

[Chairman: Mr. Ady]

[10 a.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would like to call the meeting to order. We'd like to welcome before the committee this morning the Hon. Ken Kowalski, Minister of Public Works, Supply and Services, and the department officials he has with him. We will welcome some opening comments from the minister in a few moments, but we ask for his indulgence while we digress for a moment and accept recommendations the committee may have prepared that they would like to read into the record this morning. Do we have some?

The Member for Lacombe.

MR. MOORE: Thanks, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to make the following recommendation to the committee for consideration:

That no more projects be considered or expansion of existing projects be considered until such time that funds are again flowing into the heritage trust fund from royalty revenue.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, hon. member.

Are there any others? Thank you.

Hon. minister, today we have three projects before the committee, as I understand it, that are eligible for discussion, those being Capital City Recreation Park, Fish Creek Provincial Park, and the Walter C. Mackenzie Health Sciences Centre. All of those either do receive or have received funding from the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund. We'll ask the committee to contain their remarks to those projects.

We would like to have the minister introduce government officials he has with him today and then give whatever opening remarks he would care to give. Then we will move to the question portion of our committee meeting.

Hon. minister.

MR. KOWALSKI: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. I've always enjoyed the opportunity I've had since I've become a member of Executive Council to appear before this very important committee of the Legislative Assembly. I recall with a great deal of fondness recent years when I had an opportunity, Mr. Chairman, to sit in the chair you have, in the time frame 1982 through to 1986, as chairman of the Standing Committee on the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund Act. I view this as the most important committee that exists arising out of the Legislative Assembly committee system, and I welcome the opportunity to be here with you this morning.

With me are four gentlemen I would like to introduce. The gentleman to my immediate left is Mr. Ed McLellan, who is the Deputy Minister of Public Works, Supply and Services. The gentlemen to my right: first of all, immediately right is Tony Hargreaves, who is an assistant deputy minister of capital development, Public Works, Supply and Services; and the gentleman one more removed to the right, Mr. Herman Lucas, is assistant deputy minister of accommodation services of Public Works, Supply and Services. To my extreme left is Mr. Ray Reshke, who is the executive director of finance administration, once again of the Department of Public Works, Supply and Services.

Mr. Chairman, you indicated in your opening remarks that there would be three items that could come before the purview of the committee this morning. One of those three items that you mentioned, Fish Creek Provincial Park, is completed, and there were no expenditures during the fiscal year under review, 1988-89. The investment of that particular project was com-

pleted prior to the fiscal year you have under review, and there were no expenditures at all in the 1988-89 fiscal year with respect to Fish Creek Provincial Park arising out of the capital projects division of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund.

The other two projects did have expenditures in the recent fiscal year. The first of those is the Capital City Recreation Park. There is documentation, I guess, in the annual report of the Provincial Treasurer with respect to the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, on page 26 of that report, which basically indicates that in the fiscal year under review, the '88-89 fiscal year, there was an expenditure level of some \$400,000, an investment at March 31, 1989, in the Capital City Recreation Park here in the city of Edmonton. It now has arrived at a some \$43 million level.

This project, Mr. Chairman, was initiated in 1975 when the province of Alberta entered into an agreement with the city of Edmonton for the development of the Capital City Recreation Park for the purpose of a park, recreation, and environmental conservation, a series of objectives. That agreement was effective - the first one - from February, 1975, through to July 1, 1978, and then was amended on further dates thereafter, including the most recent amendment which occurred on March 16, 1984. Originally there were three provincial departments involved: the Department of the Environment, the Department of Lands and Forests, and the Department of Culture, Youth and Recreation. It is the Department of Recreation and Parks which now represents the province of Alberta with respect to the operation and maintenance of Capital City Recreation Park, whereas the department I'm minister of, the Department of Public Works, Supply and Services, provides reimbursements for land acquisitions required to complete the park. And that is our only role: the provision of reimbursements to the city of Edmonton for land acquisitions required to complete the park. That is the situation that currently exists and has existed.

We're now into the final years of land acquisition with respect to Capital City Recreation Park. A recent agreement in the 1987-88 fiscal year saw Alberta Public Works, Supply and Services, through the capital projects division of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, set up an arrangement with the city of Edmonton that over a four-year time frame, from 1987-88 through to 1990-91, a total of \$2 million would be approved in those four fiscal years to clean up these last remaining parcels of land acquisition. In 1988-89 that \$400,000 was exactly for that purpose. We have a figure of \$800,000 in the current fiscal year, '89-90, to continue that process. We believe that by the fiscal year 1990-91 those land acquisition parcels will be complete. There are a small number of parcels, approximately only 25 totaling approximately 42 acres in size, that are needed to finish this job. Of course, the initiative would be done with the city of Edmonton doing the negotiating and the city of Edmonton then being reimbursed by the province through this mechanism we have to complete that.

So the bottom line in all of this is that by 1990-91 there should be no further draws out of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund with respect to Capital City Recreation Park, unless, of course, the committee in its wisdom were to recommend that additional work provisions be undertaken. If that were the case, that would be done in consultation, of course, with the lead department of our government, Recreation and Parks, and the city of Edmonton, and it would come back to the Heritage Savings Trust Fund.

The second project, a major project that undoubtedly will have a question or two this morning, is the Walter C. Mackenzie Health Sciences Centre. This is a project that was initiated a

number of years ago. In fact, the construction of this very, very massive centre began in the 1977-78 fiscal year and essentially was completed in April of 1986. To date there has been an investment of some \$390 million on this particular project. In the fiscal year under review there was some \$2 million in funding provided. This project over the years has seen a number of administrative mechanisms deal with it. Where we're at today is that an independent board administers the Walter C. Mackenzie Health Sciences Centre and runs it and makes recommendations and the like. A number of projects that are currently under review by the board itself may very well be funded under the Department of Health in the future rather than the capital projects division of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund.

So like the previous project, we are now into basically looking down at seeing a completion of this. While there is a budget of investment for the current fiscal year, when we go into the 1990-91 fiscal year there will be no additional draws for the Walter C. Mackenzie Health Sciences Centre arising out of the capital projects division of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. In the fiscal year under review there was some \$2 million allocated for a variety of minor projects associated with the cleaning up of the project.

Members will recall that when we dealt with the estimates of the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund in the Legislative Assembly during the summer of 1989, there was a series of questions associated with it and responses as well. Those questions and responses are contained in *Hansard*, beginning on page 1203, of 1989.

So, Mr. Chairman, perhaps that gives us the status of where we're at with these two projects today. I'd be very pleased to stop now and attempt to answer any questions hon. members might wish to direct.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, hon. minister, for a good overview.

I'd like to recognize the Member for Edmonton-Centre, followed by the Member for Calgary-Fish Creek.

REV. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and welcome to the minister and his officials. I'm still a bit unclear as to what public works is funding and the operation of recreation on one side or health on the other, so I'm sure if I ask any questions out of line, Mr. Chairman, you'll bring me back to order.

Starting with the Walter C. Mackenzie, the minister's right in suggesting that we did debate some of this, or ask some questions during debates, during the last session, but I don't recall answers to two questions which I'd like to ask now. The first one has to do with the fate of the old wing of the old hospital. I never get my years straight; I think it's the '56 wing. I know there's some debate as to whether or not it's going to remain as a long-term care facility. Now, my view is that it's below code, it doesn't meet any necessary standards for a health care facility today, and it should be demolished. I think your department would be doing that. Whether it comes under Walter C. Mackenzie - I mean, it's on that site. I'm just wondering if you have any information to update me with on the status of that old wing.

MR. KOWALSKI: Some time ago, and that was no more than within the last two fiscal years, there was a proposal that there be undertaken a demolition of the wing known as the 1950-57 wing of the University of Alberta Hospital. Since that time there has been further review by the board. Where we're at

right now is that that matter is under review by the board. I think the jury is still out in terms of what is anticipated or what will happen with respect to that. But should the decision be to demolish it or should the decision be to continue it, that project would then be dealt with by the Department of Health, not the Department of Public Works, Supply and Services, and there would not be an anticipated draw that would come out of the capital projects division. It would be a GRF funded decision, and the board and the Department of Health in essence would be involved in the final decision.

