

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Title: **Friday, June 23, 1989 10:00 a.m.**
Date: 89/06/23

[The House met at 10 a.m.]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

PRAYERS

MR. SPEAKER: Let us pray.

We, Thine unworthy servants here gathered together in Thy name, do humbly beseech Thee to send down Thy heavenly wisdom from above to direct and guide us in all our considerations.
Amen.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS**

MR. FJORBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to introduce to you and through you to members of the Assembly His Excellency Hiroshi Kitamura, ambassador of Japan. He is seated in your gallery, and I would ask that he rise and receive the warm welcome of this Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER: Member for Banff-Cochrane.

head: **READING AND RECEIVING PETITIONS**

MR. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move that the petitions for private Bills that I presented to the Assembly this Wednesday past be deemed to have now been read and received.

[Motion carried]

head: **INTRODUCTION OF BILLS****Bill 247****An Act to Promote the Use of Environmentally Sensitive Products**

MR. McINNIS: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce a Bill, Bill 247, An Act to Promote the Use of Environmentally Sensitive Products.

The purpose of the Bill, Mr. Speaker, is to create jobs and protect the environment by pursuing the purchase by the government of recycled paper products, motor oils, steel, aluminum, and other products. It bans the use of CFC manufactured products by government and also would require companies extracting resources in our province to utilize their own waste products in production of goods and materials.

[Leave granted; Bill 247 read a first time]

head: **TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS**

MS McCOY: It's my pleasure, Mr. Speaker, to file with the House today the annual report of the personnel administration office for the year ended December 31, 1988.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

Member for Calgary-Mountain View.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to file copies of what I was not able to file in Committee of Supply last night: a r e p o r t . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I'm sorry, hon. member. Inappropriate comment, Just file, please, and thank you.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's a report from corporate registry, Consumer and Corporate Affairs, indicating Tycor Electronic Products Limited was

struck off the [corporate] Register and deemed to have ceased to carry on business in the Province of Alberta on February 1, 1986.

It was the company for which we were asked to provide a million dollars in nonbudgetary . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. member. A filing is a filing. Let's not abuse the process of the House. Thank you. Could the document also come here. Also, limp wrists are not part of the process of the House either. Thank you.

Solicitor General.

MR. FOWLER: Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to submit the annual report of the Alberta Racing Commission for the year ended March 31, 1988.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

MR. FJORBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure to introduce to you and through you to members of the Assembly Mr. Jim Corlett of Portland, Oregon, who is the executive director of the Western States Legislative Forestry Task Force. The western states legislative task force is comprised of legislators from six western states and Alberta and British Columbia. Mr. Corlett is visiting Alberta and Edmonton for a couple of days. He's seated in the members' gallery, and I would ask that he rise and receive the warm welcome of all the members of the Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER: Minister of Culture and Multiculturalism, followed by Olds-Didsbury, followed by Calgary-McKnight.

MR. MAIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure to introduce to you and through you to the rest of the members of the Assembly 14 fine individuals from the great constituency of Edmonton-Parkallen, 13 of whom are students in Allendale school, and their teacher Miss Ursula Buffi. They are seated in the public gallery up behind me, and I'm sure they'll be excited and anxious to get a warm welcome from this Assembly, if they would rise.

MR. SPEAKER: Olds-Didsbury.

MR. BRASSARD: Yes, Mr. Speaker. It gives me a great deal of pleasure to introduce to you and through you to all members of this Assembly 44 enthusiastic young students from the W.G. Murdoch school in Crossfield. The students are accompanied today by their teachers Mr. Chris Barrett and Mr. Jim Crowder. I'd ask that they stand and receive the usual warm welcome of this Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair had recognized Calgary-McKnight, then Edmonton-Calder.

MRS. GAGNON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is my pleasure to introduce to you and through you to the Assembly 30 students from St. Francis high school in the wonderful city of Calgary. They are accompanied by teachers Scott Bryant and Jim Darrah. These young people are keenly interested in the political process and our parliamentary traditions. They are seated in the public gallery. I ask them to stand and receive the usual welcome from this Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Calder.

MS MJOLSNESS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is my pleasure this morning to introduce to you 21 very special grade 6 students from the Athlone elementary school in the constituency of Edmonton-Calder. They are accompanied by their teacher Mr. John Bell and teacher aide Betty Wispinski. They are seated in the public gallery, and I would ask that they rise and receive the warm welcome of the Assembly.

MR. CLEGG: Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure and a privilege for me to introduce to you and through you 16 children from the Rycroft school in the wonderful constituency of Dunvegan, even better than the constituency of Bonnyville. They are accompanied today by their teachers Mr. T. Rehaume and Mrs. D. Pawa and parents Mrs. E. Sekulic and Mrs. M. Kosabeck. I would ask them to rise and receive the warm welcome of this Assembly.

head: ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Hazardous Materials Transportation

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, my question's to the minister responsible for disaster services. I'd like to go back to a case outlined yesterday of an Edmonton man who received a certificate of training for the transportation of dangerous goods, and that training consisted of no more than reading a two-page safety document. The minister's response to the situation was: "If such an event did occur, it clearly falls outside of what we expect to have happen under the regulations." I would hope so. But my question refers around the government's own standards, where they leave it up to the employer to decide if somebody's been adequately standard. My question, then, to the minister. How can the minister sit in this House and have the gall to suggest that his regulations are adequate when you leave it up to the employer? No wonder these things happen, Mr. Speaker.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, yesterday when the Leader of the Opposition raised the question with respect to this matter -- and again this morning the Leader of the Opposition referred to section 9.3 of the federal regulations with respect to this, regulations, of course, which the province of Alberta has negotiated with and agreed to. Unfortunately, what the Leader of the Opposition has not dealt with -- and I guess it's just oversight on his own part. He has not accepted that there's another section in those same regulations, section 9.7, which sets out the requirements for those aspects of training which must be delivered to the employee. Now, I could read section 9.7, which has half a dozen or more subsections which clearly point out what the kind of training level is, what is to be expected, and what is to have

happened. I could do that, Mr. Speaker, with your permission, because I think that would set the record very straight. But I would repeat again: section 9.7 clearly sets out the requirements of all those aspects of training which must be delivered to the employee, and the onus of responsibility is on the employer.

MR. MARTIN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I've read 9.7. It's still up to the employer to decide if it's been adequate. That's the point.

MR. SPEAKER: Question.

MR. MARTIN: My question to the minister then. Would he take the rightful responsibility here and put it under provincial regulations and make the enforcement from the province rather than the employer?

MR. KOWALSKI: Well, Mr. Speaker, I really appreciate that. We've already done it, and with a little bit of research, the NDP would have known that. Not only have we done it; yesterday in the House I also pointed out the number of cases that have been brought before the courts. What I did not point out, though, is the conviction record with respect to violations of exactly the point the Leader of the Opposition is making today. I would like to point out today that I indicated yesterday that there were 89 convictions. I'm sure that the Leader of the Opposition today would be interested in knowing that. Of these 89 convictions 23 were related directly to the inadequate delivery of training, and out of these 23 convictions 20 of them were registered against employers who had failed to adequately train their employees. Twenty out of 23 convictions is a record of 87 percent. This is the time of year when high school students are writing their final examinations. If they get 87 percent that's considered pretty onerous . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. It is still up to the employer to set the standards. His department then hands out a certificate. My question is: when will the government and this minister take the responsibility of setting up the training standards, making sure they're followed, rather than getting the odd person in count? Let's do it thoroughly now.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, we have that responsibility. We have assumed that responsibility. Hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of people across this province have been trained. We have training sessions right here in the city of Edmonton, at the Alberta Public Safety Services training centre on the west side of the city of Edmonton. I would invite any member of the opposition to go down. I'll set up an orientation program for the hon. people to see what it is. We have courses at NAIT. We have courses at SAIT. We have a private-sector firm in the city of Calgary that's developed a training program, Danatec Educational Services, in exactly this area. We have 330,000 truckload movements annually in this province, and it is very, very unfortunate that the level of spills and accidents has been in the neighbourhood of 280 to 290 for the last three years. Two hundred and eighty to 290 is not something that I'm very happy about but on the basis of 330,000 truckload movements in this province, if one wanted to calculate what the percentage of that is, I'm not happy with that percentage, but this is not Utopia, unfortunately.

MR. MARTIN: Nobody would argue that last point, Mr. Speaker.

Federal Sales Tax

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, my second question goes to the Treasurer.

AN HON. MEMBER: Premier.

MR. MARTIN: Well, the Acting Premier, yes.

Mr. Speaker, in 1987 when he first introduced the idea of a national sales tax, Michael Wilson said, and I quote from the white paper on taxation: sales tax reform will eliminate the hidden tax in the prices consumers pay. While we on this side do not agree with this regressive tax, at least at that time it was going to be visible. Now, typical of Conservative governments, they're breaking this promise.

MR. FOX: Can't be trusted.

MR. MARTIN: Can't be trusted.

He's now saying it won't be visible. Mr. Speaker, the Treasurer's reaction, as I saw it the other day: he said basically, you know, he doesn't agree with it, but he can understand why Michael Wilson was doing it, because it'd take the political heat off. My question to this Treasurer: is it still the position of the Alberta government that the federal sales tax must be fully visible?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, from time to time even the government and the Member for Edmonton-Norwood agree, and on this particular point we are in agreement. We believe that this proposed federal sales tax should, in fact, be visible so that the consumer knows what he's paying, what the level of tax is, and how much, of course, his consumption will change as a result of that federal sales tax imposition.

Mr. Speaker, we've had two kinds of messages in the past week. We had the officials of the Department of Finance indicating that they wanted to bury the tax, and then again we had Mr. Wilson saying, "I don't think it's going to be buried." Now, I'm not too sure of those two comments. The point I'm making here is that we have to have an opportunity to see what our colleague the Minister of Finance federally will do, and he's indicated to us that in a white paper that's forthcoming within the next couple of weeks, he'll set out for us the full way in which this tax will operate. I think it would be only reasonable, if not reasonable and ethical, to wait until he's had an opportunity to release that paper before we comment. Our position is clear. We think that in fact you should have this tax displayed, and I think really in terms of your jurisdiction the federal Minister of Finance understands that he has to have it disclosed. So, in fact, he's protecting his jurisdiction.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that the federal minister understands that, because one of the arguments he made . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary question.

MR. MARTIN: I'm coming to the question, Mr. Speaker. . . . was that he was hiding behind the provinces, because he

said it was unconstitutional; the provinces would have to do it. My question to the minister then. Has this Treasurer said in the strongest possible way that this is absolute nonsense and that they should take their own responsibility and not hide behind an argument like that?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, the Member for Edmonton-Norwood is asking for assurances. Let me restate that in fact Alberta has led the way with respect to this debate. We have in the strongest possible way told Mr. Wilson and in fact advised other ministers of finance across Canada what the very negative impact of this tax would be, both in terms of their own provincial jurisdiction, the impact on their own particular economy, the impact on their fiscal regime, and the fact that it does, in fact, intrude on their jurisdiction. Let me make it very clear that we have carried this argument as clearly and as strongly as anyone in Canada. At times we were alone in this issue, and now we can argue quite clearly that Mr. Wilson has had to change his approach to this taxation as a result of the effective way in which our Premier and others have carried this argument. We will not be deterred. We will continue this argument. We think it is wrong for Alberta, and we oppose it clearly.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, we would like to have seen them carrying this argument during the federal election, when it might have made some difference.

Mr. Speaker, to come back to the question, though, that the minister didn't answer. Michael Wilson has said that the reason it won't be visible is because it's up to the provinces. My question is: has the minister assessed this position of Michael Wilson, which is clearly nonsense, and are they going to make this public and talk about this in the next day or so?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, it seems to me again -- let me just recite the communication which has taken place over the fall of 1988 to the present date. I've already talked about the way in which we handled our communication of the opposition to this tax. That has been very well received, I think, in Alberta. Albertans understand our position and opposition not just to the federal sales tax but as well to the imposition of a provincial sales tax. That is clearly part of our fiscal plan. Secondly, with respect to the issue here I think it's appropriate for us to wait and see what Mr. Wilson does with respect to the implications of the tax, how it will operate, whether or not it's visible. Finally, I know, in fact, that the additional administrative burden on the private sector must be of concern. So if you were in a province where there was a federal and provincial sales tax, you can appreciate the difficult reporting and calculation process involved.

Mr. Speaker, we have made this issue very clear to Albertans. We stand behind our commitment not to have a federal sales tax and not to have a provincial sales tax. All Albertans through the last campaign knew where we stood. We made a very clear effort with respect to the sales tax position, and I didn't see any successful moves by the centralist ND Party with respect to the sales tax issue.

MR. SPEAKER: Main question, leader of the Liberal Party and Member for Edmonton-Glengarry.

MR. FOX: Premier for a day . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Glengarry, not Vegreville.

Appointments of Women by Government

MR. DECORE: Mr. Speaker, in the 1987 throne speech the government affirmed its commitment to provide opportunity for women by removing obstacles which prevent women from enjoying a wider range of career alternatives. It seems that the government says one thing and does quite a different thing, especially in the area of management of business. The government appoints or has tremendous influence on the appointment of citizens to several powerful business corporations. My question to the minister responsible for women's issues is this: can she explain why there are no women appointed to the 11-member Alberta Government Telephones Commission? There was a very recent appointment; I think 1988.

