

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA**

Title: **Tuesday, June 20, 1989 2:30 p.m.**  
Date: 89/06/20

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

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

**PRAYERS**

MR. SPEAKER: Let us pray.

We give thanks to God for the rich heritage of this province as found in our people.

We pray that native-born Albertans and those who have come from other places may continue to work together to preserve and enlarge the precious heritage called Alberta.

Amen.

**head: READING AND RECEIVING PETITIONS**

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark.

MR. MITCHELL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would ask that the Clerk read and receive the petition that I presented on Friday.

CLERK:

To the Honourable, the Legislative Assembly of Alberta, in Legislature assembled:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Honourable Assembly take whatever steps necessary to impress upon the Government of Canada the importance of not applying any proposed National Sales Tax upon music lessons in Alberta.

**head: INTRODUCTION OF BILLS****Bill 244****An Act to Amend the Assured Income for the Severely Handicapped Act**

MS MJOLSNESS: I request leave to introduce Bill 244, An Act to Amend the Assured Income for the Severely Handicapped Act.

This Bill will prevent the provincial government from deducting Canada Pension Plan disability benefits from individuals on the assured income for the severely handicapped.

[Leave granted; Bill 244 read a first time]

**head: TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS**

MR. MAIN: Mr. Speaker, I have with me four copies of the annual report '87-88 of the Alberta Foundation for the Performing Arts, which I'd like to table with the House.

MR. GIBEAULT: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table four copies with the Assembly on behalf of my constituent Mr. Spencer regarding his protest at the Legislature.

**head: INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure, sir, to introduce to you and through you to Members of the Legislative Assembly a group of 48 students from Woodbridge Farms school in the constituency of Sherwood Park. They're joined by Mr. Neil Horne and Mrs. Lynnda MacKechnie. They are seated in the members' gallery, and I would ask if they would rise and receive the warm welcome of the Legislative Assembly.

MRS. BLACK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce to you and through you to the members of the Assembly a very long and dear friend of ours. He is seated in your gallery. He is the former member of this Legislature from Calgary-North West, Dr. Stan Cassin. I'd ask him to rise and receive the wishes of the Assembly.

MS MJOLSNESS: It is my pleasure today to introduce to you and to members of the Assembly three individuals who are all board members of Disabilities Unlimited. This is a group that advocates on behalf of persons with disabilities and works towards enhancing their quality of life. I would ask that Bruce Miller, Audrey Lee, and Roberta Devaul stand and receive the warm welcome of the Assembly.

MR. MITCHELL: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure to introduce to you and to Members of the Legislative Assembly 25 students from Rio Terrace school. They are accompanied today by their teacher Mrs. Rachel Anderson and by parents Mrs. Doreen Schneider, Mrs. Marlene Pallard, and Mrs. Kathy Polack. I would ask that they all stand and receive the welcome of the Legislative Assembly.

MR. GIBEAULT: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce to you and the other members of the Assembly this afternoon a group of 52 students from Weinlos school in the constituency of Edmonton-Mill Woods. They're accompanied today by their teachers Mr. Glenn Sharpies and Mr. Bob Foo and parent Jo-Ann McMillan. I'd ask them now to stand in the gallery and receive the warm welcome of the House.

**head: ORAL QUESTION PERIOD****Taxation Policy**

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, to the Treasurer, the man with rose-coloured glasses, Magic Johnston. The Fraser Institute, the ideological godfather of the Conservative Party, released a report yesterday that seemed to contradict this government's claim that Albertans are the lowest taxed citizens in Canada. We can quibble about what they're including and all the rest of it, and I agree with the Treasurer that royalties should not be included. But say that as it may, there are a lot of other taxes that they are including. I think the point they're making is that average Alberta families are taxed and taxed heavily in this country. My question, then, to the Treasurer. Will the Treasurer now finally admit that average Alberta families are paying too much in taxes in this province?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, of course, the fact that anybody who pays taxes may well argue that you're paying far too much tax -- and I would be one who would start there. But to

argue more fully, in comparison to the context of the member's question, that Alberta's paying more taxes under the so-called Walker institute approach is, in fact, wrong. There's no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that the Fraser Institute, Dr. Walker, used many of the similar approaches used by the opposition in their press releases: faulty analysis, poor information, and misleading statements. So I can understand why the Member for Edmonton-Norwood has adopted the position taken by the Fraser Institute, because it follows the same kind of approach that he would take.

Now, usually I give the member more credit for an analysis than, in fact, what he's displayed here today. You know -- and he's already admitted it -- that the Walker analysis of the Fraser Institute is faulty because of course they're including the royalty income in the calculation of taxes. Now, everybody knows that if you were to sell your house, you would not be selling it; you'd be generating income. You'd be selling an asset. Even the Member for Edmonton-Norwood with his socialist background probably would recognize that if it came to filing his taxes.

Mr. Speaker, at the same time, the Fraser Institute includes such things as the average taxes paid in the province based on average incomes. Now, just think about that for a minute. We know in Alberta as a result of the unemployment statistics here just last week that more people are employed at higher average salaries in Alberta than anywhere else. So if you apply all the average taxes, essentially federal taxes, to a person working in Alberta, obviously you're going to have average higher taxes. The facts are clear, and we have put the facts on the table in our Budget Address, and I certainly refer all members to that analysis, showing quite clearly that Albertans have the lowest personal taxes in Canada and no sales tax and in combination with all other provinces have the absolute lowest tax regime in Canada. Be not misled by the statements of others, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you; thank you.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, everybody always has a faulty analysis, everybody else in Canada but this Treasurer. Isn't that amazing. He's the only one with the truth.

But, Mr. Speaker, I agree, taking off the royalties, and I already said that. But the report also showed that an average Alberta family this year will pay 45 percent of its income in taxes, and that's the truth. Taxes have gone up 9 percent from last year while household income has gone up 7 percent. Add that on to inflation, and average Alberta families are paying a lot more. My question to this Treasurer is this. The government promised during the election that taxes would go down. In reality taxes have gone up. When can we look forward to taxes coming down, as they promised in the last election?

MR. JOHNSTON: Ah, how soon they forget, Mr. Speaker. I'd love to draw the member's attention to the July '88 announcement when in fact we did reduce the temporary flat tax. You've heard all Albertans understand clearly the Premier's position that he would like to see taxes go down and would look at the first opportunity to remove the balance of that flat tax. Now, that's a view shared by the Conservative government because we know that we want to put disposable income back in the hands of Albertans, maintain their spending power, and give them the rewards to invest in this province. It's a very simple

formula we in Alberta have identified, and we're going to stick to that mandate.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I'm glad to see the Member for Edmonton-Norwood associate himself with this institute's report, because the experts and economists across Canada laugh at this. They say that this is a public relations event, not a serious academic review. Everyone knows that this report is fraught with difficulties, fraught with misinformation, and I'm glad to see the Member for Edmonton-Norwood has identified in his thinking process with the same kind of misinformation that's given in this report.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, everybody that disagrees with the government, including the Conference Board and every other institute, is fraught with inaccuracies. But the reality is to Alberta families . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. MARTIN: The question's coming. [interjection] Boomer's going to get excited. He's going to have a heart attack over there, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: We don't want anyone to have a heart attack, but I'd sure like to hear a supplementary question, please.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, my question is: in view of the fact that taxes have gone up and the government deliberately misled the people during the election, because they said taxes would go down, can we at least go to this? In the next budget will this Treasurer now unequivocally state that taxes will not go up on Alberta average families?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, they may as well ask me about 2025. They know that we have a very good fiscal plan here before the Assembly, which is now being debated. They know that there's very little fault with that plan, including the fact that there are no income tax increases. We have here in the last couple of weeks the prime example: the Member for Edmonton-Norwood and the Member for Edmonton-Glengarry, whom I now refer to as the Blues Brothers. You know, Mr. Speaker, it has to be dreary and dull and rainy and blue for these two people to be on their feet spouting that kind of nonsense. Everyone in Alberta knows that prosperity is here. The province is on the return. Investment levels are strong, more people employed than ever before, and clearly the lowest taxes of any province in Canada, right here in Alberta. We're proud of that record, and we stand by it.

MR. SPEAKER: Second main question. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MARTIN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I knew it was raining outside, but I didn't know it'd be as windy in here.

#### **Exploration and Development Incentive Program**

MR. MARTIN: My question is to the Minister of Energy. Time and time again it's been proven in this Legislature and outside this Legislature that this government cannot be trusted to stand up to Ottawa. I'm talking specifically about the budget. The Premier said it was okay to reduce their deficit at the ex-

pense of Alberta's Treasury. In that budget the early elimination of the Canadian exploration and development incentive program has probably cheated Alberta producers out of some \$65 million. The Bill that ends this program was recently before a Commons committee in Ottawa looking at it. That Commons committee asked this minister if he would come and talk to the committee about the impact on Alberta. Apparently this minister refused, and I want to ask the minister: why did this minister refuse to go to that committee when he could have made a strong, forceful case about how this was hurting Alberta and Alberta producers?

MR. ORMAN: Mr. Speaker, let me first say that I have made a number of representations to Ottawa. I had the first opportunity to discuss the matter with Jake Epp, the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, on the telephone. I expressed to him at that time my concern with the expiration of the CEDIP program. I subsequently confirmed in writing to Mr. Epp and to other Alberta MPs that I had a concern with the expiration of that program and the manner in which it was handled. I thereafter met with Mr. Epp in Weyburn, Saskatchewan, last week, along with the Minister of Energy and Mines from Saskatchewan. In a meeting in Weyburn at that time I expressed my concerns on behalf of this government and the industry on the manner in which the CEDIP program expired. I feel that I have done very good representation to Ottawa, Mr. Speaker, and I will continue to do it. As a matter of fact, today I'm having my staff arrange another meeting for myself and Mr. Epp the first week in July.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, the point is that Mr. Epp has no power. He didn't even know about it until the budget came down. You could talk to him all you want. This committee offered a chance for this minister to make a strong, forceful case to all parties. My question is: besides talking to his buddy Mr. Epp, why did he not go down there and stand up for Alberta right at that committee?

MR. ORMAN: Mr. Speaker, first let me say that I had a request by a member of that committee, the NDP MP for Edmonton East. My staff explained to that member that I do not believe it is appropriate that I make those representations to Ottawa through the committee, and if this member is suggesting that some NDP member in northeast Edmonton has more clout than the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, I don't believe that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MARTIN: What an arrogant answer. Minister Epp went to that committee, Mr. Speaker. Are you above Minister Epp? You won't even go and stand up for Alberta because of protocol? Is that what you're saying?

MR. ORMAN: Mr. Speaker, the tradition in this country is very straightforward, and that is that ministers meet with other ministers of the Crown for other provinces and the federal government to deal with the problems that face their particular jurisdictions on a one-on-one basis. If Mr. Epp had some particular difficulty with his colleagues in the way that the CEDIP program was handled, I cannot make an apology for that. I will continue to make my representations. I have, in person, to Alberta MPs. I will again see Mr. Epp and express my concern and continue to stand up for the industry in this province.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Calgary-North West, followed by Clover Bar.

### **Dominion Glass Plant in Redcliff**

MR. BRUSEKER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was pleased to hear the Provincial Treasurer talking about the glories of investment in Alberta here, because I have some questions about a glass plant he may be interested in. Yesterday we learned that the government has offered \$7.5 million in grants to attempt to keep the plant open. This government has made a commitment of \$75 million to support the development of infrastructure for 1,300 northern pulp mill jobs. Given that kind of a ratio, the government could be offering \$28.6 million to support Dominion Glass. My question is to the Premier. Why is this government placing such a high emphasis on northern pulp mill expansion rather than maintaining an established business in Redcliff?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, first, the hon. member is using a series of statistics and comments that I'm not prepared to accept on his part without looking into it further. He and his party have consistently been so incorrect in their comments to the House that a person should not take any of their allegations as being correct.

But, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister of Economic Development and Trade dealt with this matter in some detail yesterday. He negotiated with the company. He may want to add to my reply. There's no question that the government of Alberta offered to do everything possible to help the company maintain their operation, maintain their work force in the Redcliff area. The company made a corporate decision not to do it.

MR. BRUSEKER: Well, my second question is to the Premier. Why didn't the government get involved earlier in maintaining this business in terms of developing some innovative economic development planning, which you claim you're so good at, including diversification of markets, instead of a last-minute, band-aid solution?

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. member. Let's get with it.

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, we've been involved for quite some time. The previous minister of economic development and the present Member for Medicine Hat had been involved when it was still under the corporate structure of Domglas. We also have had intensive discussions with the present president of Consumers Packaging, Mr. Thomas Timmouth. I talked to him again today to see if there was any possibility of reconsideration of this. We indicated to him by way of a letter plus at a meeting we did have with him on a personal basis some weeks ago whereby the Member for Medicine Hat, the Member for Cypress-Redcliff, and myself met with him to leave him with the assurance that we would do everything within our power to see the maintenance of that plant in Redcliff.

MR. BRUSEKER: Well, the logical question then is: if you've been working with the company for so long, why have you failed to save those jobs for Albertans?

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, the decision was a corporate decision made because of the consumer preferences that have

shifted over the years, if one examines. Even our milk consumption: at one time it was in bottles; now it's in milk cartons. One looks at the beer consumption; it has shifted to cans. We look at juice consumption; it has shifted to Tetra Pak. There is nothing we would have liked better -- and we feel in our own minds that we did not leave a stone unturned as it relates to this issue. Notwithstanding that fact, we're going to continue to work very closely with the two MLAs concerned and community groups to see if we can't attract other industry to that area to offset this job loss situation, because we recognize the seriousness of the problem, and we want to work very closely with the community involved.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Clover Bar, followed by Calgary-Mountain View, Edmonton-Whitemud, Athabasca-Lac La Biche.

### **Job Training Programs for New Industries**

MR. GESELL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is directed to the hon. Minister of Career Development and Employment. With the considerable number of initiatives and projects that are occurring throughout Alberta and that are proposed, there will be a requirement for an adequate and skilled work force. What role will the minister's office play to see that we have a skilled work force to achieve these projects?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I think, first of all, the department obviously has a number of skill-enhancing programs, and it would take a long time to cite those. I would say, for the hon. member's information, that the apprenticeship program would probably be closest to the program that would produce the kinds of employees that many of the major construction areas that are coming into the province would need.

As well, Mr. Speaker, the government of Alberta has many skilled journeymen within the employment area, and we have now introduced a \$2 million program that will see apprentices working within the province.

MR. GESELL: Mr. Speaker, in 1988 there were 40,000 jobs created. We are looking at 10,000 in construction for the projects and another 4,000 permanent jobs. Where will that work force come from? Do we have sufficient people in Alberta?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, it is important to note that there will be a number of ministers involved in awareness programs, but in particular we are going to try to reach a number of the particular communities that have not accessed what we call nontraditional jobs. We have a large number of women we hope will be interested, particularly in the apprenticeship area: immigrants, older workers. As a matter of fact, I had a meeting at noon today with a group that works with the over-45 category, and we think there are a whole host of people who, if made aware of the opportunities available, will look to the apprenticeship and other programs.

MR. GESELL: Mr. Speaker, in a number of instances the projects are very large. There are very specific new industries to Alberta, and they will require some very specific employment characteristics. How will the minister address those specialized needs that we might see for those new industries?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, once again I would have to identify a specific program. I believe I've raised it before in response to possibly the hon. Member for Athabasca-Lac La Biche in his questions about the various projects in his and other related areas. As well, I believe the hon. Member for Clover Bar will be having a major project. We would see the tailor-made training program as the one, again, that could be best utilized when we talk about a specific geographic area, working with the industry itself, and training the people who are indigenous to that area.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Calgary-Mountain View, followed by Edmonton-Whitemud.

### **Funding of World Blitz Chess Championship**

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In recent days the Minister of Tourism has told this Legislature his department used care and diligence before granting public funds towards the cost of a now-defunct chess tournament in Calgary. However, they made a payment as late as May 1989, after it was well-known that creditors were not being paid, private backing had not come through, a key organizer was under suspicion because of an NBC documentary, and nothing had been produced or performed by the organizers under the contract since late October 1988, seven months earlier. What could possibly have persuaded the minister and his department to commit public funds towards the expenses of this event as late as May of this year?

MR. SPARROW: Mr. Speaker, again the preamble of the question is very much in doubt, and I have to take disagreement with it. Very definitely work was done with the city of Calgary and early in January and February with the Associated Canadian Travellers, and contracts were put into place. Only after the contracts with the new organization of ACT did the funds flow in early May.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Well, Mr. Speaker, the tournament was scheduled for July of this year. When it was obvious to everyone else by March or April of this year at the latest that this tournament was going nowhere, what was revealed by this minister's department's investigation that convinced them to throw away public money as late as May of this year?

MR. SPARROW: Mr. Speaker, again I must reiterate. We had a contract with the proponents, and it wasn't a grant, as we fall into that category quite often. They had produced the agreement, as I said earlier, with the city of Calgary, who had an agreement with ACT. By contract our payment was due and payable, and the department decided with the facts they had at the time to allow the funds to flow.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Mr. Speaker, if his department did everything right in its investigation, all we have left is the minister. Will he tell the Legislature: was it his decision to proceed with the payment as late as May of 1989?

MR. SPARROW: The answer to that, Mr. Speaker, is no.

### Industrial Waste Site in Edmonton-Whitemud

MR. WICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Minister of the Environment assured this House that he would reply to questions pertaining to the use of a Crown-owned site as an industrial waste storage site. I realize that the minister is searching for answers to those questions, but subsequently I have learned that low-level PCBs were indeed found on Crown-owned land. My question to the Minister of the Environment: is he prepared to respond as to what type of contaminants were indeed found on this site?

MR. SPEAKER: Before the minister responds, the Chair was indeed informed before question period that the minister was going to supplement the information at the end of question period, so that's fine. Please, Mr. Minister.

MR. KLEIN: I can, Mr. Speaker, do it now or do it later; it doesn't really matter.

MR. SPEAKER: Now.

MR. FOX: Why wait for spring?

MR. KLEIN: Do it now.

According to the information received from the department, Mr. Speaker, Alberta Environment investigated the site last summer and confirmed indeed the presence of PCBs. The department requested the site be fenced immediately to restrict public access from nearby residents, and apparently that was done. They confirmed that Public Works, Supply and Services would be responsible for the site cleanup to Alberta Environment standards. Alberta Environment's role is restricted to that of regulator and technical advice relative to the cleanup. Public Works, Supply and Services has carried out site characterization through a private contractor. I understand site decontamination and reclamation plans are to be implemented by Public Works, Supply and Services to the satisfaction of Alberta Environment, and I understand that work is being contracted now. I think I would defer to my colleague the Minister of Public Works, Supply and Services to respond relative to the status of the site cleanup.

MR. WICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, to the minister of public works. Will the minister respond to the question as to the cost of the cleanup and whose responsibility it is for the cleanup?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, last August when Alberta Environment brought to the attention of Public Works, Supply and Services that in fact there were low-level PCBs found on site -- and I might point out that the standard that's used in our country and the standard that's used in the province of Alberta is 5 parts per million in a residential area -- there were a series of samples. They basically indicated that in seven samples there were 2.2 parts per million PCBs, one sample at 4.7 parts per million, and then there were 18 samples taken with nondetectable levels of contaminants within the soil.

Last August two small parcels were fenced off. There has been an individual that has been patrolling the area since then. Stanley Associates was hired as a waste management consultant to deal with this particular matter, Mr. Speaker, and since that time a series of initiatives has been undertaken. One is the

determination of the method of reclamation; secondly, the determination of the amount of surface oil that would have to be removed; and thirdly, there would be a determination of the detailed reclamation plan. Part of the cost of arriving at a solution would include the cost of a public meeting that will be held later this week in the area. It's anticipated that the total cost to reclaim these two small portions of land will be upwards of \$1 million. I was made aware of this matter on June 5, Mr. Speaker, and on June 5 directed that the expenditure level of \$1 million should be undertaken to deal with this, and work is now under way.

MR. WICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, to the minister of public works. Is the minister telling me that this situation has been allowed to go on for almost a year while residential properties are being built adjacent to it, residential properties with children living in those homes, and at the same time no concrete action has been taken up to now, prior to the matter being raised in the House, to correct this situation?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, I really would ask everybody, then, to review the Blues, because it seems to me that just in the last minute or two I've outlined at least six to eight to 10 different initiatives that have been under way since August of 1988. For the Member for Edmonton-Whitemud to stand there and pound his chest and say that this was only dealt with because he all of a sudden stumbled on something is absolutely silly.

The second point, Mr. Speaker, that is really important: I've already given the statistics in terms of the level of contamination. It's the standard used in Canada, in Alberta, and in the city of Edmonton, and this member knows full well what that standard is, having served on the council of the city of Edmonton. The samples that I've outlined all fall below the standard considered for safety at all. So for the member to suggest that there is any situation of danger to anyone is absolutely misleading and is detrimental to what I think is the dignity of a member of this Assembly.

### Forestry Projects in Northern Alberta

MR. CARDINAL: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. minister of forestry. As the minister is very well aware, my constituency is within the Canada/Alberta northern development boundary, which was established about 15 years ago. This boundary identifies an area that's socially and economically depressed. I have communities of 3,000 people within that boundary that presently face unemployment of 80 to 90 percent. We have one chance, one opportunity, to diversify the economy in our region and be equal with the rest of Alberta: the very projects that the opposition is trying to cancel at this time. And they talk about the welfare trap. My question to the hon. minister is: what assurance can he give this Assembly that these projects will not be canceled and will be done within the time line planned originally?

MR. FJORDBOTEN: Mr. Speaker, our commitment to the development and diversification of the economy in this province is without parallel by anyone anywhere. Each one of the projects that is approved in northern Alberta now, of course, is subject to an environmental impact assessment process, and we want to be sure that there's an adequate length of time taken to review that. We have taken that time and will continue to do so.

We want to see those projects continue, and I support us continuing on that process. I support the work of the Minister of the Environment, working with all due haste to make sure that we move and don't disadvantage the companies in any way, because we all recognize the importance for job creation in northern Alberta.

MR. CARDINAL: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. minister of forestry again. What assurance can you give this Assembly that when the forest management agreements are signed, local small operators will be involved and considered in the agreement?

MR. FJORBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, in that particular area that the hon. member raises, in the Alberta-Pacific project small operators were certainly recognized, and negotiations in working towards a forest management agreement, that is not yet signed but that we're working towards, leaves much opportunity for small operators. We want to make sure that they're protected, that their quotas are protected, and that the miscellaneous timber units have been set up so that small operators can grow and thrive in that area and in all areas of Alberta.

MR. CARDINAL: My question is directed to the hon. Minister of Career Development and Employment. Because of the high unemployment rate in my constituency, what assurance can you give me that you'll look at opening up regional offices in north-east Alberta?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, ordinarily we make provision for a committee, as I discussed the other day in question period, but I think that given the amount of activity that's potentially in that region, I would certainly have to assess the need for an office.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Calgary-Forest Lawn, followed by Edmonton-Meadowlark, then Wainwright.

#### **Alberta Royalty Tax Credit Program**

MR. PASHAK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Last Friday in this Assembly the Minister of Energy said that changes in the Alberta royalty tax credit program are under, and I quote, "active consideration." Well, when I questioned his predecessor on the same matter in this Assembly over a year ago, he told me pretty much the same thing: that the government was studying the matter. To the Minister of Energy. Given that during the time the government has been studying the matter, hundreds of millions of dollars of revenue have been lost to the provincial Treasury, when does the government plan to stop studying and start acting to change the program? What's the minister's time line?