Where we're at right now is that there is no decision in terms of the demolition of the 1950-57 wing and there is ongoing discussion. So I think there are great opportunities there for some innovative uses of that building, or, quite frankly, I guess if the board in consultation with the Department of Health concluded it was more advantageous to demolish the building, they would announce that decision at the appropriate time.

REV. ROBERTS: Another question that was raised when we visited the centre, Mr. Chairman - and again I don't know if it's a health matter or whether it's going to be under this minister - was funds from the heritage fund to construct a heliport someplace near the hospital for landing air ambulance. I know they use an old ballpark right by the traffic circle there. If we were to make a recommendation from this committee - because the hospital can't do it under its operating budget; I don't think there's money in Health to do it - if it's of a capital constructive nature to build a landing pad for air ambulance, would this minister advise as to whether that should go ahead or whether he would be responsible for it?

MR. KOWALSKI: As it sits at the moment, Mr. Chairman, to the hon. member, the answer to this question is very similar to the answer to the last one. There currently is a review of ambulance service going on in the province of Alberta that all hon. members are participating in. The question of the helicopter landing facility was raised earlier in the year during the discussion of the estimates. I indicated at that time that that matter was once again being reviewed by the hospital board in consultation with the Department of Health. One decision has been made to this point in time: when and if the decision is that there should be a helicopter landing facility located as part of the whole facility, it would be treated as a separate project by the hospital board and the decision between the hospital board and the Department of Health to fund it would be one they would make together. The funding source of it would become the General Revenue Fund, not the Heritage Savings Trust Fund.

REV. ROBERTS: Okay. That clears up those two. Thank you.

The other one is about Capital City Park, a great park, may I say, in the capital city, one that I and my family use quite often for walking and hiking and cross-country skiing and bicycling. But I'm just unclear - I'm sure the member to my right would want to know as well - how far west it's going and how fast. You talked about four more years, with \$2 million for the last remaining land acquisition. I can take it only to the Groat bridge, and I'm wondering just how far west it's going to go beyond that and how far west that final land acquisition is going to enable it to go.

MR. KOWALSKI: The basic boundary for Capital City Park is coterminous with the restricted development area that was

enunciated by Alberta Environment a number of years ago under the Department of the Environment Act, and my understanding is that basically Groat bridge is the western extreme of it. Now, I've heard there has been discussion in the city of Edmonton and the city of Edmonton itself has from time to time basically said there's a need to look at expansion of Capital City Park, but I can only say I've heard that by way of discussion rather than any formal resolution that has come from anywhere. That's basically where we're at right now. We've had claims in the fiscal year under review of only a selected number of properties with respect to that, and they all fit within the current boundaries that exist, and that is essentially the restricted development area.

I would make an editorial comment, Mr. Chairman, on the quality of Capital City Park. I would agree with the Member for Edmonton-Centre that it is a wonderful facility and probably a wonderful facility very few people even in the city of Edmonton are aware exists. There's no doubt at all in my mind that during many of the long days we sat in this Assembly from June 1 through the end of August of this year, periodically I found my little 10-speed bike and went riding. I even went hiking, which may surprise some people. I had a great appreciation given to me about the quality of Capital City Park, but I also want to make the point one more time that I think it is for the most part unknown and probably has minimal usage.

I've been thinking in my own mind of how you can go about improving that awareness here within the city of Edmonton. There are some difficulties, and that's access to the park itself. If you live in the inner core of the city of Edmonton in many of those high rises, how do you safely get to an access point to the Capital City Park? I think there are some administrative things there that would have to be improved in the years to come; no doubt at all about that. A heck of a project, but probably not utilized or not known as well as it should be.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Member for Calgary-Fish Creek, followed by the Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark.

MR. PAYNE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As I understand it, Mr. Chairman, total investment from the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund as of March 31, '89, was \$45 million. I'm wondering if the minister could clarify how much of that \$45 million expenditure was related to the acquisition of the 3,300 acres of land and how much was related to the various recreational facilities and historical sites that make up the wonderful package of Fish Creek Park.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, I cannot provide that answer today. I will provide that answer in the future. The reason I can't is that there were no expenditures on this project in the last fiscal year. I simply didn't prepare myself for it. But we would be pleased to provide such information to the hon. member.

MR. PAYNE: Thanks. Of course, Mr. Chairman, the minister is quite correct in pointing out that the expenditure related to the question I posed does relate to previous years. I'm more than happy to await the response of the minister at a future time.

But staying with the question of land, I wonder if we could clarify today, Mr. Chairman, the minister's future land acquisition intentions. I raise the question because residents in the

adjacent communities, particularly at the eastern end of the park, periodically hear rumours of additional recreational opportunity investment which would involve additional land acquisition. So on their behalf, I suppose, and on behalf of the committee, I'm asking: are there any plans afoot to acquire additional land for the park?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, there are none to my knowledge. What would happen, of course, is that a department like Public Works, Supply and Services in essence would become a service department to other departments of the government. If they were to come forward with projects they would want to see pursued, they would ultimately come to Public Works, Supply and Services and ask this department to acquire land. But to this point in time I do not recall ever having given any approval that has my signature on it for the acquisition of additional land for that project.

MR. PAYNE: Final supplementary, Mr. Chairman.

From an environmental perspective, the minister well knows that Sikome Lake, the nine-acre swimming and skating lake and park, was closed to use by Albertans for a period in excess of a year, perhaps even a year and a half. As I understand it, of course that was to improve or upgrade the water quality because there had been complaints of various physical discomforts and ailments associated with questionable water quality. Given that the minister's department this year was involved in major lake improvements, I wonder if the minister or his officials would be prepared to comment today or provide any assurances that any lingering concerns about water quality are no longer justified.

MR. KOWALSKI: Yeah. I'll ask Mr. Hargreaves, who's our assistant deputy minister of capital development, to supplement my response, but to my understanding this lake has now been reopened. It was reopened in August of this year. Tony, would you like to follow through for specifics?

MR. HARGREAVES: I can perhaps only state that the treatment facilities for the water now are equal to a swimming pool. However, one has to recognize it is an outdoor lake and therefore you're going to get soil and dust and so forth blown onto the water. But the actual water is treated equivalent to swimming pool quality.

MR. PAYNE: Thanks, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

The Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark, followed by the Member for Ponoka-Rimbey.

MR. MITCHELL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. To the minister: I guess in answer to a question he raised, in fact there is an expansion planned for Capital City Park. There's an elaborate plan that's been developed by the city of Edmonton which ultimately will constitute an expenditure of \$48 million to extend it throughout the west end and in some sections, I think, to the northeast as well. I'd like to pursue that issue. I wonder if the minister can tell us – and I may be wrong in my assumption – why it at least appears that the Heritage Savings Trust Fund at one point invested in considerably more than just land acquisition. It seems to have invested in facility construction and development for the Capital City Recreation Park, but now it is limiting its role, through this minister, only to land acquisition.

MR. KOWALSKI: Well, that's basically where we're at in terms of what the original agreements are. The hon. member has to appreciate that when the agreement of 1975 was signed, an agreement between the city of Edmonton and the province of Alberta, there was a limit of expenditure set, which would only appear to be good fiscal management and responsibility, that when an agreement is signed we know what the scope is of what we would want to do. That scope in the 1975 agreement called for expenditures of \$34 million. Now, that \$34 million was in the dollar value of the funds of the day, 1974 dollars, and that was set aside for park development and land acquisition. Those actual dollars expended by the end of the fiscal year are in the document, of course, and have been then geared to their value in 1988-1989 dollars. And we followed through on the agreement. As I already indicated, there were amendments made to this agreement subsequently, but the general tone of the agreement set up that we would have established in the city of Edmonton an urban park and it would have a scope and a set dollar limit on it. That appears to me to be intelligent fiscal management, and that's where we're at at the moment.

So we're now in the final years of concluding that agreement, and I have no doubt at all that there would be anticipatory desires to see people expand the park and go beyond. Those are policy questions and policy decisions that will have to be made.

