

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Title: **Monday, March 30, 1987 8:00 p.m.**

Date: 87/03/30

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

head: **COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY**

[Mr. Gogo in the Chair]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Will the Committee of Supply please come to order. Before we proceed, there has been a request that we revert to Introduction of Special Guests. Would the committee agree if we revert briefly to introduce special guests?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. Member for Cypress-Redcliff.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

MR. HYLAND: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to introduce four members of the Western Canadian Wheat Growers Association who have met with government members: Jim Miller from Rockyford, Jack Gore from Three Hills, John Graham from Vulcan, and Ron Hireth from Milk River. They're standing in the members' gallery, and I'd ask them to be welcomed to the House in the usual manner.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, it gives me pleasure this evening to introduce six members of the Alberta Grain Commission, also in the members' gallery: Chairman Ken Beswick from Spring Coulee; John Vos from Keg River; Doug Cooper from Lacombe; Jack Gore again from Three Hills, a man of many talents; Dennis Hueppelsheuser from Blackfalds; and Ken Motiuk from Mundare. Please welcome them.

head: **COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY**
(continued)

Department of Public Works, Supply and Services

MR. CHAIRMAN: The authority for the votes is found on the pages facing the votes, beginning with page 272. The Hon. Ernie Isley is the minister. Mr. Minister, would you care to make some opening comments relative to your votes?

MR. ISLEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The 1987-88 budget for my department reflects a realistic approach toward providing required support services for the government during a time of economic restraint. The budget for my department is a reflection of my government's commitment to reduce the size of the deficit and thereby not leave a legacy of debt to our children. In that regard, the total funding requirements for my department for 1987-88 have been reduced by 16.3 percent. Included in that reduction are 295.1 full-time equivalent man-years, which includes 162 permanent positions. The decreases in budget funding in manpower have been accomplished by reviewing and streamlining all operations of the department. I am pleased to announce that of the total manpower decreases, the department served only 22 notices of position abolishment to permanent

employees in 1986-87. The remaining reductions in manpower needed for a more efficient operation were accomplished through careful manpower planning which provided a base of vacant jobs to be eliminated, thereby minimizing the impact on permanent employees of the department.

My department began its downsizing program in 1983-84. Since that time a total of 814 permanent positions have been eliminated from this department, resulting in a lean and efficient organization which continues to provide required services to the citizens of Alberta in a more expeditious manner. Although every program in my department has experienced a reduction for 1987-88, the decreases were done in a manner which will allow Public Works, Supply and Services to provide the necessary and sufficient resources in order that other program departments in the government may deliver their programs to the citizens of this province. I feel that all employees of my department are to be congratulated for holding the lid on expenditures while at the same time continuing to provide quality service and assistance to other areas of this government.

In conjunction with my government's belief that the private sector will provide the engine for economic recovery, we have, where possible, attempted to provide additional fuel for that engine by privatizing whatever functions can be delivered more effectively and efficiently by the private sector. Our construction program has always been highly privatized, and we are moving more in that direction in the area of property management, thereby allowing many small firms in the province to compete for projects which would otherwise have been delivered exclusively by the government. It should be noted that wherever cuts have occurred in line activities within my department, there has been a corresponding decrease in the administrative budget as well.

Despite a decrease in the amount of funds for the capital construction program in 1987-88, sufficient dollars have been retained to ensure orderly completion of existing projects and provide for many new construction projects of various sizes and complexities throughout Alberta. Furthermore, our system of tendering jobs to the private sector ensures that any interested firms are given the opportunity to bid on projects anywhere within the province. We feel it is imperative to continue our capital construction program at the current high level of expenditure per capita to ensure that the province obtains the facilities required for delivery of government programs and to provide jobs required in the construction sector.

It should be stressed that facilities we are building today are energy efficient and that many facilities today are replacing older buildings that have outlived their useful life. By proceeding with this program, we save in two ways: firstly, the province gets the facilities it needs to provide services to the people of Alberta; secondly, the overall operating cost for government facilities decreased, which leads to further savings for the taxpayer.

Not only are we replacing facilities that have become outdated and costly to run; we are also renovating existing facilities which have useful years in them but can be operated more efficiently through replacement or repair of building operating systems. Our program of planned preventive maintenance is aimed at not only ensuring the preservation of the multibillion dollar physical plant the government has but also striving to operate it at the most efficient level possible. This program provides jobs to many firms in the economy and helps to ensure that Alberta's scarce resources are used wisely.

Some examples of the above construction or renovation pro-

jects are: the new Correctional Centre at Fort Saskatchewan. This project is designed to replace the existing jail at Fort Saskatchewan, which has served this province well throughout its life but is becoming increasingly expensive and difficult to maintain. Retrofits to the northern and southern jubilee auditoriums: these major retrofit programs will ensure that Albertans will continue to have the use of these facilities for many years to come. Young offenders centres in Edmonton and Calgary: with the implementation of the Young Offenders Act, new facilities were required to meet the conditions imposed by the legislation. These facilities are on stream in terms of completion and will provide for the administration of justice in regard to young offenders for many future generations. The Baker centre, Calgary: a total of \$5.8 million next year is being provided for a new facility for medically dependent handicapped, a total of 10 new group homes, and a new structure to accommodate day programs at the centre. Six point four million dollars has been allocated to upgrade or replace facilities at Michener Centre, Red Deer. The Rosehaven Care Centre in Camrose: funds are contained in this budget to plan and commence a 100-bed psychogeriatric unit at this site. Claresholm Care Centre: \$1.2 million provided in this budget to replace the existing Starholm unit and to do repair and maintenance on mechanical systems in other buildings.

As you can see from the above examples, the projects contained in the 1987-88 capital budget for my department are intended to facilitate delivery of needed programs for the people of this province. The fact that we are proceeding with these facilities at a difficult time in the Alberta economy indicates our sincere commitment to providing services to Albertans and to assisting the construction sector of our province at a time when they are experiencing difficulties. In summary, we have changed with the times and have adopted a lean and trim posture which will allow us to continue to provide assistance to other government departments in this time of economic restraint.

I would be pleased to discuss the details of the 1987-88 budget or respond to any questions hon. members may have. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. Member for Edmonton Beverly.

MR. EWASIUK: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. First, let me express some frustration again with the budget forms. I feel that the way the budget is spelled out, not only in this estimate but in all provincial estimates that have been before us, lacks information, and it's impossible to make a proper analysis of really where the expenditures are. I think this kind of budget is really a discredit to the members of this Assembly and to Albertans.

Mr. Speaker, the Department of Public Works, Supply and Services is really a service department, therefore when you speak to the estimates of this department, you really almost have to address virtually all the departments because they make demands of this service to provide service for them. So I think in looking through the estimates you have to address the various provincial departments.

Something I've counted as quite evident throughout the estimates -- I don't think the minister has alluded to it -- is that there certainly have been major cuts in all government departments. I guess one can't be particularly surprised in light of the fact that this appears to be the strategy of the government. I suppose we could have anticipated that this would happen in this particular department.

Mr. Chairman, the Official Opposition also felt that in light of the proposed \$3 billion deficit that this province was facing, it was necessary for us to also deal with an analysis of the various provincial departments and to suggest to the government areas where cuts could be made to try to cope with this particular deficit. During our studies of the departments some things became very evident to us. There was a lot of waste in the government, not to mention the pork-barreling that exists throughout the various departments. Our studies certainly proved our suspicion to that effect.

One of the major factors that seems to be highlighted throughout this particular estimate, and I think through all departmental estimates, is that this government is particularly top heavy. I think you can start by saying the cabinet is top heavy. When you compare the cabinet of this province to, say, three others which have populations greater than ours, we still have the largest cabinet in Canada. When you then calculate the deputy ministers, the associate deputy ministers, the directors, and so on and they're taken into account, you can see that we have a heavy and expensive bureaucracy. As the minister has indicated, his department, but also all other departments, have made efforts to reduce manpower. Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, it would seem that most of the reductions have occurred in the lower scales, and consequently what we have here is a triangle with the top-heavy management sort of tapering down to the worker category. I certainly think that's not an efficient government that's attempting to deal with a deficit.

Another startling revelation here is that your deputy ministers and acting deputy ministers in almost all departments are again amongst the highest paid in Canada. Now one can't argue ...

AN HON. MEMBER: Not true.

MR. EWASIUK: Yes, it is. One can argue that we need to attract capable, competent people, and to do that you have to pay them. You don't argue with that rationalization. However, when you compare ours -- our deputy ministers range in area from \$59,000 to \$97,000 compared to Ontario, the second highest, with \$77,000 to \$91,000 -- we are higher.

Let me also, for an example, point out the Social Services Department, where they spend some \$5.4 million on the minister's office and the deputy minister and associate ministers -- \$5.4 million in a department that has reduced people in the field. Again, it seems to me that the priorities in terms of reducing costs or reducing manpower are certainly not done right by this government.

Earlier I stated that the estimates reflected all departments have made cuts. I also referred to the study that we did. The recommendation we have suggested was the government could indeed have reduced expenditures by some \$751 million, and if you add the possibility of amalgamating some of the cabinet positions and eliminating some of the expenses in that area, you could quite easily add another \$11 million.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Hon. member, the Chair is having some difficulty in that these are not the Premier's estimates, they are Public Works, Supply and Services. Perhaps those comments should not be addressed to reducing the size of the cabinet but indeed perhaps reducing the size of a department.

Hon. Member for Edmonton Beverly.

MR. EWASIUK: Well... [interjection] No, it's not. It could have been, because that's the way this government has been making changes since last year -- except cut people services. They cut people services.

I might tell you, Mr. Chairman, that our analysis of the department suggested that cuts needed to be made; no question. However, I think the cuts should not have been made in people services, as this government has done. Going through some of the estimates that we have before us, for example, in Advanced Education 44.4 percent has been cut; in Education, a very people oriented department, 45.8 percent has been cut. Perhaps the minister may want to respond to those eventually.

