

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA**

Title: **Tuesday, April 16, 1985 2:30 p.m.**

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

**PRAYERS**

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

**head: INTRODUCTION OF BILLS****Bill Pr. 1****Heritage Savings & Trust Company  
Amendment Act, 1985**

MR. ALEXANDER: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill Pr. 1, the Heritage Savings & Trust Company Amendment Act, 1985.

The purpose of this Bill is simply to recapitalize the company.

[Leave granted; Bill Pr. 1 read a first time]

**Bill Pr. 2****Westerner Exposition Association Act**

MR. McPHERSON: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill Pr. 2, the Westerner Exposition Association Act.

The principle of the Bill is to exempt the Westerner Exposition Association from assessment and taxation of the land on which it is currently situated.

[Leave granted; Bill Pr. 2 read a first time]

**Bill Pr. 3****David Michael Skakun  
Adoption Termination Act**

MR. PURDY: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill Pr. 3, the David Michael Skakun Adoption Termination Act.

[Leave granted; Bill Pr. 3 read a first time]

**Bill Pr. 5****Les Soeurs de Sainte-Croix,  
Province Sainte-Therese — Sisters of  
Holy Cross, Saint Theresa Province Act**

MR. HIEBERT: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill Pr. 5, Les Soeurs de Sainte-Croix, Province Sainte-Therese — Sisters of Holy Cross, Saint Theresa Province Act.

The Bill deals with affairs for the Order of the Sisters of Holy Cross.

[Leave granted; Bill Pr. 5 read a first time]

**Bill Pr. 8****City of Edmonton Authorities  
Amendment Act, 1985**

MR. HIEBERT: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill Pr. 8, City of Edmonton Authorities Amendment Act, 1985.

The Bill basically deals with appointments and terms of office for the various authorities set up by the city of Edmonton.

[Leave granted; Bill Pr. 8 read a first time]

**Bill Pr. 6****Concordia Lutheran Seminary  
Amendment Act, 1985**

MR. SZWENDER: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill Pr. 6, Concordia Lutheran Seminary Amendment Act, 1985.

The purpose of this Bill is the power to grant certificates, diplomas, and academic degrees in divinity.

[Leave granted; Bill Pr. 6 read a first time]

**Bill Pr. 7****The St. Louis Hospital, Bonnyville  
Amendment Act, 1985**

MR. DROBOT: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill Pr. 7, The St. Louis Hospital, Bonnyville Amendment Act, 1985.

[Leave granted; Bill Pr. 7 read a first time]

**Bill Pr. 9****Le Diocese de St. Paul  
Amendment Act, 1985**

MR. SZWENDER: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill Pr. 9, Le Diocese de St. Paul Amendment Act, 1985.

[Leave granted; Bill Pr. 9 read a first time]

**Bill Pr. 10****Westcastle Development Authority Act**

MR. STILES: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill Pr. 10, the Westcastle Development Authority Act.

The purpose of this Act is to permit the town of Pincher Creek and the municipal district of Pincher Creek No. 9 to incorporate an authority to develop the Westcastle recreation area.

[Leave granted; Bill Pr. 10 read a first time]

**Bill Pr. 11****The Calgary Municipal Heritage  
Properties Authority Act**

MR. OMAN: Mr. Speaker, I should like to introduce Bill Pr. 11, The Calgary Municipal Heritage Properties Authority Act.

This Bill would create within the city of Calgary a corporate body which would have the right to acquire,

develop, manage, and operate any right or property which the authority deems to be a heritage resource in the city.

[Leave granted; Bill Pr. 11 read a first time]

**Bill Pr. 12**

**Highfield Trust Company Repeal Act**

MR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill Pr. 12, Highfield Trust Company Repeal Act.

This Bill will repeal the Act which incorporated the company. The company never commenced operation as a trust company and has since dissolved. The Act is therefore redundant, and a petition to repeal it has been presented by the liquidator of the company.

[Leave granted; Bill Pr. 12 read a first time]

**Bill Pr. 13**

**Society of Management Accountants  
of Alberta Amendment Act, 1985**

MR. NELSON: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill Pr. 13, the Society of Management Accountants of Alberta Amendment Act, 1985.

This Act is primarily to change the accounting designation for this profession.

[Leave granted; Bill Pr. 13 read a first time]

**Bill Pr. 14**

**The Youth Emergency Services  
Foundation Act**

MR. ALEXANDER: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill Pr. 14, The Youth Emergency Services Foundation Act.

The principle is to incorporate the Youth Emergency Shelter Society of Edmonton into The Youth Emergency Services Foundation.

[Leave granted; Bill Pr. 14 read a first time]

**head: TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS**

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table a report pursuant to section 31(6) of the Legislative Assembly Act, and with it the reply to Motion for a Return 162 of 1984, which provides more detailed information.

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the most recent annual report of the Alberta Association of Registered Nurses.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I am tabling the 1983 annual report of the Superintendent of Insurance, the '83-84 annual report of the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, and the 33rd annual report for the year 1984 that is requested under the Public Contributions Act.

**head: INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

MR. PLANCHE: Mr. Speaker, I'm delighted today to introduce to you and my colleagues in the Legislature 29 young Alberta citizens from grade 6 in Chinook Park school in Calgary Glenmore. I had a very nice meeting with them

today. They're very interested in what's going on here, Mr. Speaker, so I want you to pay attention to your duties. I ask that the members of the Legislature acknowledge their presence.

MR. SCHMID: Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank teacher Richard Wilson and parent Mrs. Kittlitz for bringing 24 grade 6 students from the Avonmore school to the Legislature. They are looking forward to the question period. I ask them to rise to be welcomed to this Assembly.

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce to you, and through you to members of the Assembly, 14 grade 10 students from Victoria Composite high school. They are accompanied by their teacher, Mrs. Shirley Armstrong-Kates, and student teacher Susan Boytang. They are seated in the public gallery, and I ask that they please rise and receive the warm welcome of this Assembly.

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to have the opportunity to introduce to you, and through you to Members of the Legislative Assembly, 32 students from the grade 10 program at Concordia College in the constituency of Edmonton Highlands. They're accompanied by their teacher, Mr. Willie, who has visited with us on many occasions. They are seated in the public gallery.

I think it's particularly appropriate that they are here this afternoon for the introduction of a private Bill that relates to the operation of Concordia College. There may be one or two students in this class who will go on to study in the seminary, but as is the case with most grade 10 classes, I'm sure it's not going to be all of them. Would they rise to receive the welcome of the Assembly.

**head: ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**

**Hazardous Waste Disposal**

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the first question to the Minister of the Environment. Yesterday the minister said he did not have available even an estimate of the volume of PCBs that are now stored in Alberta awaiting disposal. Has the minister gotten around to finding this crucial information? If not, when might this Assembly find out this information?

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, does the hon. member mean all wastes stored in the province?

MR. MARTIN: I was talking about Kinetic and the PCBs we were talking about yesterday.

MR. BRADLEY: I don't have an exact figure with regard to PCBs. Mr. Speaker, but the department has a ballpark figure of some 5,000 tonnes of contaminated material stored by Kinetic at the facility in Nisku.

MR. MARTIN: Five thousand tonnes; that's interesting.

On March 20 in this Assembly the minister said he had no idea what the cost to the Crown would be of dealing with the hazardous materials of the bankrupt D & D Group at Nisku, which the province is now stuck with. My question to the minister is: in the ensuing month or so has he gotten together any information on the volumes stored there and the potential cost to the Crown at this time?

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, as I explained on March 20, the province will be exploring avenues with regard to recovery of costs. I'm advised that there are some 700 tonnes of material at the D & D facility.

MR. MARTIN: So the minister is saying that at this point we don't have the cost to the Treasury of that.

Let me go from there to the Kinetic Ecological Resource Group. I raised the financial capabilities of the Kinetic group with the minister on May 2, May 24, and May 25, 1983, in this House. My question to the minister is: what bonding or other protective arrangements has the minister come up with to prevent our being stuck with all the waste at the Kinetic site in the same way we've been stuck with it at the D & D site?

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, I can advise the Assembly that on March 20 the department contacted Kinetic Ecological Resources with regard to the bonding requirements, in terms of any new material which would be stored at their site, and arranged for new material to be bonded. I think that responds to the question.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question. I'm asking now if there is any arrangement. The minister is well aware that there is a tremendous amount of material stored at Kinetic. What will happen if they go the way of D & D? Have we got some bonding or some protection for that?

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, to some degree that's a hypothetical question. I think I've responded that bonding must be in place on any new material that's stored there. I think I explained to the House earlier that the Special Waste Management Corporation is exploring and negotiating with that particular corporation with regard to its future role in the special waste management system in the province.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Hypothetical or not, there have been well-publicized financial problems there. We know what happened at D & D, and we're stuck with it. Kinetic has been importing PCBs from all over the country for many years. There are estimates of some 12 percent of the nation's total. My question to the minister is simply this: is the minister saying to this Assembly that there really is no arrangement at all to protect us if Kinetic goes into public bankruptcy?

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, legislation was introduced last fall, and those amendments were proclaimed this spring, with regard to how the Special Waste Management Corporation was empowered to handle these situations. The legislation has been in effect since March 13. I've advised the House that the corporation is negotiating with that specific company in terms of its future role in waste management in the province of Alberta.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question. With all due respect to the minister, that's not answering the question. I'm well aware of the legislation. My point is: knowing the financial straits of this company, is it possible that we will end up taking it over, as we did D & D?

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, the legislation provides the framework in which the province can operate, and it provides the Special Waste Management Corporation with certain responsibilities. They are carrying out those responsibilities,

and they are negotiating with the specific company with regard to what role it will continue to have in waste management in the province.

MR. MARTIN: It's obvious, by those answers, that this Treasury could get stuck for a fair amount of money.

Mr. Speaker, on March 15 the president of the Kinetic group was quoted as saying he would continue to import PCBs into Alberta whether or not he had a permit. My question simply is: can the minister indicate how he is ensuring that that importation will stop after May 15?

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, there are certain authorizations the Special Waste Management Corporation is prepared to provide that corporation. If those authorizations are exceeded, we will use whatever means possible within the law in the province of Alberta to ensure that those authorizations are carried out.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question to the minister. The chairman of the Special Waste Management Corporation is quoted today as saying that Kinetic will be allowed to transfer PCBs around Alberta until September 30. Can the minister or the Minister of Transportation and of Disaster Services advise what protection is in place to prevent recurrence of what recently happened in Kenora with the Kinetic truck?

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, there are certain provisions by which that company would be hauling and transporting wastes within the province. There is the federal Transportation of Dangerous Goods Act, which has not yet been proclaimed but which is being followed in a voluntary fashion by companies in the province at this point in time.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question. Other than that federal Act they're talking about coming into place, is the minister saying that no special precaution is being taken in the province by this government at this time?

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, with regard to the transport of these goods, they are following a voluntary manifest system which tracks the goods and following whatever provisions and regulations are now in effect with regard to the transportation of those goods in the country.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question. Could the Minister of Transportation and of Disaster Services indicate what would happen if we had a similar situation as recently happened in Kenora? Do we have plans in place to deal with a disaster like this?

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I think the Minister of the Environment adequately answered that question. Insofar as the Transportation of Dangerous Goods Control Act and regulations attached to it are concerned, this Legislature passed the legislation some time ago. We have been working for a period of about three years to encourage the federal government to issue preliminary draft regulations. That was finally done last December.

We're now in a process period of about 12 months wherein we expect the industry to be able to comply with the regulations that have been drafted with respect to the transportation of dangerous goods and hope that early in 1986 the regulations will be finalized and be law. In the meantime, as the Minister of the Environment has indicated,

there has been extremely good voluntary compliance with the draft regulations and with the regulations that were in effect before that under legislation that is the responsibility of the minister.

MR. MARTIN: One final supplementary on this to either minister. What contingency plans are being developed for transportation of hazardous wastes to the Swan Hills plant in the future? For example, are only certain roads going to be used? Are any plans being developed at all?

MR. M. MOORE: With regard to the transportation of all dangerous goods, the hon. member should be aware that there is a very complex system of designating certain routes within the province for the transportation of dangerous goods. The new legislation and the regulations attached to it will be even more extensive in terms of the manner in which dangerous goods will be handled, placarded, and so on. That is all in addition to the legislation the Minister of the Environment has responsibility for regarding the transportation of chemicals, which he has already referred to.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it's fair to say that in the area of the transportation of dangerous goods, both hazardous chemicals and other dangerous goods, Alberta is a leader in Canada in not only the development of the legislation but being prepared to handle situations that might arise from time to time with respect to spills.

MR. MARTIN: We're certainly a leader in the country in bringing in hazardous wastes; there's no doubt about that. It's a growing industry.

#### Native Self-Government

MR. MARTIN: I'd like to direct my second question to the Premier. It's with regard to the most recent conference he attended on native rights. Would the Premier indicate on what basis or studies he has developed his position that a constitutional amendment to entrench aboriginal rights would not, as I believe he put it, significantly improve the quality of life for our aboriginal people?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I don't think that's quite the context in which I've responded to the situation. What has to be made clear first is that there has been no adequate definition of what is proposed by way of self-government for the Indian, Inuit, or Metis people. There's a wide difference in their view as to what their aspirations are. There's a significant lack of definition of what is intended.

The constitutional process we've embarked upon arose out of the Constitution Act and the discussions of November 1981 in which it was agreed, under section 37 of the Constitution, that we would meet within a year. We met in 1983 to identify and define the aboriginal rights referred to in section 35(1) of the Constitution.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question. Could the Premier indicate why it is his concern that entrenching a general resolution about self-government would stop the process of what he is talking about in terms of defining what aboriginals are and what their rights are?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, the more I think about the subject, the more convinced I am that you can't deal with the Constitution of Canada in terms of entrenching

rights that are not defined. I really think that's the simple matter.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question. Has the Premier met with various Alberta native associations to determine if they share his view that a constitutional amendment would not be an improvement?

MR. LOUGHEED: First of all, Mr. Speaker, the treaty Indians in this province have taken the position, for which we have some support and understanding, that their position arises out of treaty rights to the Crown in right of Canada and that, therefore, the process we're undertaking is not a process they think is appropriate. The treaty Indians of this province believe that under section 91.24 of the Constitution of Canada the exclusive jurisdiction for Indians and Indian land claims rests with the federal government. It shouldn't involve the provinces, and it shouldn't involve the provinces in terms of conferences or in terms of numbers. The treaty Indians of the province would generally like, therefore, to work out a degree to which they can improve their control over their own destiny and a degree of responsibility for their own affairs, and we have considerable sympathy for that.

As I stated in the conference in Ottawa, as far as the government of Alberta is concerned — speaking now about the treaty Indian people — it would be our view that whatever arrangements are worked out between the federal government and the treaty Indian people in this province, we would then sit down with them afterwards and interface with them in terms of the multitude of services we provide to them as Albertans. As the hon. Leader of the Opposition is aware, they briefly came into the conference room. They were given an opportunity — I'm talking about the prairie treaty group — and they made a presentation. The presentation on the record concurred with the position taken by the government of Alberta.

We are not significantly involved in the Inuit situation. With regard to the Metis people, there are two distinctions. One is with the eight settlements and the one and a quarter million people who are involved in the settlements.\* We've been working with them through Dr. MacEwan's report, which is in our hands with the group involved and being considered. Together with my colleagues the Minister responsible for Native Affairs and the Minister of Federal and Intergovernment Affairs, I've met with the Metis Settlements people. We've had a number of discussions with them in following up Dr. MacEwan's report.

With regard to the Metis Association to the degree that they are generally representative of the Metis people in the province, we've had discussions with them. I've now written them and requested them to give us some further definition of what they have in mind in terms of the proposals that are now being discussed.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Would the Premier indicate whether the Alberta government's reluctance to settle with the Metis over resource and land rights has something to do with the resistance we place in entrenching self-government in the Constitution?

MR. LOUGHEED: No, Mr. Speaker, they really have no relationship. The situation with regard to resource rights is a matter of the definition of their rights by the courts of this province, and we hope that matter will be expedited. Whatever the courts determine are the rights of the Metis

\*See Statement corrected on the following page

people involved in the settlements, we will of course respond to the direction of the courts.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure the Premier is well aware it's been going on for a long time, and I'm sure that's part of the frustration faced by the Metis people. I understand one of the reasons they want it in the Constitution and amendments is that it would at least force some of these land claims.

My question to the Premier, to give a specific example, is: would the Premier advise if the unilateral withdrawal by the Alberta government of the traditional hunting rights of the Grande Cache Metis people in December is a signal of the manner in which this government intends to proceed on Metis rights so long as this is not in the Constitution?

MR. LOUGHEED: They're really very separate matters, Mr. Speaker.

It's been noted that I said "one and a quarter million people." I meant "one and a quarter million acres" in regard to the settlements.

With regard to the latter question from the Leader of the Opposition, I refer it to the Minister responsible for Native Affairs.

MR. PAHL: In response to the question, Mr. Speaker, I'll recall for the hon. Leader of the Opposition that the accord signed in 1983 was an extension of the process to identify and define existing rights and possible further rights for aboriginal peoples of Canada. There are, in effect, three aboriginal peoples of Canada: the Inuit, Indian, and Metis people. Notwithstanding the opportunity for Metis who live on settlement lands to hunt and fish, there are no existing aboriginal rights for the Metis people of Alberta.

The Grande Cache situation was one wherein the members of the co-operative who live on lands provided by agreement with the Alberta government claim to be status Indians. Status Indians have the right to hunt and fish. The confusion was that the Grande Cache co-operative members held the view that it was up to government to prove they were Indians, and the governments of Alberta and Canada had the view that it was their initiative.

My colleague the Associate Minister of Public Lands and Wildlife and I had a meeting with the MLA for the area, the Member for Edson, and there was an agreement to extend the subsistence hunting program to them so that they could continue to enjoy their traditional life-style. In addition, we agreed to assist them in working with the federal government to try to ascertain whether they were indeed legally entitled to status as Indians. Then, of course, they would have hunting and fishing rights, as do all status Indians across Canada. In fact, if they insist on being identified as Metis people, it is quite clear that the Metis outside the settlements have no aboriginal rights, particularly with respect to hunting and fishing.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question to the minister. Let's be clear on what he's saying. Is it this government's position that Metis people outside the settlements have no aboriginal rights and will not have under any future constitutional amendments?

MR. PAHL: Mr. Speaker, it's not the position of the Alberta government; it is the reality of the Constitution. In framing the Constitution of 1982, it was agreed that the aboriginal people were defined as the Indian, Inuit, and

Metis people, and they were resident with existing aboriginal rights. The reality of our country, our Constitution, and our development is that at the moment no aboriginal rights accrue to Metis people. It is not a position of this government: it is a constitutional fact.

Among other things, the purpose of the constitutional rights talks that will extend to 1987 is to identify and define, by agreement, some rights beyond what exists now. What exists now with respect to the Metis people is a recognition of the cultural and historical contribution to Canada's history, but there is no accrual of aboriginal rights flowing from that recognition.

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

MR. MARTIN: As I understand it, the constitutional talks will be coming back in May. My question is to either the Premier or the minister. Is it the Alberta government's position that the Metis should not have aboriginal rights, or is the government going to promote some sort of aboriginal rights for the Metis people at that May conference?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I think it's the problem the Leader of the Opposition is using in terms of rights and in terms of programs in working with the Metis people that need to be distinguished. Under section 35(1) of the Constitution, the existing rights of the aboriginal peoples are affirmed. Aboriginal peoples, as just mentioned, include the Metis. That was at the suggestion of the province of Alberta. The responsibility for identifying and defining those rights has arisen out of section 37 and is one that we're working on in this process. We have asked for the view of the Metis people, of course, and there are wide differences of views across the country as to what those existing rights are. But it's not our view and never has been our view that this is a matter that solely starts and finishes with the Constitution, nor should it. We believe in taking initiatives as we can to improve the situation with regard to the Metis people whether or not they're on the settlement. We have brought in a multitude of programs, including the land tenure program, which concerns some Metis groups but has been well accepted by others.

So it's our intention to continue to work as closely as we can with the various Metis communities in the province to improve their way of life and their standard of living. But I do believe one of the concerns has been that there's been a feeling that there is a panacea, that the problems are going to be resolved with regard to constitutional matters.

