

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Title: **Tuesday, July 18, 1989 2:30 p.m.**
Date: 89/07/18

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

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

PRAYERS

MR. SPEAKER: Let us pray.

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

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

Amen.

head: INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure today to introduce to you, sir, and through you to Members of the Legislative Assembly the Hon. Yuri Bondar, Minister of Local Industries of the Ukrainian Republic. Mr. Bondar and his delegation are in Edmonton to present the Ukrainian trade and cultural show, which is being held in conjunction with Klondike Days at Edmonton Northlands.

Mr. Speaker, this event, as was indicated yesterday, is very significant in that it is the first time the Ukrainian Republic has staged such an exhibition internationally. The choice of Alberta for the first exhibition reflects the importance of our shared cultural heritage with Ukraine. We believe it will open up new and important links between the province of Alberta and the Ukrainian Republic.

Mr. Speaker, our guests are in your gallery, sir, along with Dr. Horst Schmid, our commissioner general, and I would ask if they would rise to receive the very warm welcome of the Legislative Assembly.

**head: PRESENTING REPORTS BY
STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES**

MR. ADY: Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 52 I wish to table the annual report of the Standing Committee on the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund Act. Copies of this report will be delivered to each member as soon as publication is complete.

head: NOTICES OF MOTIONS

MR. GIBEAULT: Mr. Speaker, I rise to give oral notice under Standing Order 40 to request after question period and before the calling of Orders of the Day unanimous consent to debate the following motion.

Be it resolved that in light of the extensive support provided by individual Albertans and development organizations to Nicaragua in the last 10 years, the Legislature extend its congratulations to the people of Nicaragua on the occasion of the 10th anniversary of the popular revolution that overthrew the Somoza dictatorship on July 19, 1979, and be it further re-

solved that this resolution be communicated by the Speaker of the Assembly to the Nicaraguan ambassador to Canada.

head: INTRODUCTION OF BILLS**Bill 10****Financial Administration Amendment Act, 1989**

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill 10, the Financial Administration Amendment Act, 1989. This is a money Bill. Her Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor, having been informed of the contents of this Bill, recommends the same to the Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, while improving the way in which the government manages and effectively controls the cost of our investment funds and our cash management strategies, there is one very important element in this Bill that takes place every year, and that's a requirement under the Financial Administration Act to increase the debt limits of the province to \$9.5 billion from the present level of \$7.5 billion.

[Leave granted; Bill 10 read a first time]

head: TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table the annual report of the Department of Transportation and Utilities for the year 1987-88.

MRS. BETKOWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to table with the Assembly four copies of the annual report of Alberta Hospitals and Medical Care for 1987-88, the statistical supplement of the Alberta health care insurance plan for 1987-88, and the annual report for the Department of Community and Occupational Health for 1987-88. Copies will be distributed to all members.

In addition, I am pleased to file copies of the following audited financial statements: the Alberta Hospital Edmonton for the year ended March 31, 1989; the Charles Camshell Provincial General hospital for the year ended March 31, 1989; the Foothills Provincial General hospital for the year ended March 31, 1989; the Glenrose Rehabilitation hospital for the year ended March 31, 1989; and the University Hospitals Board for the year ended March 31, 1989.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table copies of the annual report for Lethbridge Community College 1987-88 and also the annual report for Fairview College for the same year.

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 guests from both the local area and from Toronto. This pleasure is that much greater in view of the fact that they are parents of one of our outstanding pages. I would ask Mr. and Mrs. Lee and their guests and family to rise so that we can extend to them the very warm welcome of this Legislative Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Drumheller.

MR. SCHUMACHER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my privilege and pleasure this afternoon to introduce to you and through

you to all members of the Assembly a former page of this Assembly, Miss Shirish Chotalia, who is seated in your gallery and who has now gone on to join the legal profession in the practice of law in the city of Edmonton. I'd ask her to rise and to receive the courteous reception of the Assembly.

MRS. McCLELLAN: Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to introduce to you and through you to the members of the Legislature four ladies who are visiting our capital city and enjoying our Legislature and our beautiful grounds. First a constituent, Shirley Jorgenson. She is accompanied by Mrs. Aileen Young from Portage La Prairie, Manitoba, and Mary and Margaret Parkhill from Ontario. They're seated in the members' gallery. I'd ask them to rise and receive the customary warm welcome of this Assembly.

head: ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Loans and Loan Guarantees to Peter Pocklington

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, to the Treasurer. Albertans already know that Peter Pocklington has \$6 million of our money and that neither he nor the government will tell us what he's done with it. Albertans also want to know how much of our \$55 million loan guarantee Mr. Pocklington has already used. But it turns out that the question Albertans really need answered is: how much had he already used before we even gave him the guarantee? Mr. Speaker, records show that on the day the loan guarantee was approved, Gainers Inc. had outstanding debentures with the Continental Bank of Canada worth \$70 million. Now, we believe that that guarantee may have covered part of these outstanding debts instead of financing expansion and job diversification and creation as the government had promised in their press release. My question to the Treasurer. Will the Treasurer admit that on the day the government approved the \$55 million loan guarantee, the Continental Bank of Canada already held Gainers Inc. debentures worth \$70 million?

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Speaker, presumably the amount of money which is on the balance sheet is a matter of record. I obviously can't confirm that statistic.

MR. MARTIN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that if I were giving out money, I'd want to know what they owed.

Mr. Speaker, my question more specifically, then, to the Treasurer. Will the Treasurer tell us now whether or not the guarantee of March 3, 1988, had any relation to existing debentures issued by Gainers Inc. to the Continental Bank over the previous four years?

MR. JOHNSTON: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MARTIN: Well, Mr. Speaker, now the truth comes out. In other words, that press release they put out was an absolute lie. It had nothing to do with job creation; it had everything to do with bailing out Gainers.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary question.

MR. MARTIN: Will they admit the truth now, Mr. Speaker?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, if you want to talk about what

was done or what was happening, of course that could be quite a debate in itself. As we have said before, this is a straightforward process whereby the government guarantees a loan, and we have done that. There is nothing unusual about this. This is done all the time in normal corporate practices. What we have done is just as the member has outlined, and that's exactly the process we've talked about before.

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Avonmore.

Maintenance Enforcement Program

MS M. LAING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Attorney General. Research done by the Institute of Law Research and Reform here in Alberta in 1981 shows that 80 per cent of ex-husbands have sufficient disposable funds to meet their support obligations and that the main reasons for nonpayment were continued feelings of bitterness over the marriage breakdown and a lack of a sense of responsibility for their children. My question to the Attorney General. In view of this research, how can the minister justify collecting all moneys in only 32.5 per cent of cases and reporting that "you cannot obtain blood or water from a stone"?

MR. ROSTAD: Mr. Speaker, it's funny; we have the same problem as we had yesterday, where they lead with erroneous information. The 3.2 percent was fully explained yesterday as being just the people who are within the system that that's being collected. There are people who, once they were getting full payments, have withdrawn from the system. There are people who never registered because they were getting complete payments. That's erroneous information.

The second point is that the report that's alluded to that was done by the law reform commission was merely a survey, not done scientifically, on an ad hoc basis, dropping in to see people who were on maintenance to gather data as a prelude to putting in the maintenance enforcement program and was not to be taken as scientific data that you could compare from one year to another.

MS M. LAING: Mr. Speaker, in view of the minister's inference that statistics are being manipulated and that withdrawal from the program equals success, will the minister determine how many creditors have in fact withdrawn due to the frustration they experience and are pursuing the matter legally themselves?

MR. ROSTAD: Mr. Speaker, the program was set up to save people who have a maintenance order the cost of collecting and, with a regulated system, be more effective, and it has been effective. Again, as explained yesterday, there are many instances where the cause of the problem is beyond the program itself. If the program cannot locate one of the debtors or if that debtor happens to move to another province where we have reciprocal agreements, that is again outside the control of this program. That program is there to collect maintenance, under legal orders,

from people who have the resources, and it's effective. Obviously, there are going to be some people who aren't going to have collections finalized, but that is not due to lack of effort.

MS M. LAING: Mr. Speaker, the women of Alberta are not impressed.

As the minister has indicated that the maintenance enforcement officers' caseloads will be reduced to approximately 800 files, does the minister actually consider that 800 cases is a manageable number for effective enforcement when two-thirds of them require active intervention?

MR. ROSTAD: Mr. Speaker, I don't know exactly what the ideal is. There are certain parameters we have to work under. Since I have become minister -- and that's all I can speak about on this program -- we have brought forward more money, which has enabled us to increase the number of enforcement officers. Since January 1987 there has been a doubling of the amount of money that has been received from the various debtors. I will continue to monitor this. I will continue to work with the recommendations that have been made by the Alberta women's groups, and hopefully we can improve the program. It's not the ideal, but it's certainly better than what was there.

Appointments to Boards and Commissions

MR. DECORE: Mr. Speaker, the process that the government employs to put men and women into positions of authority, boards and tribunals, has come under considerable criticism in the last few years. We've had a Conservative fund-raiser/organizer appointed as the head of the ALCB. We've had another high profile Conservative and a neighbour appointed to the chairmanship of the Land Compensation Board. We now hear what we expected to hear, Mr. Speaker, and that is that the former Member for Stettler is being considered for another high profile position. Albertans are interested in the best men and the best women to serve in these positions of authority. My question to the Associate Minister of Agriculture is this: would she be prepared to table in this Assembly a description of the qualifications and the process by which she and the government are engaging, using, to appoint the new chairman of the Alberta Hail and Crop Insurance Corporation to satisfy Albertans . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. The question is asked.

MR. DECORE: . . . that the process is fair?

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MRS. McCLELLAN: Mr. Speaker, the process by which the Alberta Hail and Crop Insurance chairmanship is made is through the minister and through cabinet. I would be happy to discuss that with the member and with any other members at any time.

MR. DECORE: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Premier. Would he be prepared to ensure that those high profile positions, to be determined perhaps by a standing committee, that that person, that man or that woman, would be selected using a standing committee to help in the selection process?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, there are the odd occasions when a

standing committee may be used, as for instance in the case of the Ombudsman or Provincial Auditor, but clearly the government is elected to fulfill its responsibilities in the appointment of people. I for one am very pleased that so many Albertans are prepared, under a great deal of loss of time and energy and commitment to their personal work, to serve the people of Alberta on boards and commissions in the way they do, extremely pleased. Now, there's always judgment involved in these matters. Sometimes there's an ideal choice that is obvious, and you can move very quickly to appoint or select that person. Other times you have to take into account the qualifications, the responsibilities, the geographical location of the need. In some cases as well there is a reason to have a national search. But all of these are a matter of judgment, in which case the government exercises a judgment and then appoints people.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, that I find it pretty offensive on the part of the hon. member to single out the recent appointment of the president of the Alberta Liquor Control Board. That was a national search. That search was conducted by five people, of the reduced number, when it was isolated down to the last few choices. Those people were, in the case of Mr. Strain, two well-known Liberals, to my knowledge, and three public servants. I had no idea that Mr. Strain had sought the job, nor had he ever raised it with me. I find it offensive for the hon. member to pick his selection now and try and point some type of innuendo at someone who is serving the people of Alberta.

