

## Legislative Assembly of Alberta

Title: **Wednesday, May 23, 1990 2:30 p.m.**

Date: 1990/05/23

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

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

### Prayers

MR. SPEAKER: Let us pray.

Our Father, we thank You for Your abundant blessings to our province and ourselves.

We ask You to ensure to us Your guidance and the will to follow it.

Amen.

### head: Notices of Motions

MR. MITCHELL: Mr. Speaker, I rise to give notice of a motion under Standing Order 40 that I would raise at the end of question period to debate. It is a motion which concerns the issuing of licences for Daishowa Canada Co. Ltd. I am calling for the revocation of these licenses until such time as proper environmental impact assessments can be undertaken to ensure that if that plant is to proceed, it will proceed properly.

### head: Introduction of Bills

#### Bill 25

#### Alberta Income Tax Amendment Act, 1990

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill 25, the Alberta Income Tax Amendment Act, 1990.

Mr. Speaker, this piece of legislation is an amendment to the Alberta Income Tax Act, the Act essentially governing personal income tax in this province. While many of the changes deal with the attempts by all governments of the provinces to harmonize their legislation with the federal legislation, one of the more substantive sections in this piece of legislation deals with the changes announced in the budget with respect to the Alberta royalty tax credit and the impact on the personal income tax calculation under those sections.

Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of Bill 25, Alberta Income Tax Amendment Act, 1990.

[Leave granted; Bill 25 read a first time]

#### Bill 30

#### Alberta Corporate Income Tax Amendment Act, 1990

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill 30, Alberta Corporate Income Tax Amendment Act, 1990.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is similarly founded in the budget, which was the focus of our spring session so far. The budget, of course, dealt with some significant changes which affect both the Alberta royalty tax credit and the introduction of a financial institution tax. Those changes are outlined in this piece of legislation. At the same time, changes in the ARTC as they affect double dipping or the so-called proliferation of associated companies are, in fact, dealt with here as well. Finally, along with all tax legislation this piece of legislation amends our provincial corporate tax Act in line with the changes announced

under the federal legislation and brings into harmony our legislation with theirs.

So I move first reading of this Bill.

[Leave granted; Bill 30 read a first time]

#### Bill 31

#### Livestock Industry Diversification Act

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill 31, being the Livestock Industry Diversification Act.

The purpose of this Bill, Mr. Speaker, is to transfer responsibility for overseeing game animal production from Alberta Forestry, Lands and Wildlife to Alberta Agriculture and to permit the sale of elk meat in Alberta. Responsibility for export and import requirements, health, and genetic standards will remain with Alberta Forestry, Lands and Wildlife.

Mr. Speaker, I request first reading of Bill 31. [interjection]

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order. We're at Introduction of Bills stage, thank you. It's not quite question period.

[Leave granted; Bill 31 read a first time]

#### Bill 43

#### Oil and Gas Conservation Amendment Act, 1990

MR. ORMAN: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill 43, the Oil and Gas Conservation Amendment Act, 1990.

The purpose of the Bill is to implement the ethane policy announced in August 1987 and the decisions announced in October 1988 with respect to the Energy Resources Conservation Board's recommendations on implementation. This Bill would empower the ERCB to design, implement, and administer a program to ensure the availability of sufficient ethane to maintain the threshold volumes required by the petrochemical industry. Mr. Speaker, this Bill also addresses further the issue of compulsory pooling. Pursuant to section 72 of the Oil and Gas Conservation Act the ERCB issues pooling orders with respect to a drilling spacing unit. This Act will deal with penalties related to forced pooling in this connection.

[Leave granted; Bill 43 read a first time]

### head: Tabling Returns and Reports

MR. ORMAN: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased today to table the annual report, 1989-1990, for the Alberta Electric Energy Marketing Agency.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to file with the Assembly today responses to questions 286 and 287.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.  
Banff-Cochrane.

MR. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased today to file the Final Report of the Joint Government/Industry Task Force on Builders' Liens. This report was prepared for the Attorney General's department.

I wish to extend thanks to the chairman of the committee, Peter Knaak, Q.C., and to the entire task force made up . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. member. I'm sorry. It's just a matter of filing. Say what it is, and sit down. Thank you.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the 1988-89 annual report of Fairview College.

#### head: **Introduction of Special Guests**

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure today to introduce to you and through you to the members of the Assembly three executive members of the Alberta Game Growers Association. Seated in the members' gallery is Norm Moore, the president, from Alder Flats; Stuart Norton, vice-president, from Magrath, Alberta; Paul Rebekowich, past president and director, from Wandering River. I'd ask that they stand and receive the welcome of the Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER: Minister of Labour.

MS McCOY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure today to introduce to you and through you to the Assembly 106 students from the A.E. Cross school in Calgary-West. They've been visiting today with their teachers Mr. Art Hanson, Mr. Gardiner, Mrs. Bojoiolois, Ms Purcell, Mrs. Tutty, Mrs. Turner, and Mr. Moore and Mr. Torres. They went this morning to see the Edmonton science centre. They are here today with us, and following this they will go to another establishment, the West Edmonton Mall, which I'm sure they're all looking forward to. I would ask all of the members of the Assembly to give them their usual warm welcome.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Lloydminster.

MR. CHERRY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure today, on behalf of my colleague the Member for Wainwright, to introduce to you and through you to members of the Assembly a group of 37 students from the Blessed Sacrament school in the Wainwright area. They are accompanied by their teacher Mr. Schoenberger; parents Mrs. Thibodeau, Mrs. Smith, and Mrs. Watt; and the bus driver Mrs. Ermel. They are in the members' gallery, and I would ask that they rise and receive the traditional welcome of the Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Highlands.

MS BARRETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure to introduce to you and through you to members of the Assembly today someone who's visiting Alberta from Quebec for the summer. He is Benoit Beauchemin, and he has been hired under the Quebec/Alberta exchange program under the Department of Career Development and Employment. He's seated in the public gallery. I'd ask him to rise and receive the traditional welcome of the Assembly.

#### head: **Oral Question Period**

##### **Daishowa Pulp Mill**

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of the Environment. Last week we had the spectacle of an environment minister who isn't trusted by his own government to bring in a major piece of environmental legislation. Yesterday the minister showed us just how far he's prepared to go in caving in to other

government members who don't think pulp mill developers should have to be inconvenienced by public hearings into their projects, and of course I'm talking about the fact that yesterday he issued an operating licence for the Daishowa pulp mills behind closed doors with no public input. Now, not too long ago the minister said this in an answer to a written question from the Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place, and I quote:

Public involvement is a fundamental principle of the Government of Alberta's commitment to the protection, improvement and . . . use of the environment now and into the future.

So much for fundamental principles from this minister and this government. But just out of curiosity, to the minister, Mr. Speaker: does the minister still stand by this statement?

MR. KLEIN: Of course, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, that is a rather interesting answer, because yesterday he did precisely the opposite. If he still believes in fundamental principles, why is it, then, that he issued this operating licence? Why did he double-cross the people of Alberta and issue these operating licences with no public input, which he said was a fundamental principle of his?

MR. KLEIN: First of all, Mr. Speaker, there was public input. Secondly, there was no reason not to issue the licence.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, you're a disgrace, from the statements that you've made. You're saying to this Assembly that there was public input. The minister knows full well that's claptrap. There was no public input. I want to ask this minister: can't he see that by issuing the Daishowa licence now without public input, he is betraying the public, environmentalists, natives, and the Peace River itself? That's what he's doing, Mr. Speaker.

MR. KLEIN: Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Leader of the Opposition is a disgrace himself. He's a disgrace for misleading this House, Mr. Speaker.

Now, I'm going to tell the hon. member a story. I'm going to tell him a story about a company that came to this province – Daishowa – wanting to build a mill, wanting to invest half a billion dollars of their own money in this province. I want to tell him about a company that submitted an environmental impact assessment, that held public consultation meetings throughout the whole of the forest management area. I want to tell the hon. member about a company that submitted all their documents to my department, including the public comments for a deficiency review. I want to tell the hon. member a story about a deficiency review that was submitted to the federal government and signed off under the rules of the day. Mr. Speaker, that company played by all the rules of the game. As a matter of fact, they went beyond the rules of the game. They spent millions and millions more dollars to refit that mill midway through the construction, to make it probably one of the cleanest mills in the world.

Now that the mill is built, what would the socialist NDP do? They would sit there and look at it. They would sit there and look at it, or they would say: "My gosh. What we're going to do, we're going to deny employment. But maybe we can dismantle it and give people jobs, and maybe 'remantle' it at the west end of the Legislature to create more paper for the hon. Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place."

MR. SPEAKER: Perhaps the hon. Minister of the Environment would be kind enough to stand up and withdraw the remark directed at the Leader of the Opposition: mislead the House. It was ruled out of order in '85 and again in '89. Hon. minister.

MR. KLEIN: I'll withdraw the statement, but it doesn't change my opinion of the hon. member.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, that's fine. I accept the apology in the light that it was given. We know he has no clout with the cabinet, and he's lost every battle.

I'd like to direct my . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Sorry, hon. Leader of the Opposition. The Chair directed that it be withdrawn; it was withdrawn. An apology – yes, right. Carry on with your main question.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to designate my second question to the Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place.

MR. McINNIS: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of the Environment hides behind the tattered fabric of Alberta's environment laws. [interjection] You call it a game. That's deadly dioxin that you're allowing to be dumped in there. I would like this minister, who says in his news release that these are the most stringent standards "that we know of in the world for a kraft mill" – if you would tell that to Oregon, where they told Daishowa to take their dioxins and get lost; if you would tell it to Sweden, where they told their industry to get zero dioxins by the end of this century or they're out of business; or if you would tell it to the proponents of zero effluent pulp mills in Saskatchewan and British Columbia. I wonder if the minister would now care to stand up and name one, just one, environment minister anywhere else in the world who has licensed a new source of dioxin pollution this year. Name one.

MR. KLEIN: Well, I'll name Alberta. Mr. Speaker, I was recently in Washington, where I had conversations with the EPA. As a matter of fact, there are mills there under construction. They are bleached kraft mills. There are numerous studies going on in the United States relative to this issue of dioxin and furan. As a matter of fact, they're studying about 104 bleached kraft mills that are far worse polluting mills than any that would ever be allowed in the province of Alberta. Mr. Speaker, the simple fact is that whatever is deemed the best in the world – if it's deemed to be the best in Sweden, if it's deemed to be the best in the United States, including Oregon – then that is what will have to be applied here. I've said that time and time again to the hon. member, but as usual he can't understand.

MR. McINNIS: Well, this minister thinks he's going to solve the problem of other people's polluting mills by building more chlorine bleached kraft – dioxin – pulp mills. I mean, where's the logic in that? Are you going to solve their problem by building more and licensing more?

The minister has claimed ignorance of the research on the effects of lethal cancers, lethal heart disease, and lethal neurological damage caused by dioxins, in which case he is willfully negligent, willfully ignorant, and I say: shame on him. I would like the minister to say today what proof he has that the dioxins he licensed last night in the middle of a hockey game are going to be benign and not cause health effects in Alberta. What proof do you have?

MR. KLEIN: Well, being a Calgary Flames fan, the hockey game had less importance and significance to me than perhaps to the hon. member. Nonetheless, we released the permit coincidental with a meeting with the town council in Peace River, coincidental with the meeting of the Daishowa citizens' liaison committee in that town, and coincidental with a meeting with Friends of the Peace, and we thought it was only fair to let those people know before the licence was issued. I think that demonstrated a tremendous goodwill on their part, because they missed the hockey game as well, Mr. Speaker.

But with respect to this whole issue of dioxin and furan, the fact is that we are achieving in this province 1.5 maximum absorbable organic halides, which include the whole family of dioxin and furan, and those standards today are deemed to be the best available standards in the world. If there are standards, Mr. Speaker, that can be achieved that are better, what we have agreed to do – and the Friends of the Peace thought this was a commendable move – is set up a review process, legislate that review process if possible, have the citizens involved in monitoring the evolution of new technology, and make sure that technology is applied to the mills before new licences are reissued.

MR. McINNIS: Mr. Speaker, it's clear that these standards are just numbers on a page to the minister, and his words about community input are just words on a page: only that. I wonder if the minister would undertake this much: if he would agree, instead of these chemical standards, to have biological testing of pulp mill effluent in Alberta so for the first time we would test the effect of these effluents on living organisms, especially chromosome damage. A company in Edmonton can do that. Will he agree to bring in biological monitoring standards for pulp mills in Alberta so we can know the effects of these things and not simply his words?

MR. KLEIN: Mr. Speaker, this whole issue of pulp mill technology is evolutionary. As new technologies are discovered, yes, we will participate in any kind of a study that is going to improve the environmental protection on pulp mills, but the simple fact is that unless we want to get rid of all paper, paper that the Japanese, as the hon. member pointed out, want to have to wipe their noses and other parts of their body, which I thought was inherently unfair – if we want to have paper and if we want to have a good and diversified economy and an environmentally safe economy, then we have got to accommodate a certain amount of industry. But we've got to make sure, as we are making sure in this province and through this government, that it is environmentally safe and that we're constantly on top of the technology that is evolving with respect to environmental protection. That is exactly what we are doing, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Calgary-Buffalo, on behalf of the Liberal Party.

#### **Meech Lake Accord**

MR. CHUMIR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Deputy Premier. Mr. Speaker, all Canadians have to be concerned at the impact of recent events in Ottawa on national unity and the consequent need to reach out to the province of Quebec. At the same time, the strong support of Meech Lake by extreme Quebec nationalists like Mr. Bouchard tends to fortify our

concerns about how Meech Lake weakens Canada and would prevent Senate reform. So this is clearly a time for meaningful leadership and compromise so that June 23 doesn't become a time bomb which blows this country apart. I'm wondering whether the Deputy Premier would be able to tell the people of Alberta whether this government has any sense of whether a first ministers' meeting before June 23 would be positive or whether it would simply tend to polarize differences and therefore be inadvisable?