#### **Confidentiality of Doctors' Records**

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question to the Attorney General is with regard to section 13 of the Alberta Health Care Insurance Act, which gives the Attorney General the right to confidential records in criminal cases or suspected criminal cases. The minister has indicated that there may be a review of this section, which has already been passed in this session of the Legislature. Could the minister indicate whether that review will take place and if any amendments will be coming into the current session of the Legislature?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I intend to ask for further views of the law officers of the Crown on that very point, and that will be done in the next day or so. I have had occasion to observe that the matter was not one that came

up in debate. It is a very broad issue but at the same time, given the difficulty of statutorily defining some of the things we're involved in there, one that should perhaps be looked at further.

Maybe I can give the hon. member an inkling of my own views on the matter. I take the position that evidence that is available in the hands of any person and that could point to the commission of a criminal offence should be disclosed to a proper authority. One has to balance that against the very delicate, important, and historic issue of the confidentiality of certain types of records, in particular patient records, and the presumption a lot of people have, although I know of no legal basis for it outside of what a statute might provide, that communications between a doctor and patient are privileged in some way. That is not the legal position unless a statute makes that specific provision, but it's widely assumed to be the case.

Given the concern that has been expressed, that perhaps the provisions of our existing legislation have gone too far in that respect, that's the point I would like to have reviewed and, as I indicated to the hon. member, would have further opinion on that point from the legal officers of the Crown.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. In terms of the words "suspected criminal", would the definition be part of the review as to the records that could or could not be made available to the Attorney General? It's under that classification at the present time, as I read the amendment. Would that be a matter of a review by the minister?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I want to be sure I got the hon. member's words correctly. Suspected criminal activity? I think that is really where the area of difficulty is. There is no intention that anything other than this situation, for example, should occur. If a professional body or someone who has in their possession the same records that are available to a professional body under their disciplinary procedures — for example, as records are available to the benchers of the Law Society relative to lawyers' activities within their offices, records are also available to the College of Physicians and Surgeons and their disciplinary processes relative to records in doctors' offices. Should something in the course of an examination of the practice of some doctor come to the attention of the disciplinary arm of the College of Physicians and Surgeons and should it point to the potential of a criminal activity, that should be assessed by someone who has the duty along with the professional expertise to make that particular assessment, because it involves assessing evidence. Those persons are the law officers of the Crown, and in that sense that information should come to an agent of the Attorney General. That is the sort of thing that is done within the legal profession. There was some controversy over it. That's a statutory provision in the Legal Profession Act. I suppose there would continue to be some controversy over the same point relative to the medical profession.

This is the assurance I want to make as clear as it can be made, Mr. Speaker, and I adopt the view that the law should say what it means and not leave ways in which it might be applied in some way other than what is intended. But if I can speak to the intention of it, it is surely not intended that any person, be he a representative of the college or a representative of the Department of Hospitals and Medical Care, should enter into something like a survey of records in order to see if offences are disclosed. It is

a much different situation from that, and I hope the intent I have expressed is readily enough understood and seen to be within the normal course of gathering evidence in criminal cases.

### **Red Meat Stabilization**

MR. FISCHER: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Agriculture, concerning the dumping of subsidized European red meat into Canada and the extremely harmful effect it has on our meat industry. Could the minister tell us what representation he has made on behalf of the cattle and hog industries regarding the new import levels being contemplated by the federal government?

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, I can report to the Assembly that last week I sent a telex to my federal counterpart, the Hon. John Wise, and indicated on behalf of Alberta producers that we were disturbed by the reports that the federal government was about to increase the import quota by about 26 percent. It really is happening in a year in which our industry is under difficult stress, and the magnitude of that increase is certainly negative to our whole industry. So I carefully tried to explain to the federal minister the impact it would have on our producers in western Canada.

MR. FISCHER: A supplementary question. Could the minister advise the Assembly what discussion he had with Ottawa on Bill C-25?

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, I also telexed the Hon. John Wise and outlined Alberta's support for Bill C-25, and I understand the Bill is now being brought back after being dropped after first reading. Bill C-25 will really provide the authority for the federal government to undertake agreements with provinces on a national red meat stabilization program. At this time I believe there's an opportunity for the federal and provincial governments to correct a situation that is having a damaging effect on agriculture, and they can address the agricultural policy in this country in the red meat sector in a manner that will benefit all Canadian farmers. I think this really means setting aside the desire for provincial self-sufficiency in programs, working in a North American market where we can have more freedom, and getting out of some of the short-term programs that have been put in by provinces that have caused such balkanization. I think there could be a real service done, Mr. Speaker.

I also emphasized to the federal minister that a federal/provincial ministers' conference should be called on this issue. The objective of that would be to get a commitment from provincial governments to immediately cease operations of their provincial stabilization programs. Doing so would bring about a removal of the U.S. countervailing duty that has now been imposed on our pork producers. The challenge really is great, but I think the opportunity is certainly significant.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to follow up on the questions the hon. member just asked. I'd like to know how recently our minister has met with the Alberta pork producers to be brought up to date on the precarious nature of their business at this time. When did the minister have the most recent discussion with the Alberta pork producers?

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Last Wednesday and last Saturday, Mr. Speaker.

DR. BUCK: In those discussions, Mr. Speaker, when the minister talks about a federal stabilization program, are we going to have it while there are still pork producers left in this province or after they're all bankrupt?

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, that's a deep concern our government has also. It's unfortunate that the federal government hasn't provided that leadership and taken this Bill through. As I stated to a previous question, it is our strong representation that we are pushing them to quickly implement that red meat stabilization program to get rid of the balkanization that is destroying our industry in this country.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. In light of the fact that the other provinces are very heavily supporting the pork industry, are we going to wait until we have a federal program or follow the other provinces and provide some support for our pork producers?

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, not all other provinces have a stabilization program. One of the largest producers is Ontario, and it doesn't have a program.

As we walk through this process, having the countervailing duty and the U.S. Trade Commission right at this moment checking all across this country what subsidy programs are in place, we have to be very careful of the approach we take in helping our producers. I don't want anyone to feel that we don't have at heart the importance of our red meat industry, and particularly our pork producers and their long-term future, in any action we take.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I met with some of the producers last week, and the situation is very, very serious. Has the minister given any direction or had any discussions with the Agricultural Development Corporation to advise them that there might be a program coming and to hold off on some of those proposed foreclosures? The one man I sat with, Mr. Minister, said that if we don't get some help within a few months, you're going to be raising the hogs — or ADC is going to be.

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, that is certainly a concern we have in our government. I took the opportunity to call the bank agrologist and tell him that certainly there is a problem in the industry at the moment but that the world isn't going to end tomorrow and be patient, because the chances of our being successful in turning back the countervail are very significant and the red meat stabilization plan is coming soon. So I tried to place that comfort before them. I've also had ongoing discussions with the Agricultural Development Corporation on the issue.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary. Is the minister in a position to indicate how many foreclosures we've had by the Agricultural Development Corporation that are directly related to hog operations? Is it a significant number, or is it a number that the minister would have at this time?

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, I'd have to get that number and report back, but I don't believe it's significant at all.

### Native Self-Government (continued)

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to follow up on questions to the Premier on the Constitution. As I understand it, there is another conference coming up in May. Will Alberta be advancing a new position or any new ideas to break the impasse on the self-government resolution at the May conference?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, we have some very serious reservations about this process. We expressed them in Ottawa when we were there.

I will repeat what I said earlier in this question period. We think what should happen is that the federal government should accept their responsibilities under the Constitution for exclusive jurisdiction over the Indian people and Indian land claims and include with that the Inuit — sit down with them and work out what the process might be, which varies significantly across the country, for supporting and improving the standard of living of the Indian and Inuit people.

We in the provinces that have significant numbers of Metis, which includes Alberta, should reassess the programs we have. With regard to the settlements in this province, we should look at Dr. MacEwan's report and the recommendations contained in that, try to move forward with regard to those recommendations relative to the settlements, expand our programming with the Metis people on a community basis — perhaps not on a provincewide basis if we can't work it out appropriately — and try to do so to improve their standard of living. We think that would make a great deal more sense and create a great deal more progress for the aboriginal peoples of Canada than a continuation of the process we've been going through for the last number of years.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question. I take it that the native people don't agree with the Premier on that position. What I hear the Premier saying is that, basically, the May conference is a waste of time. He doesn't even agree with the process. Therefore, nothing new is going to come from Alberta at that conference. Is that a correct clarification of the Premier's point?

MR. LOUGHEED: We look at this matter in terms of improving the standard of living of the people involved, and we're not satisfied this process will do that.

I would have to take issue with the preamble to the Leader of the Opposition's question. I mentioned earlier in this question period that as far as the treaty Indian people of this province are concerned, the vast majority of them don't support the process either. They want to deal directly with the federal government. They want to rely on their treaty rights with the Crown in right of Canada. With regard to the Metis Settlement people, they want to work with the Alberta government in terms of Dr. MacEwan's report. With regard to the balance of the Metis people, we're working on programs and asking them for their proposals.

MR. MARTIN: One final supplementary, so we're well aware; it's an important issue. Is it the position of the Premier of the Alberta government that at this time they will not accept any resolution dealing with aboriginal rights?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I don't think we'd put ourselves in the position that we would not accept any

resolution. We certainly won't accept any resolution of which we don't know the consequences, and I trust the Leader of the Opposition would hold a similar view.

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

### head: MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

205. Moved by Mrs. Cripps:

Be it resolved that the Assembly urge the government to undertake a review of government senior citizens' housing policies and principles and consider the establishment of an ongoing senior citizen housing review committee.

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I'm pleased to introduce this motion, which will allow members the opportunity to think about and discuss this very important issue. At the outset I want to point out that I believe Alberta has the very best senior citizens' programs in North America. Some of the programs are designed to allow senior citizens to remain in their homes as long as they wish or as long as their health permits. Programs such as the pioneer repair program, the home heating allowance, the home care program, the senior citizens' tax reduction program, and the homemaker service make it possible for many senior citizens to continue living in their homes far longer than would be possible without those programs.

If it becomes desirable or necessary for senior citizens to move out of their homes, we have low-cost housing programs such as the self-contained units, where the rent is subsidized but the senior citizen essentially maintains his own residence and provides for himself, and the senior citizens' lodge program, where all services are provided to the senior citizen. In addition to that Alberta has an excellent network of nursing homes and extended care hospital beds either fully funded or subsidized.

For the purpose of this debate I want to discuss extensively the senior citizens' lodge program. Senior citizens' lodges were first established in Alberta in 1958. I'd like to emphasize, Mr. Speaker, how important it is for these lodges to be scattered throughout the province and in the smaller centres. This makes it possible for senior citizens to remain an integral part of the family, with the family being able to drop in or take mom and dad or grandma out for Sunday dinner. This contact, which is often lost when an elderly person is removed to a larger, more remote facility or centre, is very essential. Continued family and community support is so important to the mental health and welfare of the senior citizens.

The senior citizens' lodge program guidelines and philosophies have not kept pace with the changing needs of the residents. I was unable to find the original figures for the early 1960s, but I do know that the average age of residents was much younger than it is today. In 1974-75, 3 percent of senior citizens in lodges were under 65, 25 percent were between the ages of 65 and 74, 57 percent were 75 to 80, and 15 percent were over 85. In 1978 another survey was done, and 2.5 percent were under 65, 18 percent were in the 65 to 74 age bracket, 48 percent were 75 to 84, and 32 percent were now over the age of 85. In that four-year period the residents over 85 had jumped from 15 percent, and the total number of residents over 75 had moved from 72 to 80 percent of all those in

senior citizens' lodges. This means that the needs of senior citizens in the lodges will be changing just because of the chronological differences in their numbers that are presently in the lodges.

An article in the January 1985 *Reader's Digest* that I picked up says:

Thanks to better health care, people are living longer.

Already there are about 950,000 aged over 75, and by the end of the century the number is expected to reach 1.5 million [in Canada].

I want to dwell for a minute on the physical needs which may require policy changes. I talked to a nurse the other day, and she indicated to me that many people, not just senior citizens, have incontinence problems. In the lodges it sometimes becomes cause for removal to a nursing home or an auxiliary hospital. I discussed the problem with the director of home care. She indicated that if she could bring in a home care worker to bathe, change sheets, and generally see to the cleanliness of the residents, they were able to stay in the lodge. If there were two or three people in the lodge — and at one time she was looking after nine people in the lodge, not necessarily on a daily basis but on a weekly basis — the cost could be justified. If there was only one person it was fairly expensive, because they had to pay two hours regardless of whether there was one, two, or three.

She suggested that the lodge management might need to look at employing a personal care aide, so the needs of these people could be met in the lodge, or at co-operating more extensively with the home care program of the health units. Some of these seniors need assistance with bathing, medication, incontinence, et cetera — problems which result in removal to a nursing home. In the cases she described to me, it really was not in the best interests of the resident, the family, or the taxpayer to make the move to the nursing home. Other than some extra personal care needs, the residents were able to function in the home and were content and happy there. What's more, they dreaded being moved.

The problem of medication needs also arises. Some boards absolutely will not even allow the staff to remind a resident to take their pills. The problem could be readily solved by the use of a bubble pack. The druggist can put the medication for each day, each meal if necessary, in a bubble pack for the month. The pills are punched out as needed and as directed. In the case of the home I was discussing earlier, the health nurse checks the bubble pack to make sure that the medication is correct. Of course, this requires the flexibility of a board to allow staff to remind residents that the pills must be taken. Mr. Speaker, I think the board would want to show this flexibility if it is in the best interests of the senior citizen residents in their lodges.

The lodges are excellent physical structures and, for the most part, provide adequate if not exceptional food and lodging. The lodges are clean and neat. The food is varied, tasty, and well prepared. One of the purposes of the senior citizens' review committee should be to assure that this is so.

Mr. Speaker, one of my major concerns and a partial reason for raising this issue for discussion is the atmosphere within the senior citizens' lodges. The Senior Citizens' Advisory Council included this paragraph in their 1983 annual report:

Lodges provide board and room for elderly persons, supposedly well and able to care for themselves. Some lodge residents are now receiving some personal care, either from the staff or from community services such



as home care. We suggest that more Foundation boards managing lodges look at ways of using these services in their facilities, and also expanding health surveillance and assessment and life enrichment activities for their elderly residents. These latter activities are as important as meeting the basic needs for food and shelter, and some staff time needs to be devoted to them.

I believe that came from the annual meeting of the provincial advisory council.

I believe it's important to re-evaluate our philosophies and policies. It is important for the foundation to set objectives and goals. These goals and objectives must be designed to serve the needs of the senior citizen residents, not the foundation board or the staff. One foundation has set out a policy paper. It might be worth outlining just a few items. They have a statement of purpose first, which is

to provide accommodation in a caring, home-like atmosphere for senior citizens able to care for their own personal daily needs; to provide the daily aids to living of the senior citizens in conjunction with other public service agencies; to ensure that self-contained housing facilities best meet the needs of senior citizens; and to provide opportunities for residents to participate in leisure, recreational and social activities which foster their continued involvement in family and community life, within the limits of the physical, human, and financial resources available to the Foundation.

Mr. Speaker, they've recently adopted some goals too, and I think they are worth mentioning in this discussion. Number one, to provide a cheerful, homey atmosphere for seniors, where they can be sure that they are cared for as individuals. Two, to provide leadership in and provision of recreational activities and opportunities for seniors to occupy their time and energies to help them maintain or develop wholesome social contacts and activities. Three, to provide healthy, nutritional meals for residents in lodges. You notice that the home atmosphere is before the meals. To provide safe, clean, and structurally sound physical accommodation. Five, to assist residents in conjunction with other community agencies and services to maintain their independence and well-being. Six, to ensure that all residents may reside in dignity. Seven, to encourage maximization of individual self-reliance and independence upon the framework of the lodge structure. Eight, to promote positive attitudes for all board members, staff, and residents. Nine, to develop, encourage, and promote an open and trusting atmosphere for all staff and residents. Ten, to encourage social contacts with family and community. Eleven, to represent the interests of the lodges in municipal decisions. Twelve, to be responsible for future planning, giving consideration to changing statuses. Thirteen, to ensure that the minimum level of social and physical standards are maintained within each lodge. There are a couple more, but I think that gives an idea of the goals of the foundation. I'd just like to re-emphasize that the first two main goals are in the provision for the social and spiritual needs of the resident.

These goals clearly illustrate that the total welfare of the senior citizen resident is the priority of the board. Many of the elements which make the difference between a lodge being a residence and a home do not cost a cent. It may be a procedural or attitudinal change. I want to use the Shangri-La Lodge at Drayton Valley as an example. When one walks through the door, one feels an atmosphere of welcome, of people busy and participating, of goodwill and camaraderie. The home looks lived in. There are crafts in

almost all the common areas. Those who are not actively participating are watching, usually advising, and are interested in what's going on around them.

The Shangri-La has a social club which plans social activities, makes recommendations to the management board, co-ordinates the craft activities, and sponsors fund-raising activities. Just before Christmas they raised \$3,000 at their craft bazaar and tea. Every morning at the Shangri-La there is an exercise led by one of the staff, because they found that the residents are much more relaxed working with one of the staff than with somebody from the outside. I was there one day. One of those exercises consists of holding a piece of paper in one hand [Then Mrs. Cripps crumpled a piece of paper] and then undoing it and spreading it out so it's flat again. If you think that's easy, just try it; it's very difficult. But it keeps the hands and the fingers flexible. It's the kind of activity you and I would never think about, but it's certainly important to the welfare and well-being of the lodge residents.

A craft co-ordinator comes in every morning and works with the residents, and started crafts can be found all over the lodge: beads, egg cartons, et cetera. Craft materials are tidied up, but they are never put away. I've been in some lodges which are clinically spotless, but the atmosphere is sterile — no craft materials left around. In fact, in some lodges the emphasis is on being able to polish the tables and dressers even in the rooms. Some lodges have a policy of not allowing anything on a surface which could collect dust or which would have to be moved to wipe off the furniture. This applies to the rooms as well as the main recreational area.

In a January 1985 article from the *Reader's Digest* — and I'm going back to the same article, How to Choose an Old People's Home — it says:

But too often rooms are impersonal. In one Ontario home I visited, every identical room was neat as a pin, and the residents, many in wheelchairs, sat grouped along the hallways, however much they might have felt like going back into their rooms for a nap. In contrast, residents in another home nearby displayed houseplants, family pictures and personal belongings. It was clear that their rooms were not merely their rooms, but their homes.

A good clue to the quality of life in a home is the amount of activity among residents. Usually this is governed by what they are encouraged — or allowed — to do for themselves.

All senior citizens will tell you that moving from a home to a senior citizens' lodge is a major emotional as well as physical change. It's a new life-style. Now the mundane things are done for them, and their needs for food and accommodation are being met. Therefore, they need something new to challenge them, an opportunity to continue achieving. In some cases they were unable to remain in their own homes because they could not handle the housekeeping or cooking. Quite often their health may improve after they move into the lodge, especially if their minds and hands can be kept active. The atmosphere of a senior citizens' lodge should be one that is conducive to keeping morale high, minds alert, and bodies healthy.

The Health Facilities Review Committee just assessed the Shangri-La Lodge, and I'd like to read you two paragraphs of that report:

Members had an enjoyable time at the lodge visiting with most of the residents and some of their family members. All residents had positive comments about

the kindness of staff and the comfortable, homey atmosphere. It was evident your residents and staff are proud of their lodge and make visitors welcome.

The activities and the participation of residents are to be commended. Members were interested in the way the Activities' Director and the Matron managed to obtain the involvement of the residents.

Needless to say, the residents and staff of the home were delighted with the report and really appreciated having the Health Facilities Review Committee come in. Quite frankly, if a lodge is doing a good job, I think they should welcome this kind of involvement by the government and appreciate the responsibility we have.

One of the residents made a comment the other day. He said the Shangri-La has a waiting list of people wishing to enter the lodge. I believe there are 12 or 14 on the list right now, and there aren't more because people know there is that list. One of the residents of the lodge said that if some of the foundations that are scrambling to make ends meet because their occupancy is down would take a look at the involvement of the senior citizens in the Shangri-La Lodge and recognize that the waiting list is because the Shangri-La is a home, not an institution, they could resolve their dilemma with half-filled lodges. I thought that was quite an adept statement for a senior citizen living in a lodge to make. He's right; some lodges are partially empty because of the atmosphere in the home. Certainly there are people out there who may need or wish to be in a home but don't go because they just can't stand the thought of moving into an institution.

I believe it's imperative that lodges be managed by local management committees which are vitally interested in the health and welfare of the lodge residents and in their community. There is a provision in the charter of the foundation for setting up boards of management. These local people should have enough flexibility, as long as they live within their budget, to make the lodge a real home rather than an institution in which people are incarcerated.