MR. DECORE: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Premier could assure this Assembly that he hasn't made a deal with the former Member for Stettler to pay him off for the services that he has given the government. Will he give us that assurance?

MR. GETTY: Again, Mr. Speaker, there's a certain cheapness about the question that the hon. member expresses. He casts an aspersion both on a former member of this Legislature and on myself as a member of the government. I could say that Mr. Downey and myself have both said publicly that there was no agreement to any type of follow-up relationship.

I will say this as well. Brian Downey is a talented, capable Albertan with a great deal of interest in many matters in this province. I believe he has a great deal more to contribute to the people of Alberta, and I for one will look for opportunities for him to make that contribution.

MR. SPEAKER: Clover Bar, followed by Edmonton-Mill Woods.

Highway 14 Intersections

MR. GESELL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

REV. ROBERTS: We'll send you to Nicaragua.

MR. SPEAKER: Clover Bar, not Edmonton-Centre.

MR. GESELL: Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Transportation and Utilities. There are some very serious safety concerns related to the intersections along Highway 14 within the Clover Bar constituency: the 23rd Avenue intersection, the Whitemud freeway intersection, and the entrance to South Cooking Lake. The most critical one is the 23rd Avenue intersection, where we have seen some recent fatalities,

as recently as last Saturday. To the minister. Will the minister accelerate contemplated improvements to the 23rd Avenue and Highway 14 intersection to alleviate the escalating potential for loss of life?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, I think I should point out two things with the utmost concern. Safety is a very, very significant feature and concern of mine. The fact that we've had two recent tragic deaths at that intersection has caused me to ask the department to do a full review of what is occurring at that intersection and what we may be able to do, both in the short term and in the long term, to adjust and hopefully remove the possibility of that occurring in the future.

Two things I should point out, Mr. Speaker. The city of Edmonton is working on the extension of the Whitemud freeway from 34th Street to their boundary at Highway 14. Those funds are available in the basic capital grants, and anything we can do to assist in that area will be done. After every fatal accident there is an investigation team that goes out and does a complete analysis of what has occurred and makes some recommendations to us, and I await those recommendations right now.

MR. GESELL: Mr. Speaker, the minister has referred to the Whitemud freeway intersection, and I have in my preamble as well. Will the minister give some indication of what improvements are contemplated there and the time frame for such improvements, because it does impact on the 23rd Avenue intersection.

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, I am aware that the city is presently in land acquisition for that particular site right now, and I'm not just exactly sure what the completion date would be.

MR. GESELL: Mr. Speaker, the third area of concern is related to the South Cooking Lake entrance. I would ask the minister if he would undertake to evaluate the requirement for street lights at that intersection to increase the safety in that location.

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, what I will do is take that as notice and certainly look at the traffic counts and the likes of that for the intersection at . . . Cooking Lake turnoff?

MR. GESELL: South Cooking Lake.

MR. ADAIR: South Cooking Lake turnoff.

Employment Equity

MR. GIBEAULT: Mr. Speaker, recently in the House the Minister of Culture and Multiculturalism said, when we were talking about employment equity, that he wasn't really sure what that was all about. In my efforts to assist in the minister's education, I'd like to refer to the Employment Equity Act, which was passed by the federal government in 1986 -- that's three years ago -- by the Conservative government, which said that

employment equity means more than treating persons [equally] in the same way but also requires special measures and the accommodation of differences.

I'd like to ask the minister this afternoon: since his federal Conservative colleagues saw the need for employment equity legislation three years ago, can he tell us why he and his government are taking so long to see the light?

MR. MAIN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't know that we're taking a long time to see the light at all. As a matter of fact, employment equity provisions are in place in some aspects of the government, and I'm sure the Minister of Labour would be glad to explain some of those areas.

In reference to the member's earlier question, he seemed to be heading towards an area of affirmative action, where I have some difficulties, as do most Albertans, realizing that now, in the cold, hard light of day, some of the areas of affirmative action in fact turn out to be reverse discrimination. I'm sure the member opposite would not be in favour of that.

MR. GIBEAULT: It's discouraging how little support there is for fairness, Mr. Speaker, from this government.

Let me just ask him this. Since the experiences at the federal government and at other jurisdictions across this country, at the provincial and municipal levels, have shown that you must have affirmative action employment equity measures to achieve some measure of fairness -- you have to have definite goals and timetables and measures that will accommodate that -- will the minister commit himself today to implement exactly those kinds of measures in Alberta?

MR. MAIN: Well, Mr. Speaker. The commitment of the government is clear. There is a commitment to fairness and equity of opportunity. That's what Canada is all about. That's why millions of people come to this country, because of the fairness and equity and availability of opportunities. If the member opposite is suggesting we do some strange things to make sure that certain individuals get certain jobs, that's not going to happen. But what we're going to do is make sure that all jobs, all opportunities are available to all people. That's the Canadian way; that's the Alberta way.

MR. GIBEAULT: Mr. Speaker, since even this government's large business friends have endorsed the employment equity concept, including the Calgary Chamber of Commerce, will this minister tell us when he's going to take off his ideological blinkers here and introduce an employment equity Act that all Albertans can be proud of?

MR. MAIN: Well, Mr. Speaker, never. I'm not the Minister of Labour. I won't be introducing any employment Act. I think the member opposite could figure that out.

But let's just go back to the main thrust of the question, which is fairness and equality of opportunity. That's what we're here for, to provide fairness and equality of opportunity and anybody can apply for any job for which they are qualified. But I again repeat that forcing people to accept certain jobs, forcing employers to hire certain people is not fair. If you want fairness, then that's what we're here for.

MS McCOY: Supplementary information. I was speaking with the Calgary Chamber of Commerce subcommittee on labour relations less than a month ago, and the subject we discussed included employment equity. I would like to correct the record. They are not asking for legislation, and we should have that clearly in *Hansard*. What they do encourage -- and I think it's farsighted of them, and it's one thing that we are working with as well -- is to include in our programs and to assist the private sector in their programs for training, because they recognize, and I think rightly so, that one of the challenges facing Al-

bertans is occupational segregation.

So programs like Stepping Stones, which we have in place for young women, introducing them to occupational diversity, programs like the equity officer, which the Minister of Career Development and Employment . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. minister. That's sufficient listing of programs on additional information on a supplementary.

Edmonton-Meadowlark, let's go. Thanks.

Advisory Panel for Alberta-Pacific Project

MR. MITCHELL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of the Environment has lunched along to the creation of a makeshift environmental impact assessment process for the Athabasca pulp mill project. It is neither fish nor fowl, and it's very unlikely that it's going to be able to evaluate with any effect the impact of this project on both these species, among others. Today we learned that we have an agreement with the federal government at the same time that we find two more appointees to the environmental board for the Athabasca project have resigned in recognition of conflict of interest To the minister. Does the minister now understand that it is very important that his selections be based upon impartiality?

MR. KLEIN: Mr. Speaker, the selections were based on the recommendations of the municipal jurisdictions, those jurisdictions that are closest to the people. With respect to the two individuals who resigned, they're good-thinking individuals; they're honest members of their community, hardworking members of their community. I asked them when I first met them, when I met them for the first time a week ago and when I learned that two of them had expressed some opinion relative to the pulp mills, to examine their conscience, to get back to me within four or five days, and if they felt that in any way they were going to jeopardize the process, then do the right thing. And they did the right thing. They're good people, honest people.

MR. MITCHELL: So he appointed them, and then he assessed their impartiality.

Perhaps the minister could give us some insight on how this board will work with, on the one hand, federal members appointed on the basis of strict regulations governing expertise and impartiality and, on the other hand, provincial members to this board appointed on the basis of ministerial whim, without regard to depth of expertise and impartiality.

MR. KLEIN: Well, I think that the hon. Mr. Bouchard, the federal Minister of the Environment, would take strong exception to that particular remark, because the selection of all the members was a joint process. In other words, the members were selected with the concurrence of the two ministers. Mr. Bouchard has concurred completely with our choice of members, and we have concurred completely with his choice of members. It's that kind of co-operation that's going to make this board work. It's that kind of co-operation that hopefully will establish a model for environmental impact assessments in the future.

MR. MITCHELL: Mr. Bouchard concurred, but the appointees themselves didn't concur very interesting.

I wonder if the minister could tell us what criteria he is

utilizing to select replacements for the provincial membership on this board. Can we have assurances that impartiality and depth of expertise will be at least two of the criteria he will involve in that process?

MR. SPEAKER: Two questions in one; answer the first, please.

MR. KLEIN: Mr. Speaker, the board is in place, and the criteria for selecting the member to replace Mr. Hunter, who did resign, was that which was outlined in the first place. That is, the municipal jurisdiction recommended Mr. West, who happens to be the superintendent of schools in Athabasca, again a very hardworking, honest individual, committed to the community. That appointment was related to Mr. Bouchard, and Mr. Bouchard concurred. He said: this appears to be the right man for the job. Simple as that.

MR. SPEAKER: Calgary-Fish Creek, followed by Edmonton-Calder, then Calgary-Buffalo.

Calgary Public School Board Contract Negotiations

MR. PAYNE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Alberta Teachers' Association negotiators and Calgary public school board negotiators reportedly have decided to suspend their current negotiating sessions until September. For those constituents who have expressed serious misgivings about this unfortunate suspension of negotiations, can the Minister of Education offer any rational explanation for this puzzling and casual approach to what obviously is an important round of negotiations with great implications for Calgary taxpayers and their school-age children?

MR. DINNING: Mr. Speaker, I share the hon. member's interest and anxiousness to see an agreement struck between the Calgary public board and the local of the Alberta Teachers' Association, and not wanting to get in between those important local negotiations, I am informed that the next meeting between the two parties will take place sometime in the last week of August.

MR. PAYNE: Well, Mr. Speaker, that's more than a month away, and for those with memories of what casual negotiations have done in the past in this context, is the Minister of Education prepared today to contact the parties and use his influence to encourage the negotiators to get on with the job?

MR. DINNING: Mr. Speaker, I take the hon. member's representation and will make contact with both the board representative on the negotiating side for the board and with the Alberta Teachers' Association local's president.

But I want to underscore, Mr. Speaker, the importance of negotiations taking place between two responsible parties at the local level. There are 150 active school boards in this province, and I believe it is the responsibility of locally elected trustees and the locals of the Alberta Teachers' Association, working beside and with that board of trustees, to come to a fair and reasonable agreement. But I appreciate, as I said, the hon. member's representation and will make contact with those appropriate parties.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Calder, followed by Calgary-

Buffalo, and then Drumheller.

Eligibility for Day Care Subsidies

MS MJOLSNESS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My questions are to the Minister of Family and Social Services. In 1982 this government identified income levels at which parents would be eligible for day care subsidies and levels at which they would not be eligible, and no adjustment has been made since 1982. Some parents have had to refuse even modest wage increases because their day care costs would go up so dramatically, and others have quit their jobs and gone on social assistance because they cannot afford to pay the fees. In view of the fact that the income levels warranting assistance in 1982 are far too low for 1989, will the minister adjust the income eligibility levels so that they are appropriate for 1989?

