

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Title: **Wednesday, August 27, 1986 2:30 p.m.**

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

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

MR. SPEAKER: Let us pray. We give thanks to God for the rich heritage of this province as found in our people. We pray that native-born Albertans and those who have come from other places may continue to work together to preserve and enlarge the precious heritage called Alberta. Amen.

head: INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I am delighted today to be able to introduce to other members of the Assembly guests seated in your gallery who are very well known to yourself. I as well have had the pleasure of knowing your father and mother for many years during their life in Medicine Hat. I must say that the honourable Archdeacon John W. Carter, as an Anglican clergyman in this province for many years, did and does his work well. He joined my wife and me together in holy matrimony over 22 years ago, and that has lasted.

I would like to ask now that all members of the Assembly welcome the Speaker's parents, Archdeacon John W. Carter and Mrs. Mabel Carter, to the Assembly. They are accompanied by Dr. Carter's sister and brother-in-law, Keith and Pat Taylor, also from Calgary, and by other relatives, Mr. Hamish Rankin from Goose Bay, Labrador, and Mrs. Barbara Hercus from New Zealand. Will they please rise and receive the welcome of the Assembly?

**head: PRESENTING REPORTS BY
STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES**

MR. SCHUMACHER: Mr. Speaker, the Standing Committee on Private Bills has had under consideration the petition of the Board of Trustees of the Canadian Native Friendship Centre Building and recommends that the time limit in Standing Order 89(2) be extended to August 21, 1986.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree with the recommendation?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed? So ordered.

head: INTRODUCTION OF BILLS**Bill 44****Department of Municipal Affairs Act**

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill 44, the Department of Municipal Affairs Act. This being a money Bill, Her Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor, having been informed of the contents of this Bill, recommends the same to the Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, this Bill would achieve the consolidation of the departments of Housing and Municipal Affairs and continue the normal powers and responsibilities of both departments.

[Leave granted; Bill 44 read a first time]

Bill 42**Alberta Energy Company
Amendment Act, 1986**

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill 42, the Alberta Energy Company Amendment Act, 1986.

The Alberta Energy Company was incorporated under the Companies Act, which has been repealed. We now have the Business Corporations Act, and the amendments in Bill 42 are in line with the Business Corporations Act to ensure the continuance of the Alberta Energy Company beyond this fall.

[Leave granted; Bill 42 read a first time]

Bill Pr. 15**Board of Trustees of the Edmonton
Canadian Native Friendship Centre
Building Amendment Act, 1986**

MR. HERON: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill Pr. 15, Board of Trustees of the Edmonton Canadian Native Friendship Centre Building Amendment Act, 1986.

The purpose of this Bill is to provide the Board of Trustees of the Edmonton Canadian Native Friendship Centre Building the power to transfer its property to the Canadian Native Friendship Centre, which has the object of furthering the interests of native peoples.

[Leave granted; Bill Pr. 15 read a first time]

Bill 47**Chiropractic Profession
Amendment Act, 1986**

DR. ELLIOTT: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill 47, the Chiropractic Profession Amendment Act, 1986.

This Bill addresses two major issues, one being the scope of practice of chiropractic, the other being the requirements of registration of members.

[Leave granted; Bill 47 read a first time]

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill 47 be placed on the Order Paper under Government Bills and Orders.

[Motion carried]

Bill 244**Environmental Impact Assessment Act**

MR. YOUNIE: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill 244, the Environmental Impact Assessment Act.

The Bill would make the preparation of an environmental impact assessment mandatory for any development having a potentially negative effect on the environment. As well, it provides for full public hearings and financial support to intervenors as a matter of course.

[Leave granted; Bill 244 read a first time]

head: INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, this past summer the Department of Transportation and Utilities operated at a number of fairs throughout the province — in Drumheller, Calgary, Edmonton, Medicine Hat, and Camrose — some computer games that deal with school bus safety, bicycle safety, road hazard and vehicle safety, and pedestrian safety. Young people were allowed to put their names in for a draw. Today I have the pleasure and honour of introducing the two winners, one from Edmonton and one from Calgary, along with in the one case a friend and in the other case the young lad's mother and a couple from the department of transportation safety branch and our communications branch.

We also have in the members' gallery, Mr. Speaker, our safety mascot, Freeway. He's rather big and green and warm.

What I would like to do now is introduce these young people to you. The five-year-old winner from Edmonton is Patric Ferguson. He is accompanied by a close family friend, Angela King. The six-year-old winner from Calgary is Stephen Cantwell, accompanied by Stephen's mother, Mrs. Angelica Cantwell. They are accompanied by George Harker of the department of transportation safety branch, Laurie Pushor and Terry Lotzer from the communications branch of transportation and, of course, our mascot, Freeway. I would ask the Assembly to welcome them in the usual manner.

MR. GIBEAULT: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce to you and to members of the Assembly seven members of the 102nd LDS scouts and cubs group from Edmonton Mill Woods. They are here today in the members' gallery with their leader, Eileen Zemp, and I would ask if they'd please rise and receive the warm welcome of the Assembly.

MR. DROBOT: Mr. Speaker, it's a great honour to introduce to you, and through you to members of this Assembly, 35 senior citizens from the beautiful land of the lakes, Vilna, Alberta. They bring with them a combined 2,315 years of worldly experience and will leave many footprints in the sand of time. They are seated in the members' gallery. I would like them to rise and receive the traditional welcome of this Assembly.

head: ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**Natural Gas Deregulation**

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the first question to the Minister of Energy. I have here the current natural gas policy for the Small Explorers and Producers Association of Canada, which has just been released.

Mr. Speaker, amongst other things the policy recommends a one-year moratorium on gas deregulation and a freeze on the commercial residential price outside Alberta during that one-year period. My question to the minister: why is the government so determined to press ahead to try to reach the November 1 target when the small Canadian sector is so opposed to that?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, we were very happy to receive the brief, the position of the small explorers and producers. I met with the organization recently to discuss their particular proposal. We have also received position papers from the

other umbrella organizations of IPAC and CPA, primarily to receive their presentations and to discuss the concerns they have. We are looking at those concerns and seeing if it's possible to resolve them before the deadline of November 1, and they will be very helpful in assisting us to address those concerns. We know their position, and as I indicated before, we will be working towards meeting the date if we can resolve their concerns. If the concerns aren't resolved, then we will have to address the question of whether or not to proceed.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Their concern is deregulation. I might point out that Ken Croft, an analyst for Midland Doherty, in a recent study has concluded that gas deregulation will result not only in price cuts of 25 to 30 percent but in volume declines as well, and that's going to hurt the small producers the worst. My question to the minister is simply this: why on earth are we pursuing deregulation, given the harmful effects it's going to have on the Alberta industry and Albertans in general?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, the answer is very obvious in that we signed a natural gas pricing agreement — Alberta, Saskatchewan, British Columbia, and the federal government — to deregulate gas in this country, and commitments were made in that particular agreement. The overall benefits in the long term are seen by the industry and the different levels of government, and we are proceeding, as I indicated, to meet that deadline. We are receiving information from as wide a range of the industry as we possibly can, very useful information that will help us arrive at a decision down the road.

MR. MARTIN: Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I'm well aware that we signed this silly agreement, but my point to the minister is this: seeing that it's going to be the small Canadian sector that's hurt the worst, why are we going to proceed with it? Are we making arrangements with the federal government to say no to gas deregulation or at least give it a year moratorium, as these people are asking for? Is that our position or not?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Leader of the Opposition, by indicating it was a silly agreement, is indicating to the public that he believes that adjective not only applies to the governments but to the industry, the people out there that wanted it in the first place. If that is his position, then fine. It was the industry and the different levels of government that wanted that agreement. We got the agreement. It's a good agreement. We have a number of problems because of the decline in prices in the world, and we hope to resolve those concerns and will proceed if those concerns are removed.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. There are certainly energy recommendations here from the small Canadian sector that say, "Don't do it." I wonder how much weight they have as compared to CPA. But my question has to do right here with provincial revenues, that price and volume drops for Alberta gas will further reduce provincial revenues at a time that we least need it. My question to the minister: could the minister give us a ballpark figure on how much gas deregulation will reduce provincial revenues over the next year?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, it may not reduce them at all. It simply depends on the discussions with industry that we proceed with in resolving their concerns. So we're not in a position to be able to predict that. Certainly if certain conditions aren't met, the industry is saying they expect prices to fall, but we're seeing if we can't meet those conditions.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Further to the mess he's in, will he not admit that there is no hope of a delay in gas deregulation since he promised it as a condition for the federal government to remove PORT?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Leader of the Liberal Party is very humorous. Where would he ever get that idea from? No agreement along that line at all.

Labour Legislation Review

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the second question to the Minister of Labour. It has to do with some more questions about the minister's triumphant world tour in 1986, "Speedy Reidy and the Jet-setters." On Monday I asked what other countries the group is going to visit, and he wouldn't say. I now understand that we now have Japan, Australia, and New Zealand on the itinerary. My question is: does the minister have any more surprises up his sleeve? Is this the last group of countries, or are we going to have some more added to the list?

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, I think it's unlikely any more will be added.

MR. MARTIN: That's interesting. I guess the six is good enough. I appreciate that answer, Mr. Speaker, but as I noted yesterday in dealing with this tour, this tooting about the world will occur while labour relations continue to deteriorate here in Alberta. My question is: what special measures has the minister taken, other than the usual appointment of mediators, to try and bring about a resolution to the labour disputes at Zeidler and Suncor?

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, first of all, I don't anticipate any change in the legislation during the interim. Secondly, in relation to the specific disputes the hon. member mentioned, the normal process is available, that of the government mediators being available if the parties wish. In neither case is there any indication of a requirement for further intervention at this time.

MR. MARTIN: Well, Mr. Speaker, it seems like we just cross our fingers and sit there and hope that something will be solved.

But let me go into another one. It's been some time now since Mr. Dubensky tabled his report on the Gainers dispute, which was rejected by both sides, and standard mediation seems to be going nowhere. My question is: has the minister offered to play a personal role in mediating the Gainers dispute in order to get both sides negotiating again, and if he hasn't, why not?

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I'm underestimating my own ability, but in view of the experience and the intensive efforts of Mr. Dubensky and the results of his efforts, I am not anticipating that my personal intervention will be any more successful, and I haven't offered it.

MR. MARTIN: I didn't know, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Dubensky was the Minister of Labour. That's interesting.

But let me try with the Premier then, Mr. Speaker, and ask a question. Other than sending the minister out of the province on an around the world in 80 days tour, has the government any other proposal for bringing these bitter and lengthy disputes so that they will be satisfied and settled in the next little while?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I think all members of the House know that the responsibility for settling labour disputes lies between management and labour, and if they show an indication of good faith and working together to settle their disputes, settlements are arrived at.

As far as the minister's around the world in 80 days, Mr. Speaker, I'd say that I think the minister has met with his committee and the committee has decided there are certain areas that they feel are necessary to go to in order to make recommendations that would help in this province in coming forward with amendments to our labour legislation. I think they should do it. I think the last thing we should do as legislators, having appointed this group, is to try and tear down the credibility of the group as the hon. Leader of the Opposition and his pal Dave are.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, to our peripatetic Minister of Labour there. I know his aversion to having a budget; he likes to do things after they're done rather than before they're done. But now could he give the House the approximate cost of the Dubensky report and Dubensky use up to now in the labour agreement?

DR. REID: I don't have the figure at hand. I know that it's almost completed, and when it is completed, it'll be presented to the Assembly in the usual way. I don't think there was any overcharging on the part of Mr. Dubensky, and I anticipate that the results would not have been any different had there been more or less money spent.

MR. NELSON: Mr. Speaker, considering the type of government they have in Australia right now, it might be well and good to have a look at the disaster.

Mr. Speaker, to the Labour minister. Is it not the intent of the committee to deal with the concerns of all Albertans, find the best possible legislation for all people of the province and not just one political segment, and become a Canadian leader in labour legislation?