I want to briefly mention another senior citizens' lodge, which is working on an activity space. Some lodges were built a few years ago without much activity space. The senior citizens at the Winfield Lodge requested additional activity space from the Department of Housing. Unfortunately, their request came at a time of budgetary restraint. The social club decided they would raise the funds for the addition themselves, and they have. Maybe it was a fortunate "unfortunately", because there is community involvement in that lodge as there has never been before. Alberta Housing gave permission to build a recreational area addition and did the design for them. I believe they signed a contract with Alberta Housing yesterday to build the recreational space and turned over \$51,000 which they had raised locally and through recreation grants from the Department of Recreation and Parks. Needless to say, the residents and the community are extremely proud of what they've been able to achieve by working together for themselves and in co-operation with Alberta Housing. Mr. Speaker, I've deliberately not dwelt on private lodges, which of course are profit-oriented.

I believe that part of the recommendation which requests the government to consider the establishment of an ongoing senior citizen housing review committee should also have the ability to address concerns raised by residents of this type of facility. In fact, the Senior Citizens' Advisory Council says:

The Council further recommends that standards be established for the lodge program and that lodges be licensed by an appropriate body and regularly inspected by that body.

This might be well worth thinking about.

There are some real problems in attitude. I know of one lodge where the house rule is that staff must not talk to residents. This certainly makes it difficult for the staff, and it must leave the residents feeling very cool and neglected. In another senior citizens' lodge an elderly fellow was severely scolded by a staff member for an accident which certainly wasn't intentional. The senior citizen was embarrassed enough without the scolding. It was a major bingo night, and the daughter of one of the other residents was sitting nearby when he finally got out of the limelight. She said he turned to her with pain-filled eyes and said: "I've got to get out of this place permanently. They hate me." Two days later he was gone permanently — deceased.

In this *Reader's Digest* article on how to choose a senior citizens' home, it says:

Staff attitudes toward residents are a sure guide to the suitability of a home. Be wary if you hear a staff member say to a man who's four times his age, "Come on, Tom, be a good boy."

I believe the fundamental senior citizens' lodge program in the province of Alberta is excellent. But I believe it's imperative that we take a look at the role of the foundations, boards, matrons, and staff in providing a home for the senior citizens. I recently read a quote where one administrator indicated that they ran their lodge like a hotel. The province of Alberta is not in the business of building hotels; we are building senior citizens' homes.

Recently a senior citizen asked my advice about a personal problem. I indicated that I simply could not give advice in such a situation, because it was neither my place nor in the senior's best interest for me to make a judgmental decision which the senior would have to act upon. I received the laughing reply from the senior citizen: "Well, a nudge is as good as a push to a blind horse." So she really didn't want my total advice; she just wanted a little nudge. Another meaning that could be taken from the above quote is that senior citizens do not want to be forced into doing things, be they activities, decisions, or major moves. In many cases, given time and a nudge, they'll come to their own conclusion in due course. There is really no need to push.

Senior citizens are as different in their senior years as they were through the decades before. Some seniors have always made decisions and still want to be involved in decision-making, even though physically they may not be totally able to care for themselves or to carry out the decisions. Others have made decisions all their lives and have absolutely no intention of ever making another one. Then there is another group of senior citizens who've never made decisions and don't intend to start now. In each of these cases, the senior citizens' lodge as a home should provide enough scope to allow each and every senior citizen to function without feeling threatened or pressured. A senior citizens' social club within the lodge allows all seniors to be either involved in the decisions or not, as they choose.

It's important that the philosophy of the senior citizens' lodges and nursing homes be such that not only the physical comforts be provided but also the emotional, intellectual, and mental needs be considered. Senior citizens' lodges must not be a time out between life and death but can be a continuation of life in a new, relaxed atmosphere which encourages initiative, productivity, hobbies, or just restful

coexistence with the rest of the world if that's what they desire. Mr. Speaker, I ask all members to support this motion and to think carefully about the changing needs of the senior citizens who reside in this province.

I've got some pictures here, taken at the Shangri-La bazaar, and I'll pass them around while the motion is going on.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

[Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair]

MRS. FYFE: Mr. Speaker, I would like first to thank the Member for Drayton Valley for bringing forward this motion on a review committee to take a look at our housing policies related to senior citizens, particularly the lodge program. I'd like to compliment her sensitivity in this area, which I think is extremely important. I also would like to compliment the minister responsible for housing for his concern and sensitivity in the area of senior citizens. I know he's done a tremendous amount of work, is extremely interested personally, has demonstrated a great deal of interest in the whole area, and has plans to improve what is already a first-rate program in the province. For that, congratulations.

I can say that I am familiar with the lodge program only through those within the constituency I represent. Like the Minister of Economic Development, who sometimes says he's not inhibited or burdened by additional facts, I would say that my knowledge comes more from personal experience, and I address my remarks this afternoon from that knowledge base.

I would also like to pay tribute to the volunteers who work within the lodge program on the boards of management, who become very much emotionally and socially involved with the seniors within the lodges in their jurisdictions. These people I have met contribute a great deal of time to the lodge program and to the seniors within it. I know the families that have seniors in the lodges appreciate it, but I think it's worthy to add to the words of the Member for Drayton Valley our words of tribute in the Legislature to that vast volunteer force that carries out the work that is so important to the seniors within our lodge program.

As the Member for Drayton Valley said so well, the lodge should be a home. It should be a place of joy. It shouldn't be a place in which the resident feels imprisoned or lacks freedom.

One of the benefits of the lodge program is that even though the room may be small, it provides privacy to the individual. I think one of the deepest concerns I have for our nursing home program is that many seniors who are independent people that have contributed to our society end their last years in a room having to share with a total stranger. It's often very difficult as a young person to share with someone you don't know, and I think it becomes even more difficult as you get older, having to share a small space with another person that is not your spouse. I think the lodge program, because it is a recent program, has been able to accommodate seniors in a positive atmosphere that provides and respects the privacy I think is very important to each of us as human beings.

One of the very important factors in locating a lodge is the actual physical location. Too many younger people tend to think that because you're a senior citizen, you want tranquillity, a place that could be termed "the shady meadows", a place where you can get away from life, a place where you can have quiet and respite from the active world. From all the seniors I talk to, this is totally and completely

false. About the last thing most seniors want is to be away from life. In fact, the closer they can be to an area such as a school ground or day care centre or family facilities, the better it is. If they have access within walking distance to commercial facilities, a drugstore, post office, meat market, bake shop — all these things where they can go and pick up little things as they have done their entire lives — it means the continuation of a life-style that is simply part of them. So it is extremely important that the location of a facility within each community recognizes that seniors want to be part of life, the same as they have always been. Because they have reached the magic age of 65, 70, or 75, they don't turn into another creature; they're the same person they always were. The vast majority of them still want to feel that they can make a meaningful contribution to life, even though it may be in a slightly different way. The old saying goes that you're as old as you feel, and many feel much younger if they know they are still treated as active and valuable members of our society and our community.

Before I deal directly with the motion and the committee, I would like to comment briefly on some of the structure that is already in place to assist the lodge program. The Alberta Health Facilities Review Committee has played an extremely important role in assisting lodge personnel and boards of administration to review the types of food services and the kinds of facilities in operation within the lodges. This is a very important function that goes about quietly without much fanfare, and that's the way it should be. It continues to operate and play a very good, very important role, and that should continue.

Whether a committee such as the housing review committee could work as an adjunct with the Alberta Health Facilities Review Committee is one potential of the model I think we should consider. I don't know whether it's necessary to establish an independent committee or whether there are a lot of resources on the Alberta Health Facilities Review Committee that could contribute in resources and knowledge. I think that's one aspect that should be looked at before any final decision is made.

The health units obviously play an extremely important function in the lodge program in assisting individuals with their personal hygiene and health concerns. In speaking this morning at the largest lodge within the constituency I represent, I asked about the question of medication, for example, and how this is handled. I understand that a variety of systems have been tried and that in order to get around the question of liability in the dispensing of medications, the health units have been extremely successful in setting up a system which allows the public health nurse to put the medication required by the individual resident into dosettes or individual containers. These can be dispensed by the staff, and it is working exceptionally well. I think it's important that we recognize the extremely important role that the health units, in particular the home care program, play in supporting seniors in the lodge program, which keeps these individuals in their own rooms and in these facilities for a longer period of time and, I believe, keeps them more active and also part of the community as a whole.

One of the areas that I believe is extremely important for a housing review committee to consider is the education of the matron or administrator — whatever you want to call the person who's in charge of the facility. Currently the administrator or matron is an employee of the local foundation, and that's good. That's something that should

be continued. I recognize that the senior citizens' housing association is working at establishing some standards or criteria of qualifications for matrons. I think that establishing some guidelines is an important area in which the government could assist.

I certainly don't think it's necessary to have a four-year university degree in social sciences to be a matron. I think it's far more important that the administrator or matron be a person who has personal skills such as sensitivity, a person who can demonstrate caring and loving respect to the seniors but also treat them as equals and adults and persons that deserve their respect. It takes a special kind of person to continue to be patient day after day and listen to the small concerns that do become large if they're not dealt with. It takes a special person, and it takes one that should have, if not formal training, at least some degree of support through informal training classes on an ongoing basis — a type of training that upgrades the personal qualifications and assists those people that have the personal qualities to become able to deal with some of the problems they must deal with on an individual, day-to-day basis.

I think this is a most important area that the committee should address as one of its top criteria, because some of the stories and incidents the Member for Drayton Valley enunciated do not need to happen. Some of the horror stories that have perhaps taken place in the odd location are simply not acceptable. By establishing some type of upgrading or training, I think we could develop a calibre of administrator or matron that would be far above those kinds of incidents.

One of the other areas I'm concerned about in relation to lodges is the actual boundaries of the foundations. The foundations were established in order that more than one municipality, at least outside the two major centres, are able to combine resources and that the deficits are costed out on the basis of an equalized assessment of the participating municipalities. I believe this is something that should be flexible. We should consider the fact that those boundaries may not be as relevant now as they were when they were originally established. Those communities that have the benefit through the equalized assessment need to ensure that all decisions that affect their neighbouring municipalities are made on what is completely realistic, rather than another municipality picking up a greater share of the deficit. I would very much like to see a review of some of the boundaries of the foundations for lodges.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to say it's important that this committee be very concerned about the question of local autonomy. My personal belief is that it's most important that we not be seen as coming in and trying to usurp the very good work or take credit for any of the work that has been done at the local level by the volunteers, by the staff and, more importantly, by the families. This is something we must respect. I think this motion should be passed, and it should be passed in the spirit that we wish to provide support for a first-rate program and that there are specific areas which senior government can assist the local communities or the local foundations to improve.

One of the specific areas I believe it's important to deal with relates to what happens within the lodge programs themselves. A lodge that does not have a specific activity program probably does not have seniors who feel that the lodge is really their home. For example, the recreation area that's required within a lodge should be a place to meet, to eat, and to greet family and friends. It is extremely important that families always feel they have a responsibility

for the senior members in their family, that they don't feel that simply by placing the senior member in a lodge they can abdicate the responsibility to communicate with and to love and care for those family members. A place that is active and brings the family members in for lodge dances, for example, or lodge programs that have a community orientation, are extremely beneficial to the seniors themselves.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to conclude by saying I believe this is an extremely worthwhile motion that the Member for Drayton Valley has brought forward. I once again commend her for thinking about the lodge program and being concerned about the needs of the program. In my opinion, this program is essential and worth while. It's an excellent program, but like all programs it needs our support and concern. Excellent programs can still be made even more excellent, and, with that, Mr. Speaker, I conclude.

MR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to participate in this debate brought to the Assembly by the hon. Member for Drayton Valley. It has been said that as we get older our bodies get shorter and our anecdotes longer. Well, I must assure members of the House that I will keep my remarks brief this afternoon.

I wish to look at one major issue: the implications of our changing demographic structure upon senior citizens in general and more specifically on senior citizens' housing policies. It goes without saying that the number of elderly persons in Canada and Alberta will grow substantially before the end of the century. In Alberta in 1984 there were approximately 180,000 Albertans 65 years of age and over. This represents some 7.6 percent of Alberta's population. Another way of looking at these figures, Mr. Speaker: the number of Albertans 65 years and over represents the populations of Lethbridge, Red Deer, Medicine Hat, and Fort McMurray combined. When viewed in this way, there is no question that they represent quite a large total of the population of Alberta.

In the next quarter century, however, the number of senior citizens in Alberta will double, and I might add that most of us at this debate today will be part of that group — might I add, hopefully be part of that group. Projections to the year 2026 estimate that there will be over 700,000 seniors in Alberta — more than the present population of Calgary or Edmonton. Studies and projections indicate that seniors not only are living longer but also are healthier, wealthier, and better educated than their predecessors. These demographic changes will place new demands on senior citizens' housing, and there is a need to evaluate present programs with a view to future needs and possible alternatives. However, in our evaluation and reviews it is vital that senior citizens have continual input into housing policies. Seniors are very important information resources regarding housing, for they are the users and are directly affected by choices we as politicians may make.

One of the important features in seniors' housing is the availability of choice. Seniors, like the rest of the population, are mixed groups with a variety of service needs and housing preferences. Alternatives should be provided to give them greater choice in their living arrangements. The Department of Housing, along with other departments, should examine means whereby a wide variety of housing alternatives with a range of choices from independent living to institutionalization can be made available. Mr. Speaker, there is already a good deal of input from the Provincial Senior

Citizens' Advisory Council and Senior Citizens Bureau on senior citizens' housing policy in this province.

The resolution before us asks that we "undertake a review of government senior citizens' housing policies and principles." No doubt such a review would include a review of the present housing programs in Alberta. I believe the present housing programs for senior citizens in Alberta are some of the most progressive in North America. I'd like to look at just a few of them.

First of all, the senior citizens' self-contained program: a super program, Mr. Speaker, providing hundreds of senior Albertans who are mentally and physically self-sufficient rented bachelor and one-bedroom apartments in complexes built under this program. Some complexes also provide suites that are modified for the disabled. In Edmonton Kingsway the self-contained units are tremendous. They're well kept, they're clean, and they provide an extremely positive environment. In reviewing the orientation booklet for management agency board members produced by Alberta Housing, extensive guidelines and policies are stressed, Mr. Speaker. Evaluation procedures are stressed, and roles of housing manager, maintenance staff, and others are underscored. But I believe a review of this program would be beneficial. Why? To obtain positive and negative feedback from seniors, managers, and board members.

A second program that has been alluded to by both the previous speakers is the senior citizens' lodge program. Mr. Speaker, I think it's important to stress what these lodges are supposed to do. What is their objective? Why have they been provided by the provincial government? And why has there been support to lodges? Well, lodges provide housing for seniors who are in good health but do not wish to maintain an independent household. Unit rents include meals, laundry, and housekeeping services. While medical services are not provided by the lodge, residents may obtain personal care services through local health units. Lodges also offer short-term accommodation for seniors under a vacation relief or respite care program. This program offers temporary housing alternatives for families caring for their elderly at home or for seniors needing accommodation for a limited period of time. Yes, Mr. Speaker, the lodges are excellent in so many ways. It is a home to seniors. It is a caring place. It is not simply a building but an environment of warmth, friendliness, togetherness, and yet independence.

But I believe a review of the seniors' lodge program would also be in order. Specifically, the demographic changes I alluded to earlier have drastically changed the resident component of these lodges we were referring to. Last year the Alberta Health Facilities Review Committee visited 84 of the 133 lodges in the province of Alberta. Here are some examples of how situations have changed, and I raise these issues so that when the review occurs, they will be considered.

First of all, residents are living longer, with an average age in some lodges of 85 years old or older. Many residents require more care medically, mentally, physically, and socially. In some cases lodges have become intermediate care facilities. In some lodges over 50 percent of the residents require some type of help from a home care group, lodge staff, or others. This help I am referring to, Mr. Speaker, includes medication, bathing, oxygen, walkers, wheelchairs, et cetera. There is a growing percentage that require nursing-home level care.

With these changes I have just referred to occurring in our aging population, I ask the question: should there be more of a dovetailing between Alberta Housing and the

Department of Hospitals and Medical Care with respect to lodges? I ask the question: could lodges that have low occupancy rates open a wing of those buildings and offer intermediate care, a step before nursing home care, to citizens that require it? I ask the question: should there be any thought of removing the lodge program from the purview of the Alberta Health Facilities Review Committee? I will answer that question, Mr. Speaker. I think not; in fact, I stress that it must not.

Mr. Speaker, other senior programs I'd like to refer to include, of course, the seniors' home improvement program. Here is a cost of over \$140 million that has assisted over 50,000 senior citizens to improve and maintain their residences. Another program deals with special home heating grants for 85,000 seniors living in their own homes. This rebate has been extended to the end of 1987 at an estimated cost of \$25 million. Alberta has the most extensive housing programs in Canada. A major priority of this government is to provide suitable housing in the immediate surroundings of senior citizens, close to services, family, and communities that they have been a part of during their entire lives. A wide range of housing options exists in Alberta. Briefly again, programs have been established to help seniors remain in their homes. Self-contained apartments are provided where no care is required. Lodges exist for those who need a minimal level of assistance in daily tasks, and nursing homes are available to those requiring further assistance. But there are gaps in the continuum, and those gaps must be filled.

This motion is two-pronged. It suggests "a review of government senior citizens' housing policies and principles." I am heartily in favour of such a review due to the demographic changes I've enunciated. It is time to truly look at all accommodation for seniors now and to begin planning more fruitfully for the future growth in our aging population. I welcome this review and suggest that, no question, a mechanism be established as soon as possible to deal with this issue.

The motion also suggests the need for an "ongoing senior citizen housing review committee." The term "ongoing" implies another bureaucracy. It implies more funds to be expended. I just cannot support this component of the motion. I don't believe we require the ongoing committee in view of the fact that many are presently knowledgeable of what is occurring in housing for seniors. Who are they? The Minister and the Department of Housing; the Minister and the Department of Social Services and Community Health; the Minister and the Department of Hospitals and Medical Care; the Senior Citizens' Advisory Council; many, many private organizations, societies, and associations dealing with seniors; and the Alberta Health Facilities Review Committee.

Speaking of the Alberta Health Facilities Review Committee, I am proud to say I am one of its members. I give praise to the 10 public members of the committee who have shown such extensive dedication in attempting to make our facilities a better environment for all citizens. My congratulations, too, go to the chairman, the hon. Member for Calgary Currie, for his leadership and his continued support for all members in fulfilling their role.

Mr. Speaker, the committee recently submitted the 1983 annual report to this House and made a number of recommendations directly related to this motion. I believe it is important to read these recommendations into the record, because they cover much of what has been indicated by the Member for Drayton Valley. First of all, recommendation 2 dealt with multicare facilities:

For the unfortunate people whose deteriorating health forces them to relinquish the independence of maintaining their own homes, life can become a series of leave-takings — from home to lodge, from lodge to nursing home, from nursing home to auxiliary hospital. To ease the stress of leaving friends and familiar surroundings, consideration should be given to providing multi-level facilities to accommodate different levels of care.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is time this recommendation be dealt with. It is not a new one; it has been on the books for a number of years. I hope this Assembly will deal with it at some time in the near future.

There are many recommendations in the 1983 annual report with respect to senior citizens' lodges. I will simply touch upon some of them, keeping in mind that in most lodges the accommodation, the people, and the care are excellent. However, some changes and recommendations are provided, dealing first of all with home care:

Home Care provides a valuable service to lodges and we applaud this, but we believe that it is time for the Government to review the whole concept of lodges. This would require the joint discussions of the Minister of Housing, the Minister of Social Services and Community Health, and the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care.

The second recommendation deals with training:

The staff of most lodges are doing an excellent job in providing comfortable and happy homes for the residents, but they should have help. Training courses for matrons, cooks and maintenance staff would encourage them and help them with problems. Many receive no training and are left to work things out [on their own]. In a number of cases this results in complaints about food, complaints about maintenance, and complaints about lack of recreational activities.

A procedures manual for matrons would also be helpful for their guidance and reference. This should include sections on human relations, supervisory skills, budgeting, nutrition, maintenance, and information on services available to lodges and [other] residents.

Mr. Speaker, the final recommendation deals with medication:

Matrons sometimes undertake the responsibility for giving residents their medications. It would be advisable to have Home Care nurses and pharmacists set up a proper dispensing procedure for residents requiring assistance.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, a review of housing policies and principles for seniors — yes, and now. However, in my estimation an ongoing committee is definitely not required.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I'm very interested in the issue raised by Motion 205, brought before the Assembly by our colleague the Member for Drayton Valley. It is interesting to analyze the motion and see that it is, indeed, in two parts. The first part is readily of a positive nature in terms of the fact that any government should keep the matter of its ongoing programs in all areas under constant review, and especially keep in review and analyze the underlying principles with respect to various programs. Senior citizen housing is, indeed, a very important program, and as has been mentioned by other speakers, the programs in place in the province of Alberta really rank first among the programs available throughout this country.

