustainability fund is used for, and that's what adds stability to the projects that we have.



You just talked about one year, and now you're talking about three years. Hon. member, let's just be realistic about this. What happens is that we have committed to put \$17.6 billion into infrastructure over three years. What happened last year? Did we just about have the same amount of money that was put into the three years upcoming? Yes, we did. That is stability.

You say that there's no plan. There's a 20-year plan. There's a 20-year plan that looks into the future at what's necessary. Also, I need to say to you that I'm going to ask you just to – you know, you have an assistant with you. Get her to look under Education. She'll see the projects that have been approved. Also, go onto the medical side. She'll also find the projects that have been approved.

Mr. Chairman, at the beginning there was discussion about so much time for us and so little time for them. [interjections] Well, I think that the questions that were asked I'm trying to answer as quickly as I can if they don't interject.

Seventeen point six billion dollars committed to infrastructure over the next 10 years: I have to ask the hon. member again where he wants me to cut. I mean, you know where the projects are. You have said in question period – I'm not sure if it was you, but your party has said very clearly that they want to cut \$2.4 billion.

**An Hon. Member:** How much?

**Mr. Danyluk:** Two point four billion dollars. Is that adding to stability of construction? I would suggest to you: no, it isn't.

You talked about deny and dodge, and I don't know what the hell that is. Also, when you talk about proof and looking at projects that we have – and the projects, of course, are the partnership projects – for every project we do a comparison to a conventional build. We look at that comparison to see if that funding is there.

I don't think we want a different outcome. I'm not sure where this comes through as far as the different outcome, but I'm going to go to the management fee cost that you talked about. Management fees: you know, these projects are publicly tendered to get the best value, and we choose the best delivery method based on value. That money is out there.

4:20

You know what? I will acknowledge what you had stated about the Auditor General saying that we overstated \$20 million as he looked. We looked through the books, our comparison and how it was done, and we agree. But he also said that at the end of the day it still had excellent value. It was just the way that we had done things. So that's true.

One point. We don't own them. The private sector does not own the schools; they're owned by the school boards. They will be turned over to the school boards. If I can say it, they're owned by the boards. The method of building is for the boards. They are not leases. The partnerships are not leases. Write that down in bold letters. After 30 years the facility is returned in good condition.

You made mention of announcing a project and not doing a project. Well, we announced Grande Prairie. Grande Prairie is being built. The testing has been done. We have the design. They are looking at building the facility. They're already having consultations with the physicians, with the town, and also the college. That consultation is already happening. Edson: same thing. We own the land in Grande Prairie and Edson. High Prairie is signed.

The other day, not yesterday but the day before, I was at Fort Macleod having discussions about the water line and where the water line was going to come onto the property. We're building that project.

The cancer institute in Lethbridge: being built. Red Deer: being built. Grande Prairie: adding on to the Grande Prairie hospital.

The education facilities to accommodate education in Grande Prairie: being built.

I know that you said a project that was announced and not built. I sort of recall you having a question about the federal building and stopping its building. Is that security for contractors and construction? No. You were going to stop the federal building halfway through its delivery. That's not planning. That's just reaction, immediate reaction.

Tell me about a project that was announced and is not being built. I'm sorry; I don't know of any. Was there a change in focus and direction with the Royal Alberta Museum? Yes, there was because we needed a facility that was going to accommodate all the needs that were necessary, and that gave us opportunity.

Schools that we have said we're going to build. Guess what? We're building them. Now, you also say: well, Airdrie isn't getting this, and Airdrie didn't get that. You know, I want to say to you: Beaumont. There are needs for those communities: Fort McMurray, Beaumont, Airdrie, Chestermere, Red Deer, Calgary, Edmonton. Yes, there are. Are we looking at it, and are we going to build those schools? Yes, we will. I don't know how you can stand up one day and say that we're going to cut and we're going to take away and then: yes, we've got to build schools. You have to have a philosophical direction that has some commonality. You cannot go in opposite directions.

What else do I have here? Fort McMurray, the land that you talked about in Fort McMurray: 980 acres in the south land that have been released. The municipality and the business community are very pleased. Also, it's an open and competitive process, not based on one proposal. It was a bid system. What was one of the criteria? To get it done as quickly as possible. It's there, trying to accommodate the commercial needs.

Okay. I still don't know about the hospital delays. I'm not sure where they are, and I don't know where you mean, right? But I know that what we are building, of course, are continuing builds. Right before Christmas we met with the oncologists. That process maybe took a little longer. We met with the oncologists from Edmonton, and we met with the oncologists from Calgary. The discussion around the table was that we deal not only with the issues of the day but look to the future of what's necessary, how we accommodate the technology that may be coming into the future to try to address the needs of individuals. That's exactly what the . . .

**The Deputy Chair:** Hon. minister, Standing Order 59.02(1) states that 10 minutes are allowed. I'll give the hon. Member for Calgary-Glenmore an opportunity now.

**Mr. Hinman:** Thanks, Mr. Chair. Always entertaining to watch the minister go on like that, but it's quite obvious that the point that this government fails to understand – and I don't see it; I don't think they ever will, but they will get replaced if they don't – is the priority list. Even such things as the federal building we wouldn't have started because we had other things that were more important. A 20-year plan is only a wish unless it's written down. This is a wish of this government to go forward.

What we want is a prioritized list. What are the top five priorities for schools? What are the top priorities for a hospital? They don't understand. How many ministers – and this is why I think they rotate through them, so they can reannounce. Whether it's the Fort Macleod police station, the Grande Prairie hospital, Mr. Chair, these have been announced, like, three different times. They go back and make a big announcement that it's coming forward. It's a joke.

The management fee. They're putting the bid out. There's a management fee for building these buildings when what they need is a lump-sum bid. All of the subcontractors, Mr. Chair, have to give solid bids on what they're going to do, whether it's for the steel, the concrete, the windows. They're all locked in. But we have a management fee that balloons and is out of control and isn't in the taxpayers' best interests. Yes, three firms put in a management fee bid. But how about a lump-sum, solid bid just like the subcontractors, where they're forced to actually answer that they're going to put \$5,000 worth of steel in and \$5,000 worth of windows and \$5,000 of electrical. All of the subcontractors are forced to do that, yet this government continually goes – and he didn't answer. How many of them are management fee versus the full fee?

**The Deputy Chair:** We're now into the next set of 20 minutes, and I'd like to call the hon. Member for Edmonton-Highlands-Norwood.

**Mr. Danyluk:** Can I answer his?

**The Deputy Chair:** The 20 minutes is up between you two.

Member for Edmonton-Highlands-Norwood, you will be sharing the 20 minutes between you and the minister?

**Mr. Mason:** We'll see.

**The Deputy Chair:** Okay. All right.

**Mr. Mason:** This guy could talk the leg off a chair, Mr. Chairman. Wow, was that ever productive, the last 20 minutes.

I want to just ask basically the same question, and that is: why is there not a priority list for capital projects? When I was with the city of Edmonton, we considered a capital plan. It was a three-year plan. We considered it on an annual basis, and it had a list of projects ranked by priority. Those projects were available for everyone to see, so I know it's possible to do this and actually have the individual projects ranked.

It was then possible for us on council to say: you know, in our opinion this hockey arena is more important than this expansion to the water treatment plant. We could move, by motion, to move one project above the line, and then another one would drop below the line, or we could of course find more money. So I'd really ask the minister why we can't do that here in this province. I know it's very possible.