MR. OLDRING: Mr. Speaker, I'm happy to say that it's a matter I'm looking at right now and that we hope to be able to make some announcements as it relates to that sometime in the early fall.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary.

MS MJOLSNESS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Supplementary to the minister then. We continue to hear this, that we have to wait until the fall. I would ask this minister does he recognize the urgency of this issue, and would he move to make a decision and an announcement much sooner than the fall?

MR. OLDRING: Well, Mr. Speaker, I can only say as a new minister that I have made it a priority, that it was one of the first things I took the time to address once assuming office. The member opposite knows full well that we did increase the subsidy rates to low-income families, and I think that was a substantive step in the right direction and a substantive increase, some 20 percent. I can only say that I want to make sure we have all the facts and information, that we don't just jump ahead and make decisions without getting all the knowledge we should have. I'm looking forward to having . . . [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. OLDRING: . . . the full information, and once I receive that I'll make some decisions, Mr. Speaker.

MS MJOLSNESS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, I would bring to the minister's attention that we've been waiting since 1982. We have all the information.

I would ask this minister is he aware that parents are having to quit their jobs to go on social assistance, and many parents, many single parents, have had to refuse wage increases because they're waiting to get this certain subsidy level adjusted?

MR. OLDRING: Well, Mr. Speaker, I would only want to add to the comments that I've made already, the commitment to review the situation, the commitment to make some necessary adjustments by September or October.

I would also want to reiterate the commitment and the effort this government has made over the years towards day care and making day care alternatives available. There isn't another province in Canada that actually has a vacancy rate. There isn't

another province in Canada that is providing the per capita funding that we place into day care each and every year. Last year we committed \$68 million to day care. This year we've committed \$75 million to day care. Mr. Speaker, clearly this government is committed to helping those single-parent families and other families requiring, day care and other alternatives for their children.

Loans and Loan Guarantees to Peter Pocklington

(continued)

MR. CHUMIR: Mr. Speaker, to the Provincial Treasurer. The government has been hiding the true facts of its strange dealings with Pocklington and the Gainers group for some time now. The press release dated March 3, 1988, issued by the government stated that the \$55 million guarantee was part of a package to expand the plant in Edmonton and build a new hog plant. We now see from the minister's admission that the guarantee related to existing loans, that this is really a bailout of Gainers and its bankers. I'm wondering whether the minister would now be prepared to tell this House: what is the amount of the existing liability of Gainers which is being covered by our guarantee? What's the current amount of the risk to the provincial government under that guarantee?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, as we have said repeatedly, about \$55 million has been put aside for the short-term credit line.

MR. CHUMIR: Would the minister then please advise this House how much the province is receiving, whether directly or through one of its numbered companies, in fees or other payments as a result of this \$55 million guarantee and on what basis the fee is calculated?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, if he's talking about a fee, the normal fee on a guarantee, subject to confirmation, would be one-half of 1 percent.

MR. CHUMIR: I wonder whether the minister might confirm a statement that the government and its numbered companies are in receipt of the amount of \$900,000 per month in respect of the guarantee or some loan aspect relating to the guarantee. Is that or is that not accurate?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, the member is obviously fishing for information. If he's got a question, I'd be glad to answer it, but I'm not going to try and guess what the point is he's making. I've answered every question that's been put to me in the House. My colleagues, the minister of economic development and the Minister of Agriculture, have satisfied every question before us, and I can't guess what the member is meaning by his question.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

Member for Drumheller, followed by Edmonton-Centre.

Maintenance of Rural Hospitals

MR. SCHUMACHER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the hon. Minister of Public Works, Supply and Services. In view of the apparent failure in construction of the Oilfields

hospital at Turner Valley and reported problems at hospitals in Pincher Creek and Magrath, can the minister say if the prototypical hospital design developed by the government, which has been used for many hospitals across the province including the very worth while and successful Valley General hospital at Strathmore, is in any way responsible?

MR. KOWALSKI: Absolutely not, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member has raised three different hospitals. Last Wednesday in this Assembly the hon. Member for Highwood raised questions about the Oilfields General hospital. Last Wednesday the government of Alberta, through myself as the minister responsible, conveyed an information letter to that particular hospital board that we would be allocating some \$275,000 to assist in any difficult clay swelling problem their hospital has been experiencing.

In the case of Magrath a 25-bed hospital was completed in Magrath in 1985 at a construction cost of \$7.5 million. In early 1987 there was a minor problem which required some remedial work to the total amount of \$26,000.

In the case of Pincher Creek a 40-bed active hospital was completed in 1983 at a cost of nearly \$13 million. In the spring of 1989 they experienced a sewer backup problem. Remedial work at the estimated cost of approximately \$50,000 has been undertaken this spring.

MR. SCHUMACHER: Did the government of Alberta have anything to do with choosing the sites for the hospitals that have experienced these difficulties?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, in the province of Alberta independent hospital boards appointed or elected at a local level make a number of decisions with respect to hospital construction. Number one, it is the hospital board that chooses the site for a hospital. It is the hospital board that purchases the land for such a hospital. It is the hospital board that determines the size, the scope of the type of hospital. It is the hospital board that hires the architect and the engineer and hires the contractor. The province of Alberta plays a role in providing funding for the actual construction of the hospital and works hand in hand with those hospital boards. But the procedure that we've always followed in this province and one that all hospital boards in the province want us to follow is that local autonomy be recognized and preserved.

MR. SPEAKER: Final.

MR. SCHUMACHER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will there be any new procedures implemented to reduce or overcome the structural difficulties experienced by these three hospitals now that the Department of Public Works, Supply and Services has taken over the responsibility for hospital construction from the Department of Health?

MR. KOWALSKI: Well, Mr. Speaker, in the fall of 1988, when the Premier made adjustments to responsibilities by various members of Executive Council, one of those changes in responsibilities occurred in the transfer of responsibility for supervision and involvement in the construction of hospitals from the Department of Health to the Department of Public Works, Supply and Services. What we have done in this department over the last number of months is offered our ability of good offices and expertise to any hospital board in the province of Alberta

who wants to work hand in hand with the engineers that are currently a part of the government mechanism of the Department of Public Works, Supply and Services.

In the last number of months the number of hospital boards, small hospital boards that don't really have access to the great amount of expertise that a larger hospital board might have in a large urban centre, have made use of this availability of information. The system seems to be working quite well. I want to underscore, Mr. Speaker, that the province of Alberta will recognize the autonomy of hospital boards throughout this whole process. We will not force our way into a hospital boardroom to tell the local hospital board what they must do on each and every occasion.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Centre, followed by Calgary-McKnight.

Control of Chinese Cooking Wine Sales

REV. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There's been a lot of concern and attention being paid recently to the health care of people who have low incomes who live in the inner city. As well we've heard from the Solicitor General the fact that he wants to get drinking and driving under control and look into the issues of substance abuse. One of the issues that's currently arising in the city of Edmonton as well as in the city of Calgary is the use of Chinese cooking wine as a beverage that's used by inner-city residents and has a very negative health effect. I'm just wondering if the Minister of Health has studied this matter and what she can recommend to the Assembly in terms of actions being taken with respect to this issue?

MRS. BETKOWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I'm not as aware of the issue as I would like to be before responding to the questions in the House. I will take them on notice and report back to the hon. member.

MR. FOWLER: Supplementary answer to that. My department is aware and has been made aware through our police contacts in the department. There is a regulation in written form now, signed by me, which will be addressing the matter of Chinese cooking wine, reducing the alcohol content to 20 percent, which will be controlled by the Alberta Liquor Control Board. The cooking wine we have found to be 40 percent and creating a serious problem in that area.

REV. ROBERTS: Well, is the Solicitor General then saying that he's consulted with the Boyle McCauley Health Centre, the Edmonton city police, and others in the inner city to remove Chinese cooking wine, which is 40 percent proof, which is only \$2.25, from the shelves of grocers in Edmonton?

MR. FOWLER: What I've indicated, Mr. Speaker, is that we will be controlling anything above 20 percent. If there is any wine on the shelves over the 20 percent amount, then it will be removed.

REV. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, that doesn't seem to go far enough. I mean, 20 percent proof can still do a lot of damage to people who use this in a substance abuse way. I wonder what criteria it is that the Solicitor General is using the 20 percent proof and not reducing it to even further than that to better en-

hance the health of people in the inner city?

MR. FOWLER: I suppose, Mr. Speaker, we could remove it completely and then deal with the culture of the Chinese community that make use of this wine. The Alberta Liquor Control Board people have advised the department that we are going to utilize that 20 percent, and the same salt content will be there. It's the matter of salt content in the liquor that helps to make it watered down. If the same salt content applies to the 20 percent wine as the 40 percent wine, by the time they get it watered down where it can be potable, I believe it would likely be somewhere around the beer content.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.
Calgary-McKnight.

Continuing Education Programs

MRS. GAGNON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In the throne speech and Budget Address this government stated that education was its highest priority. The plight of Alberta's continuing education programs is a clear indication that the government is failing miserably in meeting this commitment. Organizations like the Grand Centre Regional Continuing Education Council provide many benefits to Albertans in communities across the province, and continuing education programs offer adults an invaluable opportunity to participate in noncredit educational enhancement programs. It is an abomination that the operating grants to these programs have not increased since 1981 and that inadequate funding for administration costs has, in addition to increasing tuition fees, placed these programs in serious jeopardy. My question is to the Minister of Advanced Education. Is the minister aware that excessive increases in tuition fees for continuing ed programs may discourage Albertans from enrolling in these valuable programs?

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, there's no question that excessive fees in anything would tend to restrict participation. But it's not the view of the government nor of this department that tuition fees at any of our postsecondary institutions are excessive. Indeed, they're amongst the lowest in Canada.

MRS. GAGNON: Mr. Speaker, it seems as though we're heading for full user fees. Is the minister aware that inadequate administration funding has created a situation whereby the program administrators, of which the majority are female, are continually underpaid for their services, and some of them have offices in their own homes?

MR. GOGO: Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member's obviously putting forward a question that asks for a judgment. I'm not in a position to state that judgment other than to say that our department and this government has funded, in our view, adequate funding to carry out continuing education in the various institutions.

MRS. GAGNON: Mr. Speaker, I would then ask the minister to commit today to undertaking a thorough review of further education funding to assure that the programs continue and prosper.

MR. GOGO: Well, Mr. Speaker, the request by the hon. member to have a review: I would point out that even though we're

still on the estimates of the 1989-90 budget, we're entering the process of preparing a budget for 1990-91. I would assure the hon. member that there's always due diligence given to budget preparation by the department, by the institutions, and certainly by the government.

MR. SPEAKER: Calgary-Mountain View, followed by Edmonton-Whitemud, then Edmonton-Gold Bar if there's time.

Funding of World Blitz Chess Championship

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In answer to my questions on June 22 about his contradictory statements regarding a now defunct chess tournament in Calgary, the Minister of Tourism told the Assembly:

I've asked my department to do a complete file for the House of our involvement, and we'll be tabling that to clear the air and the concerns.