I know the minister responsible and his department have a great deal of sensitivity and concern with respect to the various facilities for senior citizens which fall within the ambit of the department. I for one would like to compliment the minister in particular and the people within his department for their ongoing concern in this area, bearing in mind, of course, that senior citizen housing is but one of a number of aspects in that complete department.

The second matter within the motion is the consideration of the establishment of an ongoing senior citizen housing review committee. As I look at the wording of the motion, I see it in a far broader context than the proposer of the motion. As I listened to my hon. colleague's comments, she seemed to focus more in the area of senior citizens' lodge accommodation and then went on from there with respect to nursing home accommodation. In terms of my comments I see the establishment of an ongoing senior citizen housing review committee as having far broader parameters, and I speak in favour of the establishment of such a committee.

Before I go on to my comments, I too would like to pay a full compliment to the Health Facilities Review Committee, under the chairmanship of our colleague from Calgary Currie and our colleague from Edmonton Kingsway, who has membership on that committee. Together with the other members of that committee, they carry on a very vital function, a very necessary and useful function, as they go and visit the various facilities. I think there are approximately 360 facilities throughout the province in the total ambit of their committee. Members of the Assembly should be very cognizant of the fact that when that committee goes out to visit, it indeed visits in depth. When they're dealing with lodges and especially with nursing homes and active treatment hospitals, they spend a considerable amount of time there. I know that in the case of hospitals they often spend two or three days trying to go through the community, if you will, of a hospital, because our hospitals are often larger than some of the residential communities throughout the province of Alberta. One needs to bear in mind that the thrust of that committee, while it has a fairly broad spectrum, indeed does cover a narrower focus in terms of senior citizen accommodation than what is really embraced within the total ambit of the Department of Housing with respect to the other types of facilities for senior citizens.

For a few moments I would like to talk with respect to some of the experience I've had working with senior citizen accommodation over the last 12 to 14 years. The comments primarily relate to the area of self-contained senior citizen units. In the last decade there has been tremendous explosive growth in the province in this area, particularly in the last seven years. The majority of the concentration of construction of these units has taken place within the major urban centres, particularly in Calgary and Edmonton. Nevertheless, the broad thrust of the program has enabled smaller communities to have smaller residential accommodation facilities put in place so that we now have self-contained units for senior citizens in almost every community throughout the province of Alberta.

That immediately puts a fair amount of pressure upon volunteer organizations and individual volunteers in the communities throughout the province. I believe the record to date has been really quite commendable. But I think that in terms of the wear and tear on volunteer organizations — for example, I know that some groups within the city of Calgary are now experiencing some type of depression. Having gone through the initial exhilaration and all the hard

work of planning for a senior citizens' self-contained housing project, all the agony and anxiety that's involved, the expenditure of person-hours in terms of the development and everything, trying to work out what the plumbing system really ought to be, the amenity areas, the colour of the interior, and the other important factors such as special hardware for handicapped persons as well as for aged persons — once you've gone through that initial burst of energy, there is indeed a letdown when it comes to the so-called ho-hum everyday operation of the facilities. As we all know, those ho-hum days are really the essence of the ongoing provision of a communitylike, familylike atmosphere in caring for the everyday needs of the individuals who live within those facilities.

Being a member of a nonprofit group, Trinity Place Foundation of Alberta, over the last 12 years, I have seen the inevitable wear and tear that can happen to a board. For example, as past chairman and an ongoing director of that board, we consciously look to a changeover within the members of the board. You do it on a long-range basis. You phase out one member out of 10 about every year or two years so that you're bringing in new people, but you're also allowing some of your members who have been with you for a long haul to finally have a rest. So it is that at least one of our board members, Sister Jean Golden, who was so essential to the construction of our initial project, Carter Place, now lives in a facility which is located in Canmore but still comes into Calgary and works with us in terms of the three facilities which we now operate, Carter Place, Murdoch Manor, and King Tower. We have consciously gone to younger board members so that we are able to stretch out the learning curve and the experience, and after some of the rest of us start living in some of these senior citizen facilities, we in turn have really been bringing along and developing other people who will be able to carry on. As a conscious policy with the development of Trinity Place Foundation of Alberta, we have indeed been looking not just at the immediate needs, as important as they are, but at long-range planning. At the moment I believe that as a board we already have in place sufficient experienced person-power to be able to handle those facilities over the next 20 years. That is a very conscious decision which is a very important philosophy that needs to be put in place by various other groups throughout the province. I know that some others have indeed taken that kind of philosophy into consideration in the development of their facilities.

One of the reasons I'm in favour of this motion and the establishment of a review committee is that such a board not only would take into consideration senior citizen lodges and nursing homes, which are presently covered by the Health Facilities Review Committee, but would take on this tremendous number of self-contained units within the province. That's a huge number of units where we really do not have direct access, and we certainly do not have any access to that through the present legislation covering the Health Facilities Review Committee.

I make the brief comment that one of the real needs in the province is for the development of more nursing homes. Whether that might be done through the private sector or some other way is a moot point for discussion. I think that's the area where we are yet to see the crunch in terms of what's happening in the aging process of the residents within the facilities. As the sponsor of the motion has put forward, this is a real concern. For example, in January 1977 we moved the first residents into Carter Place in

downtown Calgary, and we have 180 units. It is a constant source of concern to me that every time I go into that facility — and I probably go at least once every 10 days on an irregular pattern of hours, early and late — the thing that keeps striking me is the aging process which has taken place. Some of our original residents are there, but they are much frailer with the passage of just seven years. By the same token, they look at me and realize that I've aged considerably during the same length of time.

In the course of the last number of months — last September as a matter of fact — Trinity Place Foundation of Alberta was privileged to take on the challenge of Murdoch Manor, with 360 senior self-contained housing units, and King Tower, which has an additional 143 units. So in total we are now grappling with the challenges of 683 units of self-contained housing. Mr. Speaker, I hope the minister will forgive me if I make mention of the fact that we've had some additional challenges involved, but I think he realized that those challenges were there in terms of the physical difficulties of taking on Murdoch Manor and King Tower, which previously had been administered by the Calgary housing authority.

First, one needs to point out that because the previous program was so good and we built more and more projects of self-contained housing for seniors within the city of Calgary, once we came into a downturn in the economic cycle, we inevitably had more of the seniors from the downtown core who were living in some of the original buildings moving out to be closer to their relatives — and that made sense — or because some of the new facilities had better amenity space or more space in which to live because of the three projects administered by our nonprofit foundation. In effect, we have a tremendous number of smaller bed-sitter accommodations.

When you stop to think of it, the majority of us here in the Assembly are accustomed to living in a fairly large home of reasonable size, having more than one bedroom. But if you suddenly become an M.L.A., move to Edmonton, and get yourself into a bed-sitter situation, you don't have a bedroom, which has happened to me. I'm learning to live in a smaller and smaller space. Inevitably, the smallest space you're going to have to deal with is your casket. [interjections] That's what's known as a very positive approach, but I assure my colleagues that it's also a very realistic approach, unless the rest of you have found a way that you're going to live forever.

One thing we encountered with Murdoch Manor and King Tower was unexpected operational difficulties. For example, we are now dealing with replacing the roof of Murdoch Manor, which is costing \$120,000. During the break last week I was up on top of that roof, together with two other members of our board. It's an interesting situation to see the city of Calgary from the top of that senior citizens' high rise. It was also interesting to suddenly look to the west and see a commercial helicopter picking up a dinosaur and flying it from the zoo into the new park area that's been developed.

AN HON. MEMBER: No pink elephants?

DR. CARTER: No pink elephants. This actually happened.

With respect to King Tower, for example, we suddenly discovered that in the construction of that project, which took place in '77 or '78, the workmen had left a few odd things in the sewer. So suddenly we had to rip out the whole ground floor main lobby in order to effect sewer

repairs. In Murdoch Manor we discovered why they were having trouble with heat controls in the whole south section of the building. None of the thermostats had been hooked up, even though the building has been open for 12 years. In addition, with respect to King Tower, the seniors living on the top floors had complained about the heat buildup in the summertime, yet the building was set up to have proper air ventilation and so forth. When we moved in, we discovered that the previous group occupying the south tower of King Tower had blocked off all the cooling system to the senior citizens but were making sure that the cooling was going down to the operation of their offices on the ground floor. My board members and I really don't think that was exactly the way to run the facility. These examples are there — and I could give many more with all three facilities — to say that while we have a number of voluntary groups out there and while the department tries to keep in meaningful contact with the groups, nevertheless there's a need from the construction side, the physical plant side, for people to be able to go in and compare various projects throughout the province and make positive suggestions about how you can change and deal with the physical, structural difficulties.

In addition to that, it's a matter of attitudinal concept. It's a matter of dealing with senior citizens. We're talking about self-worth, about self-reliance, and about dignity. Let's face it; the people who are within the self-contained housing units have more experience than many of us in terms of a lifetime, the various jobs they have done, the various projects they have been able to accomplish, and the various talents they still possess. Many of them just want to be asked for their help. They certainly want to be asked in terms of their input.

But attitudinally, in terms of a board's relationship with the people who are managing the facility, I still believe your frontline people are the ones who determine the atmosphere within the facility. In the case of senior citizens' self-contained, in our experience we find that when it comes to the hiring process the number one people have to be the caretaking staff. It's part and parcel of the caretaker's job that when a senior citizen resident goes by and says hello and wants to spend a few minutes visiting, you stop cleaning the floor and carry on with the visit. What's involved here is a matter of interpersonal relationships. It's a matter of communication and of self-worth, because many, many people do not have relatives, or very few friends, and to be able to feel that the caretaking staff, the receptionist, the executive director, or the board members who move in and out of the facility will at least stop and say hello is an acknowledgment of the fact that "Hey, I still exist, and I am still a person of self-worth."

That's a factor which applies to all types of senior citizen housing, but it's something that all of us need to bear in mind. In terms of having an ongoing committee which would visit the whole spectrum of senior citizens' facilities throughout the province, one would have to select a committee that would have that kind of sensitivity, so when they walked into a facility, they would indeed meet with all the staff, the board members, and the residents. It doesn't take you very many minutes before you can determine, get a feel for the atmosphere within a facility, as to whether it's being run in a too dictatorial fashion or there's any kind of input at all from the residents as to what's happening in their home.

Remember too that the quality of life within those senior citizen homes is very much under observation and very

much commented upon by the general public. You have delivery people moving into a building. They can pick up a sense of whether that facility is really working with the residents and catering to the needs of the people for whom the place was supposedly built. By the same token, we also have relatives and friends, the children and grandchildren who come to visit grandma or grandpa. They also can very quickly pick up on whether or not you have a facility which is run with a great deal of sensitivity or one which is just another type of senior citizens' warehousing.

One of the other concepts which should be examined with respect to these facilities is the matter of that flow of other people coming in. I don't know if the minister would be open to the thought, Mr. Speaker, but there's an open area in one of the three facilities we administer which has not yet been picked up for other use. One of the things I would like to see considered there is a day care facility with a lot of the workers being on a rotational basis, some of the residents, some of the senior citizens. A lot of young children fail to have much contact with older people, often because of the mobility of our society, because we move all over the country and your grandchildren may not be raised in the same city as your children. It would perhaps help the youngsters to have more of an appreciation of older folks. It certainly would bring to the situation the appreciation the older folks have for young children, but only on a limited basis so you don't need to put up with them all the time. Another thing would be that some male senior citizens might also be able to put in more time working in that kind of day care. As I've travelled throughout the province with other facilities and come into day cares, it's interesting to note how many young children, male and female, come running to me because I'm a male figure. So much of their life really doesn't have a man in it because we have such a predominance of single-parent families using the day cares.

I just use this as an example of the kind of overlapping that can take place, that different kinds of people should be able to move in and out of our senior citizens' facilities. We haven't built them as ghettos but as places of human interaction. For example, one of our facilities, Carter Place, has the police department on the ground floor, and it's interesting to watch the kind of banter which takes place between the policemen and the seniors. There's a whole kind of watchfulness, an observation process which takes place because you've got other age groups and other occupations coming in so that you have an interchange of ideas.

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

Amenity space is something which is difficult to build in because of the cost. I think most of our facilities are to be commended for the efforts they make in terms of trying to deal with arts and crafts, whether it's woodwork, ceramics, painting, singing, or whatever, but again that becomes a matter of how the residents view their own home facility.

As has been mentioned by others, the real problem of life is that we're undergoing constant change, but when it comes to the fact that we've been retired, we have more time to think about the change. Most of us in this Assembly go at such a pace and have so many things to do that sometimes we don't have sufficient time to think about some of the things; for sure, we don't have time to brood about them. That's one of the very important differences between still being employed and the time of retirement, when you have more time to think about what is happening, more



time to brood about it, and you feel less in charge of what is happening to your life.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to give evidence of a new use for a senior citizens' facility, which I should have thought about before because of one of my occupations — there are more than one. About two months ago I conducted a funeral in the Lynnwood facility here in Edmonton. The person who died had been a resident in that facility for about two years and was the father of a close friend of mine. The service was conducted in the facility, not at a strange church, not at a strange funeral home, not at a place where all the residents of the facility would have to go a number of miles to find the funeral. At the wish of his family, his funeral service took place in the midst of his second family, those people who had come to love and appreciate him and deal with his medical disabilities in the last two years of his life. I found that in essence that was a very good example of what we're really trying to create in these various facilities throughout the province: meaningful communities where people care about each other, even at the time of death.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. APPLEBY: Mr. Speaker, as a member of that elite group of three people who are members of this Assembly and who belong to the subject under discussion this afternoon, I thought it might be appropriate if I made just a few comments. I do so for several reasons, Mr. Speaker. One is that in your present position, you yourself are restricted from doing so. The other is that I can claim a chronological seniority over the hon. Member for Chinook.

But there's another reason that I think would be interesting to members of this Assembly, Mr. Speaker. About the mid-50s the program for senior citizens' lodges in this province was implemented by the then member for a place called Pembina, which included parts of the present Athabasca constituency. The member at that time was the hon. Bob Jorgenson, and he was the minister of health and welfare in those days. He represented, as I said, a constituency called Pembina, and at that time that included part of the present Barrhead constituency and also included the town of Westlock. I mention the town of Westlock because it was there — and I'm sure the hon. Member for Clover Bar will recall — that in the mid-50s a special ceremony was held to open 25 newly constructed lodges in this province. A radio network was set up in Pembina Lodge at Westlock. The hon. Bob Jorgenson was present along with Premier Manning, and they did the official opening for all the lodges. Of course, in all the local communities represented in the other 24 centres, there were MLAs and local members of government and various special people who took part in those ceremonies.

About five years ago, Mr. Speaker, in the town of Westlock, I was fortunate to be able to take part in the 25th anniversary of this special opening of the lodges here in the province of Alberta. It was interesting that at that time the hon. Bob Jorgenson was a guest in Pembina Lodge in Westlock. He was present for that 25th anniversary ceremony, as were the hon. Harry Strom and the hon. Alf Hooke, who had been members of the former government at the time the special ceremony was held 25 years before. It was quite a momentous occasion, I can assure you.

I think that what I've listened to this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, certainly pinpoints some of the things that have to be looked at as far as lodges are concerned. Before I was an MLA, I was at one time a member of the board

of Pleasant Valley Lodge in [Athabasca]. I cannot help but note how great the changes have been, because at that time we agonized many times for a long period as to who we would admit to the lodge. We set up a screening formula and a method of rating people so that we could take whoever we thought had the most right to be in the lodge, because we always had a waiting list. That has changed. I now have lodges in my constituency that are running way under capacity. Members this afternoon have pinpointed some of the reasons for that, and certainly the self-contained units, the home care program, and the homemaker's program have all contributed to that. These programs are good, but it shows that we are changing what we need to do in the way of looking at this type of care in the province.

I think some of the comments, recommendations, and suggestions are very worth while. I congratulate the hon. Member for Drayton Valley and all the members who have participated, and thank the hon. member who stood aside for a few moments to let me speak.

Thank you.

DR. BUCK: It's all right, Dick. You don't have to stand up when I make a speech.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to get in the debate very briefly this afternoon and say that I certainly support the intent of the resolution. But I have to agree with the hon. Member for Edmonton Kingsway that we have departments set up to look after the facilities we establish, we have local boards, and we have the senior citizens' groups that look after their own facilities. So I think it would be a make-work program if we were to go ahead and have an ongoing review committee. Now, I realize there are a lot of Tory backbenchers that need a little extra income and a little extra work for the rest of the year. I say that rather facetiously, because I know the hon. member who proposed the resolution didn't have any ulterior motive.

I wish to compliment the government on the continuation of the program that was established in the '50s by the previous government, as the hon. Member for Athabasca mentioned, and I support wholeheartedly the fact that in this province we probably have the best facilities for our senior citizens of any in the world. I have seen some in other countries, and we don't take a backseat to any other country in the world.

I want to say that there was something that bothered me when we first started centralizing some of these facilities; that is, people were going from their own community into larger communities. Because we're in such close proximity to the city of Edmonton, I know of many cases where people from, say, Bruderheim, Fort Saskatchewan, Stony Plain, Leduc, St. Albert — because their families lived in the city, a lot of these senior citizens in their later years would move to the city to be close to their families. They found that that was a devastating mistake. Now that young families are so mobile, you may move from Fort Saskatchewan to Edmonton to be with your family, and four months later the family moves to Toronto. So I think we have learned something, and I compliment the government for the foresight to have the small, self-contained units throughout the province. I think that was an excellent move. It was well thought out and very, very important. Because we are finding out, as the hon. Member for Athabasca said, that you want your retirement years where you and your friends grew up all those years, in these small communities. That's where you can go and watch them curl, Mr. Minister

of Health, or even curl. Or you can watch them golf or even play golf. You know, that keeps us healthy.

MR. COOK: You're sensitive about this, Walt.

DR. BUCK: We have recognized that this was a problem, and we've reversed that to have small, self-contained units. I sincerely compliment the government.

The hon. member from Calgary mentioned the fact that the people in these lodges and self-contained units become second families. We know, of course, that there are always a few petty problems in some of the facilities, but as long as you put in different people from different walks of life, you're going to have a few disagreements. But we also have to remember that there are medical reasons for some of these people not getting along too well. As we get medical conditions like hardening of the arteries, atherosclerosis, we see personality changes. People who have had small strokes are not like they were many years ago. Some of them become very cantankerous; some of them lose their memory. So we have personality changes, and we have to recognize these.

I want to close by once again complimenting the government, Mr. Speaker, because we have invested the taxpayers' dollars wisely in establishing so many of these facilities across the province. We as younger members of this Assembly, compared to the senior citizens in many of these places, have to make sure, as someone mentioned, that we don't make these dumping grounds for our senior citizens. Too many times as MLAs we've experienced the condition where some of these people never have relatives visit them for months on end. When our parents move into some of these facilities, and hopefully some of us will be moving in, we hope our relatives and friends will remember that.

Also, in the selection of sites, I know at one time the philosophy used to be: there's a nice piece of land over there; let's put it over there; it's sort of out of the road; they'll like the peace and quiet. Peace and quiet are the last things senior citizens want. They want to be where the action is. So we have recognized and rectified that situation.

At the same time, I'd like to make a little comment on — I believe somebody has a resolution, or it's been spoken on, where we're looking at removing the mandatory age of retirement. I believe the hon. Member for Edmonton Kingsway mentioned that fact or that he is proposing a resolution, and I think that's a step, God willing, I never really want to say I am retiring from my profession, or I am retiring from something. I think those of us who are self-employed have that luxury; we can sort of semiretire. On the other hand, there are people who think retirement is the greatest thing. If they think that's the greatest thing. I'm glad they like to go that route, but I don't think I look forward to the day when at the magic tone of midnight, when you're 65 years of age, if you're employed, you're put out to pasture. That devastates people. Some people cannot adjust to that. Some people have not had any counseling, and I know one or two cases right in my own community.

This is really a tragic story, because this person had so much to contribute. We didn't realize this man was a university graduate. We thought he was the local town drunk. The man was a functioning alcoholic. We knew he had this problem, but he seemed to be able to work at his job and show up all the time, do a decent job. But he quit his alcohol problems cold turkey because the medical doctor

told him: "You have two choices. You can keep drinking and be dead in six months, or you can stop drinking and live a long time." The man quit cold turkey, and I admired him. I didn't think he had that kind of backbone, but he did. Seven years later all of a sudden he started drinking again. I phoned his daughter. I was really quite upset; I felt so badly. She said: "Yes, he has started drinking again. You'll never guess why." I said, "No, I can't understand why." She said, "He's going to retire in 18 months, and he doesn't know what he's going to do with his retirement." It wasn't three months after that that his wife came home and found him dead from a mixture of alcohol and drugs. That's how devastating it is to some people when they can't face compulsory and arbitrary retirement.