**Mr. Danyluk:** Okay. You know, I'm not exactly sure where to start, but let me just start that the government has a 20-year plan – okay? – and the purpose of the 20-year plan is to be able to try to predict some of the development, what is going to happen, some of the revenues, some of the expenses that are going to be necessary to accommodate a population that may be growing and may not.

4:30

We're very much a commodity-based province. Whether it be agriculture or oil and gas, it's commodity-based, right? Let us talk about your theory for just a second, okay? Your theory is a priority list. So we have a priority list that says: "You know what? Edmonton should get this many schools, and Calgary should get this many schools." That's traditionally what has happened. We've had traditionally an agriculture, manufacture base with a little bit of oil and gas.

Oh. All of a sudden Calgary increases to the point of 35,000 people a year. Airdrie has increased in population over five years to the tune of, I think, 80 per cent. Chestermere has increased 50 per cent. Beaumont. So what happens? We say that we had a

priority list, and we've got to change it because right now we can't use that because we have areas that we have to accommodate. Grande Prairie has grown exponentially, if I can say the word, and that is why we needed the health facility that's there, and that's why we're building it.

Why are we building the cancer institutes in Lethbridge and in Red Deer and in Grande Prairie? Because the populations have grown there, and it gives a service to the people that are there. To say to you that there is a plan, well, we can't exactly predict where people are going to live. Did you know that Airdrie was going to grow to the extent that it did?

**Mr. Mason:** I did, Mr. Minister.

**Mr. Danyluk:** You did know that?

**Mr. Mason:** Yes. I had a pretty good idea that it was.

The point the minister is completely missing in his rather unnecessarily lengthy response is the fact that priority plans change on a regular basis. There are always changes made to priority plans on an annual basis. It's part of the budgeting process. The question still remains: why is this Legislature not dealing with the 20-year plan that the minister is talking about? [Mr. Danyluk rose] I'm not done. I'm not letting you back up again.

You know, it is a legitimate question. Why does this Legislature not deal with the 20-year plan that this minister keeps referring to?

Now, I want to express a concern here, and it has to do with the willingness of your office to provide our staff with background information. When it comes to other ministers' offices, we're able to get background information so that we don't have to waste time in this Assembly asking just for basic background information. We've been unable to get the co-operation from your office, and I think it's unfortunate, Mr. Minister. It's clear from the answers that this isn't about having a back and forth about actual information that's relevant to the budget. It's about the minister standing up and making bombastic speeches about whatever he wants to talk about and wasting our time, frankly.

I want to talk a little bit about P3 schools. The Auditor General said that there was room to improve transparency to the public by publishing a value-for-money report. He raised concern about the process by which the ministry estimated maintenance costs, which was clear and not made available. He found that estimates for risk evaluations were not validated against actual experience from other school projects. Risk evaluations were based on opinions of staff and anecdotal evidence. I'd like to ask about that.

The question is that the ministry has created its own guideline, saying that they must publish a value-for-money report upon signing a P3 agreement. I'd like to know why that's not done. The AG report found that no report was published with respect to this, and the department did not demonstrate in a transparent manner how value for money was obtained. Finally, it was published in June 2010. The question is: why, really, did it take so long?

Another 10 schools have been scheduled to open in 2012 using the P3 model. In April 2010 the government signed an agreement with the B2L partnership to design, build, finance, and maintain 10 new schools for a 30-year term in Edmonton and the Calgary region as B2L partnership had the lowest bid price. The government claims the costs of doing the same work through traditional delivery methods would be \$358 million, so they're claiming a savings of \$105 million. Yet, again, no value-for-money report has been published despite the contract already being signed.

With an agreement in place the minister is required to release the reasoning and justification for using a P3 model, but the minister hasn't released it. Why not? I'd like to know whether the

public cost comparators have been released for the ASAP 2 school projects, and I'd like to know about key information about P3 contracts having been withheld from the public for proprietary reasons. The government claims that it is saving money by pursuing P3 projects, but when the public is not allowed to see the information, it backs it up. So there's a lack of transparency. I'd like to know if there are any steps that you're prepared to take to improve the transparency of P3 costs so that we can see that they're actually cheaper than building it through traditional public finance.

The other thing about schools is that they've been built in order to find economies that don't rise out of the P3 model but rise out of economies of scale, so they've designed a single, one-size-fits-all approach. These schools do not match with the government's promises or do not take provincial standards into consideration. Nine new schools planned for Calgary are being designed with classrooms larger than necessary for the recommended class sizes, and the head of a parents' group fears the schools will subsequently become jam-packed.

Each new school built under a P3 has a permanent core facility surrounded by modular classrooms. According to the plans schools expected to hold 400 students will now have 16 classrooms, and the schools holding 450 students will have 18 classrooms. That works out to 25 children per room even though the province recommends class sizes of 17 for kindergarten to grade 3 schools.

Why won't the minister acknowledge that this cost-saving technique and the P3 model are not adequate for meeting the needs and demands of each of the schools individually?

The question of P3s shows that the public sector enjoys two fundamental advantages over the private sector in financing public infrastructure. The public sector can borrow at a substantially more favourable rate than a private-sector operator of a stand-alone project. It is because of being able to pool risk over a larger number of projects. The public sector can manage risks associated with project costs more cost-effectively than a private operator of a stand-alone project. In other words, the very factors that are touted as P3 advantages are in reality the core factors that lead inevitably to the conclusion that, if properly compared, P3s cannot compete with direct public-sector provision.

A decision to bear the higher costs and proceed with P3 financing will inevitably result in one or both of the higher costs for taxpayers. Mr. Chairman, I'd like the minister to respond if he can to precisely and specifically why P3 projects are more cost-effective in the government's opinion. I'd really like it if he could provide some very concrete evidence that they are.

I want to ask about the Lieutenant Governor's mansion. Now, that is a real boondoggle. The temporary home that the Lieutenant Governor currently stays in is a \$2.1 million home near the old residence. They're now proposing to build a new Lieutenant Governor's. This was just kind of slipped into the announcement of the new museum. Two years before the government spent \$380,000 in design and consultants and then cancellation fees. The cost to taxpayers will be around \$550,000, but it could be over \$600,000.

The cost of renovating the old residence was estimated at around \$400,000. The government described the old building as a money pit, so the building was demolished.

We have more homeless people on the streets now than we've had for a long time.

4:40

**Some Hon. Members:** Not true. Not true.

**Mr. Mason:** Well, we still have a considerable number, hon. members. We still have a considerable number, not to trivialize it, please, and I know that that minister won't, but that minister will. I want to know how we can justify spending \$10 million on a mansion for a Lieutenant Governor and call that a good use of taxpayers' money given the fact that we have serious housing needs remaining in our province. I think that's something that's really important to me.

I want to ask how it is that we make decisions between building new facilities and being able to staff and operate them? What does the government do to make sure that when we build a hospital, for example, we are also planning so that the budget is available and the staffing is available to operate that facility as soon as it's open?