MR. ORMAN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is stating the absurd when he says that we have lost hundreds of millions of dollars under that program. The Alberta royalty tax credit program is a very important part of the small producers' cash flow. We do not want to move in a way that is without consultation, and if the hon. Member for Calgary-Forest Lawn is suggesting that, we won't accept it.

MR. PASHAK: No, Mr. Speaker, it's the majors that have been

benefiting to the tune of hundreds of millions of dollars, not the small producers.

My supplementary to the Minister of Energy is: given that last Friday in this Assembly the minister did not answer my question on how much revenue has been lost to the provincial Treasury, through bending of the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I'm sorry, hon. member; that's still inappropriate.

MR. PASHAK: Well, I'll ask the minister again the same question. How much money has the provincial Treasury lost through bending of the associate ownership rules under the royalty tax credit program?

MR. ORMAN: Mr. Speaker, I would be pleased to discuss that matter with the hon. member during the discussion of the Department of Energy estimates in this Assembly. I cannot put a price tag on the program, which goes back to 1974, at this particular time. But I again reject any suggestion that this money is somehow lost or frittered away. If that's his belief, Mr. Speaker, then he's not talking to the industry, and I suggest that he should start.

MR. PASHAK: Well, I am talking to the minister, and I have made some specific suggestions, and I'll make them again. Given that the only specific change to the royalty tax credit program that the minister has come forward with is moving to a price-sensitive regime, why won't the minister tell this Assembly that he'll reduce the cap on the Alberta royalty tax credit program, perhaps down to a half million dollars, and at the same time target that program more effectively at small producers?

MR. ORMAN: Mr. Speaker, I do not recall not alluding to that point in question period last. I can tell the hon. member, though, that I have met with the small producers, I have met with IPAC, and I have met with other members of the industry to talk about the Alberta royalty tax credit program. Some of the recommendations that have come to me and to my predecessor deal with the ceiling and the percentage of the credit. We'll be taking that under active consideration. I did indicate to the hon. member that I met with IPAC last week. We discussed those issues that were on the table; they're part of the recommendation. In due course and when we reach something that satisfies both the needs of the small producer and the requirements of this government, we'll be bringing something forward as a recommendation.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Meadowlark.

#### **Alberta-Pacific Project**

MR. MITCHELL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Pulp mills produce sulphur emissions. [interjections] It's nice to know that they caught on to that.

A recent study by Dr. Hulbert of the University of the Alberta indicates that sulphur emissions are a much more serious health hazard than was originally thought to be the case. To the Minister of the Environment. Is the minister aware that the Athabasca pulp mill will be spewing eight tonnes of sulphur equivalents into the air each day?

MR. KLEIN: We're aware, Mr. Speaker, as a result of the environmental impact assessment documents that were submitted, that the company, Alberta-Pacific, is trying to live up to all the environmental standards that are in place today, which according to our information are state of the world standards. If, indeed, through the environmental impact assessment process and the review by the public review committee, the citizens' committee, it's found to be deficient, then the company will be asked to correct those deficiencies and comply with the standards.

MR. MITCHELL: Mr. Speaker, eight tonnes is exactly what they talk about in this document . . .

MR. SPEAKER: No exhibits, hon. member. Order please.

MR. MITCHELL: . . . their own document. Why would the minister allow eight tonnes of sulphur equivalents to be spewed into the air by this pulp plant when, in fact, the Energy Resources Conservation Board in this province will allow only one tonne per day to be spewed into the air by gas plants? How is it that he can say these are meeting world standards when his own standard for gas plants is in fact higher, considerably higher?

MR. KLEIN: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member is mixing apples and oranges and bananas and pears and everything else. There are all kinds of industries that are not related to the gas and oil industry or to the pulp and paper industry that emit pollutants far in excess of those mentioned by the hon. member. But relative to the particular kind of industry, those standards are deemed to be acceptable under the circumstances. As I said before, if the standards are not deemed to be acceptable, it will be identified as a deficiency and the company will be required to correct it.

MR. MITCHELL: Perhaps the minister can clarify for us now what "deemed to be acceptable" means to the residents in that area, who are going to have to contend with health hazards as inevitable as those suggested by Dr. Hulbert.

MR. KLEIN: Mr. Speaker, to the hon. member. A citizens' review board will be established. That review board . . .

MR. TAYLOR: Without funds.

MR. KLEIN: That review board will be established with funds -- with funds, Mr. Speaker -- to allow public participation. Through that public participation process, through that democratic process, if indeed deficiencies are identified and concerns are raised, the company will be requested to address those concerns and correct any deficiencies.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Wainwright, followed by Edmonton-Calder.

#### **Alcohol and Drug Abuse Counselor for Provost**

MR. FISCHER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the chairman of the Alberta Alcohol and Drug Abuse Commission. In view of the fact that Provost has been classified as having one of the more serious drug and alcohol problems in the province and the government has increased spending by 18.9 percent to

the commission, can the chairman tell me why we are still without a drug and alcohol counselor in Provost?

MR. NELSON: Mr. Speaker, the Provost and district community development centre has made a number of proposals to AADAC over the last number of years with regards to the addition of a counselor in the community. The community has been advised that Provost is on the top of the list when we are able to provide counseling services, and we have addressed this issue a number of times. It will be further addressed during the estimates when the budget of the Minister of Health and AADAC is presented in due course.

MR. FISCHER: Why couldn't Provost be facilitated through the "Slim" Thorpe Recovery Centre in Lloydminster, making use of our volunteers there as opposed to incurring the extra expense of establishing a regional office in Provost?

MR. NELSON: Mr. Speaker, to the hon. member. The request by the "Slim" Thorpe centre in Lloydminster has also been made for an additional counselor to assist Provost with their addiction concern. Again, I would suggest that the member raise some of these concerns during the discussion of the estimates, where they will be discussed completely.

MR. SPEAKER: Final, Wainwright.

MR. FISCHER: Thank you. Could you then tell me when we could expect funds to be made available for our area?

MR. NELSON: Not definitively, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

Edmonton-Calder, followed by Westlock-Sturgeon.

#### **Assured Income for the Severely Handicapped**

MS MJOLSNESS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My questions are to the Minister of Family and Social Services. In the throne speech last year this government made a promise to enhance the status, dignity, and quality of life for Albertans with disabilities. Yet this government continues to deduct dollar for dollar the Canada Pension Plan disability benefits which have been earned by recipients of the assured income for the severely handicapped. Last month the federal minister of health and welfare reiterated that this benefit was to be passed on to the poorest of the poor. How can this minister justify taking away this money, which is earned and is not the government's money, when people on AISH in Alberta are living below the poverty line?

MR. OLDRING: Mr. Speaker, the member opposite rightfully made reference to this government's commitment to those who are socially disadvantaged and need our help. She's making reference to the AISH program specifically, and it's a program that this government takes a great deal of pride in. It's a unique program here in Canada. We are the only government to have such a program. The province of B.C. has tried to emulate it, but their benefits, of course, are considerably less generous. The province of Ontario has comparable benefits, but the rules and regulations around it are much more stringent.

In reference to the deductions of CPP, Mr. Speaker, it's something that I'm addressing currently with my department

The information that I have been given indicates quite clearly that for us to do it at this time, we would be in contravention of the Canada Assistance Plan. That would jeopardize some \$15 million worth of funding to this province, and I'm just not prepared to take that risk at this time. I'll continue to review it. If we can get some information from our federal counterparts that clearly states something differently, then I'd be prepared to reassess it at that time.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary.

MS MJOLSNESS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, the federal government is saying just the opposite of what the minister just said, so I suggest that the minister check out his facts.

My supplementary question is: will this government keep its promise and enhance and improve the dignity of life for people with disabilities in this province and stop deducting this money?

MR. OLDRING: Mr. Speaker, again, this government keeps all of its promises. Time and time again we're able to stand up here and reiterate that in good conscience, because we know that we stand behind our promises. Again, as it relates to the question brought forward by the member opposite, I indicated very clearly that I'm reviewing the situation, that I'm seeking clarification from our federal counterpart. Once I've had that, I'll be able to evaluate it at that time.

MR. SPEAKER: Final supplementary.

MS MJOLSNESS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the minister. Given that the minister is reviewing and we'll have to wait and wait again, will he do at least the proper thing and increase the monthly money that is allowed under the AISH program so that these people do not have to live in poverty?

MR. OLDRING: Well, again, Mr. Speaker, I pointed out earlier that this is probably the most generous program in Canada. We are spending close to \$140 million right now, helping close to 16,000 Albertans across this province. We recognize the unique situation that they find themselves in, and we're quite prepared to help them. We've done it through this unique program. As I say, we're very proud of it. It takes a backseat to no one in Canada, and we'll continue to support this program.

MR. SPEAKER: Westlock-Sturgeon, followed by Edmonton-Beverly, Calgary-Fish Creek.

### **Sulphur Emissions**

MR. TAYLOR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's to the Minister of the Environment. The area surrounding Edmonton has three-quarters of a million people, and of course includes my own riding of Westlock-Sturgeon, and is one of the most productive agricultural areas in the world. Yet the government has allowed the proliferation of small gas plants in this area, 67 to be exact now. The mounting face of evidence, particularly by Dr. Hulbert's evidence this last weekend, is that sulphur emissions from these plants do affect one's health. Can the Minister of the Environment, in light of this new knowledge, indicate what steps, if any, he is taking to ensure that the health of the area residents is not being adversely affected by all these plants?

MR. SPEAKER: The time for question period has expired. May we have unanimous consent to complete this series of questions?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed? Carried. Thank you.  
Minister of the Environment

MR. KLEIN: Well, Mr. Speaker, the department is constantly monitoring H<sub>2</sub>S emissions to make sure that those emissions conform with the standards. If there are health problems, those problems are immediately reported and immediately acted upon. I think the hon. member would be interested in knowing that through the Alberta Environmental Centre at Vegreville this province is the leader in H<sub>2</sub>S technology. As a matter of fact, 70 percent of the technology that has developed in the world relative to H<sub>2</sub>S and the emissions and the monitoring of H<sub>2</sub>S is developed right here in the province of Alberta.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. For his knowledge, this is the only province in Canada that produces H<sub>2</sub>S, so I would hope that they would know something about it.

Back to the minister then. Is he aware, though, that in the monitoring of these gas plants that takes place, his department does not monitor for trace elements, for rare gases, or for carbon dioxide? It's only sulphur that they are monitoring for.

MR. KLEIN: Well, Mr. Speaker, if in fact the information that has been provided by the hon. member is factual information, true information, then I'm sure that we can work with the industry to remedy any situation that may cause him some concern. But as far as my knowledge goes on the matter and as a result of my briefings from the department, our standards are complete in every way, shape, and form. If there are some deficiencies, we'll be very, very happy to deal with them.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, that's what we are trying to do: to convince the minister that his department doesn't know what it's doing or the minister doesn't know what he's doing.

I would ask the minister, then, in view of this new information and in view of the fact that over 220 tonnes of sulphur dioxide -- by the way, H<sub>2</sub>S is not emitted, Mr. Speaker; it is burned and comes out as sulphur dioxide. Does he know that this 223 tonnes a day or more going into the air where three-quarters of a million people are living is now considered dangerous? What is he going to do about it?

MR. KLEIN: The standards, Mr. Speaker, under the Clean Air Act -- and the maximum levels are defined through regulation. [interjection] If he will listen, the ambient standard is .01 parts per million per hour average, and as far as I know, there is not one plant in the province exceeding those standards. If there are, then our department will check it down, and we'll make sure that those who are violating correct the situation.

MR. SPEAKER: The time for question period has expired. The Chair would like to make brief note of the fact that again today we have six members left on the question period list. Perhaps starting tomorrow we could have shorter answers as well as

shorter questions and go straight to supplementary questions, please.

### ORDERS OF THE DAY

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed? Carried. Thank you.  
Calgary-McCall.