Well, Mr. Speaker, virtually a month has gone by since he made that statement in the Assembly, and as each day passes, the air is still not cleared and the the concerns just haven't gone away. Will the minister take the opportunity today to give us a specific date when we can expect him to make public his file, or will he let this matter drag on indefinitely?

MR. SPARROW: Mr. Speaker, the report has been finalized, and our staff are presently verifying with all the proponents and getting their approval to allow their documentation to be part and parcel of that report. We expect that to happen very shortly, and as soon as it's available and approved, I will be filing copies of it for the House, as stated.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Tourism. Will this file, when it's made public, give the creditors and small businesspeople who have been bilked out of approximately \$200,000 an indication of where they can go for redress? Will this report help them?

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed? Carried. Thank you.

MR. SPARROW: Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the file will not address those issues. As we've stated earlier in the House, our files were given to the Attorney General's department. A legal matter of individual payment of those bills is being discussed between the lawyers and is not part and parcel of my report. We were not responsible for any of those payments as a government and had no contract arrangements with outsiders, other than the ones that will be in the report.

MR. SPEAKER: Final.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will this report when it's made public indicate to the taxpayers how the government intends to recover the money it has lost as a result of the department's careless handling of this matter?

MR. SPARROW: Mr. Speaker, there's a budget that we have to live within. We tackle some projects in a very positive way, anticipating to have success, and we end up with a few failures. So I think that had we not taken a risk in some ventures, we couldn't gain. To give you an example, under the CATA agreement we've got some 380 projects that are successful and moving on and some \$35 million of government funds, both the Alberta government and the federal government, that we've put into it, and that's leveraged some 357 projects that come up to some \$205 million, some 6 to 1 leveraging. Under the community tourism action planning process we now have about 120 communities that have finished the average goal and objectives set, and those are some 30 each; that's 3,600. Out of those projects we've only spent about a million dollars, and that's leveraged \$12 million. Undoubtedly, if we keep investing in tourism, Mr. Speaker, those good projects will definitely get our money back time and time again.

head: **MOTIONS UNDERSTANDING ORDER 40**

MR. SPEAKER: Standing Order 40 request by Edmonton-Mill Woods. Speaking briefly to the matter.

Mr. Gibeault:

Be it resolved that in light of the extensive support provided by individual Albertans and development organizations to Nicaragua in the last 10 years, the Legislature extend its congratulations to the people of Nicaragua on the occasion of the 10th anniversary of the popular revolution that overthrew the Somoza dictatorship on July 19, 1979, and be it further resolved that this resolution be communicated by the Speaker of the Assembly to the Nicaraguan ambassador to Canada.

MR. GIBEAULT: Well, the urgency for this motion, of course, Mr. Speaker, is that tomorrow is the 10th anniversary of the Nicaraguan revolution, and I believe that this is an important resolution to many Albertans who have been to Nicaragua and who continue to work on behalf of development of the people, the resources, the communities of that particular country, because of the change in government that has made development possible in Nicaragua. I would therefore ask for the unanimous support of all members of the House so that we might have a brief debate on this important resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Mill Woods has given the request for urgency. Those in favour of this proceeding, please say aye.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed, please say no.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. SPEAKER: Fails.

MR. SHRAKE: We'll put that through when they have freedom of speech in that country.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please, Calgary-Millican.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

head: **WRITTEN QUESTIONS**

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

MR. SPEAKER: Having heard the motion by the Deputy Government House Leader, those in favour, please say aye.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed, please say no.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion fails on a voice vote.

CLERK: Motions for Returns.

MR. SPEAKER: No. We're staying with the question. We have one here. Written Question 148.

148. Mr. McInnis asked the government the following question:

- (1) What is the government's best estimate of the tonnage of paper, including stationery and envelopes, acquired and used by the government, its departments and agencies, during the most recent fiscal year from which these estimates may reasonably be derived?
- (2) What is the government's best estimate of the cost of that paper?
- (3) How much recycled paper or paper products were used in that fiscal year?
- (4) What is the government's best estimate of how much of the paper could be substituted by recycled paper products?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, it's my understanding that questions cannot be amended. But the hon. Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place and I have had a discussion, and it's my understanding that the hon. member would like to rephrase 148 so that the government could accept it. As it now stands, we would have to reject it, and I don't really want to do that. So perhaps I could sit down and see what the hon. Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place as the author of the question would like to do.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. minister. The Chair has had some information that the Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place might be willing to consider some minor modifications, and then perhaps we could proceed on this question.

MR. McINNIS: I have a rewritten question which I believe is acceptable to the minister. How would it be if I withdraw this and resubmit the question to be dealt with on Thursday?

MR. SPEAKER: The member, then, has withdrawn the question and indeed will resubmit the matter to my office later this afternoon. Thank you, hon. member. Thank you, Mr. Minister.

193. Mr. Mitchell asked the government the following question:

What agreements are in place or are being discussed by the government of Alberta with Alberta-Pacific and/or Daishowa to shelter either or both of those companies should pulp prices decline in the future and threaten the viability of their commercial operations in the Peace River and Athabasca areas?

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, it's my intention to say no to the question because there are no agreements.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Both questions have been dealt with.

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 170, 174, 177, 191, 192, 195, 196, and 198.

[Motion carried]

149. Mr. McInnis moved that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing a copy of the forest management agreement between the Crown in the right of Alberta and Alberta Newsprint Company Ltd.

[Debate adjourned June 21: Mr. McInnis speaking]

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair would point out that this is summation. Thank you.

Edmonton-Jasper Place.

MR. McINNIS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We're dealing with Motion 149 as amended by the government. I think it would be helpful in concluding debate on this matter to outline for the members the nature of forest management agreements so that they might understand why a motion seeking a forest management agreement in the form of an order for a return is not necessarily going to add greatly to the collective understanding of Albertans on this issue and to the public life of the province. I think perhaps the best way to do that would be to briefly outline the nature of forest management agreements and to deal with some of the specific problems that exist so that members can be fully aware of what it is we're talking about and why that particular approach to the disclosure of public information is not adequate. I think it's important because there was discussion previously on this motion and a number of members indicated their feeling that what was being sought after was some information which is of a commercially confidential nature, that it might involve speech notes and all kinds of secret material relating to the negotiating process. Of course, that's not what's being sought at all. What's being sought is the definition of the agreement as it exists between the government of Alberta and a particular company.

Forest management agreements are contracts which tie up forest lands in the hands of a particular company for a long period of time. A forest management agreement is initially struck for a 20-year period, but it is, according to the terms of all of the FMAs that I've seen, renewable automatically so long as the conditions within the agreement are met by the parties. So it's a

document which remains in place for a very long period of time, although it's arrived at through a process which is essentially a closed-door negotiating process between the government and the particular forest company involved.

I have pointed out previously that forest management agreements have been signed or are under negotiation for an area of approximately 30 percent of the landmass of the province, some 200,000-plus square kilometres. I appreciate that not every square kilometre within that territory can be logged, but it does dedicate the use of that land to production of fibre, usually for a pulp mill. In our province that's what forest management agreements are used for. The area involved is approximately three times the landmass of the province of New Brunswick by way of comparison, or, as someone pointed out to me the other day, it's equal to all of the forestry lands in the state of Washington, which is a state known for its forestry production.

Secondly, forest management agreements are negotiated through a bilateral type of negotiation which doesn't involve the public in any meaningful way at all. Preparatory to the negotiations that are currently under way, the department of forests and the Forest Service held a series of, I believe, more than a hundred open houses, coffee parties, where individuals came and could look at coloured maps of the area affected. They could listen to what the Forest Service had to say; they could ask questions of Forest Service people. But there is no suggestion, I think, on anyone's part that those discussions have anything whatever to do with the negotiations that take place on a forest management agreement, because the people who are at the open houses and coffee parties don't sit at the table when it comes time to negotiate the forest management agreement, which is what I mean when I say that there's no meaningful public input into the negotiation of a forest management agreement.

These meetings are intended, in the first instance, to mollify the public who have concerns, because remember that most of these meetings took place before, during, and immediately after a provincial general election campaign. Obviously, there was some sensitivity to the criticism that a very major public policy decision is being made which affects the future of the province, and nobody knows anything about it and nobody has very much opportunity to involve themselves in that historic type of decision.

I have to look back to the Environment Council of Alberta, which conducted comprehensive hearings on the environmental aspects of forestry development in our province, produced a landmark report in 1978, which was tabled in this Legislative Assembly. Recommendation 1 of that report is that we've got to be very, very careful about awarding new forest management agreements. I'm paraphrasing, but the report said that a decision to sign another forest management agreement should only be made after the greatest possible consideration, discussion, and dialogue on a matter of significant public policy and, more importantly, that there should be full public hearings and a full environmental impact assessment of any future forest management agreements. That's what we're talking about in this motion and all of the similar motions to it that are on the Order Paper.

So we have a process, and so far as I know -- I raised this question again yesterday -- so far as anyone knows, none of the forest management agreements are going to be available during the time that you can still discuss whether or not these projects should go ahead. During the time that there's an environmental impact assessment on Alberta-Pacific, for example, and

Mitsubishi/Honshu corporation, there is no forest management agreement to look at.

In the case of Motion 149 as amended, we're dealing with the question of the forest management agreement for the Alberta Newsprint Company. Now, we're in a special circumstance here. As I understand it, the Alberta Newsprint FMA has been signed by the government and the companies, but it hasn't been through the cabinet; it hasn't been published in the *Alberta Gazette*. Therefore, it's a document which exists but which hasn't yet been made public. To that extent I suppose there is some benefit to the public in having this motion passed today, although it still doesn't answer a lot of other pertinent questions, and it's these that I hope to deal with.

The third difficulty with forest management agreements is that they don't create jobs. I've presented to this House detailed comparisons of various forest projects, various forestry operations across Canada in relation to the ones that we're now contemplating or now in the process of constructing in the province of Alberta, and we find that these projects create jobs at only one-quarter the rate that an average forestry project does in Canada. I appreciate that it's difficult to describe the average forest project in words, but it does indicate that there are many different ways that forestry can develop. Forestry is an industry which creates numerous end products out of a similar raw resource. The productivity in forestry is quite large at this point in time, but it's going to get larger and larger in the future as we find more ways to use wood fibre, more ways to put wood fibres together in products which are useful to consumers in our society. So when you're making this type of comparison, the number of jobs created per thousand cubic metres, there's quite a wide variety of forestry developments that are in that. But the fact remains that these bleached kraft pulp mills in Alberta create about one-quarter of the jobs of the average forestry project, and there's a very simple reason for it, Mr. Speaker.

The proposal in all of these forest management agreements is to mechanically log with a device some people call a feller-puller. I think Daishowa uses a slightly different term to describe the same apparatus, which mows down the tree and gets it into a position where a mechanical delimber can mechanically take the limbs off the tree. They're then loaded mechanically onto a logging truck, rolled into a fully mechanized state-of-the-art mill where they become bales of fluffy white pulp, which is sent off to the United States or Japan for further processing. So it's the very bottom end of value added as far as our forest industry is concerned. Our fibre is exported in what I call semi-processed form under these projects, and that's the reason why the number of jobs created is relatively low.