There are many examples in this provincial government of expensive capital facilities being constructed and remaining partly or completely vacant. I have one in my own constituency, which is the east Edmonton health centre, that was supposed to include a number of services for people in the northeast part of the city, which is significantly underserved by medical professionals. When it was opened, they simply moved in the old public health clinic and starting operating that. They've added a couple more things, but major improvements to the health of the community that were planned there and particularly the capacity to take a load off of the emergency rooms at the Royal Alexandra hospital have not been opened. We see this in the Mazankowski Heart Institute and in the Calgary hospital. Throughout the province we see the government building expensive capital facilities and then not staffing them and not opening them fully.

This is a serious problem. It really indicates that there's a lack of co-ordination on the part of the government. I'd like to know about that.

**The Deputy Chair:** The hon. minister.

**Mr. Danyluk:** Well, thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I want to make sure that this is very clear for the hon. member. The shelled-in space that was discussed by him right at the end is shelled-in space for future growth and expansion. When we talk about the Don Mazankowski centre, I just want to say that that's done very deliberately. The cost that it would take to expand – and we know that the hospital is going to expand. We know that the facility is going to expand. I would suggest to you that that is very good planning to be able to have space when it's needed, to be able to accommodate the needs of the community. I have no apologies at all for planning. You made mention of other facilities, and I would say that that holds true for them as well.

The other point that was discussed was a \$10 million Lieutenant Governor's residence. Mr. Chairman, let me make it clear to you that, yes, that was the anticipated cost a number of years ago, and that is why we didn't build it. It wasn't the right time to build. There is not going to be a cost to the taxpayers of Alberta because the residence that is there right now and the land that is there will pay for the residence. You say: "Well, why? It was just kind of conveniently slipped in." It wasn't conveniently slipped in. What happens is that there's Government House that's right there on that facility. That facility is not going to accommodate condos or anything else, and it is the perfect site for a Lieutenant Governor's residence, a Lieutenant Governor's residence that's able to be viewed, especially on the outside, by people when they go to the site.

Mr. Chairman, I very much want to talk about the 20-year plan. I guess I have a little bit of trouble because, you know, some want less, and some want more. I think, being right in the middle with a 20-year plan and having a focus and a direction, I'm kind of feeling right now that we're in the right place.

You also made a comment about getting information. This is the purpose of these estimates. It's to get information from ministries. Now, that was done days before. My feeling on this is: "Hey. You're here. Great. If you have any questions, I will answer them."

I also want to talk about the transparency. You know, the transparency is there. It's posted on the website. The transparency on the value of money – it's very clear. When we talk about the value for money, the value for money takes what the cost is, the cost of a partnership as opposed to a conventional build, which, by the way, goes through the system of comparisons. ASAP 1 was somewhere between \$90 million and \$100 million in savings. That is posted, the value. ASAP 2 has a savings of \$40 million. That is posted. That is there. So I say to you: just check out the websites, and you will find your information. The numbers are posted.

You talked about releasing information. We release all information except the proprietary information of contractors. There's information there that should not be released and is not released because it's information confidential from the public.

As far as looking at partnerships, I want to say to you that when a project comes forward, we do that comparison. We look at the aspects, and we look at the benefits. We do a cost benefit, making sure that we're looking at it from the budget side, also ensuring that the timing of the project is there, ensuring the 30-year warranty, and also, when we talk about the 30-year warranty, making sure that those buildings come back to us in a very positive state. [A timer sounded] There's your buzzer. I know the hon. member from the fourth party . . .

**The Deputy Chair:** Thank you. The fourth party has been recognized.

Now I'll recognize the hon. Member for Red Deer-South.

**Mr. Dallas:** Well, thanks very much, Mr. Chair. I'm pleased to attend today and have an opportunity to interact with the minister and have a discussion in a number of areas. I want to start out, first of all, with an observation. Over \$428 million of the minister's budget is devoted to operating and maintaining existing government buildings.

I've got some specific questions, but I think that before we get to that, I want to ask the minister to spend a little bit of time talking about what the ministry is doing to ensure that we're making effective use of existing space – I know that from time to time I have constituents and others making observations about facilities that we have that are either in transition, renovation, or that might be vacant for a period of time – and how we optimize the use of the facilities that we have, making sure that we don't have more capacity than we require at any given time and, certainly, the effectiveness strategies that we employ in terms of how efficiently those facilities operate. It's more than just utilization. It is around the costs of operating those facilities once they are fully utilized.

To the minister, then, a quick discussion about that, and then I can drill down to some questions that I have.

4:50

**Mr. Danyluk:** Thank you very much. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that last year we completed an accommodation review. The accommodation review was basically a review that looked at the spaces that we have, looked at the leases that we have, looked at how we can re-engineer some of the spaces that are necessary. Technology has changed tremendously in the last 10 years. The way that we provide services has changed. So looking at how we provide space for staff has also changed.

I'm just going to give you just a couple of comments. I want to say that the implementation process is now under way. Also, just

as an example, you know, to answer your question a little bit, we changed the process of furniture delivery to different ministries. Previously different ministries had their own budgets. As far as furniture delivery we now have a co-ordinated management of government furniture. We also have a co-ordinated management of IT. That has led to efficiency. Over time this will lead to more efficiency of space. It will provide more flexibility when change is necessary. For some of the areas that we're looking at, it's going to reduce lease space and going to be more flexible in a lease space. We've gone to a different system where staff, if I can say, have maybe smaller spaces but spaces that they seem to be very much more comfortable with.

The new federal building, in fact, will have that accommodated space in it. I did mention before the more appropriate workspace for the modern realities of what we're doing, areas for greater collaboration, flex space, accommodating telecommunications, more natural light, and better noise control. Really, more space that's accommodating as well. Of course, one of the major examples – and I would sure encourage anybody to go and take a look at it – is the Access Building that we have on the south side. We're also continually reviewing inventory to ensure that the space is used efficiently and effectively.

The surplus properties will be offered first to municipalities for community use, but we're always looking for the best way for infrastructure to retrofit and adapt and looking at new ways of building.

**Mr. Dallas:** Okay. Well, that's helpful.

I think, you know, I want to explore a little bit some of this funding, what it's used for. There are some changes in these estimates over prior years. If you'd just take a moment and have a look at page 216 of the '11-12 estimates, specifically down to line 2.1, the first thing I'm looking at there is that property operations are expected to cost \$24 million more than last year. Obviously, we're talking about how we're going to use space more efficiently, how perhaps we can contract the total amount of space per employee, that type of thing, but we're proposing to spend \$24 million more. I want you to comment on that.

Likewise, not very far away there, the next line item, 2.2, accounts for a \$29 million increase in estimated expenses on leases. So some rationale as to why we need to spend \$29 million more there.

Conversely, I guess, you mentioned the accommodation program review. You're proposing to spend \$1.5 million; less there. Are we not going to do the same work as we have been? Work is done once, good for three years. I'm not sure there.

So I wonder if you could comment on those items.

**Mr. Danyluk:** Well, you know, that is a great question. What happens is that we look at the lease space that we do have and the cost of lease space – and we have lease space that comes up for renewal. Some of this lease space has been in place for maybe for 10 years – right? – some of it a little longer. When it comes up for renewal, the costs definitely are higher. That is why it is so important to have the re-engineering. That's why it's so important to be able to fix up spaces that we're going to be able to use. At the end of the day it is going to cost a lot more money. There is no significant expansion at all for lease space.