Where we're at as of this day in November of 1989 is that no decision has been made to further expand it. I have no doubt at all that there are all kinds of plans and ideas and desires and aspirations, but that decision to expand Capital City Park would have to be made as a result, no doubt at all, of recommendations that would come from this committee. It would have to be made on the basis of what all the priorities of the province of Alberta are. Where we're at today is that we've got a very unique park in the city of Edmonton with some \$43 million of government of Alberta expenditures in it.

MR. MITCHELL: Given that a quarter of a billion dollars has been spent on the park facility at Kananaskis, which basically is a facility certainly more for southern Albertans than for northern Albertans, and given that Fish Creek Provincial Park has seen an expenditure of \$45 million, again for southern Albertans more than northern Albertans, would the minister consider at this time accepting a recommendation and acting on a recommendation that he in fact renegotiate an agreement with the city of Edmonton for the completion of the Capital City Park over, say, a 10-year period and that funds in addition to the \$15 million allocated by the Recreation and Parks department be considered as an expenditure from the Heritage Savings Trust Fund?

MR. KOWALSKI: Well, to repeat what I said a little earlier, Mr. Chairman, the operation and maintenance of the Capital City Park rests with our provincial Department of Recreation and Parks, not the Department of Public Works, Supply and Services. We are a facilitator department, an expeditor department, and depending on what this illustrious committee may choose to do in terms of recommendations and depending on what the position of the Department of Recreation and Parks and, of course, the city of Edmonton is, if the city of Edmonton were to come to the government, I suppose, and list all the priorities on the agenda of the city of Edmonton but were to put Capital City Recreation Park number one on the agenda above recycling initiatives, environmental improvement initiatives, drainage initiatives, water improvement initiatives, health care

initiatives, social services initiatives, then I would suspect the government would be most willing to accommodate a request of the city of Edmonton.

MR. MITCHELL: So I guess the minister's saying, then, that he thinks . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: You have a supplementary?

MR. MITCHELL: Yeah. I guess the minister's saying that he thinks, for example, that the heritage trust fund should involve itself in recycling initiatives and . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. member, that's really not pertinent. He has outlined that it should fall under the jurisdiction of Recreation and Parks. He doesn't have jurisdiction over the expansion of parks. It just passes back to him to acquire the land.

MR. MITCHELL: Mr. Chairman, in fact he has jurisdiction. Otherwise the Capital City Recreation Park is in contravention of the law of that program, because they've already spent money on things I'm suggesting they spend money on. I can ask him questions about that. I'm tired of getting cut off.

My third question concerns the irrigation headworks and irrigation systems program under the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. Why is it that when the minister himself as Environment minister made the commitment to transfer dams and related projects from his department to the public works department, this project, irrigation headworks and systems . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. member . . . Member for Lacombe.

MR. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, the young Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark is again not up to what this is all about. This is an examination of the spending of the heritage trust fund by this particular minister's department. I realize that you left a lot of leeway to the first questioner when he went into the demolition of buildings - hopefully we aren't demolishing buildings with heritage trust funds; we build things with heritage trust funds - but I think the leeway has gone too far now. If this is what we're here for, I think we should adjourn and go. Now, I'm prepared to make that motion if we are going to go on in areas not applicable to the heritage trust fund and this minister in particular, Mr. Chairman. The previous speaker is right out of order.

MR. MITCHELL: Mr. Chairman . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. member, the Chair has to ask that you stay within the jurisdiction of this department when they're the ones that are appearing before the committee, and other projects should be applicable to those departments.

MR. MITCHELL: Mr. Chairman, if I'm not mistaken, the minister himself has recommended and now accepted responsibility for dams which are related to irrigation, if I'm not mistaken, under his department. What I'm asking . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. member, they're not funded under the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund.

MR. MITCHELL: So what? They could be, couldn't they?

MR. CHAIRMAN: That would come in the form of a recommendation through the committee, and you have the opportunity to make that recommendation through the committee. It would seem more appropriate that that would come in the estimates from his department as opposed to flowing through this committee. Would you please stay to the three projects and his responsibility for funding.

MR. TAYLOR: Point of order, Mr. Chairman. Just because it's not on the agenda doesn't mean it can't be . . . Because there has been a transfer. Certainly the headworks . . . When the Environment minister was in, we could have questioned him, but it was rather useless because he no longer had responsibility for it. The responsibility for dams is now in the hands of this minister. So just because your agenda, which was set up probably a year ago, said we're going to examine the Minister of the Environment on irrigation doesn't mean that in the ensuing time that responsibility's been transferred to this gentleman, who has celebrated the event of getting out of Environment by taking up smoking, he is no longer responsible for answering it. I don't understand it. If there's been a shift, this is the guilty man.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Chair would like to make a comment. With the logic you're putting forward, we would have no order in this committee. We would discuss whatever comes as a whim to the minds of the members. It's absolutely essential that we stay within some reasonable guidelines. The Chair has been lenient, and all I'm asking is that you stay within reasonable bounds of the responsibilities of this minister as it pertains to expenditures from the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund. So without debating it further, would the member just please stay within reasonable bounds. That's all the Chair is asking.

MR. MITCHELL: Mr. Chairman, in keeping with the question I asked of the agricultural minister, which you allowed to proceed and which was answered, in fact, by the Associate Minister of Agriculture very well, I will ask: why is it that irrigation headworks and the main irrigation systems improvement program funded by the Heritage Savings Trust Fund is under the Department of the Environment and not under the Department of Public Works, Supply and Services? I'm trying to make this man's job bigger.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But, hon. member, didn't you receive an answer on that from the . . .

MR. MITCHELL: I just received one with respect to the agricultural minister, but I haven't received it with respect to the public works minister, and I'd just be really . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: So is that your question?

MR. MITCHELL: That's my question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. minister, are you comfortable with handling that question? If so, I'll allow it. If the hon. minister feels no responsibility . . . [interjections] The Chair will place the committee in the hands of the minister on this question.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very much the endorsement of my ability put forward by the Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark. I appreciate his confidence in my ability to administer an ever increasing package of capital

projects in the province of Alberta.

The answer to the question, I think, is a very simple one. When the Premier made administrative changes in September of 1988, there were two large segments of capital funding that were transferred to the Department of Public Works, Supply and Services, neither of which are funded under the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. One was hospital construction, and the other one was construction of major dam projects in our province. I would suspect, a year later, that the amount of responsibility given to the Minister of Public Works, Supply and Services is a rather sufficient amount for one individual to look after.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

The Member for Ponoka-Rimbey, followed by the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon.

MR. JONSON: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. I'd just like to move over to the Mackenzie Health Sciences Centre. I know the minister did comment on a number of pertinent items with respect to that complex, but I just want to check on something, sort of a trend that seemed to develop, with respect to this complex.

As I understand it, Mr. Chairman, the project was to be completed in 1986. However, in the subsequent years we've had \$2 million here, \$1.6 million there being added to the expenditure on the health sciences centre. I'd like to start with this question: does the minister see this as being the final, final year of Heritage Savings Trust Fund commitment to this project?

MR. KOWALSKI: I anticipate, Mr. Chairman, that when we arrive at the fiscal year 1990-91 - in other words, the current fiscal year - it will be the last draw of capital expenditure under the Heritage Savings Trust Fund for the Walter C. Mackenzie Health Sciences Centre.

MR. JONSON: Mr. Chairman, could the minister just review for us what is being purchased or built with these last amounts of money that have come through in the last two to three years?

MR. KOWALSKI: Yes. They were dealt with earlier, Mr. Chairman, when I appeared before the Legislative Assembly in terms of the general estimates. I would point out that, in essence, they were smaller expenditures in terms of some cleanups. In terms of the current fiscal year, not the fiscal year under review, we're basically looking at some \$2 million. There would be some dollars provided for department of medicine clinics; one of the intensive care units would be upgraded; there would be a modest amount, less than \$200,000, that would be spent on landscaping east of the centre; some upgrading of lighting in the pediatrics wing; black-out blinds would be provided to patient rooms; and there's a telelift station as well on level 6, which is the part that has a minor expenditure level of some \$35,000, \$36,000. There are small additional improvements to the overall facility that would be undertaken.