Now, I hear the Member for Athabasca-Lac La Biche time after time argue for jobs in his constituency. I believe that his constituents should have those jobs, but I believe they should have more and better jobs than these projects offer, because we don't have a training program anywhere in our province to operate this mechanical harvesting equipment. In fact, it's very difficult for an individual of modest means to go into the business of contracting with these firms because it's very expensive equipment that we're talking about. You have to invest millions of dollars to become a logging contractor in this kind of logging. It's not the sort of thing where you can go out and buy a chain saw and some boots and a four-by-four and you're in business. You've got to invest major sums of money, and we don't have in place in our province programs which would allow local people to get involved in setting up their own logging operations or

even to train them to operate these mechanical harvesting machines which are the order of the day in this type of logging operation. So we don't have the jobs that we might have out of the development of this forestry resource, bearing in mind that these forest management agreements will tie up that resource for a very long period of time.

Fourthly, and this again was the subject of discussion yesterday, government revenues under these forest management agreements are very low. The comparisons are complicated because different provinces, different jurisdictions, require companies to pay certain expenditures out of their revenues. Others require that those expenditures be made from government revenues, so you have to do some sorting of expenditure as well as revenue. But I think in the comparisons that have been made, the pattern is relatively clear: Alberta is among the lowest by, I suggest, a very significant margin. Of course, we don't know the price to be negotiated for Daishowa and Mitsubishi/Honshu, for example, or, for that matter, Alberta Newsprint, which is the subject of Motion 149. But we do note in the existing FMAs that the prices for softwood range from \$1.50 to \$2, and for hardwoods it's pennies. It's 27 cents, I think, for Procter & Gamble and 65 cents for Weldwood. So on average these revenues are low, and of course they don't come anywhere near close to covering the cost to the taxpayers of Alberta of maintaining the forest resource. So we don't even recover those costs. This obviously is not a source of revenue for the provincial government and for the taxpayers of the province of Alberta.

In fact, a forest management agreement appears to be a source of expenditure, if I can use that language, and I think it's one reason why some further elaboration is required so that the understanding of these forest management agreements can be improved among our population. I received a letter from the minister of forests some time ago taking me to task for saying that not one person in 10 understands the nature of these forest management agreements. I do admit that I was wrong on that score. I've since talked to quite a few more people about it. I would say it's not one in a hundred who understands what these forest management agreements are all about, and I include some people who make their living gathering information about precisely these types of issues. An FMA is a very complicated document, and it in itself only scratches the surface as far as what happens in forest management in our province.

The fifth problem, and I think this is one that intrigues me a great deal, is that the province doesn't have an adequate forest resource survey of the lands involved. I know the minister is going to argue that point, but we don't know the critical wildlife habitats throughout this region. We don't know the recreation potential of all of these areas. On Friday we discussed the Lakeland area, which is only one part of this huge FMA territory, which has excellent, well-documented recreational potential. It's not at all clear how the future recreational potential of the Lakeland district is going to be impacted by these forest management agreements. Similarly, many organizations in our province have asked for a northern boreal ecoreserve, or ecological reserve, in order that we preserve some parts, especially the older growth boreal forest, as wildlife habitat. Even though those proposals have been made, they haven't been developed prior to the time that the negotiations are under way for forest management agreements.

So the province, I think, is somewhat handicapped in its negotiations. It doesn't know what lands to reserve with great cer-

tainty, for what purpose. It doesn't know with great certainty what the economic value of the resource will be extended in time in the future, because that's what all of these agreements do. It does have to set a price in the negotiation, and the price is set. It's escalated and de-escalated according to the most recent forest management agreements according to the price of pulp, which means, especially if you're negotiating at a time when pulp prices are high, there is some downside risk in these contracts, that even the modest revenues that I've been talking about may not be there in future if the price of pulp moves downward. I think part of the problem is having to negotiate a price in the absence of competitive bidders, in the absence of perfect information, in the absence of detailed land use plans for the entire region.

A related point: the sixth problem with these forest management agreements is that the province is in a position of having to compensate the FMA holder if they decide to withdraw some lands from the FMA, which may very well happen. Suppose we discover a critical wildlife habitat, and suppose we have a government, for a change, that decides it wants to protect critical wildlife habitat within the forest management area. If those withdrawals exceed 2 percent of the area, we have to compensate the companies for that. Now, this is an agreement that they didn't pay us to get in the first place. It's an agreement that gives them the right to exploit these particular lands for a purpose: to supply fibre to a pulp mill. And if we want to withdraw some of the territory, we will have to pay them for anything more than 2 percent. It tends to put the forest management company in the position of the landlord under these contracts, and the government of Alberta and the people of Alberta, who are represented by this government in the position of tenants.

Why should we have to compensate forest companies if we decide that there are some critical wildlife areas that need to be preserved, if we decide that there are some native land claims that need to be resolved in these areas, if we decide that there is recreation potential and we want to have provincial parks in this area? If we decide any other approach to the forestry lands, if it can't be accommodated by negotiation with the companies, we have to compensate them under this particular agreement. It's another aspect to a forest management agreement that's very difficult to understand unless you are somehow privy to what else is on the table, what else are we negotiating, what else is agreed to by the companies and the governments aside from the narrow confine of the forest management agreement.

Point number seven, Mr. Speaker -- and here we get into the management of the forests -- the management then shifts, once an FMA is signed, from the Forest Service to the company involved. Companies prepare forest management plans based on a survey that they themselves conduct, and this survey is done after the FMA is signed. They hire consultants, go through and count the trees, how big they are, and try to come up with a guesstimate of how much fibre is grown within this forest management agreement within a year. The Forest Service then has the option of reviewing these plans, suggesting changes. It's again negotiation. And I think the more I look into this, the more I dislike the use of the term "negotiation" to describe the management of our forests, but indeed that's what it comes down to. It's a closed-loop negotiation involving the companies and the provincial government.

So they come up with their forest management plan and their annual logging plan. Somewhere along the line somebody from

Fish and Wildlife gets brought in. And of course, I've heard forestry people talk about Fish and Wildlife people: they're these biologists and other people who want to save everything. They get a chance to have their go in an interdepartmental meeting. According to the foresters, who in effect do this work on behalf of the company and the government they listen to the biologists who want to protect everything. Then they tell them: "Well, this is the real world, sonny. We're going to go on and do what we're here to do, which is business, and business is logging this thing." You've got to make a pretty good case to save absolutely anything.

In fact the public policy of the province is to attack and annihilate all of the old-growth forests within these forest management agreements. This is a policy which is under attack by a great number of people who are only now coming to realize that the mature forests, not just of our province but throughout the world, are a very stable ecosystem, the only home to very many species of birds and mammals, especially large ungulates, which need the cover of an old-growth forest in order to survive. Old-growth forests are actually more resistant to forest fires than these plantation stands of evenly spaced younger trees which the practice of forestry likes to create, instead of mature older stands of forest. What amounts to a type of genocide against the old-growth forest is not really sound forest management at all. I'll grant that that's what they teach in forestry school, but it does have an ecological cost to it in terms of the species that inhabit only the old-growth forests and the stability of the entire forest ecosystem. I think that's especially the case when you have a mixed forest which is what the northern boreal forest is. It's not one type of tree; it's many types of trees. It's many types of ecosystems: there's muskeg; there are all kinds of lakes; there are grasslands, as well as hardwood stands, aspen poplar, and the prize for the forest industry, which is old-growth softwood timber.

So, you know, for example, last time I was up to Grande Prairie, I stopped in at Procter & Gamble and had a look at their forest management plan. They calculate an annual allowable cut and then they add a figure on top of that which constitutes their plan to wipe out the old-growth forest. That's the bonus in their book. They get what they themselves estimate to be the annual productive growth in the forest. They take that as given; that's their right under the agreement given by the Crown in the right of the province. Then they add the new factor, which is the annihilation of old growth factor, and that gives them a larger annual allowable cut. But in terms of the long-term management of the forest ecosystem it may very well be a disaster. I hope not but it may. And that's the public policy of the province.

Point eight, reforestation. I appreciate that the minister is reviewing policy in this area because I think it's about time that we did that. In the reforestation field our reforestation standards are far too lax. The province does like to brag about our standards being the envy of others, but it's only because we've redefined the notion of reforestation down to the point where it's very easy to give ourselves a passing grade. For example, there are, I'm told, some 190,000 hectares of already logged land in the province which is considered to be satisfactorily restocked, but you can't see a tree on it above the grasses. The trees are there. If you sort of go leafing through the grasses, you might be able to find the trees down there somewhere. In fact somebody has gone through and done that. That's why it's got the passing grade, why it's considered to be satisfactorily restocked,

but the trees aren't above the cover. I guess in the language of forestry they say the trees are not free to grow; they're just stalled. They're there, they're alive, but they're never going to reach the height and size of merchantable timber because of competition from other species.

Now, because of the effect of arbitrarily classing those as satisfactorily restocked lands, the forest company's off the hook and we the taxpayers now have the responsibility to look after that land. After seven years, if they have X number of trees per hectare -- I think it's 800 trees per hectare -- it passes, and it comes over to the taxpayers. Now, I do know that the Forest Service is studying this problem. They're contemplating using herbicides to spray down all of the other vegetation to give these little conifers a chance to get above the cover. I think there are other problems with that, and I won't indulge the Chair by entering that debate today but simply say that within the forest management agreements this problem is not adequately dealt with. I think we either need a change in that area or some explanation of why.

The 190,000 hectares I referred to was some 38 percent of the forest land that's been logged. So we're in a situation where not even two-thirds of the land logged to date is in a satisfactory state of reforestation. We're in fact in a state where less than two-thirds has achieved a satisfactory state of reforestation, and that's not good enough. In the new forest management agreements these things may or may not change. We don't know all of the facts about it, but certainly whatever agreements exist between the government and the companies in respect of this reforestation problem have to be on the table.

The ninth difficulty with forest management agreements: there are so many things they don't say. One of them is the financial arrangements that exist between the companies and the government. I think we're to the point where we have to consider some of the things that the government's doing for these companies to be corporate welfare, pure and simple. We have, in the case of the forest management agreements that are referred to in this series of motions, loan guarantees already issued from the province in the amount of \$589.6 million; infrastructure grants in the amount of \$152 million; debentures committed -- I understand that's a direct loan from the province -- in the amount of \$300 million; a participating debenture in the amount of \$120 million; further road and infrastructure grants in the amount of \$10 million; utilities grants, \$8 million; purchase of preferred shares, \$32 million. Overall exposure by the taxpayers, \$1,211,600,000. So, as if it weren't bad enough that all of these forest lands are perpetually signed over to forest companies to manage, with the Forest Service performing an auditing function, we then provide taxpayers' funds, taxpayers' credit, and generally the fiscal capacity of the taxpayers of the province in order to make these things a reality. We're not only handing over management of the thing, but we're paying companies to do that in the process.