I wanted to bring those few facts to the Assembly. We can't just put people in these places; we have to remember they are still human beings. They want the interaction of their family and their friends, and that's why it's so important that these facilities be in the small communities. Mr. Speaker, I certainly compliment the government on that program. I am enthusiastic about what the member proposes, but I'm worried that we're going to add a little more bureaucracy to the bureaucracy if we set up this ongoing review committee. So I support the intent, but I would have great difficulty with setting up an ongoing committee.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MUSGROVE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few comments about motion 205 and certainly commend the Member for Drayton Valley for bringing this to our attention. As was said by the Member for Calgary Egmont, there are actually two parts to this motion, and I would like to speak to the top part of the motion first. There are two programs for senior citizens' accommodation. One is the self-contained units that have recently become the most popular senior citizens' housing, and then there are the senior citizens' lodges.

Mr. Speaker, I spent from January 1966 until November 1977 as a member of a foundation, a board member for the lodges. At the time I first became a board member, there was a 50-bed lodge in Brooks, and it had a waiting list of somewhere around 30 percent of the capacity of the lodge. After the building of the self-contained, there were a lot of changes, and there are still changes taking place in senior citizens' housing in my constituency.

During the time I was on the board, several of us were also members of the hospital board. On the building of the new hospital next door to Newbrook Lodge, the lodge had extra land. Being on both the hospital board and the senior citizens' board and also a member of the management board for self-contained units, some of us did what they call horse-trading. We traded some land that belonged to the senior citizens' lodge to the new hospital, which in turn traded six acres of excess land at the old hospital site, and that became the site for the self-contained units. On the six acres there was room for four buildings of self-contained units. Three of those, started in 1976, are built, and the fourth went to tender early this winter and will be under construction this summer. The four villas, as we call them, on that property will have a total of 110 apartments and will be filled the day the last unit is open.

We also have one self-contained unit in Bassano that has eight apartments, and in some of the smaller centres we have fourplexes that are self-contained units for senior citizens. The ones in the smaller centres are not filled to capacity, but the one in Bassano was filled to capacity the

day it was opened and the ones in Brooks have a waiting list. So it's very popular housing for senior citizens.

One reason for the changes taking place is that there are some problems. The original 50-bed lodge we had in Brooks had 10 single rooms and 20 double rooms. The double rooms were not very popular. We had a problem finding roommates who were compatible, and we even had people move out because they didn't want to stay in a double room with someone who was not related. We built a lodge in Bassano in 1978, and it only had four double rooms which would accommodate married couples. The rest are all single rooms. It's a more modern building than the one in Brooks, but it has never been filled to capacity for the simple reason that it was finished about the same time as some of the self-contained units in the community. Because they were more popular, the Bassano lodge has never been filled to capacity. An addition of 10 beds was put on the Brooks lodge in the late 1970s, making it a 60-bed lodge, but they were all single rooms and were certainly popular in that area.

Another reason the lodges are not operating at full capacity at the present time is because of the home care program. That keeps senior citizens in their own homes a lot longer than it did back in the '60s. I'm not saying that's not a good program. As a matter of fact, I think it's delightful to keep these people in their homes in their own community as long as possible. I also think the senior citizens' home improvement program and the home heating program have helped keep them in their houses.

Another problem we are having with the lodges is that because they're not filled to capacity, the cost of operating them has certainly increased to the person who is using the lodge and also to the municipalities that are picking up the deficit. You have to staff a building to capacity if you're operating it at 60 percent, and of course the maintenance on the buildings is the same whether they're full or 60 percent full.

The Alberta senior citizens' homes organization, along with the Department of Housing, has a program to increase the rent to residents of the lodge on a graduating scale, as I understand, to a percentage of the old age pension along with the supplement. I hear some comments about the cost to the residents staying in the lodges. Although it's only a percentage of their old age pension, as I understand, in 1986 it will become something in excess of \$400, which is certainly affordable to them but some of the residents feel it is high. One of the reasons they feel it is high is that they compare it to the cost of staying in a nursing home, which is quite a bit less because it is subsidized by the province. The deficit cost of staying in a lodge is picked up by the municipalities unless it is over one mill. I believe they try to be more realistic in the cost to the resident of using the lodge. If the lodges were filled to capacity, certainly the operating deficit would be less, and this could probably be passed on to some extent to the residents. In the self-contained units the rent is 25 percent of the renter's income, and if that is their old age pension plus the supplement, 25 percent of that is what it costs to live there. They certainly get a lot more privacy and can be a lot more independent in the self-contained units than they can in the lodge.

Our lodges in Brooks or Bassano do not have a problem with recreation facilities. The board and the people from those towns bend over backward to see that those people have some entertainment and recreation. The legion bought a pool table and a shuffleboard and put them in the Newbrook

Lodge many years ago. The ministerial association has a member on the board, and they certainly see that any kind of church services people are interested in are brought in. They have a program where they visit other lodges in southern Alberta by the bus load and go down for an afternoon. They have a crafts organization where they build crafts and sell them and contribute to their tea parties and whatever. They also have a New Horizons club in both towns where they have a place to meet with other people living in their own homes. They have an ongoing program of entertainment, and they even book organized tours for senior citizens from amongst that group.

Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure that we need an ongoing committee to study this, because we have several organizations that this committee might overlap. Certainly, the Health Facilities Review Committee could play that role after we have assessed the programs. But I do have some recommendations for the lodges. One of the recommendations is that we should have as few regulations as possible for senior citizens. When I was on the board, we had matrons who wanted all kinds of regulations enforced. One particular matron was bound that they wouldn't allow any alcohol in the lodge, and some of those fellows had been at least moderate drinkers all their lives. This was a lodge, and anything that's acceptable in a lodge should be acceptable in a senior citizens' lodge. We had some problems with that. We had some problems with their leaving the lodge. Some of the matrons wanted them to report when they left the lodge and report when they came back. We didn't feel that was necessary. This was their home and if they wanted to go and visit somebody or stay out late at night or whatever, that should be their privilege. This wasn't an institution; it was a home. We even had some who said that if they weren't going to be there for meals, they had to say so before they left. Of course, in any family it's kind of nice to know who's going to be home for dinner or supper, but on the other hand sometimes they left and didn't get back on time and were severely criticized. I felt that was getting a little out of line for the matron. As long as they made some effort to let them know what they were doing . . .

Another thing is that I think in most cases double rooms in older lodges should be eliminated. In today's age you don't ask two senior citizens to share a room unless they are a married couple. To bring in two people from different backgrounds and ask them to share a room is kind of out of the ordinary for this day and age.

Also, they should have some type of nursing care in the lodges nowadays. In the self-contained units home care comes in at the request of the secretary-manager and looks after people if they need insulin shots or have to have certain drugs administered that they feel they can't look after themselves. There is a certain amount of that in our homes, but in the last 20 years the average age of residents of our foundation lodges has increased from 74 years to in excess of 85 years. At the present time we are looking at people who probably could use a little more care than is offered by the staff in the lodges. I really believe the way to do that would be through home care, because then we wouldn't be making it into a health institution.

It's been suggested to me that maybe with the age of the residents in some of these lodges they should have a registered nurse on staff for one shift a day. I'm not sure that would be necessary if we could expand the home care program to take care of the medical needs of some of the lodge members. We have some who are taking insulin. It's

surprising how many people in some of these lodges take insulin nowadays. To a certain age some of them are able to administer their own insulin. When they get beyond that age, it should be done by someone else.

With those comments, Mr. Speaker, I certainly support the first part of the motion. Although I'm not against the last part, I feel we could be creating another bureaucracy that might overlap some people who are doing the same thing.

Looking at the hour, Mr. Speaker, I'm wondering if I shouldn't adjourn debate.

MR. SPEAKER: Having heard the motion by the hon. Member for Bow Valley, do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: It is so ordered.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, this evening it is proposed to have the members assemble in Committee of Supply for the purpose of consideration of the estimates of the Department of Public Works, Supply and Services, followed by Transportation, should that be possible. I would therefore move that the Assembly stand adjourned until such time as the Committee of Supply rises and reports.

MR. SPEAKER: Having heard the motion by the hon. Deputy Government House Leader, do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

[The House recessed at 5:25 p.m.]

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

#### head: COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

[Mr. Purdy in the Chair]

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Committee of Supply will please come to order.

#### Department of Public Works, Supply and Services

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Has the minister any opening comments?

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Chairman, the '85-86 budget for Public Works, Supply and Services provides for continued efficient delivery of government programs, while operating in an atmosphere of economic restraint. No new program or major enhancements of current programs are being introduced. I can assure you that existing programs are constantly being reviewed to ensure that we get maximum delivery for the budgeted dollar.

In the program operating budget, a reduction of 186 permanent positions in staffing authority has been planned for, and a further 89 positions will be eliminated from the Public Works, Supply and Services revolving fund. Two hundred and seventy-five position abolishments are applicable

to vacant positions. These reductions are made possible by streamlining the program delivery in the department and the continual movement toward privatization of those areas that can best be delivered by the private sector. This reflects the government's position that the private sector will be the engine for economic recovery.

An example of the privatization thrust is in the area of property management. At the end of the '84-85 fiscal year, a total of 16 contracts representing 44 buildings, which is about 170,000 square metres of space, had been contracted to the private sector for full property management, and during '85-86 16 more contracts for an additional 207,000 square metres of space, 88 buildings, will be tendered. At the end of this fiscal year this will represent about 18 percent of the total inventory of government owned space being tendered to the private sector for property contract management.

My department has also budgeted for additional ground support equipment and spare parts associated with four new CL-215 water bombers and the Dash 8 aircraft, which is the replacement for the DC-3. These aircraft will be primarily used for forest and wildlife protection and will greatly enhance our fire fighting capacity. The CL-215s are being purchased under a co-operative agreement with the federal government, six provinces, and two territories. Mr. Chairman, you will perhaps have noted that there is a sum of \$420,000 in the revolving fund for air transportation. This represents aircraft rental or depreciation, if you like. All other costs associated with the aircraft are in the program budget, vote 5, government transportation.

The capital construction budget for my department for '85-86 provides \$217.3 million for the continuation and completion of existing capital projects and the commencement of new construction projects, which will provide needed government facilities for program delivery when completed and jobs for the construction industry now, when they're needed. The budgeted dollars are down slightly from '84-85, but I think roughly the same number of jobs will be generated due to the favourable tenders and prices we are experiencing today. The total cost to completion of these new facilities in this year's budget will be better than \$800 million.

Mr. Chairman, Alberta continues to lead the country in the category of total construction expenditures per capita. We feel that now is a good time to be undertaking these projects since we are receiving excellent value for the construction dollar and, of course, providing job opportunities for the construction industry. The projects span some 80 Alberta communities. They range from the construction of salt sheds for Transportation, small renovation projects, up to the replacement of the Fort Saskatchewan correctional centre and the major new drug and alcohol treatment centre in Grande Prairie.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that the the budget I'm requesting today is a realistic approach to providing the required support services for government programs, and details are contained in the '85-86 estimates. I'd be pleased to discuss them and attempt to answer any questions members might have.

MR. LYSONS: I'd like to direct just a brief question to the minister regarding grants in lieu of taxes on grazing land or farm land. If the land is owned by the province and it's rented to a farmer, it is expected that the farmer pays the municipal taxes. However, if the farmer doesn't pay the municipal taxes and leaves the territory, then the municipality is stuck with the taxes. I don't know how

widespread this is, but it always seemed to me that it was the law of the land that the owner of the property was eventually responsible for the taxes. I would like the minister to look further into this, and if necessary, perhaps we should have some change in legislation so that the owner of the land is indeed responsible for paying the taxes and will.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Chairman, just a couple of general comments and a number of questions. The minister said, and I tend to agree with him, that now is a good time for construction when the construction buck goes a long way. When we look at millions of dollars, it is a sizable budget. We could debate from time to time which capital projects should go ahead and which are unnecessary. We've had that debate from time to time in this House.

As the minister is well aware, the other part of it, though, is that the construction industry is the most decimated industry in the province at this particular time. What sort of process determines which project we're going to get on with and what other ones are going to be put on board? Is there quite a thing in the department? Does it have to do with the municipalities? In other words, I think there's a fair amount of confusion about finding out which projects go ahead and which don't. I'd like some general comments in that area.

The other area ties into it on the other side. In 1983 my ex-colleague and I raised questions about unused space, and we cited a case where the government had a lease in the Inglewood professional building in the amount of, I think, almost \$41,000 per month for nearly a year before it was used. Another lease in the amount of \$31,000 per month was taken out by Social Services and Community Health in the Fort Road centre, and was vacant for nearly a year. Following from that, Mr. Chairman, I'd ask if the minister or his department has developed any policy since then with respect to signing leases without confirmation from tenants as to when or, in fact, if they will move in.

The other area I would like to look at — I'd like to know about the famous Premier's office in Calgary and find out if it's generally on budget and how much it's eventually going to cost us. The final total I'd also like to know about is the concrete park situated around the Legislature.

The other one I notice in here — we've had letters and perhaps other MLAs have, Mr. Chairman, dealing with the Baker Centre in Calgary. My concern is that planning time for the centre since initiation is, I think, about 12 years now. The modest size of the project and the fact that the budget was approved five years ago — could the minister give us a reason or reasons for the continual delay with the construction of the replacement facilities on the Baker site? I notice that in dealing with the Baker site, the estimate has certainly gone up from last year's \$990,000 to \$3,655,000 for the 1985-86 fiscal year. That's an increase of 269 percent. I gather by that that it's finally on stream, if you like. Could he give us the final situation with the Baker Centre?

The only other area I would like to — and it ties in to what I've been talking about, which projects you decide to go ahead with in a major capital projects budget. What determines whether you will decide to look for lease space or rent space or you will, in fact, build? I also allude to times in question period when I raised, and the minister is aware of it, where a building is built right next to a private-sector person. Of course, with the high vacancy rate it seemed to us at the time it would have made good economic sense and been good for the private person if that had been

leased at least for the time being. So I'd like to know what are the criteria, if you like, in renting or building and what determines that.

The only other questions I'd like to ask — we've been told that the Olympic Games are on budget. At this stage in the early development that doesn't mean much, but the minister is well aware and there is a lot of controversy over the Saddledome. Would the minister just tell us, update us a bit on the Calgary Olympics, because I think all of us feel uneasy about something that massive with the previous experiences that have gone on, certainly in Montreal but in other projects in the world.

I'll leave it there and listen to the minister's answers and maybe come back.

MRS. FYFE: Mr. Chairman, I just want to make a couple of comments. I want to express my sincere appreciation to the minister in two decisions that he made since his term with his present responsibilities, and that relates to the two provincial buildings in the constituency that I represent. Those two buildings were committed before the last provincial election. Since the election we all recognize that there has been excess commercial space available, and going ahead building those two buildings I know caused some anxiety to current owners of commercial space. However, in the balance, in recognizing that the construction of these buildings in both St. Albert and Morinville would, firstly, provide additional needed jobs to people who very desperately need the employment and, secondly, fulfill a commitment to those communities that had requested the provincial buildings some time ago and had worked with government over the years to get that commitment.

I just want to express my very sincere appreciation for those buildings on behalf of both St. Albert and Morinville. Both communities have expressed their appreciation to me. The credit goes to the minister, because it is not easy to proceed with that kind of decision, given the balance that had to be made. The balance came down in favour of the employment factor, firstly, and secondly, a commitment to the communities that will provide a focus to the communities that have planned their communities around those buildings. I just want to express very sincere appreciation to the minister for keeping the commitment in these two areas.

Thank you very much.

MRS. EMBURY: Mr. Chairman, it isn't very often that I stand up here, and the first comment I make is that the Leader of the Opposition completely stole my thunder with his reasonable questions and the depth of some of his questions. I haven't even got the opportunity to debate the comments that he's made, so I guess the one good thing is that hopefully my speech will be very short.

I, too, want to commend the minister for the administration of his portfolio, particularly in the areas of privatization. I think that's very important at this time. I know the people of Calgary are very grateful for that. I have the same questions regarding the Baker Centre. I know we will get an update just on where that project is at and what the expectations will be for 1985.

I know the Member for Calgary Buffalo won't mind that I raise the same questions about the McDougall school project, because it is very important to all Calgary MLAs, and we're very anxious to have an update on exactly where that project is at. I must admit it is really a treat to be a member for Calgary, to be in the downtown core, and just to drive by that project and see the changes that are there

already on the outside. Therefore, one has to expect that the inside will be even more exciting. As I've stated before in this Legislature, it certainly is a facility that is really needed in Calgary. I hope all members will remember the very significant fact that the architect who designed this Legislature Building also designed the McDougall school. So it is really and truly an historic site in Calgary and will therefore be of great significance to the people of Calgary and the surrounding area. The city of Calgary has also been very busy working on that site, developing the underground parking. At a time when jobs were very tough in the city, it was exciting to see that amount of construction going on.

The last comments I would like to make are with regard to the Olympic facilities. I'm very pleased to say that Calgarians and others are certainly enjoying the Saddledome. It's an outstanding facility, and we receive nothing but praise and comments for the excellent facilities there. It's going to be even more important to all Albertans and all Canadians, as a matter of fact, when the Olympics come in '88. Although we seem to be three years away from the Olympics, it's exciting to be in Calgary and to see what is happening with regard to the development of the facilities. Anybody who has had the privilege to drive by or to find out a little about Mount Allan, grows more excited day by day as they see what is happening out there. I really appreciate that the minister has kept us well informed on the stages of the development out there. If anybody is involved in any of the preOlympic activities, as I was fairly recently in a cross-country national championship that occurred in that area — those people had an excellent presentation by the Olympic committee. They've put together an excellent slide presentation. I would really urge all members of the Legislature because, let's face it, these are Olympic, Alberta facilities; they're not just for Calgarians. If you know you've got constituents that are really interested in an update on the Olympics, I wish you would try to obtain this slide presentation. It's an excellent summary of all the facilities, where they're at in construction and development, and it certainly motivates everybody to learn a lot more about it. I would like to request the minister to just quickly give us an update on the Mount Allan project, particularly if we're on budget and on time.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Chairman, in addressing the Department of Public Works, Supply and Services, the first comment I'd like to make to the minister is that he obviously had influence on the government of Alberta with regard to the massive public works program this year. Clearly, with the unemployment the way it is, it has long been a principle of government to try to fit into those cycles when construction is either down or flat and we have those unemployed tradesmen around the province, to undertake important capital projects, without necessarily building in the ongoing operating costs. As we know with hospitals, the operating equals its capital every 30 months.

I'm indebted to the minister for his attitude with regard to unused public space around the building. I had a volunteer group of citizens who were prepared to get involved with young people, disabled people and asked the minister's department if unused space could be used. He was very helpful in authorizing some of that space to be used for a volunteer group. I think that is an excellent policy of government. If there's unused space, if we have a group who are prepared to volunteer their time, then I think it's

a very good policy of government to allow volunteer groups within communities to utilize that space. I'm grateful for that, and I assure the minister that that particular volunteer group appreciates it.

The minister made reference a few minutes ago to aircraft. It seems to me that when we look in the estimates and see those dollars, we're budgeted for it whether the aircraft fly at all. We own the aircraft, we pay the pilots, yet we continue to read in newspapers about the high cost of government people travelling. Frankly, I'm very puzzled by that. If we already own the aircraft and pay the salaries, then why aren't we encouraging people to use the aircraft instead of the other way around? Maybe the minister could take a minute in response and explain where these charges come about. Why do we own the aircraft — paid for — pay the pilots, and then have the audacity to say to the taxpayer that the rate is \$500 or \$600 an hour for use? If accountants have told us that, is it any wonder we got problems passing that Act? Quite frankly, I would like the minister to encourage members of this Assembly to use those aircraft, not to restrict the use.

I'm the first one to concede that our third-level and regional carriers need the business. But why do we have to go through this each year in terms of responding to, with respect, the Leader of the Opposition about the Premier's trips to Calgary? We already own the blessed aircraft, we already pay the pilots, and yet we see these headlines about \$1,000, or for the Treasurer \$1,200, to go to Calgary. I don't understand where that comes from. [interjection] But I guess the Motion for a Return makes up the difference. The Member for Calgary Egmont has made the point that \$75,000 for the Motion for a Return is a lot of flights. I'd appreciate the comments from the minister, not necessarily tonight, but if he would.