MR. JONSON: I guess my final supplementary, Mr. Chairman, would be: I understand the landscaping and these additional things which are necessary, but has any of the expenditure been related to a redesign or something that didn't work out in the original design of the building?

MR. KOWALSKI: Not major at all. I indicated already that such things as improving or upgrading of lighting in the pediat-

rics wing comes by way of experience and additional demand and the like, but not what you would consider major in any way considering the magnitude of the project itself.

MR. JONSON: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Member for Westlock-Sturgeon, followed by the Member for Lacombe.

MR. TAYLOR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good morning, Mr. Minister. I can see you through the smoke now. That was a statement, Mr. Chairman.

With respect to Capital City Park's development and a bit of background, we seem to have funded the large wilderness park concept all right, with the Kananaskis and Willmore wilderness areas, and we have the Capital City Park, but the towns and villages . . . I noticed in the last two years, Mr. Chairman, in recommendation 4 in 1988, then moved up by '89 to recommendation 2, that the Alberta heritage trust fund's commitment to the ongoing urban parks program be expanded to include villages and towns in a scaled down version of the urban parks development. Is the minister giving any thought to that?

MR. KOWALSKI: I repeat once again, Mr. Chairman, that we're a service department, that in essence when those decisions are made by this illustrious committee or the forces in various individual departments come and say, "This is what we need," we will then go out and purchase the land requirements or we'll undertake the capital construction as per the direction given to Public Works, Supply and Services.

My personal view, as a member of the Legislative Assembly – but I've found in the past that the opposition members very seldom, if ever, want to find out what my personal views are.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. member, again you have to bring your question more in line with his responsibilities.

MR. TAYLOR: I was sort of, I guess, trying to sound out his thoughts or mind on it, but as usual I've found it a very difficult thing to do.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. member, please proceed with the supplementary.

MR. TAYLOR: Secondly, then, in the funding and in making a maximum use of the fund, has the minister studied what federal funds are available in the field that could have been added to this pot to make it go a little bit further?

MR. KOWALSKI: In terms of dollars, I guess in this case the hon. gentleman would want to know if there are federal dollars that would be made available to the province for land acquisition under Capital City Recreation Park. We've certainly reviewed that in the past and have been told, "No, that's a responsibility of the province," in dealing with this particular project.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Final supplementary.

MR. TAYLOR: As a point of order here, does this mean that the land for wilderness parks or the Kananaskis park doesn't have anything to do with your department?

MR. KOWALSKI: This is correct. The land for Kananaskis is Crown land; it's owned by the province of Alberta. We don't have to sit down and negotiate with the federal government in terms of what land it is under the ownership of the province of Alberta. Kananaskis Country, all those acres, are provincial lands.

MR. TAYLOR: Well, Mr. Chairman, what I was trying to get at was that I believe there are federal funds available for wilderness parks and stuff like that. But let's move on then. The next is we'll jump . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. member, I'm stretching it for your third supplementary in view of the dialogue that's gone on. Would you please come forth with your second supplementary?

MR. MITCHELL: I found it very helpful dialogue.

MR. TAYLOR: Yes, that's right; most informative.

The third one is – I would jump over to the Walter Mackenzie area and the funding there. There again I may be on touchy ground. I've noticed in some other areas in North America that to prioritize the transplants and the specialty operations, there's a committee. I'm just wondering there, again, whether the operation . . . Does the minister have any right to make recommendations, and can he and will he, on the prioritizing of the use of the Mackenzie facilities?

MR. KOWALSKI: I want to be very clear on this so the hon. member does not continue in either a daze or a haze. The Minister of Public Works, Supply and Services does not provide directives to the professional doctors who determine what the schedule is for the use of each one of the 843 acute care beds or the 14 operating theatres or the seven intensive care units or the 40-bed day wards or the four operating rooms or the eight-bed recovery room. This minister does not send a letter to anyone at the Walter C. Mackenzie Health Sciences Centre saying that individual X must be brought forward as a priority ahead of individual B or Y or A. This is not the role of this minister, and it most certainly is not the expertise, the desire, or the knowledge of anyone in the Department of Public Works, Supply and Services.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. Member for Westlock-Sturgeon, I believe that verifies the fact that your question was, in fact, on shaky ground. We'll move to the Member for Lacombe, followed by the Member for Calgary-Forest Lawn.

MR. MOORE: Thanks, Mr. Chairman. While the minister has done an excellent job in his overview and answered a lot of questions, it's very evident from the type of questions coming out that he left none related to the heritage trust fund to be answered. However, having listened, I too have a lot of questions that relate to general topics that fall within the jurisdiction of public works. I think everyone around here has, and I think we should be given that platform. But the minister's door is always open, and I would think that rather than tie up an important group like this with those questions, they could always go down there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. member, would you proceed with the question?

MR. MOORE: My preamble was like Edmonton-Meadowlark's.

However, I'll respect the decision of the Chair like I would think people on this side here would. I respect when you say questions must pertain to the heritage trust fund spending in that department. And because he has answered all . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would you please put your question?

MR. MOORE: . . . the questions that are in the minds of people, including the ones in the front bench here, I will forgo any questions, because I haven't any left.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, hon. member - I guess.

Member for Calgary-Forest Lawn, followed by the Member for Clover Bar.

MR. PASHAK: Thanks, Mr. Chairman. Mine are just questions that will attempt to get at some information here with respect to actual expenditures. I understand the minister has the annual report for the Heritage Savings Trust Fund with him. If you'll just turn to page 46 under Recreation and Parks, under Urban Parks it indicates that there has been a total of \$86.65 million spent on urban parks. Under Fish Creek Provincial Park it shows an expenditure of almost \$17 million, but some of that expenditure for urban parks has also gone to Fish Creek. Why are they split out that way? What's the rationale? Could you break down that expenditure of \$86.65 million in terms of money that's gone to the Capital City Park as opposed to Fish Creek Park and that kind of thing?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, I'm the Minister of Public Works, Supply and Services, not the Minister of Recreation and Parks. If I had known or been given the privilege of anticipating such a question, I would have undoubtedly prepared myself for it and come here to speak on behalf of another minister, but I understand that the committee itself had the opportunity to have requested the Minister of Recreation and Parks to come forward.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. member, I believe the minister is justified in his position.

MR. PASHAK: I think he is too. I think I put the question . . . Let me try it from another direction. Why is some of this money under Public Works, Supply and Services and some under Recreation and Parks? Like, there's an expenditure of \$28 million for Fish Creek under Public Works, Supply and Services and \$16 million under Recreation and Parks out of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. Where do your responsibilities leave off and Parks and Recreation's begin?

MR. CHAIRMAN: If the Chair could make a comment. Hon. minister, perhaps it's necessary for you to give something of an overview of the arrangements that are in place for the Department of Public Works, Supply and Services in the acquisition of land and their role, because there obviously seems to be some misunderstanding of that role. So perhaps you could do that, hon. minister, and it would preclude these kinds of questions.

MR. KOWALSKI: In terms of expenditures with respect to Capital City Recreation Park, Mr. Chairman, there was an agreement that was signed originally, as I'll repeat, in February of 1975. That was an agreement between the province of

Alberta and the city of Edmonton. There were three departments that were named in that agreement. There was the Department of the Environment, the Department of Lands and Forests, and the Department of Culture, Youth and Recreation. Of course, things have evolved since 1975. I've also indicated that there were modifications of those agreements signed subsequent to that.

Where we're at, in terms of the fiscal year under review, is that it is the Department of Recreation and Parks that deals with the operation and the administration of that particular park here in the city of Edmonton, along with the city of Edmonton. It is the role of the Department of Public Works, Supply and Services to acquire land and to work as a service department. That is basically where we're at.

In the fiscal year under review there were no expenditures under the administration of Public Works, Supply and Services from the Heritage Savings Trust Fund for Fish Creek Provincial Park.

MR. PASHAK: Now, that helps somewhat.