However, I want to commend the Department of Labour, where they are going to spend over a million dollars on a fire training centre in Vermilion. That's in the estimates, and I think that is a good project and I commend the department for it. It's difficult to understand why we are either closing or not continuing with development of public buildings throughout the province. Going back to Education, we have a 50 percent cut in the portable classroom facilities for. I suspect, the various parts of the province; and here again, we have information where students are required to sit in hallways and gymnasiums because there is a lack of facilities. Again, not necessarily the fault of this department, but I'm simply speaking in general because this department handles those responsibilities for the other departments.

I am disappointed that the vocational centre in Lac La Biche looks like it is not going to continue, because all the funding has been cut for that facility.

Another major concern has to be the Department of Community and Occupational Health, where a 51.5 percent cut is shown here from last year. Again, where large money was initially spent, I'm assuming either this project has been completed or obviously it has been put on hold. It appears throughout the estimates that many facilities have either been discontinued or put on hold. I suppose that's a way of saving money. On the other hand, when you have the high unemployment rate that this province is experiencing, it seems to me it would be quite proper to proceed with the facilities in light of the fact that the wage rates have certainly decreased substantially and, I would imagine, the cost of materials also has decreased. So it seems to me that we would be fulfilling a need if the departments proceeded with some of the facilities rather than holding back and waiting for the recession to cease and then the costs will gradually increase and consequently the facilities we will still need to build will cost us more in the future.

I am also somewhat concerned, Mr. Chairman, about the rapid wholesale attempts to privatize in this department. Now, one can argue that privatization may very well serve to cut costs, but there is a problem with wholesale privatization that seems to be the trend in this department, because on a long-term basis privatization is going to be a high cost to the taxpayers of this province. One need only look at some of the experiences where indeed privatization has occurred in other jurisdictions, where equipment has been sold, where experienced manpower has left the area. When private enterprise was unable to continue to provide the service, the government had to resume that particular service at a substantial, higher cost. I think when you privatize, one has to be very cognizant of some long-term effects this may have on the operations and the services that you will be providing for the community or the province.

I again come back to some of the estimates and the projections of deletions, particularly in the public works department

where I take it that they have taken their own volition to eliminate the provision of public buildings. Again, throughout the province it seems to me there is a need -- there obviously must have been a need. You recognized the need initially, and yet now you've found reason not to proceed with these facilities. These are buildings that would obviously be providing services to the communities they serve, where people who require government services would have a facility where they can deal with government people. I appreciate the expenditures that are being made that the minister alluded to. One couldn't help but detect the fact that many of them made reference to the penal areas, where we were building, of course, the new detention centres. Those had to be built because of the takeover from the federal government. But additional expenditures are being spent for jails and penitentiaries to contain people, when on the other hand you would think we would be attempting to alleviate that particular problem by providing employment which would, in my estimation, dispel some of the crime that seems to be occurring throughout the province and the need for jails.

I note that Social Services has requested -- or at least we are not proceeding with the group homes in Lethbridge and Olds. Again, unless they have been completed, there seem to be no expenditures in that area, and perhaps the minister may want to address those questions. Also, the Youth Assessment Centre in Lac La Biche: surely in that particular portion of our province a facility of that nature is a requirement. The same applies to the assessment centres in Medicine Hat and Grande Prairie. It seems, if you follow this very closely, that the areas where need seems to be most prevalent are the areas where the government has chosen to make their cuts. That's unfortunate. Mr. Chairman, because what we're doing again is eliminating the services for people while attempting to bring the deficit in line. We should not be doing that on the backs of the people of this province.

I think Mr. Chairman, that pretty well covers the kinds of comments I wanted to make on this department, other than to conclude that I appreciate there need to be cuts; we all know that. When we are in a recession, there is the need and there is the continual reference being made to us about spend, spend, spend. We certainly concur that there have to be some strings pulled to stop the spending, but I think you have to prioritize the spending, and the spending seems to be -- and I repeat, in these estimates we're cutting people services rather than attempting to help those we're elected to help.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. minister.

MR. ISLEY: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Just a few comments in reply. I had some difficulty with the hon. Member for Edmonton Beverly's concern about not being able to understand the format and then not raising many questions where I could assist him with that understanding. I did detect some mixed reaction as to cuts. I heard comments that maybe we had cut too deep, then I heard comments that cuts were needed, and then I heard concern expressed about various projects that were cut. So I'm not sure whether the hon. member is saying "You cut too much" or "You should cut deeper."

I'd like to make a comment or two about the concern that was raised on privatization. Privatization is not something new with respect to the Department of Public Works, Supply and Services. As I mentioned in my opening comments, privatization is very extensive in the construction field. Ninety-seven

percent of our consulting costs for architects, engineers, planning, and design all go to the private sector. I would hope the hon. member isn't suggesting that we should bring those types of services within government, because that's when you're going to start paying high for manpower. At least going the privatization route we only hire those services as they are needed.

The other area where we've made some significant moves in privatization is in the field of property management, and again this provides an opportunity for small firms right across this province to get involved in business and develop new business expertise. We're attempting to further privatize in the field of EDP, or electronic data processing, and there again I think there are some very broad reasons for doing it. If we develop all that expertise in-house, the chance of exporting any of the developed technology outside of this province and hence generating more jobs in the province is very, very slim. If we can privatize a lot of that work and let the private sector develop the expertise in their shops, their shops aren't restricted to provincial borders. So I hope hon. members opposite would look at privatization as it relates to job creation, because at least on the government side of the House we're very interested in job creation.

ANHON. MEMBER: Sides.

MR. ISLEY: Sides of the House; sorry, gentlemen.

The hon. member expressed a fair degree of concern in the number of provincial or public buildings we're not proceeding with that have been at some stage of development in the past, and possibly I should share with the Assembly the strategy we use for housing government offices. Generally, in the major cities we do not build public buildings or so-called provincial buildings. We tend again to support the private sector and lease that space through the tendering process from the private sector. In small communities where there is not space available, we will tend to go with publicly owned buildings. But I think everyone should realize that in a time of restraint and slow economic growth, many of these communities that had aspirations for new provincial buildings have had a slowed down growth rate and hence the need has dissipated. I would be quick to point out to the hon. member that building a provincial building in a particular community in itself brings no new services to the community. All of our line departments delivering services to people are at the moment, I think, adequately and properly housed, in some cases in publicly owned buildings and in other cases in buildings that we lease.

With that, I will await the next speaker, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Edmonton Meadowlark, if he's quick enough, followed by the Member for Banff-Cochrane.

MR. MITCHELL: If he's quick enough. Two hours?

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I would like to address my comments to a number of areas. I would summarize them at the outset: tendering practices of the government; government contracts as an economic development tool; this department's specific responsibility for job creation; certain specific expenditure concerns; the issue of privatization within the department; the capital projects freeze policy announced in the fall -- November 17, 1986; the status of women within the department; and accounting matters related to the Heritage Savings Trust Fund that may have an implication for this

department.

We have always been concerned in our party with the lack of firm tendering procedures and guidelines designed to govern the tendering practices of this department. The government will tell us and tell the people of Alberta that they have tendering practices. What they won't say is that it is at the minister's discretion as to whether or not they implement those practices. Clearly, that discretion that does not come with it, some requirement that deviations from tendering practices be announced publicly -- clearly that practice is at odds with open government and prudent managerial practice.

While we have always been generally concerned, we are specifically concerned of late with a number of contracting procedures, and I would like to discuss those at this time. I am thinking first of the Olympia & York contract by government -- or proposed contract or currently being negotiated contract. I don't want to exclude the minister's consideration of this by not quite covering all the possible ways in which it could be dealt with at this time. We know that 400,000 square feet or thereabouts of government space are being considered. We are suspicious; we suspect that that contract for space has been improperly tendered.

My specific suspicions were aroused the other day when the minister refused to comment yes or no on whether or not the government was taking this amount of space and whether or not the government had tendered it. I believe that the minister at the time said he was not in the practice of speculating about newspaper reports. Times past, with respect to the Derrick plaza project where there was a suggestion that perhaps a government contract had made that particular building more marketable, the minister was extremely explicit about denying that there were no leasing discussions undertaken by his government and that his property people weren't even aware of that building. The fact that similar denials have not been forthcoming, the fact that the minister has not been as explicit in this case, raises our suspicions about the practices and the procedures and the implications of this Olympia & York case.

If the minister cannot deny outright that his department is involved in negotiations with the Olympia & York people or any of their agents for any amount of space in that building -- first of all, I would ask him to deny it outright or to confirm it outright. If he cannot deny it, can he please answer these questions? What tendering procedures were used? What other buildings were requested for tenders for this amount of space? Thirdly, why would we put government offices in prime downtown office space? It is unlikely that there is any more expensive land in the city of Edmonton. It is unlikely that there therefore could be any more expensive building in which space could be leased. It follows de facto that there is much less expensive space which would be, it would seem at face value, more prudent to consider. In answering that question, if the minister indicates that a decision was made to go to Olympia & York because the rates were competitive and apparently cheap, could he please assure the House that while they may be cheap today, there is no suggestion of forced renewals at higher rates, and could we see the lease rate over the term of the lease, no matter how that term is defined?

Next question: why would this government depart from its own stated plan of centralizing government offices in the government office area? There seem to be two legitimate reasons for doing that. One, it is cheaper space in that area north of the legislative grounds, and two, there are certain efficiencies to be found in having all government office space in close proximity,

at least that office space which is centralized and does not need to be regionally dispersed.

Could the minister further indicate what rate the Olympia & York space would be leased at compared to what are the current rates for space in buildings vacant now in the government centre? The minister at one point indicated to the Building Owners and Managers Association that "We have occasionally leased in city cores where the city is involved in a revitalization program." Could the minister please indicate whether that is the intention of this particular program of leasing space in the Olympia & York proposed building? And if he cannot deny that the government is negotiating with Olympia & York or actually has made a commitment, could the minister please inform the House and the people of Alberta what steps he has taken to ensure that the tendering process, if one were involved and if one weren't invoked, that the letting of that contract is above and beyond reproach so that there can be no suggestion of undue political influence or padded deals, if you will, sweetheart deals, for people associated with the government or with members of the government?