Canada Post, as we know, has become a Crown corporation. It's very efficient, very effective. They've discovered what government never discovered: it's not hard to buy people off; just pay them more money. You get your service slower, if you get your service. That raises the question: what does the Alberta government pay in postage rates each year? I've tried a hundred times to find out, and I don't know. I can't find out. But I do know that within the building we have this courier system. I'm on the fifth floor. I get a memo from the fourth floor; it takes four days. That's the courier system. Quite frankly, I'm very grateful for the courier system we have throughout the province. It has that ability of getting important documents where they should be going, on time, unless of course, they have glass in them, in which case you take them to a local contractor and have the glass replaced: if you mark it "Fragile" it becomes a challenge, as you know.

Mr. Chairman, we touched on the area of conservation last year. I would appreciate the minister indicating to the committee how we negotiate our leases. Are they triple net? Are they double net? Do they include utilities? It seems to me that we hear time and again that it's cheaper to leave the lights on than turn them off. You drive around Edmonton, and if in fact we occupy one third of the capital city's downtown through leases, it must be those lights that are going all night. I wonder if the minister would share with the committee what his thoughts are with regard to conservation, because utility rates have literally gone through the roof. It seems to me that if we negotiate a lease, we should build into that our ability to dictate to the owner of the building what conservation program goes in the

building; i.e., lights go off automatically. Do we have those things in place? I do know that the Lethbridge provincial building has been saving some \$4,000 a month for four years through improved conservation standards. The minister may choose to comment on what conservation moves his department has been taking with regard to the space the government of Alberta leases.

Mr. Chairman, the minister may also choose to comment on caretaking. I have long felt that caretaking and security do not really have to be part of a government operation. Surely that's a role the private sector is very capable of. Certainly, in my riding the security measures have gone to the private sector. In Lethbridge West we have the provincial building. The staff there, Mr. Roberts is extremely helpful to any groups who want to use the building if the space is available. I often think that many of our civil servants never get recognition. There's a Mr. Monaghan as well. They're very helpful to the citizens and certainly to me as the MLA.

Mr. Chairman, there are two final points. One is parking charges to civil servants. I understand we charge them a flat \$4 a month, plug in or plug out. They occupy space that normally goes at \$100 a month. It seems to me I get taxable benefits on a pay cheque. I guess I get it regularly; I just don't get it very big. One of those is, of course, the share the Assembly pays toward health care costs in the Blue Cross package and medicare. I'm a little puzzled why our civil servants, for example, only pay \$4 a month to park their vehicles, particularly within a hundred feet of the building. They park all day, yet as you know, members of the public who have to use that building have to park six blocks away. It seems to me it should be the opposite, that we should as a matter of policy make the first 50 or 100 spaces around any provincial building available to the public, and employees should be beyond that. If they're going to park in underground parking in the city, why is it they only pay \$4 a month? My understanding is that that policy is applicable throughout the province, whether it's Fort Chipewyan or the Pacific Plaza on 9th and Jasper. If indeed it's worth \$100 a month, let's give it to them for \$4 a month, but shouldn't we consider a taxable benefit of \$96 a month?

Finally, in the area of computers, Mr. Chairman, I have some difficulty in the estimates knowing whether or not the minister's department is responsible for computers. If it is, then my question to the minister is that I understand Hospitals and Medical Care still stores all the medical records in the United States at Ann Arbor, Michigan. I'm a little puzzled as to why. To hear the Calgary members, Calgary has the third highest number of computers in the world. If that's true, why do we have to utilize services in the United States to store data? If it's because of confidentiality, I'm at a great loss for understanding, because the further you go away — surely the confidentiality argument would lose.

With those comments, Mr. Chairman, I would like the minister to respond if he's able, if not today, then sometime in the spring sittings.

MR. JONSON: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make a preliminary comment to the minister and state that I'm pleased to see the plans to purchase the Dash 8 aircraft, although I think all of us who have ridden on the venerable DC-3 will mark its passing. Provided one has the time, it's an excellent way to see the terrain firsthand, particularly to have a close view of the mountains. I really think something of the history of transportation in this province, at least as far

government members are concerned, will be lost when that is retired.

I have two questions to the minister. In the constituency some concern has been expressed to me about the policies that do or do not exist with respect to government construction projects. First of all, what is government policy with respect to the supervision of major government construction projects? Do we have a standard policy with respect to the appointment of a clerk of the works? It seems to me that in this particular time when we're looking at contracts which are shaved down to the point where the profit margins are pretty tight and so on and so forth, as always, it's necessary to monitor ongoing construction projects to make sure that the specifications are being met. The second question I have is also with respect to government policy. In our contracts for projects do we provide a penalty and/or an incentive clause? I have been informed by legal minds that this is not standard procedure. I want to check the accuracy of this assessment. It would seem to me that at a time when we want to see the maximum number of people employed and construction projects go ahead as quickly as possible, the inclusion of incentive and penalty clauses in contracts would be a good idea.

Mr. Chairman, I raise those two items as concerns and look for the minister's reply. Thank you.

MR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Chairman, I too would like to add my congratulations to the Minister of Public Works, Supply and Services for his initiatives on behalf of all Albertans. I believe the hon. Member for Edmonton Calder has handled a tough portfolio extremely well during tough times. I have three specific questions for the minister. The first one deals with reference number 1.0.8 on vote 1, and it deals with special projects. There's an increase of approximately 183 percent in this particular estimate, and I wonder if the minister could outline what special projects his department is embarking on in the 1985-86 fiscal year, given that there is a large increase in funding for this area.

The second question deals with the entire area of vote 4, the planning and implementation of construction projects. There is a total estimated budget of \$217,309,000. I wonder what percentage of the total budget allocated for the planning and implementation of construction projects is spent on projects in Edmonton.

My third question deals with the area of privatization. Although the minister alluded to this area, I am interested, like the Member for Lethbridge West, specifically in the area of custodial services. What percentage has now been contracted to the private sector? I believe the minister indicated last year during estimates that at that time approximately 30 percent of this work was being done by the private sector.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

DR. CARTER: Mr. Chairman, just a few comments. I was interested that the Member for Lethbridge West raised two issues in particular, security and postage. Just a brief comment with respect to security. As members of the Assembly, we very much appreciate the measures in place with regard to the Assembly, not only with regard to ourselves but to the staff in particular, because they are here for longer periods throughout the year than we. Of course, one needs only think for a few moments about the incident in the National Assembly in the province of Quebec, but also the fact that just last week there was another incident on the floor of the Nova Scotia Assembly.

I understand that with respect to postage, there is a joke going around that the post office needs the extra 2 cents, not to improve the sending of communication from one place to another but rather that it's necessary to impose the 2-cent increase to cover the cost of storage.

I'd like to make a number of comments with respect to some of the projects under your department, Mr. Minister. With regard to travelling throughout the province on behalf of the Social Care Facilities Review Committee, I and members of the committee visit a large number of the facilities where you and your department are in charge not only of maintenance but the renovation process as well. So first I'd like to pass on thanks from some people who now live in the new facility at Youngstown. The committee members are also looking forward with some anticipation to some of the changes, the additions with respect to workshop areas for people who will be at the Gunn Centre. One of the difficulties at Gunn is that there really is no recreational area that could be used in terms of workshops and handicraft areas. I see from the supplementary information — I assume that \$90,000 is for a portable trailer to be moved in there to meet that need. Again, I know it's a small item of \$10,000 with regard to the David Lander Centre at Claresholm, but I assume that is the tidy-up of the fungus difficulty which was found to be evident in terms of the ventilation system there.

You mentioned in the opening remarks the aircraft and fire fighting equipment. I assume that quality control is manifest with regard to the equipment at all times. I raise that matter because of fire fighting bombers, one of which crashed west of Calgary last year, I believe. That was probably under the federal department, but one of the difficulties there was the fact that proper stress testing of the material in the wings had not taken place. So I think we'd like to have some kind of assurance that proper maintenance is being carried out at all times.

I also would like to hear your update with regard to the McDougall site in downtown Calgary. I notice the underground parking is in place and operational, and some of the landscaping has indeed been carried out by the city of Calgary, I believe. Of course, a fair amount more will be finished off in the course of this summer. It's interesting to keep an eye on how that site is being renovated. I must admit, however, that the new two-storey parkade entrance built on the east side of the property, while it may be a connector to the Plus 15 system and it has been architecturally designed to somewhat fit in with the McDougall site, I can't help but look at it at first blush and regard it as an intrusion from an architectural point of view.

I wonder if you would be good enough, Mr. Minister, to give us an update on the renovation timetable with respect to the old courthouse building in downtown Calgary. I know it fell behind because of the cost of the renovations in the past couple of years, but I'm pleased to see that it is in effect here in the supplementary information for almost \$5 million. I wonder if that will indeed cover the complete cost of renovation or if we have to look forward to additional money being set aside next year when it comes time to deal with the estimates?

Two final comments have to deal first with the Olympic Saddledome. I was fortunate enough to tour the facility with Billy Hay about two months ago, and it is indeed a fine facility. If the hockey team could have kept healthy, perhaps we could have gone a bit further, but now Calgarians have to cheer for the Oilers or some other team or switch our allegiance to the new baseball entry in the Pacific Coast

League, the Calgary Cannons. That starts Friday, so that helps us in our transition. Nevertheless, in regard to the Olympic Coliseum, it is a very fine facility, but I'm just wondering if this \$5.5 million dollars of operating capital is intended to decrease in subsequent years or is that an ongoing figure that we are committed to?

The final comment is with regard to the correctional facility at Fort Saskatchewan. This morning, thanks to the good graces of the Solicitor General, the vice-chairman of the Social Care Facilities Review Committee and I toured that facility, and we were fortunate enough to be allowed out. It is indeed an interesting facility. We toured almost every nook and cranny. I think that under the circumstances, given the number of residents at the moment, the facility is being run as well as possible. Some renovations have been carried out, in particular one area which was a 50-bed section, which seems to have been a fairly good use of the facility. I wonder if, through you, Mr. Chairman, the minister will comment as to the expected timeline involved in terms of the development and the construction of the new facility at Fort Saskatchewan. Thank you.

MR. CHAMBERS: The Member for Vermilion-Viking asked me about grants in lieu of taxes for grazing leases. He had made a representation to me some time ago. I would like to report that we're looking into it and considering possible changes that might be made in that area.

In response to the Leader of the Opposition, I believe the first question was how we prioritize projects, decide which we'll build in any given year. We really look at it in terms of what's needed to be built within a reasonable time frame. We wouldn't want to build something that's going to sit vacant for a few years. We look at what's really needed to be built or replaced or renovated and the impact on the private sector. We wouldn't want to be building a building that would adversely impact on private ownership. A number of years ago, when vacancy rates were extremely low, we had a target of getting our own government space in the province up to about 50 percent, thinking that would be a reasonable control balance. We're now at about one-third, but we've discontinued that objective. In fact, we're not building any buildings where there is any private-sector space available, other than previous commitments which are being completed.

With regard to leased space, we're now actually at .69 percent vacancy, which is very low. Depending on a department moving somewhere — at any given point in time you can have some variation — our actual leased space is essentially fully occupied. We don't sign a lease unless the tenant has agreed prior to the move-in. That's the current policy.

McDougall school — also the Member for Calgary Egmont asked that question. It's proceeding very well. In fact, it's under our original budget. We had originally budgeted \$35 million. The purchase of the land, if you will recall, was \$20 million. That was a very favourable price from the Calgary school board. They recognized the heritage value of the building and wanted it preserved. On the other hand, they were also well aware of the value of that downtown property. They were prepared, though, to make a contribution, and they sold it the province at the very favourable price of \$20 million, which they would, of course, use to develop more schools. The renovations of the building and the park were originally scheduled to be \$15 million for a total of \$35 million. Last year in the budget we had that down to \$32,600,000, and our current



number looks to be about \$30,987,000 because of favourable tendering.

The parkade, which was built by the city, is completed, and a park will be built over that this summer. The park on the west side is essentially completed. We built that last fall. The final phase of park construction will be around the renovated building itself, and we will have completed that by the fall of 1986. I would encourage any member who hasn't seen that building to take a look at it. It really is a magnificent building. The construction was very sound: heavily built, beautiful plaster work, woodwork. It's a building every Albertan will be proud to have in years ahead. I'm really pleased that we're able to restore it for the use of the people of this province.

I don't have the final figure in front of me for the Legislature Grounds, but I recollect, subject to further checking, that it was about \$63 million, total cost in as-pent dollars.

The Baker Centre: yes, there have been a number of delays related to programming, in an effort by the user department to achieve the ideal program, I guess. We're hopeful they will have completed their programming this year and that the project will be able to proceed.

With regard to the criteria we use in whether we rent, lease, or build, we would lease or rent wherever suitable space is available. There are a lot of facilities though where, of course, there isn't anything available from the private sector, whether it be a salt shed for highways or a fish hatchery or a tree nursery, something unique like that, or a correctional facility, the drug abuse centre in Grande Prairie: specialized buildings that would normally not be available are more amenable, of course, to construction by the government. But, certainly, in the area of office space our policy is to rent or lease wherever such space is available.

The Olympic Games: again, I could respond also to the Member for Calgary North West at the same time. Both the Mount Allan project and the Canmore Nordic are on target, both in terms of time schedule and cost. I'm extremely pleased with the progress. In my view, Mount Allan is going to be one of the fine ski hills in North America. I've talked to quite a number of Europeans in the ski business, and they're of the same view. In fact some of them were telling me last fall that probably Albertans don't realize just how good Mount Allan is. It really is a magnificent ski area. The south face, which is always bare in any mountain range, is the one that tended to get the media pictures taken of it. The northeast-facing bowl where the ski runs are has appreciable snow, always has. You can tell that from the size of the timber in it. Some of the largest trees I've ever seen in Alberta were logged off that mountain when the runs were cut.

Furthermore, we will have extensive snow-making equipment in place, and that will improve the economics of the mountain, as it does with any mountain. More and more ski hill operators today are now putting in snow-making equipment regardless of the snow conditions during the peak ski season because it just extends the ski season so much. The type of snow you make early can provide the ice base which will prolong the skiing well into the spring, and of course you get an early start to take advantage of the high-volume Christmas ski season, which isn't always as good with straight, natural snow. We will have a very long ski season there, excellent runs, and as I indicated earlier, it is well on target and schedule.

Similarly, with the Nordic site, international people who recently looked at the site were extremely pleased with the

quality of the trails. They indicated them to be probably the best in North America, and it appears that they will be. So I think the people of the province are going to end up with just two excellent recreational and training facilities in both the Nakiska ski hill on Mount Allan and the Nordic centre at Canmore.

I appreciated the remarks from the Member for St. Albert. It is always a tough decision to build or not to build provincial buildings. In view of the long-term commitments that existed there, we did proceed. I hope I've sufficiently answered the questions of the Member for Calgary North West. If I haven't, I'd be happy to elaborate further.

To the Member for Lethbridge West's questions and comments with regard to aircraft, I think the way we used to account for aircraft undoubtedly did cause confusion, certainly, in the minds of the media. It was obvious they, the opposition, and, I presume, the public at large were confused by it. As the Member for Lethbridge West pointed out, we have these 12 aircraft, and 88 percent of the utilization of those aircraft is on routine government business. Only 12 percent of the utilization is by Executive Council. We need the aircraft regardless. If you look at it from that standpoint, a trip to Calgary might appear to be \$1,200, if you charge everything including the pilots' pensions, the share of the rentals, and so forth. One sample flight I've calculated with King Air is \$1,125. Yet if you look at the variable costs, the actual fuel, oil, and landing fees, the actual flight might be a little more than \$300, which is perhaps the equivalent of a couple of air bus tickets. I don't ever recall being on one of those aircraft that didn't have four or five people on it, so economically it's a good deal. I'm not saying we should be out there running them full and competing with commercial airlines, but the fact of the matter is that it's very economic to use those aircraft. The utilization of the fleet is very high compared to a similar type of commercial fleet. Five hundred hours is considered a break-even for similar commercial fleets; ours are running something like 800 hours. So the utilization is high.

They're not elaborate aircraft, as you know. We don't have jets. They're practical, serviceable aircraft that run relatively economically. I think it's a good fleet. We're doing what most other jurisdictions do: we're putting into the program the actual cost of operating the aircraft, excluding the \$420,000 remaining in the revolving fund which represents the depreciation of the aircraft. All other costs are going into the program. I think that will eliminate a lot of the difficulty that happened in the past when we had this unrealistic labelling of the cost of trips.

With regard to conservation, that's an important subject. The Member for Lethbridge West is right in terms of the dollars that can be saved. In about 1975, I think, the department did a major engineering study on this subject and came up with a manual that has actually become utilized and considered a standard across the country. We found that the bulk of the savings can be realized by relatively little capital expenditure, through the use of logical control systems: shutting off the lights at night, maintaining selective temperatures in areas, things like that, as compared, say, to going out and insulating the walls more heavily. The biggest savings can be done, as I indicated, with very little capital expenditure. It just makes good sense for a building owner to do that. We've gone through all our buildings that are amenable to changes, and I've been encouraging the private sector to do the same with theirs. In a competitive era, I think it behooves them to do that. When buildings come up for lease and there is no significant competition,

the potential client is going to go for the building that's going to cost him the least to operate, because our tenders are generally on triple net, so the client is paying all of the operating cost.

With regard to postage, each department negotiates its own and is free to use our courier service. The parking policy: the member makes a good point. We are in the process of reviewing the parking policy. The computers: the Department of Public Works, Supply and Services provides a service to other departments in terms of consulting or hardware. The actual selection or decision as to what is processed on our own equipment or what is done outside or elsewhere is the decision of the department. We in effect are offering that service but certainly not exclusively.

The Member for Ponoka questioned supervision. The vast majority of our work is done by open public tender. The low bidder gets it. Of course, that would be a different supervision situation than those few projects where we utilize project management. An example of that is the Grande Cache facility when time was of the essence because of the nature of the coal contract in Grande Cache and we wished to expedite the employment factor in the area and get the construction under way and completed as soon as possible. So we have done that and are finishing that under project management, where the department selects the project manager who then is the overall supervisor of the construction operation. We of course have in-house people, supervisors in the department who monitor and watch all projects.

I've often thought the question of a penalty clause, an incentive clause, appears to be a good idea. I have never quite figured out how to make it work. I recollect that when I was serving on the Syncrude board, on the management committee, we looked very hard; in fact, we put a lot of hours into trying to come up with an incentive/penalty system. The more we worked at it, the more we concluded that it was almost impossible to come up with a suitable incentive/penalty system in contracts. I would certainly welcome any input on that subject, because like the Member for Ponoka, it has always intrigued me. If one could come up with the ideal way to do it, it would appear to be a pretty nice kind of motivator.

The Member for Edmonton Kingsway, the apparent increase in special projects: I point out that's to \$212,000 from the comparable estimate of \$74,700, so it's not really very large in terms of overall dollar context. It really reflects the conversion of the office of the former executive director of the finance division into the departmental financial system projects branch and includes the start-up EDP costs for the new financial system. There are offsetting charges as well, but the net of all of this, that is the main reason for the increase. So it's a one-time cost.

I'm sorry. What was the other question on vote 4?

MR. PAPROSKI: How much money in vote 4 would be for Edmonton?

MR. CHAMBERS: I don't have that added up, but it seemed to me when I looked at it a while ago, if you took Edmonton and region, it was in the order of \$53 million of the \$217 million, but that's subject to correction. I'll check that out further and inform the member.

I don't know if I've omitted responding to any members. Mr. Chairman, but if I have, I'll certainly be pleased to elaborate further.

MR. MARTIN: Just one other area has to do with tendering and the possibility of problems. Going by the report tabled

by the Treasurer today, section 31(6) of the Legislative Assembly Act, I wonder what the policy is in tendering, especially where we're perhaps dealing with government members who have ownership or partial ownership in various companies that might be doing business. Is there any policy at all with regard to this? For example, I notice that we do a fair amount of lease business with Project Century Ltd. This year it's \$2,937 million and some cents. The previous year it was over \$3 million and right down from 1978-79 to '83-84, over \$11.8 million. I wonder precisely what the policy is. Is there any policy at all in dealing with government members or cabinet ministers who may have ownership in business dealings with the government?

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Chairman, the only case I'm aware of is a minor ownership that the department wasn't aware of when they leased the building but that was certainly declared by the minister from day one. He's always made available to the public what his ownership in any projects were. Beyond that I'm not aware of any situations that could occur.