Then with respect to the expenditure for Capital City Recreation Park, that money is used to acquire land, I think. Is that land acquired from private landholders, or has some of that money which has gone historically to acquiring land also been for land bought from the city of Edmonton itself?

MR. KOWALSKI: I'm not aware of an expenditure of dollars to the city of Edmonton for land that the city may have owned. Now, I can be corrected on that, Mr. Lucas, if you have something further to that.

MR. LUCAS: No. All the land was bought from private landowners. But the city of Edmonton buys it, and we reimburse the city of Edmonton.

MR. KOWALSKI: After they have purchased it?

MR. LUCAS: Yes.

MR. PASHAK: Do I have one final supplementary?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, you do.

MR. PASHAK: Could you give us some idea of the nature of those transactions between the city of Edmonton and the province? Do you reimburse the city of Edmonton, say, for exactly what they've paid for that land, or do you bring in your own marketing analysts or real estate people or whatever?

MR. LUCAS: No, we reimburse the city for the market value of the land. Appraisals are carried out by the city, and we have copies of those appraisals. When the city finally purchases the land, the province reimburses the city of Edmonton for the exact cost of the purchase.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

The Member for Clover Bar advises the Chair that his questions have been answered, so we'll move to the Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark, followed by the Member for Athabasca-Lac La Biche.

MR. MITCHELL: Thanks, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to pursue the Walter C. Mackenzie hospital project. I wonder whether the

minister can tell us what the actual total cost, the Heritage Savings Trust Fund cost plus other expenditures from other budgets, is to date for the construction and outfitting of that hospital versus its original budget.

MR. KOWALSKI: Well, I was not here as a minister of the Crown when the original determination may have been made, so I can't comment on that. I know that there has been a lot of discussion over the years in terms of the whole project. Where we're at is that essentially we have a board, a board made up of private individuals who make representations to the Minister of Health and of course to the government, this committee, and others over the years. Where we're at today: the document indicates an expenditure level of an investment, at March 31, 1989, of some \$390 million. A number of years ago one portion of that particular project, the clinical research facility, the property ownership of that, was transferred to the Department of Advanced Education as the funding department. There had been an expenditure level of some \$17.632 million of public funds on that particular project. That dollar amount, title ownership for that amount, and administration for that amount rests with the Department of Advanced Education, at \$17.632 million. In the past that had been taken care of under this overall project. So very specifically to answer the hon. gentleman's question, you could add an additional \$17.632 million to the Walter C. Mackenzie Health Sciences Centre total scope cost and that would be a correct assumption. It's just that it's being administered and held through another department, and that was for the Clinical Research Building project.

Over the years as well, because these were not dollars that were called on to be taken out of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, there was interest revenue that had been generated in terms of the dollars that were set aside for the Walter C. Mackenzie science centre. They were authorized and provided to the board in lieu of grants, and they amounted to some \$4.32 million. But this is interest on dollars that were held for the project during the construction phase of the project. So there was, by way of the dollars and of the administration of the dollars that would go, if they were allocated, under the Heritage Savings Trust Fund – and the dollars sat in a separate account and obtained a minor amount of interest – some \$4.32 million that was provided to the board over an 11-year time frame, the 1977-78 fiscal year to the 1988-89 fiscal year. That interest provided to the board, in lieu of grants, \$4.32 million. So if you add collectively the three of them together, you would get, I suspect, the costing factor that the hon. member is looking for.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Final supplementary.

MR. MITCHELL: Mr. Chairman, while I appreciate that the minister hasn't been in this portfolio that long, I'm certain some of his staff have. I wonder whether they could tell us what the original budget of the Walter C. Mackenzie hospital was.

MR. KOWALSKI: I think one very important thing about our democracy, Mr. Chairman, is that our meetings are held in public, and we have *Hansard* associated with all our meetings. Surely, with nearly half a million-plus dollars provided to the Liberal caucus for research, the hon. member might choose to look at some of these previous *Hansards* to look at all the debate, the questions, and the like. The information is all public, it is all available, and the hon. member could form his own conclusions as a result of the research we've currently

provided for the Liberal party.

MR. MITCHELL: Is this minister then saying that he doesn't know what the budget is, and despite the fact that he has the responsibility for authorizing continuing expenditure on that hospital – I know it was \$2 million last year – he would do that kind of authorization without understanding what the original budget was? What is the budget?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let's be clear on the budget you're asking about. Are you asking about the total budget of that hospital, or are you asking about his responsibility for capital expenditure?

MR. MITCHELL: I'm asking about what it originally was budgeted to cost to build that hospital versus what in fact this government pumped into it, and I want an answer to it. And if he can't give me an answer, he's saying one of two things: either he doesn't know, which is extremely disconcerting, or he's not . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. member, you have clarified your question. Give the hon. minister an opportunity to answer it.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, the provision of quality health care services in this province has always been a major objective of the government that I'm a member of. The Walter C. Mackenzie Health Sciences Centre is located in Edmonton at the University of Alberta. It's a facility of 1.8 million square feet in size and provides for 843 acute care beds. It provides for 14 operating theatres, seven intensive care units, and has a research facility. It is a model in terms of the world, in terms of what it's quality-provisioned for.

Over the years this government has always followed a tradition of working with boards. We believe that local boards are very close to the people. We've asked them to give us their assessment of what they feel is important, and over the years, as a result of our listening to people and caring about what people say, we have provided for changes in scope. Such has been the case with the Walter C. Mackenzie Health Sciences Centre. If that board would come to us today and say, "We need improvements to lighting in the pediatrics wing; we need improvements to this particular operating room," we will make those, because we care about quality health care services to the citizens of this province and we will respond.

If the hon. member is suggesting that one is stubbornly saying, "This is the scope of the project, and thereafter, over a 10- or 11- or 12-year project, you will make no modifications or changes and you will still go blindly on into the future on the basis of the original amount of information that you've got," then the hon. member should say that. The fact of the matter is that the expenditure level in this particular facility is listed in 1988-1989 dollars. I would think that the bottom line in all this is that from the original estimate, if it had been projected in 1989 dollars, we would probably be right on the target that was originally envisaged some 11, 12, 13, 14 years ago, period.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

The Member for Athabasca-Lac La Biche.

MR. CARDINAL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. First of all, I'd like to commend the minister and his department for doing such an effective job. Keep up the good work.

For once I'll agree with the Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark: the park projects in southern Alberta are pretty darn nice, and also central Alberta. I think he was referring to the Capital City Recreation Park project in Edmonton. Just for the record, I'd like to make a comment: what about northern Alberta? It was mentioned a bit earlier . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. member, if the Chair could intercede, it's not the responsibility of this minister to initiate parks in this province. That falls under the Department of Recreation and Parks, and that minister has already been before this committee. That question would more appropriately have been asked of him. Now, if that minister initiates a park, no doubt he will pass on the responsibility to this minister to acquire the land if land acquisition is necessary. But at this point it would be hypothetical on his part to perceive that the Minister of Recreation and Parks might want to build a park and be able to answer your question. So I believe you have to deal in more specifics.

MR. CARDINAL: I haven't finished my question. I was just getting to it.

Public Works, Supply and Services, I know, is involved in land acquisition and some capital construction projects within that program. I just wonder: what are the positives and negatives of your involvement with a major municipality like the city of Edmonton?

MR. KOWALSKI: There are no negatives that I'm aware of, Mr. Chairman. We have undertaken a good working relationship with the municipalities of this province. And as Mr. Lucas has already pointed out, we will abide by, in a trustworthy nature, officials from the city of Edmonton, so that after they have negotiated a market value price for land that would be required for an urban park here in the city of Edmonton, we will accept, on the basis of the information provided to us, their appraisals and their assessments. We think there would be an absolute duplication, probably unnecessary expenditure of public funds, to have two or three levels of government looking over one another's shoulders. These are not principles that we would follow other than it would have to be based on market value, and that has worked quite well.

I might perhaps add one additional afterthought, Mr. Chairman, that will probably get a couple of the hon. members going. I certainly believe and endorse a park in northern Alberta, and I cannot think of a more beautiful area of the province of Alberta than that area that exists between Barrhead, Fort Assiniboine, and Swan Hills.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Chair would have some concern that this line of questioning may have been orchestrated by the two people. However, we'll continue for the supplementary.