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity on Saturday last of meeting with Senator Murray in Medicine Hat for almost two hours in which we reviewed the recommendations which the Charest task force, a select committee of the House of Commons, put forward. That was about midway through his tour of Canada and meeting with provincial governments. He concluded that series of discussions last evening in Quebec City with the Premier of the province of Quebec. Reports which have come from that meeting would indicate that the province of Quebec is prepared to meet again with first ministers to review the situation with respect to Meech Lake and the other issues that have been raised by other governments, but of course it will become an issue for the Prime Minister to ultimately determine as to whether or not a First Ministers' Conference would be warranted. It has been the position of our government, and I restate it today, that it is in the interests of Canada for the first ministers to gather once again in an effort to unlock the dilemma.

In connection with part of the hon. member's question, as well, the issue of Senate reform, of course, has been the number one agenda item which we believe must be dealt with. I've stated in this Assembly before on numerous occasions on this issue of Senate reform a firm commitment to proceed with that issue. That matter could be the very key which unlocks the dilemma. We believe that is worth considering and that we must make every effort to ensure that it does happen.

MR. CHUMIR: Well, I wonder whether the Deputy Premier would be able to advise whether the government has in mind a strategy in the event that there is no first ministers' meeting before June 23 or there is an impasse in such dealings, whether the minister has in mind a strategy of diffusing the time bomb by extending the June 23 deadline. Does the government consider that to be a meaningful approach?

MR. HORSMAN: To extend the deadline, and that has been suggested by some commentators and speculators in the past while, would require a very major effort on the part of Legislatures across the country. It would, in effect, require a constitutional amendment. Each province would have to agree to bring forward resolutions to extend the deadline, and likewise that would have to be accomplished by the Canadian Parliament, which includes both the House of Commons and the Canadian Senate. To do that all within the remaining time period would be a very major effort, and our view is that if we are going to go through that whole procedure, it would be better to deal with whatever might come from a First Ministers' Conference by way of a parallel accord, if that could be achieved.

MR. CHUMIR: Well, I can assure the Deputy Premier that his government will have the full co-operation of the Alberta Liberal Party in the event that there is such an initiative to extend the deadline.

Now, I assume the government is considering future options, and I'm wondering whether the Deputy Premier might advise whether the government is considering the option of a future constitutional conference with representation from broad segments of the public from all provinces, since one of the main defects of the Meech Lake accord has been the absence of broad public support for a document imposed by 11 first ministers.

MR. HORSMAN: Well, it's interesting to note that the Liberal Party might be prepared to come into this Assembly and vote on issues as important to Canada as the Meech Lake accord. I recall that they weren't able to find their way in here for that on one previous occasion.

Mr. Speaker, it's very, very difficult in the time remaining for us to invent a new constitutional amendment procedure, as seems to be suggested by the hon. Member for Calgary-Buffalo. Because what has happened, of course, with respect to the debates on Meech Lake – I would remind hon. members that this Assembly debated the issue at length. It was introduced in the spring and held over until the fall session in 1987 before it was passed. That involved enormous public consultation. I know the Official Opposition carried out their own particular investigation of it across the province. Our members were encouraged to do the same, and there was a great deal of public debate and discussion in Alberta. Other provinces dealt with it in other ways. The government of Ontario, for example, had a select committee which held public hearings. This notion that it was brought about solely by 11 ministers is completely false. The fact of the matter is that it has been passed through the Legislatures with debate by elected representatives in eight of the 10 provinces. It's not been dealt with now by New Brunswick or Manitoba, but in both those cases there have been full public hearings. So the notion that Meech Lake has been dealt with solely by 11 people meeting behind closed doors is just a falsehood which should be debunked. Despite the fact that I do it again, I doubt that the hon. Member for Calgary-Buffalo will accept that.

MR. SPEAKER: Athabasca-Lac La Biche, followed by Edmonton-Avonmore.

### **Social Workers' Strike**

MR. CARDINAL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question today is to the Minister of Labour. Time and time again I've brought forward to this House concerns regarding the social workers' strike and the negative impact this has on some Albertans, especially those living in poverty, and there are thousands living in poverty in Alberta and thousands more in northern Alberta in particular. If we listen to the official leader's economic policies, we probably could employ a lot of northern Albertans dismantling the industries in the north. Mr. Speaker, I understand there was a back-to-work agreement signed this weekend, in fact on Tuesday. My question to the hon. minister is: would the minister explain in detail what this back-to-work agreement means to Albertans?

MS McCOY: Mr. Speaker, the back-to-work agreement is an agreement that resulted from discussions which set up a protocol to get the social workers back to their jobs. That, as I said on Friday, was our first objective, our main objective there being to get the services back to normal for all of Albertans, and once they had gone back to work, we could get back to the contract

negotiations. That also was a term of the back-to-work agreement: that we would begin negotiating the contract terms; that is to say, the issues being caseloads, salaries, and wage parity. We'll get back to negotiating those at 10 o'clock on Friday morning.

The back-to-work agreement also contains in it a commitment signed both by the union and by the government to work very hard at those contract negotiations to bring the whole matter to a resolution. In fact, it goes so far as to say, "The employer and union agree . . . to make serious efforts to engage in collective bargaining until an agreement is reached." That recommencement of collective bargaining will be at 10 o'clock on Friday morning this week, which is a position that we have wanted to be in ever since April 26 and have been prevented from being in because of the illegal strike.

MR. CARDINAL: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Labour. Some of my constituents have concerns of being possibly suspended because of taking part in the illegal strike. Could the minister explain and give us some assurance as to what status this agreement has in relation to possible suspensions?

MS McCOY: Mr. Speaker, it was part of the back-to-work protocol that there be no striking staff fired as a result of participation in normal strike activity and also that anyone who had been engaged in strike activity would face a one-day suspension. Moreover, none of the employees who had been on an illegal strike would receive any pay for that period of time nor would their pension benefits be accruing for that period of time while they were out on an illegal strike.

#### Addiction Treatment for Adolescents

MS M. LAING: Mr. Speaker, my questions are to the chairman of the Alberta Alcohol and Drug Abuse Commission. Earlier this session the chairman of AADAC assured the House that checks and balances were in place for the controversial Kids of the Canadian West drug addiction program, which is scheduled to open this fall in Calgary, but now we find out that this is not the case. Government officials from several departments, including Health and the Solicitor General, will meet soon to discuss how to license this facility and how to deal with its potential violation of Alberta laws. My question is: why weren't these issues examined and resolved before the government gave a \$600,000 grant to the Kids program last year?

MR. NELSON: Mr. Speaker, in recommending moneys to be provided to Kids of the Canadian West, we went through and did all these checks and balances, and quite frankly it is my opinion at this present time that they are in place.

MS M. LAING: There seems to be some dispute about that.

My next question is to the Minister of Health. Research has shown that up to 70 percent of adolescent drug abusers are victims of childhood sexual misuse, an abuse of power by adults with authority. The Kids program represents a perpetuation of authority being used in an abusive manner, but complete rehabilitation requires conditions of trust and nonabusive human relationships. Therefore, will the minister require mental health professionals in her department to do an in-depth evaluation of the mental health effects of the Kids program on its graduates and the drop-outs from that program?

MRS. BETKOWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I'm at a bit of a loss as to why the question has come to me. I'll certainly take the suggestion of the hon. member under advisement, but I think that the chairman of the Alberta Alcohol and Drug Abuse Commission has responded and may wish to supplement the allegation that was made in the prelude to the question.

MR. NELSON: Mr. Speaker, some of the concerns that are raised by the Member for Edmonton-Avonmore with regards to the program certainly have been addressed and will continue to be addressed. Again, I must emphasize that the checks and balances in the agreement that was signed by AADAC and the proponents of this facility are such that it is our belief that we will have a first-class program which will enhance the addiction work AADAC presently has within the province and will continue to provide Alberta with the leadership role that we have in the addictions field.

MR. SPEAKER: Calgary-North West, followed by Calgary-Fish Creek.

#### Advanced Education Institutions

MR. BRUSEKER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Advanced Education seems to believe that he can lead this Assembly in one direction and lead the public in another. On May 16 in this Legislature the minister stated in reference to Bill 27 that each of the advanced education institutions had been consulted prior to the preparation of the Bill. Yet some institutions would suggest that that is not the case. I have four copies of a letter from the University of Calgary board of governors that I'd like to table. The letter states, and I quote, "We have found ourselves, without any prior consultation . . ." to this Bill. So my question to the Minister of Advanced Education is: which is it? The line you hand to the Assembly: here it is; they've been consulted. Or the line you give to the universities: here it is, folks; take it or leave it.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, neither, and I take some offence at the insinuation of the hon. member. For the benefit of the Member for Calgary-North West and others, last July I issued Guidelines for System Development to all the institutions in Alberta, some 29 of them, and I simply quote: "Ministerial approval is required for changes to approved programs of study" – exactly what the hon. member is referring to in the Bill – "which involve (a) terminations or equivalent actions" or reductions. The response from the institutions to me was that they were in agreement with the guidelines which preceded the Bill.

MR. BRUSEKER: Well, curiously, Mr. Speaker, over the last six days the University of Calgary, the University of Alberta, and even the University of Lethbridge, with which the minister may be familiar, have passed resolutions condemning Bill 27, specifically section 67(2), regarding this particular amendment. So, as the hon. Member for Medicine Hat might say, there are none so deaf as those who will not hear. My question to the Minister of Advanced Education is this: will he now withdraw the Bill and do the consulting that he said he would do before implementing this Bill? Let's get it right.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, I look forward to the hon. member's participation in second reading of the principle of Bill 27, where

I can amplify exactly what has happened and what is going to happen, and with the support of the House the Bill will be passed.

MR. SPEAKER: Calgary-Fish Creek, followed by Edmonton-Mill Woods.

### OSLO Project

MR. PAYNE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In recent weeks references to Quebec in our province and in this Assembly have consistently related to the Meech Lake accord and the companion resolution. There is, however, another Quebec-related issue that could have an even greater economic impact on our province, and that has to do with Quebec's possible involvement in the OSLO project. I'm wondering if the Minister of Energy could report to the Assembly today on the status of our discussions with Quebec regarding OSLO project participation.

MR. ORMAN: Mr. Speaker, a couple of months ago the Premier of Alberta had a conversation with the Premiers of Ontario and Quebec with regard to potential participation in the OSLO project. As the hon. Member for Calgary-Fish Creek knows and as I've indicated to him previously in the House, we have embarked on discussions with the Ministry of Energy in the province of Ontario and the Provincial Treasurer in the province of Ontario, and those discussions are moving toward a meeting between myself and those respective ministries.

With regard to Quebec, our Premier did have a conversation with Premier Bourassa with regard to potential Quebec participation in the OSLO project. Mr. Bourassa has given us some ideas, some leads that we can pursue. Mr. Bourassa's preference is to consider participation in OSLO through some of the corporations in which the province of Quebec has an interest, and I'll certainly be following up on that suggestion.

MR. PAYNE: Mr. Speaker, I trust you won't deem this to be a hypothetical question. I'll frame it as a request for policy clarification. Does the minister see any connection between the possibility of Quebec's investment in OSLO and the forthcoming response of Quebec to the Meech Lake accord's final resolution?

MR. ORMAN: Mr. Speaker, with regard to my area of responsibility, and that is for the development of the energy resources in the province of Alberta, I believe that today or tomorrow it is in the best interests of the province of Quebec and the province of Ontario, our two largest provinces, to promote and participate in the development of oil sands within the boundaries of the province of Alberta. It's abundantly clear to me that it is not in the best interests of either of those provinces, let alone the rest of this country, to rely on the features of the Middle East, whether it be geopolitical concerns or whether it be transportation concerns with regard to crude oil to this continent. They should take a real, fundamental interest in security of supply for those two very important reasons. That is the basis on which we're pitching the provinces of Ontario and Quebec, and quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, it's the basis on which we were quite critical of the federal government for ignoring those two very compelling issues.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to supplement the answer somewhat. I would like to assure the hon. member that there is no linkage between the Meech Lake discussions now

under way and the discussions with respect to the possible involvement of Quebec in the OSLO project.

### Worksite Safety

MR. GIBEAULT: Mr. Speaker, the appalling carnage at Alberta worksites continues unabated, with the latest tragedy being the death of Mr. Roger Doucette at the Daishowa plant near Peace River. This is the second fatality at this site in less than three months, yet I note that Hugh Walker, the managing director of the department, has recently stated at an injuries conference that it is not the department's policy to look at fines as a major accident prevention strategy. Now, given that appalling and shocking admission, will the minister now admit that the recent legislative changes that provided for occupational health and safety violation penalties of up to \$300,000 and jail terms were nothing but a farce and a cruel farce?

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Speaker, I guess the hon. member needs a lesson in how the system works. When you have a fatality at a construction site, Occupational Health and Safety reviews the matter and provides all the documentation, all the material from the investigation to the Attorney General's department. The Attorney General's department then takes it forward, if they feel they have a case, before the courts. Now, the courts then hear the evidence from both sides. So I guess that what the hon. member of the NDP is saying is that he has no faith and no respect for the judges, because it's a judge that decides the fine, whether it's a dollar or whether it's \$300,000. Now, I have it before me where a judge did that on hearing the evidence from both sides, made that decision. So when the hon. member says that it's a farce, then he's taking into question the judgment of our judges.

MR. GIBEAULT: Mr. Speaker, he just admitted that it's the Attorney General who presses those cases and presses for a penalty, and the penalties are certainly not high enough.

Let me just ask the minister this: given that the Workers' Compensation Board's own figures reveal that there's been no progress in reducing the number of deaths on the job in this province, will the minister tell us how many Albertans he's prepared to see die at work before he takes the kinds of measures that are provided for in his own Act and demand those maximum penalties?

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Speaker, I guess the hon. member can't understand. The penalties are decided by the courts after the evidence is provided from Occupational Health and Safety to the Attorney General's department, and they carry it forward. Now, surely the hon. member isn't saying that the judges in this province are wrong. If he is, I'd like to hear him say that outside the House and challenge the judge that presents these penalties. Surely to God the hon. member should caution himself in the words he uses. I think that what he's said against our judges is a disgrace.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Meadowlark.