MR. MARTIN: I'm not asking specifically about this minister. I'm asking about the policy. Is there a policy dealing with government ministers or members dealing with the government on bids, for example, or is it just the lowest or highest bid or whatever? The point that I'm raising is that there could be a fair amount of cynicism here, even if it was the lowest bid, and we find out that a government member, no matter how partial the ownership is, had ownership in that. It seems to me that there should be a policy on it. If there isn't, I wonder if you have a policy.

MR. CHAMBERS: I don't know whether I can respond to that, Mr. Chairman. Again, the question is pretty hypothetical. Our basic policy is tender and low bid. Obviously, any minister is required to submit full disclosure of his ownings, so any interest in anything would be public information. But I'm not aware of any such situations other than the one very minor interest, one-fortieth or something like that, that the Leader of the Opposition has referred to.

MR. MARTIN: That's the one I'm referring to specifically. Again, Mr. Chairman, Project Century certainly was a case. Over 1978-79 to '83-84 that would be \$236,000 for that individual, which is not exactly chicken feed. But that may be the only case. Rather than belabour that particular point, we both recognize that it's there. I'm asking the minister specifically what the policy is or if there is a policy on government ministers and members doing business with the government.

MR. CHAMBERS: Again, Mr. Chairman, all I can report is that our policy is low bidder. I have never encountered that situation, so from my standpoint the question would be hypothetical. Perhaps it's a question that may be asked of someone else. Our policy within the department is the low bidder.

MR. MARTIN: Just to follow up, then, for the example. Does the minister not see some potential for unfair competition there? If somebody is as close to the government as a cabinet minister is, might there not be the feeling that they had an inside advantage? I'm not saying that would be the case, but certainly that is why, for precisely this reason, in some other places they have a code of ethics,

so that it takes away that cloud, if you like, of suspicion. That is why I'm asking whether it is policy. Following from the government's answer, even if, say, a cabinet minister owned 100 percent of a business and they had the lowest bid, I guess they could then do business with the government. Would that be a fair assessment?

MR. CHAMBERS: No, I don't think that would be a situation that would occur. Obviously, that would be an environment a cabinet minister could not operate in. The particular case that was pointed out was a different situation. It was a prior ownership of a very minute interest over which the member has no direct control and information on which he has always made public. So that's quite a different situation from a company owned by a minister bidding, as I got the inference. That might not be a very acceptable situation.

MR. MARTIN: I agree that it wouldn't be an acceptable situation. Maybe what we have here isn't very acceptable either. I guess what I'm trying to do is find out the policy. Obviously, if you owned 2 percent, that's probably acceptable if you had it before, but if you owned 100 percent and were bidding, the minister says that's not acceptable. Where is the dividing line, then? What is acceptable and what's unacceptable? [interjection] No, it comes out of the bidding with the system I'm talking about.

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Chairman, I don't know that I could elaborate any further than I have. We are dealing with a situation that in this particular case is hypothetical, because I'm not aware of any such situations.

[Mr. Appleby in the Chair]

MR. MARTIN: Well, there is the one we both agree on. There may be others. Mr. Chairman, the point is that we develop policies to counteract problems that could develop. In the past we've talked about a code of ethics, and things have been turned down in the Legislature. I brought in private member's Bills. It's not so much that people are doing anything illegal. That's not the point. But other governments have brought it in from time to time, especially dealing with tendering and these sorts of things, precisely to avoid the cloud of suspicion that could come up. In the public's viewpoint, whether it's true or not, there would be the perception that that person who is closer to the government would have inside information and therefore could even tender the lowest bid, slightly. I'm not saying this is in fact happening, but I'm saying to the minister that if there is no policy in terms of tendering, it might be something he might want to take back to his colleagues to think about, because I think the potential is there for some serious problems.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions or comments?

MR. MARTIN: Just one other question. I wasn't sure what the minister said about the Baker Centre. He said it was now proceeding, that there had been problems in the planning stage. I take it those problems are now basically solved, and it is proceeding. Can the minister be a little more specific and give us a date when this Baker Centre should be completed then?

MR. CHAMBERS: No. I'd like to do that, Mr. Chairman. That's a fair comment. We have experienced significant delays in that project. I can say that I hope the programming will be completed shortly. Once the programming is completed, we can proceed with construction, but until such time as we have the completed program, I couldn't really be that definitive in terms of the construction schedule. I do hope we will be able to get it under way this year.

Agreed to:

1.01 — Minister's Office	\$222,300
1.02 — Deputy Minister's Office	\$318,900
1.03 — Assistant Deputy Minister's Office	\$178,100
1.04 — Financial Planning	\$591,800
1.05 — Management Services	\$2,142,700
1.06 — Personnel	\$1,651,400
1.07 — Financial Services	\$2,058,900
1.08 — Special Projects	\$212,100
1.09 — Internal Audit	—
1.010 — Metric Conversion	—
Total Vote 1 — Departmental Support Services	\$7,376,200

2.1 — Information Services	\$1,607,600
2.2 — Telecommunication Services	\$57,411,600
Total Vote 2 — Information and Telecommunication Services	\$59,019,200

3.1 — Administrative Support	\$215,900
3.2 — Property Planning	\$16,584,600
3.3 — Realty	\$109,371,200
3.4 — Building Sciences	\$2,514,700
3.5 — Property Management	\$99,086,600
3.6 — Property Contract Management	\$18,980,300
Total Vote 3 — Management of Properties	\$246,753,300

4.1 — Administrative Support	\$12,439,300
4.2 — Advanced Education	\$3,465,000
4.3 — Agriculture	\$4,485,000
4.4 — Attorney General	\$20,855,000

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Chairman, I was asked a question by the Member for Calgary Egmont which I omitted to answer. It was with regard to the courthouse facility in Calgary, the old courthouse that's being renovated as an appellate court. It's on budget and completion is scheduled for 1986. Perhaps while I'm on my feet, although it's a different vote — I misunderstood him with regard to the question on the Saddledome; that's vote 7. There is no money in there. The reason that page is in there at all is that there was money in 1983-84. Next year, of course, the page won't appear, but that's why it's in this year. With regard to the Fort Saskatchewan Correctional Centre, it should start in August 1985, and completion is scheduled in early 1988 or late 1987; total project cost \$53 million.

Agreed to:

4.5 — Culture	\$22,460,000
4.6 — Education	\$1,175,000
4.7 — Energy and Natural Resources	\$10,405,000
4.8 — Environment	\$1,870,000
4.9 — Executive Council	\$19,545,000
4.10 — Hospitals and Medical Care	\$1,500,000
4.12 — Manpower	\$3,080,000
4.13 — Public Works, Supply and	

Services	\$29,180,000
4.14 — Recreation and Parks	\$1,050,000
4.15 — Social Services and Community Health	\$16,895,000
4.16 — Solicitor General	\$33,100,000
4.17 — Tourism and Small Business	\$780,000
4.18 — Transportation	\$5,475,000
4.19 — XV Olympic Winter Games — 1988	\$24,050,000
4.20 — Multi-departmental Services	\$5,500,000
Total Vote 4 — Planning and Implementation of Construction Projects	\$217,309,300
5.1 — Administrative Support	\$128,300
5.2 — Procurement	\$3,157,100
5.3 — Operational Support Services	\$553,100
5.4 — Supply Operations	\$1,665,000
5.5 — Government Transportation	\$9,476,300
Total Vote 5 — Central Services and Acquisition of Supplies	\$14,979,800
6.1 — Administrative Support	\$1,438,700
6.2 — Culture	\$1,046,000
6.3 — Energy and Natural Resources	\$1,813,000
6.4 — Environment	\$2,392,000
6.5 — Recreation and Parks	\$300,000
6.6 — Utilities and Telecommunications	\$49,100
6.7 — Transferable Amount	\$500,000
Total Vote 6 — Land Assembly	\$7,538,800
Total Vote 7 — Financial Assistance to the Calgary Olympic Coliseum	—
Department Total	\$552,976,600

MR. CHAMBERS: I move that the votes be reported.

[Motion carried]

#### Department of Transportation

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to be able to make a few introductory remarks tonight with regard to the budget of the Department of Transportation for Fiscal year 1985-86, and to comment specifically on the construction program that we have outlined for the 1985 construction year.

I want to say first of all that the pages are distributing a new map of Alberta which was just released last week by my colleague the hon. Minister of Tourism and Small Business, the map being provided under the auspices of Travel Alberta. I note that this is the most up-to-date map of Alberta's highway network that has ever been produced. In fact, a number of roads that we had scheduled to complete paving on last year are shown on this map as being paved when, in fact, we have not as yet completed the work. In past years it used to be the opposite. They were always a year or two behind. If some hon. members notice — I believe there is one in my own constituency — that paved roads are shown that are still gravel, we do intend at some point before too long to get that work done. The reason for passing those around is that it gives members an opportunity to follow in their own constituencies and throughout the province the progress of the work we are doing.

A week ago I had an opportunity to talk to the annual spring meeting of the Association of MDs and Counties,

and in addition to other remarks, took that opportunity to review some 22 major projects that we are doing in the province over a period of the next four to six years from Zama Lake south to the Kicking Horse area on the southern end of Highway 41 that in total would cost about three-quarters of a billion dollars. When one looks at the entire province of Alberta and the mammoth job that is before us in terms of providing appropriate infrastructure for the oil and gas industry, forest industry, agricultural industry, communities large and small — indeed, while it seems like a very large budget that is before us in the Department of Transportation, it has to be spread pretty thin.

In 1984 we had about 175 major contracts in Alberta. In 1985 we will have about 220 major contracts that must be completed in order to facilitate the completion of the entire program that's being shown in the budget estimates. That's a mammoth job not only for the staff in the Department of Transportation in order to arrange the tenders and get them out and get crews on the job but, indeed, the construction industry in this province is going to be pushed to the limits in order to complete that kind of construction program. It could well be, in fact, that if we don't have extremely good construction weather, some of the projects will carry over into 1986. But that's something we don't know until we get into the construction season and see how it goes.

In that regard I'd just like to briefly refer to 1984. Again in 1984 we had a very ambitious construction program. On October 1 I thought I might have to approach my colleague the Provincial Treasurer for some additional funds to complete work that would go on until the end of November. Then in the middle of October we had a snowstorm, a virtual freeze-up, and a stoppage in construction activity throughout the entire province, which is extremely unusual, resulting in many jobs not being completed and considerable funds unexpended because of the work not being completed. The result was our decision to move into a very aggressive winter works program that would do a couple of things for us: keep many segments of our construction industry working throughout the winter months and also give us a leg up in terms of construction this season by providing additional gravel supplies and brush clearing and the kinds of things that we could do in wintertime to get ready for the 1985 construction season.

I'm happy to report that we had a very successful winter works program. By the time we add up all the bills, we will probably have spent more than the \$55 million that I did announce in terms of expenditures. We kept some 1,200 men working in brush cutting crews and similar types of jobs throughout the winter. As well, another 3,400 gravel truck operators working throughout the winter earned, many of them, up to a \$13,000 maximum limit. It was extremely pleasing to me to be able to not only have those people working but to get the kind of gravel stockpiles and brush clearing done that will make the job so much easier in 1985.

Perhaps that could then lead me into what we did with the funds that were left over from the '84 budget because of the early winter. I already mentioned the introduction of the winter works program which not only provided winter work, gave us some needed supplies of crushed gravel, and expended the money but relieved some capital costs during the new construction year, because we've got that gravel stored and the brush cut. However, some \$37 million or \$38 million are being added to the 1985-86 budget on top of the same amount that we had in 1984 to ensure that we

can complete the construction projects started last year that were not finished. In other words, the early freeze-up and snow are not going to affect the normal construction budget of 1985. However, as I indicated earlier, it will affect the amount of work the construction industry has to do.

On the bright side, however, most years all the construction force doesn't start to work on May 1. Many of them have to get tenders and be successful at that before they can put their crews out. Some of them wait till as long as July or August before they get their first job. So there's always a bit of a slow start, and then by October everybody's working and pushing the weather, trying to get it done. In 1985 it's quite different. Almost every major construction company in this province that does highway work has at least two jobs to start on. As soon as the frost is fully out of the ground, within the next couple of weeks, they will be able to go. That bodes well for the industry being able to complete the project that is ahead of us.

Now let me just briefly review what we've got in terms of figures that the hon. members would want to think of in their constituencies insofar as the total amount of dollars available. In grants to cities we have \$137 million, which is the same as 1984-85. Those funds are adequate to cover the urban transportation program that I announced last November: in round figures, \$40 million to each of the metropolitan areas; similar per capita amounts to the 12 cities in Alberta besides Edmonton and Calgary — soon to be 13 more — which will bring the sum total to 15. In addition to that we have some \$26 million in the major continuous corridors and primary highway connectors program, which are the funds utilized for ring roads in both Edmonton and Calgary, that would be allocated on a request basis to those municipalities that have not yet received funding for major continuous corridors.

We've bumped grants to MDs and counties up some \$2 million, from \$27,015,600 in '84-85 to \$29,015,600 in the current fiscal year. Part of that is to reflect the decision which we made that, while there is no increase percentage-wise in the grants provided to MDs and counties, we do have a formula that takes into consideration the miles of road and the assessment, and then comes up with a figure that each MD or county will be allocated for new road construction. Taking the decision that we will apply the formula with the same number of dollars we had last year, \$27 million, but that no municipality will get less than it got last year, we applied the formula. On the formula basis some would be entitled to less and some to more and some to the same. But we've brought all the ones that might be entitled to a lower amount up to at least the same as they had in 1984-85. In addition, we have two new municipalities, the municipal district of Clearwater and the municipal district of Cypress, formerly ID 10 and ID 1, that have joined the ranks of MDs and counties, so there are some additional funds in there to accommodate them.

Grants to towns and villages are up \$2.5 million to \$10 million this year from \$7.5 million in 1984-85. Members will recall that when we announced the grants for towns and villages program in 1984, members of the opposition said: "It's such a terrible program. There won't be any take-up. You've announced it in April; how can they get it done?" The facts are that municipalities responded very well to this 75/25 cost-sharing program, and towns and villages were off the mark quickly. I approved some \$13 million worth of applications last year in spite of only having \$7.5 million in the budget, because I believed the hon. Member for Little Bow, I believe it was, when he

said that they will never be able to undertake any work this year. The end result was that they undertook \$10 million worth of work, and we had to go back and get a special warrant for \$2.5 million to cover the work that they did do, with some \$3 million carried over. I've approved another \$7 million-plus for 1985 and accommodated almost all of the applications that were made. So that program is working well, on schedule: \$10 million spent in '84 and \$10 million at least will be spent in 1985-86. The program will carry on for another three years after that at a \$10 million level.

We'll move to capital construction done by the department. The construction of primary highways in 1984-85 was projected at \$168 million. In 1985-86, this fiscal year, we'll have \$176 million, some \$8 million increase in primary highway construction. On four-laning on Highways 1 and 16, that special project, we spent \$43 million in 1984. In 1985 we will spend \$42 million; slightly less, but that's merely the way the projects come in, in terms of our estimates. The Highway 40 project between Grande Prairie and Grande Cache is in its third year. That will be completed in 1986. We're spending \$31.5 million in 1985 as opposed to \$34 million last year; again, the nature of the projects being awarded this year.

The construction of secondary highways is something that's important to rural members in the province in particular but, indeed, many of my colleagues in the urban areas have expressed concern about secondaries too, because they and their constituents utilize them frequently. Last year \$98 million and we're projecting about \$108 million, a \$10 million increase in secondary road construction, to accommodate the heavy demands for funds by municipalities to improve the secondary road system.

Construction of resource roads: a significant \$8 million increase from \$38 million up to \$46 million. The MLA for Drayton Valley was instrumental some years ago in ensuring that we have a vote in this department that recognized the need for ensuring that there was an ability within the department to respond to the very heavy demands on the road system in resource areas like Drayton Valley. Indeed, the entire province in some respects has been subjected to very difficult transportation problems over the years because of the resource industry. The Cold Lake area right through Lloydminster this year and last year was particularly hard hit. We'll be utilizing significant funds in rural municipalities under that construction of resource road vote in 1985.

Construction of forestry roads is again at \$4 million, as it was last year. It complements the resource industry in many instances, because they're dual purpose roads. Pavement rehabilitation was at \$45 million in 1984. I've decided that we should boost that up to \$56 million, an \$11 million increase in 1985. It's important, Mr. Chairman, that we protect the investment we have in the multibillion dollar road system in this province by ensuring that there's adequate rehabilitation when and where it's required.

Mr. Chairman, our improvement district and rural road construction program involving roads to Indian reserves, Metis settlements, and residents of improvement districts is at \$30 million, the same as last year, while construction of rest areas, vehicle inspection stations, and approach roads to provincial parks is at \$6 million, the same as 1984. The special projects and irrigation bridges are at \$4.5 million, up \$0.5 million from the previous year.

Our airport construction program, including grants for terminal buildings, is set at \$7 million, down from \$9.5 million in 1984. These are round figures I am using. The

reason for that decline is that we are rapidly completing the airport construction program in terms of developing airports and paving. There will perhaps be one or two added within the next year or two, but that program, which has provided us with some 80 first-class facilities across the province, is rapidly winding to a close. Our concentration over the course of the next few years with respect to airports will dwell upon improvements that will assist with navigational aids in terms of making safety in the air one of our major concerns as we move from paving and runway construction to lighting and safety operations.

Mr. Chairman, that's a very brief overview of the major program, one that I think every member of this Legislature can be extremely proud of. I just want to conclude by saying that while we're heavily impacted by the resource industry on our highways throughout this province, if it were not for the resource industry, we would not have the funds to be able to undertake such an ambitious program that's of benefit to every single Albertan who lives in this province and has in mind some future for those who will follow us. It's a tremendous program, one to be proud of, and I recommend the members' support all of these estimates.

DR. ELLIOTT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. [some applause] That's right, because what I have to say should be noted by all of our city members. I want to take this opportunity to thank the minister for the programs he has put forth in the province in the last couple of years. I have to be one of the first ones to comment on it, because representing the constituency of Grande Prairie, the programs we had for 1983-84, 1984-85, and the programs scheduled for 1985-86 are indeed an outstanding effort in bringing not only our primary highways but our secondary roads, our resource roads, airports, and other related facilities up to a first-class standard.

I compliment the minister and his department for the manner in which they have co-operated and consulted with our improvement districts 16, 19, and 20, and the county No. 1, Grande Prairie. They work closely with the city of Grande Prairie, and we have four major towns, Beaverlodge, Sexsmith, Wembley, and Hythe. That, along with constant consultation with the MLA — the minister has been very much in tune with the needs, priorities, and requests of our constituency. In our community we've also taken advantage of the gravel stockpiling program during this last winter. Being north of the 17th baseline, our truckers were able to take advantage of that \$10,000 limit on trucking funds. So for all of these things — and we've only just touched them lightly, Mr. Chairman — on behalf of our constituency I say a very warm thank you to our minister and his department.

Having said all that, I'm almost embarrassed to ask a question, but I know that a group of people back home expect me to ask this question. I wonder if the minister might comment briefly on the criteria for determining when it is feasible to construct a bridge across a river; for example, like the one across the Wapiti River south of Grande Prairie. There are still people interested in knowing when and how that might come about in our transportation program.

MR. McPHERSON: Mr. Chairman, it seems that the last few opportunities I've had to speak to the estimates have been when the clock has been close to striking 10 o'clock, but I would be wholly remiss if I didn't take the opportunity to speak to the estimates of the Department of Transportation

and commend the minister for the recent announcement made on April 2 in the city of Red Deer regarding the long-awaited major continuous corridor project for the city of Red Deer. At some risk of burdening members with some of the laborious details of this program, I think it's important for the record that I try to enunciate the importance of the announcement made by the minister and myself on that important date, April 2.

Mr. Chairman, this project has evolved over the past more than 10 years in the city of Red Deer. Essentially what the announcement means was described by our mayor, His, Worship Bob McGhee, at the time of the announcement.

It is the most important decision Red Deer has faced since incorporation [in 1913] as it will set the stage for development for the city for the foreseeable future. The city is most appreciative of the provincial support for the project as it will benefit all the citizens of Red Deer and central Alberta.

Mr. Chairman, the major continuous corridor in Red Deer accomplishes two things. First, it will remedy virtually all of the transportation problems and accomplish virtually all of the transportation goals outlined by the city for the city of Red Deer for the foreseeable future. In addition to doing that, however, by virtue of the fact that the major continuous corridor and primary highway connector will be located through 54th Avenue, that will necessitate the relocation of the railway in Red Deer. The announcement made by the minister indicates that this project as proposed has received approval in principle by cabinet, depending on a couple of criteria, not the least of which, of course, is the outcome of the negotiations currently under way with the CPR. By relocating the railway from the downtown marshalling yards to the Edgar industrial park and by locating the main line out into the county, in Red Deer we're going to realize an enormous saving in terms of ongoing transportation costs for the future.