### head: INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS (reversion)

MR. NELSON: Mr. Speaker, it's a great deal of pleasure today to have a number of young people from the Falconridge elementary school. The Falconridge elementary school has a tremendous amount of community input, and of course English as a Second Language is a major concern in the school. With the young people are teachers Mr. Richard Murphy, Bruce Hurl, Miss Deborah Fairhurst, Joris Kempers, Shiela MacDonald, and Gord Samson, along with some parents that have traveled to Edmonton with the group: Mrs. Surette, Mrs. Siemens, Mrs. Cameron, and Steve Cranton. I would like to ask if they would rise and receive the traditional welcome of the Legislature.

### head: WRITTEN QUESTIONS

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, I move that all written questions currently appearing on the Order Paper stand and retain their places on the Order Paper.

[Motion carried]

### head: MOTIONS FOR RETURNS

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, I move that the following motions for returns stand and retain their places on the Order Paper: motions for returns 154, 170, 174, 177, 179, 180, 181, 182, 184, and 186.

[Motion carried]

149. Mr. McInnis moved that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing a copy of all agreements, correspondence, and other documents covering all understandings between the Crown in the right of Alberta and Alberta Newsprint Company Ltd. or its owners in respect of construction of a pulp mill near Whitecourt and related forestry operations.

MR. McINNIS: I hope that the government will now let people know what they have agreed to in respect of this forestry development.

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move an amendment to the motion and the motion would read: that Motion for a Return 149 be amended by deleting the words "all agreements, correspondence and other documents covering all understandings" and substituting therefor the words "the forest

management agreement" and by further deleting the words "or its owners in respect of construction of a pulp mill near Whitecourt and related forestry operations."

The other information, Mr. Speaker, was all included when the announcement was made with respect to financing and infrastructure. [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair doesn't recognize anyone at this moment. The Chair is waiting to have a copy of the proposed amendment. The Chair will figure that out in a moment, folks.

While this is occurring, the Chair would also like to point out with respect to deputy House leaders for the government that it would be useful if the proposed amendments could be circulated to the Chair a bit prior to this. Thank you. The same to all members.

We will attempt to get copies made to distribute to all members in the House, but the Chair also recognizes, first of all, if the minister wishes to speak to the amendment any further.

MR. McINNIS: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: What would be the point of order, hon. member?

MR. McINNIS: The point of order is that this alleged amendment in fact amounts to negating the motion, and if the government members wish to negative the motion, they have the option of voting against it. This isn't what the motion asks for. It's not even close.

MR. SPEAKER: I'm sorry, hon. member. If you'd like to speak to the amendment, the Chair will certainly recognize you in a moment.

Hon. minister.

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: I'm proposing an amendment to the motion that the forest management agreements be published in the *Alberta Gazette* as soon as they've been signed, so of course that document would be available as soon as it is signed. The bulk of the correspondence involves members of the public service, and memos in the public service are privileged communications. The release of financial information would breach commercial confidentiality. In the announcements, when they were made, it was made extremely clear at that point: all agreements that were arrived at with the company with respect to infrastructure assistance and what for, as well as the financial arrangements that have been made. So there are no other agreements that could be filed, Mr. Speaker, and hence the amendment to the motion agreeing to file with the Assembly the motion for a return, which would include the forest management agreements if and when they're signed on each specific project.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

The Chair will indeed recognize Edmonton-Jasper Place in a moment.

But again, the Chair had made a request in the previous week to the government benches that when amendments such as these are to be presented, there be sufficient copies for all members of the House. Are there indeed sufficient copies for all members? Well, then, I think the Chair is going to have a slight adjournment of the House while copies are made so that pages can distribute them to all.

[The House adjourned from 3:32 p.m. to 3:44 p.m.]

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Speaking to the amendment or else a point of order, the Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place.

MR. McINNIS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The motions for returns, and there are several of them which are very similar in character, all asked for an accounting from the government of what they've agreed to, what the companies and the government have agreed to in respect of the management of the forest resource commitments that are made in respect of construction of various forestry operations. The amendment proposed by the hon. minister suggests deleting the entire substance of the motion and substituting a single document known as the forest management agreement. Now, Mr. Speaker, a forest management agreement is, at the time it's signed and ratified by the cabinet, a public document. I would not waste the time of this Assembly putting a motion for a return seeking a document which is public and available to anyone who bothers to look it up in the library.

I'd like to draw the Chair's attention to *Beauchesne* 578, which contains the general prohibition against government or anyone else using an amendment to a motion to negative the motion. But sub (3) is clearly germane to this particular amendment. It says:

An amendment approving part of a motion and disapproving the remainder is out of order.

Now, it is true that the forest management agreement is a part of the understanding that exists between the Crown and, in the case of Motion 149, the Alberta Newsprint Company, but it is only a part of the understanding. Clearly, if the Assembly were to adopt this particular sleight of hand, the effect would be to approve a part of the motion and disapprove the remaining part of the motion; in fact, the part that the motion was actually seeking after. And if we're going to go that route, you might as well vote the thing down. So I submit that it's out of order under *Beauchesne* 578(3).

MR. GOGO: Speaking to the point of order, Mr. Speaker, the government would await your decision as to whether or not the amendment to the motion for a return is in order.

MR. SPEAKER: Okay. The Chair first of all points out that part of our delay was the matter of procedure of circulation of amendments, and having spoken to the two deputy House leaders for the government, that will be dealt with in future in a more expeditious manner. The Chair appreciates that I am certain that other members in the House will take heed as well.

Now, with respect to the matter of amendments, *Beauchesne* -- there are various sections there, 567, 568, 569, which are also germane to the discussion of the point of order as well as 578(3). *Beauchesne* 567:

The object of an amendment may be either to modify a question in such a way as to increase its acceptability or to present to the House a different proposition as an alternative to the original question.

So in this case the first part of 567 could well apply to the proposed amendment.

*Beauchesne* 568, again, is:

It is an imperative rule that every amendment must be relevant to the question on which the amendment is proposed.

The proposed amendment certainly fits that category. The other also follows:

Every amendment proposed to be made, either to a question or to a proposed amendment, should be so framed that, if agreed to by the House, the question or amendment as amended would be intelligible and consistent with itself.

That would also apply here after one has gone through the necessary deletions and additions in terms of the proposed amendment. Again, 569:

A motion may [indeed] be amended by: (a) leaving out certain words; (b) leaving out certain words in order to insert other words;

Both of these would apply, and

(c) inserting or adding other words.

Now, then, with respect to citation 578(3) the Chair and Table officers also looked in that direction during the break. The Table was able to pick up the *Journals* from 1932. It's very significant that that document arrive, because it is germane to the decision of the Chair on this point of order that in 1932 what did occur was that the mover of the amendment took from the original motion the one word "that" and struck out everything else in terms of the whole motion and inserted a proposition which was at odds with the original motion. Therefore, on examination of the proposed amendment the Chair perforce allows the amendment to proceed for discussion and declares that it is in order because the Chair regards it as being perforce more of a pruning operation rather than a negating of the original motion.

The Chair appreciates the concern of all parts of the House on having to deal with it but now we may proceed to debating the proposed amendment for the balance of the afternoon if so desired.

On the amendment hon. Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place.

MR. McINNIS: Mr. Speaker, I hoped not to have to waste the time of the House with this particular debate. The amendment is a joke. The amendment suggests that the request can be satisfied by the tabling of a forest management agreement. A forest management agreement as I indicated earlier, is a document which the public does get to see in relation to forest projects, but only after the game is over. It doesn't matter what the development is, if it's -- we're talking about a pulp mill, Alberta Newsprint in this particular case. Once the permit to construct the mill is in place, once the local development authority to construct the mill is in place, once the mill is actually constructed, once any financial dealings between the government and the company are complete -- that is to say, funds are transferred, guarantees are put in place, whatever -- once all of the undertakings that have been made through a variety of correspondence and other means have seen their way to fruition, once this thing is up in place, once the Minister of the Environment has pulled out his rubber stamp and given the permit to operate, then the public gets to see a forest management agreement.

That's why I brought a motion to this Chamber asking that the members of the Assembly and, through us, the taxpayers and voters of this province be allowed to see what it is this government has agreed to. Surely if we're going to give away the northern third of our province to the control of foreign corporations, if we're going to allow the construction of plants which create jobs on average at the rate of one-quarter of other forestry projects, if we're going to sign forest management agreements which I can go and see, which anybody can go and see, which provide for stumpage rates which are very low in relation to other provinces around the country and ridiculously low in comparison to other countries around the world -- surely if the gov-

ernment can agree to all of those things, we can know what it is that they've also agreed to that they're not telling us.

Now, the minister tells me in other conversations that I should be content to read government news releases which are, as far as I know, some PR flack's interpretation of what he was told by a senior official as to what those agreements contain. Well, it's not necessarily the case, as is often demonstrated, that what PR flacks are told by senior officials is what the agreement actually means. It's clear to me in the government bringing this bit of monkey business forward that they have no intention whatever to reveal what it is that they've agreed to on behalf of the taxpayers and voters of this province, that in fact all we're going to get is the forest management agreement. And I think it's been a waste of trees to allow these particular motions to be reprinted time and again when this government apparently knew that it had no intention from the very start to produce copies of agreements, correspondence, and other documents covering the understanding, when in fact what we're left with, if the Assembly is so ill-advised as to pass this particular amendment, is a motion which asks the government to produce a document which is already public.

It's an embarrassment, and I feel embarrassed that my name should be associated with that type of proposition being put forward to the Assembly, but I have no choice, because the government has the majority in this Chamber. And I plead with them to please recognize that what they're doing to my motions -- I understand that there are more such amendments following in place -- in fact results in the government refusing to release the information. There's no other interpretation of their action. However, through the sleight of hand of moving an amendment which has the effect of gutting the motion, I suppose they can go to somebody somewhere who might be gullible enough to believe that they were prepared to pass a motion and prepared to be open about the process.

But I want to make it clear. The forest management agreement doesn't come close to satisfying this request. It's not within a country mile. It is the final result; it's a kind of working umbrella that governs the process whereby the companies manage the forest. I think that at some appropriate point in time we should have a debate about the nature of forest management agreements, how they have the effect of turning Albertans from the landlord into the tenant in the relationship over the control of the forest. But for the time being, we're not debating forest management agreements. What we're debating is what this government is prepared to put forward.

Now, I phrased these motions carefully. I asked for copies of agreements, correspondence, and other documents covering understandings between the Crown and the companies, because often the understandings which make up a part of the commitment do, in fact, reside in correspondence with officials of the government. Certain people in the government agree to do certain things by certain dates. Therefore, it's no accident that you have a very slipshod type of environmental impact assessment on these projects, because there's a time frame, there's a time line that these things go to. Now, is that time line agreed to by the government in advance? Is it the case, for example, that Daishowa had to begin construction at a certain date in time or, in the case of Motion 149, that the Alberta Newsprint Company had to begin construction at a point in time because the government agreed to that? Did they agree to in effect speed up the environmental impact assessment process so that the companies could begin construction on a certain day? If they did that,

that's a very serious matter. But I suspect, should this amendment pass, we will never know whether that's the case or not.

What type of financial arrangements are in place? We get news releases that say that X amount of money has been assigned by way of loan guarantee or by way of grant or debenture or whatever. Well, what strings are attached to those financial contributions on the part of the taxpayers? What are the various risks and rewards that are involved in that relationship? I think it would be a far different matter if the government were to come forward and say, "Well, there's some particular proprietary reason why some piece of information can't be made available." I can understand that. Some members of the Assembly have difficulty understanding that on any given matter, but it's clear to me that the purpose of seeking public information about public policy matters is not to look into the private affairs of some individual but rather to know what it is that this government purports to agree to on behalf of the taxpayers vis--vis these forest companies.

The question is an important one, because a forest management agreement begins with a 20-year time horizon. That's the term of an agreement, but they all contain an evergreen clause. The clause says that the agreement is automatically renewable so long as the conditions are met on both sides. The conditions, in my opinion, are not sufficiently onerous on the part of the companies and are rather too onerous on the part of the government. Nonetheless, if those conditions are met, the agreement is renewable. So whatever other agreements, whatever side agreements, exist between the government and the forest companies have a bearing and have an influence over the course of the economic life of this province for a very long time to come. That's a reason why all of the agreements, not just the forest management agreement, need to be made public.