I mean, there are times that we need leased space. The previous Justice minister just walked in, and I'm just going to acknowledge, you know, that when we talk about southern Alberta, they needed some courtroom space. I mean, we have to accommodate those. We have to try to do the best that we can, and we are going to. That is what I would consider new lease space, but we don't do

much of that. The costs are usually in the space that we have already. Also, the contractual costs have gone up, and that is the utilities.

When we talk about property operations, it's necessary to maintain facilities and prevent them from deteriorating. That's critical. The hon. Member for Calgary-McCall I believe went extensively into those questions. He's right. I mean, we have over 1,500 buildings, and we need to maintain them, and we need to make sure that those buildings don't deteriorate because if we let them deteriorate, they get to a point where they'll cost us a lot more money. Our rule of thumb is: if it costs 75 per cent or more to renovate a building, maybe we should look at building a new building or looking at different space.

I also want to say, if it is a last comment, that the priority is for safety and accessibility for the public. You know, that has also been a cost that we're trying to accommodate to ensure that the accessibility is always there.

I hope that I answered most of your questions. Really, the accommodation program is to support property operations.

**The Chair:** The hon. member.

**Mr. Dallas:** Yeah. Thanks for that, and thanks for those comments on safety and accessibility because those are certainly issues that are brought to me on a regular basis.

Just to switch gears for a moment and talk about something that's a little bit closer to home for me, that's the Red Deer cancer centre project that's being proposed. There are some small beginnings happening around the Red Deer regional hospital. I'm wondering if you can talk about the investment, the construction schedule, and perhaps even some of the features of that particular project.

**Mr. Danyluk:** Okay. I'm not exactly sure how much time I have, but I definitely want to say that the budget for that project is \$46 million, the construction complete in 2012, and the move in should be right at the beginning of 2013. The excavation work is already completed. The bid package has been approved, and we included four subtrades, over \$100,000. The bid package 3 includes the building envelope and the mechanical and electrical and interior finishes, and that's 95 per cent complete. The concrete placing and finishing is being retendered to allow other contractors to bid on the package.

I am very excited about the cancer institute focus that this government has for Alberta. You know, I'll use the example of Lethbridge. Over 600 people are going to not have to travel because of the cancer institute in Lethbridge. This is about accessibility. This is about opportunity for people that are sick and if we can make anything a little bit easier and take the pressure off the major centres. You have a cancer institute that is going to be built in Grande Prairie, so people don't have to travel eight hours, and you have a cancer institute in Red Deer, that allows those people from central Alberta to use that facility, and one in Lethbridge.

5:00

Then you look at how much pressure that's going to take off the two major institutions in Edmonton and in Calgary, yet you bring those up to date with the technology that we have today. When I met with oncologists in Calgary and in Edmonton to discuss those future opportunities, they very much talked about making sure that whatever we build allows the opportunity for the change of technology into the future because that change in technology is so rapid. That's what you're getting in your community. You're not only getting a facility that is going to address the needs of today,

but you're getting a facility that is going to address the needs of the future. More important than anything else, it is going to address the opportunity for technology changes.

You know, the same thing happens at the colleges. I was very fortunate in that I got an opportunity to tour the college in Red Deer. What a building. One of the things that just resonated with me was the discussion about the ability to be able to change the focus of a room or an opportunity for a class. They said, "Today this could be a mechanical shop, and in three days we can make it into a life-values room." I'm going, "What are you talking about?" They said: "We are building buildings today that have accommodation. We are building buildings today that are adaptable."

So when I look at my staff, I think about what they are doing, the ingenious work that they're doing to look not only 50 years into the future but to look at how we can build buildings that work not only for today, not only for 50 years, but for maybe a hundred years into the future. That is necessary. You know, maybe we will get to a situation in the future where, as the hon. members of the fourth party talk about, we need the reduction of support for infrastructure. We need to look at buildings that provide fresh air, that provide the opportunity for students to learn, for patients in hospitals, for people that we have working. This is what it's about. It's about communities. It's about building for the future for communities, that they have that opportunity.

You know, I went with the hon. Solicitor General to Fort Macleod and had the discussions about the police college and how they saw the future, not the future of today, not the future of only tomorrow, but what this college could provide into the future for their community and how this would be beneficial. So when we look at building a building, don't build the building for the needs of today; build the building for the needs into the future, for what could happen, because we really don't know what services we will provide.

I think it's so, so necessary and so good when we go into a community like Grande Prairie, where we have the hospital that has 200 acute-care beds and, as I said, the cancer treatment, and then we just add on and say: "You know what? It's important to have an education component. It's important that we look into the future to ensure that we're educating or helping to educate people that have the opportunity to stay in their community."

This is looking, this is planning, and this is what is so important with this ministry. This ministry and the people that work in it don't look and don't watch television in the same way that maybe I do because they're futurists, because we pound and we pound every day on how they can look into the future to make sure the buildings that we're building accommodate the needs of people.

It's no different than when we talk about a BlackBerry and somebody 20 years ago said: well, I just want you to design the case for a BlackBerry. And they said: well, what is a BlackBerry? Well, we don't know. That's no different than infrastructure when we talk about trying to design for the future. We have to design for building today, and we have to design for the future.

You know, I can go on and talk about the services that are provided in education, that are provided in our schools, that we have the best education system in the world. And what does that mean? That means that we have the best teachers. That means that we have the best technology. That means that we have the best infrastructure. That means that we have opportunity for our children to learn.

I know that we look around and we see people coming and companies coming to Alberta to have a job fair. Why are they coming to this province? Why are they coming to Edmonton and Calgary? Because they know that the children we have are educated so well that they want to have them in their businesses and

they want to have them in their companies and they want to have them to help support.

We are very fortunate. Look at our universities. Look at the opportunities at the colleges that we have. You know, we look at the college in my area, which is Lac La Biche-St. Paul. What is the most important thing about that college? Accessibility for people to not have to leave the community because if they had to leave the community, if we didn't have that infrastructure, they would not be able to go to college or to university. That is what's important for that delivery. So we look at the universities, look at what the universities have to offer: the range, the flexibility, the opportunity. Hon. member from Calgary, look at the chance that your children have to be able to be leaders because of the opportunity for education. That is important as well.

Now we can go to seniors' housing for a few minutes. That's one of the major challenges that we have. As you know, you can look around and see that there is more maturity in the ranks, and we need to have those facilities that accommodate the needs of the people of Alberta, have the right seniors' care, have the right opportunity so that when you have – one of the hardest things for seniors is to have to move from one location to another location. You know, what this government is trying to do is to have the individual stay in a space and have the movement of the services, and that is very beneficial. We don't want to separate the husband and the wife, or spouse. It's important that they have the opportunity to live together. It's very easy . . .

**The Deputy Chair:** Thank you.

Hon. Member for Calgary-Glenmore, are you going to be sharing the 20 minutes?

**Mr. Hinman:** Back and forth. Back and forth.

**The Deputy Chair:** Okay.

**Mr. Hinman:** Thank you Mr. Chair. Well, no one can accuse this minister of not being passionate. But it's a good thing the bell finally went off; he was being pummeled.

Anyway, what is it all about? He was eloquent and going on, but what is it all about? What it really is all about is sustainability, and it's about balancing the budget. You know, there's another individual who's very passionate. I would almost say he's world famous, from Calgary, a chocolate connoisseur. He overbuilt. He openly admits: "I overbuilt. I got caught up in 2008, built beautiful infrastructure. I thought now was the time to build." He overbuilt. That's what we're trying to explain, Mr. Chair, to this minister. Are we at the right pace? Is it sustainable? Have we balanced our budget? The question is obvious. The answer is no, if we take the two steps back and look at it.