MS McCOY: Mr. Speaker, the question of having women appointed to various tribunals, agencies, commissions, and boards is constantly before us, and I'm very pleased to report to the member opposite that in the last three years we have increased our appointment of women by some 50 percent. It is not as many as we would like it to be, even so. There are some 30 percent of our appointments who are now women, and they used to range in the 20 percent range. We are still a long way from where we would like to be, but there has been a considerable improvement in that matter.

Regarding the specific board that the member has mentioned, I can say that to my recollection, which is over a year ago now, I don't believe there were any nominations put forward. Nevertheless, we are forever, on each and every occasion, canvassing for good women, and we have many, many good women in this province. We are getting more and more women in higher and higher positions.

MR. DECORE: Mr. Speaker, the question to the minister is clearly a focus on the management of business. Could the minister explain why she and her government have not used their powers of influence to have people, particularly women, appointed to the boards of Nova, Alberta Energy Company, and Vencap Equities?

MS McCOY: With regard to Vencap, Mr. Speaker, the shareholders in that case actually elect the boards of directors. That is not a matter that is open to this government.

As another example, though, let's look at the Alberta Opportunity Company, which is a very significant business-oriented corporation. That board we do appoint, and very recently we appointed Joanne McLaws from the city of Calgary, an outstanding woman, very highly regarded in the business community there. In fact, she was nominated by the YWCA this year for their achievement award. She was one of many -- I think about six -- who were nominated for woman of the year in the business category. We're just delighted that Ms McLaws was able to take that appointment, and I think she will bring much to that board.

MR. DECORE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the minister what assurances she can give that from this moment on, when we're talking about the Alberta Government Telephones Commission and Vencap, places where you can put influence, we will see more women appointed to these highly powerful management

areas.

MS McCOY: Mr. Speaker, I can give the member this assurance: that this government, led by our Premier, is much very supportive of doing just what you are urging. I'm very pleased to see that that same advocacy is coming from your side of the House as well as from ours. It is something that is long overdue. I'm glad we have approached this in a nonpartisan manner, and I can assure the House that as the years go by, more and more dynamic and very strong women will be in management positions.

MR. SPEAKER: Athabasca-Lac La Biche, followed by Vegreville, Edmonton-Gold Bar.

Alberta-Pacific Project

MR. CARDINAL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Order in the House, please. There's entirely too much conversation going on amongst members. Thank you.

MR. CARDINAL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is directed to the hon. minister of forestry. As the minister is well aware, my constituents are anxious to get the forestry initiatives moving in my area. As you are well aware also, there are regional disparities still in Alberta. Too many of my constituents are on welfare. Just yesterday the opposition member indicated to the House that native people plan for seven years in advance. Well, too many of my constituents already have been on welfare for three generations, and if we listen to the opposition, they will continue to be on welfare for another seven generations. The very jobs that would make the difference, the opposition is trying to cancel out

My question to the forestry minister is: can the forestry minister assure this Assembly that these projects are proceeding within the original time lines?

MR. FJORBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, I believe they are proceeding well and in the time frame. I understand the concern of the hon. member, because the future opportunities, security, and stability of working families in northern Alberta rely in a significant way on the opportunities that will be realized in these projects, not only in northern communities but in the city of Edmonton and all of the jobs here that were related directly to that I'd like to say that we are working as quickly as we can, recognizing environmental concerns must be met, but to make sure that construction is able to start, and those jobs and those opportunities for native people and all people in Alberta are fully realized. This government will always see to that fact and stand up for working families. [interjections]

MR. CARDINAL: My second question to the hon. minister, supplementary question. We have a number of small sawmill operators within the forest management area that's designated for Alberta-Pacific. These operators are concerned that they may be left out in the management agreements. Can the minister assure me that he will meet with the operators in the near future and possibly with the person who is designated to get the FMA?

MR. FJORBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, I might say I'm surprised

the opposition members think job creation in northern Alberta and that security is funny. I just find that humorous and sad that they would feel that way.

Mr. Speaker, with respect to the small operators in northern Alberta, they are being protected in a very significant way, and we want to make sure that they realize fully the opportunities that are there. I've established basically six steps to work on seeing that the small operators are protected and those opportunities are there for them. Number one, their quotas are protected. Secondly, the miscellaneous timber units have been set up provincewide to make sure small operators are fully recognized. There is also sawlog material that will come for those small operators that's made available from the forest management agreements to make sure that there's proper utilization. There are also the chips that are generated now, that have been wasted and burned. Now we'll have a market, and we've worked on that in a very significant way. We've also set out a reserve of up to 5 percent of the FMAs for small operators, and in some cases there have been entire management units set aside for small operators. So yes, Mr. Speaker, we are working very closely with small operators, and I'm meeting with them to make sure that there are opportunities, recognizing in many cases they're limited. You can't have all of the wood in the province; that's for sure. But we want to make sure that the stability for those small operators in those jobs is there.

MR. CARDINAL: My final question is to the hon. Minister of Family and Social Services. What assurance can he give my constituents and this Assembly that he will work in coordination with Career Development and Employment in relation to addressing our welfare problems in that constituency, and when will he commence?

MR. OLDRING: Mr. Speaker, a very good question. I would want to preface my comments by saying that this government cares about Albertans. We care about the situation that the hon. member so aptly describes in his constituency. He's aware of some of the unique and innovative approaches that we've taken to address those problems in the past. I'm thinking of the Calling Lake project. I would only want to assure the member that again in the past this government, the minister responsible for social services and the Minister of Career Development and Employment have worked very closely together in coming up with some new solutions -- the alternative employment program, which was so successful and introduced by this government last year, or two years ago now.

I would only want to assure the member that it is the intent of this minister to continue working very closely with the minister responsible for Career Development and Employment. I can assure the member opposite that we will be working closely together to address that concern. But I also want to say that the real solution, Mr. Speaker, lies in the diversification initiatives that this government is taking, the forestry projects, in particular, and what . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. minister. You're not the minister of forestry at this stage.

Member for Vegreville, followed by Edmonton-Gold Bar.

Farm Foreclosures and Quitclaims

MR. FOX: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased that we've

been able to convince the Minister of Forestry, Lands and Wildlife to stand up for working families. I'd like to try and persuade the Minister of Agriculture to do the same.

Yesterday the Farm Credit Corporation lost in its bid to have the Supreme Court overturn a ruling made a year ago by the Alberta Court of Appeal in regard to the case of Mr. Peter Holowach, a farmer from Bruderheim. Now, Mr. Speaker, this ruling clearly determined that the Farm Credit Corporation as a Crown lending agency is not above the law and that farmers would not have to shoulder the entire burden and responsibility for falling land prices on their own. Is the minister now prepared to agree that provincial lending agencies like the ADC are not above this law as well?

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Speaker, I believe I'm being asked for a legal opinion.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary.

MR. FOX: Mr. Speaker, the legal opinion has been levied by the courts. I'm asking the minister if he is prepared to assure the farmers in Alberta and the members of this Assembly that the lending agency that he's responsible for will not try and exercise above and beyond the assets to which they're legally entitled.

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to assure the farmers of this province and the Assembly that the Agricultural Development Corporation and other modes we have of farm financing will operate within the law and will operate as understanding and compassionately as possible in dealing with farm debt.

MR. FOX: Well, Mr. Speaker, the ADC has regularly pursued farmers for assets above and beyond what's secured through mortgages. What action has the minister taken to advise his agents that they ought not to be pursuing farmers for assets above and beyond what is specifically secured by the mortgage?

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Speaker, it's my understanding that in ADC's dealings most foreclosures and most quitclaims are usually settled with the assets that are being held as security, be they land, equipment, livestock, et cetera. There have been cases and there will continue to be cases where we may attempt to exercise on a personal guarantee if there's evidence that the farmer was diverting income from that farm into other directions. I'm pleased to report to the House at this point in time that quitclaims under ADC are down significantly; foreclosures are down significantly. There's a very renewed interest in agricultural borrowing in this province both through the farm credit stability program and the Agricultural Development Corporation. Times are looking pretty good in agriculture, and that will probably be disappointing to the NDP.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Gold Bar.

MR. FOX: Excuse me.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. member. It's been a question and two supplementaries. Order, please. I'll check with the Table. Table? Thank you.

Edmonton-Gold Bar, followed by Edmonton-Avonmore, Red Deer-North.

MR. FOX: Mr. Speaker, I asked one question, and one supplementary w a s . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. According to my records and according to the records of the Table, it's been three. Edmonton-Gold Bar.

Chinese Students in Alberta

MRS. HEWES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Canadians and Albertans continue to be appalled and outraged by the brutality and retaliation in China. On June 7 the Government House Leader said the government couldn't predict at that time what additional steps would be necessary to take. Well, the situation is clearly deteriorating. We see constant violent reprisals against Chinese citizens, reprisals that, sadly, have reached into our own borders here. Given the fact that the Chinese government is attempting to contain the democratic movement by cutting off funding to students studying in Alberta, my question is to the Deputy Premier, the deputy House leader, the Minister of Advanced Education, or the minister of multiculturalism: whoever has the answers. The question is: has the government consulted with local Chinese student leaders in Alberta to determine what assistance needs to be provided now and in the future?

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Speaker, the intergovernmental affairs department and as well a variety of other ministers have in fact been monitoring the situation fairly carefully. I would not want to give details about who it is we talk to and file reports because that's usually the second kind of follow-up. But let me make it clear that we became aware of this possibility, perhaps during the period itself, and have been watching and consulting with students here in the province and the External Affairs department to ensure that we may be able to move if necessary.

MRS. HEWES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister then answer: will the government assure the House that this government will provide sufficient emergency financial support to these students in Alberta, without which many of whom may be forced to return to China to face possible persecution? Can we be assured of that?

MR. JOHNSTON: That is right, Mr. Speaker. I think the minister of intergovernmental affairs also reported that he was in contact with federal External Affairs, the minister, Joe Clark. He had discussed ways in which they can provide additional support to those Chinese students who are now in Alberta in terms of the two items they talked about; that is, both the income support to ensure that there's an income level that's acceptable should there be some retaliation by the Chinese central government and as well in terms of reconsideration of the term of visas, to ensure that there's no pressure to end their stay here in Alberta, or in Canada for that matter.

MRS. HEWES: Mr. Speaker, it's good to hear that there is some plan, some strategy, in place.

Final supplementary. Has the government considered a hosting plan, which has been conducted very successfully in the past, involving community support to foster Chinese students?

MR. JOHNSTON: Yes, Mr. Speaker, that's a very good sug-

gestion. I can't comment specifically on that, but I do know that Albertans here have been very open with respect to their response to this problem, not just triggered by the recent disaster and catastrophe in China, but historically we have been very open in the way in which we've operated. I'd remind all members that the relationship with Heilongjiang goes back to October 1980. I think to some extent there's been a development of a family relationship between our province and their province. We as a family would like to extend our arms to those students who are here in our province, and they know that they have found a home away from home, if you like, here in Alberta.

Violence Against Women

MS M. LAING: Mr. Speaker, on Sunday morning a man broke into a woman's home, pounded her chest, stomped on her, threw her against the wall, choked her until she was almost unconscious, and put her in fear for her life and the lives of her children. She called the police, who upon their arrival said that because the man was her boyfriend, therefore the incidence had been a domestic dispute and they could do nothing until things cooled down. The police refused to charge the man with assault. Will the Solicitor General tell this Assembly whether he personally has conveyed to every police force in Alberta the fact that when a woman is assaulted, it is the responsibility of the police to lay the charges and that the woman should not have to lay the charges herself?

MR. FOWLER: Mr. Speaker, I'm personally aware of a number of occasions in Alberta where police have in fact laid charges under these circumstances, but in every circumstance the police must have available to them proper witnesses and testimony in which they can properly prosecute that charge. If there is no co-operation at that level, a charge will not likely be laid. If, in fact, the complainant indicates that they will go to court and give evidence at that level, I believe charges are laid. However, I would appreciate hearing from the hon. member, and I would inquire into that specific matter.

MS M. LAING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The woman has already called the hon. minister's office. In fact, the woman obtained a medical certificate to support her claim of injury and the Crown prosecutor continued to refuse. Will the Solicitor General agree to meet with the Attorney General to ensure that the policies are co-ordinated and that women and children are protected?

MR. FOWLER: This ministry, Mr. Speaker, will do everything possible to protect women and children in this province.

MS M. LAING: Mr. Speaker, we know in this issue that there are gaps in services. Will the Solicitor General commit to meeting with the Alberta Council of Women's Shelters to determine where the gaps are in police service and to ensure that all women and children are protected?

MR. FOWLER: Mr. Speaker, my office is ready to meet with any group at any time in this province if it's in the best interests of those groups, and at no time since taking over the ministry have I refused to meet with any group or any person where the protection of women and children is involved.

MR. SPEAKER: Member for Red Deer-North, followed by Edmonton-Calder, Westlock-Sturgeon.