Finally, and I think this is a matter that also needs to be explored by review of the understandings that exist between the government and the companies, why is there no environmental impact assessment being done on any of the forestry operations? The forest management agreement gives forest companies the right to do logging practices over a large area of the province for a long period of time. Surely that's going to have an impact on the environment, one that's potentially even greater than the impact of the pulp mills themselves. We may get to a state, and I hope we do, where we can reduce the pollution that comes out

of pulp mills to close to zero. I think that's feasible, certainly within my lifetime, within this century in fact. I think we could get almost to a closed-loop type of system where you don't have to put any effluent into the river system, where you don't have to blow sulphur dioxide into the atmosphere.

But you would still be mowing down trees with, in effect, a very large and very complicated lawn mower. You would still thereby create the potential for erosion problems, for not only soil instability but lack of soil nutrition over a long period of time. Because if the industry indulges in clear-cut logging or they windrow the slash and burn it in piles, it doesn't take very long for those soils to suffer severe nutrient deprivation. That's one part of a sustainable type of economic development to the north. We don't have an environmental impact assessment into these forest management agreements as to the question of the type of logging practice, the mechanism for preserving soil nutrients, for preserving the genetic diversity of the forest, for preserving the diversity of ecosystems within the forests. We don't have a process for discussing the types of policies that would make this type of sustainable forestry possible.

So, very briefly, Mr. Speaker, I have outlined 10 major problems with forest management agreements by way of indicating that I don't think it's enough for the government to simply make a forest management agreement available at some point in the process. Whether that's in response to a motion for a return put through the Legislative Assembly or whether it's done in the *Alberta Gazette* through a cabinet meeting, which is normally the way these things are made public, that leaves an awful lot of questions unanswered or problems unresolved, if you like it that way. It's getting at the root of those . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. member. Your time has expired. Thank you.

[Motion carried]

150. 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-Pacific Forest Industries Inc. or its owners in respect of construction of a pulp mill near Athabasca and related forestry operations.

MR. McINNIS: Mr. Speaker, may I speak to the motion?

MR. SPEAKER: Since the member has asked the question of the Chair and the obvious answer is yes, the member may speak to it. However, the Chair is going to pay particular attention to the fact that the hon. member's motions -- the next 13 of them -- are related roughly to the same areas. So rather than have to listen to all of the arguments that we have heard in the last while with respect to these motions for returns, perhaps we don't have to go through all of that information but hon. members may refer to *Hansard*. The Chair would then hopefully find that the member would respond to the direction to deal more to the specifics of these individual operations, whether it be Peace River and Grande Prairie and so forth, as we go through motions for returns.

The request is made because of the matter of importance for other members in the House to be able to get to their motions for returns as well. We see that later on we do indeed have motions

for returns as sponsored by Edmonton-Kingsway, Edmonton-Highlands, Vegreville, Calgary-Mountain View, Edmonton-Centre, again back to the hon. Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place, then Edmonton-Whitemud, Vegreville, Edmonton-Meadowlark, and Edmonton-Whitemud. So it might be of some help to other members in the House.

Edmonton-Jasper Place.

MR. McINNIS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the guidance from the Chair, and I'll attempt to follow that as closely as I can.

I don't think it's necessary to repeat the argument I've just given on the nature of forest management agreements. Obviously, no forest management agreement exists in the case of the Alberta-Pacific project, which is the subject matter of Motion for a Return 150. But it is a very important project to our province, one that's occupied a considerable amount of the discussion and debate and questions raised during the Legislative Assembly session to date.

It's interesting that today the Minister of the Environment has announced what he calls a finalization of the review process for the Alberta-Pacific project, or Mitsubishi/Honshu as I suppose it might otherwise be known. The minister has announced that he has concluded some type of an agreement with the federal government to set up a seven-member review panel which will begin trying to sort out its mandate within the next few days, begin trying to make some sense out of the very sketchy terms of reference that have been announced by ministerial order, also announced earlier today, and I think also attempt to come to terms with numerous other procedural questions about the conduct of public meetings: where they'll be held, who is entitled to attend those meetings, who may speak, for how long, who may ask questions of whom, what they can do to secure answers to those questions -- all very important procedural questions that will have to be decided by this panel before they can begin their work.

But when all of the procedural issues are dealt with, you still have to come back to the substance of the Alberta-Pacific project. One of the things that environmental impact assessment review board will attempt to do is determine what are the environmental impacts of the Alberta-Pacific project. The company has prepared a study which is of considerable bulk -- it's about eight inches or so in thickness -- which outlines the situation as the company understands it, and that's been public since about the middle of May, I believe, and available for scrutiny. There's also a news release available from the minister of forests and the hon. Premier which was made available in December of 1988. Those two documents are basically it, as far as understanding what this project is and how it's going to impact on our environment.

Now, we sometimes forget that the environment includes people as well as the more traditional understanding of ecosystems and trees and river systems and so on and so forth. I think my argument in appealing to the government to approve this particular motion today is based on a relatively simple concept, and that is that if you are going to have an environmental impact assessment process that works, you have to treat the people who are going to be involved in it with some dignity; you have to give them that they can read a document and come to some conclusion about the meaning of it, or if they can't themselves do it, that they can acquire technical advisers and other types of advisers who can help to interpret documents and tell them what

they mean. Because when we do an environmental impact assessment, anybody who approaches a project like this will have questions that are generally framed around the concept of: "How does this affect me and people like me?" It's interesting that the citizens review board doesn't have a clear mandate in terms of where it's going to hold hearings. Mention was made by our Minister of the Environment today that there would be hearings held within the local area, but it's one of many questions left up to the citizens review panel, to determine where they are going to have their meetings.

I think when you look at the allocation of a 100,000-square-kilometre block of land in support of a particular project, that's a decision that affects the public interest of the entire province of Alberta. It's not a decision that affects only people who live in the Prosperity area, which -- you know, the Minister of the Environment's trying to adopt the Prosperity farmers as his wards, if you like. The big guy -- he's going to come and help these farmers out and make sure they don't get shafted by the big company. Well, in reality, the concerns of the Prosperity farmers are very important, as are the concerns of the local GM dealer in Athabasca and all the rest of it, but it's of concern to the entire province that this project may be built and that a 100,000-square-kilometre block of timber has been allocated to this particular company on some basis.

Now, the basis for handing this over must be some understanding that exists between the government and the companies. The government is not going to give 100,000 square kilometres to somebody who comes along and says, "Gee, I'd like 100,000 square kilometres too." The world doesn't work that way. There is an understanding or a series of understandings that exist between Alberta-Pacific company -- a subsidiary of Crestbrook forest products, a subsidiary of Mitsubishi Corporation and Honshu Paper company of Japan -- and the Crown in right of the province of Alberta. Now, anybody who goes to assess this particular project, whether it's the car dealer in Athabasca, whether it's somebody who lives in Calgary who just happens to be concerned about the future of the province or a farmer in the local area, I think would like to know what is the understanding that exists here between the government and the company.

That's what Motion 150 asks for. It asks for a copy of all agreements, correspondence, and other documents covering all understandings between the Crown in the right of Alberta and Alberta-Pacific Forest Industries Inc.

It doesn't ask for a lot of commercially confidential information which may have been submitted to the government by way of justification of the project. Sure, the government may have had questions in the negotiations -- "What are you planning to do? What process are you planning to use? What are the product characteristics? What markets are you going to sell into?" -- a lot of information that they would supply in support of their application. But none of that constitutes an understanding between the government and companies.

The concern has been expressed in this House and in other forums as well that passing a motion like this would result in some commercial secrets being leaked out to the benefit of the competitors of these forest companies, which would serve no particular public purpose. I can't see how that's possible under this motion, because there's nothing in such information that constitutes an understanding between the government and the company. Rather, an understanding is where you exchange commitments, if you like: I'll do this, if you do this. All I want to know is: what has the government said it's going to do,

really? Now, I think you can't make a lot of sense out of that unless you know what the company has agreed to do in return. What's the quid? What's the pro quo? That's what's being asked for in this particular motion.

A second concern that's been raised is that a motion like this might result in interdepartmental correspondence or intradepartmental correspondence, where an assistant deputy over here writes an assistant deputy over there, as they do. As people at senior levels of government do a lot of writing memos to each other, undoubtedly there's a very large file of internal memoranda that exists in the case of the Alberta-Pacific project I can't see how internal memoranda constitute an understanding between the government and the company. If the bureaucrats have been expressing concerns to the minister of whoever, to each other, to people within their department or other departments, that doesn't necessarily have to be a part of the public record, were this motion passed. I think the world might be better off if some of these internal memoranda did see the light of day, and I believe the Code investigation, which is concluding today, will show that sometimes internal memoranda have a very big impact on the public life of the province. But that's not the argument we're into today. We're not asking for internal memoranda. What we're asking for is "agreements, correspondence, and other documents" that collectively define this understanding, part of which is financial.

The Alberta-Pacific project has lined itself up for \$300 million in debentures. For some reason they were able to get direct access to the Treasury, Peter Pocklington style, rather than working through other financial institutions by way of loan guarantees. They got \$150 million up front, another \$150 million down the road, plus \$75 million in grants for infrastructure. That's part of the understanding that exists. Now, why are we giving them this money? Why does Alberta-Pacific get a debenture? Why is it necessary for them to have a direct debenture from the province rather than a loan guarantee? Why is it necessary to have \$75 million in grants? What does the company agree to do in return? That's the financial side of things.

On the forest management side, what is the time line? Why is Alberta-Pacific so concerned about not meeting a deadline of the end of August this year? They keep threatening to pull up stakes and move out of the province if something doesn't happen by then. Under the circumstances, I can't see how that would be possible, which does raise the question about where everybody is if Alberta-Pacific says: "Well, that's it. We're tired of playing this game. We're going to pack up our things and we're going to go home." That's happened before. It's happened in other areas of the province. Do we have a lot of people running around investing virtually all of their personal leisure time in preparing for hearings about a project that may not even be committed to by the company? This is surely part of the understanding that exists between the government and the companies. I know there are no guarantees and there's anything but certainty involved with this whole process, but what is the significance of the August 30 deadline? Is that something that exists in an understanding with the government, or is it simply something that's there in the minds of the management of Alberta-Pacific?

These are questions, I think, Mr. Speaker, that people have to know before they invest their own time and effort, their own resources, and indeed some \$75,000 in taxpayers' money which the Minister of the Environment is going to give to the local municipalities and possibly the Prosperity farmers to help them

prepare their case. Mind you, he wants to be sure that nobody gets any money that didn't vote PC in the last election or isn't likely to do so in the future, and that's his problem. I appreciate that's not the problem of the minister of forests or the subject matter of the motion before us today.

[Mr. Jonson in the Chair]

So I think it's high time this government came to realize that if it's going to go around making deals with forest companies, if it's going to give international forest companies the right to mow down our forests to supply mills overseas, it's going to have to account for every little thing it agrees to sometime down the road. I think the day and age has passed when the government can make commercial contracts with companies and hope to hide behind a veil of secrecy, because all of these agreements that are made are made on behalf of the taxpayers. It's not "Don Getty Inc." that's making these deals; it's the Crown in the right of the province of Alberta, which is all of the members of the Assembly to be sure, plus all of the people who elected us and all of the people who might have elected us had they taken the trouble to vote on election day.