I don't see, frankly, how a government worthy of a democratic name can purport to make secret agreements with corporations which are headquartered halfway around the world or south of the border to manage and control, to exploit, to pollute the lands of this province for a long period of time and refuse to make those agreements public. So I urge members to defeat this amendment. Because the amendment has the effect of refusing the request that's in the original motion, to approve the amendment in fact results in defeating the motion through a devious and underhanded means.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes Edmonton-Meadowlark, followed by Edmonton-Strathcona, because if the minister replies, it's closing debate on the amendment.

MR. MITCHELL: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I rise in support of the comments made just this moment by my colleague from Edmonton-Jasper Place. We would not support this amendment. The fact is that this amendment eviscerates the motion for a return that was originally placed on the Order Paper by the Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place. This amendment and the sentiment, the premise, that underlies it, raise a serious issue for this Assembly in the conduct of its affairs, I believe. More generally, and perhaps even more importantly, it raises some serious questions about the substance of the pulp mill issue that confronts this province today.

The request in its original form is, I believe, a very responsible and reasonable request under the circumstances. Clearly, the series of mills that have been announced, proposed at various stages in the province today, will have a huge impact on the

forests, the land use, the quality of air, water, and land in this province, and if anything has marked and has distinguished the process that this government has undertaken in announcing and approving these projects, it is that they have been rushed and that there has been a patent lack of information available. Worse yet, there has been a patent lack of pursuit of information by this government, information that is critical for the making of a proper decision about these kinds of projects.

Specifically, the information that this motion for a return seeks will allow us to answer a number of very important, substantive questions with respect to pulp mill issues in this province. It will reveal whether the environmental impact assessment process is, as many of us suspect, just a formality, because this government will have made specific commitments to the companies involved with the construction and operation of pulp mills in this province; they will have made specific, non-reversible commitments to deadlines, to schedules, to companies to be able to go ahead and build their pulp projects regardless of the outcome of any environmental impact assessments.

That, I think, is a key issue and an issue that has to be discussed and debated by this Legislature. It is not an unreasonable request by this member or any other member that we should have the kind of information that would allow us to assess whether the government had made prior, irreversible commitments which rendered environmental impact assessments useless in this case.

We also have a right and a responsibility to learn whether this government has properly assessed the economics of these projects against the opportunity costs of undertaking other kinds of economic development projects which could be implemented in the areas in the north. More specifically, has this government made any commitments to assisting these companies through downturns in the pulp market?

We all know that pulp is at a higher price than it has ever been in its history, and it is inevitable, inexorable, that that commodities price will decline, that the rash of mills that have been announced may lead to exacerbate the glut that is inevitable in world pulp markets and, in fact, create the problem that I am discussing at this point: that the obsessive manner in which this government has approached the announcement of this series of pulp mill projects will, in fact, depress pulp prices and create problems for these companies. It is so inexorable and so inevitable that one can only ask the obvious question: has this government made a commitment to the companies concerned to carry them through downturns in the cyclical markets that affect pulp worldwide?

A third question that would be answered by the kind of information that the Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place is pursuing would be whether adequate economic analysis has been done of these projects or whether the government is simply depending upon economic analyses done by the companies themselves. It isn't inconceivable from certain statements made by ministers of this government that that, in fact, is the case. And to underline how frightening that would be, it would be like a bank giving money to a company based on a company's analysis of the economic prospects of their proposal.

Finally, we need to know -- and this information would provide us with this answer -- what are the cutting and the forestry management techniques that will be utilized by the companies involved and that will be provided for under the forestry management agreements? Unfortunately, when we find out, when the forestry management agreement is public, it is too late.

I would like to close by saying, Mr. Speaker, that the fact that this minister has gone to such lengths to -- and I use the word again -- eviscerate the original request underlines the need for us to be suspicious about what that information would have revealed, and further underlines and argues so clearly the case that that is exactly why we need that information: because this government doesn't want to give it to us. Finally, Mr. Speaker, it argues so strongly for the need for access-to-information legislation.

Thank you very much.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Speaker, having recovered from my astonishment that the amendment which so clearly guts the motion is in fact in order . . .

MR. SPEAKER: An inappropriate comment on the Chair. I'm sorry.

Now proceed to talk to the amendment.

MR. WRIGHT: Yes, I'm recalling my astonishment at being so . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I'm sorry, hon. member. The Chair is interpreting it as a comment upon the Chair's ruling, and that's inappropriate in the House.

Please, to the amendment.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Speaker, if you'll allow me just to say I was commenting on my own ignorance of the rules, it seems.

MR. SPEAKER: Then, hon. member, the Chair perforce will call you to order. And a substantive motion: there are other recourses with regard to the ruling of the Chair. Perhaps we could deal with that outside the Chamber.

Now let's talk to the amendment.

MR. WRIGHT: I say this only on the amendment, Mr. Speaker. This government's predecessor came to power in 1971 committed to honesty and openness in government. They have so far forgotten about that that they make this amendment, the result of which, when applied to the other companies that seek pulp concessions in the north, is to give away the use of an area of northern Alberta greater than the size of one of the provinces of Canada -- I mean not the smallest one; I mean New Brunswick -- in secret. By that I mean secrecy of the deals, secrecy of the financial terms to be exacted, secrecy in the process, secrecy in the subsidies, secrecy in any and all of the agreements, whether written or less than formal, that bring them into being.

I hope the people in this province will take note of this dishonesty and kick this government out for this and the other similar things which I believe it will do between now and the next election.

MR. SPEAKER: Calgary-*Buffalo*.

MR. CHUMIR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to oppose the amendment as well, which, as my colleague from Edmonton-Meadowlark stated, unacceptably eviscerates the motion and essentially robs it of its basic substance. By doing so, the government once again demonstrates that it is the most secretive government in the country -- nay, perhaps on the whole of the continent. It shows that they are not prepared to disclose to the

people of this province the very basic terms upon which the government is giving away the timber resources which belong to these people, the means by which it is putting up huge amounts of money which belong to the people, who are not getting this information, and the means by which it is putting at risk the environment, which is the heritage of the people of this province.

This is not a new position for this government. For years they have refused to provide basic, fundamental information about the way in which they have been governing this province, thereby revealing a deep-seated, deep-rooted contempt for the democratic process. Mr. Speaker, it's becoming increasingly outrageous and unacceptable as the government gets more and more deeply involved in economic development up to its hip waders. We now have between \$2.5 billion and \$3 billion of public money being put at risk in various ventures throughout the province. The government tells us that we're dealing with private business, but with this kind of money it's no longer private business; there is clearly a very strong public interest in knowing what's going on.

And, Mr. Speaker, as these projects become bigger and bigger, the environmental impact upon this province becomes commensurately magnified, and the concerns of the people of this province to know what's going on are commensurately raised. There are, indeed, many questions of public interest -- not just of interest to the back room of the Tory caucus but of public interest to each and every citizen of this province -- that are raised with respect to these projects. Sadly enough, without this information, without the ability to shine the light of public scrutiny, the questions, we will not be able to find out the implications of the government's actions until far down the line, until we have the inevitable problems which we have seen arising in the Principal Group affair, for example.

You'd think, Mr. Speaker, that the government would have learned long ago the price of secrecy, but no. We have here another example of what was once said about the Bourbons: a government which remembers everything and learns nothing.

MS M. LAING: Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak against this amendment which effectively emasculates the motion for a return put forward by the Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place.

It also brings into our minds a larger question, and that is the question: why are we elected to sit in this Assembly and how are we able to do our work here? These motions are a way of us making this government accountable to the people of Alberta. This amendment violates the spirit of democracy that we hold dear in this country, and it makes a mockery of the positions we hold in this House. Surely, if we are here, we have a right to demand accountability of this government on behalf of the people of Alberta. We have a right to know, as the people of Alberta have a right to know, about the nature of the actions taken on their behalf and the disposition of their resources and our resources.

I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that secrecy has no place in a truly democratic country nor in this Assembly.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, I've listened with great interest to the hon. members who are opposing this amendment. It's long been the custom and tradition of both this House and the government, which is often asked by way of motion for a return for information, that certain information has never been, ever been, provided.

This Motion 149 has asked for information which touches

on, surely, confidentiality and privileged communications and documents dealing within the minister's department, and the minister...

MR. McINNIS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Is he speaking against the main motion? It sure sounds that way to me.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member, the deputy House leader is speaking to the amendment. There has been a certain latitude of comment accorded to all members who have previously spoken; surely this may continue.

MR. GOGO: The minister, Mr. Speaker, has proposed an amendment to Motion for a Return 149 that has been found in order. The minister, I believe, has indicated the forest management agreement will certainly be made available. In most cases it's already public knowledge. In this case I don't believe it is, at this point, public knowledge. So to hear the arguments by the hon. members of the opposition that there's some great tradition being broken by government not providing information, I would simply say, in speaking to the amendment, Mr. Speaker, that that's always been that way.

The hon. minister is proposing to the opposition, rather than rejecting the motion out of hand, an alternative, and that's what's before the House. Therefore, I support the amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Clover Bar, followed by the Minister of the Environment.

MR. GESELL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to address the amendment and some of the questions and comments that have been made with respect to the amendment. I fully support the amendment for the following reasons.

The comment made by Edmonton-Jasper Place indicates that they want information with respect to what the government has agreed to. Well, I think the forest management agreement is exactly what the government has agreed to. It sounds to me that the members who have spoken against the amendment feel that there needs to be information that involves the Liberal Party and the New Democrats in the negotiating process for these agreements. Well, that is not the message that was sent to us during the election. It was this government that was to negotiate those agreements, and that is what has been done. The final results of those negotiations are accumulated in the forest management agreement, and those are public information once they have been signed. Those can be taken to task, and the accountability of this government can then be questioned with respect to those conditions that have, in fact, been agreed to. That is the spirit of democracy, Mr. Speaker, that it is important that we should keep in mind here.

Also, comments made by Edmonton-Jasper Place and Edmonton-Meadowlark indicate that information is sought about what has been agreed to that is not being told. Well, this to me sounds like some degree of paranoia, Mr. Speaker. I think what has been agreed to, again, is within the forest management agreement. In respect to the deletion of the word "correspondence," as has been referred to by the hon. House leader, there is confidentiality there that precludes release of that information, and again, it's part of the negotiating process. The other documents referred to in the original motion, which are deleted in the amendment, is too broad a statement, Mr. Speaker. It opens the door to all sorts of information that could be requested then, if

the original motion were to pass or if the amendment were defeated. Similarly, Mr. Speaker, the last part of the amendment, which deletes "related forestry operations," opens the door not just to the discussion of the specific project that is under question but any other project of a similar nature that may be under discussion between the Crown and the province and the pulp mill. I think that, again, is too broad a question, and I believe this amendment is very appropriate.

There has been some discussion by the Member for Edmonton-Strathcona that maybe this is dishonesty on behalf of the government. I will strongly oppose that. That is not a proper situation here. I think we are undertaking these negotiations on behalf of Albertans in the spirit of democracy to achieve the best possible results, Mr. Speaker, and that does not in any way, fashion, or form constitute dishonesty on behalf of this government.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. KLEIN: Mr. Speaker, I believe the amendment is a reasonable amendment, and I think that what we've tried to do is to do what is reasonable. I think that to go any further makes a mockery out of a reasonable request for information, most of which is already contained in the forest management agreements.

Mr. Speaker, there are 15 similar motions for returns, and the paper that will be generated by these motions will result in the killing of at least two trees. So in the interests of saving trees, I support the amendment.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Calgary-Millican.

MR. SHRAKE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think that as the opposition they have a right to ask for documents and information. But then when you read the original motion, which we are now attempting to amend and make something workable, they say "agreements, correspondence, and other documents," and you think, goodness, what does "other documents" mean? It could get down to the point where they're asking for all studies, documents, projections, calculations, working papers, reports, speech notes, minutes of meetings, and "What did your wife think about the whole thing?"