5:10

The minister is failing to answer the questions, and I will attempt again. What we need is not a 20-year plan that sits up there in the clouds somewhere but a 20-year plan that is actually written down and made public and that we know. What we have been asking for, and what I have been asking for since 2004, is a prioritized list. When I'm in business, I know what the infrastructure is, what we need to buy, what equipment is wearing out. We have a list, and we say: "You know, this is going to be needed. It's a \$250,000 expenditure." It's all prioritized.

Sometimes things do shift. Demographics can change, economics can change, and all of a sudden the pressure is released. Then you can shift and say: "Well, no. We're going to prioritize this school now in Chestermere because this kept growing; these other areas haven't." Like I say, if you don't have the list, it's very

difficult to prioritize when it's just waiting or it seems like it's a political list.

What we're asking for – will you do it? – is that you don't give a 20-year plan without a prioritized list for all Albertans to see. This hospital is ahead of these five schools; these five schools are ahead of this remand centre: put out the list so that we can see it. That will make good sense.

The sustainability, you know. He talks that, yes, we're going to spend \$17.6 billion, but he doesn't seem to understand, Mr. Chair, what our question is. After that \$17.6 billion has been spent and we have no sustainability fund and we're still running a deficit, what are we going to do? At some point are we going to hit the wall and stop building, like we did in 2003, and then traitor an industry? We want a sustainable one that the industry knows. That's what we're talking about. Is the minister going to stand up and say, "Yes, we have another \$18.6 billion that's going to be added"?

I mean, this government, Mr. Chair, just lauds its five-year sustainability plan for health care and acts like that solves it: we've solved it; it's five years. They know the money is coming in, but if you go back the previous five years, they've actually spent more money than ever. If that plan is so wonderful, which, again, having five years sustainable funding is, why don't we have it in Education? Why don't we have it in Infrastructure? We've only got it for two or three years more, and industry is asking the question, whether the minister is listening or not: then what happens? They see the writing on the wall: that we've run out of money, that it can't be continued. That's the question we're asking the minister. Is he committing another \$17.6 billion for the next three years? That is not sustainable. We need to do it.

Predictability. They got up and said: well, what aren't we building? How many times and how many ministers announced the Grande Prairie hospital? You know, the promises prior to 2008 for seniors' facilities in Strathmore, up in Fort McMurray. Yes, they're finally doing them now because they're spending so much, but those have been rehashed and given out many times and need to be looked at.

I want to refer to for a minute and ask questions about the Auditor General. I don't think he ever used the word "excellent" whereas the minister does seem to use it: oh, this is an excellent process. What the Auditor General has actually asked for several times is that he wants a value-for-money report and not just any value-for-money report. What he says for these P3s is that we need to improve the processes, including sensitivity analysis, to challenge and support maintenance costs and risk valuations. Yes, if you look at the actual box of oranges that they're doing with their P3s, the Auditor General is saying, "Well, they're getting fairly good value." But the question is: "Are oranges expensive right now? Should we be getting them from, instead of California, maybe Florida or somewhere else?" They're not really comparing all of the options out there. With what we've got, yes, it is. But if we were to actually look at full cost, full bid prices that are locked in for these schools, I question whether we're doing it.

That's the most important question I have. In all of the projects that you are building, Mr. Minister, how many of them have been put out there in lump-sum contracts versus – what's the wording? – the management fee contracts that, you know, you could just add the management fee, and it's not locked down? What I'm trying to say is that all of the subcontractors actually give a solid bid to the management fee contractors, and these management fee contractors can bring in a lot of extra costs to projects because they're not locked in. You want to lock in everything in these projects, lump-sum contracts, not management fee contracts, because that leaves the taxpayers wide open on what's coming through. So have there

been any lump-sum contracts? Here are the blueprints. Here is what we want. Let's do it.

I'll ask another question for the taxpayers. When you see some of the superstructures going up in Calgary, they're made of steel. There's no question that steel is usually more cost-effective than concrete. Now, there are always some special conditions; for example, with the courthouse. You might want it to be antiblast. Again, it's interesting that even with the steel structures, they're built such that if they blow out one-half of the building, it will still stand. I mean, that's just the new technology. Don't ask me how they do it, but they do.

Are we opening up the bids and not necessarily saying: "You know what? We just want concrete"? I don't know if that's the best thing. Are we getting the best value for our taxpayers' money? I question it. I want you to do more homework on that and check and see what we're getting for that. [interjection There's lots of debate. I had to get some water, there, you know. I'm as bad as you, just going on and on. We'll go back and forth. I want you to write it up so you can be efficient with your time, Mr. Minister.

When we look at some of the P3s, again, we're not looking at the full scope. The parameters, we feel, that you're putting out there are questionable. Having a wide-open, competitive field is, like I say, questionable.

It's also interesting that the luck of the draw – and I'm specifically going to talk about Notre Dame high school in Calgary. It was built. You just talked about BlackBerry's and new technologies and all of the future in our schools, you know, what opportunity we have, yet the last school that you built before you went to the P3s does not compare to the quality that you are building with the P3s now. It seemed like Notre Dame was put in there for cost-effectiveness and not necessarily effective educating. Like I say, with the Smart boards a lot of the new technology was left out, yet it was a new one. Are you going to go buy an old Apple computer or a new MacBook Air? Where are you going to go? What kind of battery life?

A year ago a report came out saying that hospital repairs were going to triple in money. Could you tell us: is there a problem with the hospital repairs, that we have a lot of hospitals in poor or bad condition? I remember Beaverlodge, but I think you've worked on that. Are there some unseen or unaccounted-for repair bills and maintenance bills coming up in our hospitals that are kind of hidden or kept off the balance sheet because they're not really there? Are you aware as the Infrastructure minister of a balloon that's coming down that is going to hit us again next year or two years from now because you know that the maintenance isn't there? There have been some reports out on that, so it's very concerning in that area on whether you're going to do it.

I guess the biggest question is that when you talked about predictability, you talked about going into the future. Will you put out a prioritized list of infrastructure? Will you commit today to five-year solid funding at \$6 billion or whatever the transportation/infrastructure spending is? Are you going to be so bold as to say that you got your five-year funding guaranteed, like you do in health care? I don't think so. Are you going to do a better process analysis of these P3s so that we really do know that Albertans are getting full advantage from the tax dollars and not just saying: well, in the little parameters that we've got, we're not too sure, you know, about the risk analysis, the maintenance cost, but we've been told this. The Auditor General says that your process for assessing P3s is not as good as it should be. Are you doing anything about that? That is definitely a question that we need to answer.

I guess that to sum up, you know, the Fort Macleod . . .

**The Deputy Chair:** Hon. member, the 10 minutes have elapsed.

I'd ask the hon. minister to respond.

**Mr. Danyluk:** Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I'm going to try to answer some of the questions that were brought forward. I need to express to you that the Calgary Courts Centre was a fixed price. I'm going to start maybe with some of the comments that you had made, so I can answer them in order if you want the answers. Okay?