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, the member has given me yet another chance to expound on the subject. [interjections] I think in view of the circumstances perhaps I'll desist from repeating the record.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, to the Premier. Has the Premier given any consideration to amending the committee so that either the Leader of the Opposition or an opposition member and one other government member be on that committee so we have a representation of elected people as well as people who are involved in management and labour?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, there is no question that that was one of the options considered by the government, but when you consider that our responsibility will be to amend

the legislation when those recommendations come in, it would seem to me far better that we have an independent group brought together as they are, representing management, labour, and the public, and then make a recommendation to us which we can bring to the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Main question, Leader of the Liberal Party. All the supplementaries have been exhausted on the previous question.

Psychiatric Care of Children

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care. The increasing numbers of young people in Alberta's psychiatric hospitals are a disturbing trend. Equally disturbing, however, are the serious inadequacies in the provision of psychiatric services to adolescents. In light of the increased demand for adolescent psychiatric care, when will the minister be increasing the number of facilities and hospital beds that are specifically designated for the treatment of young psychiatric patients?

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, we dealt with that issue at some length in the Legislature earlier. We have been involved in a program for at least the last five years of building new hospitals and identifying hospital beds for the treatment of psychiatric patients throughout the province. I think we've made good progress. If the hon. member has some specific area in mind where we haven't made some progress, I'd be pleased to look into it.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, I was talking about adolescents, which hasn't been covered, and as you know, you've changed policies a couple of times in the building of hospitals. I'm talking about adolescent psychiatric care. What steps has the minister taken to ensure that psychiatric treatment facilities for adolescents, residential day hospitals or outpatient services, are available throughout the province in order that a very important element of adolescent psychiatric treatment, parental and family involvement — in other words, not just a couple up here in the north end — can be maintained?

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I'm still at a bit of a loss to understand what the hon. member is talking about. My predecessor for several years has been involved in that exact problem that the hon. member raises. We don't differentiate in every single hospital between care of adolescent patients and others in terms of psychiatric care, but we have certainly made a great deal of progress in providing psychiatric care through active treatment hospitals throughout the province. It cannot be accommodated in every single community; that's very obvious. But we think on a regional basis we've made very good progress.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, I just don't believe the regional progress is there, at least for the parents that are complaining.

But let's move on a bit. Will the minister recognize the need for increased accessibility to professional help for disturbed adolescents by allowing health care payments to be made to clinical psychologists?

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware that there is presently a problem with respect to health care payments being made to recognized physicians who are involved in the treatment and care of psychiatric patients. If there is,

again, perhaps the hon. member could give me some specifics, and I'd be pleased to look into it. I think it really involves, though, the hon. member taking the opportunity to talk to hospital boards and others throughout the province to see the progress that has been made. I think it's been very good, and I just cannot agree with the hon. member's suggestion that there's something terribly lacking in this area.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, the last supplementary, I believe. A clinical psychologist is not a physician; a physician is not a clinical psychologist. However, I won't take this up further with you apparently.

What initiatives, if any, is the government taking to increase the number of child psychiatrists — now you're getting into physicians — and other clinical child care professionals in Alberta in view of the very limited and inadequate numbers of child care professionals presently in the province? What are we doing to increase the numbers?

MR. M. MOORE: Well, I'll try again, Mr. Speaker. I simply cannot agree with the hon. member that there is a major lack in this area. I think we've done very well and will continue to try to improve our services in that area. But for the member to suggest that there's something terribly wrong in services in this area is simply not correct, in my view.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, to the minister or else the Minister of Social Services. Can either one of the ministers indicate if they have sufficiently trained social workers who are trained in psychiatry, even elementary psychiatry and psychology, to provide counselling to these emotionally disturbed adolescents?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, while I'm not familiar with all the courses a social worker would take over a four-year period, I'm sure that education would at least provide the basis for a social worker to understand what type of counselling or therapy an individual may in fact need. We have people around the province, and obviously the Minister of Community and Occupational Health would also have some people who are involved in this area, although it is the primary responsibility under the Child Welfare Act for our department. But we access services from various people around the province, and that would be done on the recommendation of social workers or other professionals.

REV. ROBERTS: To the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care. Is he not aware that, for instance, at the Royal Alex adolescent psychiatric care unit there is a waiting list of over eight months and that the staff have been constantly complaining about the lack of attention in this area, as the hon. member has already raised?

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I'm aware that in this province we have more active treatment hospital beds for both regular care and psychiatric care than any other province in Canada and any other place in the world. I'm also aware that people talk about waiting lists from time to time, but unless the hon. member is prepared to provide some solution to the problem other than building more beds, I can't be more specific than that.

I think we've made some good progress in the last several years. We've got the finest hospital system that

exists anywhere in the world, period. We ought to be proud of it, and we ought to put our imagination now to finding ways where we can keep that system and pay for its operating costs.

Municipal Policing Costs

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Solicitor General. The city of Edmonton has made a request of some \$500,000 in terms of policing costs relative to the recent and current Gainers dispute. Could the minister indicate the disposal of that request, and if the decision hasn't been made, when will it be made?

MR. ROSTAD: Mr. Speaker, I have had conversations with the chairman of the Edmonton Police Commission relating to overtime costs. I have assured him that I will search through my total budgetary parameters to find out if there might be a little excess cash. In the meantime, we're also attempting to authenticate the alleged overtime figures and how they might relate. I have indicated to the president of the commission that I wouldn't wait with bated breath.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Could the minister indicate whether a policy review will now be taking place under the leadership of the minister in terms of unusual circumstances such as this, so that a policy is in place to deal with future mishaps such as this one?

MR. ROSTAD: Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his question, but as I've indicated previously in the House, policing in this particular instance is the responsibility of the city of Edmonton through their Police Commission. My department does give an \$18 per capita grant towards policing, but it's an unconditional grant and it can be utilized in any manner and through any budgetary means they so wish. Outside of the city of Edmonton there are certain municipal agreements with the RCMP and a provincial agreement with the RCMP for policing, and those are on either the \$18 or the \$12 per capita contributions. Again, the policing is within the particular municipality's responsibility. I don't see the need for an unusual situation policy.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. At this time, is the minister indicating that there most likely will be no payment to the city of Edmonton, that the city of Edmonton should look at its budget sources and various means, and if that means an increase in taxes, so be it?

MR. ROSTAD: Mr. Speaker, as pointed out in the House previously, the policing costs in Alberta are paid by all taxpayers, be it provincial taxpayers or municipal taxpayers. As I've just indicated, we do contribute an unconditional grant towards policing. It's up to the particular municipality in how they utilize that.

MR. EWASIUK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Premier. In light of the jet trip that the Minister of Labour is taking to study labour legislation in other parts of the world, how can we justify the cost of that trip when we're having difficulty rationalizing the payment of the requested fees for police costs to the city of Edmonton?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, of course it's a judgment on matters such as this. I think the hon. member could probably

estimate that the city of Edmonton receives somewhere in the order of perhaps \$0.5 billion from the province in a given year and that the municipalities in our province are treated more generously than any municipalities in Canada.* There are circumstances now and then that require additional consideration, and as the hon. minister said, that is happening. There are many areas in which to lay the cause of the problems in that labour dispute. Perhaps all of them should contribute to the funding for the police.

MRS. HEWES: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the Solicitor General. Can the Solicitor General tell members of the Legislature when he will be making a decision relative to the city of Edmonton's request for additional information?

MR. ROSTAD: Mr. Speaker, as I've indicated, I have given a commitment to undertake a review of my total budget to find out if there were any excess funds that could be accessed, and then a decision would be made. We aren't yet halfway through our budget year, and at this stage it's certainly premature to determine whether there are going to be excess funds or not. I have satisfied the chairman of the Police Commission that the review is being undertaken and the answer would be coming as soon as possible but not, again, to wait with bated breath.

Rural Electrification

MR. MUSGROVE: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Transportation and Utilities. There was a new master agreement between the power companies and the Rural Electrification Associations agreed to in 1985. Could the minister inform the Assembly how many of these agreements have been signed?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, I get a report every week. The last report I received, there were 88 of 206 agreements that were signed by the REAs and 47 of the agreements signed by the power companies. I should also go a little further and state that the 47 that were signed are by Alberta Power. At this point in time TransAlta has not signed any of them, although I'm given to understand that as of today when I got the report, 11 are in the hands of TransAlta for signing and they had been held up slightly because of initialling of the contracts — which is more a legal side of it, where they were initialling changes that were made by both parties prior to the agreements being put in place.

MR. MUSGROVE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I understand that there have been some meetings between the REAs and the power companies recently with regard to the power companies buying out the REAs. Could the minister inform the Assembly how many of these sales have taken place recently?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, I don't have the exact number of how many sales have taken place in recent months. I can indicate that the last two meetings that did occur, the REAs in their wisdom chose not to sell. As you may recall, some time ago we provided a change in the percentage of voting members that were able to agree to a sale and moved that to a two-thirds majority. I believe in one case the vote was 31-29, and so it was on hold again. The other REA chose to defer it until more information was available for them.

*See member's explanation on p. 1340

Wood Preservative Plant

MR. YOUNIE: Mr. Speaker, for the Minister of the Environment. Now that negotiations that weren't happening have led to an announcement of Bradbury industries of their intention to open a PCP plant near Edmonton, perhaps the minister will be more willing to answer questions.

The minister has shown a reluctance to initiate any form of public hearings. Will the minister now outline what official procedures concerned members of the public must follow to cause such hearings to occur, including, preferably, the name and phone number of the appropriate official in his department?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, I thought I responded to that type of question on Monday of this week when it was addressed to me by the Member for Clover Bar. I simply don't understand what further would be added to that. I pointed out in my response on Monday that a guideline document had been published in December 1985 which refers to the environmental impact assessment procedures followed in the province of Alberta. That document is public information. There are thousands of copies that had been printed and circulated to all offices, I suppose, in the province of Alberta, perhaps even including the office of the New Democratic Party. I'm sure that the member could access that information.

There are no negotiations between Alberta Environment and Bradbury Chemicals, as I pointed out earlier. An application for a development permit was submitted to the county of Strathcona; I think I made that public on Monday in response to a question asked of me. It's up to the council of the county of Strathcona to see how they wish to proceed with the development permit. If the council decides to turn the development permit down, the matter will end there. Nothing will happen.

MR. YOUNIE: Thank you. I guess concerned members of the public should just phone the minister directly.

I'm wondering if the minister will go beyond saying an environmental impact assessment is a possibility, depending on his whim, and will in fact commit himself to a full environmental impact assessment in the area to be affected.

MR. KOWALSKI: I guess we're in the realm of the hypothetical again, Mr. Speaker. I do not know, nor does any man or woman in this Assembly know, whether or not the county of Strathcona will approve the development permit for Bradbury Chemicals Ltd. If the county of Strathcona turns it down, it won't come to the attention of Alberta Environment.

There is provision under the development permitting process and the bylaw process, and perhaps the hon. member might wish to study the Municipal Government Act to understand what steps are in place. That local municipality can cause a public hearing to take place. Once again, I'd be very, very pleased to provide the member with a copy of the document called Environmental Impact Assessment Guidelines, approved by the Minister of the Environment, issued and made public December 1985. It indicates all of the procedures that can be followed by individuals with respect to an EIA.

MR. YOUNIE: I don't know whether to say thank you or not.

Considering that one forest plant in B.C. is testing an alternative to PCP as a wood preservative and we may end up with a white elephant that no longer has a market and considering the motive behind that testing, will the Minister or Acting Minister of Community and Occupational Health and the Minister of the Environment commit themselves to reviewing evidence that has caused the International Woodworkers of America to oppose the use of this chemical and pressure B.C. forest industries to look for alternatives?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, I'd be delighted to inform all members of the Assembly and, I guess, all people of Alberta that I have received no correspondence from the particular union in question, which is located in British Columbia, over the past several months. One would think that if there were important information that could contribute to our understanding of this issue, that particular union located in British Columbia would want to make it available to authorities here in the province of Alberta. But we have received no such information; no such written contact has been made with my office or for that matter, to my knowledge, with anyone in Alberta Environment. So I think in terms of the information base that we're all dealing with, it would be helpful and it would be very important, if such information is available, for all to know that I would be delighted to receive it.

MR. YOUNIE: Thank you. I will get Dr. Ledger to have their Edmonton office send you the same information she sent me.