Federal Sales Tax
(continued)

MR. DAY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Provincial Treasurer. From all indications it appears as though the federal government is committed to going ahead with their plan to implement the 9 percent goods and services tax. Of course, we believe that that is going to be inflationary, it's going to be regressive, and it will actually cost us jobs and opportunities here in Alberta. Does the Treasurer have any hard statistics that he's showing to Ottawa to prove the point that a low tax regime helps the economy and a high tax regime hurts it? Does he have any hard statistics, or has he just been playing . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. member. Let's save some for supplementaries.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, there are certain signs, obviously, that we've talked about in this Assembly, that do reinforce the fact that the current tax regime which the province of Alberta has maintained is, in fact, a very effective one which protects the disposable income of Albertans, ensures that Albertans have money to invest in such things as Alberta capital bonds, for example, and to spend on important consumer items. And that's why we are very fearful of this 9 percent federal sales tax, because in fact household income will be impacted dramatically by that tax. As soon as it's applied, the next day, you and I have 9 percent less, and I can assure you that through the collective bargaining process we'll be trying to capture that back. That's why over the near term this tax is inflationary, and that's why we have strongly objected to it all along. So, Mr. Speaker, we have made this case time and time again with our federal counterparts. We have talked about the negative impact on our economy here, because we're essentially a service economy. That's why we have maintained this argument very vociferously over the past year at least.

MR. DAY: Does the Treasurer have a contingency plan in place if the upcoming white paper shows that in fact Ottawa hasn't been giving two hoots about our concerns?

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Speaker, when we were standing alone as a province arguing against this federal sales tax, we argued that it would, first of all, be inflationary; secondly, that it was not going to be revenue neutral, it was going to be a tax grab by the central government, and all Albertans know full well that we're paying more than any other province per capita to central institutions; and it would have a negative impact on the economy. So we felt that it would hit us more than any other province.

Mr. Speaker, I want to bring some good news to the Assembly. We have a little good news that should be put on the Table. I've already indicated that we are concerned about the impact of this federal sales tax on our economy, and we have maintained the lowest tax regime of any province in Canada. Guess what, Mr. Speaker? It's showing up in retail sales per capita. Do you know what that means? [interjections] It means that in April our retail sales in the province expanded by 6 percent, for a variety of reasons: the highest retail . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Order. Final

MR. DAY: I can't believe the opposition is not concerned about this problem. [interjections]

Has the Treasurer done any projections or studies to determine how many Alberta tax dollars will be lost as Alberta businesses are driven underground in an attempt to escape the heavy burden of federal taxation?

MR. JOHNSTON: Yes. Mr. Speaker, there must have been a shortage of peanuts this morning. The monkeys across the way have been very active. [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: I'm sure the Provincial Treasurer will withdraw that and find some other wonderful way to circumvent t h e . . .

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, of course I take that back; I apologize. [interjections] Well, the most serious things are said in jest, of course.

I wanted to confirm, Mr. Speaker, that we do feel that a federal sales tax imposed in this province because of the high per capita income and the very low tax rate would probably, at the margin, impact on our economy more than it would any other province, because we have a very buoyant economy. Given our population rate, the application of this 9 percent sales tax would take more dollars out of our economy and transfer it to central government. We know that through the equalization process we agreed to support those other provinces, but we do object when time and time again such policies as the national energy program, for example, or other forms of central taxation take more dollars from Alberta than we can in fact bear. We are fearful that this tax may in fact do that, and that's why this strong opposition consistently has been directed towards the federal government, and we'll continue to do just that.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Calder.

Corporal Punishment in Child Care Centres

MS MJOLSNESS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This government in its throne speech expressed a concern regarding violence in the family, yet this government continues to condone the use of violence against children through guidelines that allow for the use of corporal punishment in child care centres. To the Minister of Family and Social Services. When will this minister act in a concrete way to reduce violence against children and prohibit the use of corporal punishment in child care centres?

MR. OLDRING: Mr. Speaker, we've had a couple of questions now revolving around concern for children and women in this province. I would want to say that yes, we made reference to family violence in the throne speech, and yes we are very concerned. It's a problem that's being addressed right across Canada right now, family violence.

MR. SPEAKER: Through the Chair, please, hon. minister.

MR. OLDRING: I'm trying very hard, Mr. Speaker, to speak through the Chair.

MS BARRETT: Just answer the question.

MR. SPEAKER: Order in the House, please.

MR. OLDRING: As it relates to the question in reference to day cares, there are provisions with permission of parents only, and I think that's reasonable, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary question, Edmonton-Calder.

MS MJOLSNESS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the minister. How can Albertans trust this government to be concerned about violence against children when Alberta is the only province in Canada that doesn't have a specific policy forbidding corporal punishment in day care centres?

MR. OLDRING: Again, Mr. Speaker, I pointed out that it was in very unique circumstances as it relates to permission of the parents, and I think they have that right as parents. Now, the member keeps talking about this government not doing anything about family violence, and I just don't accept that. Let me . . . [interjections] Again, Mr. Speaker, they don't like to hear the things that we are doing.

But let me refresh the member's mind. I started earlier to talk about the leadership that this government is showing in working with other provinces across this nation, in coming up with a national strategy to address a national problem. Now, having said that, it is the intent of the provincial governments collectively to submit a report to the minister responsible for health and welfare sometime this September.

But this government in the interim has not been sitting back and doing nothing, Mr. Speaker; quite the contrary. I go back to 1982 when this government introduced a major advertising campaign entitled Stick up for a Child. At the same time, we introduced a child abuse hot line. In 1984 that was followed up with the establishment of the office of prevention of family violence. In 1985 that was followed up with the Child Welfare Act, that clearly showed leadership and the establishment of the Children's Guardian . . . [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. minister. Order please. Perhaps in the supplementary the additional information could be given. Final supplementary.

MS MJOLSNESS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Albertans are tired of empty words, and they want some action from this minister. I'd like to ask the minister: is he saying, then, that if parents agree to abuse of children, it's all right? Is that permissible? Is that what the minister's saying?

MR. OLDRING: Mr. Speaker, not empty words at all. The only thing that's empty is . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Your head.

MR. OLDRING: I don't want to say something I might have to retract, but I think clearly they got the message.

I outlined the course of actions that this government is taking. Let me say this: this minister and this government will not tolerate child abuse under any circumstances, and for that member to suggest that we are is right out to lunch.

MR. SPEAKER: Westlock-Sturgeon, followed by Edmonton-Mill Woods, Cypress-Redcliff.

Farm Foreclosures and Quitclaims

(continued)

MR. TAYLOR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Back to the Minister of Agriculture, who apparently didn't realize that the Holowach case had been finally dismissed by the Supreme Court of Canada, meaning, as we have said in the House for some years, that this government has been illegally harassing the farmers, forcing them off their land in both quitclaims and in mortgage foreclosures. Time and again they have gone out and demanded cash from a farmer even though they had been turned down in the Supreme Court of Alberta and in the district courts of Alberta. Now it's definite. The court of Canada says they cannot sue on a personal covenant. What I want to know is when this government is going to get out and replace and return the money that they've taken off farmers as they've chased them off the land. When will they get their money back?

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure where the member comes from. I would be very interested . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Westlock-Sturgeon.

MR. ISLEY: I'm told now that he comes from Westlock-Sturgeon.

I would be very interested in him sharing with me outside this Assembly some specific examples of people that he feels any provincial lending corporation. Crown corporation, treated in the way he has described. He should be aware that we can't discuss individual cases inside the House, but he can certainly draw individual cases to my attention outside. I don't think he knows what he's talking about.

MR. TAYLOR: Surely, Mr. Speaker . . . I mean, his ignorance is only exceeded by his gall here. Surely he knows that the Alberta Farm Credit Corporation has time and again gone to a farmer and said, "Look, we not only want . . ."

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. member. The time for question period has expired. Might we have unanimous consent to complete this series of questions?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed? Carried.

It is a supplementary question not a statement, Westlock-Sturgeon.

MR. TAYLOR: In view of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that when the farmer was willing to foreclose and give up the land, often they have asked the farmer for additional amounts because they thought they could sue on the personal covenant, go out and collect machinery or extra money -- time and again the farmer has put up money in addition to the quitclaim.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. TAYLOR: Certainly, but you have to draw pictures for this minister.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. member. The question. I didn't hear a question.

MR. TAYLOR: The question, very simply: will he return that . . .

MR. SPEAKER: All three . . . Thank you. Park it, please. Now the question.

MR. TAYLOR: Will this government return with interest to the hundreds of farmers in Alberta that they have collected money from to get a quitclaim for the land that the farmers had mortgaged?

MR. ISLEY: First of all, Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased that the hon. Member for Westlock-Sturgeon recognizes that I have one characteristic that exceeds my ignorance.

In response to his specific question, the hon. member should know that a quitclaim is a negotiated arrangement. If I am negotiating an arrangement, nobody is really forcing me to do anything. The forced legal action is the foreclosure arrangement. If the settlement in the quitclaim is some cash in addition to securities or some cash in lieu of securities that I've disposed of or some cash in lieu of that crop that I've just harvested or the cash crop that I've just sold, and is reached through negotiations, then I don't see any reason why I should get involved in it.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, maybe I'll have more success with going to the Bonnie of the Bonnie and Clyde of agriculture over there. The hon. co-Minister of Agriculture, who is in charge of the Ag Development Corporation, I am sure understands the question I'm getting at. In the negotiation process the threat was used year after year that they would pursue under personal covenant. That was wrong. Will you give back all the moneys that you acquired from farmers when you foreclosed on an order to get either the foreclosure or the quitclaim? That's all we want: the money back.

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. TAYLOR: Sit down, Clyde; it's Bonnie we're talking to.

AN HON. MEMBER: Use the machine gun, Bonnie.

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Speaker, if the agriculture critic of the Liberal Party would do a little research, he would know that the Agricultural Development Corporation falls under my area of responsibility, not the associate minister's, and I believe I've already answered his question.

MR. TAYLOR: I still think Bonnie's smarter.

MR. SPEAKER: Better looking too.

Hon. members, it is indeed easy to tell that it's Friday morning. The Chair would like to point out that while the Chair's been trying to speed up question period this week, the Chair as always -- indeed question period flows at the rate at which members wish it to flow. The Chair, however, would point out that waiting in the wings today were eight other members who would have dearly loved to get into question period before they got home to their constituents this weekend.

head: **ORDERS OF THE DAY**

MR. SPEAKER: Might we revert briefly to the Introduction of Special Guests?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed? Carried. Member for Stony Plain.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

(reversion)

MR. WOLOSHYN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It gives me great pleasure to introduce to you and through you to the Assembly 30 students from Broxton Park school. They're accompanied by their teachers Mr. Hoffman and Mr. Thachyk. I'm sure they thoroughly enjoyed the Friday morning question period. I would ask them to rise and receive the traditional warm welcome of the House.

MR. SEVERTSON: Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure today to introduce to you, through to the members of the Assembly, 40 students from Penhold school. They are accompanied today by their teachers Ms Edith Shepherd, Mr. Rick Lardner, and parents Ms Vivianne Armstrong, Mrs. Susan Alton, Mrs. Karen Malsbury, Mrs. Sandra Newton, and Ms Alma Kenyon. Would you please rise and receive the warm welcome of this Assembly.

head: **COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY**

[Mr. Schumacher in the Chair]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. It's now a couple of minutes past 11, and in view of the other activities that will be happening before we close today, I believe it would be a good idea to get on to the business of the day, which is the estimates of the Department of Public Works, Supply and Services.

head: **Main Estimates 1989-90**

Public Works, Supply and Services

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would ask the hon. Minister of Public Works, Supply and Services to present those estimates which are to be found at page 267 of the main book, with elements at page 111. Hon. minister.

MR. KOWALSKI: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. With a great deal of interest I stand in the Assembly today to deal with the estimates of the Department of Public Works, Supply and Services. I might point out at the outset that the actual department itself was created in our history by the government of Alberta in the year 1906. It has evolved since that time to a department that now in this fiscal year 1989-90 has a requested budget of \$493.444 million. That figure is 6.7 percent down from the comparable 1988-89 estimates. The department currently has a permanent full-time positions complement of 1,927; that's the same level that was carried through fiscal year 1988-89. In terms of full-time equivalents, we've a request for 2,154.5 full-time equivalents, and that's down from the figure of

2,176 in the fiscal year 1988-89.

The information with respect to the estimates of Public Works, Supply and Services, Mr. Chairman, is contained in the large book, Government Estimates, from page 267 through to page 283. It's a large, vibrant department and one I very much appreciate being minister of.

Mr. Chairman, I'm going to be very, very brief, because I'm sure colleagues of mine will want to address various questions with respect to the department. I might point out that in the excitement of the day and the excitement of things that are happening and going on and the questions made to me yesterday with respect to responsibilities I have in addition to being Minister of Public Works, Supply and Services, at approximately three minutes to 10 this morning as I walked into this Assembly, I was given a note that basically said: Oh, my God, there has been another spill in the city of Edmonton. So I fully anticipated that the first questions that would have come this morning from the opposition leader would have related to such a thing. I of course directed at 9:57 this morning that I wanted a complete investigation of such, and I've now had a report. Of course, it didn't come up during question period, but I thought hon. members would want to know that this is the report: "Mr. Kowalski, the spill was ice cream from a garbage truck at 34th Street and 51st Avenue. The Edmonton fire department responded and went home. Case closed." Mr. Chairman, these sorts of things happen. Of course, they are part of the record of spills we have in the province of Alberta, and all of us in all our variety of ways are going to be responsive and reactive.

