

Legislative Assembly of Alberta**head: Introduction of Special Guests**

Title: **Friday, May 18, 1990 10:00 a.m.**

Date: 90/05/18

[The House met at 10 a.m.]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

Prayers

MR. SPEAKER: Let us pray.

O Lord, grant us a daily awareness of the precious gift of life which You have given us.

As Members of this Legislative Assembly we dedicate our lives anew to the service of our province and our country.

Amen.

head: Introduction of Bills**Bill 32****Irrigation Amendment Act, 1990**

MR. MUSGROVE: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill 32, the Irrigation Amendment Act, 1990. This Bill has three main issues, one of them being that irrigation boards will be allowed to do things other than deliver irrigation water to farmers. There will be an appeal process for irrigation farmers to appeal actions taken through policy by the district boards, and it sets out a voting procedure for election of board members allowing only one vote for each person.

[Leave granted; Bill 32 read a first time]

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Clover Bar.

Bill Pr. 9**Young Men's Christian Association
Tax Exemption Amendment Act, 1990**

MR. GESELL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I request leave to introduce Bill Pr. 9, Young Men's Christian Association Tax Exemption Amendment Act, 1990. This Bill removes the tax exemption for certain lands previously owned and used by the YMCA and exempts the lands known as the Jamie Platz family YMCA as long as the land continues to belong to the YMCA and is used for its purposes.

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

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill 32, the Irrigation Amendment Act, 1990, be placed on the Order Paper under Government Bills and Orders.

[Motion carried]

head: Tabling Returns and Reports

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, I rise to table a document prepared by my department entitled Alberta Forestry, Lands and Wildlife Programs, Activities and Initiatives.

MR. SPEAKER: The Minister of Public Works, Supply and Services, followed by the Minister of Economic Development and Trade.

MR. KOWALSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On behalf of myself and the Member of the Legislative Assembly for Stony Plain and the Member of the Legislative Assembly for Westlock-Sturgeon, I'd like to introduce to you, sir, and to all Members of the Legislative Assembly 45 young people from Muir Lake community school. Muir Lake community school is located at the confluence of the border of these three constituencies, just a few miles to the west of the city of Edmonton. The young people are accompanied by two teachers, Mary Brackenbury and Diane Lefebvre, and by four parents, Mrs. Yu, Mrs. Beckwith, Mrs. Book, and Mrs. Van Neck.

Mr. Speaker, there comes a point in time in life when you see life coming back full circle to you. One of the parents with the group today is a former student of mine who was a member of the 1972 Canadian national *Reach for the Top* championship team, the only time ever in the history of Alberta that a group of academic students from our province ever won the national title. It's really kind of interesting when you see a former student of yours now in front of you with a child of her own and you have the privilege to introduce such a person in the Assembly. I guess it's a circle of life that keeps flowing right on.

But I'd ask these young people, their teachers, and their parents to stand and receive the warm welcome of all members of the Legislative Assembly. They're in the public gallery.

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure, sir, to introduce to you and through you a number of students from the Father Kenneth Kearns school in Sherwood Park. They're joined by teachers Bruce Plante, Melodie Kostyuk, and parents Yvette Bortnick and Marlene Krokosh. They're in the members' gallery, and I'd ask if they'd rise so that they could receive the warm welcome of the Legislative Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Whitemud.

MR. WICKMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure to introduce to you and through you 31 fine students from the constituency of Edmonton-Whitemud attending St. Stanislaus school. They're accompanied today by two teachers, Mr. Paul St. Cyr and Miss Jeannette de Moissac; also a parent, Mrs. Huguette Hébert, and a grandparent, René Hébert. I would ask through you, Mr. Speaker, that all members of the House give them the usual warm applause as they stand up in the public gallery and receive recognition.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Belmont.

MR. SIGURDSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's a pleasure to introduce to you and to all members of the Assembly two guests from Toronto. They're here to see my seatmate the hon. Member for Stony Plain. They're seated in the public gallery. I'd ask that Thomas and Taylor Woloshyn stand and be recognized by the Assembly.

head: Oral Question Period**Provincial Debt**

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the first question again to the esteemed Treasurer, our silver-tongued devil, Magic Johnston. We're heading into the long weekend, and I certainly don't want the Treasurer to go away thinking he's managed to pull a fast one on the state of this province's deficit. We notice that he can now borrow up to eleven and a half billion dollars. These great managers of the economy, the Conservative government: eleven and a half billion dollars. I can imagine if it was another government what they would be saying. He has introduced a Bill that will add \$2 billion to the province's line of credit, but he's still sticking to his line that Alberta's going to have a balanced budget by 1991-92. His arguments are wearing thinner and thinner. Yesterday the Treasurer insisted that – and I quote – revenues are predictable. Well, let's take a look at the Treasurer's predictions. My question to the Treasurer is: how much has he received from the stabilization payments from the federal government up to this point?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I knew the question of stabilization would come around eventually. I flagged it last time the Leader of the Opposition raised it, and he had to change his notes so he wouldn't agree that I knew it was coming.

What I can say about stabilization, Mr. Speaker, is that the province of Alberta has made a very substantial claim under the established program financing Act which would see the province on a very legitimate basis claiming over \$550 million because of the oil price collapse which took place in 1986, a change in economic circumstances which no province has ever experienced in the history of Confederation. The legislation is clear that by December of 1990 a settlement must be effected by the federal government and the province. To date we have received \$75 million as an indication that the federal government has recognized there is an amount due to the province. At the present time, we're in negotiations with the federal government to secure the best possible amount of money for the province of Alberta – some large amount of money, Mr. Speaker.

We have had some difficulty, of course, with the federal government because of the strength of our economy. Because we're in very good fiscal shape, it's hard for the federal government to in its own mind give the money to the province of Alberta. But that hasn't daunted us. This claim is due to the people of this province, it's agreed to in the established fiscal arrangements of this province, the heart of the way in which the provinces co-operate on a federation basis, and we're pressing that claim ahead. I would expect that by the end of this year, as the budget indicates, a very large amount of money will come to this province, probably more than that which was in the budget itself.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, that'll be interesting. We'll put in the budget: "a very large amount of money" coming in.

The point that I make: he probably is not going to get any of it, and now he's putting it in his predictions, so there's one of his predictions gone wrong right away. As I pointed out the other day, he didn't even bother to appear before the Commons committee that is pushing through cuts to our federal transfer payments. That's going to be at least \$250 million in the next couple of years, Mr. Speaker, probably more. So there's another

prediction out the drain. Maybe he can put in his budget: "a very large amount of money" we should have got.

Now, my question to the Treasurer is this: how can the Treasurer say he's on track with the deficit reduction when his only strategy for meeting projected revenues is going to court, whining to the federal Tories, and crossing his fingers?

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Speaker, I know that the Member for Edmonton-Norwood has never been involved in these kinds of negotiations. Let's hope that it never will happen, because you can see exactly what would happen: these people would cave in at a moment's notice. They would never pursue that which is justly due to the province, as this government will, I can assure you. We'll be after this federal government. We're in the process right now of pursuing our claim. We're well prepared. The time is in our favour, and the dollars are considerable. Now, I think the member across the way should be supporting us, should be saying: "Let's go out and get that money. Let's go out and ensure that it comes to the province." I think instead he's saying, "Why don't you give up and go away?" Well, that's not the way we operate. That's not the way this government operates. We're going to press the case. I can assure you I'd be willing to make a wager that that money will come to the province of Alberta. It's due to us. It's due to us under the fiscal arrangements of this country, what ties these provinces together, and it's going to come to us. It's a question of time. A large amount of money important to our fiscal plan . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. [interjection] Thank you. Supplementary. Final.

MR. MARTIN: Well, Mr. Speaker, the Treasurer is right. We wouldn't manage things the way he does. We wouldn't put down: "a large amount of money" coming in, and put it in our books. It's an interesting prediction that the Treasurer has made. I hope he's going to be better than he has in his budget predictions in the past.

Mr. Speaker, my question to the Treasurer is this. There is simply no way that your budgetary deficit is going to be \$780 million, not with the GST, the federal high interest rate policy, unstable oil prices, federal transfer payment cuts, and over \$300 million in stabilization payments that are anything but predictable. My straightforward question to the Treasurer is this. I want the Treasurer finally to come clean and give us the straight goods. What's the real story on the financial mess that you've created for this province?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I guess I have to give a bit of a picture about the financial strength of this province. The member has asked for it. I guess I have no recourse but to explain what in fact is happening. We've already heard that the strength of this province is clear, the economic growth is probably as good as any province in Canada. We came out of the recession of 1986 with a remarkable rebound. The growth in 1988 and '89 is very high. Real growth is very strong in this province, driven by the confidence that the private sector has and by the dollars that Albertans have in their own hands. They have disposable income. They're spending it. Investment is taking place here, and as my colleagues pointed out yesterday, unemployment is working in our favour.

Now, I said "second" unemployment yesterday. It's third by one small percentage point, and that's merely a statistical

abberation. We're as good as any in terms of our unemployment, and it's moving in the right direction.

Moreover, the strength of this province is clear: the only province in Canada with more assets than liabilities; the heritage fund is working in our favour, generating over \$1.3 billion to us, far above the cost of borrowing. Anyone knows that in terms of the way you manage your economy, manage your fiscal plan, you have to have a plan. Now, if you look at the information that we've provided going back to 1986, we're one of the few governments in this country who've said: we have a problem today, and by '91-92 we'll have a balanced budget. Now, you look at the graphs that we gave, Mr. Speaker. We're on . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, thank you. Second main question, the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, the plan is: spend, spend, spend and borrow, borrow, borrow.

Meech Lake Accord

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the next set of questions to the Premier. I have in front of me the report of the special committee to study the proposed companion resolution to the Meech Lake accord from the House of Commons committee. I think, by and large, they've done a pretty good job. Some of the amendments that we tried to bring in the debate are in this particular report. I think the Premier would agree there are some encouraging signs flowing from this exercise and some discouraging ones. Encouraging ones: it seems to at least have gotten some of the dissenting provinces on board. But, of course, Quebec still seems, at least in the initial reports, unwilling to compromise. I think the Premier agrees that the majority of Canadians, including the majority of Quebecers, want to see an end to this Meech Lake process, and they want one that will end up with a strong and united Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to look at some of the particular recommendations here with the Premier though. Would the Premier tell the House, having had time to review the parliamentary committee's report, whether he is prepared to accept some of the recommendations, such as one specifically, the suggestion that there be regular conferences on aboriginal rights?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, first of all, I agree with the lead-in to the hon. Leader of the Opposition's comments before his question, that there are some hopeful signs here. There seems to be some movement that would allow provinces who do not support the accord to perhaps be able to work to close the gap. However, I think it would be extremely unwise, and certainly not something I'm going to do today, to pick and choose one or other of the recommendations and say, "We're for that one; we're not for that one." I don't think that's the way in which these discussions can be conducted because, first of all, this is a House of Commons committee report. There's nothing complete about it in terms of whether it's the only thing that will be discussed in the First Ministers' Conference, assuming we have a First Ministers' Conference. There are the Manitoba desires, Premier Wells' desires, and New Brunswick's desires. So while I would only say to the Leader of the Opposition that yes, this does appear to have some capacity to move into the middle ground if we're going to be able to reach any closing of the gap

on constitutional reform, I certainly can't pick out any individual one and say we endorse that or don't.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I think we would all agree that at this time, time is somewhat of the essence. The Premier has talked about this himself. I think the key is for all people at this time in the history of our country to be somewhat flexible. It seems to me that this is going to be at least a starting point for discussion if there is a First Ministers' Conference, and I'll come to that, Mr. Speaker.

I appreciate that you don't want to go through . . . I'm trying to get a general impression if there's some flexibility on the Premier's part in terms of aboriginal rights. And the other one, Mr. Speaker, without trying to negotiate here: if he can give us some indication of how he feels, though, about northern residents' recommendation that they be allowed to have people appointed to the Supreme Court of Canada and the Senate, and with the suggestion that for new provinces, to get away from the unanimity, the federal government along with the affected territories have that right to form a new province.

MR. GETTY: Well, I understand what the Leader of the Opposition is trying to do, because there are certain areas that, it appears, there may be consensus in Canada that in a second round or in some parallel accord could be dealt with. But again I tell him that I'm not going to pick and choose and comment on various ones at this stage. There is the potential for a first ministers' meeting within days, and it wouldn't be wise – as a matter of fact, it's the biggest mistake, I think, first ministers could make – to start saying, "This is one we're going to have to have," and not be prepared to be flexible and negotiate.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I'm well aware that you have to go in, if there is a First Ministers' Conference, with some flexibility on the points. But I think it's important, the Premier being our representative from this province, that we have some idea how he feels about the report and some of the recommendations. It's very hard for us to know what stand he's going to take, and by that time it may be too late.

But my question, then, is to the Premier in terms of the process, and maybe he would comment on that. It seems that one of the strong recommendations they are making is that – and the Premier's talked about this himself – there has to be a First Ministers' Conference, probably at the latest next week. My question is: what is the Premier doing to ensure, then, that a First Ministers' Conference is held as soon as possible so that this impasse might possibly be resolved?

MR. GETTY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I've told the Prime Minister and other Premiers – over the last several days I've talked to, I guess, perhaps seven Premiers and the Prime Minister. I'll be talking within an hour, if possible, to Senator Murray to express my belief that we should have a first ministers' meeting; we should have it as quickly as possible. It's obvious to me that with the Manitoba process, which requires approximately a month to get through their Legislature, and we're aiming at June 23 – obviously we're here now on May 18. There isn't a lot of time in order for us to have a meeting, and have some agreement that will allow Manitoba to start their process.