I would like to ask if either the Minister of Community and Occupational Health or the Minister of the Environment has followed up on my previous suggestion to contact the government of Sweden to review the reasons for their ban on use or production of PCP.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, I find it rather interesting that earlier today in question period a number of suggestions were made that ministers not make international contacts and not go to certain places. In the past the Member for Edmonton Glengarry has suggested that I go to Tacoma, Washington, which I have crossed off my agenda. I will not go to Tacoma, Washington. He has suggested that I should go someplace else, he has suggested that I should go someplace else, and he has suggested that I should go someplace else. I very, very much appreciate that.

I would, however, like to inform the member and all members of the Assembly that in the third week of September 1986 an international symposium will be held in Denmark to talk about special, hazardous materials. I want all members to know that despite the fact there have been several amounts of pressure put on me to go, I will not be going. I would like members to know that representatives of the Alberta Special Wastes Management Corporation here in the province of Alberta have been invited to participate as spokespersons with respect to the positive Alberta experience. I will be asking them to make contact with colleagues in the scientific community who might be there from Sweden to ascertain and gather further information with respect to the decision of the government of Sweden.

Psychiatric Care of Children (continued)

MRS. HEWES: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Social Services. The provincial psychiatric services presently available to young people fail to meet the unique needs of children and adolescents even though two pieces

of legislation exist, the Child Welfare Act and the Mental Health Act, that give the government the mandate to provide such services. We are seeing, as was mentioned before, a disturbing trend towards increasing numbers of adolescents and children needing care and in psychiatric hospitals. Recognizing the therapeutic importance of maintaining a mentally disturbed child within the family, will the minister review the frequent and disturbing practice of requiring that a child be made a ward of the government in order to access in-patient or compulsory care treatment?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the work now done under the new Child Welfare Act would indeed mitigate against the type of thing that the hon. member has raised. Certainly all of us in the department, in the policy area right through to the people working in this area, are very aware of the importance of the family and the importance of children remaining within the family and will dedicate services to that end. I'm also aware that we do have a shortage in some areas in terms of professional people and would hope that somehow we can handle that situation. I'm not sure whether the hon. member would have some suggestions. Certainly in the first instance our dedication is to keeping children within the family and providing the support services in the community to that end.

MRS. HEWES: Mr. Speaker, thank you. That's good news.

Perhaps the minister will then tell us what precise steps are being taken to ensure that treatment plans for adolescents and children emphasize that very family involvement and participation, since they have not done so in the past.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, in terms of my own awareness of how situations have been handled in the past, I wouldn't say that there was an emphasis on taking children out of the home. Certainly we have seen a need for enhancing services within the community. As we change the emphasis and resources are freed up, obviously we will be looking to provide those resources within the community. There are a number of pieces of work that will be undertaken.

Earlier this spring, again as resources became available in the Calgary area, we used that opportunity to look for people to provide us with possible plans speaking to the child abuse area, because certainly this is where some of the problems have arisen, and then in the end finding children with special emotional problems. That work is ongoing. I believe it was in the neighbourhood of \$600,000 or so that had been designated in that area. When we see how this works, what types of plans the community can present to us — because it's obviously something that the community as a whole is working on — I will be forthcoming and inviting all hon. members to participate with their ideas.

MRS. HEWES: Mr. Speaker, is the minister developing a specialized psychiatric care program for native children, given that there are no culturally appropriate psychiatric resources for the native population and, further, that traditional psychiatric services are often ineffective in dealing with the unique problems faced by native youths?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has raised a very important point. I think it's with some sadness that all of us reflect on the lack of success that we have had in terms of working with a lot of children in the native community. I'm sure the hon. member is aware that the

native or Metis children form a very large percentage of the caseload handled by the department. To that end we have some signed agreements now with some of the bands who are most interested in taking over the work in the child welfare area, with our assistance. Maybe the hon. member will also be aware that I have committed some funds for special training dedicated solely to native people who will go into the welfare area in our postsecondary institutions.

MRS. HEWES: Mr. Speaker, along the same line, has the minister's department or in fact anyone in the government discussed with the social workers' association or the University of Alberta or the University of Calgary how psychiatric social worker training could be extended in order that our workers could perform more effective case management and improve co-ordination?

MRS. OSTERMAN: I'm not aware of a discussion of that nature, Mr. Speaker, but I'll certainly undertake to check. If it hasn't occurred, I will also undertake to make it occur.

MS LAING: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Has she developed specialized care units for children who have either been kicked out of their homes or left homes due to abuse and whose parents are unwilling to be involved in treatment?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Again, Mr. Speaker, every circumstance of a child coming into our care really means that we ought to develop a case handling of that circumstance dedicated for the particular child. Again, it would be handled first with the family, and in the cases where that doesn't occur, a special case planning occurs with the people who are dedicated to the child welfare area.

Suncor Fire

MR. ALGER: Mr. Speaker, my questions to the Minister of Energy today are similar to the other day. Is the fire at the Suncor plant under control? If so, does the minister know which part or how much of the plant was damaged or destroyed?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, the fire was under control within an hour of its starting the other morning. The fire was contained in the kerosene unit. We do not have an estimate of the damage yet.

MR. ALGER: A supplemental, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, how many barrels of oil per day is Suncor losing to the energy markets as a result of the accident?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, when the plant begins production — and it's expected to start production on September 5 — it will be up to 50,000 barrels a day, which is near capacity, although at the time of the fire production was of a magnitude significantly higher than that, something like 65,000 barrels a day if I recall.

MR. ALGER: Will the minister call for an investigation into the causes of this unfortunate accident, Mr. Speaker, in an effort to prevent such a thing ever happening again?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, the Suncor investigation team is carrying out an investigation and assessing the time frame as to when that particular unit could be replaced and brought

up to production. They're now thinking that even though there will be full production by September 5, it will not be until November 3 that that particular unit will be back. However, they can still come up to full production on the crude without having that unit in place at all.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. As I understand it, Suncor is getting a grant or loan or a combination of both to keep in service for the next while because of the extraordinary low oil prices. Is there any tie-in between the agreement we have with Suncor and settlement of the labour negotiations?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure — if he's suggesting that the assistance to Suncor with respect to royalty assistance can be tied in to settlements of the sector ... If he would repeat the question, I would appreciate it.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, I'm just talking about the financial aid that Suncor gets, the royalty assistance. Is it in any way, shape, or form tied in to whether or not they are able to settle their labour negotiations?

DR. WEBBER: I don't see any connection, Mr. Speaker.

Suspended Drivers

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Solicitor General and concerns suspended driver information. The question arises from the recent case of a suspended Manitoba driver who got a licence in Alberta, returned to Manitoba, and killed three people while driving last weekend. In view of the fact that the Canadian Police Information Centre has had all information regarding suspended and disqualified drivers in its records, supplied by all provinces for many years, will the Solicitor General confirm that his department has nonetheless no access to this Canadian Police Information Centre computer, even for driver information from other provinces, and explain why not?

MR. ROSTAD: Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure that I can answer that right at the moment. I'll certainly take it on notice and get back to the Assembly.

MR. WRIGHT: Yes. Somewhat surprising that, since it's the main instrument, Mr. Speaker.

Is there not a routine check made for out-of-province suspensions when a driver appears in a licence issuing centre in Alberta and asks for a new licence?

MR. ROSTAD: Mr. Speaker, I'm led to believe that, yes, in some instances there are checks. In some instances there aren't, because we're not aware they're from out of the province.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Speaker, how then did a case such as the Reimer case arise, inasmuch as it is normal to make a check of either the computer or out of province?

MR. ROSTAD: Mr. Speaker, in this particular instance, I can't give a direct answer. But if a person came from another province to Alberta, applied for a driver's licence, and fraudulently did not disclose that they were from another province, I don't know how we would have the wherewithal to check in every other province.

MR. SPEAKER: The time for question period has expired. Might we very rapidly finish this series of questions? Do we have agreement from the Assembly?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed?

MR. WRIGHT: Much obliged, Mr. Speaker, and rapid it is.

Will the much publicized new regime due to start on September 1 improve the flow of interprovincial communication so tragedies like this may be on their way to being averted?

MR. ROSTAD: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member points out something about a new regime. I have the utmost confidence in the personnel of the motor vehicle division as well as the police. The particular program alleged to by the hon. member will definitely cut down on suspended drivers and help to apprehend many more. We are more than willing at any time to take the advice that the hon. member might be able to put forth. If he has been listening in the House and reading the newspapers, I'm sure he's well aware of the thrust our department has taken to communicate with all provinces and territories across Canada to attempt a network of information to apprehend the suspended driver.

Municipal Policing Costs

(continued)

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, when responding to the hon. Member for Edmonton Beverly earlier, I believe I used the term \$0.5 billion for Edmonton when I meant it for municipalities.*

ORDERS OF THE DAY

head: GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

13. Moved by Mr. Johnston:
Be it resolved that the messages of Her Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor, the 1986-87 Capital Fund estimates, and all matters connected therewith be referred to the Committee of Supply.

[Motion carried]

14. Moved by Mr. Crawford:
Be it resolved that, pursuant to Standing Order 58(6), the number of days that the Committee of Supply will be called to consider 1986-87 Capital Fund estimates shall be two (2) days.

[Motion carried]

15. Moved by Mr. Crawford:
Be it resolved that when the House rises at 1 p.m. on Friday, August 29, 1986, it shall stand adjourned until 2:30 p.m. on Wednesday, September 3, 1986.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, Motion 15 is a proposal for one extra day for members after the Labour Day weekend.

[Motion carried]

*See p. 1337

head: **COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY**

[Mr. Gogo in the Chair]

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

1986-87 Capital Fund Estimates

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're asked today to consider the Capital Fund estimates, which is a new process. This is the first time these types of estimates have been before the committee in this form. We'll be considering two votes for the Capital Fund: Hospitals and Medical Care and Advanced Education.

Before we proceed, I would ask that the hon. Provincial Treasurer make some opening comments relative to the vote.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, my comments will be very brief this afternoon, allowing for the two ministers to present to the Assembly in this Committee of Supply an outline of the dollars requested for their two capital programs. My only comment will be, first of all, that in terms of procedures, I think all members are aware that we're dealing with the Capital Fund estimates '86-87. As well, in the back of the April '86 summary of elements, you will find details of the Hospitals and Medical Care and Advanced Education expenditures. Further, Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister of Advanced Education, during consideration of the estimates of his department, tabled in the House certain information which will support and reinforce the request for funding under these two important votes.

Let me say as well, Mr. Chairman, that we're considering the Capital Fund estimates this afternoon. Members will note that Bill 30, the Financial Administration Act, has also been introduced in the Legislative Assembly. The authority for the Capital Fund estimates flows from that legislation, and I'm sure that as we debate the Financial Administration Act, we will then understand that the Capital Fund concept will be set in place and the estimates will flow from the authority given to us by the Financial Administration Act itself.

It is our intention, Mr. Chairman, to borrow from a variety of sources the funds needed to finance the Capital Fund estimates. That money will likely be borrowed from Canadian sources. The amount of money required this year is as tallied in the back of the estimates, \$332,796,000, allocated between Hospitals and Medical Care, \$281,128,000, and Advanced Education, \$51,668,000. Accordingly, the estimates of the two departments provide for retirement of the capital portion of the fund costs, the carrying costs of the fund and the retirement of the debt. The Treasury Department itself covers the interest costs expected for the borrowing portion of the \$300 million and some asked for under the Capital Fund estimates.

Mr. Chairman, I leave it to my two colleagues to respond to the various questions which have been raised, and I know that in their capable way they will be able to outline for you the priority they've assigned to the Capital Fund estimates. I'm sure that if there are any other broad questions with respect to the way in which the fund will operate, from time to time I will be available to answer those as well.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Treasurer. The Minister of Advanced Education is with us. Perhaps, hon. Minister,

we could go to your comments first, even though you're the second vote, if that's in order.

Advanced Education**2 — Construction of Postsecondary Education Facilities**

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Chairman, I think the amount of funds being asked for today is quite reasonable to maintain the construction program under way. During the consideration of my department's estimates earlier in the session, I did refer to the fact that these capital funds used to be combined with operating funds as grants and therefore were distributed among various votes to the various institutions. If the hon. members wish to refer to the Capital Fund estimates found in the element booklet, the second last page, it shows the breakdown. This year we are asking for just over \$59 million.