MR. CARDINAL: Once the project is completed, will it be transferred to city Parks & Recreation, and will Public Works step out of it after it's completed?

MR. KOWALSKI: The land would rest that way, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CARDINAL: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

The Member for Edmonton-Centre, followed by the Member

for Calgary-Foothills.

REV. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. On page 46 of the annual report of the fund, it certainly lists this minister and his department as being responsible for the Walter C. Mackenzie as a deemed asset. I know the minister and maybe other members of the committee might argue that this minister is not able to financially evaluate his asset there and maybe the Treasurer will tomorrow, but we're going to be busy enough with questions to him. I was just wondering if officials in his department do in fact know, despite what's been invested in the Walter C. Mackenzie, how much it is currently worth. Has it appreciated? Has it depreciated? I know there are several CAT scanners which are kind of old school now and a number of other things in and around it that need some upgrading, and I don't know how we would ever know exactly its real market value. But I don't think it's fair just to say what's been put into it represents it as a financial asset to the province now, and I'd like this minister to answer what his understanding is of it as a deemed asset.

MR. KOWALSKI: We've never gone, Mr. Chairman, to the marketplace to ask for a private-sector evaluation in the marketplace of what the value of the Walter C. Mackenzie Health Sciences Centre would be if it were offered for sale. There is absolutely no plan, no thought, no idea, and no objective anywhere in this government to sell the Walter C. Mackenzie Health Sciences Centre.

REV. ROBERTS: Is the minister, then, saying it's not deemed as an asset to the province? There needs to be some way to determine how that asset is arrived at. It seems to me to make some sense in that regard, but . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. member, the deemed asset thing we've debated at various times, and perhaps that would be a fair question to bring to the Provincial Treasurer.

REV. ROBERTS: Another thing. Just because it's got the Walter C. Mackenzie here, and it is a big outfit, and now with the responsibility of the department to build hospitals generally for the province - and I'm not asking about dollars that will come out of general revenue or other capital dollars to build hospitals. But I am wondering: does he have officials who are aware enough of what has gone on at the Walter C. Mackenzie so that they now know when they build hospitals what to do and what not to do? I'm thinking particularly in the sense of hospital waste or biomedical waste: that issue. In the Walter C. Mackenzie there is carpeting on the floor of patients' rooms where blood, urine, and food get spilled, and nurses are saying, "We don't need carpets there." And so other hospitals should have a tiled floor instead - these kinds of things. Does he have officials who, in fact, are learning from the development of the Walter C. Mackenzie in terms of what to do and what not to do in hospital construction from now on?

MR. KOWALSKI: Yes, sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you have a final supplementary?

REV. ROBERTS: Yes. I'd just like another clarification from the minister - he was somewhat direct and firm about it in session - about the Department of Public Works, Supply and

Services going to open tender for all of its activities. Of course, we know that both in Ottawa and in past practices here in Edmonton, Public Works, Supply and Services is often a department where there's a lot of patronage and there are a lot of things going on behind the scenes . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. member, really you're off the pertinent question. If you have a final supplementary, please make it.

REV. ROBERTS: Well, I just would like to ask the minister if dollars that he is responsible for from the trust fund for capital construction or public works that need to have contractors' help with it - that it in fact does go through an open tendering process.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, we're getting away now from the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. The quick answer to the question is yes. The hon. member should be aware and should appreciate that in terms of hospital construction, which is not funded under the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, it is a local board that, in essence, would determine finally what the scope of the project would be. It would be a local board who would hire an architect, consulting engineers, and what have you to design the project, and finally the project would be tendered for construction in an open environment - in an open environment: public tendering.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
Member for Calgary-Foothills.

MRS. BLACK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Welcome, Mr. Minister.

I have sort of two disjointed questions, and I hope you'll allow me to ask them both. The first one: I'm back to Capital City Park; I'm interested in exactly what was the total reimbursement of land costs by the province to the city of Calgary for the land according to the agreement in 1975.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. member, do you mean the city of Edmonton for Capital City Park?

MRS. BLACK: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR. KOWALSKI: Four point nine million dollars out of the total project for land acquisition. This is Capital City Park in Edmonton?

MRS. BLACK: For 3,000 acres.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, hon. member. I believe you're confused. The 3,030 acres . . .

MR. KOWALSKI: Capital City Park, Edmonton, is 1,812 acres.

MRS. BLACK: And we paid four point . . . Did you say four point . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Chair believes that the hectare/acre thing has come into play here and has caused a little bit of confusion. The record I have is 1,200 hectares, hon. minister,

which equates to about 3,000 acres, slightly over.

MR. KOWALSKI: We should clarify, Mr. Chairman, just one point here, so that there is no confusion, and I hope the Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark is listening to this as well. You've got in the document 3,000 acres, and I gave a figure of 1,812 acres. That figure of 1,812 does not include river acreage, which you would find within the 3,000, and also does not include the Strathcona Science Park acreage. So together you get that figure. We're talking about the land that we had to acquire.

MRS. BLACK: And what was the cost?

MR. KOWALSKI: Four point nine million, I'm advised.

MRS. BLACK: For 1,800 acres. I'm looking on page 46, as well, of schedule 6 of the deemed assets, and I'm trying to draw again a correlation between the costs. We have almost \$43 million in Capital City Park and \$28 million in Fish Creek Park designated as land. I'm wondering what the expenditure for the land cost was for the two parks which are similar in size, because I gather it elapsed over the same time frame.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, once again for clarification here in terms, because of the nature of the question. I indicated and I responded that the city of Edmonton has 1,812 acres in their title for the park. Remember, originally in Capital City Park there was a whole series of minor, little neighbourhood parks that came together. The question was how much money then was utilized to purchase land, and we gave the figure of \$4.9 million. But that \$4.9 million was not to acquire that total amount of 1,812. There were two separate questions, and I responded to them. To web the two together doesn't give a correct assessment.

MRS. BLACK: I wonder if you could give me further clarification on the arrangements with the city of Edmonton, please.

MR. KOWALSKI: If you'd like to know exactly how many acres of land were purchased since the 1975 agreement through to 1989 and at what cost, we would provide that in writing to the chairman so that he can send it back to hon. members.

MRS. BLACK: My second disjointed question, sir, is: I would like to know what the book value of the Walter C. Mackenzie facility is, not the market asset value. I'd like to know what the depreciated book value of the facility is. I don't know whether that can come from this minister or you can provide that to me, but I would like to know what that is.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. member, when the amount is carried in the report . . . Well, the Chair will leave it to the minister to respond or not respond to that question. He can give you the amount that was expended by the department and the government and . . .

MRS. BLACK: I'm asking for the book value of the facility, not the expenditure. Just the book value.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I believe he responded as best he could to the hon. Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark on that question.

MR. TAYLOR: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. That's the

point, though: as best he could is not good enough. All we got was something that we could burn in the place, but nothing that we could . . . All we're after is the total funds that were spent: the book value. It's very easy.

MRS. BLACK: The depreciated value.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. minister.

MR. KOWALSKI: We'll consult with the Auditor General. I'm sure the Auditor General has such information that he can deal with it. In terms of dollar expenditure, we can give you that. I mean, it's there; it's public information. We've provided for it. How an individual would depreciate it or adjudicate it on the basis of accounting principles is something we're not going to spend too much time on in the Department of Public Works, Supply and Services, because we're essentially builders, not bookkeepers.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
The Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark.

MR. MITCHELL: I wonder whether the minister can tell us what it costs to heat the Walter C. Mackenzie's 1.8 million square feet, given the original design which created a huge atrium in the middle?

MR. KOWALSKI: I think it would be really, really . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. minister, we have a point of order.
Member for Lacombe.