I do understand the Leader of the Opposition's point, though, that he would like to know as much as possible about this, and I think that's a legitimate point of view. I don't know if there is a first ministers' meeting or some other type of get-together,

but I would certainly give consideration that if we are going to some type of full-scale first ministers' meeting, perhaps the Leader of the Opposition and perhaps the leader of the Liberal Party might come to that meeting. They certainly wouldn't be in the meeting in a negotiating position, but they might well be observers and be able to have discussions with myself or the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs and perhaps other people at that meeting. Now, no decision's been made on that, but I've been thinking of the pressure of time and that we may well want to be moving something through this Legislature as well. So that's just an idea that I've been considering, and it may be able to help both sides of the House in dealing with something that is so important as the unity of our country.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Glengarry, the leader of the Liberals.

MR. DECORE: Mr. Speaker, might I say at the outset that because so much is at stake with Canada – Meech Lake, the companion accord – I welcome the suggestion that the hon. Premier has made. I'd be delighted to attend and to give whatever assistance I could.

Public Service Strikes

MR. DECORE: Mr. Speaker, it's now the third week that Albertans see social workers on strike, the second week that jail guards are on strike. Day after day we've asked the government to enter into negotiations, to have the Premier or the minister responsible for Social Services or the Minister of Labour engage social workers and the jail guards in meaningful discussion, and day after day we were told that that couldn't be done as long as people were in the streets. Well, surprise, surprise, surprise; we've learned that secret discussions have been taking place, and I congratulate the minister responsible for social services in that regard. The nicest surprise is that the reports show or seem to suggest that progress is being made. It seems to be that the issue of this turmoil has to be broadened, and learning from the error of one's ways, I would like to ask the Premier whether he's prepared to dispatch the minister responsible for the jail guards to deal personally with those jail guards, because I think we can solve that one as we appear to be solving the other one.

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, perhaps the Minister of Labour will want to add to my comments. I don't want the leader of the Liberal Party to in any way believe that there have been collective bargaining negotiations going on or any kind of contract negotiations going on. That is not happening, and that will not happen until the employees return to work. So don't be misled by any reports to that extent. We will not negotiate the collective bargaining, we will not negotiate any contracts while the employees are out of work and breaking the law.

Now, there are discussions going on about the conditions of returning to work, and I would ask the Minister of Labour to comment on that.

MS McCOY: Mr. Speaker, let me confirm and underscore exactly what is being said here. Contract negotiations are not occurring and will not occur until the social workers, or anyone else who is on an illegal strike, go back to work. The issues in dispute here are pay, wage parity, and caseloads, and those have not been discussed. They are not under negotiation. But as this government has said from the beginning, we are eager to get

back to the table to negotiate those items, because it's at the negotiating table where they will be settled. A precondition, however, is for the illegal strikers to go back to work. What we are, therefore, exploring at the moment is a back-to-work agreement to get them back to the table so that those negotiations can occur. They were discussions. They went on for 23 hours. It was not completely resolved, but there is some possibility that we will be making progress. Our first objective will be met, and that is to have the social workers back to work.

MR. WICKMAN: Why not do the same with the jail guards?

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Glengarry, not Edmonton-Whitemud, thank you.

MR. WICKMAN: Oh, I'm sorry.

MR. DECORE: Mr. Speaker, on a number of occasions I've asked and suggested that the Premier or ministers comfort the striking public employees by engaging them in dialogue, saying that things can be resolved. I think we have moved in that direction to a great extent. I'm wondering whether the Premier would be prepared to comfort social workers even more, to a greater extent, by saying now that no punitive action will take place against these social workers at all. This is moving along nicely, and that's the last sign they need.

MR. GETTY: No, Mr. Speaker. It's impossible to make that kind of comment. I can't do that. I don't know how the social workers are going to conduct themselves. But I say this to them: I care about them, and I believe we can help them, but they are taking a course of action now that prevents me from helping them. There is one course of action that they should follow, and that is to return to work. Then we can get into the process of working together. But there can be no negotiations and no guarantees while they are still breaking the law.

MR. DECORE: Mr. Speaker, given that we are making progress, because discussions are taking place, but given the fact that we've gone through a strike in 1988 with nurses and now a social workers' strike and a strike involving jail guards, would the Premier be prepared to admit that there is something wrong with the labour legislation in this province and set up a special task force of Albertans from the Chamber of Commerce, from labour organizations that will review . . .

MR. FOX: Send them around the world with Ian Reid.

MR. DECORE: Not to travel the world; to keep this problem at home.

. . . and look at the problems to ensure that we don't have continued strife because of this very unfortunate legislation?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I just draw to the attention of the leader of the Liberal Party that a huge percentage, some 99 percent, of all labour management negotiations are conducted within the Alberta labour legislation in a very successful manner. The parties get together, under good legislation, and reach agreements, as they should. That's what happens in Alberta, and it is better than it happens in other provinces. So why would we now start to dismantle a system that is working? Now, if the hon. leader of the Liberal Party wants to present something in this Legislature for consideration, he has the right to do that,

and it would be given consideration. But why would we change something that this House endorsed just a year or so ago and is working so well?

MR. SPEAKER: Highwood.

Summer Temporary Employment Program

MR. TANNAS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question today is to the Minister of Career Development and Employment. The student temporary employment program over the last few years has given much-needed summer employment to students and has proven to be a helpful training ground, as well as providing financial assistance to many villages, towns, municipal districts, and local associations in my constituency of Highwood and, I daresay, other constituencies as well. It helps to employ young people in useful community work. My question, then, to the minister: how many students will be employed in STEP this year compared to last year?

MR. WEISS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to respond to the hon. Member for Highwood and certainly appreciate his remarks as they refer to the program. I'd like to indicate and emphasize that the main emphasis of the department is that it does not create jobs but does provide assistance along with career training and development wherever possible. That is the main objective. In particular, STEP, or the summer temporary employment program, is one of those programs that does provide assistance to people entering the labour market, for the first time in many cases.

The 1990 budget this year has been allocated at some \$20 million. That compares very favourably with last year's budget of some 22 and a half million dollars. With the decrease in the unemployment stats, we felt it was more than adequate and certainly is proving to be so. While the requests exceed the number of dollars that will be committed, it doesn't mean that all jobs won't be funded, because in many cases they fall through the cracks in that they're not completing the program or they're not necessary. Our main emphasis will be on career training, and there will be two sides to it, the career and labour sides. There will be approximately, to our best guesstimate at this time, some 7,900 positions taken up, and that relates very favourably with the 8,000, 8,100 in the previous year.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary.

MR. TANNAS: Yes, Mr. Speaker. My supplementary question is again to the Minister of Career Development and Employment. Have all the communities and associations in Highwood been notified as to their STEP allocation for 1990, and how does this allocation compare to last year?

MR. WEISS: Mr. Speaker, I'd be surprised if they've all not been advised by this time, because of course the deadline has come and gone. While all might not have received their number of requests, that is because the decisions that had to be made – and I can assure the hon. member and all hon. members that those were made on a fair and equitable basis. I once again emphasize that it was on the career side rather than on a more mundane, say, lawn mower exercise. Where a request may come in from a municipality for 20-some jobs, we would have to look and say: how do those relate to being career oriented? But some 330 of the 372 municipalities have been provided funding

of some \$4 million from the program, and that relates to approximately 1,100-plus positions.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Jasper Place, followed by Westlock-Sturgeon.

Natural Resources Conservation Board

MR. McINNIS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Energy was perhaps a little too quick and a little too aggressive in his reaction when his earlier comments on environmental impact assessments were referred to in the House yesterday. Now that the minister has assumed de facto responsibility for the environment, obviously his views on these matters are much more important to Albertans. The Environment department is now under soft receivership. The Appeal Court decision ruled that Alberta's current environmental impact assessment is deficient in not providing for an independent scientific review by qualified expertise and failing to guarantee public hearings. Albertans need to know now whether the de facto Environment minister has decided that project panels set up under this proposed legislation will be staffed with fully qualified, independent scientific expertise. Will they?

MR. ORMAN: Mr. Speaker, to answer the first part of his comment, we on this side of the House all assume responsibility for the environment. With regard to his question, he may want to ask the Minister of the Environment.

MR. McINNIS: This is the minister who is bringing this legislation before the Assembly, and this is the legislation under which these projects are dealt with. Let me give you a for instance. Al-Pac's latest proposal makes extravagant claims about reduction of toxic organic chloride pollution based on an unproven new bleaching process. I think it's obvious to everyone, except perhaps this government, that such claims must be evaluated by competent people who are independent of the sponsoring government and the project proponent. In view of this memo, which we dealt with in the House last week, in which the idea of expert panels was attacked by the province's director of natural resources policy, Albertans want to know: when they go to this board, are they going to face a pool of Tory hacks rather than strong, independent scientific people? Which will it be?

MR. ORMAN: He'll have to wait for the legislation to be presented to this House, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Westlock-Sturgeon.

Oldman River Dam

MR. TAYLOR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question today is to the Premier and Deputy Premier. As all members in the Legislature know, as Native Awareness Week has drawn to a close, one of the major problems we still have to resolve is down in the Peigan area and the area of the Oldman dam. Treaty 7 of the 1800s plus Supreme Court decisions both in Canada and the U.S. would give the indication that the Indians have a strong claim to the water rights, and I know the provincial government has argued otherwise. Also, environmental studies have shown that any river immediately downstream from a dam is tremendously affected as to trees, fisheries, and wildlife, all very, very

much closer to the Peigan style of life than might be in the normal nonnative community. My first question, then, to the Premier or the Deputy Premier is: could they update the House as to the state of negotiations between the Peigans and the Alberta government as to compensation for the water that's being used and how much water the Peigans will get to use for their own irrigation purposes?

MR. ROSTAD: Mr. Speaker, I advise the House that the matter is presently in the courts, and I think we'd have sub judice without any doubt in this matter.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, I was afraid of that. Going to the courts is a cop-out. These are the types of things that should be negotiated out.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member, order please. Take your place, please. It's been pointed out on numerous occasions in the House that sub judice convention is a rule of this House. It's not a cop-out. So please, the supplementary without the comment.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, to attack it from another angle then. Because of the federal implications and the environment impacts immediately downstream from the dam, has this government had any approaches made from the federal Minister of the Environment as to environmental studies or environmental hearings particularly apropos as it has to do with the Peigans immediately downstream from the dam? Has Bouchard contacted you?

MR. ROSTAD: Mr. Speaker, all I can advise again is that there have been untold meetings and consultations with the band in this matter, and in fact a great deal of money has been paid to the band to conduct studies pursuant to water below. If he has any specifics he'd wish of the Minister of the Environment in communication with Mr. Bouchard, I'm sure we could accept those and have them answered by the minister when he's back.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.
Calgary-Glenmore.

Glenmore Dam

MRS. MIROSH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Recently in this Assembly I brought to your attention the problems regarding the Glenmore dam in the Calgary-Glenmore constituency. This is the city of Calgary's main water supply and reservoir. Recently I've met with commissioners and they've indicated that this dam is structurally unsound. I'd like to ask the Minister of Public Works, Supply and Services and public safety to indicate to the Assembly whether or not his department is working with the city of Calgary with regard to safety for the public and whether or not this dam is in fact structurally sound.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, several years ago, in 1988, the government of Alberta introduced new requirements for emergency response plans for all critical dams in the province of Alberta. I did that in my capacity as minister responsible for Alberta Public Safety Services. We also identified that one of the critical dams in the province of Alberta was the Glenmore dam, which is owned by the city of Calgary and located within the city of Calgary. Since that time, in the last couple of years

an emergency response plan has been developed in consultations between the government of Alberta and the city of Calgary, and that plan is now before the council of the city of Calgary awaiting their approval. At the same time, a private-sector consulting firm was also hired to do a dam safety evaluation. Such a report was filed with the city of Calgary, and that report recommended that three improvements must be made to the Glenmore dam: one, that there had to be improvements to the spillway, there had to be improvements to the downstream channel, and also there had to be improvements to the dike. Since 1988 improvements have been made to the first two of the subject matters, the spillway and the downstream channel, and improvements are planned to be made to the dike. The standard that's being requested of the city of Calgary to ensure safety of all individuals living downstream from the Glenmore dam is a standard of one in 800.

MRS. MIROSH: Mr. Speaker, could the minister outline when these procedures will be taking place and how long it would take before this dam would be completed and structurally sound?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, to repeat, the dam is owned by the city of Calgary, and that's a decision the duly elected council in the city of Calgary must make. But it's my understanding that work has already progressed on two sides of it and work has to continue presumably in 1990 with respect to the dike. Safety concern is always high magnitude, and we've had revised, updated criteria with respect to emergency response plans on all critical dams in our province. We introduced them in 1988, and we're following through with them now.

MR. SPEAKER: Stony Plain.

Criminal Records Retention

MR. WOLOSHYN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Throughout my questioning the Solicitor General has had a very, very difficult time understanding a very simple concept. That is, it's an unwarranted invasion of a citizen's privacy for the province to retain personal physical information about that citizen after he or she has been acquitted. In fact, on Wednesday the Solicitor General made the shocking assertion that an individual acquitted of an offence is somehow less innocent than he was before he was charged. Given that in this country there are only two possible verdicts, guilty or innocent, and given that the Solicitor General's department treats those who have been found innocent by a court of law differently than those who have never been charged at all, can the Solicitor General explain how many types of innocence he thinks exist in Alberta?

MR. FOWLER: Mr. Speaker, the findings of any court in a trial in fact are guilty and not guilty.