I should mention what's involved in the system change this year, Mr. Chairman, because it's important to know that what we're doing this year by way of major capital works is simply what was done in Alberta up until the early 1970s; that is, you borrowed money, just as any one of us in this room would borrow money to purchase or build our home or business and debenture it and make the annual payments on it. That used to be done in Alberta through the hospital services commission for hospitals and through the universities commission for university and colleges construction. During the early '70s that was changed to a system where we reverted to a pay-as-you-go program for all capital projects. I recall that that was done with some debate because there were two sides of the coin, saying: is it fair to ask the present population or generation to pay for everything that will be used by a future generation — the other side of the argument — or should the life of the debt be spread over the terms of the users of the facility?

I just mention that background because what we're doing here because of our current revenue situation is simply reverting to a system which is in effect in many other provinces and governments and which was in effect until the early '70s here in Alberta.

We have a total plant out there in the system which is worth many hundreds of millions of dollars and is continually being expanded, renovated, and upgraded. I'm sure all members have advanced education or postsecondary education facilities in their ridings and are very proud of the capital facilities. I should mention also that the \$59 million that is being debentured does not represent the total capital dollars available to the system, because in addition to that, under the operating budget, under formula funding, there's another \$62 million which takes care of debt retirement, furnishings and equipment, building renovations, and site and utility upgrading. So in addition to that \$59 million there's another \$62 million. This represents the cash flow requirements for one year to keep the projects that have been approved going through either the planning or the construction stage.

It's an ongoing, cyclical thing, as members can appreciate. As a university or college finishes a project, we're able to put one or two more projects on the list. This year the \$59 million is being asked to support the cash flow requirements for capital facilities that are under way at the University of Alberta, the University of Calgary, the University of Lethbridge, Grant MacEwan Community College, Lakehead College, Mount Royal College, Olds College, and as

well about half a million dollars worth of improvements to the four hospital-based schools of nursing.

I'd be pleased to answer questions, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Minister. Mr. Moore will be with us shortly, so we'll deal with vote 2.

MR. GIBEAULT: Mr. Chairman, I think a number of comments need to be made about the Capital Fund proposals here for postsecondary education facilities. First of all, I'd have to express my regret that as an Assembly we're being asked to authorize some \$51.6 million in capital expenditures. Previously in Motion for a Return 153 we asked for the various proposals that were submitted to the Department of Advanced Education for various expansions and the government stonewalled us on that. Now here we are with a variety of proposals, and I think, generally speaking, it's surely not asking too much for the minister to give us some overview as to for what particular purposes these proposed funds are going to be used.

Fifty-one million dollars is a sizable amount, and I'm sure it will be able to cover many useful and worthwhile projects. But at this point, with the information we have, sketchy as it is — it's just some general numbers — I think it's really inadequate to make a proper and responsible decision, Mr. Chairman. So I'd ask the minister if he could give us some general outlines as to the various projects these funds are going to support for the institutions in the coming fiscal year.

In particular, there are a couple of other points that I want to make. One is that we see a decrease in the amounts for the two universities. It seems to me the last figures I saw showed increasing enrollments in these two institutions, and yet our capital commitments are declining. It seems to me that that's somewhat inconsistent.

In the case of the University of Lethbridge we see that there's a \$600,000 provision where there was none in the '85-86 estimates. I'd like to know what that is scheduled to be applied to, Mr. Chairman. I'm wondering if it applies to the problems that the University of Lethbridge is now facing in terms of structural problems that have been discovered in the neighbourhood of some half a million dollars. Is it to repair that? If it's not, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to know if the minister is going to be considering an extra allocation to assist the University of Lethbridge in correcting those structural problems that have been discovered recently.

Along that line I think maybe we should also ask if the minister is looking at considering some kind of inspection for the Red Deer college of arts, because the same architect that designed the University of Lethbridge designed that facility. We may perhaps be considering a similar kind of problem there down the road. Perhaps it would be worth making some kind of inspection to ensure that that is not the case.

As well, we see the largest decrease in terms of the public colleges. We're looking at a 22 percent reduction, and that has some rather alarming concerns for us, Mr. Chairman. In the case of Grande Prairie Regional College, for example, we see that in '85-86 there was some \$350,000 allocated and in the '86-87 period there is none. The situation at Grande Prairie Regional College is particularly severe in terms of an overcrowding situation. Even though the college was built to hold some 550 to 600 students, its current full-time enrollment is in the neighbourhood of 1,100. This has forced the college to move many of its programs off

campus to portable classrooms, industrial parks, and rented office space. I'm sure the minister can appreciate that to have people spread out all over the place is not good for student morale or for the growth of a proper learning environment. In fact, during the last election the Premier himself promised funds for a badly needed expansion there. The estimates for the Capital Fund suggest that perhaps the people at Grande Prairie will have to wait. I'd like the minister to confirm if in fact that is the case. Are the people in Grande Prairie going to see the promise the Premier made fulfilled in this current '86-87 fiscal year, or are they going to have to wait once again?

[Mr. Musgreave in the Chair]

We have the case of Fairview College as well. We know that they have twice tried to gain approval for a new sporting complex at the college and now have been refused twice. We can see that again they are looking at absolutely zero in terms of a Capital Fund allocation for them. It seems to me that some explanation should be forthcoming in that particular case.

Another problem is in terms of the Alberta College of Art, a facility that has one classroom and a 200-seat lecture hall. It received some funds last year to begin an office/classroom wing but has not yet received the funds to complete it. The department gave the college some \$200,000 last year, in my understanding, to fix a ventilation problem because of a variety of noxious chemicals and materials that are used at the college, but another \$400,000 will be needed to complete that particular project. I do not see any allocation in the estimates here for that. I would like to know why that is.

In the Advanced Education area we're looking as well at increased enrollments at all the colleges. While these particular capital estimates for the various colleges and universities — in some cases an increase and in some a decrease — may meet some of the problems the institutions are facing, they also imply that down the road we're going to be looking at significant operating costs associated with the various expansions. I'd like to know if the minister has given the various institutions a commitment that they will receive the operating costs that will be required to maintain the programs associated with the expansions proposed in these '86-87 estimates. Mr. Chairman, there is no point in having extra buildings if we're not going to have the instructors, support staff, and related facilities to provide the program support that is required.

Mr. Chairman, with those comments, I would like to hear what the Minister of Advanced Education's comments might be.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Chairman, first of all I think this system being introduced by government with regard to capital facilities in both hospitals and universities and colleges is a very sensible proposal. For many years we've always based repayment of highways on their lives. In other words, as they're used, revenue is collected and they're paid off. So I think it makes ample sense, Mr. Chairman, for the province to borrow these funds for these capital facilities and amortize them over the lives of the institutions. I frankly don't know what the lives of the institutions are. When we look at parts of eastern Canada, we see some that have been there for 300 or 400 years and obviously that's not the intent. The minister may comment, though, on what

the span might be for that debt repayment from the General Revenue Fund.

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make a comment relative to Advanced Ed with regard to the University of Lethbridge. The Member for Edmonton Mill Woods has made a comment or two. At the moment there is some \$71 million in assets represented in bricks and mortar in that institution, including its library facility. I think the U of L has made a major difference to educational opportunities for citizens of southern Alberta. As the Member for Lethbridge West, I'm very grateful that the government has been able to do this, particularly through the high-income years that the province has experienced. As the minister is well aware, the regional Max Bell Aquatic Centre opened recently, which is an Olympic-sized facility. What we would have done without that endowment program, I frankly don't know. It simply wouldn't have been possible. I think credit has to go to the city of Lethbridge — it made a substantial contribution — the citizens down there, the Department of Advanced Education and, of course, the Max Bell foundation.

Looking ahead, Mr. Chairman — and the minister may choose to comment on this when he's answering — the needs are still there. To my knowledge it's the only advanced education facility where the university sector does not have a student union centre. I understand the students have put together a substantial amount of funds ready for that. I don't know when we might anticipate the government being able to assist. We're grateful, of course, for the renewal of the endowment fund, the matching grant program.

In addition to that, Mr. Chairman, unlike Calgary and Edmonton we don't seem to have those major facilities for recreation. I understand the University of Lethbridge is now looking toward providing an ice centre for its hockey team as well as the community. If the minister in his wisdom can find any way with his capital projects to assist in that regard, we would be extremely grateful.

I'd like to conclude, Mr. Chairman, by endorsing the proposal before the committee today to recover funds and capital assets over the life span of those projects. I would certainly encourage members of the committee to support it.

MR. PASHAK: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to deal with the estimate of \$17 million to Mount Royal College and commend the government for that amount. I'm quite sure everybody in the college community in Calgary is very pleased with the addition of these new facilities to Mount Royal College.

I'd just like to make one point, though, about the kinds of students that are attracted to Mount Royal College. Essentially they come from the southwest quadrant of the city. I think college students are a little different from technical and university students. Technical and university students seem to be more goal oriented. They will spend a lot of time driving to a university or a technical institute, whereas college students seem not quite as motivated. The presence of a community college close to residential areas is very important. Not only is the drive time a factor but the presence of a college seems to change the aspirations of students that live near such a facility. As the Member for Calgary Forest Lawn, I'm really concerned about the fact that the whole east side of that city is relatively deprived when it comes to postsecondary institutions. It just so happens that the university in the city of Calgary is on the west side of the city and so is the technical institute and Mount Royal College.

A very wonderful opportunity to meet the needs of these Calgary residents presented itself rather recently when some very preliminary discussions were entered into between the Calgary public school board and officials at Mount Royal College. I recognize that this is a time of financial constraint, and the minister made the decision to cut back on those discussions. I think it's really unfortunate, because here you had a situation where you could get a facility which could be used by two different groups of educational students, so the costs of these facilities would have been reduced in a sense. The figures I've looked at in this regard are that for about an extra \$10 million there could have been provision for something like an additional 250 to 300 full-time equivalent students in this facility. I'd like the minister to comment on that. I think it represents an opportunity that would have been very exciting. Instead of having to build a whole new facility, we could have moved into an area where we had joint use of a facility and thereby eliminated some duplication. As I understand it, the high school would have had a number of classrooms and facilities available for adult education programs in the evening and that sort of thing.

MR. McEACHERN: Mr. Chairman, I suppose my remarks are directed more to the Treasurer. He gave a brief explanation about setting up a capital fund and that these are the first estimates we will be passing under that legislation, which is still to come although it has been introduced in the House.

My question to the Minister of Education in relation to this — you mentioned that some \$62 million in capital costs is covered under the estimates that we approved previously. I'm wondering what makes these particular capital cost estimates different, what makes the government decide to separate those from the estimates and say, "Okay, here they are." I accept the point the Member for Lethbridge West made that if you have to borrow money and if you're going to build something that's going to be used in the future, maybe you amortize that cost over the number of years of the life of those buildings. But I'm wondering what prompted the government to separate these costs from the costs we've already approved. Why wasn't this \$51.6 million included in those estimates? What was it that prompted this change in approach at this stage? Maybe that question should be put to the Treasurer, as it may have been his responsibility rather than yours, but I'm sure you'd have some thoughts on that.

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to deal with the questions that have been asked to date. First of all, responding to the points put forward by the Member for Edmonton Mill Woods, I did table several copies of written questions and answers that were brought up during my estimates. Perhaps the pages are missing from the set the hon. member has, but there certainly is a full and detailed explanation of the dollars in every project, as was asked for by the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View. The list is included in the response to the questions by that hon. member because he was the member who put that question.

The second point the hon. member made was the reference to the correlation between enrollment and capital expansion and/or decrease as it may evolve. That's certainly a very difficult issue to handle. In some cases it's very straightforward. For example, Mount Royal College and Grande Prairie Regional College and Lakeland College are presently, I think quite rightly, experiencing demand for more space.

They can prove pretty definitely that expanded student population will be there in a year or two. With the universities it's a bit more difficult. But the way it's developing now, as the economic times change and people at various ages and stages of their lives move in and out of the postsecondary educational system, it's very difficult to exactly match the capital space available with the numbers of students, to build space deemed on what you believe will be the student enrollment and provide the board of governors with the funds to at least make the space operable or inhabitable — lights on money, as they call it. I use Mount Royal College and Grande Prairie Regional College as current examples. From there you go on to the second set of parameters and decisions as to whether or not you then want to expand programs and staff as well as the space or if you simply want to give an expanded student body more space in which to function under essentially the same operating budget.