5:20

**Mr. Hinman:** I want them.

**Mr. Danyluk:** Okay. Good. I want to say to you that you had made some accusations or, at least, comments on overbuilds as far as schools are concerned.

**Mr. Hinman:** I ran out of time.

**Mr. Danyluk:** I understand. I understand the question because you talk about the overbuilds in schools. I need to tell you that what has happened is that the schools that we have built right now are usually full when the students go into them, but we have built schools differently now than we used to before. We build schools that have a very core area. They have the gymnasium and the offices and some of the work areas, some of the basics that are needed in schools.

We are able to use flex spaces that are high-performance classrooms, and that really gives the opportunity for schools to expand or become smaller, depending on the needs of the students that are there. These high-performance classrooms, I want to say to you, are not portables. You know, they're not modules. They are high-performance classrooms. In fact, we went to a school in Grande Prairie that had the high-performance classrooms, and the teachers would rather be in the high-performance classrooms because of their adaptability, if I can say, into technology, and that's so important.

You asked a question about a priority list, and I'm going to read you some of the comments, but I'll do that in a little bit. You talked about predictability. You say: "I want a list, and then the list changes." Well, you know what? You come from a smaller community. You come from a community that's stable. I'm not saying your representation in Calgary. I'm saying where you come from.

**Mr. Hinman:** I grew up in Calgary.

**Mr. Danyluk:** Okay. Well, where you served before.

I want to say to you that there may be a school that's necessary in that area. When you have that school in that area and if you were representing that area and you put that school on a priority list, they say: "You know what? I just want to tell you that you are now on the priority list. Oh, sorry. We've got a little bit of a growth spurt in Fort McMurray. You're now not on the priority list. You're off."

**Mr. Hinman:** They would understand.

**Mr. Danyluk:** Yes. They would understand the first year. Then next year it's Airdrie that may need three schools or Chestermere that may need two and then Beaumont that may need two. What ends up happening is that the community that is expecting a school and trying to accommodate that direction maybe doesn't hit the priority list.

We have a 20-year plan where we talk about education and talk about the needs of education, but we know that in this province we

are commodity based, that the fluctuation of people is so dramatic that we have to be able to accommodate, number one, safety, number two, of course, capacity. You know, if your school in that area is safe, it's going to get built, and it's going to get built right away. Also, if you have the capacity, you know you're going to get schools in that area. I don't see the priority list, but I'm going to give you a priority list, a little bit, right away.

The other question was: how do we build? Well, you know, with every project that we do, we look at what the best way to deliver that project would be. Should it be a conventional build? Should it be a design build? Should it be a construction management build?

**Mr. Hinman:** That's the one.

**Mr. Danyluk:** Well, you know, construction management builds fit in places.

Should it be what I would consider a partnership build? We assess what's best for the community, what's best for the people that are going to use it. We also assess what the most economic way to do it is, and then we post the value for money, so it's there.

You know, even when we use construction management, we use this to fast-track design, and sometimes that's necessary. I also need to say to you about all subcontracts are always open.

**Mr. Hinman:** The subcontracts are. I'm talking about the management build contracts.

**Mr. Danyluk:** Well, you know that the management build contracts still have the openness of what the building costs.

I want to go on. There was a comment made about Notre Dame having poor technology, and it was built before the P3 schools were built. They don't have Smart boards, and they didn't pay for Smart boards. You know, we don't pay for Smart boards. We don't pay for a Smart board in a new school. That is the responsibility of the school board. That's who pays for Smart boards. I just wanted to be clear.

On the other point that you made, that there was about a balloon that was floating and that it was going to hit us and that we won't spend the money, I'm not expecting this from your party, right? There are other parties that one day spend and the next day cut. Your party has been traditionally: cut. Now it's going to be a balloon that's going to hit us because we're not spending more money. I'm not quite understanding where you're coming from, but I want to say to you that there is a balance, and that balance is important. I see the hon. Member for Airdrie-Chestermere has something wrong with his hand or something, where he's waving on a continual basis. I just need to say to you that if you were listening to the discussion we had on the necessity to have maintenance and the necessity to have new builds, you would have understood or had that question answered ahead of time.

The other part that I want to say to you is that you talked about the process for partnerships, if I can use the word. Well, I've got to go back and answer that question for you again. It doesn't make a difference what project we have. We look at the ability to deliver and the best way to deliver.

Now, I want to say, just to answer it again, that we have completed value-for-money reports for both the partnerships, the P3 project, ASAP schools, ASAP 1 and ASAP 2, and they are posted on the website, all of the Auditor's recommendations, and they're accepted. Also, I talked to you a little bit about the construction management and the fixed fee for management, and it's all open. It's all open.

You have been asking for, numerous times, a list, so I will tell you about a list. This is our capital list: IMP maintenance and

renewal; south Calgary health campus, new facility; Grande Prairie; the Queen E II hospital redevelopment; the capital transition innovative phase 1; the capital clinic south, new facility; the Calgary and Edmonton cancer strategy, phase 1; Medicine Hat regional hospital upgrade and expansion; the Foothills medical centre; the care centre renovation.

**The Deputy Chair:** Hon. minister, the time has elapsed, and I will now recognize the hon. Member . . .

**Mr. Mason:** Point of order.

#### **Point of Order Tabling Cited Documents**

**The Deputy Chair:** What is your point of order?

**Mr. Mason:** My point of order is that under the rules of the Assembly, since the minister has referred to a document, he must table it.

**Mr. Danyluk:** If I can, it's the capital plan. You just have to open up the book, and what I was reading from is in the capital plan, pages 106 and 107 in the capital plan.

**The Deputy Chair:** Thank you. Okay. We've cleared that up.

#### **Debate Continued**

**The Deputy Chair:** I now recognize the hon. Member for Calgary-Nose Hill.

**5:30**

**Dr. Brown:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will be very brief. I know there are some members of the opposition who wish to ask further questions. I have two basic points that I would like the minister to address, and I would thank him for his introductory remarks and outlining some of the projects.

In particular, he mentioned the Royal Alberta Museum, which is planned to be a some \$340 million project, as I understand it. It certainly must be one of the biggest arts and culture projects in the history of the province if not the biggest, and I certainly applaud that project. I was present when the minister spoke most eloquently at the announcement about the scope of the project and the importance to the cultural history of the province. I certainly applaud the project. I think it's going to be a fine opportunity not only to redevelop the downtown of Edmonton, but it'll be a real cornerstone and an exciting point of education and enjoyment for all Albertans and a tourist attraction as well.

I would like to make a couple of comments as a member representing the city of Calgary, and I hope the minister will appreciate that my comments are not meant as a slam against our sister city of Edmonton in any regard. Of course, we have the Glenbow Museum in Calgary, which has been around for a long time, and we also had the Provincial Museum here in Edmonton, of course, for a long time.

I would also like to make the remark, Mr. Minister, that I think there was great wisdom in the actions of the government in the past in spreading some of these cultural institutions around the province in various parts, things like the Royal Tyrrell Museum in Drumheller, the Reynolds-Alberta Museum in Wetaskiwin, the Remington Carriage Museum in Cardston, the Head-Smashed-In Buffalo Jump Interpretive Centre, west of Fort Macleod. Dinosaur provincial park and Writing-on-Stone provincial park both have very interesting interpretive centres.