MR. WOLOSHYN: Mr. Speaker, the identification of criminals Act compels only those charged with an indictable offence to be fingerprinted. Yet the police practice in this province is to have those charged with hybrid offences which are less serious than indictable ones attend for identification before their first appearance, resulting in the unnecessary fingerprinting of many individuals. Given that the simple solution to this practice is merely to change the police policy so that the date for identification is set after the first appearance, would the Solicitor General

agree to effect this change to ensure that individuals charged with hybrid offences are not unnecessarily fingerprinted?

MR. FOWLER: I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the House would best be served if I took that question on advice and actually researched that particular Act myself or had it researched.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Gold Bar.

Day Care Policy Study

MRS. HEWES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The white paper on day care reforms continues to cause great anxiety for Albertans. Our constituency offices are besieged by parents, operators, workers, child care students, and employers with unanswered questions. Unfortunately, as MLAs we have no new information to pass on, especially with regard to the subsidy schedule. Now department staff tell me that the government hasn't developed the new rate schedule, and worse, it has no idea how many parents are going to be eligible for how much. That seems to me to be shameful. A government has asked us to buy into this scheme on vague details and the rhetoric of "Trust us." I want to ask the Minister of Family and Social Services: does the minister have a new rate schedule for day care subsidy; yes or no?

MR. OLDRING: Mr. Speaker, we've just gone through a very exhaustive consultative process with Albertans. I'm really pleased with the response I've had on the white paper. I'm really pleased with the opportunities I've had to meet with many, many day care advocacy groups, parents of children in day care, day care operators, and I can say that as a result of this process, yes, we'll have final schedules and final recommendations that we'll be able to share with Albertans in a very short time period.

MRS. HEWES: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think the minister recognizes that nobody can move, nobody can make plans, until we have that in our hands.

My second question to the minister, Mr. Speaker, is: why have all the committees established to work on the reform been placed on hold? These are accreditation, regulation, training certification, and equivalency. They appear to have been placed on hold.

MR. OLDRING: Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware of any committees being placed on hold. We're progressing very quickly and very effectively, again making sure that we continue to have the best day care programs and the best day care systems in the country. I'm looking forward to releasing our final recommendations as a result of this process. Again, I'd want to say that it has worked extremely well, and I really appreciate the participation of Albertans. I really appreciate the number of parents that have taken the time to write to me personally, and I can assure the member that I have taken the time to read all their letters as well. I would tell the member that it's some 1,500 letters I've gone through. As I say, it's been helpful, it's been a good process. It's the kind of process this government likes to utilize. We recognize that it's important to work with Albertans in addressing these very important issues, and we're going to continue to do that. As I say, Mr. Speaker, we'll be releasing some recommendations and some final conclusions. Albertans can all say we are a part of it and we participated, and that's the way the system should work.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Mill Woods.

Education Funding

MR. GIBEAULT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My questions today are to the Minister of Education. He will know, of course, that the Edmonton public school board has now submitted its 1991 capital priority list to the government for facilities to meet the educational needs of students in the newly developing areas of the city. The top of the list includes three very badly needed new junior high schools: the Weinlos junior high school, Hairsine junior high, and Lorelei junior high. I'd like to ask the minister today if he can make a commitment to ensure that the necessary financial support from the province will be forthcoming to ensure that the school board can meet its target of having these three urgently needed new junior high schools open by September of 1992.

MR. DINNING: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the representation from the Member for Edmonton-Mill Woods, as I appreciate the representations from all my colleagues, to ensure that we as a government continue to support quality education in this province and continue to support the construction of new schools and the modernization of old schools where it's necessary. This province, this government, has committed some \$1.2 billion to that capital construction over the last decade, and I am convinced that that significant contribution by Alberta taxpayers will continue in the 1990s.

MR. GIBEAULT: Mr. Speaker, the parents and children in Mill Woods and these other communities have been patient. They have been waiting for several years, and they would like a commitment from the province now. I want to ask the minister now: can he give some concrete backing to his government's rhetoric about how education is the number one priority and give a commitment that this funding for those schools will be approved without delay?

MR. DINNING: Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier, I'm proud of this government's contribution to the cost of the construction of those new schools, a significant number of new schools, I believe some one-half dozen new schools in the hon. member's constituency over the last six or seven years. So this government has gone some considerable distance in meeting not just the needs of the residents of Mill Woods but the needs of students and our children throughout this province over the last decade.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Whitemud.

Daishowa Pulp Mill

MR. WICKMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The recent death of another Daishowa pulp mill worker emphasizes the need to ensure safety regulations are being enforced. This is the second worker in three months to be killed on that site. Now, I understand the production in the wood room has been shut down, but that's only a temporary solution. I feel that we've got to address from a long-term point of view occupational safety in this province. My question to the Premier: can the Premier respond to the comment made by Joe Miller, director of communications in the department of occupational safety, where he stated, "It's doubtful the worker killed Wednesday went through the safety program," because the sessions "were for

construction workers, they didn't involve the production workers"? Can the Premier respond to that and give us some assurances that these safety regulations are going to be beefed up to protect the workers of Alberta?

MR. OLDRING: Mr. Speaker, as the Acting Minister of Occupational Health and Safety, I'd be happy to take that question as notice.

MR. WICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, to the minister that is prepared to take the questions under notice, possibly he could comment on this to some degree. There have been discussions, and the minister responding would be aware of those. Those discussions involved the Alberta trades council, where they have requested the establishment of a safety committee with the power to shut down a company if it's dangerous to the worker. Can the minister give us some assurances that this joint committee will in fact be put into place?

MR. OLDRING: Mr. Speaker, again I'd be happy to take that as notice.

Disaster Assistance for Peace Region

MR. FOX: Mr. Speaker, earlier this year the Premier and several of his colleagues in the cabinet and back benches of the Conservative Party went up to Sexsmith, Alberta, to introduce a farm aid program for the farmers in the Peace River country who weren't able to harvest their crops and for those who did but their fields were damaged substantially. Now, it was a great photo opportunity – a lot of glitz and glamour to the announcements – but unfortunately there hasn't been much in the way of substance or meaningful assistance to the farmers that need it. People found they had to wait in line for up to two days to make application for the program, and they're finding now that the people who were out there trying to administer the program were being unnecessarily stingy with their interpretation of the guidelines. They suspect it's got something to do with the fact that the \$14.9 million committed to the program won't nearly begin to cover the claims that are coming in from perhaps twice as many farmers as they anticipated would apply. My question to the Premier is: recognizing that each dollar they put into this program will likely be matched by the federal government through their farm aid program, will the Premier agree to commit the necessary number of dollars to cover the full cost of the claims by all the farmers in the Peace River country and instruct the inspectors to be generous in their interpretations?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, when the Minister of Agriculture returns to the House, he may want to deal with this matter. Currently this matter is under the administration of the Minister of Public Works, Supply and Services, and I'd ask him to respond.

MR. KOWALSKI: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. The introduction by the Member for Vegreville is one of the most untrue introductions I've ever run across in 15 years in this Assembly. Over 3,000 applications from individuals in north-western Alberta have been dealt with. Some 2,000 letters and cheques have gone out, and as I stand here today, I have not received one negative letter from anyone impacted by the announcement of this government with respect to the very

generous disaster assistance program the Premier announced in Sexsmith several months ago. Mr. Speaker, that is a fact.

MR. FOX: If he hasn't had one, Mr. Speaker, perhaps he's had many. The Minister of Agriculture certainly has got letters to that effect.

But in terms of the application of the program, there is a part of the program that will pay people for rut damage to fields if the ruts are six inches deep or deeper, not if they're five and three-quarter inches or five inches or anything like that. I'd like to ask the Minister of Public Works, Supply and Services why the government has made it necessary, made it compulsory for anybody who's eligible to receive assistance under that portion of the program to apply for and pay for crop insurance for a total of two years, meaning that they're going to have to give the government more than twice as much as they're likely to receive through the program.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, let's be clear about one thing: disaster assistance as provided in the province of Alberta is a response to individuals who've been impacted by events beyond their control, and also for situations that are noninsurable. In other words, it would hardly be fair to ask the taxpayer of Alberta to provide assistance to an individual for a decision that he or she may have made not to purchase insurance if insurance is readily available. We have in this province of Alberta a Hail and Crop Insurance Corporation that's funded in essence jointly by the federal government and the provincial government and the participants who are in it. If an individual chooses not to purchase an easily accessible program, Mr. Speaker, and then chooses to make an argument to the taxpayer of Alberta that he or she should receive a subsidy payment for a decision they've made, that would hardly be fair. We have to protect this purse on behalf of the taxpayer of Alberta, and we're doing that in the government.

MR. SPEAKER: Might we have unanimous consent to revert to the Introduction of Special Guests?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed? Carried. Thank you.
The Attorney General.

head: Introduction of Special Guests (reversion)

MR. ROSTAD: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure to introduce to you and through you to the members of the Assembly 25 students from the Cornerstone Christian school in Camrose. They're seated in the members' gallery. They're accompanied by teachers Monica Rode and Tim Downie, and a parent Mrs. Zook. I would ask that they all rise and receive the usual warm welcome of the Assembly.

MR. SPARROW: Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to introduce to you and through you to the Members of the Legislative Assembly a school group from my constituency. We have with us 42 grades 5 and 6 students from Pipestone elementary school in Millet, and they are accompanied by their teachers Mrs. Erhardt and Mr. Siepert and several parents. As they rise, I would ask that the members join with me giving the students a warm welcome.

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure, sir, to introduce to you and to Members of the Legislative Assembly a group of 41 students from the St. Theresa school in Sherwood Park. They're joined by teachers Connie Poschmann and Mary Hornby. They were to be in the AV room, but I understand visitor services did find room for them in the public gallery. I would ask them to rise and receive the warm welcome of the Legislative Assembly.

MR. DINNING: Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure today to introduce a number of students from a number of schools throughout the county of Parkland. They are here visiting the Member for Stony Plain and me. They came at an invitation I gave to them when I visited Kitaskinaw school during Education Week and had the good fortune to see an incredible array of talent, a display of art I've never seen children put together in a school system ever before in my days in this job. I'm proud to note, too, that the Member for Stony Plain was a former principal of this school. They are here today, some 10 students, to make a presentation to the member and to me to display some of that art in our office over the next six months. They're joined by their teacher and the organizer for this, Mrs. Marilyn Doig, and four parents. I'd ask them to all rise in the members' gallery and ask all members here to give them the cordial welcome of the Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER: Vegreville.

MR. FOX: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure to introduce to you and to members of the Assembly today 30 grade 5 and 6 students from the Tofield school in Tofield. They're seated in the public gallery, accompanied by their teachers Sam Wheeler, Jeanne Commance, Penny Wood, and Sandra Norton. I'll have a chance to meet with them very shortly and have pictures taken, and I'd like to ask them to rise in the public gallery and receive the warm welcome of members of the Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

Last evening the Member for Edmonton-Highlands raised a point of order on remarks made by the Premier in question period yesterday. The member cited Standing Order 23(i) and *Beauchesne* 484(3). These authorities deal with imputing false or unavowed motives to a member. One of the comments complained of refers to the "NDP," not to an individual member, nor did it identify the New Democrat caucus.

The other comment complained of was indeed imputed to the Member for Edmonton-Highlands, that which related to breaking the law. However, the reference appears to be to statements made outside the House, and the Chair cannot rule on whether this does impute motives which are false or unavowed as the statements do not form part of the record of this House. This is essentially a dispute as to facts between two members as to what is the essence of the Member for Edmonton-Highland's position on breaking the law. It is not a point of order. *Beauchesne* 494 applies, which is:

It has been formally ruled by Speakers that statements by Members respecting themselves and particularly within their own knowledge must be accepted. It is not unparliamentary temperately to criticize statements made by Members as being contrary to the facts; but no imputation of intentional falsehood is permis-

sible. On rare occasions this may result in the House having to accept two contradictory accounts of the same incident.

The Chair has also received, with proper notice, a question of privilege, and since it involves the temporary occupant of the Chair, the Chair then absents himself from the House so that the matter may be dealt with by the Deputy Speaker.

[Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair]

Privilege

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Mill Woods has given notice of a question of privilege. The Chair would now recognize the hon. Member for Edmonton-Mill Woods.

MR. GIBEAULT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is my contention that my rights as a member of this Assembly were breached yesterday when the Speaker refused to recognize me in question period when he was aware of the intention I had to ask questions during question period to the Premier regarding the recent fatality at Daishowa. My rights were also breached by the fact that I was not notified that I had been barred from question period for nearly a week, even though I had been subject to that disciplinary sanction during that time. Finally, my rights were breached when I was told to withdraw remarks the Speaker ruled last week did not need to be withdrawn, or be subject to barring from question period indefinitely.

Mr. Speaker, changes to laws in parliamentary democracies are not made in secret and sprung on the public after the fact. The public is entitled to due notice, and this is why legislation receives three readings before enactment. The same thing applies to institutions. For example, a prison warden could not withhold bread and water from a prisoner because the warden decided after the fact that he didn't like the utterance of a prisoner from the week before. This is all the more true if the warden told the prisoner upon hearing the utterance that while he didn't like that utterance, he would not punish the prisoner for the utterance.

Due process is the cornerstone of law in a democracy, and this is the case for both civil and criminal law. Neither Parliament nor the court has the right to enact or uphold a law and then subsequently and without notice silently punish one who did not violate the law and then a week later declare, arbitrarily, that "I have changed by mind; I have changed the rule of law, and your behaviour is subject to retroactivity whether or not I bothered to tell you or put my decision through any due process."