So it's a situation that has several factors involved in it. It is not simple and is subject to sudden change, as we've seen here in Alberta very close at hand: the rush three or four years ago to build Westerra Institute. It was primarily an apprentice facility on the western outskirts of Edmonton. Of course, now that need has almost entirely disappeared just as the institution was nicely getting established. However, I'm sure some new need will develop or be identified. The board is currently working on that. So it's a very volatile and to a degree delicate phenomenon to work with.

The \$600,000 for the University of Lethbridge that the hon. member referred to is for dealing with the structural problems. In my meeting with the board chairman and the acting president of the university, I was concerned about the same kind of question the hon. member raised: the responsibility of the consultants and the builders of that institution. I understand they do have their legal advisers looking at that, but in the meantime it's essential that remedial work be undertaken.

The hon. member made the statement that the same architect was involved at the Red Deer college of art. We're talking about a Canadian architect of international status, Arthur Erickson. He's done first-class, world-class, gold medal style buildings all around the world. I think Alberta is fortunate to have examples of his work. I'm just as distressed as anyone that after several years, because of the nature of the site at Lethbridge, some remedial work is necessary. I hope that will not in any way detract from the significance of the design of those buildings and the attention they have received.

The question with respect to Grande Prairie and the commitment made by the hon. Premier during his visit there during the election campaign. I understood that hon. members were aware that both the Lakeland and Grande Prairie college boards had been given money during the current year to plan those expansions; in the case of Grande Prairie Regional College, \$1 million, and in the case of Lakeland, \$700,000. We were able to do this without changing the budget as presented to the Legislature because of a delay in construction at the Lakeland College student centre; the cash flow that had been allowed will simply not be used. We've taken money out of that vote, and that shows up in your element book as was printed. If the hon. member looks under Lakeland College, he will see an estimate of \$5.5 million, and we're actually taking \$1 million out of that for planning money at Grande Prairie, allowing Lakeland to take \$700,000 out of that for the planning of their

Lloydminster campus, which will still leave \$3.8 million in that vote. I'm assured that that will be more than enough to carry through the cash flow requirements on that project because of the speed at which it's going.

The hon. member asked about the Fairview recreation centre, and of course the community is hard at work. We're encouraging them with respect to the involvement of the community in a joint use recreation centre and seeing if it somehow can fit into the matching endowment fund dollars that are there. We'll simply see how that one develops during the next few months.

I should say that in a number of these projects, the requests that the members of the Legislature are now hearing about are being included by their board members in budget requests for '87-88. That's a good example of one that is being asked for consideration in the next fiscal year. The other one, of course, is the student union proposal for the University of Lethbridge that was mentioned by the Member for Lethbridge West.

[Mr. Gogo in the Chair]

The Alberta College of Art. Again, they're doing some remedial work, and they also have some expansion plans under way. I met again with the chairman of the board and the president there, and I think they're going to be okay this fiscal year, using surplus funds which they have available and putting them into ventilating and other mechanical and architectural upgrading that is necessary there. Again, we're naturally pleased at the enrollment and activity taking place there, particularly in their first year of autonomy and full-board governance, so it will be important to give them the support that's needed. Again, like any autonomous institution they're learning very quickly that wishes have to be paired to match the funds that are available by way of government grants.

I believe that deals with the points raised by the Member for Edmonton Mill Woods. The Member for Lethbridge West spoke in favour of the debenture system of paying for these capital facilities and relating them to the life term of the facility. I'm not sure they will always match. I would expect that the debentures will generally be 25-year debentures, although my colleague the Treasurer can confirm that, whereas I would expect that many of these facilities will have lives of 40 years or more.

The student union proposal being considered by the University of Lethbridge is modelled after the financial plan that was developed by the students' union at the University of Calgary in that there were a number of donations and sources of funding, and money was made available from the matching endowment fund. That, together with some capital support from the provincial government, was able to fund that.

Again, the ice and recreation centre for the University of Lethbridge is a kind of exciting proposal. I recently met with the administration there and suggested to them that they may want to look at the model that the communities of Red Deer and Medicine Hat have used, whereby the community might find a cash donation to put up, thereby kicking off matching endowment funds from our endowment program and getting a facility that would be multi-use and could be used by the community as well as just the university. My understanding is that they are looking at that.

The Member for Calgary Forest Lawn referred quite properly to Mount Royal College because he's got a nice office waiting for him down there when he finishes here, and we'll try and see that he gets there quickly. They're

doing very well down there, and the cash flow requirements because of the pace of construction are estimated at \$17 million. The hon. member perhaps would not be aware that our Treasury Board recently approved another \$2 million-plus to take care of some inflation and extra costs that were involved as a result of the bankruptcy of the first architect involved there. The board made a legitimate proposal, so there will be even a bit more money than the \$17 million going to the Mount Royal College board this year. The construction there is in my view going along at quite a remarkable pace. It's rather a complex and complicated construction program with bits, pieces, and additions going on in many locations of an already complicated building design, so they're doing very well down there.

The hon. member made reference to getting a \$60 million addition on the west side of town but what are we doing for the east side? I think we really have to consider what we're saying when we look at a metropolitan centre like Calgary where we have a university, a technical institute, a college, and a vocational training centre and then say, "Yes, but we don't have all things in all quadrants of the city." At some point people are going to have to use the public transportation system, avail themselves of student financing assistance plans, and perhaps make their way. I'm not saying that I can't see a multi-location campus in the future. We're seeing it, of course, here in Edmonton with Grant MacEwan Community College in several locations, and there is an exciting opportunity in northeast Calgary. It would be nice to go ahead with it right now, but I suggested to the president and the chairman of the board that perhaps it would be better to finish the \$60 million-plus project on the south side of town and get it operating and then perhaps we can look at expansion in the north or east part of the city.

I think the idea of combining resources with the public board of education is an exciting one and one which we should encourage. As a matter of fact, I'm going to be meeting with the chairman of the school boards shortly and we're going to talk about that, because in my view there is no way that the idea should be dropped just because the cash isn't available right now. We may find a way of phasing it in or doing some future planning or allowances or something. I agree with the hon. member that it's a good idea, it's an opportunity, and we shouldn't just drop it.

The hon. Member for Edmonton Kingsway asked about the difference between the dollars in the Capital Fund and the capital dollars that are still contained in the standard operating votes and how we arrived at the difference. Very simply, Mr. Chairman, the difference is this. The funds in the operating vote are what we call formula funding; they're simply funds that are there and given to each institution on a formula basis to take care of depreciation. That's regarded as an operating vote, although it does look after capital things, things being furnishings and equipment. The equipment in this case is mainly specialized lab research equipment. It looks after minor building renovations and site and utility work, so the repairing of utility lines and landscaping and all that stuff you see is done by way of a formula that's worked out and simply included in the operating budget. But the idea of the Capital Fund established by the Provincial Treasurer this year is a fund which will borrow money and from which the cash requirements for the design and construction of new capital projects will flow. That's the difference, and perhaps I shouldn't have mentioned the other money, but it is another \$62 million that is used for

the capital enhancement and maintenance of the plant. I thought I should use that these capital fund dollars are really new construction dollars. I hope that explains the difference.

MR. NELSON: Mr. Chairman, I have just a couple of comments, as I want to wait to get in on this hospital. First of all, I'd like to say to the Minister of Advanced Education that we certainly encourage the development of a facility in northeast Calgary. However, in some respects I'm of mixed mind as to the present consideration of this development as a high school, basically because it would probably ultimately slow down that development. The residents of the area have certainly waited long and patiently for the approval process and the development of this high school for their young people. It is certainly more important at this point in a young person's life to try and attend a school facility in close proximity to their home as opposed to an older person that may wish to attend a college where there are young adults and what have you.

However, there are opportunities for young people that are not too far away at SAIT and the University of Calgary. There's good bus service to those two facilities and also to Mount Royal College from the northeast end of the city through the Forest Lawn area, the 72 and 73. However, sometime in the future it may be useful to consider a joint-use facility, providing you can get the land and the site that may be appropriate. Of course, where the proposed school is at the present time is not appropriate; there's just not enough land to extend a tremendously large facility that will be used to the extent necessary. And as we all know, the high schools and many of the other schools are used extensively for evening programs for adult education.

There is of course the availability of a very good and appropriate building in the northeast that has been discussed by the board for a number of years on occasion. Now, with the vacancy rate in buildings and in this particular one, it's certainly prudent to examine this. It might be useful to examine it as either a purchase for future expansion of that particular building or a lease-purchase over a period of time, because there's no question that in the future there will be a necessity for a satellite of the facilities offered by Mount Royal in the north end of the city. Certainly this is an ideal opportunity for the residents of the northeast, where there is not an overabundance of educational facilities as far as postsecondary is concerned. I would certainly lend my full support to that eventuality.

Thank you.

MR. MUSGROVE: Mr. Chairman, I just want to say a few words about the prospects with regard to Brooks college. It's an arm of the Medicine Hat College; it's been operating for the past seven years in an old hospital building. The classrooms are very, very crowded, and when I visited the college this spring, I found their laboratory to be something less than what we're offering in a lot of rural high schools. The college presently has 250 full-time students. They offer two-year university courses as well as innumerable short courses. The 250 full-time students do not include a lot of part-time students that vary from time to time because of the courses they're taking.

Mr. Chairman, I am aware that we're into a restraint program. I particularly recognize the economic state of the province and certainly am not pushing to get a college in 1986 or whenever. But the governors of the Medicine Hat College certainly have Brooks as one of their top priorities and would like to see a commitment sometime in the future,

not necessarily in the very near future. They have 60 acres of land that is owned by Medicine Hat College. It is very close to the provincial horticulture station in Brooks and would be an ideal place to offer some short courses in agriculture. I'm not saying that we need a college right away, but we would like to see some kind of commitment made by the province for a program in the future. Brooks, by the way, is about 65 miles from Medicine Hat, where they do offer similar courses. But when I hear people saying that in Calgary they need a college in different regions of the city, I certainly think we should recognize that we need a college in regions of the province where towns or cities are 65 miles apart.

I would also like to make a few comments concerning hospitals. In Bow Valley constituency we're adequately equipped with hospitals. However, Bassano recently got an auxiliary and nursing home district coterminous with the boundaries of their active treatment hospital district, and they don't have any auxiliary or hospital beds. There have been some renovations for the Bassano hospital on hold for seven or eight years, as I understand. They did get some renovations this year to the emergency part of the hospital, but that was only a portion of the need for repairs and renovations. The Brooks hospital ...

MR. CHAIRMAN: I hesitate to interrupt the hon. member, but we're dealing with only vote 2, Advanced Education, at this time.

MR. MUSGROVE: Sorry. I thought we were talking about hospitals too.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the vote?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

Agreed to:

| | |
|--|--------------|
| 2.1 — Universities | \$24,500,000 |
| 2.2 — Public Colleges | \$26,702,000 |
| 2.3 — Hospital-based Nursing Education | \$466,000 |
| 2.4 — Technical Institutes | — |
| Total Vote 2 — Construction of Postsecondary Education Facilities | \$51,668,000 |

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

[Motion carried]

Hospitals and Medical Care

1 — Construction of Hospitals and Nursing Homes

MR. CHAIRMAN: The estimates are on page 9. The minister is the Hon. Marvin Moore. Mr. Minister, any opening comments?

MR. M. MOORE: I don't think so, Mr. Chairman. We dealt with the construction of hospitals quite a bit during the course of my regular estimates. I'd just be prepared to answer any questions the members may have.

REV. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, I have a few questions just at the outset. I don't know whether to direct them to the minister or the Treasurer in terms of, again, the new setup of this fund and the way it has been presented. Just some clarification. When the Treasurer says that he would

then go out and borrow the moneys from sources in Canada, I wonder if he could be a bit more specific. Is this from the private money markets or from other places? What would the interest rates charged in that case be? And in a sense, why is that the case, and why don't we continue to borrow from our own sources and our own fund? I understand in Ontario there is a move by the government to borrow all kinds of money on the private market because of its critical cash flow problems, particularly in terms of capital. It ends up paying not only interest on the private money but then also operating, so we get the worst of both worlds. When you say we have a triple A rating and our own heritage trust fund, I wonder if that's the direction in which we should move. It's not clear why we have to go outside and borrow moneys in this separate sort of way.