The second area of concern is the Sterling Place project. We're aware that currently the government has committed to almost double the amount of space that the department of economic development had in that building. Could the minister confirm that, exactly the amount of space the government has now, the amount of new space that it will be taking or has taken? In addition, could the minister please indicate what tendering procedures were utilized? Could the minister please indicate whether his department gave any thought to tendering the total space requirement, not just the new space, in light of these considerations: the potential economies of scale to be achieved by a lease that would be twice as big as the expansion that was being considered; and secondly, in light of the possibility that increased negotiating leverage could be achieved by dealing with a new landlord rather than with one who happens to be closely associated with this government, with the Premier, a landlord who already has a major portion of the department's requirements and might therefore feel in a particularly strong position and not feel compelled to negotiate or to give a sufficiently low tender?

A third case to be considered is the Swan Hills waste management plant. While this contract was let by the Department of the Environment, it seems to me that the minister of public works, with whom the responsibility for tendering adequately -- at least, the experience with tendering would be found to be most strong. Could the minister please inform the House what responsibility he would have for tendering procedures utilized by other departments, whether he has any concerns, or sees any shortfalls in the tendering procedures utilized for the Swan Hills waste management plant, owing to his experience with these procedures elsewhere?

Would he consider in this case and more broadly in cases for which this case will have implications the following matter. When the Swan Hills waste management project was originally tendered -- I believe it wasn't tendered but proposals were requested; that seems to be appropriate, given the nature of this particular project -- but at the outset it was given to a company that was prepared to take risk. As the negotiations proceeded, that company's proposal changed substantively. That company no longer was prepared to take risk, and in fact the return that the company will experience now changed fundamentally from the nature of the return provisions allowed for originally in the tendering or selective tendering or request for proposals process.

The implication is that a government can let a contract and then, as time proceeds and negotiations proceed, have that contract changed substantively and in a material fashion to the benefit of the party that originally was successful in the tendering, change the elements of that tender and that contract so significantly that other companies now might find it to be very attractive. Can the minister please comment on whether his government has a procedure for announcing publicly substantive changes to tenders or contracts once they have passed their original state or changed from their original state?

Fourthly, the Kananaskis development. The program of acquiring a private-sector builder raises similar concerns about the government's tendering process. Mr. Ghitter, a former member of the Legislative Assembly, a former candidate for the leadership of the Progressive Conservative Party, was given an \$85,000 contract to find a private-sector builder or financier for the Kananaskis hotel project. The announcement of Mr. Ghitter getting the contract, the announcement of finding the private-sector developer I think spanned about 14 working days. Subsequent to that we assume there was legal . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Member for Calgary McCall on a point of order.

MR. NELSON: Mr. Chairman, I would like to maybe assist the Legislature here with time and what have you. The hon. member is discussing areas -- for example, the area of Mr. Ghitter's \$85,000, et cetera, that being the case. But I would like to suggest to the member that that may be more appropriately discussed in Public Accounts rather than estimates, which are of the nature of a futuristic area, rather than the situation that happened behind us, whilst we're discussing this issue here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I believe the hon. Member for Edmonton Meadowlark is discussing it in the context of either acquiring or building or finding a builder for a project in Kananaskis park. I think that was the understanding of the Chair. If the hon. minister wants to dispel any thought right now as to the propriety of that, perhaps he could say so.

MR. ISLEY: On the point of order, Mr. Chairman, both this subject and the last subject the hon. member addressed are not contained in my estimates. He would be much more appropriate to bring those matters up when the minister involved is before the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Then the Chair would accept that point of order, if that's acceptable to the Member for Edmonton Meadowlark.

MR. MITCHELL: It very likely is acceptable, Mr. Speaker, with one further question. Would the actual construction project come under the minister's department or some other minister's department, the Stuart Olson contract I'm thinking of?

MR. ISLEY: If we were talking about the actual construction of the hotel complexes at Ribbon Creek, if we're talking of the construction of the Swan Hills waste management plant, if we're talking of the construction of the Oldman River dam, my department doesn't have them in my estimates.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Member for Edmonton Meadowlark.

MR. MITCHELL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. That leads to another question. Is there anybody in this government that has an overall responsibility for ensuring that tendering procedures are consistent amongst departments? If so, what minister would that be? And perhaps the minister could comment on that in responding to my questions.

In any event, here are four projects with very questionable implications for the quality of this government's tendering procedures. In each case the project involves a tender going to an individual or a company with extremely close ties to the Premier of this province, and in each case there is some suggestion that prudent tendering procedures were not followed.

MR. NELSON: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, please. I would suggest to the hon. member -- you know, there's some suggestion that there's some collusion between the Premier and the tendering process here, and I would suggest that the member be very careful in how he words his statements. I think you should get your old gavel out there if necessary, Mr. Chairman, because yes, what is being suggested here, it certainly puts some aspersions on some of the members of this House, in particular the Premier. I think it's unfair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That would be, I think, the prerogative of the hon. member speaking. If the hon. member breaks any rule of the House, the hon. member will be called to order. Member for Edmonton Meadowlark.

MR. MITCHELL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I know that when the hon. member begins to rise on a point of order, we're getting close to the quick, and so I view this as a measure of our success in questioning. I would have been disappointed if he hadn't risen on two points of order.

Two issues arise out of these questionable tendering practices. One is the possibility of excess expense to the people of Alberta at a time when of course we have to be particularly concerned about expense. We always have to be concerned about expense. This government should have been more concerned in the '70s and the '80s. [interjection] Two wrongs don't make a right.

The second issue is the likelihood of Albertans losing confidence in the process of government. That, Mr. Chairman, is a particularly severe concern. There is a tremendous cynicism on the part of Albertans about the political process. I believe that cynicism is beginning to transfer to the institutions of government themselves, and that is a particularly distressing observation. People are beginning to believe that government does not work in their interest but somehow operates in the interests of politicians. It's very difficult to govern properly as long as people believe that. I would therefore urge that the minister consider these examples of questionable tendering practice, and I trust and hope that he will be able to convince the Legislature and the people of this province that they are above and beyond reproach.

I would like to mention at this time the Liberal Party's proposal for the open contracts Act. This Bill, Government Open Contract Act, removes from ministers the ability to circumvent the public tendering system by requiring tenders to be called for all contracts exceeding \$50,000 and requiring that these bids be published. If ministers decide to award contracts apart from public tendering procedures, this Bill would require them to announce publicly the details and reasons for deviating from published tendering guidelines. I would ask that the minister con-

sider that proposal.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Chair is very reluctant to interrupt the hon. member. Section 62(2) of *Standing Orders* -- and rather than have the member read them the Chair will quote:

Speeches in committees of the whole assembly must be strictly relevant to the item or section under consideration.

And with respect, hon. member, it should be relevant to the minister's six votes. Now if the hon. member could occasionally while he's espousing Liberal policy include the minister's department or some part thereof, the Chair would have difficulty interrupting. So if the hon. member would bear that in mind, would you please proceed.

MR. MITCHELL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Would the minister please have his department review this particular Bill and comment upon its applicability to his department's tendering procedures? Thank you.

Second major area of concern: government contracts as an economic development tool. Clearly, this minister controls a huge portion of the government's capital expenditure -- or doesn't control it properly, but in any event has that huge portion of this government's capital expenditure under his purview. Could he please answer these questions? One, what is the government's policy with respect to buying Alberta first?

Number two, will the minister consider a 10 percent leeway for bids from Alberta companies for construction work and construction supplies and so on and so forth? This is a practice utilized in a number of other provinces. Everything else being equal, an Alberta firm would be able to be as much as 10 percent more expensive in their contracts and the contract would still be awarded to that Alberta firm, owing to the economic development benefits that would follow from an Alberta firm being able to undertake that contract. I would like to say that to some extent the government was not incorrect in allowing open competitions; certainly there are certain advantages to that. But particularly at times like this when economic development requirements are heightened, it seems that this open policy would be worthy of reconsideration. At the very least, where other provinces have that kind of a policy would it not be worth while for Alberta to invoke a reciprocal policy concerning firms from provinces who currently have the 10 percent leeway or some other such leeway provision?

Next question: has the minister considered an active industrial benefits program? Under such a program guaranteed contracts might be given to Alberta firms to entice them or encourage them to undertake a new process or to retool for a new piece of equipment so that they could fulfill a contract here rather than having it lost to a company from another province. An example of that, which doesn't necessarily fall into your department, might be the need for a thousand hospital beds that can be projected due to the construction of new hospitals. A thousand beds would warrant a major investment by an Alberta firm that is producing something similar or something parallel. A guaranteed contract, which they might not be able to bid for competitively until they knew they had the contract, as it were, would allow them to branch off into a new industrial pursuit which would be of tremendous economic development benefit to our ...

AN HON. MEMBER: Province.

MR. MITCHELL: ... province. Thank you.

The department has a tremendous responsibility for job creation, as I said. Could the minister please outline what procedures his staff undertakes in analyzing the labour intensity of given projects? And is the decision to choose between projects or amongst projects based upon the level of labour intensity?

Certain specific concerns next. Vote 1. Why have salaries, wages, employee benefits increased while manpower has decreased? Secondly, why have personnel costs in that department increased by 4.1 percent? Thirdly, why has the deputy minister's office costs increased by 1.1 percent?

Vote 2. Why has manpower increased from 87.5 full-time equivalent employment to 91.5?

Vote 3. Why have grants increased by 10.5 percent?

Vote 4. Why has 4.11 increased 100 percent? Could the minister please inform me as to whether the ring route for south-west Edmonton is included in the allocation for the transportation department under vote 4.18? And finally, under 4.21 for Technology, Research and Telecommunications, why has that budget been cut by 53 percent when that is a department that is very much critical for the future economic development of this province? Could the minister please explain that particular 53 percent cut?