I think, Mr. Chairman, all hon. men and women have a very exciting budget they can look forward to, and I'd be very pleased and very prepared to respond to any questions my colleagues and members of the opposition as well might want to raise with respect to these estimates.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

The hon. Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place.

MR. McINNIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm a great fan of the hon. minister. I see he often comes here wearing a jacket that looks like an ice cream man's jacket, and I thought perhaps he might put his jacket on and go out there and deal with this problem personally, because I believe some action is needed in the area of dangerous spills in the province of Alberta. I did plan to deal with that in some detail when the estimates for Executive Council are up, because Executive Council is the funding mechanism for public safety services.

However, I do feel, in view of the minister's comments this morning, that perhaps a comment or two on the dangerous goods spills report tabled yesterday in the Legislative Assembly is worth mentioning. I note that the document appears to be dated June 12, 1989. My copy isn't a very good one; perhaps I'm misreading it. I do wonder why the minister held on to it for what appears to be 10 days before it was tabled before the Assembly. But apropos of the minister going out to personally look after things, I think this report is rather typical of the kinds of reports you might expect from government bureaucracy if you're not careful. I get a kick out of the first recommendation, "The provincial government should not overreact." Well, I would not accuse the provincial government of overreacting to this particular problem, in view of the fact that all they seem to be good at doing is copying down federal regulations and hiring people to administer those. It goes on to say that "to enhance

spill prevention, the provincial government should . . . lobby the federal government," and it goes downhill from there.

I think the report can be summarized basically in two phrases. The first is "do nothing," and the second is "do it slowly." Doing nothing and doing it slowly may in fact suit the officials, but I think the minister involved should attempt to be a little more aggressive in dealing with that problem. Because, Mr. Chairman, Alberta is not the same as every other province when it comes to the handling of hazardous materials. We have a very large petroleum industry, a very large petrochemical industry. Those industries handle highly toxic materials. We have essentially untrained drivers traveling around our streets in vehicles which are not precisely equipped to deal with dangerous materials. I think to come in with a report that says there should be no reaction . . .

MR. GOGO: Mr. Chairman, point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Minister of Advanced Education on a point of order.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Chairman, I am extremely reluctant to interrupt the hon. Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place. He's addressing matters that, although they may relate to the hon. minister, come under the vote of Executive Council, because they're dealing with disaster services, as I construe what he's saying. We're dealing today with Public Works, Supply and Services, which is an entirely different vote.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I think the Chair would tend to agree with what the hon. minister has to say so far, and I assume that this was just in response to something that was said by the minister and the member will be getting on to the estimates of this department before us.

MR. McINNIS: Mr. Chairman, you've anticipated my direction with great foresight, and I shall do precisely that.

The Ministry of Public Works, Supply and Services is a large department. It's not one of the glamour departments. Mostly, the people who work in that department operate in support of the other agencies of government. I would wager that they do a very fine job in that capacity, making sure that the public service of the province is supplied with vehicles, with office space, with paper, with equipment, with all the things that are required to do the business of government. But I think it's a very important mandate, and perhaps sometimes it doesn't get the profile it deserves.

I'm hoping I can convince this minister to take his department in a strong new direction in support of developing recycling industries in our province. This morning I tabled legislation which I think may help guide him in those deliberations, but I'd like to address a few remarks toward the role of the Department of Public Works, Supply and Services in promoting recycling industries in our province. I think first it's worth while pointing out, Mr. Chairman, that the recycling industry is already a very large and in many ways very successful industry in our province. The recycling industry currently employs more than 3,500 people in our province and produces goods worth in excess of \$300 million. Now, this is a record of some success, but I suggest it's an area of economic activity that can be expanded to not only create jobs and economic opportunities on a very large scale but also help to protect our environment in the

process. Anytime you can do those two things in one, I think that's worth having a look at, and I hope the minister will do it.

Perhaps a good place to start would be to refer the minister to a very good report in my view, very readable and full of information. It's called *A Social Perspective of Recycling in Alberta*, published by the Environment Council of Alberta. The report is one of a series leading up to a conservation strategy for the province, and of course that's another issue we'll deal with. This report does identify a critical problem, and I think it's one we see in government as well as everywhere else. We're in a throwaway type of society. Consumers of all kinds, and I include government in that, tend to favour disposable items: disposable drinking cups, the kind you would find, for example, in the lobby of the Legislative Assembly; paper towels; disposable diapers; things that are used once and thrown away. This, of course, is an environmentally destructive practice, and I'm trying to focus today on different things that can be done to break that pattern.

Recycling is not, of course, one activity. There are a number of ways things can be recycled. I want to underline that, because we tend to think of recycling as industries that collect garbage and turn them into products that can be used later on. You can certainly recycle by reusing a product for its original purpose: a ceramic coffee cup compared with a styrofoam cup; of course, the one is reusable, the other is not. Reusing products in their original form for a new purpose: sometimes containers that are used for shipping material are used to contain other products later on. Reusing material for remanufacture of the same material is the most commonly understood notion of recycling. And reusing material for a new purpose: sometimes waste paper can be used for insulation, glass bottles can be crushed and made into beads for sandblasting, plastic beverage containers can be shredded and used as an insulating filler for winter clothing, all these kinds of things. Sometimes it takes imagination at the worksite as well as a different method of supplying materials to government. So I think if we're going approach recycling, we have to look at it from all four different dimensions and not simply in the perspective of purchasing recycled material.

Nonetheless, if you look at the government budget for acquisition of goods and materials, it's a very, very large sum of money. Of course, this thing is operated in a revolving fund, so not all these sums show in the Department of Public Works, Supply and Services. But if you look at the revolving fund -- pages 282, 283 -- it gives you an idea of the sums of money that are involved in expenditure in the revolving fund but also the supply of vehicles and supply of furniture and equipment used by government.

Now, I've identified a number of areas that I think the minister could get to work on. Paper is obviously a place to begin. Recycled paper has come an awfully long way. The material I tabled this morning was on recycled paper which, if you hold it up, you can't distinguish from so-called virgin fibre, the type of paper we all use. Recycled paper products are now available in almost any description you can imagine. You can get letterhead, very impressive looking letterhead. You can get computer paper. You can get a glossy type of paper. You can certainly get photocopy paper as well as the more traditional kind of brownish looking product that's there. I don't have the figures on the amount of paper used by government because that question is still sitting on the Order Paper, but hopefully in the interests of enhancing this debate, the minister could find that infor-

mation and table it in the Legislative Assembly.

I would say parenthetically that the Assembly itself will very soon have recycled paper available in the catalogue. The officials of the Legislative Assembly have been testing recycled paper products in the computer printer and in the photocopiers. They're just about to make it available for the use of hon. members in our offices. I'm basically saying that the minister should do the same and do it in a way that helps to create a recycling industry in our province. Unfortunately, if you want to buy recycled paper in Alberta, you have to import it from the United States chiefly. It is considerably more expensive than paper which doesn't contain any postconsumer waste. Now, we're in the process of developing a pulp industry in the province. A paper industry shouldn't be far behind. If the Minister of Public Works, Supply and Services brings the resources of government to bear as a consumer of those products, it'll move the process ahead, it'll help to create jobs, and I think it'll help to make our forest resource more sustainable.

But paper isn't the only commodity. Motor oil is a very important one. Alberta does have a recycled oil industry. There's a plant in Edmonton and a plant in Calgary. I believe approximately 20 percent of the oil that's presently consumed is recycled. It could be an awful lot higher than that, but there's a problem with recycled oil. The problem is basically this: vehicle manufacturers consider recycled oil to be inferior to the new product, and at this point they refuse to honour warranties for vehicles that use recycled oil. Now, we've spoken with a number of people in the field, including Tom Rogers, the recycling co-ordinator for Alberta Environment, and this is basically a spurious argument. The motor oil produced by refineries in Alberta is of excellent quality. It's of sufficient quality to meet the standard for new motor vehicles. The reason some of the manufacturers don't like recycled oil is that there was a time in the United States when a few shoddy operators were producing inferior products, but those days have passed. In fact, Alberta's recycled motor oil meets or exceeds warranty specifications. However, an individual consumer has no negotiating position with manufacturers when it comes to warranty issues like this.

I would wager that the provincial government, with a fleet of 6,000 cars and another 2,800 motor vehicles that use motor oil, would be in a much stronger position negotiating with manufacturers in terms of the use of recycled products. If it's the case, and I'm assured it is, that these products are good enough, then we would be in a position, the government would be in a position, I think, to make a deal with the manufacturer to allow the use of recycled oil. This is a problem that's faced by local governments and by corporations and individuals throughout our society. Because of an unnecessarily restrictive warranty provision, they're not allowed to use recycled oil. I think that's definitely an area the government could move in with its large fleet of vehicles.

The recycling industries in the province now extend to steel. Stelco remanufactures steel. Some canned goods are still produced in steel containers even though the majority are aluminum. There is no aluminum recycling facility here, perhaps something that could be looked into. Plastics is an area that's ripe for recycling. Plastic products can be recycled. We have a large petrochemical industry but no recycling industry at the present time. I think that's another area the government could take a leading role in. So I'm suggesting that the minister -- and perhaps he has some initiative under way; it would be nice if he would inform the Assembly of that. But I think a long

path needs to be followed, and I'm hoping the government will get to work on that right away.

I'd also like to speak about the building management process. The minister, of course, is responsible for the management of office space in other buildings that are used by the provincial government. Historically in our province there's been a policy of 50 percent leased space, 50 percent owned space. I believe the rationale for that is that the government likes to have alternatives. It doesn't like to be captive of landlords; it likes to have some of its own data to measure the costs against the costs that are quoted by private operators. I understand that the provincial government eliminated that policy in 1983 when the hon. Tom Chambers was the Minister of Public Works, and I'm curious to know what has happened during that time. Looking at the estimates, the balance in expenditure appears to have shifted in favour of leased space over owned space, I think, where it's 60 percent leased, 40 percent owned according to the expenditure. I don't know for sure whether that corresponds to the amount of space, but I know the expenditure has shifted fairly markedly in the last five years or so in favour of leased space.

Now, leasing space has advantages and disadvantages. Presumably, if it's well managed, the advantages could be realized by the government, but if it's poorly managed, I think all the disadvantages become apparent fairly quickly. I suppose there is no case that displays the disadvantages any more than the Olympia & York project in downtown Edmonton. This is a project in which the provincial government, apparently bypassing the director of property planning and the property planning branch of the department, went ahead and cut a secret deal with the Olympia & York corporation to lease 400,000 square feet of triple A downtown office space in a building which, of course, at that point had not yet been built. They signed a 20-year agreement without any sort of tender and, as I said, with no or perhaps very minimal involvement by the property planners of the provincial government.

Now, the notorious fact about this project is that it was commenced by an individual by the name of Mr. Les Mabbott who, among other things, is famous as the Chair of the Premier's leadership campaign, I believe a primary fund-raiser for the Progressive Conservative Party in the 1986 provincial election. It seems Mr. Mabbott got to work on this project a matter of days following the Conservative Party's success in the 1986 election. According to the news reports of the time -- well, of course the company's records do show that he was assembling the project right away -- he was involved in discussions as early as May and June of 1986 with the mayor of Edmonton, who at that time was Laurence Decore. The hon. Member for Edmonton-Glengarry was involved with Mr. Mabbott in planning that project, according to media reports, in May and June of 1986.

There are a number of people who were in the building owners and management group who were very concerned about the way the government carried out this project. People who own and manage properties believed there should be such a thing as a market involving these things, and if the provincial government is going to move away from owning space to leased space, more than one individual and more than one company ought to be involved in the lease of a project, especially given that most people in the industry understand that the lease over 20 years is for something in the neighbourhood of \$20 per square foot, which is an absolutely enormous price to pay on a 20-year lease. This is a gift that goes on giving, Mr. Chairman. You lease 400,000

square feet at 20 bucks a foot; that's \$8 million a year. If you extend the lease over 20 years, that's \$160 million. Now, Mr. Chairman, that is a very generous type of lease arrangement, and I'm wondering if the minister in his comments would care to confirm that or perhaps even do what I think would be the more honourable thing and table the lease agreements so we can find out what it is exactly the provincial government has agreed to in the case of the project currently under construction in the city of Edmonton.

It does seem clear that long before the project was announced back in May and, as I said, in June of 1986, Mr. Mabbott was tying up the properties for what became the Olympia & York project. The suspicion has been raised publicly that Mr. Mabbott received a commission in the neighbourhood of \$1 million to \$2 million for the work he did assembling that property and, for all I know, gathering the lease and pitching the project to the Olympia & York group. I'm hoping the minister will indicate that under his regime this type of arrangement is going to come to an end, because it has a very bad odour as far as not only people involved in the industry, but the taxpayers are going to have to pay the \$160 million, or whatever the precise figure is, over the 20 years of the lease agreement.