I also wonder whether some of this has to do with something we talked about this morning in Public Accounts, with some of the Auditor General's recommendations and whether this new way of doing things is going to help the problem of lapsing which he recommends needs some attention in terms of capital funding for hospitals and that the department should liaison with the Treasury Department to help hospitals resolve problems in connection with funding commitments that lapse at fiscal year ends. Is this method going to help ensure that those problems of lapsing are remedied?

Thirdly, as I think as I've mentioned before — I know the Treasurer was here at the time — I also wonder if the minister of hospitals can give the Assembly some indication or clue as to the formula that is being used in the department for calculating in I guess general terms what the results will be for operating costs in the future in terms of what is being spent on capital now. In other jurisdictions the planners in hospitals are saying that for every dollar we spend on new capital construction we need to set aside 50 cents next year and the year after that. I know the concern of the minister and myself about cost containment. Have they really sorted out what spending an additional \$281 million is going to mean for future operating costs when that capital construction needs to be funded to operate? Is it going to mean an additional \$140 million next year and the year after if that formula exists? What other formula is there? And how is the minister prepared to deal with the increased operating that's going to result from voting for these capital dollars?

In terms of the moneys going to specific health care institutions and centres, again, I know there seems to be a great competition growing between the University of Alberta hospital and the Foothills. Just for what it's worth, why is there such a discrepancy there, with nearly \$6 million going to Foothills in Calgary and only \$55,000 going to University? Again, you must have some patience with us in terms of the number of dollars that are going to the Walter C. Mackenzie and the University of Alberta hospital. It's coming from so many different sources, and it really is hard for this member, at least, to keep track of where it's all coming from, what it's all adding up to, and why it's coming from this source and not that source. Put beside Foothills, it looks like a real discrepancy.

Similarly, in terms of the major urban medical and referral centres, I know that in my own constituency the Edmonton General and the Royal Alex — I have some concerns about the shake-up at the Edmonton General Jasper Avenue site and where that's going vis-à-vis the \$425,000 that's going to the General. Is that going to help create some new beds, or what is that going to be doing, particularly

as they're trying to come to terms with what the Jasper Avenue site will have vis-à-vis the Mill Woods hospital? If the minister, as he said this morning, is not quite sure of the necessity of the Mill Woods hospital, I wonder if maybe the Jasper Avenue site could stay in its totality, as well as the Royal Alex. Does this represent the first phase of their — what's it called? All those terms. But is this the first phase of what they've asked for, or is that still to be decided? Is this a firm commitment to the \$70 million that they have asked for in terms of their new redevelopment, or is this something else? And if it isn't, when is the first phase of the redevelopment moneys to be assured? As it was, I think before the election there was some election promise by the previous MLA.

Also, some clarification in specialized health care with the minister's recent announcement of additional funds going to Alberta Hospital, Ponoka. Is the \$6 million there that figure, or are the moneys that have recently been announced in addition to the capital moneys of \$6 million already listed here?

Then we come to the \$1 million for the Northern Alberta Children's hospital. I guess we can begin to ask a few more questions about when, why, and what is going on there. I'm still told that pediatric beds throughout the city of Edmonton are at a less than 60 percent occupancy rate, that there is a great concern among the medical community of the purported need for the Northern Alberta Children's hospital. Though the Premier obviously has given it his sanction and they're going ahead, is it still proposed to be a new freestanding, separate hospital with emergency, intensive care, and the whole ball of wax for \$100 million? Or is this \$1 million planning for a redevelopment of some other sites that might be more moderate, given both the need and the economic situation that the province is facing now and in the future? What is this million dollars doing, and what is the status of the plans for that hospital? Is there still some room for negotiation around that?

As has been raised in the Assembly in various ways in terms of both community-based hospitals and rural community-based hospital facilities, given the capital moneys that are going to those facilities, is the minister giving any consideration to in a sense converting some of the already existing beds in some of those facilities so that they are more than active treatment, so that perhaps they could become auxiliary care beds as well? I'm told from high sources that they have chronic low occupancy levels in some of these hospitals, that the communities and the people are clamouring for the use of those beds in ways other than active treatment care; i.e., auxiliary care. Despite the moneys going to continued capital funding for active treatment it seems, is there any proposal for multilevel care or for converting some of the active treatment beds for other uses, particularly for auxiliary care?

I'm glad to see, as we again talked about this morning, the sizable increases to long-term chronic care, as that represents at least one way to try to deal more effectively with the health care needs of the elderly and, particularly, the unmet need for more auxiliary care beds. As I learned this morning, these moneys are often set aside in estimates but not necessarily spent. Can the minister give us some assurance that the moneys to meet this urgent need and priority to build new chronic care beds is on stream? Is that going to meet the urgent need to have them operating sooner rather than later?

I think that concludes my comments and some of my concerns, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

MR. NELSON: Mr. Chairman, first of all, I would like to say that the construction program of the Department of Hospitals and Medical Care through the government of Alberta is one to be commended by all members and, I think, most citizens of the province. We have without doubt one of the finest medical programs, through the capital investment in these programs, anywhere in Canada and probably North America. I think we all have to examine that. There are, of course, some concerns I want to address relevant to the Peter Lougheed hospital. I'll basically just deal very briefly with the item we have before us, being the capital costs of the project. There are other concerns I have relevant to the hospital district running this show, which I can deal with at a different time.

I know the minister has indicated that the hospital will be completed on time and possibly ahead of the original schedule. But there are concerns — and the minister might just address this — relevant to the completion of the hospital and the nonfurnishing of some wards within that hospital. It is my understanding that the fifth floor of the hospital will not have beds or bed tables but in all other aspects it will be completed in total. I'd like some confirmation of that, as the expenditure there is considerable and it would appear that the moneys allocated are in tune for the completion of the facility.

Also, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the minister if he's had an opportunity to visit this project and also have an examination of the Calgary General hospital to determine, as funds are available, when we might have an examination of the proposed refurbishing or redevelopment of that very large facility. I'm sure if the minister hasn't already and he does make a tour through the General, he will understand the concern that I along with others have, especially as I did spend a couple of years with the board of the General, in that the General needs a considerable amount of money put into it to bring it up to modern-day standards. We have a 1950-odd facility with about a 1920 plan that was implemented many years ago. The hospital certainly needs some quick fixes rather than continually expending considerable dollars in the area of administrative and board offices, which are quite fancy compared to some of the areas where people have to work and our patients are asked to stay. When that was done I didn't appreciate our spending those kinds of moneys to give board members and senior executives of the hospital fancy-Dan facilities for their particular function. That in essence would suggest that we examine that particular facility for future upgrading to the standards that other facilities have and certainly for the care of our patients in Calgary.

I will repeat: the Calgary General hospital certainly needs a considerable amount of attention, and of course the one related to the Peter Lougheed hospital as far as its total completion is concerned.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before we proceed, I'd draw members' attention to the Capital Fund estimates, page 1, which is really the purpose of these estimates; that is, capital projects only.

MS BARRETT: Mr. Chairman, I just have a couple of remarks and questions for the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care. First of all, I'd like to know if it's part of the overall plan of his department to actively start promoting integrated health care facilities, particularly in environments which find it difficult to sustain individual chronic care

hospitals by virtue of being unable to hold staff, or actually in some instances lower than anticipated actual need for acute care facilities but perhaps higher than anticipated need for auxiliary facilities or even nursing homes, day therapy centres, and that sort of thing. I'm sure the minister is aware of the kind of proposal I'm making. What I'm asking for is the department's blueprint for the future with respect to construction here, particularly if the minister finds that during the process of construction the actual needs of the communities in which these projects might be planned or are already under way might in fact require more integrated multilevel care facilities.

The other question I have for the minister is if he will give his commitment to supporting the pilot project in Edmonton with respect to the Edmonton Chinese elders' building, the Mansion, which by the way is bridged with the Edmonton Chinese Multicultural Centre. I'm sure the minister and the minister of housing are aware of the proposal that is in front of the Alberta government at the moment. When the additional construction of housing units in that facility takes place, the proposal is that a nursing home cum auxiliary hospital facility actually be built in on a couple of floors. I'm a great proponent of this for a couple of reasons: partly because I know that it would be well used; secondly, because I think it recognizes a particular ethnocultural sensitivity to a community which has been instrumental in building our province and in fact is instrumental in keeping our province going from day to day; and finally, because I think this is a vitally important way for us to look at the expenditure of health care dollars.

The Official Opposition recognizes, as with every department in the province, that we have to spend the taxpayers' dollars in as careful and as efficient a manner as possible. It seems to me that the integrated service, which is under consideration of the minister's department now in conjunction with the Minister of Municipal Affairs, is a very timely example of a pilot project we could very feasibly be spending our money on at no risk at all, at the same time developing a means by which we can assess the overall efficacy of this project, particularly with respect to smaller communities in which it is proposed that we build additional auxiliary or nursing home or long-term chronic care facilities.

If the minister would respond to those two concerns, I'd be very pleased.

MR. EWASIUKE: Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak to the Capital Fund estimates. I want to initially place before the minister a lobby on behalf of the northeast quadrant of the city of Edmonton, and I think it's appropriate to do it under this vote: the need for some kind of active treatment hospital in that sector of the city. I know this proposal has been put forward by others before me, the need has been identified, and of course the need continues to exist even today. I want the minister to know that we still feel there is a need. Certainly when you're developing priorities in terms of development of active treatment hospitals, the northeast sector of Edmonton should be considered.

I also want to address this vote in terms of the long-term, chronically ill and supervised personal care. Those are the areas of my concern at the moment. This morning we had an interesting discussion in Public Accounts relative to the cost of our hospitals and medicare in the province. I think all of us are concerned about the escalating costs in that area. We also looked at a number of reasons why that is happening, and I'm sure all of them are valid. We

can certainly attempt to take measures to improve those escalating costs and try to bring them down.

One area that was not touched on this morning I think needs to be addressed. I have some statistics I received from one of the hospital boards in the city of Edmonton that deal with patients who have been assessed for auxiliary hospital care and are in fact in active treatment hospitals awaiting placement for auxiliary hospital care. The figures here demonstrate that this is not an immediate problem, something that developed recently; it is a problem that has been with the province for some time.

For example, in 1982 some 211 persons were occupying expensive active treatment beds while waiting to be placed in an auxiliary hospital. In 1983 the figure rose to some 225. This year, as of May 1986, the figure has continued to increase and is up to 273 people. That certainly is a use of an active treatment hospital that should be averted. I think it adds to the cost of the operation of that hospital. At the same time, there are people who really shouldn't be there. They're not comfortable being in an active treatment hospital. The doctors would prefer that they weren't there. The hospital administrators, if they want to run an efficient, effective hospital, would prefer that these types of patients be in an auxiliary hospital rather than an active treatment hospital.

Just to further extend the figures I have here, Mr. Chairman, the waiting list that now exists for auxiliary care in the Edmonton district — and I'll use hospital board district 24, which I have figures for. In 1976 there was a list of 325 people waiting to be placed in auxiliary care hospitals under the jurisdiction of district 24. In 1981 that increased to 487. As of May 1986, the figure has climbed to some 564 persons. Mr. Minister, that suggests to me there obviously is a need for an expansion or construction of additional auxiliary care. If not auxiliary care, I agree with what the minister said this morning, that they develop another process of home care and day care facilities or programs so we can accommodate particularly those who are occupying costly active treatment hospital beds and should in fact be in a less expensive auxiliary care hospital.

In addition to the auxiliary, there is also the need for expansion into the nursing home area, Mr. Chairman. Again, I have figures here from district 24 dating back to 1975. In 1975 there were some 231 people on a waiting list to be placed in nursing homes. Those figures have fluctuated somewhat, primarily because the Dickinsfield extended care facility came on stream and that alleviated the problem temporarily. However, in 1982 there were 112 people still on the waiting list; in 1983, 145 people; and in May of this year 110 people still awaiting placement in nursing home facilities — only those recorded by district 24. If you extend this to other boards across the province, of course, those figures would become quite significant.