Privatization. Could the minister please indicate, for any maintenance contracts in government buildings that have been privatized over the last six months, what were the wages of the people working before and what are the wages of the people working there now? Could the minister please assure us that adequate tendering procedures are being used in that privatization process and what those tendering procedures are? And could the minister please indicate the number of people that have been laid off from the government employment rolls over the last six months due to these privatization procedures and whether any special programs have been undertaken to retrain those people or to provide them with severance arrangements, those kinds of things?

Capital projects freeze. On November 17, 1986, the minister announced that there would be a freeze on capital projects. He has refused to answer Written Question 145. I would like to ask him specifically: could he please indicate to the House why tenders were advertised for the courthouse in St. Paul very shortly after the announcement of the capital projects freeze? Why is it that that particular courthouse missed the freeze? Could the minister also provide us with information on any construction project started after the freeze was announced on November 17, 1986, any physical construction that was started on those projects after that time, any project over \$100,000?

Next point. This department employs 2,355 full-time equivalent personnel. It therefore has a huge impact on the hiring practices of this government and can therefore have a significant influence on the employment equity practices of this government as they affect women in the public service. Could the minister please provide us with an analysis of the number of women in middle management and senior management positions compared to the total number of positions at those two levels? Could the minister please indicate what the average pay levels for women in these positions are compared to the average pay for men in the equivalent management level?

Mr. Chairman, those are my questions. Thank you very much.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. minister, followed by the hon. Member for Banff-Cochrane.

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to respond briefly to some of the questions the hon. Member for Edmonton Meadowlark brought up in the House, and for the other more specific ones that required numbers, I'll provide the information to him direct. The first question, I believe, had to do with tendering practices. As I outlined in the House last week, there are basically three methods by which we tender: the open, public tender ...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Excuse me. Order in the committee, please.

MR. ISLEY: ... the select tendering process, and the direct negotiation route, as I believe I've already indicated in *Hansard*, depending upon what we're tendering for. If we're tendering for office space and just the location of a town or a city is important, it would go by the open public tender. If a particular region of a city is necessary for the delivery of the program of the client department, then we will go the select tender route: identify certain facilities that will satisfy the client, have the client view those facilities, then solicit a bid from each of the owners, and the lowest bid takes it. If, for a variety of reasons, a site has to be very specific -- and the normal reasons would be the expansion of a department or the amalgamation of a department -- then we will enter into direct negotiations with the owner of that complex. If we feel we're getting a competitive price and we're in that marketplace enough to deem what is competitive and what isn't, then we will close the deal.

The hon. member then went on to spend a considerable amount of time talking about some Olympia & York project which, to the best of my knowledge, has not been announced. When one will be will depend -- the member seems to know more than I do. I can assure the House that there is nothing in the estimates of this department that is in any way related to such a project that he may have in mind.

Concern was brought up with Sterling Place, and this was discussed earlier in the House. Again, I'm going a bit by memory. If my recollection from the research I shared with the House last week is correct, January 1, 1985, we first acquired space in Sterling Place by the select tender route. July 1, 1985, we acquired additional space by the select tender route. Following the amalgamation of certain departments after the 1982 election, there was a desire for a departmental amalgamation, and we acquired, as of March 1, 1987, some additional space that would approximate approximately half or 50 percent of the space we already had. That was acquired by direct negotiations because the client department, for administrative reasons, wanted to have things in close proximity. I've already shared with the House that we brought those direct negotiations in at a rate lower than the January 1, '85, select tender.

I would respond to the hon. member's suggestion of taking the total space requirements and putting them all back on the market. The hon. member should realize that there's a pretty high cost to government in moving, not only the disruption to the delivery of service but the actual, physical cost of moving a large department from one building to another. If a department has to increase its space by a certain amount, we're certainly not going to take the larger part of the department and go through the cost of moving it to another location.

Some of the other projects referred to I've already advised the hon. member he should bring up when the appropriate minister's estimates are before the House.

He raised some questions with respect to government contracts as an economic development tool, and I can assure the

hon. member that we are very concerned about using our procurement practices to bring about economic growth in this province and diversification wherever possible. The only comment I would make in reaction to the proposal of a 10 percent leeway on all tenders is that the House must keep in mind that that means you're going to pay 10 percent more for the service provided.

I was intrigued by the idea of guaranteed contracts to Alberta firms, because it seems to me that on one hand the member is suggesting that through direct negotiations we may be preferring some individual over another individual, and then you're encouraging me to go with a guaranteed price for a certain product to a certain individual. That's interesting, but touchy.

A number of questions were asked with respect to votes. They were rattled off very quickly and very specifically, and I'll respond directly later on those. The grant increase that the hon. member was referring to that I did pick out is the grants in lieu of taxes paid to municipalities, and we simply don't control that amount of money.

With respect to the impact of privatization and how tendering is done in privatization, the basic tender route used there would be either the open public or the select tender. If we want to ensure that a firm within a particular community or particular region of the province gets it, we will simply go select tender.

There were some questions raised with regard to layoffs. I indicated in my opening remarks that we achieved a significant reduction in manpower and the elimination of 162 permanent positions, but because of careful planning in advance, we only put out 22 layoff slips. I would also indicate that the early retirement program is viewed as very attractive by many members of the staff of Public Works, Supply and Services, and I think a fair number will be taking advantage of it.

The construction freeze of November 17 was referred to, and as I pointed out to the House when I turned down the question, there was never a construction freeze. All asset acquisitions and construction projects were put on hold and subject to a review process.

Two specific questions were raised: why did the St. Paul courthouse get advertised and proceed after the freeze, and what other new programs may have started up after the freeze? The suspension of contracts as of November 17 was the suspension of those contracts that hadn't hit the tender stage. If the hon. member will check the newspapers, the St. Paul courthouse was advertised for tender prior to the November 17 suspension of capital projects. And it, like any other project that had been tendered but not awarded, was proceeded with; it was not caught up in the suspension. So it was because it was advertised publicly prior to the freeze, or the suspension of capital projects, that it proceeded, not due to the heavy lobbying of the M.L.A. for St. Paul, although he does do some good lobbying for his constituency. My constituents tell me that all the time.

The first new project that we proceeded with following the freeze that I had to take back to priorities committee and get reviewed and approval to go was in response to a request from the party that the hon. member is a member of, submitted in writing by his leader, so that we could proceed with a contract to provide the space that they so dearly wanted. There are a number of other leasehold improvement projects that we proceeded with. There are a number of other renovation projects that for safety reasons we proceeded with, but there were no -- to the best of my recollection -- big, new capital projects that flowed out following the suspension on November 17. There were contracts awarded where a small tender had to go out to complete a

project that we'd already made a significant investment in. In other words, I suppose what I'm saying is that we didn't freeze all construction activity. If you needed another \$100,000 tender to complete a \$13 million project, that was never put into the suspension [inaudible].

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Banff-Cochrane, followed by the Member for Edmonton Belmont.

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Chairman, thank you. It's a pleasure to participate in the estimates for Public Works, Supply and Services. When I put my hand up, I had a number of questions developed in my mind for the constituents I represent and also with respect to the Alberta Alcohol and Drug Abuse Commission, of which I have the privilege of being chairman. But particularly, as I listened to the presentations and questions from the members for Edmonton Beverly and Edmonton Meadowlark, I had a number of questions. However, I think the minister has capably responded to most of the questions that they've raised in my mind as well.

I had some comments I would like to leave with the Assembly and reflect briefly, Mr. Chairman, on some of the content of the budget for the department before us.

With respect to the Member for Edmonton Meadowlark's proposal for a 10 percent leeway, which I believe the minister has responded to very well, I would like to add not only the concern that I or my constituents would have with respect to adding to the costs for all Albertans if one were to develop a policy like that -- it would be a very dangerous practice on behalf of any government, and our government would be one -- and that would be that to politicize -- the Member for Edmonton Meadowlark can say "fathomable" and I can't say "fathomable" either -- the tender process, the select tender process, or the economical procurement process I think would be a very dangerous game for any government. I think that with the minister's and his department's steering of all of these things, and all things being equal, obviously the nod would be given to an Alberta tender. If there was any question at all about the quality of the products or, in other words, that his department would be seeking tenders on the basis of performance rather than on identifying brand names, that will give Alberta suppliers an equal opportunity to make their presentations.

I would like to comment, Mr. Chairman, on the rapid assistance of the department with respect to all members of this Assembly. Currently under Members' Services, directed by the Speaker, there is a request to form a subcommittee. That subcommittee has been formed, and that subcommittee is considering how to develop further information services and telecommunication services for all members. Obviously, any purchase of equipment, any modifications to equipment, any additional equipment can be very costly. There is technological advancement every day, and I think that the minister and his department in their response and willingness to assist the members as they develop new approaches in this is very appreciated. I think I should mention that Mr. Chairman, since the Speaker obviously is not able to convey that in the Assembly.

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to bring to the minister two special concerns that have occurred in Cochrane, a town I represent. One involves another agency, the Alberta Liquor Control Board, which has developed a new facility and a parking lot beside a provincial building which is undergoing renovations, and I'm very pleased to see the presentations in the budget. I think it's unfortunate that even today in our government, with the co-

operation that we have, it was necessary to try and get the agency, ALCB, and the department to work together on one common parking lot design. I compliment the minister for ensuring that staff in his department were available to the town council to develop a proper parking policy which will recognize public use of these parking areas as well as the requirement for the department which provides space in the provincial building for a number of agencies.

On that point, Mr. Chairman, I think we should acknowledge the effort of the department to ensure that all MLAs have access to all provincial buildings throughout our province whenever we are meeting with our constituents. The welcome that I received from the staff, the preparation of the facilities, the fact that they may be there long hours to close up, is very appreciated. I think it helps us all in our duties.