### Daishowa Pulp Mill (continued)

MR. MITCHELL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Last night in justifying the proceeding of the licensing of Daishowa without a proper public hearings process, the Minister of the Environment

apologized and said: I just don't seem to have the legislative authority. That was ironic, coming from a minister who had the authority to impose a public consultative process on Procter & Gamble for its relicensing, Procter & Gamble, a mill that is under way, fully constructed, has been operating. This is odd, coming from a minister who had the power to impose a public hearings process on the Alberta-Pacific project long after this government made a commitment to that project. This is very odd, coming from a minister who had the power to tell Daishowa to change its construction plans long after Daishowa had begun construction. A pretty powerful minister, Mr. Speaker, up to about . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, hon. member. That's sufficient introduction. The question.

MR. MITCHELL: Will the Minister of the Environment please admit that in fact he has the legislative authority to do whatever has to be done in this Daishowa case but that he cannot exercise his mandate under his department because the Premier . . . [some applause]

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Thank you, hon. member.

MR. KLEIN: Heavy thumping over there.

Mr. Speaker, I'll make no such admission. I'll explain once again for the benefit of the hon. Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark and the hon. Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place. When this mill was first proposed and when this company came to Alberta and said that they wanted to build a mill on the banks of the Peace River near the town of Peace River, there was not a peep – not a peep.

AN HON. MEMBER: Liar.

MR. KLEIN: Mr. Speaker, there was no . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: Liar.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. members have enough sense to be able to refer to *Beauchesne*. Shouting "liar" across the Chamber is inappropriate, unparliamentary, and exceedingly rude. Please refrain from doing so.

Minister of the Environment.

MR. KLEIN: Mr. Speaker, I've tried to find some record of demands for public hearings . . .

MR. McINNIS: Check the record. You've got 10 of them on your lap.

MR. KLEIN: . . . and demands for a . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. Minister of the Environment.

The Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place has had an opportunity to be in question period. Perhaps he might even get back in if enough questions were able to be asked. Please control yourself.

Minister of the Environment.

MR. KLEIN: Nonetheless, Mr. Speaker, the company came to this province, wanted to put in place a mill, a clean mill, went through the environmental impact assessment process that was

in place at that particular time, played by all the rules, refit that mill midway through to add even more environmental protection standards to make it probably one of the cleanest mills in the world, using some of the best environmental protection technology available today. This company played by all the rules that were in place. Yes, we're changing those rules, and we're going to put in place a formal process for public hearings on new projects, but one can hardly expect to go back and change the rules midstream, especially days and weeks before the mill is to operate. I say once again, once this mill is built, what do they expect people to do with it? Just sit there and look at it?

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. minister. [interjection] Order please. Order please.

Supplementary, Edmonton-Meadowlark.

MR. MITCHELL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Last night the minister went on to say:

While I am disappointed, my commitment is to implement public review of licences by including such provisions in the upcoming Alberta Environmental Protection and Enhancement Act.

Why doesn't the minister just go one step further: delay the licensing of this plant the two or three weeks it will take him to bring the natural resources conservation board legislation to this Legislature, put the powers in that legislation to review Daishowa, review Daishowa properly under that board before he allows the licensing to proceed?

MR. KLEIN: Again, he is asking for a total change in the rules.

MR. MITCHELL: You said that you're going to change the rules yourself, Ralph. You said it right here.

MR. KLEIN: We said that we will change the rules . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. minister, I apologize to you. Hon. Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark, you asked your question; please have the decency to sit there and listen to the answer.

AN HON. MEMBER: It's hard to do.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. member. It can be arranged otherwise.

The Minister of the Environment, please.

MR. KLEIN: Mr. Speaker, we're refining the rules. We're refining the technology that applies to these pulp mills, but my gosh, you know, you can't be retroactive. How far back do you go? Do you go back 50 years? Do you go back to those stinking, rotten, polluting, belching pulp mills that were built 30, 40, 50 years ago and apply public hearings to them?

What we have said, Mr. Speaker, is that we will put in place a public, legislated review process to monitor the licences. What we have done, and I think it's commendable on the part of this government, is to issue licences for a three-year period – these aren't lifetime licences – and to put in place a review process that will allow the public to review on a day-to-day, on a minute-to-minute basis if need be, the operating procedures of a pulp mill and to make recommendations to government prior to the reissuance of those licences. But to do these things retroactively, Mr. Speaker, I guess one, then, would have to ask the question: how far back do you go? Are these people willing to go back 40, 50 years? Is the hon. Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place willing to stand up with his buddy from West Yellowhead and

say, "Retroactively we should do an EIA on the Hinton mill, which was built . . ."

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

Red Deer-North and, if there's time, West Yellowhead.

MR. DAY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of the Environment. We hear a lot from the minister about environmental standards, and I was encouraged somewhat today to hear from an opposition member that Sweden hopes to have in place by the end of the century standards we have in place today. But I'd like some clarification. It makes me a little nervous, a little concerned to hear that halfway through the construction of a mill of this size a refit has to take place. If our standards are that good, why was this not caught in the initial phase instead of this having to take place halfway through?

MR. KLEIN: When the mill was first proposed, Mr. Speaker, this thing, absorbable organic halides, AOX, had a formula of 2.5 kilograms per air-dried tonne. As technology advanced, new standards were deemed to be better than 2.5 AOX and were deemed to be achievable, and those new standards turned out to be 1.5 AOX. So as a department and as a government we said that the new standard now is 1.5 AOX. Therefore, before this mill can come on stream, they must meet 1.5 AOX. That's what I mean, Mr. Speaker, by mills having to meet on a constant basis, on a consistent basis the best available technology to protect the environment. I'm glad the question was asked, because it gave me an opportunity once again to explain for the benefit of the opposition what it means to have the best available environmental protection standards in the world.

MR. DAY: Mr. Speaker, supplementary to the minister responsible for our forests. A mill of this size is going to have quite an appetite for trees, and what we're talking about are the green lungs of our province. Albertans don't want just vague assurances; they want some specific regulations, guidelines. What can the minister tell us that will give us some assurance that as forestry operations go forward, we're not going to see a collapse of the green lungs of our province?

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, we all support the fact that the trees are certainly the lungs of the earth, but that mill will not only be using roundwood; it will be using chips that are presently being burned and causing an environmental problem. As well as that, the wood that is cut – the reforestation practices they must follow are among the toughest, if not the toughest, in the world, and we're making them even tougher, with very tough operating ground rules and a public process which I'm nearly ready to announce that will give the public an opportunity to review those cutting practices, review the reforestation, have input into that continually over the lifetime of the projects. Mr. Speaker, I take the hon. member's representation as serious; it's raised with me by many Albertans: to make sure that our trees and our forests are better for our grandchildren than they even are today.

MR. SPEAKER: Perhaps we could have unanimous consent to revert to Introduction of Special Guests.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed? Carried. Thank you.

First, Red Deer-North, followed by the Minister of Forestry, Lands and Wildlife.

head: **Introduction of Special Guests**  
(reversion)

MR. DAY: Mr. Speaker, it's an honour for me today to introduce to you on behalf of our Premier a group of students from the Stettler junior high school. They are accompanied by their teachers Larry Ambury, Don Anderson, and Karen Bromley, and parent Charlene Butt. The Premier has many times talked warmly of the young people of Stettler. Some of them are here today. I'd ask them to rise and receive the warm welcome of this Assembly.

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, it's not very often that I get to introduce a school class because it's so far to come, and I've certainly never had the opportunity to introduce one from Stavely, a very fine community in my constituency. Today we have 29 students from the Stavely school. Their teacher Hala Georgi-LaCoste and parents Margo Cochlan, Eunice Gatz, Sandi Heidmiller, Jeannette Vegter, Cathy MacDonald, Barry Gammel, Adèle Chartrand, and Melva Comstock are here. They're in the public gallery. They've driven about five to six hours to get here. I would like to see a warm welcome given to them by the Members of the Legislative Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER: Actually, hon. members, the Chair had overlooked a note that had been sent up earlier. The Minister of Health wishes to respond to an issue raised the other day by the Member for Edmonton-Centre.

The Minister of Health, please.

head: **Oral Question Period**  
(continued)

**Royal Alexandra Hospital**

MRS. BETKOWSKI: Mr. Speaker, thank you. Last week the hon. Member for Edmonton-Centre raised a question with respect to an elderly patient at the Royal Alexandra hospital, and I would like to advise the House of the following. Firstly, with respect to the individual named by the member, it's not my practice to name individuals on the floor of the Legislature with respect to their health coverage, and I don't intend to change that practice. Nonetheless, I have reviewed the situation with the hospital, and I have been assured that although the person's admission was delayed, medical and nursing treatment occurred during that period of time.

Secondly, the member went on to question the government's commitment to the redevelopment project at the Royal Alexandra hospital. I want to assure the House again that the government recognizes the pressures being faced by this facility, which operates one of the busiest emergencies in Canada, and it is because of that recognition that we have placed a priority on the project, as I explained during my estimates a week ago. Although it may not be moving as quickly as many of us would have hoped, the project is still progressing. As a matter of fact, I met yesterday with the board of the Royal Alexandra hospital and discussed a wide range of issues including the redevelopment project.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary.



REV. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the minister's good attempts to try to gloss over this issue, but clearly it is unacceptable for an 87-year-old woman to be delayed admission to one of our hospitals and to be in a hallway. I mean, obviously she's going to receive nursing and medical treatment; the fact that she was in a hallway for well over 48 hours continues to be unacceptable. I know the minister's trying to work at getting the redevelopment at the Royal Alex completed, which is no doubt the answer to this kind of issue recurring. So I want to ask the minister very clearly: when will they turn the sod? When will they begin the construction and complete the construction so that this kind of incident for this 87-year-old and other 87-year-olds doesn't have to happen anymore in this city?

MRS. BETKOWSKI: Mr. Speaker, it is reality that our hospitals get a little squeezed sometimes. That is the reality of our health system. [interjections] We have more beds per capita in this province than any other province across Canada, and if the hon. Leader of the Opposition would like to discuss it sometime rather than making his guffaws, I would be delighted to do so.

With respect to the redevelopment process, I can't give the hon. member a time, except to say it is my hope that within the fiscal capacity of the province we can be into construction on this project in the '91-92 fiscal year.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

We had a point of order during question period. [interjection] No. That's it, hon. member.

REV. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I just had a class to introduce. That's all I was wanting to do.

MR. SPEAKER: Forgive me. An introduction as well. Please proceed.

I guess we'll have the consent of the House. We'll take it as an overriding concern.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Please, Edmonton-Centre.

It would be more useful in future, hon. members, to send the notes up here ahead of time. It's too confusing here.

REV. ROBERTS: My apologies. I got the note rather late, and I was trying to get your attention. I'll send a note in the future. I'm sorry.

#### head: **Introduction of Special Guests** (reversion)

REV. ROBERTS: I do have a class from St. Joseph high school in Edmonton-Centre, a class of 14 English as a Second Language students, a very important program at the school. I'm glad the students are here to witness the legislative debate. I'd ask them now to please rise and receive the welcome from the members.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

Point of order arising from question period, Edmonton-Jasper Place.

MR. McINNIS: Mr. Speaker, during question period the Member for Red Deer-North arose and accused me of suggesting that Sweden bring in current Alberta standards for pulp mill effluent 10 years from now, and I couldn't imagine a more damaging set of words to put in my mouth. In fact, the Swedish standard 10 years from now is zero, and perhaps the member might understand the difference between zero and what we have in Alberta if he looks at the 24-hour levels in the Daishowa permit. They're allowed to dump 2,800 kilograms . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, hon. member. The Chair has attempted to send a message for the Member for Red Deer-North to return to the Chamber. That has not occurred. The Chair then notes that the Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place has given appropriate, immediate notice to the Chair. The matter will be discussed tomorrow or later this afternoon if opportunity does arise. Thank you.

Orders of the Day.

MR. MITCHELL: Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Point of order? Yes, sir.

MR. MITCHELL: I gave notice under Standing Order 40 to . . .

MR. SPEAKER: You're right. Thank you very much.

#### head: **Motions under Standing Order 40**

Mr. Mitchell:

Be it resolved that the Assembly urge the government to revoke the licences for Daishowa Canada Co. Ltd. to operate under the Clean Air and Clean Water Acts until such time as the government has carried out a proper environmental impact assessment with a full public hearings process, such assessment to incorporate, among other things, a study of the cumulative impacts of all pulp mills discharging into the Peace and Athabasca river systems and a full review of the Daishowa forest management agreement.

MR. MITCHELL: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I rise under Standing Order 40 to press, request, the Legislature to give unanimous consent, on the basis of the urgent and pressing nature of the following motion, to debate this motion.

Before proceeding with my comments on the urgency of this matter, Mr. Speaker, I would like to acknowledge my awareness of the sub judice concern that you might have, since the Daishowa project is currently before the courts. I would like to point out that sub judice cannot be applied or should not be applied in this case, since the government itself has proceeded by issuing licences despite the fact that this case is before the courts. If it were that a ruling of sub judice were applied now so that we couldn't debate it, then it would seem to me a prima facie case, clearly, that nor could the government issue the licences in the first place.

Why is it urgent that we debate this matter now, today, and that proper action be taken today, Mr. Speaker? These are the reasons. If this project proceeds, is allowed to commence its operations, it will do irreparable damage to the environment, and it will, among other things, render it impossible to conduct proper baseline studies against which the impact of that mill and other mills can be gauged in the future. This mill will under current circumstances, if we believe that it will even meet the

standards the government has set for it – and of course it's difficult to believe that until those standards and the operation of this mill are properly reviewed in an open public hearings process. If it is, however, that it proceeds even in keeping with those standards, this mill will emit upwards of 1.4 tonnes of dioxins, furans, and other organochlorines into the Peace River system each day, day after day, into perpetuity, for as long as this mill operates.

Mr. Speaker, not only will it do that independently – we think it will do no more; we're told it will do no more, but at the very least it will do that – in addition, it will contribute to a cumulative dumping of dioxins and furans and organochlorines, which, amongst the four major kraft pulp mills that will exist in the future on the two northern river systems in question, will amount to over six tonnes per day of organochlorines, dioxins, and furans. If any member of this Legislature took one-sixth of that, one-tenth of that, put it in a pickup truck, and dumped it into the North Saskatchewan River, that person would be subject to fines, to imprisonment, to the full recourse of the law. This . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member, a summation with respect to the matter of urgency, which is what Standing Order 40 requires. Urgency.