The same basic rule of fairness must apply to members of this Assembly. This is so evident that there are no Standing Orders or *Beauchesne* or *Erskine May* references to state that the Speaker must inform a member if the Speaker changes his mind on a ruling. This is all the more true if the Speaker chooses to punish a member without telling him that the ruling has changed or that he is being punished, in fact. Fairness of law, Mr. Speaker, dictates that the violator must be told that he has committed a crime before he can be charged with it or punished for it if found guilty of that charge.

I was told on May 9, 1990, that the Speaker would not insist upon a retraction of utterances I made on May 8. That was the Speaker's ruling. I remind the Speaker of a vitally important *Beauchesne* citation which applies well to this context, and that is *Beauchesne* 189, which reads as follows:

A very important function of those persons in the Chair, either in the House, or in committees, is the maintenance of order. In

doing so, those who preside must be mindful of the rights of Members to speak freely, and the equally important right of the House to be free from obstruction and grave disorder.

There is no question that the Speaker has the right to rule on points of order to maintain decorum in the House and to name or expel for one day those who disregard the authority of the Chair. There's no question that the Speaker has the right to not hear a member by way of punishment for a noted violation of the rules or disregarding the Chair. There is also no question, certainly, that a member has a basic and fundamental right to be told if the Speaker has changed his mind on a ruling, and there must be no question, of course, as well, that a member in the House has a basic right to be advised of that change of mind at the earliest possible opportunity. And there is no question at all that a member must be informed if he is being punished for a violation he was previously told he would not be punished for. None of these conditions were met when the Speaker advised the Assembly and me yesterday that I have, without my knowledge, been barred from question period for the past week for not withdrawing remarks that I had been told by the Speaker last week that I did not have to withdraw.

Mr. Speaker, I contend that my basic privileges as a member of this Assembly have been breached in all regards, and so, in effect, have the rights of all my constituents whom I am elected to represent. I ask that you find a *prima facie* case of privilege in this matter.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark.

MR. MITCHELL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's with a good deal of trepidation, of course, that each of us in the Legislature confronts an issue of breach of privilege that affects and relates to the conduct or alleges to affect and relate to the conduct of the Speaker, and I certainly share that trepidation as I rise to represent my caucus' concerns and interests in this matter.

All of us know that the Speaker's role in supervising this sometimes emotional and always intense place is extremely difficult. It is not simply a matter of arbitration between and amongst dispassionate debate upon technical matters. It is all too often arbitration between passionate and emotional positions on extremely heartfelt issues. We do see this Speaker exercise grace, discretion, good judgment, and good humour in the conduct of this very difficult task. Most of us, in fact, have encountered a kind word and a sympathetic ear over some difficult issue or some personal circumstance from this Speaker.

However, denying a member of this Legislature the right to speak in this Legislature under circumstances that have now been drawn into question by the member raising this matter of privilege, if proven, can only be the most serious of breaches of privilege. This particular incidence, if proven, reflects certain themes in the Speaker's manner which we believe have emerged from time to time and which are disturbing to us because they can be disruptive to the unimpeded democratic functioning of this Legislature. Inherent in the particular incidence, if proven, is a certain arbitrariness and inconsistency in the exercise of rules, which we have seen in other instances, we believe, as well. We have known, in addition, the Speaker to be provocative at times in the way he enters debate and to have indulged in political activity in at least one case outside the House, which is inconsistent with *Beauchesne* 164.

Mr. Speaker, we believe this question of privilege, because it is an incidence which is of course isolated and limited in one

sense to the matter raised by this member but also because it reflects perhaps broader themes which are of concern to us, must be aired fairly. Our position in the Liberal caucus is that it should be referred to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections immediately, where it can receive open and fair debate. We believe, Mr. Speaker, to do anything else, to take any other action, is to risk debasing and eroding the ability of this Legislature to operate properly, to operate in the way that it is designed to operate.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, this is a matter which really is between the Speaker and a member of the Legislature who has raised the point of privilege to a very large extent with respect to a particular set of circumstances. I only rise because I take objection to the remarks by the Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark: alleged political activity of a Speaker outside this Assembly, which has absolutely nothing to do with the point of privilege raised by the hon. Member for Edmonton-Mill Woods. I think that was an inappropriate comment, and I think it should be noted that it was inappropriate. Certainly the circumstances which have been alluded to by the hon. Member for Edmonton-Mill Woods should be taken into consideration in that context and that context alone.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Chair has listened to the representations of the hon. Member for Edmonton-Mill Woods and also those of the hon. Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark. The Chair has also listened to the hon. Government House Leader. I would characterize this as a very distasteful matter that the Chair has to deal with today, and the Chair is also of the opinion that the hon. Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark has not made it any less distasteful at all. The Chair would say that the point referenced by the hon. Government House Leader is certainly correct: it has nothing whatever to do with the point raised by the hon. Member for Edmonton-Mill Woods.

The hon. Member for Edmonton-Mill Woods has raised a point of privilege with respect to Mr. Speaker's decision yesterday not to recognize the member during question period. Proper notice was given and the matter was raised at the earliest opportunity. In the member's notice to the Chair he quotes *Beauchesne* 75, which deals with the absolute privilege of freedom of speech in this Chamber, in support of his point. The Chair would observe that the Member for Edmonton-Mill Woods has otherwise than in question period yesterday been recognized by the Chair, whether in Assembly or in committee, throughout the proceedings of the Assembly and Committee of Supply.

The Chair recognizes the privilege of freedom of speech, and of course that is the basic reason for having a set of Standing Orders supplemented by convention and rulings contained in *Beauchesne* and *Erskine May* and other important writings on the subject. But it also has to be pointed out that that privilege of freedom of speech does not extend and guarantee the member or any member the floor at any particular time. The Chair would refer all hon. members to *Beauchesne* 77, which may be of more relevance in the case at hand. It reads:

Freedom of speech does not mean that Members have an unlimited or unrestrained right to speak on every issue. The rules of the House impose limits on the participation of Members and it is the duty of the Speaker to restrain those who abuse the rules.

MR. MARTIN: Which rule?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The rule was against unparliamentary language, Mr. Leader of the Official Opposition.

There is a rule in this Chamber that members are not to use unparliamentary language. On May 9 the Speaker ruled that language was objectionable. He also said that at that time he was not insisting that the hon. member withdraw, although he suggested that it was unparliamentary and certainly gave the suggestion by giving the opportunity to the hon. member that he could withdraw. *Erskine May* at page 180 summarizes the well-known power of the Speaker to determine the speaking order of members and decide who shall be recognized. Specifically it reads: "He," meaning Mr. Speaker, "calls upon Members to speak – a choice which is not open to dispute," and it is common practice that a Speaker may choose not to see a member if the member's conduct has been called into question. This is the practice in the House of Commons and elsewhere, and is referred to in *Beauchesne* 192, which reads:

From time to time Speakers have resorted to other methods to discharge their duty to maintain order in the House. On several occasions Speakers have refused to hear Members who have, in the opinion of the Chair, exceeded the bounds of orderly conduct.

The other matters the member raised in his notice are not relevant to the purported point of privilege and are essentially a complaint about the interpretation of the May 9 ruling of the Chair. While the member also complains that the Speaker did not offer an explanation or cite the authority relating to the Chair's decision not to recognize the Member for Edmonton-Mill Woods, on reading *Hansard* of May 17 it can be seen the reasons were provided by the Chair as required by Standing Order 13(2). The member's dissatisfaction with the Chair's explanation does not constitute a matter of privilege. The Chair, therefore, finds that there is no prima facie case of privilege in this matter.

But, in addition, hon. members, the Chair would like to say and remind all hon. members that this institution is the most visible and obvious example of what we have received from Westminster in the area of the British parliamentary model, and the British parliamentary model does not require the use of blunt instruments. That is the great strength and perfection of the British parliamentary model: that blunt instruments should not have to be required. And it isn't a case of a Speaker or the Chair having to lead members by the hand and tell them what they can do and can't do all the time. There should be some sensitivity by all hon. members of what the decent and proper thing to do is in order to get the business of this Assembly done. Certainly, when the Chair gives an indication that the Chair is not happy, all hon. members, whether they're on the government side or the opposition, should recognize that.

In this case there was a clear indication that the language complained of was not proper and should not stand, and it is not up to the Chair to be required to use the blunt instrument of directing an hon. member to withdraw on the pain of being named. Surely we don't have to go through that procedure. But in this connection, in this context, the Chair would also like to refer hon. members to an incident in the House of Commons. We don't have to discuss this, but this can be dealt with in the next ensuing days, maybe over the long weekend. The Chair would refer members to *Hansard* for the dates of October 29, 30, and November 18 of 1987: on October 29, pages 10532 to 10534, 10541 to 10546; on October 30, pages 10583 to 10584; and on November 18, pages 10927 and 10928. I think all members would find that reading very useful for the future conduct of affairs in this Chamber.

Orders of the Day

head: Committee of Supply

[Mr. Schumacher in the Chair]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee of Supply would please come to order.

head: Capital Fund Estimates 1990-91

Advanced Education

1 – Construction of Postsecondary Education Facilities

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Minister of Advanced Education.

MR. GOGO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm pleased today to defend the estimates of the Alberta Capital Fund, vote 1, as it applies to the Department of Advanced Education.

There's some \$70.2 million, Mr. Chairman, that is proposed for approval by the committee. As members know, several years ago it was decided in the wisdom of government to fund our capital projects in a manner that was somehow commensurate with the life of the project and then amortize through the General Revenue Fund each year the cost of those projects. This year, as I said, vote 1 of the Capital Fund is some \$70,215,000, down about \$25 million from 1989. I'd like to go through what the various projects are as a way of advising the committee how those dollars are deployed.

I would point out at the outset that each year in the process of determining the budget and the requirements of both operating and capital funds, we ask the institutions – and there are some 29 institutions under the department – to set their priorities and justify the priorities to the department. I'm sure it's no surprise, Mr. Chairman, that when one deals with how the institutions perceive the priorities, sometimes called a wish list, that list can be very high indeed, perhaps even as high as three-quarters of a billion dollars.

Mr. Chairman, I think what's of particular significance this year is to point out the priorities of the department in recognizing the priorities of our self-governing institutions so that they may meet their mandates in terms of their construction requirements. I point out at the outset that the Alberta government recognized very early that occupational health and safety and safety of staff was paramount with regard to the institutions, and that's why members will be aware this year of a total of \$8 million budgeted for PCB removal from our institutions. That's the liquids within the transformers. This year's request in the Capital Fund is for some two and a half million dollars, which sees us well on the way to the removal of the PCB content in transformers within those institutions.

I'd like, Mr. Chairman, by way of information to the committee, to go through the various projects that have been requested, and then any members who have questions or concerns, I will do my best to answer them.

Of the \$70 million being requested this year, some \$44,350,000 is being spent on the university sector. As members know, we have the U of A, the U of L, the U of C, and Athabasca University. I'm going to go through the projects, albeit somewhat quickly, and then if the committee has questions, I'll respond.

First of all, Mr. Chairman, here at the U of A across the river, the request from the committee for capital funding falls in the

following areas. First of all, Corbett Hall: there'll be some \$7 million spent this year. Corbett Hall, which was constructed many, many years ago, back in 1929, requires major upgrading, particularly with the approved expansion of the physical and occupational therapy program. The total amount of this requirement is some \$12 million, of which we're requesting \$7.178 million this year. That building will be completed, if all goes well, in the '91-92 fiscal year.

Secondly, Mr. Chairman, there's the Clinical Sciences Building renovation at a cost of some five and a half million dollars. That's to improve the administration and teaching space which was commenced back in 1988. The total project cost of this is over \$6 million, and we would anticipate the completion of the project by a year this December.

One of the major requirements with expansion of campuses, Mr. Chairman, is the whole question of utilities upgrading. This year we're requesting \$5.3 million, again to complete it during the current fiscal year; that's 1990-91, the budget that's before the House. This will enable the university to improve the supply of utilities to university buildings, including the Walter C. Mackenzie Health Sciences Centre and the Cross Cancer Institute. The total cost, Mr. Chairman, for the benefit of members, is almost \$20 million for the utilities upgrading.

Then we have the extension faculty building that's going to require some \$6.2 million. This will provide for the relocation of the Faculty of Extension from Corbett Hall. Those tenders, I understand, have already gone out, and it's to be completed in the 1991-92 fiscal year at a cost of almost \$10 million.

I've already shared, Mr. Chairman, about the PCB removal. One and a half million dollars of this year's request of \$2.5 million will go for PCB removal at the University of Alberta. That shouldn't be surprising, because it's Alberta's oldest institution.

With regard to the University of Calgary, Mr. Chairman, there's some \$12 million requested under the Capital Fund in the following area: the business program expansion. As hon. members know, a year ago in our budget we announced the business program expansion to accommodate additional students who wish to take business management. The total project cost there is about \$8 million. Scurfield Hall is now under construction, and the professional building portion is being planned. There's a request of \$4.8 million for that. With regard to the business program expansion there's a requirement for equipment and furniture for new spaces. That request is for \$1.176 million. Oddly enough, that's \$100,000 more than the total cost. I'm having a little trouble rationalizing that, but that's what my figures say, so I take that as gospel.

We announced, as you know, Mr. Chairman, a year ago the new professional building, which would provide new instructional space to relieve overcrowding. That request this year is for five and a half million dollars. The total project, which was authorized a year ago by the House, was some 47 and a half million dollars. We would anticipate, for the benefit of members of the committee, that that project be completed, if all goes well, in early 1993.

With regard to safety, PCB removal requirement in Calgary this year is budgeted at some \$470,000 of a total cost for the University of Calgary of \$1.4 million.

The MBA program equipment requirement in Calgary for the recently approved program is \$168,000, Mr. Chairman, and that will continue through '91-92 until that program is complete under the terms of the approval given in 1986-87.