Mr. Chairman, with respect to privatization, I think that the minister might take a moment to remind us all that the agreement between the government and all employees who are in the bargaining unit provides for appropriate notices if positions are to be abolished, and for those employees who are not redeployed, there are appropriate payments made to those employees to help them in their readjustments. But also I believe the minister might comment on whether or not some of the contracts that he has authorized require that the employees be given an opportunity to obtain employment through the privatization process. I'm thinking particularly of provincial buildings, caretaking and that area.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to compliment the department also on the on-time again, under-budget construction that was managed by this department for major facilities for Albertans in the Olympic facilities, both at Nakiska and at the Canmore Nordic Centre. I see in this budget the completion of those projects is proposed, as well as additional facilities to serve Albertans throughout Kananaskis Country and elsewhere.

I also mention, Mr. Chairman, the pleasure that I had when I saw the Minister of Tourism open the travel information centre in Canmore, again a facility built by the department, or under its administration, and conducted and carried out very well. It's one of the special attractions that Canmore provides to our visitors.

Mr. Chairman, when I went through the budget, the only other comment I had was with respect to the the Alberta Alcohol and Drug Abuse Commission's Grande Prairie northern area addictions treatment services. I am pleased, Mr. Chairman, that there is a line entry in this year's budget for the facility. That's the good news. The bad news, though, is that there are no dollars attached to that entry; that is, there are no capital dollars in this year's estimates for this facility, which is a new facility, well planned, designed to provide new services, improved services, and a facility which, when completed, will provide not only a new centre and a new focus for northern Alberta for this problem of drug, alcohol, and chemical abuse but an opportunity to reduce family breakup, family disruption, and travel problems. I can only say to the minister and also to the Provincial Treasurer that this facility remains the commission's number 1 priority for the coming year.

Mr. Chairman, I should say, too, that I've had some discussions with the mayor, and of course the one who is poking from behind is doing a very good job -- the Member for Grande Prairie -- in not only poking me but in poking the minister, and I'm sure we'll be back poking him together.

Mr. Chairman, I thank you and thank the minister. I think the department has done a tremendous job for all Albertans in

carrying out a very responsible program. In closing I note that this department's budget provides for a reduction of expenditures of some 16.3 percent. All departments that have had to be rolled back to take reductions have helped make our government's contributions towards education and hospital care and social services even more important.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. Minister of Public Works, Supply and Services.

MR. ISLEY: Just a couple of points, very briefly, Mr. Chairman. I don't want to leave the House with the impression that in our move toward privatization, particularly in the property management area, we are doing it through layoffs of existing employees. We are doing that with a strategy of amalgamating our staff as people leave our employ, and privatizing those areas we can free up. So we're not firing people in order to put out contracts on our privatization policy.

Secondly, I would thank the hon. Member for Banff-Cochrane for his representation on the AADAC centre in Grande Prairie. I'm hearing much the same thing from the hon. Member for Grande Prairie. We have a staff that is ready to build it; we have an architect in place who would love to see it go. Keep making the representations, and hopefully we will go with it.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. Member for Edmonton Belmont.

MR. SIGURDSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I rise to make just a couple of brief comments this evening. I notice that sometimes during the day [interjection] -- well, questions too, hon. member; questions too -- the members opposite rise and say all we want to do is spend, spend, spend. Well, tonight, Mr. Minister, I want to direct something to you that I hope will save your department a little bit of money.

Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure if my concern is under vote 6, vote 3, or more specifically 3.3.2, which is the land leases. I suspect it's probably the latter, but it doesn't really matter which vote it's under because it's of particular importance to two of my constituents.

Mr. Chairman, I've got constituents who sublease land from a particularly dairy located in St. Albert. The people that sublease the land have lived on that particular piece of property for a period of about six years, and they lived there while they were in the employ of Crozier Dairies of St. Albert. During the six-year period that they enjoyed their employment with Crozier Dairies they made a number of improvements, and I'll just list a couple of them. They resingled and replaced steel on the barn roof, repaired and resingled parts of the garage roof, rebuilt the barnyard fence, replaced gravel on the driveway twice, repaired and replaced the wiring in the barn, replaced the storm door on the house, and they built the majority of the fence around the homestead. So they made a number of substantial improvements to the land. Now, when their employment with Crozier Dairies ended last July, the HED Property Management firm served notice to the Crozier Dairies, and Crozier Dairies, of course, in turn served notice to Mr. and Mrs. Hodgins. The Hodgins were led to believe at that time that they would have the opportunity to negotiate with HED Property Management for that 7.6 acre parcel of land. Unfortunately for the Hodgins, that was not the case.

On that small parcel of land, Mr. Chairman, the Hodgins op-

erate a purebred registered cow/calf operation, and they have laying hens. So they've set down some roots there. Last December they were somewhat surprised when they found out that the department has decided to re-lease the land to Crozier Dairies, giving Crozier Dairies the opportunity, of course, to sublet to another tenant. In the interim, however, the department has decided that for a period of eight months it will allow, and in fact it has got, a lease with the Hodgins for an amount of some \$450 a month. Now, this is supposedly a nonrenewable lease, which is most unfortunate. At the end of that eight-month period the department is prepared to give the Hodgins \$5,000 to get off the property: \$5,000 to get off a piece of property that they would like to have the opportunity to maintain and live on, where they've lived for six years, where they've made substantial improvements. And the department has turned around and re-leased the land to Crozier Dairies, their former employer.

Mr. Chairman, this is an opportunity for the department to save not an awful lot of money when you look at the overall budget of the government, but it's an opportunity for the department to save \$5,000. It's an opportunity for the Hodgins to continue to reside on the land, raise their family, continue with their operations, and quite frankly it is not at all going to affect the dairy operation that is owned by the Croziers.

Mr. Chairman, with that I'll conclude my remarks, and I hope that the minister will be able to give me some kind of a response.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Member for Athabasca-Lac La Biche.

MR. PIQUETTE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. ISLEY: If the hon. member wished a response, then I'll do it very briefly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Minister of Public Works, Supply and Services.

MR. ISLEY: The hon. Member for Edmonton Belmont is sharing with the House some information which I haven't been made aware of at this point in time and that I will take under advisement as far as some of the details. I believe I recollect the broader issue because I believe the hon. member and another member brought it to my attention. If my recollection is correct, the lease agreement we were in was with Crozier Dairies as opposed to the employee of Crozier Dairies, and any subleasing or changes that have been made since that I'm sure have been done through mutual agreement of all parties as opposed to us breaking a lease with anyone.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. Member for Athabasca-Lac La Biche.

MR. SIGURDSON: Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry. I suppose I have to go to the bottom of the list now in order to continue on this conversation or this exchange with the minister?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, the hon. Member for Athabasca-Lac La Biche. And the Member for Edmonton Belmont could perhaps go and talk to the minister privately.

MR. PIQUETTE: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to make a few comments here and perhaps a few ideas that we could toss around. One of the things I'd like to ask the minister about -- looking under vote 3, tenant improvements, we

notice a big decrease of 46.9 percent. The question I have of the minister is: are we saving today to perhaps double the cost later on in terms of maybe not doing the improvement that is required now and waiting for perhaps more expensive repairs that are going to be required later on?

In the Lac La Biche area the Alberta Vocational Centre had a proposed residence that was submitted to the government a couple of years ago and had all gone to the architectural drawing. The Lac La Biche AVC is a fast-growing vocational centre. One of the problems they have right now is that for a lot of the programs they have in mind, there is a lack of residences available for students coming into the Lac La Biche area. For example, they have just got a manpower grant from the federal government for the program for training people to serve the tourism industry, and with the influx of people into Lac La Biche there is going to be a severe housing crisis in terms of affordable housing for those students. So I would urge the minister to look at that very seriously in the upcoming year.

Now, another concern that I have is related to the courthouses. I am not sure if you recall a letter that I sent to the minister relating to the Boyle courthouse, but in rural Alberta the courthouses are vastly underused. They're used very often about one week or one day a month, when the judges come around on their circuit, and one of the problems that it does present is that we have vacant premises basically about 20 days out of 21 on an average monthly basis. I was just wondering if the minister could perhaps look into the possibility of allowing other government departments or facilities to access the use of the courthouse. For example, in Boyle there's a number of offices that could be made available to perhaps a part-time DA office or other government services which need to have a place to at least meet their clientele, whether it be social service or whatever, and a lot of these visits are part-time. So I think we should be looking at a much greater multi-use of these purposes, and I think that the courthouse is one area that we can recover our cost by reviewing that.

[Mr. R. Moore in the Chair]

Another thing which I was quite pleased about is that the minister saw fit to have the Social Services building in Lac La Biche constructed last fall just before the freeze. That was a private firm that the government is leasing from, and looking at all the cancellations -- here I'm looking at more the idea that public works could be used in a sense of creating jobs for Albertans. I know the time, the recession, where we don't have maybe the funds to be building all these courthouses and provincial buildings, but has the government looked at the fact that maybe instead of building their own provincial building they would allow the private sector to build these buildings and then lease from them, using private money as opposed to government money, creating jobs, and at the same time providing the needed services in those communities? I wonder if the minister has looked at that possibility, like it seemed that we did that in Lac La Biche last year for the Social Services building.

The same thing here. I notice that in Athabasca last year the department purchased a Fish and Wildlife location for a future building. Will that simply be put on the back burner, or can we perhaps look at the private sector to build that warehouse for the department and then lease it from them? There's always a way when you're leasing a building: if you no longer require it, you simply terminate the lease, if you have a renewable agreement to do that. I think it would be a way in terms of maybe smaller

communities to have access to those kinds of facilities without spending a lot of provincial money. In Calling Lake, for example, which is quite a distance from Athabasca, there's a need, with the high native population, for Opportunity Corps to be centralized, to be relocated, social services, et cetera, to be properly housed, or CVC. I notice this year we have a cancellation of the provincial building that was indicated for the community of Calling Lake. Again, I would urge the minister to look at a more innovative and creative way of perhaps getting these buildings under way this year or next year with a different form of funding.