When I look at the references to 1.8 and 1.9 in the summary of vote 1, there are significant percentage increases, 63.6 and 68.5, for both the auxiliary and nursing homes. One can be impressed that there is significant additional funding being made available in those areas. However, I think it's deceiving because the actual total increase for auxiliary care is a little over \$5 million and for the nursing home area only \$148,000.

Those are areas that I urge the minister and the government to give consideration to. We're dealing with probably the quickest growing population, our seniors. They are the ones who primarily occupy those facilities. While I certainly agree that we in the province of Alberta have good active

treatment hospitals, I wonder why we sometimes have two hospitals being built rather close together. There may be a reason for it; I'm not going to suggest there was any political influence there. I appreciate and take off my hat to the government for the development of hospitals, particularly in the rural areas. I think they need them to provide for those living in those areas.

I would again come back to my opening remarks. Northeast Edmonton has served as an area for penitentiaries and other government facilities. I only hope that the next project put into the northeast quarter of Edmonton is going to be an active treatment hospital.

Thank you.

MR. McEACHERN: Mr. Chairman, there are a few statistics in my presentation, but mainly I want to tell a sort of personal problem a couple of my constituents had to illustrate some of the problems in the extended health care system.

I got a call from a middle-aged gentlemen, later talked to his wife, and then talked to him again. I talked to the two of them several times over a number of days about a month or a month and a half ago. Their problem was this. They had an 80-year-old mother in the Charles Camsell hospital — her mother, I believe, if I remember right. She had been in the hospital for some time, and I gather her acute problems were dealt with. It was felt that she was ready for an extended care facility, and she had been placed on a waiting list. They wanted her to go to Dickinsfield, but she was placed on the list along with everybody else and was slated to go, they felt within a few weeks, to Mill Woods instead. They protested and followed every possible line of complaint to everybody they could possibly think of, and when they finally gave up themselves, they phoned and asked me if I could do anything. So I started to follow the case and talked to a number of people to see if I could do anything. I admit that I also had to give up.

The story went something like this. I talked to the administrator at the Charles Camsell hospital. I talked to the people at the central placement office, finally getting to the lady who was basically in charge. She said there was something like a 500- to 600-person waiting list to get into Dickinsfield and that it was taking two to three years on the waiting list to get people into that facility. These people's particular problem was that the man worked and the wife, who wanted to visit her mother fairly regularly, was not too confident in her driving ability and felt that if the mother was moved from the north side over to the Mill Woods site, she would only get there a couple of times a month as opposed to two or three times a week when she was in Charles Camsell or where she would be in the Dickinsfield centre.

They were wondering if there was any way you could change the priorities of who moved where. They had given up and seemed to run into a stone wall with everybody they talked to. So they talked to me, and I went through the same process and talked to all the same people. I asked the administrator at the Charles Camsell hospital about how you could change the priority. Instead of sending this lady to Mill Woods — she's number 3 on the list or something — couldn't you send number 8 or 10 on the list if they are willing to go to Mill Woods rather than to Dickinsfield? He said there was no guarantee that that next person was intended for Dickinsfield or anywhere else either. And it wasn't his problem; it was the problem of the central placement office.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. member, I'm reluctant to interrupt. The Department of Hospitals and Medical Care estimates have been passed by the House.

MR. McEACHERN: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're dealing now with the capital estimates only. If the member could ...

MR. McEACHERN: Well, I suppose this does relate ...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Could the hon. member attempt to keep his comments within that range of the capital projects.

MR. McEACHERN: Okay. I'll move to the point a little more quickly then. It is related to the number of facilities in the area of the north side of the river and the number of people who want into those facilities. In that sense I think it is very closely related to the capital expenditures made available for the number of beds in auxiliary hospitals. I'm sorry that I hadn't sort of related it to that as specifically as I might have.

If you look at the facilities we have, we have acute care facilities, extended care facilities, nursing facilities, and then home care facilities. Our problem surely is to make sure that we don't use acute care when extended care would do, that we don't use nursing care when home care would do and so on, and that we use the cheaper one each time. The number of facilities and the placement of those facilities becomes a very important consideration, even when you're doing capital expenditures for facilities.

In any case the Charles Camsell was not willing to say, "Well, this person will stay at this number and not be sent out; when her turn comes, we'll send somebody else instead who wants to go to Mill Woods," basically because they have pressures on them, of course, to run an efficient ship. I realize that at that stage I'm talking about operating costs for a moment.

Then I got on to the placement people. They listened with a certain amount of compassion and understanding and said they felt a certain amount of sympathy for these people. In fact, I heard the story before directly from those people. They said, "If you think this is bad, how about the gentleman who is 80 years old and does not drive any more, does not even have a licence any more, and his wife is the one who is slotted to go to the south side?" I guess what I'm raising at this stage, Mr. Chairman, is the need for the government to look very carefully at the number of extended care facilities available in the different regions of the city and the need to have them scattered around the community so that people don't have to be placed under a great deal of hardship. We know the importance for 80-year-old people to be visited by their families. It just seemed like we built in a bureaucratic sort of set procedure that we had to follow, was inevitable, and could not be changed because of where things were. A couple making a perfectly reasonable request was totally unable to get satisfaction because there are other cases that are much worse, and even those could not be accommodated. That was the point I wanted to make, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you.

MRS. HEWES: Mr. Chairman, I just have a few comments and questions for the minister. Yes, this is indeed a very large budget, some \$281 million. I think it's important that

we ensure our expenditures produce maximum results. The dollars we spend, however large they are, don't necessarily guarantee that we have the efficiency of operation and the quality of care in our health care systems that all of us want to see available to everyone in the province.

Mr. Chairman, on the first page, in vote 1, I'd like to ask the minister if in fact the capital improvements in either these major urban or other referral centres or, in fact, the community-based hospitals on the next page are capital improvements included in existing facilities that will accommodate the needs of adjusting to accepting involuntary patients with mental disturbance. One of my favourite questions, Mr. Chairman — and perhaps the minister can inform me — is whether any of these capital expenditures include those kinds of improvements which will inevitably have to be made if centres are to be designated for this purpose, which I believe they should be.

The other thing I would like assurance on, Mr. Chairman, is the Royal Alex hospital with the expenditure of \$1.1 million, almost \$1.2 million. Will that in fact take care of their requirements to bring that hospital up to the operating level that was so dramatically described before the last election, where they have excellent equipment and a very dedicated and sufficient staff but they're gravely hampered by lack of space requirements? I think the citizens of Edmonton need to know that that amount will allow the Royal Alex to bring itself to a proper and efficient operating level.

Mr. Chairman, on the next page, still continuing in vote 1, I have a few questions particularly concerning the community-based facilities, over 40 beds and under 40 beds. I would just like to say that I support the improvements to the Alberta Hospital, Ponoka. I think this will be a great improvement in our total mental health care services throughout the province. I'm pleased to see those are in. But in the 1.6 column, I wonder if the minister would be good enough to explain to me what is included in 1.6.4, community-based facilities, in the amount of \$57,471,000 and what the breakdown of that rather large expenditure consists of? I think I need to know in the 1.6 column and the 1.7 column how many hospitals we're talking about and how many beds we're talking about providing or extending to those hospitals. There is an expenditure in those two of approximately \$85.5 million, and I'd like to know what it is that that expenditure will provide in addition to what we presently have.

Mr. Chairman, I'd just like to add a few of my comments to those that have already been made about long-term chronic care. The 1.8 section: in spite of the fact that it appears to be a fairly substantial increase, 63.6 percent, it's not enough in my mind. I feel that this is the one part of our health care operation that is going to give us the most efficiency both economically and in human life.

The hon. Member for Edmonton Highlands has already spoken about the nursing home for Chinese citizens, hopefully to be built in conjunction with the Chinese Elders Mansion in the city of Edmonton. While I'm very familiar with it, I understand that in some cases we're reluctant to build specialized nursing care facilities for special groups in our community. But I would submit, Mr. Chairman, that we have already done this. There are a number of ethnic groups, people of different national origins, who have organized themselves and appealed to the government for assistance and in fact have secured it — not to say that those nursing homes they construct and operate are exclusive to that particular group, but they do in fact cater and try to make certain particular services available to them.

I think this is absolutely essential in this case with our Chinese community. The elderly Chinese in particular suffer from isolation. I believe we really need to respond to the Chinese society's requests to the province and accede to their requests so that the elders will be able to move easily from the Chinese Elders Mansion into some kind of minimum level and even greater nursing care. Their needs for socialization, their language needs, and in fact their nutritional needs and habits are quite different and really are not and cannot be accommodated in some of the other extended care facilities we have.

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask the minister if he would comment on rationalizing all of our hospital services throughout the province. We constantly hear comments that numbers of smaller hospitals and hospitals throughout Alberta are unable to make total use of their facilities as active treatment hospitals due either to lack of staff or a change in the demand in the catchment area they serve. Like most people in the House, I have complete respect for the desires of residents of our province to have easy access to hospital and health care. I think most people really believe that we have a grand plan and that it is a rational plan and it extends right across our province. But in light of the information about the smaller hospitals, I believe we should know from the minister: are new hospitals being constructed within a provincial rationalized plan for comprehensive health care, including extended care and multilevel care facilities?

Certainly economies can be achieved if our plan is comprehensive in that fashion. We all know that many of our citizens shouldn't be in acute care and are there simply because they cannot get into auxiliary hospitals because there are insufficient numbers of beds in their area or insufficient numbers in general. Mr. Chairman, it's not a problem, I submit, of the placement service. The problem is with the constraints. There are too few beds available for extended care. We have a desperate need for these services to be developed in that rational fashion. That includes not only acute care but multilevel convalescent care and extended care to those with chronic treatment needs. The cost to the taxpayer is higher than it needs to be. There's no question that the human cost, hard as it may be to measure, is very visible to all of us.

My last question, Mr. Chairman, is: if the minister's answer is that there is a provincial rationalized plan for all hospitals and health care facilities — and I hope the answer to that is yes; I need the confidence of that answer — I'd like to know if that plan includes a public/private provincial/municipal program for a standardized ambulance service. I believe that should be an indigenous part of a rational health care system in any province and certainly a province such as ours. I think consideration of it is overdue.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Mr. Chairman, there have been some important questions posed this afternoon. If it would assist the process to have the minister respond to any of the questions, I'd be quite happy to let my name drop in order to allow him the time to answer those questions this afternoon.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, hon. member. The Member for Calgary Millican.

MR. SHRAKE: Mr. Chairman, I think a lot of the members have spoken about the need for auxiliary hospital beds, and I won't go into that. In Calgary we do have a problem with that. I think the previous minister wove his way through

the Holy Cross. He had a plan that probably would have solved the problem, but he got into the war of save the Holy Cross. Then he transferred the problem to the Belcher. Unfortunately, that didn't work out; our veterans were not too happy. But I think he's on the right track on that, so I won't go into that one.

The Member for Edmonton Beverly hit upon one of the problems in Calgary, the percentage of our population that is over 60. This segment is growing, and needless to say, the need for nursing homes is increasing. I think there is now a waiting list in Calgary, and we have the problem of putting capital funds into your budget or you put it in and we build a nursing home or we go the better route, which is the one I advocate and I think is the one that's been most successful; that is, we just grant additional approval for the private enterprise nursing home operators to build additional nursing homes if they go through the process and get the approval of hospital board No. 7. But if we get into that route ...

The Edmonton group has been speaking of something which is being addressed in Edmonton. I think we have the same thing in Calgary but much more so; that is, the need for a Chinese nursing home. If we can get a Chinese nursing home, whether from your capital funding or we go the better route and let the private enterprise people build and run it and we put in the subsidy, we would probably free close to 100 beds in all the other nursing homes in Calgary. More than that, we'd do one heck of a humanitarian service. For the Chinese to put their people, their parents, in a nursing home is a very traumatic thing. To them it's like putting their parents in prison, because when they go there they cannot speak the language. Very few people in nursing homes can speak Chinese. To go into a totally different cuisine — they are used to a very rich diet with their variety of vegetable and rice dishes. Frankly, I like their food better than food I've seen in nursing homes. If they go into one of the normal nursing homes available right now, they're looking at thin slices of roast beef, peas, carrots, corn — this type of food — and the old traditional slice of bread, or you get soup and crackers and these types of things.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. member, I hesitate to interrupt, but building a facility is a long way from crackers and soup. If you could keep your thoughts on the construction ...