I would also like the minister to advise the Assembly, if he would, what plans the department has for the future of the Legislature precincts. We're hoping, of course, there won't be any repeat of the incident in which a false ceiling in the tunnel to the annex collapsed in 1987. Fortunately, no one was in there. But there is some uncertainty as to what the government's plans are in this area. We do know that the government has acquired the federal building up the hill, which presumably will be available for office space -- for whom, one doesn't know. You have to wonder why it would be necessary in almost the same time frame to acquire that huge federal building just up the hill and also rent 400,000 square feet of triple A office space downtown. Who's going to occupy all that space while we're paying for it?

AN HON. MEMBER: It stinks.

MR. McINNIS: I believe it does stink.

However, the question has been raised: what's the future of the Legislature Annex if we have all that space in the federal building? Is it to be demolished? There are some discussions to that effect. Is it in the plans of the department to expand the Legislative Assembly building? Those are questions I'd like the minister to answer.

There's a third area I'd like to deal with briefly, because the minister is responsible for the construction of the Oldman River dam. I can well understand the present Environment minister wanting the current minister of public works to take that project with him. As I listen to the Minister of the Environment, he wants as little to do with that thing as possible, perhaps for good reason.

There are two questions I'd like to ask in respect to the Oldman River dam. One is whether the department has a contingency plan in the event that the court rules some or all of the permits underlying that project invalid. We're very close to that day, Mr. Chairman. July 21 is the date on which the court will be hearing the petition in the case of the Oldman dam. It does seem to me that if the department is prudent in its management of this project, it would be considering what could be done in that case. If, for example, the environmental impact of that project is found to be sufficiently harmful to require some re-

evaluation of the project, I hope we don't waste the money that's been spent and I hope the environmental damage that's already been done doesn't go for naught. I wonder if the minister has looked at perhaps some way the work to date could be involved in a more environmentally friendly project rather than having those funds completely wasted.

I also wonder, Mr. Chairman, if the minister has seen a preliminary evaluation of the bedrock structure of the Oldman River dam site area in southern Alberta, prepared by Dr. Robert G. Greggs & Associates, geological consultants of Calgary. For the minister's information, Dr. Greggs and his associates made a preliminary structural evaluation of the bedrock conditions present in the area of the Oldman River dam. Now, it's been known for some time that there are faults and cracks and so forth. My understanding is that the construction process involves pouring a lot of concrete down these cracks to attempt to seal them off and essentially to rearrange the way nature caused that particular part of the earth to be formulated, in the hope that that would stabilize the situation. But the study prepared by Dr. Greggs & Associates to me has some fairly alarming conclusions. Now, it's based primarily on a review of the reports that were already done by the government in the process of its engineering work. I'd just like to read a small portion of it.

The widespread regional stress system in Alberta produces a pattern of vertical faults dominantly oriented NE-SW and NW-SE. Preliminary assessment indicates that a minimum of five vertical faults crosscut the dam and the reservoir area.

Vertical basement faults are subject to intermittent movements, as a consequence of natural tectonic flux. Earthquakes, as commonly understood, are not necessary to cause bedrock instability. In the Oldman dam area such movements would adversely affect the stability of any construction, such as the dam, dyke and spillway and the water retaining capabilities of the river floor and walls. The effect of these 'jiggling' movements on the dam has the potential for risk to public safety.

This is a report prepared by professional geologists, and I wonder if the department has had a look at this report, because it was prepared in February of 1989.

AN HON. MEMBER: Was he ever on the site?

MR. McINNIS: The geologist? I can't answer the question whether he was on the site or not. However, he is a geologist I'm not, and I suspect the hon. member isn't. If a geologist suggests that there is some instability under the site in a report that was prepared earlier this year, I suggest that's something that people who are constructing a dam should have a look at, because obviously when you build a dam of that size and you put some three, four, or five hundred million dollars of public funds in it, you want to make sure the thing isn't going to burst and cause environmental damage, not to mention risk to public safety.

So those are some of the concerns I'd like to raise with the hon. minister, and I look forward to his reply.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, perhaps it would be most appropriate to respond to some of the queries made by the Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place this morning with respect to the estimates of Public Works, Supply and Services.

I appreciate the gentleman's interest in the recycling industry in the province of Alberta. I welcome the hon. member now to sit in his place in this Assembly, but surely the member should be aware of a number of interesting points which really respond

and reflect the Department of Public Works, Supply and Services. But if there's one subject matter that I enjoy talking about publicly it's the whole subject matter of recycling.

All hon. members who had served in the previous Legislature will know full well the countless numbers of speeches and countless numbers of approaches that were taken with respect to this whole matter. Perhaps the hon. member is unaware that it was I who directed the Environment Council of Alberta, along with my predecessor the hon. member who currently represents Pincher Creek-Crowsnest, to have the Environment Council of Alberta undertake a massive and sweeping overview of the recycling potential in the province of Alberta. A very important document was filed and tabled in this House some time ago when I served as the Minister of the Environment, pointing out where we're at today in the province of Alberta, where we might go in the province of Alberta. The hon. member might also be interested in knowing that it was when I served as the Minister of the Environment that we directed the Environment Council of Alberta to undertake a major commitment, an overview, in preparation for a conservation strategy for the province of Alberta.

The hon. member may also be interested in knowing that I served as the honorary chairman of the recycling industry in the province of Alberta. That was an honour given to me by the industry and all the people who are involved within the recycling movement in this province. I felt very deeply moved the day on which I was invited to attend such a provincial conference in which that honour was bestowed upon me. The hon. member might also wish to know that it was I who basically, worked with the Paper Chase people in the city of Edmonton in the province of Alberta, a Paper Chase firm initiated by a group of volunteers to help unemployed people here in the city of Edmonton, a firm located right beside the Coliseum in the city of Edmonton. I attended the official opening and provided substantial dollars and other capacities to ensure that Paper Chase is a viable option, one, from an environmental perspective in our province and, secondly, from a social perspective to be sure that people had gainful employment.

It was also I who ensured that here in the Legislature Building -- it was I who directed memos to every department of the government saying: "Would you kindly ask Paper Chase to come into your office? Put one of those black plastic barrels in your office where you might take all your paper that you don't need at a particular end of the day and have them filed in the Paper Chase thing." I've received countless numbers of commendations from Paper Chase for the initiatives we've taken with respect to that.

Mr. Chairman, the whole area of recycling is a fascinating one, and I appreciate very much that the hon. member may also have been unaware that I also served as a member of the Members' Services Committee when we discussed the whole question of what the use of the Legislative Assembly would be with respect to recycling paper. Those initiatives that are under way today are as a result of that. Mr. Chairman . . .

MR. McINNIS: On a point of order. What the minister says is fascinating, but I was hoping he would say something about the public works department.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, oil, and recycling of oil. We have a very massive organization throughout the province of Alberta that has oil drop locations throughout the province of

Alberta. Surplus oil from Alberta Public Works, Supply and Services is directed through the recycling concept that we have with the oil drop system in the province of Alberta. I appreciate the hon. member as well talking about steel and the recycling of steel in Stelco. And that's absolutely correct. Under the initiatives we've taken as a government to ensure that is part of the container return system that we have in the province of Alberta, that steel recycling would take place, Stelco would be involved.

The gentleman also talked about plastics, Mr. Chairman, but erroneously made the statement that there is no recycling of plastics in the province of Alberta. Here in the city of Edmonton we have one of the most unique plastic recycling firms to be found anywhere, Applied Polymer Research, located on the south side of Edmonton. Our Beverage Container Act in the province of Alberta -- and Alberta is the only jurisdiction that has a Beverage Container Act of the type we have -- dictates that all plastic pop bottles, beer bottles, and the like are to be directed for recycling, and we've of course got Applied Polymer Research. I would like to reassure the hon. gentleman that a great deal of work has been done to see what the future expansion potential is for the recycling of plastics in our province. In fact, I would invite the gentleman to go and visit Applied Polymer Research. There's something like over 100 people employed on the south side of the city of Edmonton in this very exciting and very important area of recycling.

I'm bringing it all together, Mr. Chairman, because the hon. member had some concern whether or not the current Minister of Public Works, Supply and Services might even know anything about recycling. I guess he was a little concerned that perhaps the minister might have a difficult time suggesting to the Department of Public Works, Supply and Services that perhaps there could be something that Public Works, Supply and Services might do in the area of recycling. I want to assure the hon. member, without any doubt at all, that if there is anyone who's fascinated by the concept of recycling, it is the current Minister of Public Works, Supply and Services.

The efficiency side of it, Mr. Chairman -- I've given enough credits in terms of what has happened in the past, and of course Public Works, Supply and Services as a department was very concerned about recycling before I even arrived as the minister. I really want to point out that a number of initiatives of my predecessor, the Hon. Ernie Isley, in this area were very, very much appreciated and accepted. I recall when I had a discussion with him with respect to Paper Chase. I said to you, Mr. Isley, "What can we do to make sure that government offices have those black containers that paper can go into?" He just jumped at it. That was an initiative undertaken by Public Works, Supply and Services, and one that will be expanded.

Mr. Chairman, it's of interest that in the area of oil recycling there are only several firms in the province of Alberta -- in fact, there are only several firms in all of Canada that are involved in oil recycling. We here in the province of Alberta have three recyclers. We have Turbo Resources here in the city of Edmonton, we have a recycler located in the city of Red Deer, and we have a recycler located in the city of Calgary. I recognize that the hon. member's a new member to the Assembly, but gee whiz, it's too bad he didn't do some research to find out that in the past several years it was his colleagues in his particular party that said: close down that recycler in Calgary; close them down because they're polluting the environment; close them down; go after them with your guns blazing; take out your Colt .45 and start firing shells. And I stood up, Mr. Chairman, in this par-

ticular bench, and defended the importance of recycling in the province of Alberta. I defended the importance of making sure it was to be expanded so that we could clean up and protect the environment. [interjections] So it's of interest to me how it comes out of both sides of the mouth. It's something I think we all have to be cognizant of and we have to be very concerned about.

Mr. Chairman, the hon. member also raised some questions with respect to the building management process and gave out some statistics. Where we're at today is that approximately 585,000 square metres of space is being leased for government departments and agencies. We also have 2.2 million square metres of owned space, space owned by the province of Alberta. Just to repeat those figures so we have the proper balance on this 23rd day of June, 1989: approximately 585,000 square metres of space is being leased for government departments and agencies throughout the province of Alberta, whereas the public of Alberta, the people of Alberta, own 2.2 million square metres of space. Those are the current figures and the current statistics with respect to that.

The hon. member said, "What's going to happen to the Legislature Annex?" Well, rest assured, hon. member, that in the last number of months the NDP caucus and the Liberal caucus have come to me and said, "Hey, Ken, come on, give us a break; renovate our offices; give us more space; come on in there; give us an interior decorator so we can have nicer aisles and nicer offices." Both of them received absolute, total co-operation from me to make sure their office statements would be improved. I really appreciate the co-operation of the hon. member who serves as the House leader for the Liberal Party, and I had just delightful co-operation from the House leader of the NDP Party. In fact, we discussed -- and I'm sure all the men and women and the employees who are associated with both caucuses are just going to be really pleased with the pretty colours on the wall, the wider aisles, the better organization.

So, Mr. Chairman, if we're committing that, those kinds of massive dollars for the comfort of both the NDP caucus and the Liberal caucus, why would we have a mysterious plan with respect to the future of the Legislature Annex? I think it's self-reflective: the question answers itself by the action we've already addressed to it. Surely fiscal responsibility is the mainstay of what we're talking about, and if the NDP and the Liberals want us to improve the quality of their offices in the Annex, well, surely we have no other plan with respect to that.

The hon. member also asked what is the status of this new building we've got just north of here, the federal building. Well, a number of years ago, Mr. Chairman, the federal government, in association with the council of the city of Edmonton, came to the province of Alberta and said, "Look, we believe the city of Edmonton needs a new federal building." And as a result of discussion, as a result of the commitment of our government to see the downtown sector of Edmonton improved in quality in terms of perspective, ensuring better services -- the leader of the Liberal Party I think was the mayor of the city of Edmonton then and got good co-operation from the federal Tories in Ottawa, those nasty guys that sometimes they've returned to and spoken about -- and good co-operation from the Conservatives here in the province of Alberta, a decision was made that basically a new federal building would be built in downtown Edmonton. A request was put to the province of Alberta: could you make use of the existing old federal building? Because of the co-operation that our provincial government has always had

in dealing with municipalities in this province and the co-operative spirit we have from time to time with the federal government, we agreed that Edmonton could use a new federal building, and the province of Alberta purchased from the federal government the old federal building.

The old federal building, Mr. Chairman, currently sits vacant, and I've asked that a review be made to me in terms of what the cost would be of renovating the current federal building to bring it up to a standard that we might want to use should we make the decision to have it renovated. It will take some time for such a report to be made to me because, quite frankly, until we have a determined need for the space requirement, I don't want to see the expenditure of countless numbers of millions of dollars expended on a public building for renovation and upgrading if there is absolutely no need for it at the moment. On the other hand, the preservation of the land, the retention of the land, is something very important. So the bottom line with respect to the federal building, Mr. Chairman, is that the matter is under review. I would anticipate that in the next year or so I will be getting a report with some recommendations and suggestions with respect to that matter.