MR. MITCHELL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My point is that as soon as this mill commences, it will be dumping highly toxic, carcinogenic dioxins and furans into a river, the impact of which we have not taken the time to properly assess.

Secondly – and this is another reason for its urgency – it will preclude the possibility of doing proper baseline studies in the future. No matter what recourse this government or its successor governments may take, much of what can be done will be precluded because this mill will already have begun to alter the baseline circumstances of that northern river system.

Mr. Speaker, what we need to do before this project can proceed is a proper open public hearings process that considers the cumulative impacts of the four Alberta pulp mills proposed and in progress, the pulp mills upstream in British Columbia as well. We need to do open public hearings, not just the kind of coffee parties that were structured by Daishowa, where I and other members of the public would sit and be told what this company wanted us to hear. We need to assess the recent findings, which indicated that previous conceptions of what dioxins and furans would do in terms of health risk have been thrown out because the studies upon which the scientific community based those assumptions were deemed, were determined, to be fraudulent, and the proof was given of that fraud under oath.

Mr. Speaker, the fact is that this minister has the power to stop this process now and to structure proper public hearings, to structure a proper environmental impact . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. member. [interjection] Thank you, hon. member. The member really has been straying considerably from the matter of making a case of urgency.

We have proper notification under Standing Order 40. Those members willing to give unanimous consent for this matter to proceed, please say aye.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed, pleased say no.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. SPEAKER: The matter fails.

## Orders of the Day

head: **Committee of Supply**

[Mr. Schumacher in the Chair]

head: **Capital Fund Estimates 1990-91**

### Public Works, Supply and Services

#### 3 – Construction of Hospitals and Nursing Homes

MR. CHAIRMAN: Members of the committee, it seems like a long time ago, but we were last visiting this subject on Friday. It's the Chair's recollection that at that time the minister had almost concluded introducing his vote, and I'd ask him if he would like to conclude at this time.

MR. KOWALSKI: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. On Friday last – and my remarks are contained in *Hansard*, pages 1345 through to 1346 – I gave a brief overview on some 69 projects associated with the health care construction side of government.

Mr. Chairman, the total budget that I'm requesting is \$135.3 million, as compared to \$105.7 million in the last year. I trust that in essence you want to deal with vote 3 now and conclude it before going on to votes 4 and 5. I gather that's the process that the hon. members want to follow, so I'll quit now and I'll be gone.

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

REV. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It has been a while over the long weekend, and a lot has gone on, but I do have a number of questions I'd like to put to the Minister of Public Works, Supply and Services as they pertain to capital costs of hospitals and nursing homes in the province. I would like to begin by thanking the minister for his overview of the five stages involved in the whole capital deployment of hospitals in the province. I thought it was a fairly good dissertation of what the stages are. We have stage 3 with its four substages, and I think for most people it does get very complex and complicated. We have certain processes at work, but we also have a lot of politics at work, and how they end up in the projects that we have before us today I think bears some further scrutiny and some questions I'd like to pose.

The first one is, though, Mr. Chairman, that still I cannot in conscience see how we can vote away \$135 million with such little information before us in terms of applying where the hospitals are with respect to the various stages the minister has already talked about. We need far more information about the hospitals. I know members are going to be frustrated today because I think we only have about an hour and a half left to go over this, and I don't know if we'll even be able to get out of this vote 3 with the number of questions that I'm sure members have about hospitals and nursing homes in their own constituencies.

It's not just in terms of the status of particular hospitals, but despite the minister's attempt last Friday, I think we even need more information about the process itself. Now, we did some digging around, Mr. Chairman, and came up with a rather weighty document called *The Planning Process for Capital Projects* that was put out by the Department of Hospitals and

Medical Care and which talks quite a bit about what the minister reiterated last Friday. It even has a nice little flowchart of the five stages of the planning process, and it's very helpful for those of us who really want to dig into this matter.

The problem though, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, is that it was put out in 1984. That was the second edition in 1984, and as we know, there's a lot of hospital building under the bridge that's gone on since that time. A more major thing might be the fact that it's even shifted departments, to the minister of public works. The whole business of what lessons were learned in terms of hospital building with respect to the Walter C. Mackenzie Health Sciences Centre, which went way, way over budget – and the sort of cost accountability around that project I think still went on despite this manual of 1984. So I would like to recommend to the minister that he needs to update this '84 document into a brand spanking new 1990 one, not that it has to be in briefcases and sent to all members, but at least the library and those of us who want to dig into the processes of the different stages. It needs to be updated with more information in terms of even the design stage. As the minister last week noted, there are now four substages in that, and I think that needs to be clearly outlined so that we have more information of what's involved in the whole process, particularly with respect to accountability both on the dollar side and on the health care side. Are we getting the kind of health care facility that we really hoped to get, and are we going to get it at the cost which we have set as a goal?

I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman, but I still have some difficulty understanding, despite the minister's comments, where his authority picks up and begins, where the Minister of Health's authority lets go. The Minister of Advanced Education sort of ducked the question. He said that, well, it's up to the board; the board really drives the project. But I would like more information with respect to how this process – maybe in the flowchart we could even have some greater sense of at what point Department of Health officials are involved and how much of it's just a construction implementation phase. Because I think – and it's not just myself. A number of people I've spoken to throughout the province are still concerned. For instance, in the Vegreville example, I talked to some folks out there at the Vegreville auxiliary, and interestingly enough they tell me they were told by Public Works, Supply and Services to put in a request for a whole redevelopment of their long-term care facility. Then they went down that road and did that according to what they were told from public works, and after they'd done that, they turned around and were told by the Department of Health: "Oh, no, no, no. We don't want to redevelop the whole system; we just want to add a 40-bed wing onto the existing centre." So these kinds of mixed messages I think aren't at all helpful, and I'd like to get some further clarification of why that kind of thing goes on.

Also, with the Black Diamond situation we talked about last summer, when there are cracks or hospitals are built on faulty and shifting sands and there are problems, I take it the minister of public works does begin that litigation process and goes after the faulty architects, builders, or whoever. I still wonder what impact that has on the Department of Health in terms of: are they going to build a new hospital, or are they going to shift the patients for how long a time and shift them to where and so on. So there are still lots of questions with respect to authority, and I'd like them to be cleared up.

Then the minister last week made a statement about the tendering process, that when we go into third stage – it goes out to tender – they've done some work in terms of what the project was estimated to cost, but of course they keep that secret because you don't want to give away your hand to those who are bidding on the project. Now, unless I misunderstood or don't understand the process, I then wonder why in all these nice news releases that the minister of public works has put out . . . For instance, just on April 11, 1990: "Tenders to be called for renovations and major addition to Hillcrest nursing home." Then it says that, by the way, the project's estimated to cost \$4.75 million. So I have to wonder, if they're putting it out to tender, why they're putting in what they estimate the cost to be. Similarly: work "to be called for Cross Cancer Institute foundation construction." They put it out to be tendered and said, "By the way, we expect it to cost approximately \$2.3 million." Then for another one up at Beaverlodge, they called for tenders and said that the first project's estimated to be \$900,000. So I just don't understand this process, that when the minister last week said the estimates are kept secret, yet even in the news releases they seem to be quite up front about what they expect it to cost, and I'm sure whatever contractor is bidding on it will keep that in mind as they bid on the tender.

I hope what we have in front of us is all the information the minister has with respect to the funding process, but interestingly enough we went through this process last year, thought we had a good budget for the capital construction of hospitals throughout the province, and then, lo and behold, February 15, 1990, guess what? Special warrant. So it wasn't just what we voted in last year in terms of this vote. They had to go for a special warrant, and no small amount. I think there's just over a \$100 million budget that we had last year. They come in for a special warrant of \$41 million for projects which I'm sure are legitimate; they at least use the language that the funds were required sooner than anticipated. That's all well and good, but certainly we need to have a more accurate reflection of what is going on and if some projects are ahead of schedule or not and if the budget that we're allocating today in this vote is a realistic one or whether they're going to have to go to cabinet next February again and get another special warrant for another \$40 million or \$50 million. I think that's unacceptable, and I'd like to know why that continues to occur.

One other question. The minister raised an issue last week when he said, "Well, this year we're not canceling any projects, but they can go and complete the phase they're in." Well, I'd like to know what that means. Again, a lot of the projects that I've heard about have finished the stage they're in and are awaiting approval to move to the next stage. So, I mean, it seems kind of double-talk to say, "Well, you can complete the stage you're now in." We're going to get to that a bit later in some questions I have, but I'd like to get some clarification on that.

Then other questions. The minister didn't mention anything about Capital Upgrading and what might be in there for \$19 million or \$20 million, a 51 percent increase. I guess it is a various number of proposals, whether it's for boilers or heating or, I'm sure, capital upgrading. But that's a lot of money; I'd like to have a bit further clarification on where that might be going. It raises some other questions, it seems to me, about how much capital upgrading is going to go on for some facilities, when you don't finally get to that point where some say you're throwing good money after bad. At what point does a facility become so outdated that in fact further capital upgrading isn't

going to help it all that much? I know that's a thorny question. I'd like to pursue it a bit with the minister myself, but some clarification there would be helpful.

As well, I think I understand that this capital upgrading might include the cost of equipment in the various hospitals, but as we know, medical technology and medical equipment continue to be one of the biggest-ticket items going. Every hospital wants the latest equipment, not to mention a couple of hospitals that would like an MRI machine. I'm not sure if that's to be included in this vote or if it's a separate vote. A lot of us have some questions about MRI machines.

MR. TAYLOR: It tells you how you voted in the last election.

REV. ROBERTS: Oh, it's out of lottery money, is it? I know the lithotripters went that way. But I'd like further clarification on equipment purchases in general and MRI machines in particular.

Then an issue which has been raised with me – and I think it's a key one, though it's not of a particular nature, and I must confess I haven't thought this through myself. I don't know myself an answer to it. I'd like to have the staff that the ministers over there have to sort this one through. It has to do with what policy there is on the measuring of depreciation or replacement. I'm told they have that nice, big Walter C. Mackenzie health sciences facility over there, but they brought in a lot of equipment which is out of date or needs to be replaced already, which seems odd to me when you have a brand-new hospital. But those difficult questions about at what point a hospital or a wing or a unit or something becomes out of date as opposed to what this government likes to brag about in terms of being state of the art . . . Now, we don't want to go to either extreme, but sometimes things just fall into such disrepair or need such great replacement that they have to be replaced. But are we always going to bring things to be upgraded and state of the art in every situation? I know we want to get away from this concept of the boys playing with their toys, in the sense of having every bit of the latest computer information technology in medical imaging and all the rest, but there is a question of buildings being built to Fire Code and up to the standards of health care and accreditation.

Again in the Vegreville situation, it was quite appalling to see how some people who were in wheelchairs couldn't even get into the bathroom in their rooms. They had to be sort of lifted up by two assistants and put from their wheelchair and moved around and onto the toilet in their bathroom. It seems so outdated, and it was just a glaring example of something that I think was way out of date. But again it's at that end of the extreme, and we need to look more closely at that.

Now I'd like to move to the other, not just the process of all this that we've talked about that the minister raised last Friday – some questions I have about that – but rather to some of the politics involved in this process of hospital building, hospital construction. Because, Mr. Chairman, as you know, we New Democrats were very firm, very up front, about a policy we had with respect to hospital construction which firmly and clearly said that we as the New Democratic Party in the province of Alberta would not support the building or construction of any new acute care beds that would add beds to the overall health care system. That's what we said. We said no new acute care beds, and we had that in a motion here just last year. We campaigned on that in the '89 election. We said that we need to slow the capital side, slow the capital construction of acute

care beds, and increase operational support and increase community health support. We were on the record saying that close to two years ago.

We did not say this applied to long-term care beds. We did not say we should freeze for five years any amount of work that could be done in outpatient or with day surgery or anything that was attended to in a hospital which could keep people out of beds. We did not say it applied to health centres or clinics, even the northeast of Edmonton here or anywhere else around the province. We talked about beds, inpatient acute care beds. We didn't want any more of them. And, of course, members on that side of the House, in the Tory Party, grossly distorted our position, so that we had the former Member for West Yellowhead saying, "Oh, the NDP doesn't want any more hospitals, wants to close hospitals." It was interesting how the position, which I thought we were very firm about and very clear about, got so distorted, because what we were basically talking about was no new acute care beds.

Interestingly enough, then, the Hyndman report came out and agreed with us. As you saw in the Hyndman report of last January, on page 127 – if I could just read into the record because I'm sure members might not have read every word of the Hyndman report. It said:

The Commission feels it would be best for government to curtail investment in new, as yet to be approved, hospitals at least until the year 2000.

I mean, we were just calling for a five-year freeze. Here's a 10-year freeze on investment in new hospitals yet to be approved, and I'm not sure if that's just on the acute side or not. But interesting, wasn't it, how despite that position, which I felt very strongly about, which our party campaigned on – it was not only misrepresented but I think showed a certain lack of integrity on the part of this government, who then went to the polls in 1989 and not only tried to misrepresent our position but then went around trying to promise hospitals to people all over the province.

[Mr. Jonson in the Chair]

Yet after the election, they'll talk about 35 projects being on hold. They certainly didn't talk about that last March, in 1989. In fact, the former minister of hospitals out of Calgary . . . What is that? Where did Dave Russell run?

AN HON. MEMBER: Elbow.

REV. ROBERTS: . . . Calgary-Elbow – thank you – and the current Minister of the Environment I'm told campaigned vigorously on the fact: "We're going to have a whole new Holy Cross hospital in our constituency. We're going to renovate it and do all kinds of wonderful things. You elect us Tories and keep the ball rolling here, and we'll get you a whole renovation at the Holy Cross." Well, that was before the election. After the election, guess what happened? It's frozen. No money for renovation at the Holy Cross. In fact, they're talking about closing the emergency at Holy Cross.