Frankly, Your Worship, I think the minister is attempting to work with the opposition. He's brought through a very fair amendment. He says: "Okay; fine. We'll boil this all down." Otherwise, when you use a broad term "all other documents," you think, well, gosh; how far does that go? Down to where he wrote a note to himself one day and maybe threw it in the garbage can? You wonder, how far do you go?

Well, as the opposition they do have a large budget for their research. Okay. This forest management agreement brought everything down to the bottom line. It's not a one-page letter or something. Those are big documents and they cover a lot of information. I doubt seriously if the members will sit down and read that page by page. If they do, they've got a lot of reading ahead of them. If they feel there's something wrong, fine; get this forest management agreement, as the minister has offered to them, sit down with it, use some of that hundreds of thousands of dollars of research money they've had, and if they've got a problem, if there's some skulduggery happening or something drastic or so on, then come back. But only after they've got that and they read that; if they figure some horrible, drastic thing

is...

I have sat in this House year after year, and I remember the one time they asked for this massive list of documents, as though something was being hidden. So the hon. Member for Fort McMurray, the Hon. Norm Weiss, thought, "The heck with them; I'm going to bring them all of that stuff," even though it wasted away hours and hours of the staff time and some of us members did have problems which were being neglected because he had about half his staff chasing that down. It took two pages from this Legislature to haul that stuff in. They brought it in, and they sent it over, and you know what? After all of that work, I kept waiting -- the months and the years rolled by -- and they never came back or made reference to all of that material again. And that gave me a little lesson. Sometimes I think people play some political games in here as well.

So I would suggest that if they get the forest management agreement and if there is something dire and drastic and something terrible and awful happening out there and they come in and they want additional information, I'll stand up and vote right alongside of them, helping them get that information. But I think the first thing we do is go along with a very reasonable offer by the minister, a very good amendment here; get that and then come back, before they start crying foul. They cry wolf so often that some day there is going to be a wolf out there. Nobody's going to pay any attention, and they're going to get eaten before anybody comes to the rescue.

MR. SPEAKER: Member for Edmonton-Highlands.

MS BARRETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Okay, Gordon. Now, without looking at the amendment, please tell me what it says.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. member. Order please. The members in the House can only be referred to by their constituency, not by first names or surnames. Thank you.

MS BARRETT: Shall I make the same challenge to the Member for Calgary-Millican?

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Millican himself got the whole thing wrong. What he says is that, you know, after all, Mr. Speaker, how could we know just the extent to this "other documents" that you mean? Are we really talking about any little memo that the minister might have written to himself? If this minister, the forestry minister, didn't want to answer "other documents," he could have asked for an amendment that said, "and delete 'other documents'" and then gone on to agree to give us all the agreements and correspondence related to the understandings between the government of Alberta and Alberta Newsprint Limited with respect to the construction of a pulp mill near Whitecourt and related forestry operations.

Mr. Speaker, the point is that this amendment means that all that any member of this Assembly aside from members of Executive Council can even have a look at is the stuff that will, after the fact, be public information. Now, that's not much of an amendment. It doesn't make much sense. If you're asking for information about how many dollars are being spent under what circumstances, the terms of the agreement, any other memos related to the deal that might have been struck between the government and Alberta Newsprint, their projections for the life of the pulp mill -- for heaven's sakes, even the projections for the price of pulp, which in the long run or probably in the medium

run will go down — you know, Albertans have a right to know this before our money is spent.

This amendment, so shamefully presented and sponsored by the minister of forestry, will prevent people from having access to information that I think is vital to the health of the province and also to the fiscal responsibility of the province. For them to say, "Oh, well, you know, you've got researchers," Mr. Speaker -- I say no amount of money is going to buy researchers that are going to break the law to break into the minister's office. Is that what the Member for Calgary-Millican is challenging us to do? Surely he understands that we have to respect and obey the law in this Assembly, which is why we ask for the information and don't send out robbers to steal it.

The fact of the matter is that if the minister really has reservations about, "Well, you know, at what point do we stop handing it out?" if he really has that, he knows from experience that this opposition New Democrat caucus has been more than reasonable in accommodating reasonable amendments where we understand natural limitations or reasonable limitations to a request. That's not being done in this case, Mr. Speaker. What's being sponsored in this amendment is the sneakiest, most underhanded and despicable form of getting around answering to a democratic forum about the way you people plan to spend our money and what you plan to do with our environment during the next four years. We'll remind you of this. It'll only be four years, Mr. Speaker, because this is the sort of secrecy that is going to turf people like that minister right out of office. And I say, the sooner the better.

MR. SPEAKER: Calgary-Foothills.

MRS. BLACK: Mr. Speaker, thank you. I have been sitting in this House now for I guess almost three weeks, and it seems like a long time to sit and listen to the nonsense that comes out of the opposition's mouths, words such as "sneaky," "despicable," "underhanded." I feel really sorry for the members from the opposition, because it becomes very apparent very quickly that they really have never been involved in any kind of negotiations or business dealings. It's too bad, because this is a business relationship.

AN HON. MEMBER: Also government.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, in the House.

MRS. BLACK: Normally, Mr. Speaker, you're allowed to speak without rude interruptions. However, that doesn't appear to happen as well.

What I'd like to say is that under normal contractual negotiations and contractual work the strategies are not always the same and not always laid out, because you're trying to strike the best deal between two players and come up with the best for the corporation or Alberta. I know that's hard for the opposition to understand because they've had no experience in this. But I would be very much opposed to having all documents laid out on the table. I think it would put our negotiation position in jeopardy for future negotiations, and I think it's really quite absurd for anyone to expect that to happen.

What has been offered in the amendment to this motion is perfectly straightforward. I agree with the Member for Calgary-Millican. If they read the forest management agreement, as is in the amendment to the motion, and at that point had

questions come out, specific questions instead of continual rhetoric, then I think it would be dealt with by the hon. minister on a specific . . . [interjection] Well, you didn't deal with it, sir, I'm sorry, in the House.

This motion asks for all documents and correspondence. I think it would put this House in a position of jeopardy, and not only the House but any future negotiations that the province of Alberta may be entering with other forest product companies, or any other company for that matter. So I would be very much opposed to this motion. I would think it would be wise for the opposition to go and look at the techniques of negotiation and contractual work before they come down and decide that it would be unfair and despicable and underhanded and sneaky for anybody to negotiate for the best possible position for Alberta.

Thank you.

MR. LUND: Mr. Speaker, I too would like to join in this debate on the amendment to the motion. I certainly support the amendment. I believe the information that will be contained in the forest management agreement will certainly answer the questions that are needed to be answered.

I, too, have sat here now for a very short time and can hardly believe the rhetoric we hear from the opposition, comments like the statement today that an alternative to these methods that we are going to be harvesting this timber. I wonder, do the hon. members realize this is a renewable resource? It's something that grows and will eventually die. If we don't harvest it, what's going to happen to this timber? It's going to rot and decay and be useless to everyone. Certainly . . . [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, in the House.

MR. LUND: If in fact there were other methods of harvesting this valuable resource, it would have been done years ago. I think we're just grappling here when we ask for all these agreements and correspondence and this type of thing. So I heartily support the amendment to the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The call for the question on the amendment.  
Member for Vegreville.

MR. FOX: Mr. Speaker, if I might speak briefly on the amendment as proposed by the hon. Minister of Forestry, Lands and Wildlife, I do appreciate the advice provided to the Assembly by the by now quite experienced Member for Calgary-Foothills. Nevertheless, I do want to oppose this amendment. And quite frankly, I'm surprised. I've developed a healthy respect for the hon. minister over the years, and I can't bring myself to believe he really had this particular amendment drafted, because it's absurd.

What the Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place is asking in this motion for a return is simply that the government be open, frank, and honest with the citizens of the province of Alberta regarding some very important agreements that have been made on their behalf. Let's be honest with one another, Mr. Speaker. We represent Albertans in this Assembly. We're not just 83 people who come here to flap our gums on any subject we feel like talking about. We're here representing Albertans. They charge us with the responsibility of making sure their interests are protected, that the money we collect from them and from others is collected in a fair and responsible way and is spent in the best way possible to help develop this province now and for

the future. They trust us to do that, and we've got to do the very best we can on their behalf, and I'm sure all hon. members will agree to that.

So when a member of the opposition comes forward seeking in a very sincere way some important information about deals that have been negotiated, I think it only proper that the government be willing to provide the information the member seeks. These things should be a matter of public record, and it's not enough to hide behind the secrecy or the smoke the Member for Calgary-Foothills tries to throw up, that these are confidential business agreements and, you know, people in Alberta don't have the right to know what agreements the government's made on their behalf. I think that's nonsense. I think Albertans have a right to know and deserve to know just how much of our future has been committed by this government behind closed doors in all these secret negotiations.

I'd like to hear one government member stand up, Mr. Speaker, and tell us what they're so afraid of. Why are they afraid to provide the information that's requested in this motion? Why do they have to come forward with an amendment that so thoroughly guts the motion for a return as to make it no information at all? "Go and look up the forestry management agreements." Well, those have been a matter of public record for some time, and nobody in this Assembly has spent as much time going through them as the Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place. I can assure you that they don't provide the kind of information Albertans need to know, just how much of our future has been compromised, how much of our land mass has been given away, with very little in the way of significant return, to companies that have their headquarters beyond our borders, and how much money the government's giving them to do it.

That's a reasonable question to ask, Mr. Speaker, and I think the Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place is not only within his rights as a member to seek that information, he's not only doing his job as a member of this Assembly by trying to seek that information, but he's doing all Albertans a favour by seeking the information. To suggest that the information would be provided in the forestry management agreement as proposed by this amendment is, again, more than a little naive. I think the opportunity has presented itself for this government to come clean, to be open with Albertans for a change -- as they promised when they were first elected in 1971 -- to be up front, and to go out and make the case to Albertans that they are indeed acting in the best possible way on behalf of all Albertans. If what they are doing with these forestry management agreements and all these pulp mill deals and newsprint company deals is in the best interests of Albertans, convince people that they are good deals; don't just hide behind a wall of secrecy and refuse to come forward with the information we seek. Because I can promise you, I know the Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place well and he's a fine, upstanding gentleman who has only the best intentions in seeking this information and would make . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, hon. member. No one in the Assembly is calling into question the action or the intentions of the hon. Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place. Perhaps we could just deal with the amendment

MR. FOX: Mr. Speaker, the amendment proposes that no information be provided at all. I don't think that's acceptable, and I'm speaking against it. I'm speaking against it. Surely the Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Order please, hon. member. The Chair allows you to speak against it or for it, whatever you want to do with the amendment. Please listen to what the Chair said. There was no question about the motives or intention of the Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place. You made the point not only once; now you are starting on it for the second or third time. [interjection] Order please, hon. member. To the amendment please. To the amendment.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes Edmonton-Kingsway.

MR. McEACHERN: There was no necessary conclusion that the Member for Vegreville thought anybody in here had maligned the Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place just because he started to praise the Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place.

MR. SPEAKER: We now go back to Vegreville, please.

MR. FOX: If you'll pardon my confusion, Mr. Speaker, you did call the hon. Member for Vegreville to order and reminded me that nobody here called the Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place's character into question. I'm not sure if that was a point of order or a direction to the Member for Vegreville to . . .

MR. SPEAKER: It was a direction from the Chair, hon. member. If you care to examine the Blues, I'll call for the Blues. For the last time, please continue on the amendment or you lose your chance.

MR. FOX: Yes. Well, I'm speaking against this amendment for very obvious reasons, and it's certainly clear the members opposite are feeling quite sensitive about this. The Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place did his homework, put a number of motions for a return on the Order Paper because he wanted to base his inquiries in this Assembly and his statements to Albertans on fact. He wanted to know what arrangements have been made between this government and their wealthy and powerful friends in business to carve up and give away a good portion of this province. I think he's well within his rights to do that and I'm speaking on his behalf in support against this amendment which I think makes the motion for a return all but useless.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Member for Smoky River.