The hon. member also asked a question with respect to Olympia & York. I should point out, Mr. Chairman, that that was a fascinating -- fascinating -- conclusion that was engineered by my predecessor with respect to Olympia & York. This government has always been concerned about improving the quality of downtown Edmonton, the economic revival of the city of Edmonton: job opportunities and the like. I want to point out that the agreement that was arrived at with respect to a private developer was an agreement that had a number of very important objectives in mind.

You'll recall, Mr. Chairman, that a release was issued on April 2, 1987, a time in which there was pretty chronic unemployment in the province of Alberta and pretty chronic unemployment in the city of Edmonton, and one of the reasons for getting involved with a private-sector development with Olympia & York was, in fact, to make sure that there was new construction occurring in the downtown city of Edmonton. It was anticipated at that time that there would be something like 2,500 man-years of direct construction work and a further spin-off of some 2,900 indirect man-years of work for Albertans. That is very substantial, Mr. Chairman. That was a major, major, major plug in our cornerstone to ensure economic and viable job employment and job creation. And these were works for the little guy, the common man: construction jobs and those people who are involved in it. In addition to the estimated value attached to the manpower, of course, we also estimated at that time that in addition to that \$75 million worth of wages provided to construction workers there would be a further benefit that would occur to the Edmonton economy and the Alberta economy of some \$50 million to the use of Alberta-purchased construction materials for the project.

Mr. Chairman, the Olympia & York project is a major one. There is a negotiated agreement that the province has with Olympia & York. Certain aspects of the agreement have already been made public, and there will be occurring, within another six or seven or eight months, a movement of certain government offices into Olympia & York, and with it will come a further expansion of the Olympia & York project. Parts of those agreements have been made public, but it's also very important that the subject matter of commercial confidentiality be maintained as well. The government is in a position to negotiate with

people in terms of lease space, the actual dollars, and the like. There is a marketplace out there. There is a very, very competitive marketplace out there, and I appreciated the private member's Bill brought forward by the Member for Edmonton-Glengarry yesterday, in which he recognized commercial confidentiality appeared to be one of those things that was very, very important.

Mr. Chairman, the fact of the matter is that the Olympia & York building is basically under construction. In six or seven months from now there will be a number of government departments that will be relocating to that particular building, and with it undoubtedly will come a further expansion of development in the downtown Edmonton area. Unemployment in the city of Edmonton has dropped dramatically, as we all know, over the last several years, directly and indirectly as a result of initiatives made by this government working hand in hand with a municipality here in the province of Alberta, the city of Edmonton. I don't know; I'm not so naive to believe that there isn't sometimes some of these motives to say we'll only use what we want from the NDP as bad news. But this is a good news story, Mr. Chairman, one that I'm proud of as an Albertan and one that I'm very, very proud of as person who lives part-time here in the city of Edmonton.

Mr. Chairman, there was a last series of questions that the hon. member raised with respect to what I think is the most important environmental project that has been commissioned in the province of Alberta in decades, and that is the Oldman River dam. It is incredible to me -- incredible to me -- that the Oldman River dam should be a subject matter of contention by the NDP. We're building the Oldman River dam after nearly three decades of review, study, analysis, evaluation, re-evaluation -- re-evaluation and re-evaluation. The purpose of the Oldman River dam is to store, conserve, and preserve the most precious resource in the province that we have, and that is water. Anyone who has any idea about life in southern Alberta will recognize that there are nearly 50 communities -- towns, cities, and villages -- who have their quality of life totally dependent on a secure supply of water. Water moves from the Rocky Mountains in this province and it flows into Saskatchewan. It flows, Mr. Chairman, during two months of the year when the prime movement occurs, and that's the months of May and June. For the remainder of the year you can as much as walk across the Oldman River at various spots and not get any water above your ankles.

Mr. Chairman, we have gone through a critical water shortage situation in our province through 1981, 1982, '83, '84, '85, and '86. We talked about drought. We talked about dust bowls on the prairies. We talked about the Palliser Triangle and the reality of it coming true. Mr. Chairman, if ever there was a visionary and bold decision by this government it was that decision to deal with the Oldman River dam. The people of southern Alberta cannot be ignored. They have every much a right to have a quality of life in this province as the people in Edmonton have and the people in Calgary have. For anybody to suggest that it's okay here in the city of Edmonton right now -- any hon. member can go to the washroom, flush the toilet, because they're going to have water. How do they get water? There are two dams -- two dams -- located to the west of the city of Edmonton that have been built to ensure that there is a continuous flow of water to the people of the city of Edmonton. Seven dams, Mr. Chairman, are located to the west of the city of Calgary. Seven dams ensure that the people of Calgary have a

continuous, consistent water supply 12 months of the year. And for anyone to suggest -- for anyone to suggest -- that the people of Alberta who happen to live in the southern part of the province of Alberta should be second- or third- or fourth- or fifth-class citizens is stupid, ignorant, dumb, irresponsible, and completely out of order, for any honourable person in this province.

The Oldman River dam, Mr. Chairman, will provide quality of life for all the people who live in the southern part of the province of Alberta, provide that continuous water supply for the people who live in those 50 or so communities. It will ensure that the agricultural industry, a mainstay of the commitment of the Progressive Conservative Party, will remain as a viable long-term alternative into the future. It will ensure that the wildlife numbers that we have in southern Alberta will grow, Mr. Chairman -- will grow. It will ensure that the environment will be protected. The alternative, no Oldman River dam -- the alternative over the next 30, 40, 50, or 60 years, if anybody looks and talks about the greenhouse effect and everything else, could very well be a dust bowl in southern Alberta. And if the NDP wants that to happen, let them continue to oppose the Oldman River dam.

What I find interesting, Mr. Chairman, is that, oh boy, through '85, through '86, through '87 and '88, they really hammered the old Minister of the Environment and others. But in the last couple of months -- in the last couple of months when there was a provincial election -- their candidates were running around southern Alberta saying: "Oh well, just a minute here. We're going to rethink this. We can't stop the Oldman River dam now." Hey, Mr. Chairman, if you ever saw it coming out of two sides of your mouth, that is a prime example.

The Oldman River dam is under construction and will continue under construction. The water reservoir will be completed in the fall of '90-91, and the people of southern Alberta will have a future. You know, Mr. Chairman, whenever you're going to build a project of that magnitude, a project of \$349.6 million in 1986 dollars, you are going to have this concern and that concern. We're aware of that. Hey, we've built projects before. We've been involved in the Paddle River dam, the Dickson dam, all kinds of other water resources. You've got to have determination to do it. You've got to have the vision and the determination to make it happen. Oh, you're going to get blind-sided with this unexpected thing and that; that's a normal kind of thing that goes along with a construction project. And you're going to have people standing in the Assembly: what about this report; what about that report; what about this report. Well, I want to assure all members that I have tabled every document associated with the Oldman River dam in this Assembly that came to my attention when I was the Minister of the Environment. You all saw me, the hon. members here, walk in one day. They had four or five desks piled up with paper. They're there. They've never read them. They asked for them, but they never read them.

Mr. Chairman, we have an international panel, an international panel of the wisest people in the world with respect to dam construction, advising us and dealing with us. And all reports that are done go to that particular international panel. And there ain't no hanky-panky. These guys are the best, and I've been advised and assured there ain't no problems, Mr. Chairman. Now, somebody can stand up in this Assembly and say, "Well, we got some geologist that said, 'Hey, this is liable to happen.'" I'm sure the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon has lost a pile of money over the years getting advice from geologists

and drilling for oil in certain spots and then having nothing but a dry hole. That happens.

MR. TAYLOR: I've found more water than you have.

MR. KOWALSKI: Yeah, found water. Found water -- a wonderful conclusion to that.

Mr. Chairman, I'm excited about the Oldman River dam. I'm extremely pleased. I'm extremely pleased that when the Premier asked me to assume new responsibilities with an Executive Council in the spring of 1989, one of the projects under my supervision was the Oldman River dam. That's the kind of enthusiasm I'm bringing to this portfolio and this job, Mr. Chairman, and I'd be very happy to get some more questions, because I feel good.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Westlock-Sturgeon.

MR. TAYLOR: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. In congratulating the new minister on his job, I'd first want to thank him for allowing me to save my hearing aid batteries for the last half hour. I was able to turn off the thing and still get the wax blown out of my off-ear. Fortunately it was only wax, whereas his was sawdust. Nevertheless, I'd like to congratulate him on taking over his new department. Actually he may have found his niche -- or maybe cavity, whatever way you want to look at it -- because being one of the eager beavers of this government in rushing out to build a dam here, a dam there, a house here, or whatever it is, he is a very competent administrator, I believe. Maybe where I'd like to question him a little more is on principles. He does remind me of our national emblem, the beaver: he doesn't give a damn where he builds dams; he just starts to work wherever things go ahead.

I'd like to ask a couple of questions. When you mention the recycling of oil, is the minister's department responsible -- or will he be, in the Recycling Act -- for recycled oil and paper? Does the minister have anything to do with the recycling of glass? Because that's going to become quite a problem, and I was just wondering if the minister has any plan. Obviously the minister of economic development has been a failure with keeping our own glass recycling going in Redcliff. My understanding is that the recycling of glass can be separate from the actual glass plant itself, and maybe the minister's contemplating buying or just starting up that section of the work, keeping that section of work going or starting that up somewhere else or a subsidy to transfer glass to B.C. or whatever it is. There's a whole field there where I think the minister should be giving some direction to the people of Alberta as to what will be done, because it's not a desirable situation to dump it in the various dumps around the province.

The other area is the competitive bidding process. I'm intrigued whether the minister has a line over which he submits for tender. Reading some of the past minister of public works' statements, I notice that when a contract was under \$200,000 they submitted it to the local areas, hoping that local people would bid on it. But it doesn't say where -- and the Olympia & York deal points this out. Just where does a competitive bid come in and where does it drop out? I rather get the impression from this government that up to about \$200,000 it's given out by the minister, from \$200,000 to about \$3 million it's competitive bid, and when it gets to \$3 million it's given out by the minister again. In other words, we have something a little reverse

or different from most processes. It should come up for competitive bid at a certain level and stay that way.

And while I'm at it -- I know it's a rather fruitless task -- I wonder if the minister is going to be prepared to table the contract we have with Olympia & York. I'd like to ask him when he is going to table the rental contract we have with Olympia & York, because it's a big money expenditure and I think the people of Alberta would like to know just what's going on or what our liabilities are in the years ahead. Tied into the Olympia & York -- it's rather a puzzle to me why the federal building he mentioned has vacancy. Was not the federal building vacancy anticipated when they signed the Olympia & York deal, or just why has the federal building been empty as long as it has?

The next area I'd like to request some information on, Mr. Chairman, is the management of properties. Now, my understanding is that the figures -- I did a quick calculation, and about 26 percent is being run by private firms. That is almost identical with what the previous minister had a couple of years ago. So by this time there should be some studies available in the public works department to tell whether that 26 percent that has been set out to private management has indeed saved the government any money. In other words, the fact that it's been arrested at 26 percent the last few years would suggest to me that maybe the privatization of management isn't working as well as they thought. But then if it's not working as well as they thought, we shouldn't be sticking at 26 percent. We should be going back down again. If it's working as well as the original minister said, then we should be increasing from the 26 percent under private management. Why have we stopped at this spot for the last couple of years? Maybe the minister would care to table a comparison of costs in the House or at least tell us orally what's going on.

Land assembly was an intriguing part of the budget too. I'm a firm believer in greenbelts around Calgary and Edmonton, and maybe Red Deer will soon be ready for that too. I think no city in the world has ever regretted having a greenbelt established around it. Yet it would appear that land assembly costs are going down. In other words, when property is cheap, we should be assembling the land. This government has had it all backwards. They jump into the market, start assembling land purchases when the land appears to be in short supply, therefore driving the price up and going into the market competing against private investors and housers and running the price out of sight. When the price starts to go down, the government shows the same panic that the private investors do, and they all bail out. It complicates the issue. So while we're on why the greenbelt, I'd like to hear whether the minister is pursuing the greenbelt idea around Calgary and Edmonton, which I would very much support.

While he's at it, an ancillary or, I guess, related area that's in my constituency, particularly in Gibbons -- and there are other towns around Alberta where there is a huge inventory of Alberta Housing that's presently leased out or just plain empty. I'm not positive the disposal is under the public works department, but has he got any plans on putting those back on the market now as the housing market is recovering? It seems to me that there's a lot of housing the provincial government controls that could be put back on the market at this time.

Again, going through the budget, as the minister knows, and I think it maybe under -- I don't know if it's under Municipal Affairs or whether it's under the Department of Health. The question of granny houses or whatever it is: the building of

these units that they put on the sons' and daughters' property where senior citizens or, as they call it, grandmother and grandpa can live. There's about six of them, I believe, right now: three of them in southern Alberta, the Lethbridge area; and three of them up in the Stony Plain area. I would wonder whether he's set any moneys aside -- I think they cost around \$70,000 apiece -- to build any more of them, or are we going to wait another year or so on that experiment?