With regard to one of the most outstanding universities in Alberta, Mr. Chairman, the University of Lethbridge, there is a request before the committee of some \$6.493 million, which is to be broken down in the following manner. The student centre: there's a request for \$400,000. This centre will be completed by this fall, in 1990, and it will house student services, the university bookstore, and some retail space. It should be noted, Mr. Chairman, that much of this was funded by student donations, with a matching grant and then a direct grant of some \$5 million. The total cost is over \$11 million. There'll be some \$200,000 required for PCB removal of a total cost of \$600,000. Finally, student housing, a matter that's been raised by members earlier. In order to construct 52 town houses and single quarters for over 200 students, there'll be a requirement this year for almost \$5.9 million for the student housing. I'd point out that the total cost of that is some \$18 million. That's not all new construction; some of that is to renovate existing student residences within the University of Lethbridge.

Then, Mr. Chairman, the college system, and we have an extremely successful college system in Alberta. We're requesting some \$45.795 million to be utilized in the following way from the Capital Fund. First of all, the Grande Prairie Regional College. We're requesting some \$12.5 million to complete the phase 2 expansion of Grande Prairie Regional College at a cost of some \$34 million. When it's completed in 1991, it will give the college some permanent facilities for 1,600 students. As part of the trade-off there, Grande Prairie Regional College will not have to lease space which they're now leasing to accommodate the programs, and in addition it'll do away with the portable classrooms that are being used.

Here in Edmonton at the Grant MacEwan College, members will recall the announcement in 1988 with regard to the new campus at Grant MacEwan. This year we're requesting \$5.75 million for the city centre campus to allow them to continue planning for the 4,500 students they'll be expected to teach once it's completed. That was the project announced, members will remember, by Premier Getty back in 1988, at a cost of some \$100 million. We would expect that to be complete in 1993 if all goes well. Members will recall that a year ago I had asked permission of the committee to approve replacing the roof on the Jasper Place campus, which had to be replaced at a total cost of \$1 million. We're asking this year for \$500,000 to complete that project. It should be completed this time in time for the fall enrollment.

Lakeland College, Mr. Chairman, for which we had the privilege last week to open the Lloydminster campus. We're requesting this year \$800,000 to complete the Fort Kent campus. That has been a major restoration of a school built some 35 years ago. That will be complete this fall. That's a total project cost of a million and a half.

I think, Mr. Chairman, hon. members are getting the picture. There's a great deal of construction which has been under way for some time, most of which will be completed in time for the fall of 1990 for the new classes.

We then go to Medicine Hat, Mr. Chairman, which has a very successful community college, and we're seeking this year from the Capital Fund just under three and a half million dollars for the new Brooks campus. That'll include 12 classrooms, three labs, a library, a shop, a bookstore, a cafeteria, a student lounge, a student office, and staff spaces. We would expect that construction to begin almost momentarily. The completion will be in 1991. The total cost: less than \$6 million, much of which has been contributed not only by the town of Brooks and the

municipalities surrounding that area but, indeed, the Medicine Hat College itself. In a very significant donation about seven years ago, as the Member for Bow Valley I think will confirm, the Veiner family made a very significant contribution, under the endowment incentive program, of land which could be used for this Brooks campus.

Mount Royal College. Mr. Chairman, members will recall there was a major expansion completed just a year ago, so Mount Royal campus needs very little other than \$100,000 to take some more PCBs out of there at a total cost of some \$410,000.

Mr. Chairman, the other two areas that Advanced Education deals with, or two of the other three – one is the technical institutes. That's the northern Alberta institute, the southern Alberta institute, and Westerra institute at Stony Plain. We're requesting today some \$2.52 million for NAIT. That will renovate the tower building – that's the high tower out there – ventilation system and construction of new elevators and upgrading of their fire alarm system. The tenders have gone out, Mr. Chairman. We would hope construction would be completed by the end of this year. The total cost of that is almost \$3.5 million. At SAIT in Calgary the PCBs removal request is for \$135,000, and this will hopefully complete the requirements at SAIT in terms of PCBs.

We operate, as members of the committee know, Mr. Chairman, the provincially administered institutions called the Alberta Vocational Centres. They request today from this committee under the Capital Fund the following. At Lesser Slave Lake, which is located up north, we're requesting \$800,000 for furniture and equipment for the new campus; the total equipment cost is \$1.35 million. In summary, we're requesting a total of \$8 million for the vocational centres in the following order: at the Calgary vocational centre, \$100,000 for renovations and an upgrade of their fire codes; here in Edmonton at the Edmonton vocational centre, \$70,000; at Grouard, which I made reference to a moment ago, for student family housing, \$125,000. These will come under the Minister of Public Works, Supply and Services. The total, Mr. Chairman, will be some \$8 million.

[Mr. Moore in the Chair]

If I could just summarize, Mr. Chairman, I think it's absolutely essential that members of the committee recognize that the government of Alberta through Advanced Education has some \$4 billion invested in bricks and mortar throughout Alberta. Today we're seeking permission to construct some new construction and, equally important, funds to expand and maintain and upgrade, through utilities, to ensure that those facilities we have in place are well maintained.

I would entertain any questions of the committee, Mr. Chairman, in order to defend these estimates.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for Edmonton-Highlands.

MS BARRETT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I do have a few questions for the minister. I'd like to thank him, first of all, for his comprehensive overview though. I think all too often ministers, rather than giving the details of the projects at hand, talk about the generalities of the government direction: things that are rather common knowledge or could be derived from looking at the ideology of the Conservative Party which governs. This minister, I think, takes the time to go through the details

of his estimates, and I do appreciate it. In fact, there aren't a lot of questions to ask about what he had to say. There are a few questions to ask about things that he did not talk about, though, and the first of those questions would be related to the serious housing problem at the University of Alberta.

Mr. Chairman, the minister is well aware of the structural crumbling and decay at the Lister Hall complex at the U of A. Now, I recall that in last year's estimates he said: "Well, don't look at me for the money. You tell me what they did with their capital replacement money over all those years, and then I'll see what I can do." Well, I can't tell the minister that. The minister actually, believe it or not, has more strings than I do when it comes to looking at certain books or gathering certain information. I know this comes as a surprise to the minister, given the smile he responds with. But the fact of the matter is that he is one who has the power to answer that question; I do not.

What I can speculate is that because of the operating funds over most of the last decade not having kept pace with the rate of inflation, the University of Alberta, as with all other post-secondary educational institutions, has had to either operate under deficit spending or take from Peter to pay Paul. Now, that is not to suggest that they took from capital fund or replacement fund reserves to operate their programs; I doubt they did that. What I'm getting at is that these people have been financially strapped over most of the last decade, and to expect them to come up with additional money to sponsor their own housing replacement costs strikes me as a bit unusual. So given the state of disrepair of that housing facility and especially given the fact that it tends to house for the most part rural students who come from small centres throughout Alberta to attend the university, I would like to know why it isn't a priority with this government to put money into the Capital Fund so that the housing can be made structurally sound and fireproof once again. After all, if these are the people who want to talk about the importance of rural Alberta – and I wouldn't want to question their integrity on that matter, Mr. Chairman – then I ask that they put their money where their mouths are.

The other issue that the minister did not refer to with respect to the University of Alberta, the University of Calgary, SAIT, the Alberta College of Art, and, for the most part, every other institution is the need for expanded facilities overall. Now, I know the minister is going to say, "Well, look; you know, I'm not made of money and neither is the government." That is absolutely true. The issue is: can you cough up enough money to make sure that the taxpayers and their children are getting a fair deal when they send their kids, or when the kids go by themselves, to postsecondary education? Are they forced to, you know, swing from the rafters in order to participate in a classroom? Are the classrooms now so overcrowded and so large that the purpose of teaching is somewhat defeated by virtue of the numbers?

If that is the case, then that famous billion dollar operating budget that the minister has, referring to the 29 institutions that he constantly reminds us are under his jurisdiction, may be adversely affected to the point that it is not economical for the money that he is spending. If that's the case, then why bother at all? Now, of course, that's a real reductionist argument, and I wouldn't want to bring it to that point, but I think I make the case. If you don't supply enough money to house the students in classrooms, in learning facilities, and you force them into larger and larger classrooms and diminish the ability of the instructor to instruct and the students to learn, then have you not undermined your own billion dollar operating budget

expenditures in the first instance? Of course you have. It is clear; it is logical.

Now, the minister, I know, will say, "The government is not made of money." I've already acknowledged that that is true. On the other hand, I know that it is incumbent upon this government to spend our money wisely. I recall that the throne speech had steward or stewardship – not referring to the hon. TRT minister, we note – no less than 17 times in its contents. Now, I don't want to stray into debates unrelated, but I would remind the minister that as he stands up and defends his government's Capital Fund budget, he is also standing up and defending their expenditures in all other portfolios. He assumes this responsibility when he assumes the responsibility of a member of Executive Council. This is the tradition. Therefore, he must also assume the responsibility of answering for the poor expenditure decisions that the government has engaged in over the last few years. Obviously, to do that today would not be appropriate, but he must keep that in mind when he's using his argument about this government not being made of money, because there is money available. It just, I would argue, has been spent on the wrong priorities.

Now, Mr. Chairman, virtually every institution the minister cited, with the exception of the brand, spanking, new ones that are about to go up or are still in the planning stages, suffers from the overcrowding. They suffer from old buildings or buildings that are in serious need of repair or upgrading. I would like to hear a commitment to those institutions that, if not in this budget, at least in the longer term, perhaps next year and the following years – but not just election years, Mr. Minister – there will be money to provide these institutions with the capital requirements that they have shown so clearly.

A couple of more specific items that I might mention. One can't remember every institution one visits and take down all the notes without being prepared to do a 90-minute speech, which of course the rules prohibit, Mr. Chairman, but I do recall, for instance, that the University of Lethbridge is in desperate need of a new library building. The General Faculties Council voted to begin doing fund raising. The U of L is currently using old trailers; I believe they're 23 years old, if I'm not mistaken. Those are temporary trailers. You know the kind I'm talking about? They tend to be built by a friend of the government, Ron Southern, or his company. You know Ron Southern. Well, he owns this company called ATCO, amongst some other utility companies which enjoy very – what would you call them? – envious monopolistic positions in Alberta. Anyway, this guy also owns a company that builds trailers, and they probably have a serious majority of the market. They're called ATCO trailers. They're used by a lot of institutions when they need extra space on a temporary basis.

But the critical word here is temporary, Mr. Chairman. They're not meant to be used for 23 years in a row. I know my friend and colleague the Member for Edmonton-Centre will be talking about similar sorts of trailers that have been used for years out at the Fort Saskatchewan hospital when they were promised replacements 10 years ago. It's the same sort of issue. Wherever these temporary trailers are housing long-term projects, such as libraries, for which they were never originally designed, then there is a need that is not being met by this government, which somehow manages to accommodate the financial needs of certain select of its friends.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I would note that Medicine Hat College needs a space for day care for students' children. Now, I know that the government gives great lip service to the family.

God, we've got a Premier's commission on everything, don't we? It reminds me of the old Liberal government. Anytime somebody brought up a question they didn't like, they'd say: "Oh, royal commission. No problem." We'd have millions of royal commissions. It was sort of: study, study, study. Well, now we have Premier's councils in Alberta, and they do the same thing. But the fact is that with respect to the family and the needs of the family there are some capital needs in the postsecondary education system that are not being met, such as the importance of moms and dads being able to go to school and bring their kids to a child care centre on location. Good heavens, you would think we were still in the 19th century by virtue of the fact that we don't have more of such facilities. Congratulations to the U of A for having initiated this sort of project. But now we've got a college, the only college which has an early childhood development program that doesn't have its own day care centre. This strikes me as bizarre, and I don't believe the minister mentioned it.

Now, I'm sure that as he responds to my questions and questions put by other members, I'll think of some more specific instances to ask him about. But in closing my remarks at this point, I would again – and I do not mean this facetiously – thank the minister for doing what all too often ministers do not do, and that is: give a real, nonideological, sort of objective breakdown of the expenditures under this fund. I do appreciate that and look forward to his answers.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Calgary-North West.

MR. BRUSEKER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I, too, would like to enter the debate. I would like to start off by thanking the minister, as the Member for Edmonton-Highlands just did, for the breakdown, because it does give us a little bit better understanding of where the dollars are going. I would like to make some comments about funding in general and about some particular institutions. I'm aware there are 29 institutions, and I've had the privilege and good fortune to attend three of those in my years in this great province of ours.

So I'm going to begin my comments with the University of Alberta, which was my first alma mater, if I can refer to it in such a fashion. The Member for Edmonton-Highlands has already talked about the residences. Now, Lister Hall is the central hall, and of course there are three residences, Mackenzie, Kelsey, and Henday halls, primarily designed for single students, to be used during the school year, but then also used during the summer months as well for summer students and also used for a variety of conferences and so on, because they're handy facilities in that regard. My understanding of these facilities is that they are now in a serious state of disrepair and, in fact, are bordering on becoming dangerous, and I note that the minister made no reference to capital funding for those facilities for either the replacement or for the repair, no mention at all. So I would hope that the minister would address the urgent need at the University of Alberta for that type of facility, because as I understand it, we're getting near to being in a very serious situation in that regard.

The University of Alberta in Edmonton, as the minister mentioned, is the oldest institution in this province. There are a number of buildings – Corbett Hall, I believe, was the first building, and I notice it's getting a good chunk of money. But there are a number of other buildings which do need some upgrading as well, and I would ask the minister to sort of explain

to me how the process of selection is occurring in terms of which buildings get updated. It's nice to say, "Well, we have all these buildings," but if we put up these buildings, we have to recognize the fact that maintenance is every bit as important as massive renovations and so on down the road.