AN HON. MEMBER: And their children too.

MR. McINNIS: And their children too.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, on a project as significant as this one to the future of our province, and particularly to the future of the Athabasca region, this government has an obligation simply to come forward and say, "This is what we've agreed to on your behalf, and this is what the forest companies have agreed to in return." I urge members to support this motion today.

Thank you.

MR. FJORDBOTEN: Mr. Speaker, it's going to be my recommendation to the Assembly that we reject this particular motion.

One of the concerns I have in listening to the comments of the hon. Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place is that he makes some comments that reflect that maybe there's some information that he doesn't have. Well, I don't know what information that would be, because there is nothing that's hidden. There are no hidden reports or documents of any sort, so I wouldn't be able to fulfill the motion in any event.

He mentions the fact that not one in a hundred has read a forest management agreement. Well, I don't think that's unusual. If you're not involved in the forestry sector, you probably don't even know what a forest management agreement is. In fact, I wonder how many members in this House have read *Beauchesne*, how many members in this House have read *Orders of the Day*.

AN HON. MEMBER: I have.

MR. FJORDBOTEN: Well, we find two. That's interesting. We spend all this time in the House making laws for the province and there are people here who haven't read *Orders of the Day*, yet everyone is supposed to have mandatory reading of a forest management agreement, even though they're available, they're a public document. They include the umbrella agreement by which each company will operate.

He makes a comment about what's in the forest management agreement how come we don't have an environmental impact

assessment on the forestry operations for the Alberta-Pacific project. Well, you know, it's very interesting, because a forest changes. There could be fires, and there are other things that change the forest. So if you had an environmental impact assessment this year, you'd need another one next year and the year after and the year after and the year after.

Let's take the Alberta-Pacific project; that's what this motion pertains to. Let's look at that project. He said we're giving away this land in this part of the province. We're not giving them the land. The land is ours; it belongs to the province of Alberta. We're giving them the rights to harvest timber under very strict guidelines. The reason the area is so large is that 50 percent of the area will never be touched, ever. Fifty percent will never be cut. That's because there are clear areas in there. There's also muskeg. There's old-growth forests, believe it or not, that are needed for habitat, so that's been excluded. We've withdrawn areas from there that there would be sensitivity to wildlife or watershed and all of those things. And we might even exclude more, believe it or not, depending on the circumstances and how it changes. To get the impression that we're out there cutting down all the trees in Alberta -- you know, we cut this tree today; it'll be 100 years before we get back to cut it the second time. We had one forest fire in 1981 in Alberta that destroyed one million acres in 10 days, and when all these projects are in full operation, it's going to be cutting about 150,000 acres a year. One fire. Now, we're very good with fire. In fact, we loan our forest fire bombers. They've been in Ontario the last week. They've been in the Northwest Territories helping others out, because we protect our forests. If you're going to protect them, you protect them, and we aren't going to have those kinds of fires in the future, hopefully, if we do things right.

You know, I got a great kick out of the question yesterday about the stumpage fees being too low, and this great concern about stumpage. Well, isn't that interesting? Some of the opposition wanted to kill the project, it seems, and now they're worried about the stumpage rates. The stumpage rates on some of the wood that is in the Athabasca area and other areas of this province -- it's aspen; it's a weed. What are you going to use it for? What other projects? They say we'd create more jobs with another project. What are they? I mean, are there some phantom projects out there that I haven't been told about? I don't know where they are. What do you use aspen for? You can't use aspen for very much, except for making pulp.

We work out the agreement with each company. Each one of these is made public. The public knows full well exactly what's in the agreement. It's a public document. Also, there's a public opportunity to have input each year. If you want some changes made, there is that opportunity. He says the forest management agreements that we've signed don't create jobs. We've got 12,000 new direct and indirect jobs in Alberta through these projects. Now, where are the other jobs from some of these phantom projects out there somewhere that I haven't heard anything about? I have no idea where they are, just like the Member for Athabasca-Lac La Biche, who's fought so hard to see the job creation and the people off welfare in northern Alberta. If we move these projects along properly, those jobs will be there not only for this generation but generations to come.

I want to make a comment about why the delay and August 30. Why are we concerned about delays? Any businessman knows that if you were to take on a project that's \$1.3 billion in capital construction costs, you have to arrange some financing.

When you arrange the financing, you have to arrange for the drawdown of that financing. You also have to arrange for equipment. Now, as anyone who's been through a pulp mill knows, there's a lot of equipment in that pulp mill. That pulp mill has to be ordered. You have to put the order in with enough lead time, and then when you get the machine, you pay for it. Also, who would be foolish enough to build a mill and not have the market for some of the product? You're not all of a sudden going to say: "Okay, boys, I'm open for business. I've got two trainloads of pulp here going someplace, but where do they go?" You secure the markets. And if all of a sudden you're switched from your time frame, that you move forward, what happens to a project? What happens to the financing?

I take exception when they . . . I don't know where they've been told -- by some group someplace, I would expect -- that they shouldn't call it the Alberta-Pacific project, even though that is the name. They call it the Mitsubishi/Honshu project because they think we're trying to hide that the Japanese are involved. I'm glad the Japanese are involved, because with that project we're now going to get a paper machine, if we don't kill it before it gets a chance to get going. And the paper machine, what happens to that? That paper will create more jobs, spin-off jobs, and more processing of the paper here rather than shipping it out.

The diversification strategy is working, and the forest management agreements are open. In fact, across this country they're looking at our forest management agreements as a model that they're wanting to use. And we're improving them; I'm not saying it's perfect. There are things that I think need to be changed, and we're working on those areas that can be improved and enhanced even further.

Talking about reforestation standards, you know, I'd like to be able to tell you that we're going to grow more trees than we used, but that isn't honest because that isn't true. Because when you reforest properly, you're not going to end up with a bunch of trees this big around; you're going to end up with trees this big around. So we'll grow more wood but we won't grow more trees. When they talk about reforestation standards, one of the reasons the companies came here is because the standards we have here are so strict -- and I think could be made a little stricter. It's going to cost them a few dollars, but I think that can be enhanced even further. To know that our reforestation, our regeneration standards are there so that we have a better forest by far in 80 years and 160 years and 200 years from now for the generations that come after us -- I think that's something we have the obligation to pass on to our future generations.

Mr. Speaker, there are a whole lot of other comments I would like to make. I intend to respond to the hon. member on his 10 points specifically, but I don't think anything would do more than to have a forestry tour and go out and look at regeneration; go out and look and talk to some of the companies about how they do business. When they talk about grass being up to here and you can't see the trees, do you know why? Because a lot of the opposition doesn't want us to use herbicides. So if you can't use herbicides, how do you keep the grass down? How do you keep the trees growing up through it? Once they break through the top and they're up there, they're fine. But until that point, how do you make sure that regeneration works? You can't hand-tend the whole province. There's no way you can do that. I think our future's bright, if we don't get all carried away.

I remember a fellow once that was worried about how to

pray properly. He says: "Leroy, how do you fold your hands? Do you fold them like this, or do you fold them like this?" He was so worried about how to fold his hands that he never got around to praying. Well, I don't know whether you're going to pray or fold your hands, but it's time to get on with the job of continuing the diversification in this province in an exciting way.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that this motion be rejected.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Member for Edmonton-Belmont.

MR. SIGURDSON: Thank you. Mr. Speaker, I just want to comment on Motion for a Return 150. As one of those people that happens to read *Beauchesne*, happens to read the Orders of the Day, I'm somewhat aware of the request that my colleague the Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place has made to the minister. I think it's rather regrettable that the minister in his response starts off by saying he wants to defeat the motion for a return because there isn't any agreement; there's no agreement to be had; there's nothing to be filed. Almost in the same breath we have the minister saying there are strict guidelines and there are strict standards. Well, you know, if those guidelines and those standards are indeed about the province and about the development of forestry in our province, then surely they would be embodied in some kind of an agreement or some correspondence or some document that has gone out from the minister's department to Alberta-Pacific. But the minister says it's not there.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't know if that's a slip or if there's some problem there. I really worry, though, about the government not wanting to provide the Legislature with that information. Why is it that we cannot find out about those guidelines and those standards that are supposedly in place? The minister talks about sensitive areas of land that are going to be protected, about land that's not going to be forested or harvested, and yet we're not prepared to provide the members of the Assembly and the people that we represent, all Albertans, with the information that guarantees them protection, that guarantees that those sensitive areas will not be spoiled, that guarantees that those strict guidelines and standards the minister speaks of are going to be enforced. I don't know what the problem is. Why is it, quite honestly, that we can't get copies of those guidelines and those standards? I think those are important questions to be answered, especially in light of the concerns that have been expressed not only by members of the New Democrat opposition or the Liberal opposition or the environmentalists, that the Minister of the Environment doesn't like to talk about, but folk just on the doorstep that are concerned about the pollution that's going on and the kind of increased impact we're going to have in Alberta with respect to the development of many pulp mills.

Mr. Speaker, this is a time for the government to provide Albertans with that information. This is the time, this is the opportunity, for the government to come forward and say: "Well, these are the guidelines. Here you go. This is the guarantee we're going to have to make sure the program doesn't destroy the environment that all of us are so very concerned about." I really worry, you know, about the secrecy that seems to be contained in all these refusals. I worry about that secrecy. It shows a government trying to hide or trying to hold back some information. I think that's very sad, because I don't believe this is something Albertans are going to be able to go out and demand

great changes to. But they are concerned. They're very concerned that they just have the opportunity to have the information before them so they can properly address their concerns to members of the Legislature, to members of government, so they know the specifics of the agreement. It's not too much to ask. Surely it's not too much to ask that we have some input into our future, or we know a little bit about our future, Mr. Speaker. Therefore it truly is regrettable that the minister wants to defeat Motion for a Return 150.

The minister also talked about jobs and diversification. Now, he's not alone in that. I've noticed other ministers, the Minister of Economic Development and Trade, go on about diversification. The minister of career development indeed goes on about unemployment statistics. She forgets to realize that the number of single employables on welfare has doubled over the last five years, but still the unemployment rates are down, and we're happy about that. So we've got job-creation programs. The minister addressed this concern. The minister says that we're going to have diversification. But you know, again what we seem to be doing is going on with huge numbers of megaprojects. What we've done is taken our eggs out of one basket to put them into another basket. We did that in the late '50s and the '60s and the '70s with oil. We went from agriculture to oil. We seem to be doing that now with the fall of prices in energy: going from energy, we've taken the eggs out of that basket, moving them into another basket, hoping that maybe this basket's a little more protected.