MR. SHRAKE: I'm hoping the minister will address this, take a look at his budgets, and if in the near future a proposal comes in from the Chinese community in Calgary, give some very favourable response to it. There are some dynamic groups that could get involved with the nursing homes, maybe save us a few dollars. You talk about organizations and groups. The Chinese community in Calgary has more dynamic groups than you can shake a stick at, and they do look after their seniors. If we had a Chinese nursing home, I think we could count on heavy involvement and donations of cash from the Chinatown Lions Club, the United Calgary Chinese Association, the Oui Kwan Foundation, the Chinese cultural association, all of the tongs. For the benefit of members that don't know what a tong is, it's not a sinister Chinese organization. A tong simply means "a family group." A Scotsman would probably say "a clan." I hope the minister will seriously consider either capital funds for a nursing home in Calgary or else look favourably if district No. 7 approves another nursing home, hopefully a Chinese nursing home.

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to try and respond to some of the questions that were put. First of all, with respect to comments from the hon. Member for Edmonton Centre, it would be a good opportunity right now to explain the budgetary process. The Provincial Treasurer, who is here, might correct me if I'm wrong, but my understanding is that the Capital Fund amounts for hospitals and medical care would have to be voted each year. There was \$281,128,000 voted this year, and if we don't use all of that, naturally it would remain but would have to be voted again another year. In my view there isn't any problem at all with the process.

I should explain as well the situation with regard to how we actually fund capital projects in this department. We don't decide that a certain hospital is going to be built or upgraded — say the Mill Woods hospital; it cost \$122 million — and put all the funds into the budget. We try to project how much is going to be needed each fiscal year for the hospital, and each fiscal year we add inflationary amounts, make corrections on our figures, and try to judge what's required. So sometimes there are dollars that aren't used. Other times we have to pass special warrants. Last year we had some of each because we misjudged the progress that might be made by the hospital board in planning, tendering, construction, and whatever. Sometimes we've got a facility that's complete.

This morning we were dealing in Public Accounts with the fact that we were trying to purchase the Lethbridge hospital from its private sector owners and didn't get the official deal signed before the fiscal year ended, so it had to be funded out of a new budget even though officials in my department made attempts to fund it out of the previous budget. So we don't have to worry about — once we've made a commitment, a project is developed and started, we pay for it, and the figures you see here are simply our estimate of the cash flow required during the course of the year.

The hon. Member for Edmonton Centre also asked about the funding formula in terms of operating costs versus capital, and at the present time, in two and a half years we spend as much on operating costs as it costs to build a hospital, on average. Things can be different from that depending where you're at. So in other words, if you spend \$100 million in 1986 building a brand-new hospital, one can expect that you'll spend about \$40 million a year operating that hospital in future years. Now you can't go into this vote and look at \$281 million and say, "There's going to be a requirement for 40 percent of that amount in extra, additional operating costs," because many of these expenditures are to replace existing facilities. There's \$19,260,000 for minor construction, which is upgrading existing facilities, which sometimes might even save operating costs and improve the efficiency of a hospital. I would have to sort of ferret them all out and look at which ones are brand-new facilities before actually saying how much these expenditures will increase operating costs.

While I'm on that subject, I might say that our major area of concern in Hospitals and Medical Care has to be not the capital that's in here, which is one time only, but the resulting operating expenditures which are going to occur year after year. The fact is that there is no lid on a demand-driven service like hospital services and once you open a hospital or build a bed somebody fills it — and we're going to have to deal very, very quickly with the hard facts of life when it comes to the increase in the Hospitals and Medical Care budget. We're going to have to find ways

to put some limits on the operating cost increases that occur each and every year, and that may well be doing what the Ontario government did a number of years ago. They stopped building, period, everywhere in the province, and we may have to look at that as well.

If I could go to the Foothills versus Mackenzie Health Sciences: the differences again are explained by the fact that we budget for what is actually going to occur in that fiscal year, and the University Hospital Mackenzie Health Sciences Centre is funded from the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. Foothills in Calgary is not.

I could move to some comments relative to the Ponoka facility. The amounts that are in this year's budget are largely for the activity and treatment centre which is now under construction, some planning funds for the other work that is going to be carried out that will be funded in years to come in terms of the progress that the hospital board is making.

The current status of the Northern Alberta Children's hospital is simply this: a board has been put in place; they've got some headquarters in Edmonton that they're working out of. They're working with other organizations, hospitals, pediatricians, and so on in the city of Edmonton in terms of planning. The first major decision to be made is a site for the hospital. I met with the board this morning. They hoped that they would have a recommendation to our government on the siting of it within about six months. They then have to start planning the kind of facility that is needed for the city of Edmonton.

There are 500-plus pediatric beds in Edmonton now. We believe that the Northern Alberta Children's hospital should contain 200 to 250 beds. There is no doubt that most of the other beds will need to be phased out because they are not required. Frankly, I think it's a very good decision to bring the pediatric services for northern Alberta under one roof. There is no question that the way they are scattered throughout the city now, in many cases the pediatricians and their patients are treated as second-class citizens in the hospitals. There are other things that take precedence. To bring them all under one roof and under one board will provide the pediatric services here that are second to none, and I think we can look at the other facilities that exist now and use them for perhaps chronic care. There are a lot of other things that could be done. There are opportunities to alter what is being done at the active treatment hospitals now in pediatrics to serve other areas.

To move quickly to the comments by the hon. Member for Calgary North West, the Peter Lougheed hospital will be completed on schedule, opening next year. It's on budget as well. The Calgary General upgrading program is a subject of some, considerable concern. Originally the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care suggested the approved maximum figure for upgrading should be \$100 million. The Calgary General came back and said it needs to be \$140 million. That issue has by no means been resolved. We are now considering the submission of the Calgary General in terms of those cost differences, and in due course we'll have to make a decision.

The hon. Member for Edmonton Highlands talked about integrated hospital facilities, a day care and therapy centres, and all I can say in that regard is that in my view there is a lot of work that yet needs to be done to determine the future direction of health care, particularly for elderly people. I think we've probably got enough nursing homes in Alberta right now to last us for a very long time. If we start doing some more innovative things like day hospitals

and more effective home care programs, which we're working on, I think there's literally no end to the new things we can do with respect to the care of the elderly. One of my major challenges over the next four years is going to be to try to set us on a direction for care of elderly people that is quite different from what we've known in the past, where we just simply institutionalize them when they get old and sort of forget about them. So I welcome any member's input to the kind of things we can do.

I think the field is unlimited, not just in Alberta but right across the country and in the western world. We've got a lot of things we're learning and a lot more things we need to learn about care of the elderly, and that could include — for instance, I don't see anything magic about saying that elderly citizens who need to be hospitalized in auxiliary hospitals can't, in rural communities in particular, be in active treatment hospitals. We've always sort of said, "Well, we have to build an auxiliary hospital." I'm not sure why. Maybe we could simply say that some of the active treatment beds in this hospital should be designated long-term beds and quit worrying about it, because a lot of them are now, and then provide some programming in that hospital for those auxiliary patients. In my community hospital of 40 beds there might be eight long-term care patients in an active treatment hospital programmed to provide services to them, not frustrated because they're not active treatment patients.

The Chinese elders. There are two questions there. The first one is: how do we fund a nursing home component? We don't have a policy of providing capital funding to private sector or voluntary groups who are building nursing homes. I'm working now and trying to develop one. Most of the voluntary organizations like the Lutheran society and others who've built nursing homes in this province have done so with their own funds that they've raised in various ways. The Lutherans right now are building in both Airdrie and Cochrane some very effective multicare facilities that include self-contained units, apartments, and nursing homes, but we're not sharing in any of the capital cost, only paying the per diem amounts. That has to be dealt with. The second thing is: how large should a nursing home be? You can't build it large enough to accommodate whatever people need nursing home accommodations because it generally is going to be dedicated to people of Chinese culture, and it's appropriate that it should be. So we have to decide whether it's 50 beds or 75, and the jury is still out on that. We're having discussions with them and hopefully will get to some conclusion before too long.

The hon. Member for Edmonton Beverly, who I know is a board member of one of the hospitals here — I presume still is, and likely will not be when the reappointments are made after the next election — raised the matter of auxiliary care in Edmonton, and I spoke just now about day hospitals and outpatient sorts of facilities for seniors. We recognize the need for additional auxiliary hospital facilities and will be moving as fast as we can, in addition to the designation of the Mill Woods hospital, with those facilities.

The hon. Member for Edmonton Kingsway raised the issue of placement. That's a tough one. I don't know how to resolve it. There are all kinds of people who have favourite spots they'd like their loved ones, relatives, mother, or father to stay in, but somebody has to make a decision that the patient is best suited to this facility or there is room in this one and not in this one. All we can do is live with that problem and try to improve it so that we satisfy the most people we possibly can.

The hon. Member for Edmonton Gold Bar raised the admittance of involuntary patients in our active treatment hospitals and whether or not they're ready. I have to say this: I think over at least the last four or five years, every hospital we've upgraded or planned that it was intended to have involuntary mental patients in that hospital, the planning has been done. For example, in the Grande Prairie regional hospital that just opened a year or so ago, the planning was done to accommodate those types of patients in terms of security and so on both to themselves and to the other patients and the staff in the hospital. I don't foresee any problem with meeting the criteria I outlined in the Legislature a while ago of having a number of community-based facilities designated as hospitals to receive involuntary patients meet the deadline — I believe it's about 20 hospitals — by 1989. So that should proceed.

The expenditures on the Royal Alex of a million dollars in this budget are mostly planning dollars for the larger program. We haven't budgeted in this year's budget for any upgrading at the Royal Alex because we're simply not ready. We'll be some months yet before we decide exactly what upgrading would be done and the cost of that, and we will see the first amounts for the actual work occur next year.

Community-based hospitals: over 40 beds, \$57 million. They're at Camrose, St. Mary's, a replacement facility; St. Albert general, a replacement; Wetaskiwin General, a new hospital; Banff, Mineral Springs, a new hospital; Blairmore, Cold Lake, new hospitals; Lloydminster, a new hospital; McLennan, a new hospital; Olds, Ponoka, new hospitals; an addition at St. Paul; and new hospitals at Stettler and Westlock. That's about the list. I'd be prepared to provide a copy of the actual work that's going on to any hon. member who would like it. They're listed in the book for convenience sake as a group. I appreciate that members may want to know more.

Mr. Chairman, just to conclude with some comments about ambulance services, again a question asked by the hon. Member for Edmonton Gold Bar. I think we have a very good ambulance service in the province. Yes, it could be improved upon, and I'm presently reviewing how that can be done. I hasten to add that in my view the province taking over the system will add large, large amounts to the cost. I'd like at any cost to avoid our getting into a provincewide ambulance scheme where we simply have no control over costs. I think the municipalities do an excellent job of controlling the costs and still providing the service. So we're reviewing that, and I hope within the next year to be able to have something more definitive to say about what our objectives are with respect to ambulance services in the province. I recognize the hon. member's concern.

Mr. Chairman, I think that answered most of the questions that were addressed.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Mr. Chairman, I have a few comments, but in view of the hour I presume there would

be a desire of the Assembly to adjourn very quickly. Will this be raised for five or 10 minutes at some later date in order to ...

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I could answer that. The Committee of Supply would sit again on these estimates on Friday. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

MR. GOGO: 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, 1987, sums from the Alberta Capital Fund not exceeding the following for the department and purpose indicated:

Advanced Education: \$51,668,000 for construction of postsecondary education facilities.

MR. SPEAKER: Having heard the report, would those in favour please say aye.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed, please say no.

MR. ALGER: No.

MR. SPEAKER: Carried.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, if I may. I erred in the report. The Committee of Supply has had under consideration certain resolutions, reports progress thereon, and requests leave to sit again.

MR. SPEAKER: Then the Member for Highwood was entirely correct.

Having heard the report and request for leave to sit again, does the Assembly agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed, if any. Carried.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, tomorrow night the Assembly will deal with certain second readings. It's proposed to start with Bill 30 and, if there is time, Bill 17 and Bill 11. I should say that on Friday, if there is time beyond the Committee of Supply, those same Bills would be for consideration on second reading.

[At 5:30 p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 4, the House adjourned to Thursday at 2:30 p.m.]