I'm also intrigued with his statement -- no, I'm not intrigued either. No, this is something else. I wanted to know just what the relationship is between the minister and his department and some of the assets of North West Trust and maybe Heritage Trust. Some of my informants have told me that the minister has been around with his eagle eye peering under carpets and around doors and peering fingers into corners to see how some of the assets that the descendants of North West Trust have had to foreclose on, whether the department of public works is indeed managing any of these properties for the follow-up to North West Trust; it isn't North West Trust. In other words, does he separate out in his budget, or can he separate out in his estimates when he's operating government property or whether he's operating the property that's been foreclosed on by the Treasury Branches or North West Trust or ADC and all the others? In other words, does he lump it all together, or is it all in under the one estimate?

He touched on, for a minute, a dam that had been in planning for 30 years, and this, Mr. Chairman, is one of the things that worries me about this government. They are fond of following ideas developed 30 years ago. There is a natural rise and fall of events, and for the minister to brag about finally building a dam that had been planned 30 years ago is like bragging about going out and building a buggy factory, because that idea had been conceived 30 or 40 years ago and nothing had been done about it. Unfortunately, there is too much of this rearward vision in this government. The whole question of a dam: I hope this is last one we see in Canada; the last one in the U.S. finished some years ago. There are many and other better methods of getting water on the land. However, what's done is done, and we will wait to see, indeed, whether the dam will end up floating downriver some day and the minister's reputation with it or whether it will stand there as the Rock of Gibraltar for some years to come yet before it silts up in 40 years. I don't think there's any danger of the hon. minister ever silting up.

To go on a little further, there is an estimate . . . I wondered some years ago -- the question came up and I've never fully answered -- whether the minister is getting full value out of the aircraft that we have. Many provinces Alberta's size or smaller and some bigger co-ordinate their planes with the fire fighting. In other words, the planes can be used for fire fighting, and when they're not hauling fire fighters around or fighting fires, they haul cabinet ministers around. We seem to have things reversed here. The cabinet ministers seem to feel that they are fire fighters, and they're hauled around to put out fires around the province for the next election. I would rather think that there might be some room for co-ordinating and putting together the Getty air force so it could fight forest fires.

Moving on a bit, I notice the last minister's statement that they tried to buy as much locally as possible. I haven't read in detail the free trade agreement, but my impression was that Alberta and the provinces had not been successful in getting a rider in there to do a local buy first. Now, I would be subject to correction on that because it is a very voluminous document, but I

know originally the provinces wanted protection, as did the states, so that they could buy somewhere up to around \$100,000 locally. My understanding, or I shouldn't say my understanding as I'm not too sure that's still true. In other words, how is the buy Alberta process, which was referred to by the last minister in April 1988 *Hansard* on page 743, working out? Are we able to do so with the free trade agreement?

Another area, a very quick one, is that I notice an increasing number of government cars being allotted to the MLAs fortunate enough to be chairmen of committees or whatever it is. I was wondering if the minister has any record now that chairmen have had cars, some of them for two or three years, of the comparison of the cost of those cars versus the old mileage system that we used to give an MLA. In other words, has he got a comparison of costs, or has he run a cost of what the cars to chairmen cost? I sometimes think that this government has bought shares in all the Detroit corporations by their sudden keenness to buy cars. It's getting very difficult indeed to be a Conservative backbencher without having a car thrust upon you as you enter the Legislature. I hope I am not seeding dissent, Mr. Minister, amongst those backbenchers who weren't aware that if they asked the right question and got on the committee, they could get a car. Nevertheless, I just thought those advantages might be handy to know.

Lastly, Mr. Chairman, I wanted to touch on one other area that we have that is under the minister's responsibility, and it's lotteries. I know the public of Alberta got the worst break of all in the lottery of politics by getting this minister in charge of that. Nevertheless, this minister is in charge of giving out moneys from the lottery. It puzzles me why it does not go through the local representatives -- I'm not talking about the local MLA; that might be too much to ask -- through the local councils. We do that with our recreation grants, and it seems to me that that same process we now use for our community recreation grants should be used for the lottery grants, because the priority of lottery grants are people seeking help for community enhancement facilities.

The list is getting long and is getting longer. I noticed when it started out that the minister would come to my riding and say, "Don't bother calling old Nick or your MLA; I'll handle it directly." Well, all hell's broken loose now. Everybody in the riding wants a grant. So now the minister's saying, "Why don't you call old Nick?" Well, I'm thinking that maybe old Nick and the minister should both get out of it and let the local town council and the local MDs put a priority list on the thing, the same way the minister of transport did some years ago when he got out of it a certain amount in getting them to give a priority list on what roads they wanted paved and done over. I think that in the spirit of democracy, plus maybe taking a little heat off us MLAs, the minister should give serious consideration to having these requests vetted, if you want to call it that, and prioritized by local government.

That, Mr. Chairman, is everything. Thank you.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, there were a number of very important questions raised by the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon, but I want to make sure at the outset that all members understand that this individual has never, ever suggested to anyone in Westlock-Sturgeon that they should go and discuss anything with the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon. In fact, whenever I've tried that, they said they didn't want to. It's just a minor point, but it is important in terms of the history of the whole

thing.

I'm going to do something a little differently this time than I did the first time, Mr. Chairman, if you don't mind. I'll respond in the last order because it's the freshest one in my mind. With respect to lotteries in vote 6, I think all hon. members should appreciate that what we've got under vote 6 is essentially a granting program based on dollars for class A fairs in the province of Alberta. These are general revenue funds. These are not -- I repeat not -- lottery funds. These are general revenue funds in vote 6, and basically what those dollars make up . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: For the purposes of the record I think we should be referring to vote 7.

MR. KOWALSKI: Sorry, Mr. Chairman. I'm corrected, of course. Thank you very much.

Under that particular vote we would have a \$100,000 annual allocation to the Calgary Stampede board, to Edmonton Northlands, to the Camrose Regional Exhibition, Grande Prairie Regional Agriculture and Exhibition Society, the Lethbridge and District Exhibition Society, Lloydminster Agricultural Exhibition Association, Medicine Hat Exhibition and Stampede Association, the Olds Agricultural Society \$84,000, and the Westem Exposition Association \$100,000. In addition to that, Mr. Chairman, what we have is a referral back to a number of these groups under pari-mutuel grants. So we'd have the Calgary Stampede getting \$715,225, Edmonton Northlands \$973,149, Lethbridge and District Exhibition \$17,821, and there are some smaller amounts for some few others. Then there are also provisions for three groups to get some modest capital grants under that. They're general revenue funds. They're not lottery funds, not to be associated with the independent lottery fund at all. The community facility enhancement program has nothing to do with this particular vote.

The second last point that the hon. member raised had to do with cars, automobiles.

MR. TAYLOR: Point of order, Mr. Chairman. I hate to butt in, but the minister is responsible for them. I thought all departments that a minister is responsible for come up at the same time. He's going to come back again another time on lotteries?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Lotteries will be on another heading, hon. member. Today we're just dealing with the vote for the Department of Public Works, Supply and Services and the community . . .

Hon. minister.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, all hon. members will know that I'll be back here on at least three or four occasions. I'll be here as Minister of Public Works, Supply and Services, minister responsible for Public Safety Services as a vote under Executive Council, minister responsible for the Public Affairs Bureau under a vote under Executive Council, but not as the minister responsible for lotteries, because it is not funded by the General Revenue Fund. There are other options and opportunities. That can come under Public Accounts. We all know that Bill 10 has now become the law of the province of Alberta, and one of the provisions under that is to allow the minister responsible to appear before Public Accounts. That will be done in accordance, and the Auditor General will deal with it.

Mr. Chairman, the second last item that the hon. member

raised was one dealing with automobiles. There are a number of members in the Legislative Assembly who do have access to automobiles, as there are a number of members of the public service who do. The hon. member will know that as a colleague of his on the Members' Services Committee, we've had ample discussion in the past. My personal view is that I really believe all members of the Legislative Assembly, through Members' Services, should have access to an automobile if, in fact, it is cheaper to have an automobile than to pay the annual provision that is currently provided under the Members' Services Committee. Basically, what has been pointed out to me is that for virtually all members outside the urban centre it would be more advantageous for the public purse for these individuals to have access to an automobile than, in fact, to receive the mileage amount. The same would not apply to members who would be located in the larger metropolitan area of Edmonton because of the distances and everything else. But that's a matter that Members' Services can deal with.

The hon. member's admitted that he has not read the detail of the free trade agreement. That's a shocking revelation, but then it's not out of order or anything else. One thing that is very clear to me, Mr. Chairman, is that free trade, as we all know, is a matter of prime importance to the province of Alberta and one that we believe, from an economic point of view, will have long-term benefits for the people of Alberta.

Government aircraft was a matter that was discussed. That's really a fascinating little discussion, really a fascinating little discussion. I think it's important that all members understand clearly, clearly, clearly, and clearly -- and I can't say it more emphatically than that -- that in terms of government aircraft we have a portfolio of aircraft in this province, and priority with the allocation of those aircraft is on the following basis: priority 1, health purposes; priority 2, environmental purposes, which would include forest fire fighting; priority 3, travel by Executive Council. So for anyone to suggest that usage of those aircraft is, you know . . . [interjections]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. KOWALSKI: . . . for the Premier and Executive Council, who hobnob around the province, it's extremely important that I repeat again: priority 1, with the usage of aircraft maintained by the province of Alberta -- and there are 15 units -- health; priority 2, environmental matters -- that's forest fire and everything else; priority 3, Executive Council travel. Should there be an event where we have a massive forest fire in the province of Alberta and utilization of those aircraft is required and my colleague the Minister of Energy is going to a very important meeting in Fort McMurray with the people there who may have invited him, if that aircraft is required for fire suppression, environmental concerns, he will be bumped. And there should not be any misunderstanding on that at all. We have 15 aircraft in the fleet, Mr. Chairman. Those are the priorities with respect to that.

The hon. member said: please help us from any more water management projects. He said: no more dams. No more dams, he said. Well, Mr. Chairman, we have in these estimates commitments for two reservoirs. They're very clearly identified, and if the Liberal Party's opposed to those reservoirs, they should clearly stand up and say that they're opposed to those two reservoirs. If the NDP are opposed to those two reservoirs, they should stand up and say that they are opposed to those two

reservoirs. They should say it today; they should say it tomorrow. They should say it till 1989. They should say it till 1994 and to the year 2000. These estimates contain two well-deserved, well-important water management projects in the southern part of the province. The hon. member also knows full well that the current Minister of Public Works, Supply and Services believes that a water management project is required for the Pembina River. And all hon. members will know that in the year 1986 the worst flooding in the history of the province of Alberta occurred on the North Saskatchewan River and on the Pembina River. Mr. Chairman, it should be noted that the ravaging floods of 1986 caused damage in the amount of \$25 million to \$30 million to the areas and people residing and farming along the banks of the Pembina River. At the same time the Pembina River flooded, for the first time we did not have a flood on the Paddle River. We didn't have a flood on the Paddle River, Mr. Chairman, because we have a water reservoir controlling that water in the Paddle.

Statistics provided to me, and I filed the documentation in this Assembly in the last several years, clearly indicated that if the Paddle River dam had not been there, the damage factors and problems for the people living along the Paddle might have been as high as \$25 million. We had constructed a dam at a cost of \$45 million to protect the people who live along the Paddle. The one flood of 1986 would have caused some \$25 million worth of damage; we would have destroyed their environment, hurt our environment. Because of the wisdom and the vision of my predecessors in this Assembly -- they did something intelligent. I hope I've got enough conviction and support to see something happen in the future with respect to the Pembina River dam.

As far as me going around poking my finger in this building and that building, Mr. Chairman, I want everybody to know that I take an interest in the 2,500 public buildings in the province of Alberta. I take an interest in finding out what the employees of the province of Alberta are all about. I'm concerned about their morale. I'm concerned about how they feel. I'm concerned about the kind of office space they have and whether or not it's conducive to the best employee morale and productivity. I have every intention of continuing to poke around and stick my nose in a whole bunch of other kinds of corners, back rooms, attics, whatever the heck it is, to make sure I know what's going on and to make sure, more importantly, that the public employees of the province of Alberta feel good about the work environment they're in and their productivity goes up. If the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon says that I shouldn't do that, well, I've got news for him. I intend on being close to the people of this province, and he can isolate me all he wants, but I ain't going to listen to him.

The next point, Mr. Chairman, was a question with respect to surpluses and tendering and everything else. I recall that the hon. Member for Edmonton-Kingsway already had a question on the Order Paper that the government accepted. We will be responding with all the necessary documents and papers and everything else, and the hon. member will have to find a few minutes to figure it all out and understand it. I know that he will, and if he has a problem, come along to me and we'll draw some pictures.

Mr. Chairman, we also, of course, get rid of government surplus property. That's an important aspect. In essence, it's disposed of through a normal tendering process for the most part. We have here in the city of Edmonton the disposal building near

the Coliseum, again where people can go. Redundant materials come up, and they're offered for sale. Automobiles are done that way; they're provided to various auction marts throughout the province. Then periodically a group comes to me, a volunteer group and/or the like, and says, "Gee, we could use 10 chairs because we're having a meeting to help needy people, underprivileged people," and/or the like, and we allocate small requests of surplus materials to such groups. We think it's efficient, it's effective, and it's cost effective as well. We do that periodically.