Mr. Chairman, I must say this has been a very long process, and I think it would be fair to say that while railway relocation in Red Deer has been a goal for many years, it became abundantly clear about a year and a half ago that Red Deer would not, could not, and never would qualify for a railway relocation facilities project in the city. There are about five criteria in that program through the Department of Economic Development. Those criteria are separated by the word "and" not "or", and they are all as important, one unto another. One of those criteria was that the exchange of land as a result of the removal of the railway had to make a "significant contribution to the total cost of the project". Unlike in the city of Lethbridge and perhaps other areas, that could not happen in Red Deer. So it became incumbent upon the minister and the representative for the constituency to try to determine if there was any possible way to ameliorate the difficulty in the criteria of that program and accomplish the same result.

I was most pleased, Mr. Chairman, to be able to work closely with the minister and his department, particularly his deputy minister and other members of his department, in recognizing that Red Deer did in fact qualify for a major continuous corridor. The corridor, rather than being located through the main thoroughfare of Red Deer, Gaetz Avenue, which was suggested by a study by experts — which always surprised me how experts could consider that possibility — it was suggested to the minister that the corridor be placed on 54th Avenue. Of course that does locate the new corridor directly in a utility corridor and will necessitate the relocation of the railway.

The project, Mr. Chairman, amounts to some \$72 million over the course of the next six years. I notice the hon. Leader of the Opposition has retained his seat in the House. I'm always interested in his comments on how little or how much government should be or could be doing in terms of construction projects. I always think of the fact that this budget that we are evaluating this evening represents 30 percent in terms of total construction costs: 30 percent of the overall total budget of this province is going directly into capital projects. In stark comparison to that when we look at the federal budget and realize that of the total federal budget, my understanding is that less than 2 percent is dedicated to construction costs. I think it begs the question, "what more could we do?" Clearly we are, and through the minister, making a determined effort to get needed projects on stream right now.

So I come back to it, Mr. Chairman. This particular project phased in over five to six years represents a total construction commitment of \$72 million. I've done this. I've tried to evaluate what that would represent in terms of beneficial economic impact to the constituency of Red Deer and to central Alberta, and I came to it this way. If we have a \$72 million project, I think \$60 million of that represents construction and labour and \$12 million the cost of land. If we have a \$60 million project and we assume that half of that, \$30 million, would represent labour and \$30 million would represent construction supplies and materials, we realize that \$30 million over a short period of five years is somewhere over \$5 million of labour each year for the next five years and \$5 million in terms of capital and construction materials. Mr. Chairman, that one, single project happens to represent the full amount of commercial activity that took place in the city of Red Deer in 1984. One project. If we interpolate that over the course of the next five years — I know this is rough and I can be accused of being simplistic on this — we are very realistically looking at a reduction in unemployment in the city of Red Deer of over 1 percent: one project alone over the course of the next five years. I hasten to add that the unemployment situation in Red Deer hovers at around 7 to 8 percent. It's not acceptable, but it's certainly not in the figures that we find in other places. It would be worthy to mention that the economic impact of this one project for the city of Red Deer in terms of employment, opportunity, and confidence, is going to be absolutely astronomical.

Mr. Chairman, I suppose I could go into a considerable amount of the details with regard to this particular announcement. In light of the hour I won't do that. Suffice it to say that I am very grateful for the efforts of the minister in working very closely with the representative from the constituency, with members of council, with all those people concerned with trying to bring this particular project on rail, and that's successful. I'm looking forward to working very closely with all people concerned in the successful completion in the negotiations for this particular project.

MR. ZIP: Mr. Chairman, I'm pleased to rise to speak on the supply estimates for the Department of Transportation. On behalf of my constituents I wish to compliment the minister on the excellent work that has been done over the years to improve the highways and other transportation facilities of this province, including the very significant amounts that have been expended on light rail transportation in the major centres of Alberta.

I further wish to compliment the minister for the continuing improvements that are being effected by his depart-

ment on the existing highways. I especially wish to note the improvements to Highway 2 between Edmonton and Calgary and the construction of additional rest areas on this stretch of road. I think that was a very good idea that the minister has put in additional rest facilities on stretches of highway in Alberta that are very heavily used.

Notwithstanding this, I do wish to raise the concern expressed by many of my constituents, especially the truckers, and by people throughout southern Alberta stretching from the Montana state line to Calgary, about the lack of a four-lane connection between the end of Interstate 15 at Coutts and the end of the four-lane highway at Nanton. Since this stretch of highway is the main tourist entry point into Alberta, the main auto route into Alberta, and the main truck route between all points in Alberta and the Interstate system in the United States, I would like to ask the minister when we in southern Alberta can expect this crucial improvement to the highway system in our province to be made. This is the only real concern I have. I remember very well, over the last 30-odd years I've been in Alberta, the terrible highways I've driven over 30 years ago in northern Alberta and the tremendous progress that has been made in this province. I still fail to understand why that link that has been two lanes for 30 years has never been upgraded to four lanes between Calgary and the border.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. R. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, I have just a couple of comments and a question for the minister. I'd like to mention the good job he has done for the constituency of Lacombe. We're well satisfied with the work that he has proposed for this year and are appreciative of it, especially on Highway 51. It's a start on a major link between north-central Alberta into the David Thompson Highway. The first 20 miles that are scheduled for this year are a welcome start. Hopefully the minister plans to go with the next 20 miles, and the ultimate goal is to tie-up with the David Thompson at Rocky Mountain House over on Highway 22.

Having said that, my question to the minister is: the evident fact that the hon. Member for Camrose is absent from the House illustrates that he isn't interested in any pavement this year, and I was wondering if the minister would transfer that pavement to the constituency of Lacombe where it's needed much more?

MR. ALGER: Mr. Chairman, I'd be remiss if I didn't rise and personally thank the minister for all the good he has done in the constituency of Highwood over the past several years, particularly the last two. Having travelled the length and breadth of this province all my life, particularly the last 35 years, and remembering trips to Valleyview, for instance, when you had to go around through your town, Mr. Chairman, and a lot of places like that, bordering on Lesser Slave Lake and so forth. It was so tough to get around in those days. It's hard for me to recall and indicate to you quickly enough the amount of progress the province has made, particularly in the last 15 years.

Personally, I would like to speak to and thank the minister and his executive assistant, Laurie Pushor, plus all his staff, particularly that group in Airdrie that help us so much down my way. Anytime I have a problem, I'm able to bring it to the minister and have it resolved in, you might say, a rather workmanlike manner and fairly quickly to boot. His efforts with 541 from the Kananaskis road back to Longview, which is Highway 22, will be complete this year with a big beautiful highway, and the

road from Longview down through the Chain Lakes is going to be recompleted and should be a paved road, I think this year, or certainly the next. His program for widening Highway 7 to the Turner Valley has been a long time in coming, but it's under way now with special concessions, I think, for truck stops and various things that I've asked for. His ability to pave 26th Avenue in Nanton at a minimum of tax levy to the citizens there is much appreciated by me and, of course, all my constituents. His assistance to boot on what we call market roads 549 and 543 — they were priorities of mine, and he has been able to filter a lot of the funds he had last year that he couldn't burn up in the north, so we got them in the south, and I sure appreciate it.

Incidentally, with regard to my cohort beside me, I'd have to suggest that yes, there is a definite need for the four-lane highway to Coutts in due course of time. I'm certainly concerned with that very greatly, but I'm more concerned with the safety of the road that now exists between High River and Okotoks that hasn't got a median in it at this point in time. I would tell the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View that as quickly as we get that done, I'll push him for the rest later on.

His ability with land purchasing and fencing contracts and so on does an awful lot of good for our constituents. It creates a lot of work. He has installed bridges and culverts; the roads we have in the area, in our landfill sites and places where there is a lot of heavy traffic, he has improved so immensely that it's hard to explain. I think the overpass on Highway 22X was one of the greatest things that has ever happened, and I feel that our constituents in particular really appreciate that.

In essence, Mr. Chairman, I'm not asking for any more. I just wanted to thank the minister for what we've received and, on behalf of all the constituents of Highwood, I sincerely do that.

Thank you, Mr. Minister. Good night, Mr. Chairman.

MR. MUSGROVE: I would certainly be remiss if I didn't make a few comments about the Transportation budget. I certainly appreciate the amount of road improvements we're getting in 1985, particularly on highways 56 and 36 and the secondary projects we're in line for. I would also have to say that the improvements in twinning Highway 1 that are slated for this year are certainly a benefit to me and all my constituents. I look forward to the day when I pull out on Highway 1 between Brooks and Calgary and have a four-lane all the way. I find it very relaxing when I pull off the two-lane onto the four-lane and not be concerned about oncoming traffic.

I do get some feedback from some of my constituents about Highway 56 south of the No. 1, with a connection between Highway 1 and Lethbridge. I know that that's not something for immediate construction, but I hope the minister will keep it in mind so that we can maybe look forward to some improvements on Highway 56 south of the No. 1 in the future. It will then be a direct connection between Lethbridge and Edmonton.

With those few remarks. I thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

MR. FISCHER: I, too, would like to thank our hon. minister and his department for all the co-operation that I have had over the past year, whether it be with roads or road signs. We've had quite a lot of problems down in our area because we have new resources coming in. The new \$3.2 billion

upgrader plant has certainly put a strain on our roads. We have developed quite a lot of industry in our eastern side of the province in the past few years, and we need roads to get our products out of there. I can say that we've certainly appreciated the good effort that our minister and the department have put into helping us with those.

I would like to mention some of the new industry we have. We have two feedlots that are 10,000 head or better that have to have cattle going in and out and grain going in and out. Certainly, it takes a good road to hold it, especially on a rainy day. We have our new canola oil plant that puts a big strain on our roads. Our auction markets in both towns are running through a thousand head a week or better. Right along the border we have a problem with Highway 17. We're working and cost sharing with Saskatchewan. We've had a lot of problems getting them to put their share in so we can get a little bit more pavement coming from Chauvin north to Highway 14.

I would like to close with the remark that if our minister has any extra resource money, the Wainwright constituency would really be a nice place for it to go.

Thank you.

MR. JONSON: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to raise three points. First of all, the constituency is generally pleased with the road building program. There has been improvement, and we look to 1985-86 for further improvements. We're particularly glad to see a project approved for the improvement of what's known in the constituency as the "river hill", which is a concern to pretty well everyone in the constituency.

I'd like to pass on a commendation on an announcement which hasn't been mentioned this evening. That's the program to improve the railway crossings on the CPR track between Edmonton and Calgary. Being in a constituency which has been the site of a number of accidents causing death and injury, I am certainly pleased to see that very, very much needed program of improvement.

The third thing I wanted to mention, Mr. Chairman, is in the form of a question. I wonder if in his closing remarks the minister might outline in a little bit more detail the arrangement and responsibility between provincial and federal governments and the councils of the Indian reserves in the province for the maintenance and construction of roads within the reserves.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions or comments?

MR. BATIUK: Mr. Chairman, if I may just for a minute. I know everybody's been giving the minister real applause for all he's done, and I feel much the same. I really appreciate the things that have been done, but I would like to stress to the minister that I've observed over the years that very often municipal councils — and I do agree that local autonomy is very important and the minister should listen to the local governments. In this past year it's two councils, but one in particular who had their transportation priorities set and have changed them three or four times in one year. It makes me wonder sometimes how this can be done.

When you come to major roads such as the secondary roads. I think continuity is a very important thing. We've got primary highways from east to west every 10, 12, 15 miles, but from south to north there is only one road that will cover the entire province. The secondaries north and



south are very important and continuity should play a big part. I think once a county makes a priority, they shouldn't be changing it three months later or four months later or after an election particularly. I've noticed over the years that once an election comes, the new council is in there, and each has his own priorities. As I said, I still think the roads that are marked for secondary roads should have a continuity of hard surfacing so that when a person is on them, he knows he can go a far distance rather than travel a little bit and then stop on just as good as a dead end road, and then a few miles further it's continued, and so forth. I strongly recommend that, particularly on these secondary roads which are totally covered by the province, the minister have more input on them than what has already been offered.

Otherwise, I am happy that there's a budget like that. In the past very often roads were needed, but there was a shortage of money. These last couple of years it seemed that the roads couldn't be built; there was money, and at the end there was a good number of millions of dollars left in Treasury because the work could not be finished. I recommend to the minister to give that a serious . . .

MRS. FYFE: Mr. Chairman, just a couple of brief comments. I want to express appreciation for the decision to continue the widening of Highway 2 north of primary 37 for the remaining five miles, or whatever the metric is — eight point something or other — to Morinville, which includes two overpasses. This certainly is an area where there has been a great deal of concern by the residents of Morinville and the residents north about the amount of traffic and the number of serious accidents that have occurred along this roadway. Recognizing that improved roadways do not always decrease accidents, I think this is one where the amount of traffic very much warrants the expenditure. The residents have expressed their very sincere appreciation for the decision that we'll proceed with it this year.

I'd also like to again express a concern that I've previously raised. I think something should be considered on highways that are still two-lane roadways and have a significant amount of traffic, tourist traffic on the weekends and particularly during the summer months. I have previously asked if the minister has considered passing lanes or lay-bys to facilitate slow vehicles, the recreation vehicles, to be able to pull over and allow other transportation to move past them and to alleviate some of the potential of passing when conditions are not safe. Many times on weekends I have witnessed circumstances that came very close to serious accidents happening, because of drivers who become frustrated waiting in long lines of traffic and one or two vehicles holding up a long line of traffic. Because of curves or hills unavoidably obscuring the visibility, the traffic backs up.

In some European countries they have developed third lanes, on either the extreme outside of the roadway or painting lines, if the roadway is wide enough, to facilitate extra passing. I believe that in areas where we have not yet been able to justify four lanes or widening of the highways to a significant extent, if every five or 10 miles there was some ability to facilitate the movement of traffic, we may be able to prevent further accidents that occur during the weekends in the summer months. I think we all recognize that tourism is extremely important, and maybe this is a way to facilitate safe travel of our tourists who we so much need and desire within this province.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions or comments?

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, I will perhaps make a couple of brief comments about questions that have been raised by the members. First of all, I'm extremely grateful for the comments that have been made which reflect upon staff of the Department of Transportation and my office and the manner in which they've been able to deal with concerns of members of the Legislature. It goes without saying, though, that it's the support of my colleagues in our cabinet and caucus that provides the kind of capital budget in this department that allows me to administer some opportunity to respond in a positive way. So it's extremely pleasing to be Minister of Transportation in Alberta in 1985, when we have the opportunity to provide transportation facilities with our resource dollars.

The Member for Grande Prairie asked about the criteria with respect to when bridges might be constructed in a new area, in this case across the Wapiti River, south of Wembley. All I can say is that we look frequently at the need for bridges to replace ferries or bridges where presently there exist no means of crossing at all, on the basis of the projected crossings that might occur there if a bridge were built. Needless to say, we don't take traffic counts, because there is no traffic, and that would be not very productive. But bridges are very costly; \$4 million to \$5 million is not unusual for a bridge of the nature required to cross the Wapiti River, and oftentimes as much again for the adequate construction of hills that lead to and from the bridge. We're talking about a very large amount of money that can sometimes pave many, many, many miles of secondary highways. So we have to mix all of the criteria together in terms of deciding whether or not we build a bridge, and oftentimes we like to insist that people travel a bit farther so that we can cut down on those costs. We're prepared again to look at that one, of course, and I haven't done a recent study as to whether or not the feasibility is there. It may well be.

The Member for Red Deer commented upon the major continuous corridor program in Red Deer. I didn't mention that in my remarks, Mr. Chairman, but again I'm pleased that we were able to respond. The good work of our MLA there has meant a great deal in terms of coming to an agreement in principle with the city of Red Deer, subject to our getting an agreement from CP Rail to move on a very important project in terms of the future of the city of Red Deer.

The Member for Ponoka asked about federal/provincial arrangements with regard to road construction on Indian reserves. Generally speaking, the situation is that we will build and construct primary highways that are required for public travel across Indian reserves, and we require that the title to the land be signed over to the Department of Transportation through a band council resolution and the federal department of Indian affairs, a federal order in council.

On secondary road construction, again, where it's required for public travel, we don't require the right-of-way to be signed over to us, but we require an agreement that allows us to use the right-of-way for as long as we want in terms of public travel on that roadway. As a normal rule, we do not build roads only to service the internal needs of Indian bands on Indian reserves that are a federal responsibility. That is a responsibility of the federal government and the reserves themselves. We only build roads where there is some benefit to other travelling public or to access Indian reserves on Alberta Crown land when there's a requirement for access to the reserve for the Indian people themselves.

Thus far I think we've had an extremely good relationship with most Indian bands on that approach.

Mr. Chairman, those are some answers to some of the questions that were raised. The Member for Lacombe, I, and the Member for Camrose could have a discussion about where the paving should rest in 1986. I just want to conclude by saying that if we do proceed at all through the votes tonight, I would like the final vote held because I made a commitment to one or two members who were unable to be here tonight that they would have an opportunity to address any part of the budget the next time it appears before the House.

Agreed to:

1.1.1 — Minister's Office	\$175,857
1.1.2 — Deputy Minister	\$348,350
1.1.3 — Assistant Deputy Minister — Engineering	\$221,745
1.1.4 — Assistant Deputy Minister — Regional Transportation	\$296,708
1.1.5 — Assistant Deputy Minister — Administration	\$115,503
1.1.6 — Assistant Deputy Minister — Urban Transportation and Planning	\$125,127
1.1.7 — Legal Services	\$53,992
1.1.8 — Special Projects	\$147,696
1.2.1 — Computer Services	\$8,040,214
1.2.2 — Equipment and Supply Administration	\$1,617,094
1.2.3 — Finance and Administrative Services	\$3,172,526
1.2.4 — Personnel and Management Services	\$1,219,161
1.2.5 — Public Communications	\$249,387
1.2.6 — Purchasing Administration	\$265,958
Total Vote 1 — Departmental Support Services	\$16,049,318
2.1 — Program Support	\$36,254,021
2.2 — Improvement of Primary Highway Systems	\$256,116,000
2.3 — Improvement of Rural/Local Highways	\$146,347,700
2.4 — Financial Assistance for Rural/Local Highways	\$39,738,600
2.5 — Maintenance of Primary Highway Systems	\$70,486,882
2.6 — Maintenance of Rural/Local Highways	\$18,913,794
2.7 — Apprenticeship Training	\$3,231,661
2.8 — Rural Resource Roads	\$46,000,000
2.9 Pavement Rehabilitation	\$55,969,000
Total Vote 2 — Construction and Maintenance of Highways	\$673,057,658
Total Vote 3 — Construction and Operation of Rail Systems	\$9,645,000
4.1 — Construction of Airports	\$7,000,000
4.2 — Maintenance and Operation of Airports	\$2,422,650

Total Vote 4 — Construction and Maintenance of Airport Facilities	\$9,422,650
5.1 — Transportation Planning	\$6,205,663
5.2 — Highway System User Services	\$9,438,857
Total Vote 5 — Specialized Transportation Services	\$15,644,520
6.1 — Program Support	\$749,905
6.2 — Financial Assistance — Capital	\$137,000,000
6.3 — Financial Assistance — Operating	\$21,650,000
Total Vote 6 — Urban Transportation Financial Assistance	\$159,399,905
Department Total	\$883,219,051

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

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

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

Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1986, sums not exceeding the following for the department and purposes indicated:

For the Department of Public Works, Supply and Services: \$7,376,200 for departmental support services, \$59,019,200 for information and telecommunication services, \$246,753,300 for management of properties, \$217,309,300 for planning and implementation of construction projects, \$14,979,800 for central services and acquisition of supplies, \$7,538,800 for land assembly.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has also had under consideration certain other resolutions, reports progress thereon, and requests leave to sit again.

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, tomorrow afternoon the Assembly will be in Committee of Supply dealing with the estimates of the Department of Agriculture. The proposal would be that if not all of the time tomorrow is needed, we might return either to the Department of Transportation or the Department of Recreation and Parks. It is intended that the Assembly sit Thursday night. The most likely department to be called in supply on Thursday night would be the Department of Education. That's the present intention. If there is any change, I would let the hon. leader know at the earliest possible time.

[At 10:26 p.m., on motion, the House adjourned to Wednesday at 2:30 p.m.]