By spreading these things out, I think that some things are accomplished. First of all, by putting these institutions around the province, we give the opportunities to enjoy those cultural institutions to a larger audience. I know that almost every day here in the Legislature we have visiting classrooms from Edmonton and environs, and sometimes we have them from further afield in the province of Alberta. But I can say that in six and a half years we have never, to my knowledge, had anybody, other than a private school, attend from the city of Calgary from the public school board, which is one of the two largest school boards in North America, or the Catholic school board. I think it illustrates the fact that proximity is a very important thing in terms of accessing the cultural institutions in the province.

I want to continue in that vein by talking a little bit about the Glenbow Museum, which has a large collection of very important objects. Over a million objects are present in the Glenbow Museum. It has a cultural history collection of over a hundred thousand objects. It has an ethnology collection of 48,000 items of North American indigenous peoples and, particularly, probably one of the finest collections of the North American Plains Indians in the entire world. It has an art collection of 28,000 works. Just for comparison, Mr. Minister, those 28,000 works compare to a collection of 6,000 in the Art Gallery of Alberta, which has a dedicated space of 85,000 square feet. The artworks at the Glenbow Museum are crammed onto one floor of the Glenbow Museum, and it is far, far too small to adequately display even a small percentage of the collection that they have. They also have a military collection of some 26,000 items, a very significant collection of military history from not only Europe but from Asia and around the world.

All of these collections that I've mentioned, Mr. Minister, are certainly worthy of a museum in their own right. We have great need in the city of Calgary for an expansion, and I would ask you to respond to that need by doing something similar to what you've done for the Royal Alberta Museum, looking into the future and expanding those cultural facilities and giving us an opportunity to enjoy some of those collections that I have mentioned but which right now we don't have any space at all to display.

The second point I want to make – and then I'll sit down – is with respect to what I understand are some contingent plans to redevelop the Royal Alberta Museum site and perhaps to put a residence for the Lieutenant Governor there. I think that would be a fine project to be undertaken. It would not just be a residence for the Lieutenant Governor; it would be something to be appreciated and enjoyed by all Albertans. It should be a location that Albertans can go to on special occasions. It should be a place that they can visit, that they can feel pride of ownership in.

I would go even beyond that, Mr. Minister. I think that this province is long overdue to have an official residence for the Premier of the province of Alberta. I've looked on the websites of many of the governors of the United States of America, and I can tell you that every state in the union of the United States of America takes great pride in the governor's mansion. I think, similarly, that this province should have an official residence. I know that the Premier of our province has a very nice apartment in the city of Edmonton. It's not a public place, however. It's not capable of having any formal entertaining facilities, and it's not something that the people of Alberta have particular pride in.

With those comments, Mr. Minister and Mr. Chairman, I will sit down.

**Mr. Danyluk:** Well, thank you very much, hon. member. It indeed gives me a lot of pleasure to address some of your comments. I do want to make a comment about the Glenbow

Museum. It is a fabulous facility. It is a fabulous facility that probably has more artifacts and art in a small area than one could possibly imagine. I'd say to you that I believe that at times you could go to the Glenbow Museum, come back the next day, and you would have the opportunity to see a completely different tour of all of the things that you missed the first time.

I want to say to you that I very much agree. I think it is important to look at the exhibits, look at our history, to give an opportunity for our history. It is an opportunity because it is history in motion. Our history in Alberta is so, so short. I will tell you that when we look at, if I can say, the opportunity for youth, they can come to look at a museum as children, and a small decade later they are now seeing the history of our passing time. Our history moves so quickly even now as compared to, you know, 50 or 100 years ago.

I took note of, you know, what you had written down – the hundred thousand objects and the finest collections and the 28,000 works – and I say to you that we're always striving to try to accomplish what we can as far as getting some placement.

**5:40**

The Royal Alberta Museum, of course, came forward. It's been a work that has taken, I want to say, at least 10 years to get to the position that we're at. I need to take a little bit of opportunity to talk about, as you mentioned, the Royal Alberta Museum. It is a museum that we are very excited about. It is a museum that has more interactive and flexible displays, and the kids that came to look at what was going to happen were so excited by the opportunity for the future and that opportunity to interact.

It also has the ability to host many international exhibits. It provides an opportunity for expansion. It also has improved access through the LRT and, potentially, the high-speed rail into the future and the connection that it does have with the local cultural facility and arts district.

I understand your question very clearly. Your question, I believe, says that we have a museum in Calgary that needs acknowledgement as well because we are running out of space. I think that with the minister of culture we need to look, you know, at that possibility into the future.

I need to also say that when you made comment about all of the opportunities throughout this province, I think that the children of this province very much – very much – have such an opportunity. When we talk about Head-Smashed-In Buffalo Jump in Fort Macleod, the Frank Slide Interpretive Centre, Dinosaur provincial park, which has some of the highest participation in this province, the Slave Lake interpretive centre, Milk River, Fish Creek, the Reynolds collection in Wetaskiwin – you know, I mean, we have interpretive centres. We have an interpretive centre in Fort McMurray that talks about the oil development. I want to say that when we talk about opportunity, this is a province of opportunity.

I will take those notes about the Glenbow, and I definitely will bring them forward.

I also want to acknowledge your comments in regard to the residence for the Lieutenant Governor on the present site in Glenora. I need to say to you that it's probably going to take four years to build the new museum. We are so fortunate to be able to use, instead of having to shut down, the museum that we have in place right now and to keep that land for the public. What an opportunity to keep it for the public and to have Government House and to have a Lieutenant Governor's residence to be part of this province.

We have so much as Albertans to be proud of. We have so much opportunity for our children to have an education. I think

that to have the Lieutenant Governor's house, residence, on that site is the right choice.

The residence of the Premier in this province: I'm just going to say to you that we as residents, we as people need to take more pride in who we are. I really believe that we need to be more patriotic because if we had other places that had half as much as we have in this great province, they would be incredibly enthusiastic and optimistic about who they are, about how they can express themselves.

Mr. Chairman, if I can ask, just for a moment, because it was asked before: did you know that next year, 2012, is going to be the hundredth anniversary of this building? The hundredth anniversary. Ladies and gentlemen, we need to be proud of that. We need to be proud of the building. We need to be proud of who we are. We need to be proud of who we represent.

I will say that it started off, the send-off if I can call it that, with acquiring a new carillon, giving a new experience. I always make a point. In fact, it wasn't very long ago that I had the opportunity to have a conversation, as they were in a hall, with individuals that came from Airdrie-Chestermere. They were so excited about the music from the carillon. I didn't bring anything forward, but music came on. It just happened to be at noon time. It was a group of individuals that home-schooled, and they just felt that this was such an opportunity to see this building.

So I say to you, you know, some of the things that we're doing – it was made very clear by individuals that we need to respect this building and the people that use it. We're having some upgrades. We have the reflection pool. The other day it was very clear what was necessary to make sure that that continues to be part of the accessibility for children. We have the area that's going to be just to the west of the federal building that's also going to provide accessibility for children and adults and is going to be part of showing what Alberta's history is.

We were looking at the opportunity to . . . [a timer sounded]

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Hon. Member for Calgary-Nose Hill, do you have any more questions?

Okay. I will now recognize the next speaker. The hon. Member for Calgary-McCall.