MR. PASZKOWSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I basically have two very short comments. I'm speaking in support of the amendment. There've been allegations made that indeed the people of Alberta deserve to know about these deals, that the people of Alberta would not support these deals. All these deals were announced before the election. The election gave this government overwhelming support. These people knew about these deals. Indeed, the allegations made that people didn't know about them are false. We can't accept that. The information that is provided is more than adequate. We are in a business type of society where we have to make . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: Secret arrangements.

MR. PASZKOWSKI: Secret arrangements are not the case. These are arrangements that indeed are acceptable to both

parties. This government was elected to represent the people. The people knew the deals that were before them and they accepted that.

That's all. Thank you.

MR. SIGURDSON: Mr. Speaker, I wasn't going to get involved until I heard the last speaker stand up and more or less confess that what's gone on is that there have been secret deals between the government and the parties and that the two parties are happy about the secret deals that have taken place. Well, you know, if I were to make a secret deal with somebody, I might be very happy about the details too. The other party might be very happy about the details as well, but the problem is that that there might be a third party involved that has no information available to it and is excluded from knowing what the details of the secret arrangement are. Now, that's what the hon. Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place wants to know. What are the details? What's so terribly awful about providing details so that all Albertans will know precisely what information has gone on between two parties that have constructed the deal? I don't think there's anything wrong with trying to provide that kind of information to this Assembly for all Albertans to see.

What's happened with this proposed amendment from the minister is that we're going to provide some of the information perhaps but certainly not all the information definitely. Now, how are Albertans to determine whether or not the deal is a good deal if you're only operating with limited information? That's the question before us. How are we going to be able to determine if this is indeed a good deal for all Albertans? The hon. Member for Athabasca-Lac La Biche -- I don't know if he was pointing to me or to one of his colleagues, but it seemed to be a gesture of "Trust us." Well, quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure we on this side of the Assembly are prepared to trust a government that's gone out and said something on February 20 and come back with a budget that's totally different. What level of trust should we have? If the government has proven on occasion that it can't be trusted to deliver all it promised, why should we be any more convinced today to trust the government that it's going to actually make deals in the best interests of all Albertans?

I'm not sure we can in fact trust this government at all, and therefore that's the reason, the motive, the Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place had in placing this motion for a return on the Order Paper. And I think it's extraordinarily sad that the minister would come back with this proposed amendment to the motion that takes away the attempt to provide all the information out on the table, fully disclosed, not only for members of the Legislature to see but for members of the public to view as well.

MR. McEACHERN: Mr. Speaker, I've been trying to piece together the changes and what the new motion would read. It becomes very convoluted, but perhaps I can try to figure it out. The original motion says

that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing a copy of all agreements, correspondence, and other documents covering all understandings between the Crown in the right of Alberta and Alberta Newsprint Company Ltd. or its owners in respect of construction of a pulp mill near Whitecourt and related forestry operations.

The notice of motion for an amendment by the hon Minister of Forestry, Lands and Wildlife suggests that Motion for a Return

149 be amended by deleting the words "all agreements, correspondence, and other documents covering all understandings" -- so that's the first line gone, including the word "understandings" from the next line -- and substituting therefor the words "the forest management agreement" and by further deleting the words . . . [interjections] Well, nobody has done this yet in this debate, and I don't think we've got an exact handle on what the real words are. And by further deleting the words "or its owners in respect. . ." Okay, so you eliminate most of the second last line right down to "forestry operations." Now, what does that leave us with?

AN HON. MEMBER: Not much. A couple of leaves on a tree.

MR. McEACHERN: The forest management agreement "between the Crown in the right of Alberta and Alberta Newsprint Company." So we have changed the amendment from asking for information about all the agreements, the correspondence, and other documents covering the forest management agreement to just "the forest management agreement." Mr. Speaker, that is such an incredible change that it's a total negation of the original motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, hon. member. That's enough of that. The Chair had to bring the Member for Edmonton-Strathcona to order on that specific point before. The Chair had made the ruling that this is indeed in order. It's not a negation; it is a pruning. That admonition was given at least twice to Edmonton-Strathcona. If you care to speak now to the amendment as proposed, the Chair will gladly listen to you.

MR. McEACHERN: Mr. Speaker, these forestry management projects are a giveaway of this government to big multinational corporations with no real concern for the long-term economic growth and stability of this society. They're basically saying that what's good for big multinational corporations is good for all Albertans, and they will just use these prior to the election period. By promising people jobs, we'll get their agreement and get re-elected, and then we won't have to tell anybody what's in those agreements because we'll keep it all secret. That's basically what this government has done.

Now, it isn't the first time this government has decided to keep secret some of its activities, and I'll just remind you of a few. How about the lottery moneys of this province done by the minister outside the Assembly? [interjections] Well, we're talking here about government secrecy, and there is no reason . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, hon. member. With due respect, perhaps the ambit could deal with all these other orders for a return that deal in this whole area of forestry rather than get off into those other tangents. Again, we look forward to your discussion on the amendment.

MR. McEACHERN: Mr. Speaker, when one is making a point, I didn't think it was wrong to bring in an analogy or a similar example.

We've been through these arguments many times before on a number of other issues. Without dwelling on it, I'll just mention Olympia & York, for example. We had this same kind of argument, and the arguments raised on the other side of the House were similar to the arguments we just heard from the Member

for Calgary-Foothills. Her argument in essence said that these are business agreements, and therefore because they're business agreements, we wouldn't want to make all the information available to everybody. If we did, we might in some way hurt the next negotiations or some of the businesspeople might be a little bit shy about putting the facts and figures out into the public, because businesspeople, I guess, are used to doing things in secret.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if a bank or some commercial entity makes an agreement with another commercial entity and they want to keep that secret, that's their business, at least up to a point anyway. But when a company is prepared to make an agreement with a government and the government is using taxpayers' dollars, then that becomes public business and the taxpayers who foot the bill have the right to know. If a businessman cannot bring himself to have the government make public the basic facts of the situation, then he shouldn't be entering into the agreement. If he's got something he wants to hide or there's something about the deal he's ashamed of or he doesn't want his competitors to know, then he should not be dealing with government. The government is the custodian of the people's dollars. Whether those dollars be resource based or tax based, it doesn't really matter. When the government is spending taxpayers' dollars, they should have to make public the terms under which they spend those dollars.

The Member for Calgary-Foothills has just spoken exactly contrary to a very strong argument that was made by the Member for Little Bow many times in this Assembly over the last three years. The Member for Little Bow knows. I notice he's not here to jump into the fray and defend the government's position now, because for three years he berated this government's position.

MR. SPEAKER: There is great difficulty for the Chair to listen.

MR. McEACHERN: Well, it would seem to me that when a cabinet member of the present government has spoken many times over the last three years on exactly this issue in exactly the same way I'm speaking today, about the need for public dollars to be dealt with publicly and disclosed publicly . . .

MR. DAY: Point of order, Mr. Speaker. Unfortunately, I can't give you a citation. I don't know what we do with a member who is struck with delirium. I think he could be assisted down to the medical room, because he's wasting the time of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. I'm sure, as the Chair and the Table officers search their *Beauchesne*, that it's one thing to have a member be accountable for present duties in the cabinet. Now to be quoting back previous statements is an interesting aspect as well, but let's continue.

MR. McEACHERN: I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker. If changing to the government's side suddenly means you become very secretive, I certainly hope that doesn't happen to this party when we become the government. It's certainly intended that we shall not.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, hon. member. The comment is now being directed at the Member for Little Bow in his individual, personal capacity and not in terms of his role and function as a member of cabinet. Perhaps it would be better just to

get back to the amendment, please.

MR. McEACHERN: Mr. Speaker, I speak against this amendment because it's a continuation of a government stalling over a release of information that has been going on for the last three years. I guess we're now moving into the fourth year, certainly the fourth session of this Assembly that I've been part of. It seems like this government just doesn't want to give the people of the province the information it needs to know what's going on. These forestry projects are perhaps the biggest and most comprehensive projects that the government has jumped into in such a quick way, with the least time spent on doing the groundwork, the least time analyzing or putting out information that would bring the people on side on those projects. They just made some quick promises just before the election, promised jobs and said, "Isn't this going to be wonderful?" The people have not had time to know the details, and now when we ask them for those details so we can assess more carefully exactly what they've got us into, they don't seem to have answers.

Mr. Speaker, as I said before, we've had many cases where we've argued this particular point that taxpayers' dollars, public money, should be spent in public or at least the information should be made public; we should know what's going on. But never before have we had so many dollars committed so fast and with so much at stake. We've got the whole environment of the north. We've got the trees, the forests of a quarter of the province. We've got the watersheds of two major rivers that are going to collect the effluent from these plants down into the Athabasca delta region and on into Slave River and the Mackenzie River. There is an incredible amount at stake on these projects. It's an aspect of the government's economic policy that they should really reconsider.

We do need to diversify the economy. We don't want to rely just on energy and agriculture any more. Forestry is an area we can diversify into along with tourism and a few others. But the speed and the magnitude of what they've done with these projects is absolutely staggering. We've turned to huge multinational corporations and offered them incredible loan guarantees, and exactly what we've offered them we still don't know. We've offered them cheap stumpage rates. We don't know enough details yet. But for the government to just expect us on this side of the House to take it on faith and believe it's okay without having the information is totally ridiculous.

The time has come for the government to start owning up. The degree of secrecy they have sunk to is a mark of an old and died government that is on the way out and they should realize that. If they don't renew themselves and start renewing their belief in democracy and in the right of people to know what they're doing, they will pay down the road, Mr. Speaker. There is no question that a government that's in its last years gets more and more secretive and more and more inward looking and assumes that the tax dollars are really theirs to do with as they please as if they were a party -- not only these forestry management projects, but look at the programs that were announced in the middle of the campaign with the idea that they would start spending the money right away. I mean, it's just an incredible idea that a political party can say in the middle of a campaign, "We're going to give you 5 cents off on your gasoline tax starting tomorrow night."

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member, please, relevance in debate on the amendment. Thank you. I don't see anything remotely

related to gasoline tax.

MR. McEACHERN: A parallel, Mr. Speaker, to the same thing they did with the announcements about the pulp mills. They said, "Here are these loan guarantees for these huge corporations," with very little explanation of the terms or the conditions under which they were giving those loan guarantees. All I'm saying is that they're using that far too much and in far too many ways and then expecting that the taxpayers will say, "Oh, that's fine." In other words, they're actually treating the tax dollars they're spending like they belong to the Tory party. To me that's a symbol of a government that's on the way out.

I do not understand why the new members of this Assembly on the government side would tolerate such behaviour. I do not understand why people that have been in the Conservative Party for many years, maybe since 1971 when this government was formed, would transform themselves over the years from the 12 principles put forward by the former Premier back in 1971 when he got elected -- he talked about open government and full disclosure of what the government was doing -- into this secretive government that says they can give away such an incredible proportion of our forestry heritage in this province to whoever they want for political reasons. Because mostly they were for political reasons, Mr. Speaker. The announcements all bunched up at around Christmas time were obviously a precursor to an election. There's no real belief on anybody's part that this is great economic diversification.

I know in some ways the announcements were probably hurried, being announced before January 1, because of the free trade deal. They were afraid that some of the loan guarantees and supports they were putting in might be considered unfair subsidies under the trade deal. But that still doesn't excuse the timing and quite the way they did it. It was the election they had in mind, and it was saying we can dump incredible numbers of dollars into this one idea and claim we've diversified the economy and isn't everything going to be wonderful in good old Alberta. And the taxpayers will pick up the bundle, will pick up the cost, and down the road they will find out what the costs were.

It reminds me that Grant Notley used to say that probably the New Democratic Party will not come to power in Alberta until the Tory government has squandered all the resources. Well, believe you me, you've just made an incredible move in that direction. The oil has pretty well gone; you've blown the heritage trust fund; we now have a debt equal to the heritage trust fund . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. member. The amendment. You have a few minutes left on the amendment.