With respect to the entire budget, as I listened to the minister speaking, I heard a few comments in a few areas with respect to equipment expenditures. For example, the minister talked about MBA computer expenses of \$168,000. Now, I would suggest that that is certainly an appropriate expenditure, but I think – for example, I did not hear the minister make any reference to that kind of expenditure for the University of Alberta. Certainly, if we're going to teach our students and we want to have a highly technological industry, a high-tech industry in a variety of different fields, whether it's biotechnology, electrical technology, computer technology or whatever, we need to have computers as a very solid base to a very great number of areas. While it's not necessarily critical for our computer facilities in our advanced education facilities to be leading-edge, brand-new equipment, I think we do need to be aware that there are some concerns with respect to computing, because computing, as we're all aware, is a field that is moving extremely rapidly. Changes occur almost on a daily basis in the computing field. A great number of people would argue that computing is, in fact, the most important part of high technology and high-technology development and new industries.

So, to that end, I would ask the minister to make some comment regarding funding under the capital funding for either vote 1.1, Universities, or vote 1.2, Public Colleges, with respect to computers. Part of the problem is that computers are not worn out at the end of five years, but because technology is changing so rapidly, the funding formula to purchase new computers needs to be a different funding formula than for a desk, for example, or for chairs or bookcases and so on. That kind of – if I can describe it – static hardware does not need to be changed as quickly as the more dynamic hardware of computing, so I wonder if the minister could make some comments regarding how we select funding for desks and furniture as opposed to computers.

With respect to one of the colleges in the city of Edmonton here, Faculté Saint-Jean I understand again needs some renovation and repair. It's in a little bit of rough shape. I did not hear the minister make any reference to it, and again the concern there is with the residences. I'm wondering if there is a different funding formula for residences than there is for teaching buildings, shall we say. Is there a different formula, or how is that decision made in that regard?

Moving a little further south down to the University of Calgary, another one of my alma maters, I have listened on several occasions to the new president of the university there, Murray Fraser, and he has made some interesting comments. Last year's capital grants for maintenance and replacement of equipment and so forth were about \$7.3 million, whereas the formula they came up with was a need for some \$19.5 million, which left them with a bit of a shortfall. Now, I recognize, and this has been a comment made by the Minister of Advanced Education before, that some of these universities have surplus funds sitting in bank accounts in different places. The minister has made some comment that: "Well, they've got the extra money. They're not spending the extra money. It should be all allocated to the construction of whatever capital project they wish to have." So if the campuses spend the money on capital projects, then on one hand the minister says, "Well, you're not

saving money wisely for future expenditures." But if they spend the money, then they can't save it for something else. So they're kind of in a catch-22 situation. If they spend it, they're told they're not operating properly. If they save it, they're being told: "Well, you've got an extra \$10 million, \$20 million sitting there. Use that instead."

So it's kind of a catch-22 for the universities, and I would suggest that the problem is really the formula by which funding is allocated for these capital projects. The indication we've had is that if the universities in fact use the reserves they have for operational expenses, to help defray costs on class sizes or staffing or whatever, then really the reserve they have would only last about three days because, as we all are aware, they're very expensive institutions to run. There's certainly no doubt about that.

Also, as the minister went through, he in many cases said, "Well, the government is allocating X number of dollars, but the total project is Y number of dollars," and the Y number was always much larger than what the government was allocating. So asking private industry to put more into these facilities is perhaps a good concept on the face of it, but the reality is that if we have a highly educated society that can go out and work in a variety of fields which would help our economy grow, keep people employed and so on, then in fact all of society benefits. My understanding right now is that currently some 40 percent of the funding already comes from the private sources for these capital projects that the minister has listed and previous capital projects that have been done. That may be a well that is starting to go a little bit dry. So my suggestion to the minister is that the universities are not getting all of the money they need to do the projects they want from the private sector, they're not getting it all from the public sector, and so some of the things just aren't going along as well as perhaps they would like them to be.

A comment respecting the Alberta Vocational Centre at Lac La Biche. My understanding there is that many of the students that are attending are actually staying in motels, which is perhaps expeditious but also very expensive. What should be considered is a student residence there. I'm not quite sure the size that is required, but paying for students to stay in motels seems to me to be a very shortsighted solution, because in the long run it's going to cost us much more. I would suspect that probably most of us in this Assembly would agree that over the long haul we're further ahead to own rather than to rent, whatever the facility is. So that would be a question I would put to the minister: is there a plan to provide for student housing at the Alberta Vocational Centre at Lac La Biche?

With respect to Mount Royal College. Recently I had the opportunity to go through Mount Royal College. The minister made some comments that some \$100,000 is being allocated this year just for the removal of PCBs. Recently I had the opportunity to tour through that facility, and I have to compliment the minister on the renovations that have occurred there. They're for the most part very, very attractive, a very functional looking building, but there are some classrooms that are not yet completed. I understand that there's a bit of a concern because of the way in which it was done and the, if you will, architectural controls that have been applied. They're being asked to keep the same level and degree of finish uniform throughout. Now, part of the problem is that very expensive oak doors and oak trim have been used, and I understand there's one classroom where the walls are completed but there is no funding to complete the renovations in that one particular classroom. It's in the department of mathematics. My understanding is that

there's a classroom sitting there with bare walls that is not being utilized because they don't have the money to finish off. I would ask the minister to investigate that, please, because it seems to me that if we could get a classroom on stream for a relatively small amount of money, given the demands that are being placed upon all of our institutions, it might be a wise step to invest just a little bit more than \$100,000 for the PCBs.

Finally, just a closing comment. My understanding and my interpretation of things is that across all 29 of the institutions there is some serious concern with respect to capital allocations for dollars. In fact, now the University of Alberta has four associations – the Association of the Academic Staff, the Graduate Students' Association, the Non-Academic Staff Association, and the Students' Union – that are going to join together to hold public hearings to investigate the needs and the concerns they have regarding capital funding. Clearly the message that is being sent to this government and to this minister is that the universities are not satisfied; they are not content with the way things are going. We've got concerns regarding buildings. We've got concerns regarding renovations of old buildings. We've got concerns with respect to computers.

We've also got concerns with respect to funding for libraries and making sure that libraries can maintain a sufficient periodical subscription list. Now, I recognize again that this is a self-governing body and so on, but over my years of university training the message that I heard on a frequent basis was that the number of periodicals had to be cut back. As I understand, that has continued. It becomes more difficult for students, particularly as the courses become more advanced and for the graduate students, to complete the research that they need when they don't have the current information that can be provided through a variety of these periodicals.

The message that I've heard and the message that I want to relate to the minister is that capital budget funding should and must return to levels of funding of about three years ago. People are very concerned. There's frustration. There's a sense that the commitment to keep moving ahead in terms of the capital projects on behalf of this government is not what it was in the past.

I look forward to the responses from the minister regarding those comments.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for Wainwright.

MR. FISCHER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to ask just a couple of questions here. As usual, I won't take up too much time. I would like to thank the minister for coming out to our Wainwright campus a month or so ago, meeting with our folks out there, and trying to get some of the problems that we have in the most southern spoke of the Lakeland College straightened out. Even though it's small out there, it's just as important to us as the university is here or any college that we have in the rest of Alberta.

The fact that we are bringing our education out to the people has been a major benefit in academic upgrading and of benefit to the people that have to retrain and get into different jobs. We have been very successful in our small community down there with that. Whenever you go to a graduation and you see what some of the people that are a little bit less fortunate are trying to do and the help that they're getting, the retraining, and getting them into something so they can be responsible and be

good citizens, it's an excellent feeling to go and see that happening.

Now, we've had a bit of difficulty in the Lakeland College group, and I realize that there have been a lot of capital expenditures there over the past few years. We in Wainwright have been on the priority list by the board of governors for getting a new college down there, spending a couple of million dollars or maybe a little bit more. It hasn't materialized, and I realize that we are on a much tighter budget than we have been. During our meeting, as you were aware, they did put forth another proposal where the private sector would build that college and get some kind of a long-term lease agreement with the department and see if we couldn't expand our facility and be able to offer more of the courses that are much needed in our area. We do have, as you are well aware, a building there that is leased now, a pretty old building. It's serving the purpose, but we are just barely getting by and there's no way that we can offer the things that are needed in the community out of that building, or nearly all of them anyway.

I would like to say that the private developer proposal has a lot of merit to it in that it brings more interest from the community itself back into the college. It helps the private people share the risk, the economics, and whether or not you offer everything there or whether people should be traveling a little farther and so on. It does help cultivate a little bit extra interest there that I suppose when it's government-funded dollars, that same interest, then, may not be there. I think sharing that is very important to us, anyway, as far as our government. It's helping share some of the decisions that we have to make here.

I would just like to ask the minister if there has been any further progress recently on this proposal or where we're at with it, and what his thoughts are about the proposal, whether or not we should carry on and work to put people together and develop that or not.

Thank you.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister.

MR. GOGO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I very much appreciate the comments and questions that have been made by hon. members with regard to the Capital Fund. I should point out that I sense as minister a dramatic change occurring not only in society but in the whole area of postsecondary learning. We have now over half a million adult Albertans involved in one way or another in the learning process with advanced education. Looking at our institutions, between the colleges, technical institutes, the AVCs, and the universities we're well over 100,000 people. They would be in what I would define as credit programs.

The Member for Edmonton-Highlands pointed out some interesting things, but I've got to be very frank with members of the Assembly. I think times are changing. An hour from now or earlier, depending on the goodwill of people like Edmonton-Centre, I'll be out of this House and speaking over at NAIT to a conference on computer-managed learning: a whole phenomenon where no longer is it necessary for an individual to be resident within an institution, let alone a residence of an institution, to pursue higher education.

[Mr. Schumacher in the Chair]

We now have at Athabasca U one of the first institutions in distance learning, a process whereby 50 percent of their enrollment resides in Edmonton and Calgary and really, essentially, deal by computer in terms of learning. That, I think, is a wave of the future. Now, I can't recall Naisbitt and what he said. I know communications are going to dramatically change at the turn of the century. I've got his recent book but haven't read it yet. I sense there's dramatic change in store through computers, which raises the whole question about the traditional concept of higher education requiring a person to be physically in front of a professor or a senior student – because we don't often have professors in classrooms anymore – whether we require them to reside at an institution of learning or whether they're going to be dealing with the modern concept of the correspondence school that you see at Barrhead. I sense there's dramatic change occurring.

So that raises with me, Mr. Chairman, some very interesting questions. Let us not forget that we can't have it both ways as a government. We have board-governed institutions that are responsible for managing those institutions, setting priorities and policies within those institutions, and as long as they are in concert with the policy of government that every Albertan who has the ability and the desire to pursue higher education will have that opportunity, as long as it fits within that general policy objective, institutions, through their boards, decide what happens.

The Member for Edmonton-Highlands has raised matters which I think, quite frankly, touch on the whole question of priorities. We now have being completed, in terms of capital projects, some \$340 million, of which this year we're asking for \$70 million, and that still leaves about \$80 million-odd to go. That's information members may not have but I as minister have, and I'm sharing that with you. So we have a very major capital projects construction phase under way, and it takes several years. But I would remind hon. members, certainly the Member for Edmonton-Highlands, who talks about the need for day care centres and so on, that I as minister seek out from the institutions what their priorities are. I get back a wish list which approaches three-quarters of a billion dollars – one thing I've learned: there ain't never enough money – and we ask them to rate their priorities. With very minor exceptions their priorities become my priorities. I then go to government, through its Treasury Board, seeking permission, along with the assistance of the Minister of Public Works, Supply and Services, for our own nongoverned institutions and argue the case. I assure the hon. Member for Edmonton-Highlands that it's not the top of any list in terms of a day care centre.

My view as minister is that our institutions are in the business of education, research, and community service. That's why they exist. Frankly, they've been asked now to redo their mandates under a system called guidelines for system development to let us know, as a government, how the system of advanced education should function.

I wanted to respond, Mr. Chairman, to specific questions. The Member for Edmonton-Highlands talked about a very important item, and that's residences at the U of A. Now, the Lister Hall complex over there, which houses 1,000 to 1,500 people – I think under normal circumstances, 1,100 – certainly is having its difficulties. It's having its problems for two reasons, maybe more than two. It's only 25 years old, and it seems we can't have a building in Alberta stand more than 25 years, although the rest of the world seems to have them for hundreds of years. It may be related a little bit to the nature of the construction

when it was built, but because the government was maybe involved, I want to play that down. I don't want to talk about that, because that means criticizing a previous administration, Social Crediters, and you don't do that anymore.

The other thing that concerns me greatly is our present policy, if one can understand the policy. This minister's having trouble understanding the present policy. Residences have always been the responsibility of the institution. They determine the need. They then arrange a mortgage. They build an institution; they charge rents. With the rents they do two things: pay off a mortgage and maintain a building. One has got to be extremely gratuitous to the institution across the river, if you walk through there, to ever think any money was used for maintenance. In fairness I don't want to criticize the institution, but you go by there and have a look, and you say to yourself: did they ever maintain those buildings? I've got all kinds of evidence that says, "Hey, there's no way." Now, I know they lost \$300,000 a year, because they're then faced with the whole problem of saying that in the capital city you've got to compete with the private sector. We went through a slump in Edmonton. Rents probably went through the floor. How could the U of A charge rents to maintain a mortgage if the private-sector rents had fallen? I mean, that's not easy.