We will be soon opening the regional parks workshop in Lac La Biche, and again I would like to congratulate the government for spending over \$1 million in the Lac La Biche area to build the regional parks workshop in Lac La Biche. With the expansion of Churchill park this year and Long Lake Provincial Park and some of the other campsites in the area, this regional workshop will help in cutting down the costs, because a lot of these improvements of facilities will be done by local firms.

One of the things that I have noticed in my constituency is that privatization of janitorial service for places like AVC has created a number of problems. It appears some of the local firms very often fail to win a lot of the local contracts, and we have outside firms who come in, who make the lowest bid, and it seems that we're having trouble getting good quality service from those outside firms. I know the government would like to keep the tenders free and open, but I think it does present -- in terms of janitorial service, if you're going to be privatizing it, which I guess the government is moving in that direction all the time, they should devise a method which looks at the local community accessing as much as possible those jobs so that the people who actually have pride in their community can have a chance of getting a lot of these local contracts. That seems to be a growing problem not only in my constituency but talking with other jurisdictions as well.

So that ends the questions I have for the minister. I'd like to especially, you know, get a response relating to the idea proposed about a new way of getting a lot of the provincial buildings, courthouses, et cetera, under way in Alberta, perhaps not using government money but signing leases with private firms in order to get these needed facilities going.

Thank you.

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Chairman, in response to the hon. Member for Athabasca-Lac La Biche and his specific question on section 3.2.2, tenant improvements, I would just like to point out that it's normal the year following a reorganization of cabinet and possibly a reorganization of departments that tenant improvements will be higher than in other years. I don't think it's a case of our not keeping the plant in order. It's a case of less tenant improvements, because, remember, government is not in a growth period and we're not in a restructuring period.

With respect to AVC, Lac La Biche, you know, I might point out that my constituents have a great interest in that facility, as do the hon. member's, and I think he would have to agree with me that there is a tremendous plant up there. But I think we all have to recognize that there isn't the growing demand for training opportunities that existed when that plant was started. I'm sure the Minister of Advanced Education heard his representation and will properly fit it in in future priorities.

I was very interested in the support the hon. member is giving for dealing with the private sector more in the development of facilities. I have to think the entrepreneurial spirit that exists

to the east of him, to the north of him, and with many of his constituents is starting to influence his thinking, and I'm pleased to see that. And I'm pleased that we were able to proceed with the new provincial facilities in Lac La Biche, which were done through an open tender to the private sector over a given lease period. You know, I think that is a route that we could probably use for multipurpose buildings to a greater extent than we have in rural Alberta. As I indicated earlier this evening, that's the practice we use in the major cities, but there has been a tendency in the past to want to build, i.e., a provincial building in rural communities. Maybe we have to rethink that, and I'm glad there is some support for that.

Thank you.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Hon. Member for Vegreville, please.

MR. FOX: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to just raise a couple of issues with the hon. minister concerning his budget estimates for Public Works, Supply and Services and concerning in particular the Vegreville courthouse project.

The minister was kind enough to meet with the mayor of Vegreville and myself and the hon. Attorney General early last November to discuss the status of the Vegreville courthouse project, and we learned at that time that it, along with many other capital projects in the province, was temporarily on hold due to budget considerations. The kind of deficit that we had amassed had dictated that all capital projects ought to be reviewed. I did write an article that tried in the best and fairest way possible to explain that to people in my constituency, a newspaper article that laid out the facts that the courthouse project is still an approved project by the government and it is their intention to proceed with it. It's not a matter of if, it's a matter of when, and that the government, in attempting to cope with spending priorities and cope with the deficit that we have, had decided to take a closer look at this project with an eye to development in the future.

I did lay that out for people and sent copies of the letter to the ministers involved. But the rumour persists, and I'm hoping the hon. minister will address it in some way, that this project has become -- and I'll quote a letter that someone wrote to the newspaper -- "water under the bridge," that it's a project that has been canceled, they feel, and they imply very directly that it's got something to do with the fact that I, a member in opposition, represent the Vegreville riding. I know that not to be the case, and I'm hoping that the hon. minister will address that in some way. I do note that there is some \$200,000 allocated for the courthouse project this year, and I'm wondering if the minister could explain what it's for? Is that to work towards further design of the building or to acquire some materials in anticipation of the construction of the project in the future?

Another thing I would be interested in knowing, in looking at the Public Works, Supply and Services planning and implementation of construction projects section, vote 4, I can see that there are a number of projects that have had their funding reduced, in some cases up to 100 percent. I'm not sure if that's an indication that they're projects not yet proceeded with that are on hold or if they're in fact projects that were finished last year and there is no need for an additional allocation of funds this year. So I'm not sure how to interpret those figures, and I'm hoping the minister would explain that to me. I would like to tell the people in my constituency that though the Vegreville courthouse is temporarily on hold or proceeding at a somewhat

slower pace, it shares that in common with projects all across the province and that we have the minister's assurance that people there are being treated fairly under the present circumstances.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. ISLEY: I would point out, Mr. Chairman, that the fact that there is still \$200,000 in that line means the project is still alive. That \$200,000 will be used toward the planning and design of it. We have no authority as of yet to commence construction, which is the next approval level. The timing of it is a matter that the hon. member should continue to discuss with our client department, in this case the Attorney General's. In most cases where you see a drop of 100 percent, that is a project that went on hold. In many other cases where you see a smaller percentage drop, it's a project that has reached its peak as far as its draw on construction dollars and is starting to decline toward completion. But many of the 100 percents here are projects that we had approval to plan and design and, in the odd case, to commence construction, were caught up in the suspension on November 17, were reprioritized by their departments, and didn't survive this budget review. In many of those cases, the planning may be complete, as is almost the situation with the AADAC centre in Grande Prairie, and at some future time a decision to commence construction will simply mean bringing them off the shelves and proceeding.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Highwood.

MR. ALGER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I don't have much to ask from the minister tonight, but I would like to touch on a couple of little details. I'm sorry I didn't look into the book a little earlier this evening, because I see that among other things one of the sites that I want him to seriously consider completing this year is a historical site near Okotoks. It's called the Big Rocks. But he has a marvelous deduction of 57.3 percent in his estimates for cultural and historical sites. This will grieve me, I'm sure, and I think it will probably cost me the project. However, I assure you I'll stay on his case until I get it done.

The other case -- this actually is primarily the same style of funding -- is Recreation and Parks, and it has a tremendous cut of 58.1 percent. So it would indeed at the outset grieve a fellow like me in that I don't think I'm going to be too successful in either department in getting what I'd like to have done.

You see, the Big Rocks site has been acquired by the Minister of Culture some time ago as an erratic and a historical area for the province of Alberta. At the present time, I'm trying to get this particular minister to purchase the land that the rocks are on so that they will indeed become a provincial territory, and then I would like him to work in close conjunction with the minister of transport, who is currently busy rebuilding Highway 7 right past there. It would save the province an awful lot of money, Mr. Chairman, if I could get both ministers to work together and get this ideally completed at the same time. It will take some effort on my part and very little on theirs, but I'm sure that we could accomplish that if they would strive hard and work with me.

There's another thing about finishing that highway which has nothing to do with this minister, but in case he ever does get it done, there is the interpretive centre in the Turner Valley area that I would like this minister to take a keen interest in. I'm sure I've subjected him to the proposition before, and I'll have to do

it again probably. But in any event, it is a very worthwhile project, and the Minister of Tourism in this case, minister, would enjoy working with you, I'm sure. And somehow or other I think we've got to get that one off the ground.

But the most important thing that I would like the minister to do is give me his special assistance with the Retired and Semi-Retired, a great organization of senior citizens who indeed are just as crowded as they can be in their present habitat over here on 105th Street and, I think, would like to move down to the Land Titles Building. Indeed, I have chatted with the minister in person about this, but I have come to no concrete conclusion. I would like to know just exactly where we stand in that respect. Minister, I would think that no matter how much money you spend on the senior citizens, your reward will be rich in heaven and it will be certainly well accepted in this House.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Chairman, on the first two points I would encourage the hon. member to continue to make representation to the ministers involved, who will at some point come forward to my department as a builder. Again, I indicated earlier we have staff that just love to build.

On the last point I have good news for the hon. member. His lobbying has paid off. The renovations to the Land Titles Building are included in these estimates, and you will be finding a new home for the Retired and Semi-Retired.

[Mr. Gogo in the Chair]

MR. SHRAKE: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to just ask a couple of questions about the public buildings and facilities we've got through this province also. I guess we've got buildings from one end to the other in this province, and we've got classrooms and halls and so on. And we've got a lot of organizations scattered through the province that we fund directly, indirectly through grants, operating costs, whatever, whether it be senior citizens, cultural groups, and so on. I hope our minister would take a hard look at pushing his bureaucrats or administration people a little harder on working with these groups and seeing when and where we can get the use of these buildings. Because if you've got a \$5 million or \$10 million building sitting there, yet you've got a group out there that wants to meet on Saturdays or Sundays or evenings, most of our government offices are not open in the evenings or on Saturdays or Sundays. The cost of heating that building runs just about the same if you've got somebody using it or not. Often you get certain little empires that do take exception to having another group, another organization come in and use that meeting hall or use those classrooms, but I'm sure that if you were firm with them, they'd work on those things.

We've done a lot of talking about tendering processes here tonight, and I kind of wondered a few times from seeing the equipment and the stuff that we buy -- we buy it on tender, yet we usually end up with a Cadillac class of anything we buy, whether it's a big portable welder, big air compressor, trucks, you name it. I always wondered how that happened, and I've had a few people tell me how that happens. Mr. Chairman, often when they put the specifications on what they're tendering, and if you take -- there's a big welder and there's a small welder. They'll both do the same job, and one costs about \$2,500 more than the other. How do we end up with the expensive one? It's very simple. They say: "Well, this one has an inch wider wheelbase. The boys out there want the big expen-

sive one, so in the specifications we'll say that this one's got to have the 72-inch wheelbase instead of the 71-inch wheelbase." So I really think there are some ways we can save a dollar or two there. If we've got to gear our specifications anyway -- I don't mind seeing them gear the specifications. It maybe slants them a little towards one of the Alberta manufacturers; that's fair game. I don't mind that at all.