Before the election, out went the Premier to Vegreville and said: "Vote for us; don't vote for that New Democrat. Vote for us, and you'll get a new Vegreville auxiliary hospital." Well, that was before the election. After the election: frozen. Before the election, I'm told that up in Slave Lake, the Slave Lake district hospital, a certain candidate campaigned on, "Vote for me, and we'll get a new hospital in Slave Lake." Well, that was before

the election. Guess what? After the election: put on hold, deferred for a while.

Then comes the greatest, interesting indignity, I think: the debate we had here just last year about this time about the Thorhild nursing home. I had put the challenge out to this Minister of Public Works, Supply and Services: "Go up there, and let's debate with the people of Thorhild whether they in fact want a nursing home in Thorhild or whether the people in Redwater-Andrew also want to have some say in where it should be placed or whether the medical staff was available in Smoky Lake." Well, I haven't heard if it's deferred or not, but I see in the budget before us here today that despite the bragging ways of the minister of public works last year about Thorhild, it's got an 85 percent decrease in the budget this year in terms of planning and the rest. Well, I think some of the chickens are coming home to roost, and it's interesting to see how they're roosting.

So I just want to ask why it is that this government and members across the way didn't have the integrity, didn't have the courage of their convictions – as we on this side of the House did last year and said, "Listen, we need to slow the capital side down." And I said on the acute care side; we're getting not just acute care but long-term care. Instead they, as I said, misrepresented our position and then did I think a rather shameful business after the election, getting everybody back in over there and then began to backpeddle and talk of freeze and deferral and all the rest. Well, it's not gone unnoticed, let me tell you, and I think a lot of Albertans have wakened up out there to the kind of flip-flops and hypocrisy of the messages they hear from this government.

I mean, I can become a cynic and say, well, just wait; this is this year and next year. By the run up to the next election, you wait. I can just see the minister of public works, maybe the Minister of Health, going along saying, "Okay, we're going into an election, and it's open season again for whoever wants a hospital anywhere for anything" and opening up the promised floodgates for anything and everything everywhere. I've learned a lesson in politics, Mr. Chairman, which says: you don't create expectations you cannot fulfill. It seems to me that this government and these people over here have created a lot of expectations, and they're now turning around and saying to people, "We can't fulfill them." I think they're learning the hard lesson. If and when I do it, I'd like to be called up on it, because I don't like to create unnecessary expectations in the electorate.

We want to have a vision. We want to go in certain directions. As I said, part of my vision is to slow the capital side down, because as I understand it, we have to end the day of buying votes with hospital construction. We instead base hospital construction on the needed health status of Albertans where that health status can be improved by the building of a certain hospital. We need to shift from the inpatient to the outpatient side and from acute care to long-term care and home care. That's the way to go, and I'd like to see more of it coming from this government into ways that show more integrity than in the past.

Moving, then, to some of the individual projects before us, I find it kind of interesting that the minister still seems to want to brag about the 28 percent increase overall. You know, I'm not even sure whether or not that \$105 million from last year includes the special warrant of \$41 million. Nonetheless, we have a 28 percent increase – the minister seems to want to brag about that – when in fact I think we should be saying more carefully and more clearly to people how we want to slow down

on the rate of increase there. Certainly the 28 percent increase really represents just the final construction phase, it seems to me, of a place like the Lethbridge Regional. I'm not sure what they're doing at St. Mike's. It doesn't look like a large item of \$2 million there, but it's certainly getting a lot . . . [interjection] Well, in comparison to Lethbridge Regional, which has jumped from \$440,000 to \$6 million. But St. Mike's represents some of the increase; certainly the Cross Cancer Institute in final construction phases, St. Joseph's Auxiliary, Innisfail, and again at Black Diamond. I'm not clear whether that represents some repairs there at Black Diamond. I haven't been down to check it out myself. It's quite a jump from last year. But it seems like a handful of these projects going to the final construction phase are really eating up the greater dollar amount and are where the 28 percent increase is reflected overall. Clearly, if you look line by line at most of the other projects, there are brackets there. As I say, I'm not disagreeing with that; I just want some more information about what that represents.

One other quick question. What does 3.6.29 represent? It just says Long-term Care Facility, Edmonton. I'm not sure what that refers to or represents, under whose mandate, but they're going ahead with some decrease, I think.

Anyway, what I would like to get from the minister before we all get to a vote on this this afternoon is, as I alluded to earlier, some more information about the stages and phases of the rest of these projects. I've heard both ministers talk about we've got 19 projects that are approved for construction, six projects which are proceeding to tendering, and nine projects that have proceeded with the contract documents within the limits of available funding. Now, I guess I could put a motion for a return, but I just thought during the time today I'd ask which of the many projects here before us fall into those different categories. I've got the numbers in terms of the total amount of each one, but which one is which? Again, which of the 35 are deferred or frozen?

For instance, I would like to know – and I tried to ask the Minister of Health earlier; maybe this minister knows – what is the status of the Northern Alberta Children's hospital? If, as projected, that goes on to the final construction and commissioning stages, plans call for a 225-bed hospital costing over \$106 million. Now, we have a certain position on that. There is a vote here up 73 percent but up just \$200,000. It seems to represent to me some work in the design stage. But all we can get is a sense of, well, government's committed to this in principle. What does that mean? Does it mean we're committed to 225 beds? Are they committed to closing all the other pediatric beds in all the other hospitals in Edmonton? Is it going to go to the final price tag of \$106 million? At what stage or phase in all these processes is that project at? I take it it's past the first one, the request stage, and government and this Premier still seem to be committed to whatever the board wants to put forward there. But as we know, things have changed in pediatric care, things have changed in terms of the fiscal ability of this government, and it might be a day and a time for some rethinking here. We've done some of the rethinking ourselves, and I'd like to know what this increase for the Northern Alberta Children's hospital represents, not only in terms of the phase but the final goal and outcome of that project. I think not only me but a lot of other people in the health care sector in the city would like to know as well.

I think we just got some clarification from the Minister of Health about the staging and timing of the new Royal Alexandra hospital's redevelopment of their emergency and critical care

wing, but they're not going to do it for \$2.2 million, I can tell you that. I thought the agreement was for over \$70 million, and now they're talking that it might be up to \$90 million or \$100 million. If they can begin that this year, when it's going to be completed, they're going to have the costs over both years. But come on; let's get that sooner than later. That has been promised and promised and promised. And I might point out to members of the Assembly that that does not include any acute care beds. So it falls within our policy of not creating new beds, and when opening the closed beds over there, what it does is provide better emergency, better radiological services and the rest where they're so desperately needed at a facility that was built for 30,000 and takes 80,000 emergency admissions a year.

Could we have an update with respect to the Alberta Hospital Edmonton? I've read through their proposal, and they have a lot. I know, too, what they're hoping for in terms of redevelopment up there on the mental health side. There's quite a decrease, as we see here. Again, is this some decrease because they're not able to proceed to the next part of the design stage, or what? Are they going to get some half commitments here, some half promises, or are they going to be able to proceed with what they have in mind to its conclusion? Because it's certainly an ambitious project, and I think there are, again, some questions. Some things have changed in the mental health field, so you don't always have to do it through a facility such as Alberta Hospital Edmonton. Maybe there's some creative rethinking we can do in helping them out with upgrading what they have, what they want to have, but also ensuring there are some dollars left and available for the community mental health side where, as we know, a lot more needs to go on.

On the Heritage Savings Trust Fund committee we did get quite a representation from the Tom Baker Cancer Centre in Calgary. It's not on here. I guess maybe some clarification: when the Cross is finished with its third phase of building, whether that will do it for the cancer needs of people in the province of Alberta or whether there's still going to be room to do anything in terms of what the Tom Baker people want to have done down there. When we met with them last September they had quite ambitious ideas about what could be going on in terms of improving the care for people with cancer in the city of Calgary.

Then — it's got to be in here somewhere — all of this talk about the Calgary General hospital, Holy Cross. I know it doesn't talk about the Rockyview. But sometime somebody has to get some answers about what's going to happen with emergency services in the city of Calgary with the several hospitals and the several reports that have come out, trying to consolidate some of the emergency care in that part of the city of Calgary. Once a decision has been made, I'd like to know what's going to happen to the existing emergency facility at whatever hospital closes down. Is it going to be renovated or converted to some other use or something like that? Obviously it's going to fall into this minister's lap at some point.

Then I'll just finish on the long-term care side with some of these nursing homes. I can't say it yet again, but I guess I'll just put on the record that I think Extencare and for-profit nursing homes in this province are a scourge in terms of our health care system. To continue to make gold off the old by for-profit private companies like Extencare to me does not make any sense when we have an extensive volunteer sector, an extensive religious sector, and extensive municipalities who would like to develop more of what they can in the long-term care side, both auxiliary and nursing home care level. I don't understand why

we and the public purse have to bankroll the construction costs of private, for-profit nursing homes like Extencare in this province when in fact many others want to have government put the money in and not use it in a for-profit sense but plough whatever dollars they can back into the quality of care in those places and not put it to their shareholders back in Toronto and the rest. I know it's a battle we'll never win while this government's still in office, but it hasn't gone unnoticed. I think Ontario and Alberta are still the only two provinces left which have private, for-profit nursing homes.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for Edmonton-Gold Bar.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, did you want responses for these questions?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes. Please proceed.

MR. KOWALSKI: At the outset, I say that I'm pleased to have heard the comments from the Member for Edmonton-Centre — calm and tempered today, which amazes me, surprises me, so I'm kind of impressed, Mr. Chairman. That perhaps sets the tone for some responses that will be tempered as well.

At the outset, the hon. member talked about the normal planning process. He looked at a document, dated 1984, from the Department of Health and then wanted to know what lessons were learned and the whole process. Well, I want to assure the member that that evaluation of what has been learned is an ongoing one. In the fall of 1988 a decision was made that basically said Public Works, Supply and Services would also be a playing a role in terms of the delivery of the hospital construction side of the whole entity. I certainly will take under advisement the need to have a new document printed, vintage 1990, that would go through all the steps. One of the things we would want to do is in fact streamline them.

Just to give an afterthought, I recall that a number of years ago when I was deputy minister of transportation, I once asked senior officials in that department how many steps you have to go through to deliver a road. They got all these flowcharts, brought them out for me, and there were something like 36 steps. So I consistently asked the question why, why, why, why, why. After some debate, we brought it down to eight steps. There seemed to be more logic and more intensity, and we got more done and pushed a lot less paper, and everybody seemed to be happy. If it's a requirement in 1990 that we go through that similar kind of review, I'd let the hon. member know that that's part of what is under way for some period of time.

The member also raised a question about litigation with respect to construction in a hospital. I just want to reaffirm one more time that the province of Alberta will provide literally 100 percent of the cost of dollars to an independent hospital board for the construction of a particular health care facility, but there comes a point in time when the ownership of that facility will rest with the duly appointed or duly elected board. In the case of Black Diamond, the hospital of course is owned by the board — it's not owned by the province of Alberta — so it falls upon that board to take the necessary steps with respect to whatever litigation it may choose to initiate. I want to point out, though, that if there is a request from the duly elected board for some advice and consultation, then officials in Public Works, Supply and Services will sit down, but they will not get embroiled in a conflict that might exist between professionals in the field who

may be members of APEGGA or the architects' association or the like. All sides have their particular individuals with respect to that.

The point the member made with respect to press releases that go out with estimates is a valid point. He certainly commented about the Hillcrest lodge in Barrhead. That came out under another department, but certainly put out by the particular minister and the MLA for the area, where he estimated a certain cost. But I want the hon. member to know that the estimated costs were put out in such a way that no contractor would ever be able to put his or her finger on what we expect the public tender process would really deliver, because you're getting a global figure and most of these contracts are put out for a specific number of independent jobs associated with a particular project. It's a general thing, because invariably what happens is that once you commit to a project like this, an hon. member in the House says, "Well, how much money is it going to cost?" That's the only question particularly the hounds in the news media ever want to know – how much? So it's a general kind of thing. I hope he appreciates the rationale I gave with respect to that.

Mr. Chairman, the member has very, very correctly pointed out that there's an additional \$41 million item on page 19. I was going to deal with that at the conclusion of vote 3, but I think in retrospect we'll just deal with it now. That is the special warrant we had to raise to deal with projects that were under construction in the fiscal year 1989-90. As I tried to point out the other day, on Friday last, once a project has gone to tender, we – all members of this Assembly – essentially lose control over the delivery of that project. If the project goes out for tender in May of a particular year or April of a particular year, which is the first or second month of a fiscal year, and lo and behold, the contractor's got just a super group of men and women working for him, the weather's just really fine, and all of a sudden they're going to start making better progress than they ever anticipated, it's not poor planning, hon. member, on behalf of the government. I suppose what the government could do basically in September is say, "Well, fine; your project must come to a screeching halt right now because we have no more dollars." We've always maintained a position that we in fact would try and get that construction project under way and completed.

So in the case of the \$41 million, we had very, very excellent construction in fiscal 1989-90 with respect to the Wetaskiwin General hospital, which in fact exceeded all the expectations we had in the last fiscal year. We had an acceleration of projects at the Misericordia hospital and the Glenrose Rehabilitation hospital in Edmonton and the Sturgeon General hospital in St. Albert. In essence, you take those four projects and the acceleration with respect to it – and the hon. Member for Westlock-Sturgeon is giving me the credit for it, but that would be incorrect, because it went to the private sector and it's the private sector that builds the hospital. But I appreciate him thinking I would stand there with a whip on a construction site. That certainly isn't the case. I've always found in life that you catch more flies with honey than you ever do with a baseball bat. It's a basic approach we would want to take. So I think, hon. member, that basically gives us the answer to the \$41 million special warrant. Of course, it deals with the phase that they are in. There's no bragging going on here. I just reported that the estimates and the elements basically call for a certain figure.

Within the summary by element on pages 163 to 165 – if the hon. member would like me to go through each and every one of those to bring him up to date on each of these projects, I

suspect I'd be here for some period of time. But the dollars are in there, and the dollars of each particular project are clearly identified and clearly highlighted. Now, one thing Public Works, Supply and Services does not do though – and it rests with the minister of hospitals and the hospital department – is the purchasing of equipment. So when the hon. member looks at element 3.1.1, Capital Upgrading, Various, the \$19,992 million, those are items that basically are addressed and brought to our attention during a particular year, problems that might exist within the multibillion dollar health care hospital infrastructure system in this province, and in essence what we're trying to do is respond to safety codes, necessary requirements.