MR. McEACHERN: The attempt on the part of the government, then, to diversify the economy with these incredible giveaways to huge multinational corporations without properly protecting the environment, without properly negotiating with the local community to see what should be done and how it should be developed in a way that's environmentally safe and sustainable over the long term, is certainly one of the biggest sellouts ever in this province. I guess it's the dying gasp of a government that wants to go out with a bang, but I'm afraid it's going to whimper when you look at the environmental impact and the cost to the taxpayers of this province.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes Edmonton-Calder, followed by Stony Plain.

MS MJOLSNESS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to speak against this particular amendment. It amazes me that over and over again, time and time again, this government is not willing to be forthcoming with information that should be public information. One can only think and conclude that the government has a lot to hide when they just are not willing to come forward with this kind of information the Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place is asking for in this particular motion.

There has been tremendous controversy over these forest developments. I think Albertans have a right to the kind of information the Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place is asking for in his motion, and this amendment certainly changes the intent of that motion. This is public money being spent, Mr. Speaker, and all Albertans have a right to the details of these particular agreements. I believe what's at stake here is very fundamental, and that is, again, the right to information about public money that is being spent in this province and the management and possible destruction of our forests. That to me means that Albertans have a right to that kind of information.

[Mr. Jonson in the Chair]

Contrary to what the government members might believe, the natural resources of this province belong to the citizens of this province; they do not belong to this government. The government should not feel that they have the right to do whatever they please behind closed doors. The people of Alberta: those are their natural resources. It really worries me and concerns me when I hear the members on the government side talking like Albertans don't have a right to this kind of information.

AN HON. MEMBER: Shame.

MS MJOLSNESS: It is shameful.

I think the government has a clear responsibility to come forward with this kind of information. The amendment completely changes the intent of the motion of the Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place, therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would hope the government members would vote against this amendment.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Stony Plain.

MR. WOLOSHYN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I've sat here and patiently listened to the debates. I appreciate the sympathy from Calgary-Foothills, although I think it was rather misdirected at the opposition. If any group is deserving of sympathy, it's the attitude expressed in this amendment to the motion.

I find it very, very disconcerting to see that the government would choose to withhold information, not from the opposition but from all Albertans. When I was elected as a member of this House and when the Speaker addressed his opening address to the House, he vested in the MLAs a duty to represent constituents for the betterment of all Albertans. I find it extremely difficult to take that news releases are only carbon copied to the government side, that cabinet ministers make news announcements and don't have the foresight, I guess, to copy people in whose ridings this is happening.

Now what I see before us is an effort to withhold information on one of the biggest economic ventures in this province in this

decade. We are referring to the construction of many pulp mills, mills that were supposed to create jobs for northerners. To this point the only indication I've heard of job creation is going to be for a few machine operators. I have to wonder after these mills are completed, how many natives are actually going to be working, in an area where the unemployment is so high? The hon. members in this House who are so quick with the lip might want to go and tour and see how in fact forests are harvested in slash operations, how very, very few jobs there really are after the construction phase.

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

The original motions for information as presented were an ideal opportunity for the government to inform the people of this province of all the positive steps that they claim with the pulp mill ventures. Unfortunately, the amendment has taken away anything that would be of value, any kind of information that would be of value to Albertans. And I stress "to Albertans." I've heard reference to confidential documents. I don't see anywhere in there a request for confidential documents, only a request for business dealings between the government which represents the people of this province and some very, very large corporations -- information which, I might stress, and I stress very strongly, is an entitlement for all the people of this province.

During question period the Minister of the Environment had very strange answers, I would say, for some of the questions posed with respect to environmental impact studies. I'm not sure yet how they're going to be done, who's going to do them, and who's going to pay for them. However, if everything is going to be kept secret, as this amendment would do, I don't suppose it would make much difference unless they tacked it on to the forest management package. I hope they would have the foresight to release the environmental studies along with it.

There is another rumour that has been circulating around this past summer. After the mills were announced, there were pictures in the paper of roadwork going on, buildings being built. I guess the photographers shouldn't have been there in helicopters.

AN HON. MEMBER: Daishowa.

MR. WOLOSHYN: Oh, Daishowa; that's the one. Thank you, hon. member.

Then I asked around. There was a particular contractor on a particular section of road that ran out of equipment. You know why he ran out of equipment? The foreman said that it was all up doing roads for Daishowa. I think that's very commendable, because we want that plant to get started on time.

So, Mr. Speaker, I must stress to you that I speak against the amendment to the motion for a return. The motion for a return was very, very well worded. It would have given Albertans -- and I stress the term "Albertans" -- information they totally are entitled to. The amendment to the motion basically sends us to the library, and I suppose we all do that in any event. I would hope that future motions for returns aren't subjected to these kinds of frivolous amendments, since I think it was almost an insult to the members to have a straight no answer take two hours to accomplish.

AN HON. MEMBER: You did all the talking though.

MR. WOLOSHYN: Yes, we have been doing all the talking, hon. member, and I appreciate the quips that come in, because I feel very strongly that somebody in this House has to do some of the talking to at least hopefully get the people tuned into what is being withheld from them. I would hope that the two hours taken today will not be a waste. I would hope sincerely that when the next motion for a return comes up, an honest effort is made to release the amount of information that can be realistically released by a government without jeopardizing the relationship between the government and the company they are doing business with. I would certainly hope that another amendment of this nature does not come across the House, because I would much rather for the minister to outright refuse to provide the information than have this kind of amendment. I would therefore speak very strongly against the amendment.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and members of the House, for your time.

MR. PASHAK: Well, Mr. Speaker, as the only member that has "forest" in the name of his constituency, I'd be very remiss if I didn't enter into this debate. I can spend a considerable degree of time talking about how beautiful and well forested Calgary-Forest Lawn is and talk at length about how green the grass is in Forest Lawn, but I'm quite sure you'd rule me out of order if I went on too long in that vein.

However, I would like to respond to the Member for Rocky Mountain House, who comes from an equally well-forested area that I would assume is beautiful. There's always the danger of sometimes missing the trees for the forest or sometimes the forest for the trees. I suspect that the hon. member may have made one of those mistakes earlier on when he seemed to suggest that forests are just there to be exploited. They grow old and they age. Why not hack them down and turn them into pulp before the trees rot and decay? I think that misses the essence of what trees and forests are all about.

They're a habitat for animals, and they're also essential, in fact, to the survival of the planet earth because they convert a lot of carbon dioxide into oxygen. We're very concerned about what's happening in the rain forests in Brazil, but we should be equally concerned about what we're doing with our own forests here in the province of Alberta. We have a resource that's essentially a global resource. It's important, and we have a global social responsibility to ensure that those forests are used in the interests of the environment globally.

I just have one other point to make, Mr. Speaker. Last year I introduced a Bill called freedom of information and right to privacy, and in fact the government members here voted against that Bill. The record will show that. If that Bill had gone through and had been approved, we wouldn't need this amendment and we wouldn't need the original motion this amendment is based on because we would be able to get that information from the government. I would just encourage all members when that Bill comes forward to consider voting for a freedom of information and a right to privacy Bill.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Mill Woods.

AN HON. MEMBER: Mill Woods. There we go: another forest.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. GIBEAULT: Mr. Speaker, I have to argue against this amendment and encourage members of the Assembly to defeat it, because this amendment, with all due respect, I think prunes the motion perilously close to death. I think really what we're talking about here is a . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Go to the amendment, please.

MR. GIBEAULT: Yes, indeed. The amendment is compromising the right of members of the Assembly to have information that should be available to us. What we're talking about here is whether or not this Assembly will have information that is required to make some assessment about special deals this government has made -- basically for the expediency of the election that we just went through -- to commit the future of the northern half of this province for several decades, for perhaps generations. We don't know what the reforestation agreements were, what special deals may have been cooked up, how we determined the prices for wood products. There's a whole slew of information that is simply not available through the forest management agreement itself. We need these other items, the various agreements and correspondence, so we can have a proper assessment of how this government has protected -- if it has -- the public interest of the people of Alberta.

It's interesting, Mr. Speaker, for us on this side to hear members of the government talk about how this information is so confidential, because we just discovered a couple of weeks ago that the files of injured workers in this province obviously are not confidential. Yet when we simply ask for information with corporate deals here, special deals in the back room, where we're trying to assess the commitments that may have been made between corporations and this government in terms of forestry developments affecting very substantial parts of the province, now all of a sudden the hue and cry is: "Oh, my goodness. This is confidential." So it really is curious that there is very much a double standard here with this government between what is confidential and what is not confidential. I would suggest that if this government is really serious about these particular deals and wants to ensure to all Albertans that they have done everything they can to ensure the economic integrity of the development of the forest resource, not to mention the environmental integrity of northern Alberta, they would accommodate the motion that is put forward by the Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place, and that is simply not accomplished by this amendment that has been put forward by the minister.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would urge all members to defeat this amendment and then to adopt the motion for a return.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. SPEAKER: Call for the question. Member for Highwood.

MR. TANNAS: Mr. Speaker, if we can have members from Forest Lawn, Mill Woods speak because they know the forest industry well, why not Highwood?

I was interested to hear a few days ago how some hon. opposition members castigated a minister for revealing how public money was being spent on an individual and in fact managed to abstract from that minister an apology because he gave details to the public. Now we're asking on the other hand to give details

of an agreement that has not been made. Because surely an agreement is when all parties sign such a document. It's not public and not wise to put it into the public prior to the signing. So I wondered if the hon. opposition members might consider apologizing for suggesting that we do something they've already extracted an apology for. An agreement is an agreement when it is signed. The hon. minister and this government have said that they will make public documents such as forest management agreements when they are signed and they become public documents but not before, and so I support the amendment

MR. SPEAKER: There has been the call for the question. All those in favour of the amendment, please say aye.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed, please say no.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. SPEAKER: The amendment carries.

Is there . . . The Chair has to admit it's a little bit like a bouncing ball game going on here.

MS BARRETT: He can't tell how long we stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Do we have . . .

MS BARRETT: Yes, we do.

MR. SPEAKER: How many members?

MS BARRETT: Of course; that's the reason we're standing.

AN HON. MEMBER: They're up and down like yo-yos.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Okay, thank you.

[Several members rose calling for a division. The division bell was rung]

[Eight minutes having elapsed, the House divided]

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The proposition before the House is an amendment to Motion for a Return 149. The amendment was made by the hon. Minister of Forestry, Lands and Wildlife.

For the motion:

|           |           |             |
|-----------|-----------|-------------|
| Adair     | Gesell    | Musgrove    |
| Ady       | Getty     | Osterman    |
| Anderson  | Gogo      | Paszkowski  |
| Betkowski | Horsman   | Payne       |
| Black     | Hyland    | Rostad      |
| Bogle     | Johnston  | Schumacher  |
| Brassard  | Jonson    | Severtson   |
| Cardinal  | Klein     | Shrake      |
| Clegg     | Kowalski  | Speaker, R. |
| Day       | Laing, B. | Stewart     |
| Drobot    | Lund      | Tannas      |
| Elzinga   | Main      | Thurber     |
| Evans     | McClellan | Trynchy     |

|                     |           |           |   |
|---------------------|-----------|-----------|---|
| Fischer             | Mirosh    | West      | [Motion on amendment carried]                                 |
| Fjordbotten         | Moore     | Zarusky   |   |
| Fowler              |           |           | MR. SPEAKER: Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place.                |
| Against the motion: |           |           | MR. McINNIS: [Inaudible] my motion as amended. Mr.            |
| Barrett             | Laing, M. | Pashak    | Speaker, we're in an unusual situation . . .                  |
| Bruseker            | Martin    | Roberts   |   |
| Chumir              | McEachern | Sigurdson | MR. SPEAKER: Order please, hon. member. The Chair recog-      |
| Fox                 | McInnis   | Woloshyn  | nizes the member as having adjourned the debate on the motion |
| Gibeault            | Mjolsness | Wright    | for a return as amended.                                      |
| Hawkesworth         |           |           | [The House recessed at 5:30 p.m.]                             |
| Totals              | Ayes—46   | Noes—16   |   |