The question is: what role does government or the taxpayer have in providing residences? I've mentioned the whole subject of this technology and computer-managed learning. I don't know. That's why I'd asked for a review. It's interesting when I look at the responses that have come in as to whether or not government should have any role to play in the residences question. I would think hon. members would certainly try to make the case that undergraduate people from around Alberta coming to the University of Alberta – which is not the university of Edmonton, contrary to what some people seem to think. It is for Albertans, not for Edmontonians. Then maybe a residence is necessary. If it's necessary, who should pay for it? We have in the present system a policy which consists of some loans or grants. It's really not consistent, as hon. members are probably aware, and we're attempting to resolve that now, and the jury's not in yet as to what should happen.

The Member for Edmonton-Highlands raised, I think, a very interesting question, and that was with regard to the whole question of funding and who should provide it. Well, 85 to 90 percent of all the dollars going into the system now come from the taxpayer. I'm getting the message that the taxpayer is paying enough. Now, where's the balance to come from? If the tuition fee at the U of A in 1945 was 35 percent of expenditure, how can anybody complain today when it's 12 percent of expenditure? Clearly, tuition fees have to be reviewed. There cannot be any argument.

The one area I think – and the Member for Wainwright really touched on it, along with the Member for Calgary-North West – is what's the role of the private sector? What role are they playing? As I understand it, we see on the one hand that every dollar invested in education comes back fivefold. I keep hearing that. I don't see it, but I keep hearing it. It seems to me that the beneficiary of the system is the private sector. But I'm not so sure they're playing such a major role, and is there not an area for them to play? So between tuition fees and the role of the private sector I think there is a lot that could be done, because I don't question the need of the institution for money. They can't continue to deliver a quality product without having the resources. It's a new ball game to them. With respect, we've gone through a great period in Alberta, up until very recently,

when money, frankly, was not a problem. That's how we got the \$4 billion in assets out there. That's how we ended up with policies that pay 55 bucks a square metre to maintain that stuff, through operating funding. I'm not saying it's not fair. I'm not saying it's not right, but there's a new era upon us, as members are rapidly learning, and that is that the source of that funding is no longer as readily available. So we must seek new sources. That's why the endowment and incentive fund, which is now approaching \$400 million of taxpayer and private donor, has been so successful and maybe too successful. There's a lineup of hospitals out there that would love to have it; a lineup of school boards would love to have it. Right now the post-secondary institutions are the only ones that have it, and if they don't like it, maybe other people would love to have it, because I keep getting complaints.

MS BARRETT: Yeah, well . . .

MR. GOGO: Well, with respect. They're telling me now, "How dare you, minister, cut that to \$8 million a year?" That's what I'm getting from the universities. "How dare you cut that to \$8 million a year?" Well, let's see what other people maybe want to try it. I don't think the hospitals would say, "Hey, don't you dare make it only \$8 million a year." I'm not here to argue, hon. member; I'm here to explain.

The hon. Member for Calgary-North West talked about the capital formula funding. No question that when that system was devised and Alberta was the only province, it was projected, like a lot of other things. The best experts in the world told us oil would be 60 bucks a barrel; heritage fund would be \$60 billion. That shows what happens when you hire experts.

MR. McINNIS: Those are the best?

MR. GOGO: Well, they're the best we could hire from the NDP.

Now, we look at the formula funding, Mr. Chairman, and granted it's there for furnishings, for equipment, and for renovations. It's been, I think, to most institutions somewhat disappointing, but this year it's \$32 million. The Member for Calgary-North West is right on the money when he says, "It's not wearing out; it's obsolete." I agree. We're looking for new ways, and that's why it's encouraging to look at SAIT in Calgary getting computers donated from the private sector to train people on, because once they're trained, they go and work on those computers. GM and Ford and Chrysler are to be commended; they donate automobiles for the same reason. So there's a lot of that going on. I think there could be much more. With regard to Faculté Saint-Jean, the residence question. We don't provide residences except the Lister Hall complex, and that's being reviewed now.

Mr. Chairman, the Member for Calgary-North West raised a very interesting question that I don't have an answer to. At Lac La Biche at the AVC we now use motels. I mean, I know the member is not criticizing us for using the private sector, but he says, "Wouldn't it be a better deal if we built a residence?" I don't have the answer to that. I'm not so sure it would, because I don't know the length of the program. There's a lot of things I frankly just don't know. The one thing that does concern me is that if you want to get married students into a system in the north, then residence is a very important item. You've got to recognize that AVC Lesser Slave Lake at Grouard serves 20 communities, and if they're going have people come in from 50

miles away, then shouldn't you really have residences? Well, we do, and there's a very successful one there, but does the same argument apply at Lac La Biche? Maybe; I don't know.

Let me close off with regard to the Member for Wainwright, Mr. Chairman. Wainwright is, as you know, a campus of Lakeland College: some very interesting programs, 120 students enrolled. Right now we lease space, as we do in many communities. Wainwright's been on the wish list for some years, '84-85, '83-84, if recollection tells me, similar to Vegreville's wanting a new campus. Right now we lease space out there, because in terms of the wish list it's not been approved. I met with the mayor recently and I was very excited by the examples I see in Wainwright. They have a community centre shared in terms of the private sector and the public sector. Beautiful facility. Excellent. The mayor is suggesting now that perhaps the campus for Wainwright could be the same way. In other words, if somebody were to build it, why not, in effect, the Lakeland College Wainwright campus lease that and recover the cost? I think it's a pretty exciting concept.

Members may be aware that we had a first recently at Lloydminster where the Husky Upgrader project, rather than build through ATCO trailers – which some hon. members don't seem to care for, spending three of the four million and then after two or three years having them done away with – they got together with the Lloydminster campus out of Lakeland College, and they're contributing millions of dollars to build residences in Lloyd that will be occupied by the 800 to 900 workers at the Upgrader. When that building's complete, they will then turn that over to the college for residences. That's what I mean by involvement of the private sector. I think there's great opportunity for more of that to be done. One thing I'll say about hard times: if we're in hard times, it causes people to rethink their priorities and look for new sources.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would hope I've answered all the questions of the hon. members, and I would certainly hope the committee would support vote 1 in capital projects.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Grande Prairie, followed by Edmonton-Centre.

DR. ELLIOTT: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I only want to take this minute to make reference to my comments that I made in *Hansard* Monday, March 26, with respect to the Grande Prairie Regional College and, in addition to that, just take one minute to say thank you to this minister and his department for the many courtesies and special attention that they have given the Grande Prairie college in recent months and years and the manner in which they have communicated with me and let me communicate with them on the many topics we've tackled together.

Thank you.

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

REV. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. After the congratulatory remarks about Grande Prairie I wondered about a college further north, up at Fairview College. I had the opportunity to go there earlier this year and I found – I'm sure the Member for Dunvegan will want to speak to this as well – that now that the good work has all gone at Grande Prairie, maybe up at Fairview, where they have extensive programs reaching far into the northern parts of the province and meeting the educational needs of a range of students whose needs are

not often met, they too are under some severe capital constraints and building problems. I know they've had some good new facilities there, but the thought of Grande Prairie reminded me of Fairview, and I wanted to make that comment in support of them, although I'm sure the member will want to speak to it himself.

I have three points which I would like to raise with the minister. The first one has to do with how it is that he has managed to keep control of the capital vote for Advanced Education and let it not slip away into the hands of the Minister of Public Works, Supply and Services. Now, I didn't get many good answers out of this from the Minister of Health the last time, when all the hospital construction and the rest left the purview of the minister of hospitals and went to the minister of public works, but I think this minister's doing a fairly good job.

I would like to encourage the continued authority of him to oversee the capital construction of postsecondary facilities in the province partly because, as the minister's already just been raising, there are a number of new things happening in the advanced educational system and the policy in terms of how the programs will be developing, what changes will occur, and all the rest is going to have a great impact on the capital side. I think that kind of hands-on approach – that the piper who calls for the operating dollars as well as the piper who calls for the capital dollars should be the same one who knows what the tune is. I'm told that a public works minister is just there to do the building or to implement the building process once the Advanced Education minister says whatever he wants to have built or not built. I don't know why that same argument hasn't applied to the Minister of Health. So I still have great confusion here. I think, though, my preference would be to still have public works do the building but to have it under the purview and authority of the Minister of Advanced Education. I guess I'm just pleased at his being able to retain the current status and that this continues in the future.

A second point I'd like to raise is with respect to nursing education in the province. There are a couple of votes here for hospital-based nursing education, and again I know we all have some frustration because we get a vote like that which hits at just one small part of the whole range of nursing education that's going on in the province, and I see that there is not much going to it this year in this particular vote. But I am wondering again what the overall policy is with respect to what kind of nurse we want to educate in this province and where that education's going to take place. It's going to have a great lot to do with how much money goes into whatever capital vote will proceed from that policy decision; for instance, of course, with the registered psychiatric nursing program.

Now, I hope this matter can be solved or something can get on the record so that the minister and I, either of us, don't continue to get four and five letters every other day about the registered psychiatric nursing program at Alberta Hospital Edmonton. I take it that there's still the policy that it's going to be closed down and that RPNs will no longer be trained there. I'm not entirely sure, having not done my full homework on it, in terms of what that will mean at Alberta Hospital Ponoka or what that means with respect to registered psychiatric nursing in the province generally. But that's just one small part of it.

The other issue to do with the hospital-based nursing education is that if there's going to be further support at that level, what that means for college-based nursing programs as well as university-based nursing programs. In fact, with the new collaborative program in nursing – and we haven't had any

verbal discussion of this, although I've read what the minister is wanting to do with respect to some of that – certainly a new breakthrough here in Alberta, I think, has really occurred with respect to the university program saying, "Okay; the first two years of a nursing education will qualify for entry to the final two years being completed at a university level." The kind of co-operation that that symbolizes, I think, is very encouraging, but it's still not enough.

I think the Hyndman report pointed out some other recommendations about what increased funding needed to go on for the university side of that equation, despite the goodwill of those in the system to continue to want to see that co-operation. I just don't get a sense that there's some real co-ordination here, whether it's operating in capital or whether it's Advanced Education and Health. I would like some assurance that what we have before us in terms of hospital-based nursing education in this program, even though there's no money in it this year, reflects some sort of policy direction which is going to enhance the collaboration of nursing education in the province and what that's going to mean for capital costs at the college level or at the university level or wherever else it's going to impact.

Then my third question has to do with Grant MacEwan Community College, and again I listened with interest to the minister's comments with respect to priorities and having to set priorities and the rest. I'd also remind the minister that it's not just a matter of setting priorities; it's also a matter of having made some promises. The promises that have been made even before an election time are promises which people of integrity think need to be kept. It's interesting that a certain flurry of announcements was made with respect to Grant MacEwan College and the CN land deal and all the rest. I'm sure there was a nice photo opportunity when the sod was even turned up there and everyone had the expectation that it was full steam ahead with Grant MacEwan College and their new campus. I mean, they certainly have a solid case for expansion and consolidation of their program. Under Dr. Kelly and the administration and the faculty and the students at Grant MacEwan they have done terrific work over the last few years with very cramped quarters, and the negotiations with government had successfully completed in the announcement of the new campus, which is going to be, as the minister knows, a boon not only to Edmonton but to the advanced education system throughout the province.

So there is a bit of a delay, and I'm assured that we're not to get too worried, that this isn't a broken promise, that it's not going to be cold feet that will result in the college campus never proceeding to construction. What it will mean, I imagine, is that it will in fact cost even more to build once the delay is over. If we're talking '90-91 or '91-92 dollars, the longer the delay in terms of construction costs now, the more it's going to cost in the final analysis. That I'm sure is a judgment the minister and his friends in Treasury and the rest are going to have to weigh. But I think it's a matter that needs some further clarification from the minister, particularly on the capital side. What is the timetable? What is the guarantee? What is the promise that comes from this government to the board of Grant MacEwan College? What can they expect to have in terms of the promises that have been for the new campus?

Then again, I'm not fully aware or apprised of all the issues with respect to student residences on campus and the discussion about the University of Alberta and other colleges and the rest, whether or not it should be the public sector or the private sector or whether the universities or the colleges can keep up

the maintenance of residences. But certainly the issue of housing on the new Grant MacEwan College campus is going to be an important one. I'm told that there's just no way the government is going to fund any measure of housing on the new campus. I guess it can be argued that for a community college, where it's to draw in students who actually live in and around the community, that perhaps is understandable. On the other hand, in the constituency which, of course, I represent, Edmonton-Centre, there's all kinds of fear about what an influx of thousands of new students who will want residency in the proximity of the new campus is going to mean for the housing market in the immediate area, whether it's over in the Oliver district, where there's already a tight housing market situation, or on the north side of the campus along the 107th Avenue side, which is home to a great number of Vietnamese, Cambodian, El Salvadoran, and other new Canadians who come and actually live there because the rents are less expensive than they are in other parts of the city. In fact, they're feeling a great threat that with the new college and without residency being provided for the students, the students are going to try to find housing there, and landlords are going to start putting up the rent, and the Vietnamese, predominantly, and others will be evicted or not be able to pay the price of an increasing rental market there, and it's going to have a very deleterious effect on that community. All because Grant MacEwan and this government, in my mind, still have not got a clear policy that has to do with how much can be spent on residency, whose responsibility it is, and, particularly in this case, what impact it's going to have on the wider neighbourhoods.

So those are my three points, and I'll await some response. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. minister.

MR. GOGO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Member for Edmonton-Centre raises, as usual, some very interesting points. He makes reference to the Minister of Public Works, Supply and Services building certain things and Advanced Ed building certain things. The difference, just so we're clear, is that under our system we have board-governed institutions. The boards make those decisions. They choose their architects; they do all this. All they've got to do is come in on time and under budget. As long as they do that, they become, obviously, favourites in the eyes of the government, favourites in the eyes of the minister. They're expected to do that, and they do that. I'm sure the hon. Minister of PWSS does it just as well. The difference is that for the vocational centres we run, the minister of public works does those for us because we don't have the expertise in-house.