We are not in a state of the art mentality, hon. member, in May of 1990 with respect to the estimates that are before and are being carried by the Minister of Public Works, Supply and Services. We do not have to have the best floor and the best room that exists anywhere in the world in all our [inaudible]. What we want is a very efficient, effective infrastructure that's necessary to provide a very high quality service to the citizens of Alberta, at the same time one that basically makes sure their health is number one, not the aesthetics and the vanity of an architect, the Minister of Health, the Minister of Public Works, Supply and Services, or a local member. We want functional, efficient, effective health care and hospital systems, not ones that will have people coming from around the world that want to take a photopicture and, in the meantime, we have to have individuals who are getting second state approach.

I'm disappointed in the hon. member when he said that one of the things he wanted to do this afternoon was talk about politics, because I want the hon. member to know that I do not play politics. I'm just a builder. The hon. member might very, very clearly ask various questions with respect to certain projects in here, and he wanted to know how much money was being spent on the Holy Cross. Well, the elements are very clearly there: \$350,000 this year, Mr. Chairman. Vegreville, \$475,000; Slave Lake, \$60,000; Thorhild, \$20,000: those are substantial dollars. The hon. member said he was really disappointed, because I remember him saying last year, "Hey, Ken, let's whip out there to Thorhild and have a debate." Well, I want the hon. member to know I checked with the men and women on the board of directors in Thorhild. They said they didn't want to see the Member for Edmonton-Centre show up in Thorhild, and that's why there never was a debate. I kept going back and saying, "Well, come on; I'm very happy to have him." "We don't want to see him; we don't want to see him."

The hon. member also made comments about St. Michael's General hospital in Lethbridge. Of course, the estimates look at a \$2 million requested expenditure in fiscal 1991. The Oilfields General hospital – the hon. member said, "Well, why so much?" Surely the hon. member must remember what happened to the Oilfields General hospital in Black Diamond and the difficulty the local board there had and the petitions and appeals made by hon. members of this Assembly a year ago for the government to respond and react. Well, the government did it. It responded and reacted. So don't slap us on the fingers today, hon. member. Just recognize that this *is* an important project and a very important one that we had to deal with.

The member also raised an item with respect to element 3.6.29 and said, "My golly, what is that; a long-term care facility, Edmonton, \$40,000? Well, that's part of stage 1 of the planning and looking at the assessments of the needs here in the greater metropolitan area. The member is always cautioning the government to plan, plan, plan, look into the future, so we're

doing that, hon. member. When we know the definitive thing as a result of consultation with all the people, then we'll be back. Item 3.3.5 is a programming item with respect to \$200,000. That's the Northern Alberta Children's hospital, Edmonton, and it's the continuation of the ongoing programming and review of it, \$200,000 with respect to that. Item 3.3.2 is an item dealing with Alberta Hospital Edmonton. There's a \$150,000 allocation that we're looking at in terms of programming. The Cross Cancer Institute, which is item 3.3.3, is a request this year for \$7.8 million to continue the necessary progress and work with that very important project.

I want the hon. member to know as well that the future reviews undertaken by the Minister of Health will focus on and will be governed by the inputs that have been provided by the Hyndman commission, The Rainbow Report. Those documents are all out there. It's amazing how much interest there is in it among people in the province of Alberta, boards and others. Hopefully, as we enter the decade of the 1990s, we'll all have learned that we have a little different mentality than perhaps we had as we closed the decade of the 1970s and went into the decade of the 1980s. I think, Mr. Chairman, in terms of looking at the future, we always have to keep before us an option in terms of what the private sector can do as compared to what the public sector can do. I sincerely hope the hon. member would not rule out completely that there's an opportunity for the private sector to be involved one way or another. I'm not standing here in defense of any particular project or advocating any particular project. It's just a philosophic statement I make with respect to that, because I sincerely hope none of us would ever want to go to certain rigid extremes that we would box ourselves in, wondering what might be developed tomorrow in some new, unique kind of idea. So I ask the hon. member to have a vision for the future, to open, to hear, and he'll find that the minister standing in support of these estimates today will have his ears very much open.

Mr. Chairman, I think I've responded to all the questions from the Member for Edmonton-Centre, and I'd be very pleased to hear more and respond more as well.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for Edmonton-Gold Bar.

MRS. HEWES: Thanks, Mr. Chairman. I just have a few comments and questions to the minister. I do want to thank the minister for his instructions last week. I found them quite helpful, the five points of the stage his department goes through. Having been through constructions when I was on the board of district 24 in the city of Edmonton, I found it helpful to listen to his dissertation on this and get a better idea of exactly when permission is given for sure to a hospital to go ahead and how the transfer is made. So I thank him for that.

Once again, however, I would like to comment that there really is too little information for us in the budget documents, and unfortunately it's necessary to ask a few questions. Mr. Chairman, I was absent from the Chamber for a few minutes while the Member for Edmonton-Centre was asking his questions, so I hope I won't duplicate.

Mr. Chairman, the Black Diamond hospital and that prototype being used for Black Diamond, Magrath, and Pincher Creek – I'm very conscious of the problems we had with that particular hospital. I'd like to ask the minister, if he would go back over it again – I know he's answered it partially – does the 3.5.5 item complete the reconstruction of Black Diamond hospital? Does

that bring it up to the speed to make it complete for occupancy? It's been my understanding that the cost of the repairs has been considerably higher than that, and I'd like to know if this is the end of it or if there is more. I'd also like to know if it has been determined who's responsibility the problems were and if this has been acted upon. I'd like to know what's happening with the Magrath and Pincher Creek hospitals that had similar problems and if the department has now finally concluded its investigation of all the prototype hospitals. Perhaps the minister will share with us what the total findings were.

Mr. Chairman, approximately 80 facilities had construction plans, and we understand that many of these are going ahead and some have been slowed down, and they're going to be re-evaluated next year. I'm pleased to see the Cross Cancer expansion is going ahead. The need there has certainly been well documented, as well as the completion of the St. Joseph's Auxiliary hospital. This is a very old facility, one that certainly has served the citizens of Edmonton and northern Alberta well, and much loved. I'm pleased to see that we're going ahead with that one.

I was glad to hear the Minister of Health's answers on the Royal Alexandra today. But, Mr. Chairman, I have to reinforce the Member for Edmonton-Centre. This facility desperately needs to move faster than I think this budget is allowing it to go. Some of the questions that have been asked in this House today and Friday indicate just one microcosm of the kind of thing that is happening in that hospital, particularly in relation to their emergency services. It's my understanding that the Alex has modified its proposal and has asked the government to provide at the very least enough funding to get construction going on the emergency facility. The minister says 1991-92 – not soon enough. [interjections] No, I'm sorry. Perhaps I misunderstood your answers earlier today, Madam Minister. But I think we need some reassurance to the citizens of Edmonton and northern Alberta that this is moving faster.

The Northern Alberta Children's hospital. I have some questions about whether or not the funding is going to be increased, what the current state of the art is on this one, what the government's present thinking about it is, and where it's going. I note, of course, that the Royal Alex has presented an alternate plan, or an interim plan I guess would be a better way of describing it. Perhaps the minister of public works or the Minister of Health would give us their assessment of that and whether or not there is any involvement of this budget in that interim plan for special care for children in the Royal Alexandra hospital as stage 1 working towards the Northern Alberta Children's hospital.

Mr. Chairman, is 3.3.5, \$200,000, supposed to complete the planning stage, or is there more to come related to that hospital? I need the answer to that.

Mr. Chairman, the \$23 million worth of renovations to the Holy Cross appears to be put on indefinite hold. These were promised a long time ago. Perhaps the minister would tell us what we can look for in the future, what the timing is going to be on that one. As well, are the renovations that have been canceled at the Holy Cross a result of the recommendations currently before the Minister of Health to move many of the Holy's facilities to Rockyview?

The Calgary General: \$125 million. The building of the Bow Valley Centre has been axed; what's the alternate plan there? Slave Lake has proposed a \$20 million hospital. Promises, I think, were issued after the 1988 flood and, I understood, reaffirmed during the provincial election. Perhaps the minister



of public works would tell us whether or not that's going back to Treasury Board or priorities committee for a rethink and is being brought ahead in time. I think the local administrators are hoping that the ruling here is going to be revised.

Mr. Chairman, on medical wastes. On March 27, 1990, the Minister of Health responded to questions on medical waste and included an information bulletin forwarded to all provinces, stating then that the steering committee on hospital waste management is continuing to examine alternate technology and regional disposal options. I wondered if the minister would answer to us whether or not the use of the Swan Hills waste disposal facility is part of that examination. It also seems that the minister's letter promised that the public health division is preparing guidelines for biomedical waste generated from sources other than just hospitals, other types of institutions, and an examination of the proposed changes to the existing waste management regulations under public health. I'd like to know if those guidelines have been completed. If not, when do we anticipate they'll be available for examination? Will they come before the House? I believe, Mr. Chairman, when this issue exploded a year or so ago, there was a tremendous amount of public anxiety about it, and we really need to put that to rest with some kind of regional plan or regional proposal for biomedical waste disposal and disposal of medical wastes that would come from other facilities, such as veterinary clinics and community clinics and so on.

[Mr. Schumacher in the Chair]

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask the minister if there's any plan along the way to conduct a comprehensive inventory of hospital medical equipment in the province. Our review of some of the circumstances in hospitals in Alberta indicates that there's a lot of equipment out there that has not yet seen the light of day, that has not been needed or not been used. We talk a great deal about better rationalization and common sense. It seems to me that we need an inventory, and this minister likes that kind of thing, I know, and likes to know exactly what he's responsible for. I'd like to know if there is a plan for a total inventory of our equipment out there.

I have some direct questions on the subelements. The minister has spoken to the Capital Upgrading. Mr. Chairman, do we ever get details of that? To the minister: you mentioned it in your answers to the Member for Edmonton-Centre, but \$19 million, almost \$20 million – I think it's important at some point in time that the House has an understanding of what's in that.

The Royal Alexandra hospital. I've already asked a question about the northern Alberta children's interim wing. Is that included in that budget, Mr. Minister? The St. Michael's General, 3.2.17, is up to \$2 million. Is this for an expansion of extended care beds, or what is the purpose of it?

Mr. Chairman, I'm pleased to see the General hospital, Fairview. I know their needs are quite definite and have been known for some years for an extended care facility, and I'd like to know what the minister's intentions are here. There's only \$350,000 in the budget. It doesn't seem to me they're going to get very far in developing an extended care facility, and perhaps the minister will tell us what the timing schedule is for that. That wing on the Fairview hospital is desperately needed, and I think the citizens of that part of the province need some assurance that it's going to go ahead.

In 3.4.19, the St. Albert hospital: does this complete construction, and is that one going to be turned over, according to your

five steps, immediately? The General hospital, Wetaskiwin, the same question: I need to know what the increase is for. The increases in Castor and Elk Point and Galahad. Mr. Chairman, to the minister, are these amounts for change to extended care in these facilities? Is that what the intent is: renovations to those hospitals to allow them to provide more extended care to citizens?

Mr. Chairman, I've looked over Auxiliary Hospitals and Nursing Homes. I'm interested in the one item that the minister spoke to, the Long Term Care Facility, Edmonton, an amount of \$40,000, which I assume is for planning for long-term care. I'm pleased to see that there, but I'd like to know – Mr. Chairman, perhaps the minister will comment – when we are working on long-term planning of capital facilities with the department of public works, how is the whole process of home care and community care rolled into that discussion? As we plan for extended care in the sense of capital planning, is there room in those discussions for the potential for operational funding for home care as an alternative or as part of the capital funding that would go into it? In the same vein, Mr. Chairman, perhaps the minister would comment about the use of community clinics as hospital extensions. I don't see any of that kind of funding in this budget, and I would have thought that by now we would have put some planning into place for using extensions of our acute care facilities for community work to relieve some of the emergency room work that we're finding in our major urban centres. It may be in the budget, but once again, with the paucity of details, it's very hard to determine if it's there.

I'd be pleased if the minister would answer that and my other questions.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, I could barely keep up writing. I'm not sure how I can remember all these very important questions, but if in fact I miss something in the overview comments, I want the hon. member to know that I'll follow up with her with respect to that.

First of all, I greatly admire and I listened very carefully to the comments of the Member for Edmonton-Gold Bar, recognizing that she was once a hospital board member. Of course, district 24 is well respected in this part of Alberta, so I want her to know that her comments and her views and her positions would never, ever be ignored. That would simply be wrong. Further, she's also the Premier's friend, and that's important to me.

The very specific question, though, with respect to Black Diamond. The question was asked with respect to item 3.5.5: would that \$2,650,000 be enough to complete the job? The answer to that is no; it is not going to be enough.

MRS. HEWES: I knew that.

MR. KOWALSKI: Well, why would the hon. member then raise the question if she did know? It was some time ago that I conveyed in writing to the board chairman of Black Diamond . . . Or was it a test, Mr. Chairman, wondering if I knew? Well, I want the hon. member to know that I can remember what I signed my name to, and it wasn't too long ago that I conveyed a letter to the chairman of the board indicating that in terms of the importance of the work at Black Diamond, in essence in terms of the total project scope with respect to that project, the province would be prepared to fund in the neighbourhood of \$5,750,000. So if the test was there, the question is responded to.

The hon. member basically raised questions with respect to Magrath and Pincher Creek and wanted to know if this was a difficulty with prototypical hospitals: if that was the problem, or was there something else? My understanding of the whole matter is that in fact it has nothing to do, basically, with the design; it has something to do with the work that was done as part of the site. But I have to be very careful, hon. member, because there is some litigation going on, and I hate to think that whatever comment – in trying to be nice to the hon. member today, I might say something and find myself subpoenaed in court later as an expert witness, which I am not. The general question responded to with respect to the concept of a prototypical hospital. There are many of them that have been built in the province of Alberta with no difficulty whatsoever. I point out to the hon. member one in Swan Hills which does exist, a 25-bed hospital there, and no difficulties at all. The dollars that are included in the budget with respect to Magrath are for programming, and the dollars for Pincher Creek are with respect to designing.