MR. MOORE: On a point of order. Operating cost does not come out of the heritage trust fund. Mr. Chairman, it's apparent that we've run out of questions related to the heritage trust fund, and I move we adjourn.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. MITCHELL: Point of order. I have questions here that relate directly to the heritage trust fund. They designed it, and it costs a lot to heat it. I want to know what it costs to heat it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. minister, hon. member, I believe that the member does have a point. It does not apply to money from the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund. It would seem that you'd have to pose your question either in a different forum – or another question. If the member is prepared to come forth with a question that is pertinent to the department, the Chair would respectfully ask the Member for Lacombe to withdraw his motion for adjournment. Now, do we have that commitment from the Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark?

MR. MITCHELL: Absolutely. I will . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Member for Lacombe, based on that, will you withdraw your motion for adjournment?

MR. MOORE: I withdraw my motion to adjourn, and I will reintroduce it immediately if we get on to any question that's not related to the heritage trust fund, because we have important things to do, and he can take those questions up with the minister at his own time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. Thank you.

Hon. member, would you please then move through with your questions pertinent to that, and if you have points of order perhaps we could do them after you've finished your question.

MR. MITCHELL: I'd just like to make a point of order. I mean, I appreciate very much the Member for Lacombe allowing me, quote unquote, to continue, but what he has now put himself in the position of doing is defining what questions are in order and what are out of order, because he's going to move that we adjourn if he determines that my question's out of order. That is your role to do, and I believe that it . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: I will make that decision, then, because of the commitment the member has made.

MR. TAYLOR: I have a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Westlock-Sturgeon on this point of order.

MR. TAYLOR: Yes. It's on the procedure recognizing the Member for Lacombe's motion to adjourn. I think you can recognize any member when he has a point of order. But if all he or she is going to do is make a motion, they have then to go onto the order of the agenda is what you've asked. In other words, you can't sneak a motion to adjourn in under a point of order, and this is what he is doing. So if he wants to make a motion to adjourn, he goes to the bottom of the list like the rest of us, and when his turn comes, he can make that motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. member, the hon. Member for Lacombe has withdrawn his motion for adjournment. The Chair had no way of anticipating that he would move a motion for adjournment. He came in on a point of order, and I recognized him. It's been dealt with, and we now are moving on to the Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark with his question.

Please proceed with the question.

MR. MITCHELL: Thank you. To follow up an answer given by the minister earlier in which he said that over time certain things were added as experience indicated – for example, the lighting in the pediatric wing and, I guess, the clear Plexiglas barriers on the fourth floor would have been added – I wonder whether the minister could tell us now or make a commitment to tell us in writing as soon as possible, what was the original budget, what were the increments over time to that original budget, and what were those increments applied to, so that we could see whether they were justified or not.

MR. KOWALSKI: It's all public information, Mr. Chairman. It's all contained in the *Hansard* of the province.

MRS. BLACK: Point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Calgary-Foothills on a point of order.

MRS. BLACK: That question has been asked prior, and was also dealt with.

MR. MITCHELL: The minister said earlier that probably the amount of money that has been spent to date – and I emphasize

"probably" – in 1989 dollars is equivalent to what was originally budgeted. Is he saying he doesn't know? Isn't "probably" kind of an unfortunate guess when you're considering \$400 million in expenditure of Albertans' money?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, I guess we'll use the phraseology one more time to make it perfectly clear. [interjection] To make it perfectly clear, that's not at all what the minister said. The hon. Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark may use all the innuendos that he wants to use. I've said before repeatedly, now this morning in this committee that previous discussion with respect to the Walter C. Mackenzie Health Sciences Centre is all public. This Assembly has *Hansard*. All of its committees have *Hansard*, and if one chose to go back into *Hansard*, going back to probably 1975, 1976, the hon. gentleman would find dozens and dozens and dozens and dozens of pages of text dealing with the Walter C. Mackenzie Health Sciences Centre. That is all public information. It's all there. Surely one of the responsibilities an hon. member must have is to be prepared when he comes into this committee, and surely one of the questions is not simply, "Mr. Minister, would you provide this information to me?" when it's already there. It is public information. The hon. member should find it.

MR. MITCHELL: Mr. Chairman, I have another question with respect to deemed assets. The Walter C. Mackenzie sciences centre on schedule 6 has a deemed asset value of \$389 million. At the same time, the minister indicated that there was an additional expenditure on the Walter C. Mackenzie hospital of which he is aware – \$17.63 million – and it may be that there were other expenditures from other program departments; we don't know. I wonder if the minister could indicate to us: why would it be that the deemed asset value would only include the \$389 million and not all the other additional expenditures from other departments? How is it that we distinguish? Either it's an asset or it isn't an asset. Is it?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, one of the beauties of this committee is that the committee has an opportunity to subpoena before it the Auditor General who would write some of these schedules and some of these documents. The committee also has a remarkable opportunity of subpoenaing before it the Provincial Treasurer who would also be the author of some of these documents, some of these schedules and the like. It would seem to me, at least in previous years, we used the opportunity before the committee to ascertain from those individuals who should be held responsible for the text that they would provide. It was not the Minister of Public Works, Supply and Services who wrote schedule 6, nor in fact did he write much in this document other than those series of texts associated with the projects under his direct responsibility. He's quite prepared to answer any questions with respect to those matters under his direct responsibility.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
Member for Westlock-Sturgeon.

MR. TAYLOR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The minister mentioned that there has been a great deal of – his words – modifications and changes from the original setup, the original plan that went through. Would the minister be able to give the committee sort of an approximation of what the costs of the modifications and changes were over the original plan?

MR. KOWALSKI: Once again, Mr. Chairman, they're all listed in public documents. There's an annual report provided publicly, once a year. It's called the annual report of the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund. Those numbers are here. This committee has met in a public forum. I know; I served as the chairman of this committee for at least four years in which we reviewed those matters. All of this information is public. I didn't bring it with me this morning, because I thought we were going to be talking about the fiscal year under review. Perhaps next year if one wanted me to provide a 10- or 11- or 12-year overview, I'd come prepared with the necessary documents. But quite frankly, it's all public information, Mr. Chairman. Public information.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, I read the thing. I couldn't see the modifications and changes put down as that. I'd be happy if the minister would just, say, drop me a line. If you don't have it now, just drop a line what modifications and changes . . .

MR. KOWALSKI: No, Mr. Chairman, I'm not going to waste any more of my time providing information that's already public. The hon. gentleman has it. They've got a research facility of half a million plus dollars to do research for the Liberal caucus. They've got people running around the countryside finding research. All of these documents are public information, and I'm not going to waste my time as a minister of the Crown providing a copy of a document written three years ago to the hon. member when they've already got it in his office, if he'd ever go there and find it.

MR. MITCHELL: He's in Westlock-Sturgeon at least as often as you are.

MR. TAYLOR: So much for . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: If you have a supplementary, would you please bring it forward?

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, I've just asked . . . This is the height of arrogance from the minister. He says he's printed it, and . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The minister has responded to your question. Now, do you have a supplementary?

MR. TAYLOR: Okay; the supplementary then. The minister also said that 1.8 million square feet is the size of the establishment. I know the minister reminds me a lot of a Schick Injector: one thought goes in; the other pops out. Certainly he will remember that, Mr. Chairman, that 1.8 million square feet in size.

Can he recall at all what the size was when it was originally planned?

MR. KOWALSKI: The same, Mr. Chairman, and the hon. member, I surely hope, does not view that this minister is arrogant because this minister assumes that the hon. Member for Westlock-Sturgeon can read.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. member, the Chair assumes that that information is also available. Do you have a second supplementary?

MR. TAYLOR: I'd be happy if he just said he didn't know, Mr. Chairman.

The next question, Mr. Chairman, is . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Chair has to assume that if that's true, there are two people who don't know. So would you please move on to the second supplementary.

MR. TAYLOR: There'd be three you'd bring the hon. Member for Lacombe in. Nevertheless . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please move to your second supplementary.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, the next thing was with respect to the heating again. Have any estimates been made or were there any considerations given to or evaluation of solar heating, because of the huge areas under glass, versus - I believe it's straight natural gas heating that's there now?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, when this particular project was being developed in the mid-1970s, all possible technologies with respect to heating were evaluated.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark.