With respect to the RDAs, a very, very fascinating question. The hon. member will recall that it was in the mid-1970s that the government of the day determined that there would be a greenbelt located around our two large metropolitan cities, Edmonton and Calgary. Since that time, of course, there have been other RDAs developed, I would like the member to know, over the years. Of course, in the summer of 1988 the then Minister of Public Works, Supply and Services and I issued a public document which said that we were now coming down to what the actual parameters of the transportation and utility corridor were going to be. We made it public and published maps so that everybody would understand completely what had happened. Where we're at today is that in Edmonton some 77.3 percent, or 8,000 acres, of the transportation and utility corridor requirements in Edmonton have now been assembled, and in Calgary some 72.7 percent, or 7,100 acres, of the transportation and utility corridor requirements have been acquired. We've got that situation.

In terms of all the negotiations you have with the hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of landowners, it may very well be that our requirements, as identified to us by the city of Edmonton or the city of Calgary and Alberta transportation, may only have been 43 acres for the transportation and utility corridor, but they may have had to purchase 100 acres in order to get it. So we also have a situation where we do have some surplus lands, and those surplus lands of course are made available under a policy that's market value, open tendering, negotiation, and the like.

There's been a massive amount of dollars set aside in the last decade for the acquiring of lands for the green area of the transportation and utility corridor, Mr. Chairman. It is a massive commitment. In fact, \$451 million has been spent on the restricted development area, the green area, the transportation and utility corridor. Of course, those corridors are around both our major urban centres. It's a heck of a project, and there's ample opportunity for surplus lands in the transportation and utility corridor to be turned into green areas and the like as well.

The hon. member also raised questions with respect to the federal building, and I thought that I had responded to those concerns of the previous question in the same way as I had to Olympia & York.

Finally, the hon. member raised a question with respect to glass. I'd like the hon. member to know that I'm the Minister of Public Works, Supply and Services. I really welcome him giving me new jobs and everything else, but I recall that in the last number of days in this Assembly my two colleagues the Minister of economic development and the Minister of the Environment said that they were both looking into the question of dealing with surplus glass. The hon. member should know full well that we work here as a collective. It's teamwork. We work together. We discuss together. Whatever kind of input I can provide to my two colleagues, I will certainly provide in that

regard.

I think that perhaps sums it up, Mr. Chairman, unless the hon. member needs more clarification.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'll recognize the hon. Member for Cardston.

MR. ADY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I, too, would like to congratulate the minister on his appointment to this portfolio. I would particularly like to compliment him on the way he has always handled his portfolios, in that whenever he's called on to give an answer, he always has an answer. He has an answer that is valid, has excellent content, and they have been the sort of answers that the opposition has not stood well against, if they would to come to understand that. [interjection] First of all, the hon. member behind me should understand that the last critic of the environment, which that minister was responsible for, is no longer in this Assembly, so he didn't really fare too well in coming up against this minister. The new critic may learn something from that.

I'd like to compliment the minister by virtue of the fact that although he represents a constituency from the north, he has the courage to stand up and champion a cause from the south. Certainly the cause of the Oldman River dam has been a controversial one, yet never have I seen that minister duck that issue or any other controversial issue that might come before his portfolio.

That's why I'm glad to see that he's the Minister of Public Works, Supply and Services and that he has charge of some of the projects that are going to happen in the constituency that I represent. They're important to my constituency, and one of them has to do with something in the way of fairness, in that we have an institution called Raymond Home, which is being upgraded at a cost of \$1.7 million. The construction is presently under way.

Just let me tell you a little bit about that. Raymond Home is an institution for the adult mentally handicapped. The people in the local community have formed an association which has worked closely and co-ordinated with the government to take many of those senior adult handicapped people out of the so-called institution and put them into homes, homes where six of them are housed. They have the opportunity to take care of themselves to the extent that they're capable. They take care of their own meal planning, their own housekeeping, their own entertainment. However, they do receive the assistance they require. It's working very well. Instead of those people being captured into an institution, they are now able to function far more capably in the community, and this institution will serve to enhance that opportunity for those people.

I'd like to also talk a little bit about another health related project. There are two health related projects being constructed in my constituency in the planning stages. One of them is nearly finished. The estimates this year in this department indicate that there is \$1.030 million yet to be expended. I'm confident that most of that money is to finish off paying contractors, and I'm confident that under the administration of this minister, those contractors will do an excellent job and that the job will be completed on time and in a satisfactory manner before they receive their final payment for services rendered.

The other project that I would like to speak briefly about is carried in vote 5.1.1 at a cost of \$1.470 million. It's anticipated that this project will go to tender sometime this fall for comple-

tion in 1992. I'm confident that it will be done expeditiously and on time. The former minister from Bonnyville was anxious to extend it a year, but he's changed his mind and is now going to support that it be done on time. When it's finished in 1992, it will begin to serve its purpose: to enhance the area with tourist traffic, which is projected to be in excess of 200,000 people per year to visit the Remington Alberta carriage interpretative centre.

With all these projects that are coming under this minister, I have one request and one question I'd like to ask of him. As the contracts are let, can the minister specify a high content of local labour to allow the local communities to take advantage of these construction projects that will take place in the Cardston constituency in the next two to three years?

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the comments made by the hon. member with respect to the Remington Alberta Carriage Centre in Cardston. That, of course, is a new museum in the province of Alberta. It's part of the cornerstone of a series of projects that we have under development in our province to protect the history of the province of Alberta, to afford a tourism destination point. This would be a unique collection of horse-drawn vehicles that have been assembled by an individual in that area, who I understand will now have them stored in this new museum. It should be a major tourism attraction. It's part of the commitment the province has in terms of the vision we have for the year 2000 and the promotion of tourism in our particular province.

The specific question the hon. member raised is an interesting one, and that's local content of individuals with respect to construction projects. In many ways the same principle that Alberta would have to use with respect to its situation in Canada in terms of allowing Albertans to work in other parts of Canada has to be maintained within the province of Alberta. We recognize that as an important thing, an important principle to be involved. From time to time, however, if there are chronic situations of unemployment in a particular area, as we did with respect to the Oldman River dam -- we wrote in some clauses very, very clearly that maximum job opportunities should be given to the people who live within a certain circle. The point is well taken. I accept it as advice, and I accept it as guidance. We'll do everything possible to assist the hon. member.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Highlands.

MS BARRETT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I listened with interest to the comments made by the Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place. I'm afraid I didn't hear the minister respond with respect to the taxpayers' money that was squandered on the land assembly work that was done by one prominent Tory, ultimately to lead way to the construction of the Olympia & York tower, which the government will be leasing 75 percent of at a rate yet and still unknown to anybody in the public and possibly to the minister himself. Perhaps it's time for him to come clean and give us that information under the authority of his department.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there's another issue that I think is very important here, and that is: what is the government plan to deal with the government-owned property that will be vacated when the Oly & York building is finally constructed and occupied by provincial government employees? A good suggestion was put

to me just recently and that is: does the minister have any plans to perhaps turn one of those buildings over to a housing project so that people who are currently living in the streets in Edmonton will have a place to go, winter and summer alike. It seems to me a good recommendation. The minister's got a lot of money he likes to throw around. Maybe he'd like to make a proposal in this regard.

Now, another issue that I don't believe the minister has properly addressed is the bait-and-switch policy between the Department of Recreation and Parks and their CRC grants, which have been cut, and the absence of a firm commitment for an annual support to those programs which had been supported by the CRC grants. Now, I remember how hard we fought Bill 10, the Bill that created what we call the slush fund, Mr. Chairman. In fact, we fought it so hard that the minister at that time had to invoke closure several times to get that Bill through, and I can assure you . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order. Order please, hon. member. I hesitate to interrupt you, but really these lottery questions are not part of the estimates we're dealing with this morning.

MS BARRETT: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm going to get to that in a second because I think it is. I think implicitly it is, because there's no other prior accountability process for this minister to bring to this Assembly, and I think that if the government was so concerned . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. member, it's been pointed out already that Bill 10 is now the law, and the route that questions are to be asked with regard to these matters is in Public Accounts Committee.

MS BARRETT: Well, Mr. Chairman, I beg to differ in one sense, and that is that this Assembly surely has the right to ask the minister under the authority of vote 7, which after all is taxpayers' money being used to support that hideous Bill. This minister is responsible for the expenditure of that money, and in that sense he is accountable to this Assembly with respect to how he plans to disburse the money that doesn't come before the Assembly. I'll be very careful in crafting my questions in this regard because quite frankly he is accountable to this Assembly for the disbursement of the taxpayers' money under 7.1.

I want to know if he plans to instruct his staff under that vote to make sure that the money that had gone to municipalities under the CRC grants, which have now been cut, will come up as an annual commitment by this minister's staff and this minister himself to compensate for that loss. If he plans to do that, then maybe he'd also tell us why it is that he hasn't fought the rest of his caucus and told the government to bring the full amount of that money into the general revenues and divide it up so that he gets his portion under his department and so that the Culture and Multiculturalism minister gets his portion under his department and so on and so forth.

Surely he has to answer those questions, Mr. Chairman. I would argue that he does. Does he have any intention to do this? Is there any system that this minister plans to employ for the disbursement of those lottery revenues that will be systematic and fair and program oriented rather than one-off, what I believe to be vote-buying occasions?

I'd like to respond to something the minister said yesterday in the House as well, Mr. Chairman. He says in response to

questions about . . .

DR. WEST: Point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Minister of Recreation and Parks.

DR. WEST: I do believe, Mr. Chairman, that CRC grants will come up under the estimates of Recreation and Parks, and tying them across like this, I believe, is out of order.

MS BARRETT: No. It has everything to do with the disbursement. This is taxpayers' money that is being used to hire staff to support this minister in his decision-making processes with respect to disbursing lottery funds and is absolutely legitimate under these circumstances. I can assure the hon. Minister of Recreation and Parks that I'm sure the subject will again arise when we get to his estimates, so if he waits his turn, I'm sure he'll have fun on this matter as well.

Now, as I was about to ask the minister, seeing as how he's using money that I'm paying and money that he's paying into this system for disbursing lottery funds: is he also prepared to proceed with ongoing commitments for programs and not simply those one-off occasions which may be politically convenient and expedient? The minister said yesterday, for instance: well, you know, certain ridings get certain amounts. The problem I see in this whole system -- and until the minister tells me that a plan is being developed otherwise, I have no reason to believe that the following problem is about to be corrected. That there will be a uniform system for applications for these grants and a uniform system for getting them into the ridings, I think, is crucial, not that I ever for a moment accept the premise upon which this program is based, Mr. Chairman.

So is the minister prepared to cough up a solution on this matter so that there isn't arbitrary decision-making in one minister's office, so that he has to be held accountable prior to the Public Accounts looking at these issues after the fact? I think that's an important consideration, and I'd like to hear the minister's response to it.

I remind the minister that the other questions I asked had to do with the prominent Conservative Les Mabbott and accountability with respect to the land assembly commission basis that I believe he benefited from and what it is that this minister plans to do with all those spare buildings he's going to end up with, that the taxpayers have paid for year after year not only to construct but also to maintain. What's he going to do? Privatize them? Is that his plan? We'd like to know, and I think we have the right to know what he's going to do when those premises are vacated.

Finally, I'd like to know if he's got a plan under his department to work on policies for housing the homeless, and if he doesn't, maybe he should look at one of these buildings that's going to be empty and construct a not-for-profit housing project right in there. It would be wonderful to have those people who, hitherto, have been homeless sitting right next to the Legislature to remind this minister and all the other ministers of the utter failure of their jobs in being responsible to the social and economic needs of the disadvantaged in our society.

Thank you, Chairman.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee rise, report progress, and beg leave to sit again.

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

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

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

HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed, please say no. Carried.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, Her Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor will now attend upon the Assembly.

[Mr. Speaker left the Chair]

head: **ROYAL ASSENT**

SERGEANT-AT-ARMS: Order! Her Honour the Lieutenant Governor.

[The Honourable W. Helen Hunley, Lieutenant Governor of Alberta, took her place upon the Throne]

HER HONOUR: Please be seated

MR. SPEAKER: May it please Your Honour, the Legislative Assembly has, at its present sittings, passed certain Bills to which, and in the name of the Legislative Assembly, I respectfully request Your Honour's assent.

CLERK: Your Honour, the following are the titles of the Bills to which your Honour's assent is prayed.

No.	Title
2	Appropriation (Interim Supply) Act, 1989
3	Appropriation (Alberta Capital Fund) Interim Supply Act, 1989
4	Appropriation (Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund, Capital Projects Division) Interim Supply Act, 1989-90
7	Farm Credit Stability Fund Amendment Act, 1989

[The Lieutenant Governor indicated her assent]

CLERK: In Her Majesty's name, Her Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor doth assent to these Bills.

SERGEANT-AT-ARMS: Order!

[The Lieutenant Governor left the Chamber]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

MR. SPEAKER: Please be seated.

MR. GOGO: By way of notice, Mr. Speaker, it is the intent of the government on Monday next to call government motions 9

and 10, second readings of Bills 223, 6 and 9, and if there's time, Motion 4. Monday evening it's the intent of the government to call Committee of Supply, the Department of the

Environment.

[At 12:51 p.m. the House adjourned to Monday at 2:30 p.m.]