The member raised a question with respect to the Royal Alex. I thought I'd responded to it a little earlier. We have \$2,200,000 with respect to that, and the hon. member is basically playing the role, I guess, of a petitioning MLA that says: "We have to go faster. We need more money. We've got to get it done quicker." That's common perspective, I guess, among all 83 of us that are in this particular environment. I want the hon. member to know that in terms of the planning that has been done with the board and the functioning of the progress of the whole thing with respect to the architects, the engineers, and everything else, basically it would be very difficult to do more work in this fiscal year on the Royal Alex. I know that it's always a question that we've got to try and go faster, but I'm told that functionally there is a difficulty with even going faster than the plans that have already been enveloped for this year, 1990-91.

I responded earlier, I believe, and *Hansard* will show my comments, with respect to the Northern Alberta Children's hospital here in Edmonton.

With respect to 3.3.5, the dollar figures there, the \$200,000, are for programming, hon. member.

The 3.2.3, Holy Cross, a commitment there of \$350,000. Basically, work has moved along well quite in there, but I appreciate the petition that the hon. member has made with respect to it.

I'd like the hon. member to know that recently I met with the hospital board from Slave Lake, a meeting arranged for by the Member for Lesser Slave Lake, and will review the file on the Slave Lake hospital project. I will review it because I have a particular interest in it. I was the minister responsible for Alberta Public Safety Services when the flood occurred in Slave Lake, and I was there and saw two feet of mud go through the Slave Lake hospital. So I'm very familiar with it and very much understand it, and I want to try and understand what happened in the last two years, before it basically came into this other environment, as the Minister of Public Works, Supply and Services. I've provided that commitment to the Slave Lake hospital board via the Member for Lesser Slave Lake and directly to them as well.

The member raised a very interesting question which is not part of this estimate, Mr. Chairman, but one I want to make a comment on. It has to do with biomedical waste, which again is one of those fascinating kinds of issues that we deal with, not really part of this whole estimate that we have here today, but

there is a great deal of work that's going on in this one area. The member very specifically said, "Would Swan Hills be 'the' destination point?" Swan Hills could be 'a' destination point. When we got involved in this discussion of hazardous special waste – medical waste now, in fact – we've had a review ongoing, and it's one that has involvement from the Department of Public Works, Supply and Services, the Department of Health, and the Department of the Environment. Since the review began, there has also gotten to be a very great amount of interest in the public sector with respect to this matter. So the fact of the matter is that we have to find a bona fide solution to it; no ifs, ands, or buts about that.

One solution most definitely is the Swan Hills Special Waste Management Corporation. To this point in time the board of directors for the Special Waste Management Corporation have held some public meetings in Swan Hills, interestingly enough, and on the whole the population of Swan Hills is not negative to having Swan Hills become a source of extermination for biomedical waste. But, interestingly enough, the workers, the people who are at the plant, had a whole series of questions, and that matter has not been resolved or determined yet.

So we have a variety of initiatives. First of all, we know that Swan Hills is a potential source of extermination. Secondly, there is a possibility – and some hospital boards in this province have basically said, "Well, what we really want to see is a regional kind of system as opposed to a burning facility at each and every kind of hospital." Then to tie in everything that the hon. member talked about – veterinary waste, pharmaceutical waste – to here, there, and everything else . . . Because of the awareness that the world has found with respect to what's happening in terms of our leadership role – and I don't mean to brag; I think it's an honest assessment, that Alberta is a leader in terms of destruction of hazardous special waste – there are a number now coming to Alberta saying, "Hey, this is an area that we think we want to get into."

So we're looking at the guidelines; we're looking at the whole scenario. The answer is not there yet, hon. member. I'm sorry that it isn't there yet, but I think we have to make sure that we've got all options looked at, and hopefully as we go through 1990, we will have a definitive solution. We'll deal with each and every hospital board on this question as they raise it, because most of the hospitals, Wetaskiwin for one, would have incineration facilities and the like. But we've got to do a better job, because we are talking about dignity, not so much of human waste but of human parts in some cases, and I think that as human beings we have to have a dignity associated with how we destroy something that might come from a human being. It's not simply an efficient, effective thing when that has to be dealt with as well.

A fascinating question the hon. member raised with respect to an inventory, a comprehensive review of hospital medical equipment. That wouldn't come under the responsibility of the Minister of Public Works, Supply and Services, but I'm sure that my colleague the Minister of Health will certainly . . . I have to believe those inventories exist. But if we have to do a better job, once again I appreciate the petition raised by the member. I should point out that periodically the Department of Health declares certain medical equipment in this province surplus to the needs of the health care system in Alberta. At that point in time that equipment comes to the Department of Public Works, Supply and Services, so I have the responsibility of disposing of it. From time to time there is a missionary group someplace in the world or an Alberta international aid development thing, and

if somebody comes along and says, "Hey, you've declared this hospital equipment surplus in our province; we are aware of a group someplace that needs it," if we can tie the two together, then in fact we will donate it. We have done it to Third World countries, other groups here, there, and what have you, and the missionary thing, and tied it in with our international aid. It's something that is very important, I think.

The member made a comment that it would sure be nice to get more details with respect to Capital Upgrading, and of course that's 3.1.1, the \$19.9 million. While there is some degree of planning with respect to that, that basically is a fund that allows us to respond to a problem that might develop at these multibillion dollar health care infrastructures in the province. The Black Diamond one is a good example. We had no money in the budget last year for Black Diamond, but there was a problem, there was a need, so we had to respond. Well, if the House is sitting, you can't respond by way of a special warrant, so you've got a fund that basically deals with it. All of the specific details of that I'd be very happy to make available, make public, in whatever detail the hon. member would want as we go through the year, because we'll know exactly how we have to deal with it.

St. Michael's is for acute care. Fairview is a \$350,000 commitment, a 194 percent increase. Sturgeon, Wetaskiwin: I think, as I stand here, that we're looking at conclusion towards the end of this fiscal year, as I recall. Castor, Elk Point, and the member gave me another one – I think it was Galahad – and said she wondered what the purpose was for all three of them. Castor and Elk Point were designed for long-term beds; I believe the same with Galahad. I didn't have a chance to flip through the paper because she was going pretty quickly.

Home care, community care, with respect to some planning going on here in the city of Edmonton. Well, the point the hon. member makes is a very valid one. In Public Works, Supply and Services we've got engineers; we're builders, the brick and the mortar kind of guys. The comment was: "Well, I sincerely hope that these guys and girls have more of a concern and care for the home care, community care environment." We'll respond to basically a determined need by a board, and hopefully that assessment will have been done to that point in time. But the point that the hon. member makes is a valid one that I will take back to the officials in Public Works, Supply and Services, and say that we have to be more cosmopolitan and more of a renaissance type of thing, and we simply can't be the builder without asking the questions, even among ourselves. Have we thought about this, this, and this, rather than simply being in the position of saying, "Well, we simply do as we're told," kind of thing? I think they have to be people of the world, and people of the world have to open their heads and have to have a certain degree of vision with respect to that.

I think, Mr. Chairman, I've answered those questions.

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

MR. TAYLOR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'll try to cover some of the holes that I think might have been left, not intentionally, because I want to focus more . . . I'm glad to see that the Minister of Health is here also with the hon. minister of public works, because there's some questions – I'll try to be specific. In vote 3 – I gather we're handling just vote 3 here, aren't we? – in 3.4.19, a general hospital at Fort Saskatchewan, he's got \$1.1 million set out for that. Is the minister familiar with how far that will take the hospital along? Is that going to

just be for the portables, and keep it, in other words, in a temporary stage, or is it going to be used to upgrade the hospital? I know the hon. minister was out touring the hospital, and she made soft, cooing sounds to the Fort Saskatchewan residents, but I'd like to know really what she does have in mind or what the minister has in mind.

The next area is Sturgeon General hospital at St. Albert. There's a bit of a rhubarb developing there, Mr. Chairman. I'd like the minister to comment on it. Apparently, either the Minister of Health, who isn't listening too closely, I think – maybe if you could nudge her with your left elbow, it would be of some help – or the minister of public works has designed that hospital with a laundry in it. Yet the thought now, from what I am told, is that the laundry is going to sit there unused with maybe a half a million dollars' worth of equipment, and you're thinking of putting the laundry out for bid to the outside. In which case are the Minister of Health and the minister of public works talking as distant as they are now talking – she's obviously not paying any attention to what's going on. Because that also happened with the design of the hospitals. Does she go off on her own way designing hospitals with laundries, and you go along the other way with a design to put the laundry out for public bid? Or is it . . . If I can't get the two of you to talk during estimates, I don't know how you can talk during design, but you might be able to answer what that would be about.

Next comes the Immaculata general hospital in Westlock. I notice only \$30,000 in the estimate there. My understanding is that the sisters have advanced \$100,000 for land acquisition, and surely that at least would be paid back if the Minister of Health has decided to put the Immaculata hospital on hold. Why would you stick the nuns with \$100,000 in land costs? Also, I've asked the minister if she will tour the Immaculata hospital now and meet with the board, which she was kind enough to do in the Fort Saskatchewan area. I haven't had an answer yet. I hope she does answer me in the next week or so, because it will prevent about 4,000 citizens up there having to put their names on a petition asking her to come out and visit. I would hope that the Minister of Health will find it in her time schedule shortly to let the board in Westlock know that she will meet with them and look at it and save me the trouble of organizing a petition and rattling the sabres around her ears. It took a long while to get her to visit the hospital in Fort Saskatchewan. Hopefully, this will be a little faster. But I would like to know not only why you cannot pay that \$100,000 that's already advanced for land but also if you can consult with the minister as to what estimate you might have of the total cost of the hospital when it gets under way, which leads to the next area.

Also in the Westlock area we have a great number of seniors living, and with a hospital that's already there but an auxiliary hospital that's overcrowded. I don't know if the minister's the right person to talk to or whether I should go to the Minister of Health. Has thought been made to expanding the auxiliary hospital into the present hospital and accelerating the building of a new active bed hospital? Because we're certainly short spaces in the auxiliary hospital. Certainly the present Immaculata hospital, while it might be renovated into being an auxiliary hospital, is almost impossible to upgrade anymore because it's one of the earliest hospitals out in that area.

That leads to my final – it's more of a comment. I notice that the towns of Rimbey and Thorhild . . . I don't know if Rimbey has a doctor or not; hopefully it has. But I would like to request that the minister – and it may not be as much in his department as it is in the hon. Minister of Health's department – think more

seriously in the future of the triple use of active, auxiliary, and nursing all in the same institutions, thereby having to be in towns where there are doctors, nurses, and paramedical services available rather than sprinkling the nursing homes out through the countryside as a sort of a political favour to the healthy mayors, councils, and chambers of commerce who think they're gaining business. The people that are not in good health, the people that have to attend these nursing homes and have to go into these nursing homes are not very impressed with the government's policy of sticking nursing homes out here, there, and all over. They agree with lodges, they agree with homes and all that type of thing, but when it comes to a nursing home, they realize they're in a stage very close to needing hospital care. They would like to be where there are doctors and nurses and not where the two hon. ministers think they could curry the most favour in the Tory backbenchers.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. minister.

MR. KOWALSKI: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. The Member for Westlock-Sturgeon asked some legitimate questions of the minister responsible for the estimates here this afternoon and then asked this minister to act as a petitioner for him to the Minister of Health. I think that would probably not be correct and in order. It would seem to me that the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon is a big boy, and I'm sure he can carry his own messages on his own behalf to the Minister of Health. So I'll just decline to make some comments on that.

The member raised a question with respect to 3.4.19, which is Fort Saskatchewan, and that particular item has a budget in it of \$1,150,000. The hon. member said, "Well, is that it, or is there going to be more expenditure?" We basically have to complete the plan that's been agreed to, as I understand, between Alberta Health and the Fort Saskatchewan hospital board. It will take some more money than that, so we'll have to come back next year with perhaps an additional, as a result of the final consultation – I guess there won't really be any way of knowing that towards the end of this year, but there will be additional dollars.

Also, I think the hon. member made some comments about trailers and sort of said it in a disdainful kind of way. But all parties involved, the board and Health, agree that the dollars should be spent on serving patients, not building Taj Mahals for the ego of the neighbouring MLA. Okay; you can't have it both ways. You can't say, "Well, fine; let's put the money in patient care," and then when the government agrees to do that, then we get hammered: "Well, why aren't you doing it on something else?" I guess it's a catch-22 situation, but we're concerned about the people.

I appreciate the comments from the member with respect to, quote, "a rhubarb," he said, at Sturgeon with respect to laundry. Perhaps the hon. member would be good enough to provide me with any additional information that he might have with respect to this matter to add to my general understanding.

The hon. member then really acted as a petitioner on behalf of his own constituency, and I admire him for that and I really appreciate him doing that. But in terms of 3.4.55 and the \$30,000 that was set aside for the Westlock hospital, the hon. member knows full well, though, that it's the responsibility of the local hospital board to procure the land, purchase the land, and deal with the land for a particular hospital/health care facility. That's really the only responsibility asked of a local board. The province basically pays 100 percent of the cost of it. If there's

more that the hon. member wants to add to my understanding of this particular matter, I'd be very pleased to hear from him with respect to it. We're talking there about an acute care facility, hon. member. That's the planning that's basically in it.

I'm not sure if there was a petition made with respect to Rimbey, but if there was, I missed it, hon. member. I'll read the Blues, and I'll come back and respond to you out of the normal session.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Redwater-Andrew.

MR. ZARUSKY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just couldn't help but get in on this debate on capital projects for health facilities because I think I have to speak up on behalf of rural Alberta as to how important it is to have these facilities where they're needed to serve the people in the areas. I'm glad to see that Thorhild nursing home is on stream, maybe delayed a little, but it's an important facility that's needed there because of the needs of the people many miles away. I think the hon. Member for Westlock-Sturgeon would agree that if they're overloaded at Westlock, we can bring them into Thorhild. Thorhild will accept them.

AN HON. MEMBER: Even Nick?

MR. ZARUSKY: Even Nick.