MR. MITCHELL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to pursue the Walter C. Mackenzie issue further. I'd like to know what the thinking was in the original design development that we created this huge atrium with a glass ceiling that would be extremely expensive to heat? What was the purpose of that? Why was that design consideration made, and is that something the minister would consider not doing in the future, given operating costs and their implications in the long run for operating costs?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, this minister has had no correspondence from the board of the Walter C. Mackenzie Health Sciences Centre nor any correspondence from the administration to suggest that there is a requirement to do what the hon. Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark is saying. Now, those are the people who live in that building, utilize that building, maintain that building, and operate the building. I repeat: there has been no information provided to me by those people who are closest to it to suggest that such an evaluation should be undertaken at this point in time.

MR. MITCHELL: Would the minister make a commitment and not believe it to be reasonable to study the construction of a hospital of that nature and determine that it's a very expensive way to build hospitals, given their operating costs, and ensure that we wouldn't build them that way in the future?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, there's absolutely no doubt at all that one of the things we are doing on a regular and constant basis is attempting to become more efficient and more effective, and those reviews are under way all the time. I don't know if a facility similar to the Walter C. Mackenzie Health Sciences Centre will ever be built again in the province of Alberta; I can't comment on what might happen in the years to come. But in all of the construction projects that are under way, there are two words that are asked to be constantly evaluated, and this is no different than it has been in the past. As each

year goes by, there is new technology and there's new understanding and there's new knowledge being accumulated by the engineers and the architects and the project designers for all of these projects. But efficiency and effectiveness are two very key words.

MR. MITCHELL: Could the minister please give us his personal belief about whether or not the Walter C. Mackenzie hospital should be included in deemed assets, and whether that's an appropriate accounting designation for the Heritage Savings Trust Fund?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. member, we're back on an issue that I don't believe the hon. minister has jurisdiction over. It's the Chair's understanding that that is an Executive Council - or perhaps priorities, or whatever. But I doubt that that responsibility for that decision lies with this minister. It's something that, again, more appropriately should be asked of the Auditor General and perhaps the Premier and perhaps the Treasurer.

MR. MITCHELL: Could we ask whether he has an opinion?

MR. CHAIRMAN: If the minister chooses to give an opinion, the Chair will allow it.

MR. KOWALSKI: Well, there is that identification of deemed assets in the document now, Mr. Chairman, listed on pages 46 and 47. The chairman and hon. members will recall that this is now in this document as a result of a recommendation of this particular committee. Several years in the past no such document existed. This now is in there, so I suspect that answers the question put forward by the hon. member. There is an identification of deemed assets in the document now.

MR. MITCHELL: Mr. Chairman . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: I believe you've had your question and two supplementaries.
Member for Ponoka-Rimbey.

MR. JONSON: Mr. Chairman, I move that we adjourn.
[interjections]

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have a motion on the floor.

MR. TAYLOR: [Inaudible] committee, if the Member for Ponoka-Rimbey really knows what he's doing, because this is piped into the media offices.

MR. MITCHELL: He's trying to stifle us.

MR. TAYLOR: He's trying to muzzle the committee. He can move all . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. Member for Westlock-Sturgeon and hon. Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark, we have a motion for adjournment on the floor. It's not debatable; a motion for adjournment is not debatable.

MR. TAYLOR: A point of order, Mr. Chairman. I don't think that's . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is the Chair's understanding that it's not

even debatable on a point of order. If the . . .

MR. TAYLOR: Well, the point of order – I mentioned before that adjournment is not debatable in the House but not in committee. I mean, otherwise the government could get up and move adjournment every time. That's not true.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's the Chair's understanding . . .

MR. TAYLOR: [Inaudible] appeal your decision to the Speaker, who is the ultimate authority on this.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry; it is not the Chair's responsibility to make that ruling. When a motion for adjournment comes onto the floor, the Chair has the responsibility to deal with it, and so we now have a motion for . . .

MR. JONSON: Mr. Chairman, I would like to . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Since I've allowed these two members to speak, the hon. Member for Ponoka-Rimbey.

MR. JONSON: Since there is concern in the minds of hon. members in front of me here, I have listened carefully to the last number of questions coming from members, and they are repetitious or off the topic. I would think that if the media is listening, they would recognize the same thing. If there is a relevant question, Mr. Chairman, I'm quite prepared to withdraw my motion to adjourn, but this is getting ludicrous in terms of the types of questions that are coming forward. It's over and over again off the topic or repeat, and I think that there should be some respect for the other members of the committee. We have other things to do.

I now withdraw my motion, if it's a good question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Ponoka-Rimbey has withdrawn his motion for adjournment, and we'll recognize the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon.

MR. TAYLOR: My question, I think, although I hate the idea that two members from Ponoka are . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. member, the concession has been made. Please proceed with your question.

MR. TAYLOR: All right. I just have . . . It's a most unusual procedure when a backbencher of the Tory party decides to censor whether the questions are good or not.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. member, the Member for Ponoka-Rimbey has the right to bring on that motion. He also has the right to withdraw it. Those two things have taken place. Now the Chair asks that the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon proceed with a pertinent question.

MR. TAYLOR: Okay. I couldn't resist taking a kick at him, Mr. Chairman.

Nevertheless, with respect to the Capital City Park budget, \$4.9 million was spent to acquire 1,800 acres . . .

MR. KOWALSKI: No, that's incorrect. I've already clarified that.

MR. TAYLOR: Four point nine million . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. member, the minister did articulate exactly what took place on that land acquisition and how much.

MR. TAYLOR: Well, the \$4.9 million was – you did spend \$4.9 million acquiring land.

MR. KOWALSKI: That's right.

MR. TAYLOR: Yes. I wanted to know whether there were any real estate commissions paid by the government in acquiring that.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, again now for about the fourth time I will repeat this. The process is that the city of Edmonton negotiates the arrangement with a property owner. The city of Edmonton makes the final determination. The city of Edmonton pays for the land. After that the city of Edmonton sends a statement to the government – the Department of Public Works, Supply and Services – and the government of Alberta, through the Department of Public Works, Supply and Services, reimburses the city for such a transaction.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, this is what I'm trying to find out. In the statement sent to the government, is it an overall envelope or is it broken down as to . . . Is there a real estate commission on top of the money that goes out?

I have a further questions to that. I'd like to know the breakdown of the statement.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, we have now responded to that question three times this morning within the last hour and 31 minutes. Very specifically *Hansard* will show that question has been answered three times at least.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Final supplementary.

MR. TAYLOR: I think, Mr. Chairman, you're as puzzled as he is. He's tuned into the infinite somewhere else.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. member, the Chair is not puzzled. The Chair understands very clearly what's happening. [interjection]

If the Chair could make a comment, I believe that all members of the committee should give some concern to the respect for this committee and the role that it's supposed to play. The questions should be articulated in such a manner that that respect comes forward and for the time of all the members. Please, hon. members, let's not play games in this committee. The Chair is going to have to get more rigid on lead-in questions. It is going to have to get more rigid on being sure that they are directed to the proper minister. By the very line of questioning, the Chair is being forced into a position of being more rigid. I hope that's not what the committee wants.

So, do you have another supplementary?

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, I'm just trying to find out how the city submits a bill. When you buy land, you pay for the land; you pay for a commission; you have overhead. That's the second. The next question I'd like to know: in the city's bill to the provincial government, is there anything for overhead, or is it all out-of-pocket cost to the city?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, my understanding – and again now the fourth time with respect to this matter – is that it is the market value of the cost of the land.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That concludes your set of questions?

MR. TAYLOR: It sets up another set though.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I believe you've had your question and five supplementaries, hon. member.

Member for Calgary-Foothills.

MRS. BLACK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Obviously nothing new has come forward from the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon, so I move we adjourn, and I will not back down from my motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have a motion for adjournment on the floor. If we would withhold moving on that motion, the Chair would like to take the opportunity to thank the Minister of Public Works, Supply and Services and his government officials for being here today and for the overview that they've given on those projects that they have responsibility for from the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund. We appreciate their input, and hopefully they will be beneficial to the committee when they deliberate the recommendations which we will move into next week.

All those in favour of a motion for adjournment? Those opposed?

[The committee adjourned at 11:34 a.m.]