**Mr. Kang:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. My questions are coming back to infrastructure deficit, Mr. Minister. Infrastructure deficit refers to the exchange that we need to update buildings which have a limited lifespan. Infrastructure deficit. Since most of the buildings are 30-plus years old, replacing them will cost a considerable amount of money.

In the 2009 estimates debate the minister said that Alberta is spending as much funding on infrastructure as anywhere else. The funding for the government-owned facilities preservation fund and capital projects is zero, down from \$12 million last year, estimates page 217. What is the current provincial infrastructure deficit, that is, the total infrastructure deficit? What will the future liability be of not repairing this infrastructure deficit? Is this government just offloading these costs onto future generations? The third one is: when will this total infrastructure deficit be paid off given the current funding levels?

**Mr. Danyluk:** Well, I'm not exactly sure. Let me just go backwards a little bit in the comments about the infrastructure deficit and when it will be paid off. Is that what you're saying? Well, I want to say to you that this province, you know, has an average, probably, of a hundred thousand people moving into it. This province is a very active province in the way of needing infrastructure,

whether it be roads, whether it be schools, or whether it be hospitals. We continue to try to address those services and those needs. When we look at roads and hospitals and schools and those services, I don't know if we will ever get to the point where there will be no infrastructure deficit. The only way that that may happen is if everybody moves out of Alberta. That question, I would say, is not going to happen.

5:50

We do recognize, of course, that we do need to catch up. We need to be able to maintain our buildings. Our buildings were built 25, 30 years ago, as was a lot of Alberta when it was building, and we got into the heavy activity of what I would consider development. There were a lot of buildings built. There were a lot of hospitals built, and there were a lot of schools built. We need to ensure that we maintain those. We're doing that through modernization of education facilities, and of course we do have increased spending on schools and health and postsecondary.

I would also like to make the comment that the maintenance funding has increased, you know, for the schools and postsecondary and roads and health. Minor maintenance funding has increased by \$24 million, and priority maintenance is addressed first. Hon. member, I would suggest to you that it's not what I would consider an easy task, to try to address the priorities, but at the same time we very much look at the needs and what is used and what has high address areas.

**The Deputy Chair:** The hon. member.

**Mr. Kang:** Thank you, Mr. Minister. Okay. Now I'm coming to deferred maintenance, business plan page 78. Percentage in good condition in 2009-10 was actually 62 per cent; then in 2011-12, 59 per cent; in 2012-13, 57 per cent; and then it's down to 55 per cent. You know, is there any figure? How much is the deferred maintenance for government-owned buildings this year? The percentage of buildings in good condition is significantly dropping each year. What would the cost be to reverse this trend? What is the definition of fair condition and poor condition with regard to government buildings? I think I've got a couple more here. What would be the cost to move the 3 per cent in poor condition into the fair category? I think that should do it.

**Mr. Danyluk:** Well, what I can say to you, as I said at the beginning, is that our deferred maintenance is about \$340 million. All of the measures in goal 1 are calculated using the facility condition index to report the physical conditions of the facilities. The ratio of the cost is correct: current and future five-year physical condition deficits relative to current facility replacement value.

I need to say to you that the percentages are calculated by taking the square metres of facilities in good and in fair and in poor condition, but I also had a discussion about, when we look at facilities – a lot of this is calculated into age. I can tell you that the \$340 million would put us in a great situation, but at the same time, you know, we have to have our priorities. We move those priorities around because it's not always that, you know, we do the maintenance until it is needed, if I can say. I mean, it's a situation that sometimes, you know, the facilities we have last longer. The new facilities that rate good are facilities that have been constructed or completely refurbished within the last 10 years and have not been audited or rated as being in good condition. You know, what happens is that we can say that a facility in the ranking is good because it's been done in the last 10 years, right? This measure does not include unsupported facilities such as outreach centres or residences or parkades.

**The Deputy Chair:** I hesitate to interrupt the hon. minister, but pursuant to Government Motion 5, agreed to on February 23, 2011, consideration for the main estimates for Infrastructure have concluded, and the Committee of Supply shall now rise and report progress.

[Mr. Mitzel in the chair]

**The Acting Speaker:** The hon. Member for Calgary-North Hill.

**Mr. Fawcett:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Committee of Supply has had under consideration resolutions for the Department of Infrastructure relating to the 2011-12 government estimates for the general revenue fund and the lottery fund for the fiscal year

ending March 31, 2012, reports progress, and requests leave to sit again.

**The Acting Speaker:** All those members of the Assembly that concur with the report, please say aye.

**Hon. Members:** Aye.

**The Acting Speaker:** Opposed? Please say no. So ordered.  
The hon. Deputy Government House Leader.

**Mr. Denis:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I would move that the House stand adjourned until 7:30 this evening.

[Motion carried; the Assembly adjourned at 5:57 p.m.]







## Table of Contents

Prayers .....	755
Introduction of Guests .....	755
Members' Statements	
Organ Donor Week .....	756
Mental Health Treatment Services for Children .....	756
Services for Chinese-Canadian Children .....	756
Climb and Run for Wilderness .....	757
Alberta Land Stewardship Legislation .....	757
Integrity in Government .....	765
Oral Question Period	
Patient Advocacy by Health Professionals .....	757
Nondisclosure Agreements with Physicians .....	758
Education Funding .....	758
Physician Services in Fort McMurray .....	759
Cancer Surgery Wait Times .....	759
Health Quality Council Review .....	759
Registry Service Fees for Municipalities .....	760
All-terrain Vehicle Safety .....	760
Highway 22 .....	761
Municipal Zoning Exemption for Universities .....	761
Renewable Diesel Fuel .....	761
Seniors' Pharmaceutical Plan .....	762
Artists and Education Program .....	762
L'École Parkside .....	763
Residential Building Inspection Reports .....	763
Education Relative Cost of Purchasing Adjustment .....	764
Provincial Budget Projections .....	764
Homelessness Initiative .....	764
Online Access to Historical Resources .....	765
Tabling Returns and Reports .....	766
Tablings to the Clerk .....	766
Orders of the Day .....	766
Committee of Supply	
Main Estimates 2011-12	
Infrastructure .....	766

If your address is incorrect, please clip on the dotted line, make any changes, and return to the address listed below. To facilitate the update, please attach the last mailing label along with your account number.

Subscriptions  
Legislative Assembly Office  
1001 Legislature Annex  
9718 – 107 Street  
EDMONTON, AB T5K 1E4

---

Last mailing label:

Account # \_\_\_\_\_

New information:

Name:

Address:

---

Subscription information:

Annual subscriptions to the paper copy of *Alberta Hansard* (including annual index) are \$127.50 including GST if mailed once a week or \$94.92 including GST if picked up at the subscription address below or if mailed through the provincial government interdepartmental mail system. Bound volumes are \$121.70 including GST if mailed. Cheques should be made payable to the Minister of Finance.

Price per issue is \$0.75 including GST.

Online access to *Alberta Hansard* is available through the Internet at [www.assembly.ab.ca](http://www.assembly.ab.ca)

Subscription inquiries:

Subscriptions  
Legislative Assembly Office  
1001 Legislature Annex  
9718 – 107 St.  
EDMONTON, AB T5K 1E4  
Telephone: 780.427.1302

Other inquiries:

Managing Editor  
*Alberta Hansard*  
1001 Legislature Annex  
9718 – 107 St.  
EDMONTON, AB T5K 1E4  
Telephone: 780.427.1875