I think it's important, as a representative of a rural area where the largest town has a population of 2,000, that the people deserve the same services as cities and other larger areas do, because the people live there and want to lead their lives to the fullest in their own environment. I think we have to look at building these facilities to enhance the living environment of all people. So I'm not going to take too long here, but I just want to commend the two ministers on keeping Thorhild on schedule and, hopefully, seeing the facility come up there in the very near future, because the need is there.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place.

MR. McINNIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just have a quick question for the minister with regard to a proposal from the Emmanuel centre. They operate an existing seniors' home. It's a lodge and self-contained apartments. They've proposed the idea of adding an auxiliary hospital facility onto the Emmanuel centre to try to round out the package of services that might be available to an aging population in that facility. I just wondered if the department has thought favourably about the idea of incorporating an auxiliary hospital facility, adding onto a seniors' housing complex so that as health problems develop, they have an opportunity to perhaps not have to move away and abandon the community in which they live in order to receive that type of health care treatment. I tend to think it admits to the possibility of them going back into a residence facility and going back down the care ladder, as it were, as they obtain health care treatment. I appreciate that there are other priorities before us today – but whether that one has been looked at and whether that particular concept is within the thinking of the department.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. minister, followed by the hon. Member for Edmonton-Centre.

MR. KOWALSKI: I'd be very happy to take that as a submission that I'll look into. I personally can't recall ever having been involved in a discussion with respect to that matter. I just can't remember.

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

MR. TAYLOR: Followed by who?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Westlock-Sturgeon.

REV. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to re-emphasize, as I was trying to point out to the minister, not that we want to spend all the time in the session here today, but I just wonder if there isn't some way in which, on an annual basis, we could get some clue about what phase or stage each of these different projects is in. I didn't want to go over it verbally each time, and I'm not sure whether at the beginning of an estimates review or in writing – I guess, as I said, we could do a motion for a return.

We have a clear understanding now of the five different phases. We've got some understanding of how that all proceeds, though I think there's still some jurisdictional question about what Health does, what public works does. But I would like to know more clearly what each . . . I mean, when Medicine Hat and District hospital is down 84 percent, does that mean they're finished construction? Does that mean they're not going to go to some planning? We don't have a clue what that indicates. We can guess that they might be in any one of the five stages, but I just think it's important for us as legislators to have that kind of information.

Moreover – and again it's not, perhaps, this minister's responsibility – I'd like to know how each of the different individual projects fits into some overall plan. What criteria are used to assess the projects through the different phases? For instance, an overall plan in terms of how many – the Minister of Health already raised it – acute care beds per thousand: I'd like to know what the target is. How many long-term care beds per thousand? How many lodge beds per thousand? I think in an overall sense it's well enough to talk about individual projects, but how that fits into the overall planning of the health services in the province – what is the criteria being used for assessing each of these projects as they go along their way through the different stages?

Particularly, I wasn't clear, even though the minister responded, about the issue of St. Mike's, the children's hospital, Alberta Hospital Edmonton. I'm still not clear. Are they still at the request stage? Are they in the programming stage? Are they in design? I don't know if I want to beg an answer on each one of these today. Although the minister responded, I'm still not clear what the dollar amount represents in terms of what phase they're at.

The minister didn't respond to my question – again, it's just for my own interests that it's been raised to me – about how we assess depreciation, or how we look at at what point something just has to be replaced, whether that's on an actual physical basis or in terms of its health provision basis. I'm glad to hear the minister say that we don't always want to build Taj Mahals and state-of-the-art everything: this, that, and all the rest. I agree. When you take a reasonable, efficient, effective approach to these things, you're providing quality services for Albertans. At the same time, the Fort Saskatchewan one is a case, or, as I said, the Vegreville one, where the patient can't even be lifted onto

the toilet properly, or any other variety of examples throughout the province where it just seems that it's fallen to such a level of outdatedness. So I don't know. Does the board have to kick-start that, or are there some criteria within the planning, or what?

Again, the same question comes with respect to the Walter C. Mackenzie. I mean, it's still being assessed at whatever, \$400 million, as a deemed asset, which is ridiculous in terms of how you'd ever sell that and, if you did sell it, what it would be sold for, so it's sort of related to that issue in terms of depreciation, not to mention replacement.

I still didn't get an answer on this jurisdictional question. I hate to keep nagging away at it, but I hear, for instance, as I said, that in Vegreville they claim they were told by Department of Health officials: "Give us plans for a whole new complex here, a whole new long-term care centre. Give us the plans for that." They do that, and then they get turned around and they get told by public works: "Oh, no, no. We're not going to do that. Just give us plans for a 40-bed addition or a new wing." Even on that, then, they get stalled in terms of their timetable and the rest. So it's those mixed messages and the kind of jurisdictional issue which still puzzle me and, I think, frustrate a lot of Albertans.

I'd like to believe the minister in terms of the funding appropriation being adequate for this year. I don't know how we in Her Majesty's Loyal Official Opposition can possibly believe that. Last year they were out \$41 million. Things were going along just fine, the weather was good and all the rest, and they needed a special warrant of \$41 million. Maybe I can do some homework to determine how many special warrants they needed in this department over the last few years and whether this is a recurring pattern, whether we are responsibly looking at it in terms of the \$135 million being asked for today from Her Majesty's supply, whether that in fact is realistic, or whether they're trying to cook the books here – or trying to show that they really don't need this and get a better sense that some of these projects might just zoom along, and we know that, and we need to have it in the budget and have it better reflected.

So, as I said, I'd like to trust the minister, but, you know, there is a certain cynicism that's built in when we hear that this minister doesn't want to play politics with health care nor with hospital construction. I mean, this is the same minister who went up to Athabasca-La Biche and told them, "Now, if you want to get anything done, you vote Tory," and all the rest. It strains credibility; it strains belief, Mr. Chairman. I know I was temperate, and I want to remain temperate, but sometimes I do get a temper, and it's when I hear those kinds of patently political remarks coming and, as I say, playing politics with a very essential part of our system, which is the health care facility side. So we're hoping. We're praying. We can only trust that things will improve over there.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. KOWALSKI: I think generally, Mr. Chairman, the last comments by the Member for Edmonton-Centre are the ones that really moved me to respond at this point in time, because I do want to emphasize and reamplify one more time that that does really not – I don't know where one gets this kind of reputation, but one is here to serve the public, and this business about anything else is an interpretation that's really one I don't deserve to have.

I want to assure the hon. member that we're talking about responding to the needs of people. I don't know. He quotes

something from some newspaper in Athabasca. I remember getting up in the House and saying: "Hey, come on. Show it to me, guys, and prove it to me, because it isn't so." But that's okay; if they want to believe it, they can.

But, Mr. Chairman, one thing the member did say really did catch my attention. He said a lot of things, but this one point in particular, which is important to me, I do want to make a comment on right now. Actually, there are two. First of all, if there's any difficulty that may have existed in terms of the transfer that occurred in 1988 as result of Public Works, Supply and Services now getting involved in this system and still having Alberta Health as part of it – both departments will work together and work together very, very co-operatively. But if there is a case that comes to the attention of the hon. member or to the attention of any member in this House, that perhaps officials from either department are giving different stories, then please, please – I'm going to look into this one and try and get to the bottom of it, because that's the last thing in the world that we want to see happen. I mean, it just shouldn't be different messages coming from two departments, and in fact be one or the other.

The other point that the hon. member should know is that fiscal responsibility is very important to me. I don't like special warrants, and I don't like coming back half-way through, and I don't cook books. There is a way of standing up here and then getting hammered the other way from the hon. member. I can keep all of these projects that are ready to go and not put them out to tender till next January or February, and there will be very little expended. Then I'll stand up here in the estimates next year, and, heck, only 50 percent of the budget has been expended. I'm sure the hon. member would not give me the golden award for fiscal responsibility and management. He would then hammer me, saying: "Boy, now you really blew it. You're going the other way." So, hon. member, you've got to have more trust. If you follow the same God that I do, He's a good God that cares. Just have a little more trust. We will try and put these projects out over a 12-month period with the best resources and intelligence that can be put into it. And they're not my resources and not my intelligence. I will use somebody else's and ultimately make the decision to make sure that I'm covered and checked, and we'll try and come in right on time. But there will be cases where projects will go and we will have to spend more to get the job finished. I want the hon. member to relax and feel a little assured about that, and maybe next year he'll be a little more generous.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now the hon. Member for Westlock-Sturgeon.

MR. TAYLOR: Just very short, Mr. Chairman. First, I'm disappointed that the minister is not going to participate or importune on my behalf in lobbying the Minister of Health. I was looking forward to his obvious swing and knowledge of the area to arrange an appointment with the Minister of Health for me. You know, she's one of the most difficult people to meet in the province. But no dice.

The second is to get back to the question on the Immaculata hospital putting up money for land. The minister quite rightly made the statement – and I maybe didn't make it clear that I already knew – that the board has to put up the money for the land. That's fine when you're going to go ahead and build a hospital. But when you have a minister that's suspended the hospital building indefinitely, shouldn't it be the responsibility of the government to pay for the land? Because the land was

acquired on the basis that the government had said to go ahead and start building. So I think that where the local board has been put to vesting for their share, which you properly say is right, under the idea that you're going ahead and building a hospital and then that hospital is canceled or suspended indefinitely – and the financing that we're talking about is very small, \$100,000, \$150,000, to what this government spends – why couldn't this government go ahead and give the money back to the board until they're going to go ahead with the building and then ask the board to put the money up?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, a point of clarification on the hospital in Westlock that the hon. member is speaking on behalf of. Of course, it has not been canceled. It's under the deferral program that we talked about, and there will be a point in time in which we'll do it. But the point that the hon. member makes – if we're talking here about having 5,000 people in Westlock mad at the government because of \$100,000, I'm sure we'll be happy to take a look at it, and then we can assume that 5,000 people in Westlock will be really delighted if we respond appropriately, and the hon. member will tell everybody in Westlock. Because we don't want anybody upset. We're just simply trying to do the job, to provide the best health care service in the province of Alberta within the means that we have, Mr. Chairman.

I appreciate the comments made by the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon, and I will, after his constant harassment with respect to this matter, speak to my colleague the Minister of Health to see if sometime during 1990 she'll have an opportunity to meet with the hon. gentleman to get more.

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

HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does the committee approve all estimates of the Capital Fund, 1990-91, that have been referred to the committee and have not yet been voted upon? Agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Opposed? Carried.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee rise and report.

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. All hon. members would like to be properly dressed or else retire from the House, please. Minister of Forestry, Lands and Wildlife. Perhaps the pages would be good enough to remove that other jacket. Thank you. Member for Drumheller.

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

Resolved that sums 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.

Public Works, Supply and Services: \$135,272,000, Construction of Hospitals and Nursing Homes; \$102,294,000, Construction of Water Development Projects; \$16,570,000, Construction of Government Facilities.

Resolved that a sum from the Alberta Capital Fund not exceeding the following be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1990, for the department and purpose indicated.

Public Works, Supply and Services: \$41,000,000, Construction of Hospitals and Nursing Homes.

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed? Carried. Thank you.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, I request unanimous consent to revert to Introduction of Bills.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Having heard the request, those in favour, please say aye.

HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

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

head: **Introduction of Bills**  
(*reversion*)

**Bill 39**  
**Appropriation Act, 1990**

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill 39, Appropriation Act, 1990. This being a money Bill, Her Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor, having been informed of the contents of this Bill, recommends the same to the Assembly.

[Leave granted; Bill 39 read a first time]

**Bill 40**  
**Appropriation (Alberta Capital Fund) Act, 1990**

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill 40, Appropriation (Alberta Capital Fund) Act, 1990. This being a money Bill, Her Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor, having been informed of the contents of this Bill, recommends the same to the Assembly.

[Leave granted; Bill 40 read a first time]

**Bill 41**  
**Appropriation (Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund,  
Capital Projects Division) Act, 1990-91**

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill 41, Appropriation (Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund, Capital Projects Division) Act, 1990-91. This being a money Bill, Her Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor, having been informed of the contents of this Bill, recommends the same to the Assembly.

[Leave granted; Bill 41 read a first time]

MR. SPEAKER: Procedural?

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, now that the Committee of Supply has concluded, future business by the government will be Government Bills and Orders.

MR. SPEAKER: Perhaps with the agreement of the House we might revert to tidying up a point of order which was brought up at the end of question period today.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place, speaking briefly to it in conclusion, followed by the Member for Red Deer-North.

MR. McINNIS: As I was saying, the Member for Red Deer-North . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Excuse me, hon. member, I just want to make sure that we're all on base here. Thank you.

Edmonton-Jasper Place is now recognized.

MR. McINNIS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Member for Red Deer-North, prior to his leaving the Chamber at the end of question period, alleged that I had said that Sweden should live up to Alberta's standards 10 years in the future, and I can't imagine a more damaging set of words for him to put in my mouth. The Swedish standard in the year 2002 is zero, and today in Alberta this licence that was issued to Daishowa allows 2,800 kilograms per day of organic chloride pollution. Now, I'd like to explain the difference to the member between zero and 2,800. If you had 2,800 kilograms dumped on your head, you would be very wet, and you would have a lot of toxic pollution all over your body. If it was zero, you would be clean and dry.

MR. DAY: Well, speaking to the purported point of order, Mr. Speaker, my remarks were very clear. I said, speaking from the Blues,

I was encouraged today somewhat to hear from an opposition member that Sweden hopes to have in place by the end of the century standards we have in place today. But I'd like some clarification.

Mr. Speaker, I did not name any particular member; I did not say whether I heard it in the House. I think what we're hearing here today is a reflection of the egotistical bent of this member who rises on a daily basis and pollutes the waters of understanding of the people of Alberta in terms of our environmental standards. I cannot believe how his egotism has caused him to think that there is a point of order here.

I would suggest in closing, Mr. Speaker, that this is not a point of order; it is a point of clarification and a point of embarrassment for the member opposite, and I would suggest that his approaches fall like casual dandruff on the fabric of his integrity.

MR. SPEAKER: There obviously is no point of order. It's one of those misunderstandings between members.

[At 5:23 p.m. the House adjourned to Thursday at 2:30 p.m.]