But when we get into talking about areas, it seems like we have some of the manufacturers in this province in Red Deer, Lethbridge, and Calgary that don't really wish to tender on some of the projects, some of the services and things coming out of Edmonton. There again, often the specifications are: well, you must have a plant in Edmonton. Well, of course, they can't have a plant in Edmonton if they manufacture the thing in Calgary or Red Deer or wherever. It's fair game to say that they've got to have a service centre here to service this thing, but I think in all fairness that's an area that we should look at, because too often the guy could produce it cheaper in this other centre. You can have your service centre here in Edmonton, but we are not getting the lowest on our bid if we go that route.

Then last but not least here, I hear our hon. Member for Edmonton Meadowlark talking about that Swan Hills disposal plant and saying that perhaps we should have the government run it rather than private enterprise. If he thinks that the government will run it cheaper with your unionized type of wages and benefits -- if you believe that, we'll have a crop failure for sure this year.

The other thing, I heard a comment earlier about we should have saved more money back there in the good times like the Liberals do. If anybody here in this House believes that, I've got a big bridge over here I'd like to sell you; I don't want to cross the river here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Edmonton Glengarry, followed by the Member for Calgary M c C a l l . [interjections]

MR. YOUNIE: Hush, I have a few words to say. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The anxiety of some members to get the voting done and go wherever amazes me. I think there are many important things here to discuss.

First, a general comment. The minister got up after the Member for Edmonton Beverly made a few good points about the need for cuts and the need for those cuts to be carefully calculated, and he expressed his chagrin that first we were saying don't cut anything and then we were saying cut everything or that we weren't sure how deep we wanted them to cut. I suppose to try to put it in a more graphic analogy, what we're saying about the cuts is that while the right leg has gangrene, you guys are planning to amputate the left leg. We're trying to point out that it's not just the fact of the cuts but where they're being made with which we have great problem. So I think it's very important to consider it in that light, that we're not saying no cuts need to be made but we are saying that they have to be very carefully planned. Oftentimes it seems to me that the priority the government is using is looking at who is going to be cut and judging whether or not that particular group can muster wide public support against their cuts, and if they are powerless enough that it's deemed very unlikely they would be able to find that support or mobilize public opinion, then they're the ones who get cut. Often those are the ones who can least afford it.

Specifically, in this department under votes 4.15 and 4.16, I was concerned that there seemed to be no attention paid to the old saying: an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure.

I'm wondering, where these two are concerned, how many ounces of prevention we are giving up right now and how many pounds or even tons of cure we're going to have to pay down the road. I'm speaking specifically of those two departments of Social Services and the Solicitor General. There are big increases in expansions to existing jails, and those increases represent the cure factor, and we may look at many more of those kinds of increases in the future because many of the plans that were put on hold -- and the minister said where there's 100 percent decrease, it indicates more likely that the project was put on hold than either finished or canceled and that it may come back at some future point.

Many of the ones put on hold are in the kinds of services that provide treatment, education, and problem-solving before we have a serious problem, before we have a criminal offence. So the government is saying: "Well, we won't try to prevent these problems from happening at some point down the road. We will just save the nickels and dimes today and then spend the dollars and hundred dollars tomorrow when the problems surface because we didn't take those necessary steps."

I'm wondering, under public works, is the minister in fact in any way responsible for judging the merits of the various projects under the construction phase or if he just builds what the various ministers have decided should be built. Obviously, if his position is merely to build what has been deemed required by other ministers, then this is not his responsibility. But if his department, through cabinet discussions, has a chance to express concern over the priorities, then I would hope, in future at least, we would see a little more put into the prevention so that not so much is needed for the cure.

Under land assembly, I had some questions about the grazing reserves under vote 6.3.1. that being the purchase of \$330,000 under grazing reserves. I'm wondering what kind of land is being purchased. Are these lands which will be improved under another department and then sold at a loss under the grazing lease conversion policy? Because if so, I would wonder if that makes it a good expenditure in that case. I'm keeping in mind that the grazing lease conversion policy, which we're told is on hold but not canceled entirely -- it seems that under the methods of negotiation or tendering that the minister has described in recent days, the method being considered is direct negotiation under the assumption that the only buyer worth talking to is the one who presently holds the grazing lease, whereas others, including myself, have been saying it should be tendered. So I would have concerns there.

Under vote 6.3.6, which is public access to fisheries, there is a 93.8 percent cut from \$320,000 to \$20,000. I would like some explanation of exactly what is provided under public access to fisheries and how this relates to the government's efforts to boost tourism. Will this affect the right or ability of Albertans to access lakes or streams for pleasure and recreational fishing? If so, in which areas of the province, and what might be the impact on tourism or local small businesses in those areas? If not, then what types of services are in fact being cut under this almost 94 percent cut?

Under land conservation, vote 6.4.5, I see a brand-new \$10,000 expenditure, and I'm just curious as to what is the nature of this new program. In other words, what is the nature of the land being conserved, where is it, and what happened to it that it now requires this expense for conservation?

Under vote 6.4.1, municipal waste management, it's a 12.5 percent increase. I'm wondering what new lands are being purchased this year that require the increase, and I'd prefer specific

land descriptions at some future point if possible and the nearest town to these lands. And I'm also wondering if it's related to the proposed Edmonton area dump site, which is near the intersection of the Yellowhead Highway and Highway 21, and if that's part of the cause of that increase.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Edmonton Mill Woods.

MR. GIBEAULT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. There are two comments I'd like to address to the minister of public works in his estimates this evening. One is in respect to vote 2, information and telecommunication services. I understand that his department is looking at tendering for telecommunication services for the Treasury Branches in the province of Alberta outside of Edmonton city, but I understand from my constituents who work with some of the interconnect companies that the tender specifications have almost been designed so that only AGT will be able to take the business. Many of the interconnect companies are wondering if in fact there is a fair tendering process that is available to interconnect suppliers of telecommunications equipment and services in the province of Alberta. Their impression seems to be that AGT has a monopoly here, and I think, Mr. Minister, if we could have an explanation of the government's policy there: is it in fact the policy of the government and the minister's department to make the provision of telecommunications equipment and services available on an open basis through tendering, or is it in fact the government's policy to restrict its communications supply and services to AGT?

The second item I'd like to ask the minister to explain, if he would, relates to vote 4, specifically 4.13.42, the Legislature Building in Edmonton, where we indicate that while last year, according to the budget, we had \$1.475 million in work for this building, and this year I'm glad to see there's a reduction; that's down to \$730,000. But can the minister explain, after all the money that was just spent in this building, why we need to spend another \$730,000 here in the current fiscal year?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Edmonton Meadowlark.

MR. MITCHELL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to raise several questions in response to the minister's comments. First of all, he pointed out that it would be more appropriate simply to expand economic development's base than look elsewhere for new space that would be the total of the existing space plus the expanded space. The question that I would like to ask is: why is it necessary at this time to move economic development at all, to consolidate it at all? The minister does make an interesting point to that extent. Why not just leave the department split? It's been split anyway. At times of constraint it seems unnecessary to consolidate a department that has been operating probably reasonably well; at least I'm sure the minister of that department would argue that it's been operating reasonably well under its current space conditions.

Secondly, I would like to come back to the minister's comments on Olympia & York. He did not outright deny that this government is considering leasing 400,000 square feet of space in Olympia & York. What he said was that there is nothing that affects the leasing of Olympia & York's space in this year's estimates. That's interesting but is not relevant to the question at hand, because the Olympia & York building will not be ready for leasing in the coming year. Therefore, whether or not it's in this year's estimates is absolutely irrelevant to my prior ques-

tion, which was: is the government going to lease space, is it considering leasing space, is it in the process of negotiating a lease of space in the proposed Olympia & York building; yes or no? That would be an answer that we would like to see.

Thirdly, the minister jumped to the conclusion that a 10 percent grace, if you will, on Alberta contracts tendered by Alberta firms -- everything else being equal an Alberta firm would get the contract if it were within 10 percent of the next-lowest firm tender. Does the minister jump to the conclusion that that would mean we'd automatically get 10 percent higher contract costs? Not at all. The Alberta firm will still have to negotiate or tender as competitively as it possibly can. It would not have any idea what the outside tenders were going to be, and therefore it would behoove it to be as cheap as it could. But given its economic circumstances, an Alberta firm's diminished potential for having economies of scale -- if it happens to be smaller than an Ontario competitor, for example -- the 10 percent leeway would give it an opportunity to get contracts that it would normally not be able to compete for because its lowest conceivable bid would not bring it low enough to beat a major firm from outside the province.

Fourthly, the minister argued that the idea of a guaranteed contract under an industrial benefits program was in some way consistent with the argument of tendering properly. Not at all. We have never said that the government couldn't make a decision not to tender. In fact, this government could make a decision not to tender or to pick a tender that was not the lowest. All we have said is that they should publish the fact that they did it and reasons for doing it. There are times when there are good reasons for not tendering or for specifically giving a guaranteed contract to a given firm. Millar Western got a guaranteed or a special treatment support from this government. Syncrude gets specific and special treatment from this government. People aren't arguing with that. There are legitimate reasons. What we want to know is what the legitimate reasons are for departures from prescribed, proper tendering procedures.

Finally, the minister in response to my question concerning contracts that were let, capital projects that were commenced after November 16, 1986, said that to the best of his recollection there were something like no major capital projects or renovations or leasehold improvement projects that were commenced after November 17. I appreciate his recollection and his effort to answer quickly. I would, however, ask that we go beyond his recollection and request the staff of his department to put together a comprehensive and exhaustive list of all capital projects that were commenced after November 17, 1986, in excess of \$100,000. If it is that it's a \$101,000 addition to a \$13 million project that needed to be completed, great; let us see that. It will be a clear-cut, prima facie case. There will be no question involved.