The member made reference to Fairview College, Mr. Chairman – Ian Macdonald, the chairman up there, and Fred Trotter, the president. I toured there, and I'm pleased to hear the hon. member has been there. They have a very interesting, successful program in such a variety of ways. I think I've said before that unless you've been to NAIT, no one understands what NAIT offers. Well, the same with Fairview College. We have one of the most fascinating postsecondary systems anywhere. Well, I shouldn't say that; I haven't been everywhere. But the ones I've been to have really opened my eyes. Just across the tracks here at Stan Souch's shop, I can't believe the programs they offer in technologies and so on. The same thing in Fairview, if you look with regard to animals and at how they teach various things. The hon. member mentioned Fairview, and the Minister of Transportation and Utilities, the Member for

Peace River, and I have been discussing – because the North Peace consortium has some unique problems up there in Peace River that are currently being addressed. I would hope it's resolved fairly quickly, because they're in some . . . Well, "substandard" would be giving it great credit, if you used that term.

The Member for Edmonton-Centre has raised schools of nursing. Just so we're clear: because there's nothing in the Capital Fund this year, let's not lose sight of the fact that last year there was \$2.8 million for the schools of nursing. We have various schools of nursing operating: in the University hospital, the Foothills hospital, and so on, as well as Ponoka and Alberta Hospital Edmonton. This year there's none because the \$3.8 million that was committed is now concluded, one of that being, Mr. Chairman, the new school of nursing at the Ponoka institution, which is a board-governed institution.

The hon. Member for Edmonton-Centre raised a matter that frankly is not under discussion, and that's the whole question of operating funds of the department.

RPNs, registered psych nurses, Alberta Hospital Edmonton. The member knows they've requested to discontinue the nursing program. Frankly, it's a very expensive program. At the start they had 50 students; now there's a dozen. I've not made the decision whether or not they'll be allowed to terminate that program. There's a classic example. I'm hearing the Member for Edmonton-Centre saying, "Gogo, for heaven's sake, hold tight and don't let them do it." At the same time his House leader two seats away says, "How dare you have the audacity – how dare you have the audacity – of a Bill 27 to even disagree with an institution that wants to reduce this program?" So this is going to be an interesting debate in second reading, and I call on the Member for Edmonton-Centre to help me.

Grant MacEwan Community College. Mr. Chairman, sure it was a promise. It was an announcement, recognizing the uniqueness of Grant MacEwan Community College. The chairman, John Ramsey, and Gerry Kelly – the hon. member is correct – is an outstanding president. That commitment was made in '88 for a downtown campus, \$100 million. It was not carried forward this current year because there's about \$5 million-odd in there for planning. They're not ready to go into the ground. The government made a decision in the interest of fiscal responsibility and fiscal restraint that if a project was not physically in the ground, it would not be done during this budget year. However, there's about \$5 million worth of work to do. They have those funds, and they're proceeding, and I've had not one objection, with respect, hon. member, from the board of governors.

The question of housing. The Member for Edmonton-Centre knows better than anybody else the nature of his constituency. I have great trouble in my mind looking at Grant MacEwan Community College in the heart of downtown Edmonton and having residences. Now, maybe I'm wrong. Maybe the answer is something like the HUB over at the university, where the government provided a grant of 5 and a half million dollars at the U of A to help with HUB, which has not only commercial space but residences. That may be an option; I've not had a request for that. My sense tells me that when you're in the capital city, maybe, just maybe, private developers would be sincerely interested in developing housing for those students. I don't know, hon. member, so I can't say.

I think, Mr. Chairman, they were the questions that were put to me, and I would look forward to the support of the committee in carrying my vote.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is the committee ready for the vote?

HON. MEMBERS: Question.

Agreed to:

1.1 – Universities	\$44,350,000
1.2 – Public Colleges	\$22,660,000
1.3 – Hospital-Based Nursing Education	–
1.4 – Technical Institutes	\$2,405,000
1.5 – Provincially Administered Institutions	\$800,000
Total Vote 1 – Construction of Postsecondary Education Facilities	\$70,215,000

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

[Motion carried]

Public Works, Supply and Services

3 – Construction of Hospitals and Nursing Homes

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'd invite the Minister of Public Works, Supply and Services to address the committee.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, thank you very much. It's a great opportunity once again to appear before a committee of the Legislative Assembly of Alberta to deal with estimates. This is the third opportunity I've had this week to deal with estimates in one form or another: on Monday with the Heritage Savings Trust Fund estimates; on Wednesday morning with the Public Accounts Committee, which I really enjoyed; and today, which I know I will enjoy even more, dealing with the Capital Fund.

Mr. Chairman, within the Capital Fund there are three votes that come under the purview of the Minister of Public Works, Supply and Services. The first one, of course, is the easiest, vote 3, Construction of Hospitals and Nursing Homes, and we're asking for approval of the committee this year for an expenditure level of \$135.2 million. That's a 28.1 percent increase from comparable estimates of a year ago. Vote 4 deals with Construction of Water Development Projects, a total of \$102.3 million, a 4.9 percent increase, and vote 5, the Construction of Government Facilities, the two in particular that I think are important for cultural and tourism advances in our province, and we're asking for \$16.57 million, for a grant increase of 117.5 percent.

Mr. Chairman, by way of overview comments with respect to vote 3, I'd like to just let all members know, because this is a question that periodically comes up to the Minister of Public Works, Supply and Services, basically what has been the escalation in cost in terms of the inflationary factor faced by the construction industry in recent years. Essentially, if we look back over the last three years and look to see what the difference was in overall construction costs in our comments from 1987 as compared to 1986, our conclusion is that it was 3 percent. For the adjudication from 1988 back to 1987 it was 5 percent, and from 1989 back to 1988, 5 percent. If you were to basically look, then, at a situation that occurred from 1986 through 1989, compound it, and tally it in, you basically get that compound costs increased by some 13.8 percent in the Alberta construction industry during this period. I think that should be noted as part of the scenario record which we're dealing with.

Mr. Chairman, as well, the total budget under vote 3 for hospitals and nursing homes includes funding for 69 major

projects at various hospital facilities. Of this total, 26 projects are scheduled to be under construction during the 1990-91 fiscal year, with the balance of the projects in various stages of programming or design.

One of the oft-answered questions, and it's been repeated before, is basically: what is the process that's followed? Just listening in terms of the situation with respect to Advanced Education estimates just a few minutes ago, the questions always were: who is responsible for what, and how does it kick in, and how does it follow through? I want to be very, very brief, but I think it's important for the written record to basically have on the written record what would be the normal phasing, in this case, of hospital projects.

Basically there are five steps that are followed, Mr. Chairman. The first step – and we're dealing with the nomenclature used, the words that are used in describing the process, because these are words that are used by officials in Public Works, Supply and Services, officials in Advanced Education, and are understood by those who are involved in the hospital and nursing home scenarios in our province.

The first phase is the project request stage. That's stage number one, when the Department of Health will assess hospital boards' requests for new projects, the first formal indication.

The second step is the programming stage. The functional programming by Alberta Health gets under way. Alberta Health defines the project program services and operational costs. So there's a definition that's given right at the outset. At that same time, the programming stage, there is a connection made between Alberta Health and Alberta Public Works, Supply and Services. Alberta Public Works, Supply and Services gets involved in facility programming internally within their own department, and we get involved in terms of definitions for scope and magnitude of construction and total project costs. Now, this is a three-way consultation that occurs between a local hospital board, Alberta Health, and Public Works, Supply and Services.

Once we've concluded the second stage, the programming stage, we then go on to the third stage, which is called the design stage. At that point in time, the concepts and the requirements of the project are translated into designs and detailed building plans through four subphases within that phase. First of all, everybody gets involved in something called the schematic design. The hospital board, by this point in time, essentially has the architect lined up; the consultations are under way; they've selected the individual that they want to have design it; they start talking about block schematics and sketch designs.

When they complete the schematic design stage, then they go on to a higher level of decision-making that's called the design development. We're now getting into the stage where we're going away from the conceptual mock-ups basically into final design drawings and a more sophisticated back-and-forth period of time between the hospital board, Alberta Health, and Public Works, Supply and Services. Essentially a report is then prepared saying that this is what we think basically should be the final model for this particular project.

At that point in time, we go on to a third level in this whole design stage called a contract document stage, when you start drawing up, getting and putting together, the working drawings, the specifications, and the pre-tender report, at which point in time, basically, the architect is having almost weekly meetings with the local hospital board and saying, "This is where we think we're at." We're now coming down to getting costs in terms of what all the various segments of a particular hospital project or

health care project might be. When that's concluded and when all those reports are in, the hospital board then has a darn good idea that if it gets permission to proceed with this particular project, gets that permission from Public Works, Supply and Services – we have a pretty good idea, when you put it out to the public for the tender, what it's going to come in at.

Having made that decision, then we go on to the fourth subset under this design stage. It's called the tender stage, where you basically put out the tender, you evaluate the tender, and then the decision is made whether or not you can award the contract. At this point in time, confirmation is given by Public Works, Supply and Services to the individual hospital board. We've now got a dollar figure back. It says that project X was estimated – we know what the estimate is. We don't tell anybody what that estimate is, because you're talking about a public process in the private-sector market. If the project comes fairly close to what the basic estimate is, we've by this time already started a plan within this budgetary process of what will be required. There are some occasions, basically, that the tender comes back and it's considerably higher than what everybody thought it would be, what everybody believed it would be, and we would then have to have particular discussions. But once we have agreed in that fourth subset stage – in the design stage, the tender stage – have finished the tender evaluation, we're then in a position to award the contract. A letter then is conveyed to a particular hospital board under my signature; it basically says, "You now have the approval to go."

Then we go into the fourth stage, called the construction stage. Of course, then you get the work: the bricks and the mortar, the actual physical movement of dirt, the erection, the laying of cement, and everything else, and with this the execution and the implementation of the contract for the construction or renovation of the facility. Of course, depending on the size or the magnitude of the project, it may take simply months or it may take years, and during that particular stage, needless to say, there are all kinds of issues that are raised and looked at. All kinds of meetings are held, and people decide 18 months after the contract's gone out that they want to move a wall someplace or they want to change the colour of something or they want to get a bigger door. You discover things; despite all the technical and engineering stuff that's gone into it in the first place, some errors invariably occur. That's very normal. Everyone in this room who's ever had the great opportunity to build his or her own house knows full well that after you get the house built, two years after, there's a wall that shifts a bit, there's a crack or something, and you have all kinds of discussions here and there and everything else.

So finally, when we get it all through the construction stage, we then open up the building, and we go into the last stage, and it's called the commissioning stage of a project. It's during that time that the verification of performance of the building system is then put in place, and the responsibility of the various professionals who are involved in the field comes into play. The hospital board has to, of course, accept the project. The architect, the engineer, or the contractor: all are subjected to all kinds of litigation things if things did not go the way they were supposed to go. Finally, that whole verification comes to a conclusion, and we give everybody a clean bill of health and say, "This project is now commissioned."

Now, needless to say, Mr. Chairman, this is a little more complex and a little more complicated than simply saying, "Well, look, we want to build a half-mile of road from point A to point B and the like, and we have to go through those phases." I

think it's important, because in this particular budget, which shows an increase of 28.1 percent from last fiscal year to this fiscal year, all of these various phases are under way, are in various points of development. I want to make it very clear that no projects in this vote have been canceled. No projects have been canceled. Some have been deferred until budgetary funding is available to them, and we have given authority and given permission to every project that we have to go to the stage they currently are in, one of those various stages that I just outlined in the last couple of minutes, to complete that stage in this fiscal year, in 1990-91. But I want to repeat: no projects have been canceled, and they're being allowed and the authority's been given to each of these hospital jurisdictions to go to a particular phase and conclude and complete that particular phase in fiscal '90-91.

As we go through to the fall of 1990-91, it will be my responsibility to review the progress that's being made with respect to these projects. The Minister of Health will of course have ongoing consultations in terms of requests for new projects and the like. We will come together in the fall of this year, 1990 – both the Minister of Health and I sit on the priorities and finance committee – and we will then have to deal with this matter.

Of the ongoing projects, Mr. Chairman, that we've got in here, 19 projects previously approved for construction will continue to completion; six projects have been approved to proceed to tendering and construction; nine projects have been approved to proceed to completion of contract documents within the limits of the available funding, with tendering and construction, of course, to be determined; and 35 projects have been authorized only to complete the current stage of the work, with further work to be deferred.

Mr. Chairman, I want to conclude with those brief remarks with respect to vote 3, and I know that under the rules of the House the Capital Fund will be returning several days from now, and we'll be dealing with the conclusion of vote 3 and also the conclusion of votes 4 and 5.

In view of the time I would like to suggest that the committee now rise and report.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Chairman, it's just a technicality. I believe the committee should rise, report progress, and beg leave to sit again.

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair]

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

Resolved that a sum from the Alberta Capital Fund not exceeding the following be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1991, for the department and purposes indicated.

Advanced Education: \$70,215,000 for Construction of Postsecondary Education Facilities.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has had under consideration certain resolutions of the Alberta Capital Fund for the Department of Public Works, Supply and Services, reports progress thereon, and requests permission to sit again.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Does the Assembly concur in the report?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Opposed? Carried.
Deputy Government House Leader.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, I move that the Assembly do now adjourn in accordance with Government Motion 15, which was adopted by this Assembly on May 11.

[At 12:57 p.m. the House adjourned to Wednesday at 2:30 p.m.]