What we do want to see is an itemized list of all those projects, because whether the minister thinks this is the case or not, they made the political point that they were cutting back on capital expenditures. Either they did or they didn't, and when they didn't, they did it with good reason or they didn't do it with good reason. They led people in Alberta to believe that there was a freeze. Was there or wasn't there? Could we please have an exhaustive list of capital projects commenced after November 17, 1986, in excess of \$100,000?

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Chairman, a couple of points I wish to respond to. First of all, the hon. member still has some misunderstanding of what transpired with respect to Sterling

Place. We were not amalgamating a department that had part of it here and a separate part of it over here for a number of years. We were arranging space to pull the small business component, which used to be with another department, in with Economic Development, that it joined after the reorganization.

Secondly, as a former mathematics teacher, no matter how you cut it, if you're going to allow a 10 percent preferential cost factor to be built into a tender, it's going to cost the public more. And I'm simply laying that out as a fact.

I believe what I said with respect to what occurred after November 17, when capital projects were put in suspension: that to the best of my recollection there were no major new projects started. And I wouldn't classify as a new project leasehold improvements. I did indicate there were a number of leasehold improvements proceeded with, in addition to the one I outlined to the House, for a variety of reasons. And I do recall standing in this same spot in the House, Mr. Chairman, and advising the hon. member that the question which I had to reject because of its ambiguity should be presented as a motion for a return and I'd be pleased to deal with it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Vote 1, departmental support services.

AN HON. MEMBER: Question.

MR. MITCHELL: Mr. Chairman, can I speak once more?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Member for Edmonton Meadowlark.

MR. MITCHELL: The minister has been good enough to respond to each one of my points except the Olympia & York point. Will you please indicate -- yes or no -- what the status of government negotiations are over the Olympia & York building, or will you please indicate here that you will not indicate yes or no? Could you please do one of those two things?

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Chairman, I believe I responded to that question in *Hansard* as of, I believe, last Wednesday. I would refer the hon. member to *Hansard*.

MR. GIBEAULT: I asked two questions of the minister. He has yet to respond. I would appreciate a response before we vote. Is the minister choosing not to respond to my questions? [interjection]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Member for Edmonton Mill Woods.

MR. GIBEAULT: Mr. Chairman, I was just indicating that I had asked two questions of the minister, and I have yet to hear a response. I would either appreciate a response or an indication that he's choosing not to respond.

MR. ISLEY: I can recollect, Mr. Chairman, the first question. I believe it had to do with whether or not we were defining our specifications so tightly that only AGT could bid and whether we had a policy that was attempting through overspecification to feed AGT, and I can assure the House that that is not the case. The more competition AGT has out there, I think the better we like it.

The second question I didn't make a note on, and I'm sorry, I can't recall it at the moment.

MR. GIBEAULT: [Inaudible] assist the minister, Mr. Chairman. It was in regards to the vote specifying the additional funds that were going to be spent on the Legislature Building specifically.

MR. ISLEY: Let me take that question as notice and get back to the hon. member.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. Member for Athabasca-Lac La Biche.

MR. PIQUETTE: Yes. I would also like the minister to respond to the question I had, the suggestion about the use of rural courthouses, that they're vastly underused, and whether the minister has any idea that he will be reviewing the present use of rural courthouses so that they can perhaps be, in some communities where there are no provincial buildings, used as temporary office space for social services or driver training, et cetera.

MR. ISLEY: My response to that, Mr. Chairman, would have to be that it is not the Department of Public Works, Supply and Services that determines a line service that will be delivered in a community. We always become involved in providing the space. If the hon. member can encourage certain departments or convince them that there is a need for a service and that client department comes forward, I'd be prepared to look at the type of thing he's talking about.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Member for Edmonton Glengarry.

MR. YOUNIE: Thank you. In trying to oblige those who made comments earlier about the need for specific questions, I asked a fair number of very specific questions under vote 6 and would appreciate some answers to those: the kinds of lands being purchased under grazing reserves, the effect of the 93.8 percent cut in public access to fisheries, the new expenditure under land conservation, and . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please, hon. member. It may be easier to put the question to the minister, the questions you asked that require a detailed answer. Is the minister prepared to provide those? Understandably, he may not have them at his fingertips. Hon. Minister?

MR. ISLEY: I would be prepared to respond on the questions related to grazing reserves as opposed to grazing leases and make very clear to the hon. member that what we're talking here is grazing reserves, and that's the acquisition of lands for a provincially administered grazing reserve. It has nothing to do with grazing leases or the transfer of ownership of leases.

I viewed the other questions as being so specific that if the hon. member wishes, I'll take them on notice. You know, the question asked for specific land locations, community locations with respect to the municipal waste management, and I don't have that type of information at my disposal at this moment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

Agreed to:

| | |
|--|-------------|
| 1.01 -- Minister's Office | \$189,400 |
| 1.02 -- Deputy Minister's Office | \$333,500] |
| 1.03 -- Assistant Deputy Minister's Office | \$118,300 |
| 1.04 -- Financial Planning | \$1,274,900 |

| | | | |
|-----------------------------------|---------------|--|---------------|
| 1.0.5 -- Management Services | \$2,089,800 | 5.4 -- Supply Operations | \$1,725,000 |
| 1.0.6 -- Personnel | \$1,855,600 | 5.5 -- Government Transportation | \$8,176,800 |
| 1.0.7 -- Financial Services | \$2,139,100 | Total Vote 5 -- Central Services | |
| 1.0.8 -- Special Projects | \$126,100 | and Acquisition of Supplies | \$13,563,900 |
| Total Vote 1 -- Departmental | | | |
| Support Services | \$8,126,700 | 6.1 -- Administrative Support | \$1,200,600 |
| | | 6.2 -- Culture | \$446,000 |
| 2.1 -- Information Services | \$2,374,100 | 6.3 -- Forestry, Lands and | |
| 2.2 -- Telecommunication Services | \$51,115,700 | Wildlife | \$1,534,000 |
| Total Vote 2 -- Information and | | 6.4 -- Environment | \$8,487,000 |
| Telecommunication Services | \$53,489,800 | 6.5 -- Recreation and Parks | \$452,000 |
| | | 6.6 -- Transportation and | |
| 3.1 -- Administrative Support | \$196,600 | Utilities -- | -- |
| 3.2 -- Property Planning | \$12,179,700 | 6.7 -- Transferable Amount -- | -- |
| 3.3 -- Realty | \$115,061,300 | | |
| 3.4 -- Facilities | | Total Vote 6 -- Land Assembly | \$12,119,600 |
| Performance Planning | \$4,866,500 | | |
| 3.5 -- Property Management | \$90,067,900 | Department Total | \$487,257,900 |
| 3.6 -- Property Contract | | | |
| Management | \$26,655,400 | MR. ISLEY: Mr. Chairman, I move that the votes be reported. | |
| Total Vote 3 -- Management | | | |
| of Properties | \$249,027,400 | [Motion carried] | |
| | | MR. YOUNG: Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee rise | |
| 4.1 -- Administrative Support | \$13,550,500 | and report and beg leave to sit again. | |
| 4.2 -- Advanced Education | \$2,620,000 | | |
| 4.3 -- Agriculture | \$5,895,000 | [Motion carried] | |
| 4.4 -- Attorney General | \$13,975,000 | | |
| 4.5 -- Culture | \$7,170,000 | [Mr. Speaker in the Chair] | |
| 4.6 -- Education | \$1,030,000 | | |
| 4.7 -- Forestry, Lands | | MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has had | |
| and Wildlife | \$2,140,000 | under consideration the following resolution, reports as follows, | |
| 4.8 -- Environment | \$2,930,000 | and requests leave to sit again. | |
| 4.9 -- Executive Council -- | -- | Resolved that sums not exceeding the following be granted | |
| 4.10 -- Hospitals and | | to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1988, for | |
| Medical Care | \$750,000 | the department and purposes indicated. Public Works, Supply | |
| 4.11 -- Labour | \$1,100,000 | and Services: departmental support services, \$8,126,700; infor- | |
| 4.12 -- Career Development | | mation and telecommunication services, \$53,489,800; manage- | |
| and Employment | \$185,000 | ment of properties, \$249,027,400; planning and implementation | |
| 4.13 -- Public Works, Supply | | of construction projects, \$150,930,500; central services and ac- | |
| and Services | \$13,500,000 | quisition of supplies, \$13,563,900; land assembly, \$12,119,600. | |
| 4.14 -- Recreation and Parks | \$1,875,000 | | |
| 4.15 -- Social Services | \$12,750,000 | MR. SPEAKER: Having heard the report, does the Assembly | |
| 4.16 -- Solicitor General | \$51,935,000 | agree? | |
| 4.17 -- Tourism | \$1,170,000 | | |
| 4.18 -- Transportation and | | HON. MEMBERS: Agreed. | |
| Utilities | \$5,130,000 | | |
| 4.19 -- XV Olympic Winter Games | \$880,000 | MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, the committee requests leave to sit | |
| 4.20 -- Multi-Departmental | | again. | |
| Services | \$5,000,000 | | |
| 4.21 -- Technology, Research | | MR. SPEAKER: I take universal concurrence in leave to sit | |
| and Telecommunications | \$3,000,000 | again. | |
| 4.22 -- Community and | | HON. MEMBERS: Agreed. | |
| Occupational Health | \$4,345,000 | | |
| Total Vote 4 -- Planning | | MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, before moving that we adjourn, I'd | |
| and Implementation of | | just like to confirm the notice given that the estimates for study | |
| Construction Projects | \$150,930,500 | of the Committee of the Supply tomorrow evening will be those | |
| | | of Social Services. | |
| 5.1 -- Administrative Support | \$118,800 | | |
| 5.2 -- Procurement | \$3,144,700 | | |
| 5.3 -- Operational Support | | [At 10:21 p.m. the House adjourned to Tuesday at 2:30 p.m.] | |
| Services | \$398,600 | | |