Well, I'm sure that way back in the '50s and '60s and throughout the '70s -- I can recall other motions for returns in the late '70s and the early '80s when I worked in this Assembly as an assistant to Grant Notley. There were questions on the Order Paper asking about agreements that were to be had between the developers and the province. Again, we had the same kind of lack of sharing of information between the government and the people of Alberta, people that would want to just have information, simply have information before them so they could determine for themselves whether or not the agreement was good. Because what goes on inside cabinet meetings or between ministers of the Crown, as they are charged to do when they go out and negotiate in the best interests of all Albertans . . . When they go out and take on that task, they do it in the best interests of Albertans. But we're not sure that's done. We're not sure those agreements live up to what they're charged with. We can't be sure, and our constituents aren't always sure as well. So what we do on behalf of our constituents is ask for the information. I think it's very unfortunate that when we ask for simple copies of agreements or correspondence or documents, this government says: "No, we're not going to give it to you. We're going to hold it back. You don't deserve the information." Mr. Speaker, that's not a democratic system. That's a government hiding behind doors of secrecy.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. FOX: I would like to make a few comments to clear up any misconceptions that may have been left by the hon. Minister of Forestry, Lands and Wildlife in respect to the motion for a return proposed by my colleague for Edmonton-Jasper Place. What he's asking for, quite simply, is that the government show to members of the Assembly -- and not all of them have to read it. I know that government members seldom even read the Bills

they are asked to vote on by their ministers. They don't have to read it, but we'd like to take a look at it. In particular, our Forestry, Lands and Wildlife critic would like to take a close look at any agreements, correspondence, and documents that relate to agreements made between the people of the province of Alberta, through their government, and Alberta-Pacific Industries Inc. or its owners just so we can see what great deals they've made for us.

To suggest that by asking for these agreements or by expressing concerns about the environmental standards that are going to be exercised in respect to these forest industry projects, we are therefore against jobs in northern Alberta is, I think, a very specious argument. To suggest that if these deals don't materialize, it's the fault of right-minded Albertans who want to see meaningful long-term job creation and economic development done in a sustainable way is, I think, very wrong. We in the Official Opposition, the New Democratic Party, have long taken the position that we need to be involved in job-creation strategies that go beyond STEP and PEP and handing out millions of bucks to wealthy and powerful people. We need to come up with projects that put Albertans to work for the long term. That's been our argument and it's still our argument, and we're glad to see the government has finally taken an interest in job creation.

It wasn't too many years ago when the former Minister of Career Development and Employment, now the Minister of Agriculture, was arguing that 10 percent . . . [interjection] Maybe you weren't paying attention back then, Lloydminster, but he argued in this Assembly that 10 percent unemployment is good for the economy because it helps keep a downward pressure on wages. No regard for the 10 percent he was referring to, those people that don't have jobs, but that was the strategy of the Conservative Party at one time: to use high unemployment as an economic lever to keep the earning power of average Albertans down. So they're now taking an interest in job creation apparently, and we're glad they're catching up with us.

I can remember having an opportunity to respond to the hon. Minister of Forestry, Lands and Wildlife soon after his appointment. He made a ministerial statement in the House here in respect to the beginning of forestry week, and I was sort of alone up here and had a chance to respond on behalf of the Leader of the Official Opposition. I made the point that we in the Official Opposition would be very supportive of job-creation projects, of forestry-related projects, if we could be assured that the environment's being protected and jobs are going to be created that will be of benefit to people who live in the area, with particular emphasis on aboriginal people and Metis people in the northern part of our province. That's an idea I didn't come to on my own. It was the former member for Athabasca-Lac La Biche, who I heard in our caucus meetings fighting time and time again for projects up in his constituency that would create jobs for the people who live there. [interjections]

So while I appreciate the frustration the current Member for Athabasca-Lac La Biche expresses about the high level of unemployment and welfare in his area -- I mean, it's tough living with 15 years of Conservative government, and I admit it. I can sense your frustration, compounded by a federal Conservative government as well. The economic prospects for average folk aren't very bright with that kind of scenario, so I appreciate his frustration. But we've long been supporters of meaningful job-creation projects in the province, and the forestry resource is one that needs to be developed. It has a lot of opportunity, a lot of

potential there. But as faithful stewards of the province, as people who are exercising the public trust, we need to make sure that that's thoughtful development, that our money is being used well and the resource is not going to be compromised by rushing pell-mell into this development.

I can remember the former Leader of the Opposition, the Member for Spirit River-Fairview, Mr. Grant Notley, pointing out years ago that this government, when it was rushing headlong into natural gas and oil development, was wasting more timber each year in terms of cutting survey lines and all the cut lines they do for geological exploration in the north. More timber was being wasted in the province of Alberta each and every year than we were selling. He pointed out that it was a ludicrous waste. But the government of the day, along with their oil industry buddies, had no regard for the forest resource. They wanted to rush headlong into developing our oil and natural gas, forestry be damned. Mr. Notley expressed a concern about that at the time, and the government seemed not to pay attention.

What I think is happening here, with respect, Mr. Minister, is that the government has now caught on to another brain wave and they're going to go out and develop our forestry industry. They're announcing project after project after project without much thought to the cumulative effect of the projects overall and, I submit, without much thought put into the strategy, the economic development aspect of the project, to make sure we're getting the best value for our dollar as taxpayers in the province and we're going to benefit to the maximum from these projects. We in the Official Opposition, I submit, are exercising our responsibility by standing up, asking questions of the government, making sure the ministers are accountable, making sure they know what they're doing and that people get answers, that we just don't rush headlong into these projects and do what the government and their wealthy and powerful friends in big business want us to do. We want to have a sober first look at all these projects.

To listen to my friend the hon. minister talk, you'd think there's absolutely nothing wrong. It's in good hands. The government is taking care of everything. They've made these agreements, they're looking after things, and it's just a waste of time for us to stand up and question them. Golly, I just can't come to that conclusion, and I guess the reason I can't is because I've been a member in this Assembly for over three years and seen what great managers these Conservatives are, Mr. Speaker. I've seen what kinds of deals they make with the captains of industry. I remember it wasn't much more than a year ago that the former Minister of Economic Development and Trade stood up and said in respect to the agreement with Peter Pocklington, the \$67 million financial package,

the agreement is a very rigid agreement that involves an undertaking by Gainers to build a new hog processing plant in southern Alberta and to expand and upgrade the beef processing plant in northern Alberta.

A very rigid agreement. We find out now that it was nothing more than an elaborate bailout scheme for . . .

DR. WEST: Point of order.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: There's a point of order being raised, hon. member. The Minister of Recreation and Parks.

DR. WEST: Under Standing Order 23, this is totally off this motion for a return, and I would ask that he come back on line.

MR. FOX: With respect, Mr. Speaker, this is exactly the point. We're being urged by the minister. . . .

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. Does anyone else want to comment on the point of order that has been raised?

MR. FOX: Do I get to speak on the point of order?

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hon. member, I just invited anyone else that wanted to speak on the point of order.
Member for Vegreville.

MR. FOX: With respect, you called me to order when I stood up to do that.

The point of this, hon. Minister of Recreation and Parks, is that we're being asked by the minister to vote against our own member's motion for a return here simply because it's not necessary information, because the whole thing is in good hands, the government knows what it's doing. I'm merely trying to point out to people, based on history, that that's not the case. The government doesn't know what it's doing, they've made some very poor deals with their friends in industry, and we need to get some answers before we can sufficiently judge the relative merits of this project.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Deputy House Leader.

MR. GOGO: Point of order. The hon. Member for Vegreville is clearly out of line. Standing Order 23(b)(i) clearly sets forward the business and the priorities of the House. The motion before us, the motion for a return, is very clearly spelled out as Motion for a Return 150. For the hon. member to bring in red herrings such as he's doing, dealing with something totally unrelated, is totally out of line, Mr. Speaker, and I would certainly support the hon. Minister of Recreation and Parks' point of order.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Belmont.

MR. SIGURDSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I didn't plan on getting in on this, but given the comments that were made by the hon. Minister for Advanced Education, I would, with all respect, offer that what we're asking for are copies of agreements or correspondence or documents. The Member for Vegreville is pointing out that previous agreements made with previous individuals are still agreements that should have been filed with this Legislative Assembly some time ago to see how bad those particular agreements, documents, or correspondence were at that time. I don't think there's any problem with the parallel the Member for Vegreville is giving, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would like to indicate that I've listened to the arguments on both sides of this point of order, and although I think the item the Member for Vegreville was dealing with might have been useful as an example, I would

comment to all members of the Assembly that the Chair has been tempted to rise and bring members to order on several occasions in the last few minutes because the effort is getting rather strained in terms of continuing the debate, so many things are being repeated.

But on this particular point of order, I think the illustration the Member for Vegreville was using was relevant to the question.

MR. FOX: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will sum up in referring directly to the specific motion for a return.

I think this government's record on protecting the Treasury of the public of Alberta is not good, this government's record on protecting the environment is not good, and we have every right as members of this Assembly to request that information available to members on that side be provided to members on this side so we can do our job in the opposition, and that is to examine closely the plans of the government and propose constructive, positive alternatives. Because as I pointed out earlier, it's this caucus that's interested in meaningful long-term job creation and economic development in the province; we've long argued for it. But that's no excuse, Mr. Speaker, for a government trying to catch up with us in terms of policy to rush out and helter-skelter commit 33 percent of the province's land base to a bunch of projects without giving very much thought at all to what kind of return is in it for the people of Alberta, what kind of long-term consequences, you know, come as a result.

I'll just refer back to that example. We asked government members, cabinet ministers, over a year ago to provide copies of agreements -- in fact there were motions for returns defeated by the government -- made between Peter Pocklington and the government. The rigid agreements in respect to these deals weren't provided. We had to come back a year later and through intense questioning -- and the minister of economic development might want to ask why the Treasurer didn't save his bacon a week ago and provide the answers he's providing today. It could have saved him a lot of trouble by providing those answers a week ago. You take it up with him. You know, we're getting into the same situation here, Mr. Speaker, where we're demanding information from the government and not getting it. I fear we're going to be in the same situation a year from now with these forestry projects. We'll have a situation where we find out that there were all sorts of agreements made that nobody knew about that Albertans' money is at risk, that projects aren't being undertaken, they're not going ahead, and yet we're going to be on the hook for who knows what. Maybe the loan guarantees that are going out to some of these companies are going to end up being bailout packages for them too, Mr. Speaker.

But in terms of what we want specifically in respect to these developments, the forest management agreement the minister refers to it as being a good agreement. I'm concerned about it in the long term. I think if we've committed the use of that resource and that part of the province to these companies over a 20-year period, that does limit our options. Whenever you make decisions to go in one direction, you limit your ability to go in others. For that reason, we need to think seriously about it. That's one-third of the province of Alberta committed to these agreements up there.

We do have some real concerns about the kind of technology that's being used there, and those haven't been adequately answered. We don't know why the government is so eager to

make a deal with this particular company to build a mill there, using a technology that in not too many years will be completely unacceptable the world over, and that's the bleached kraft technology. The hon. Member for Jasper Place is leading the way, showing the government how recycled forest products can be used and can sort of alleviate the need or the desire of people to have, you know, bleached kraft, super-white paper products. We can get by with the chemithermomechanical method, I think, of producing pulp. It's environmentally much better and produces a very acceptable product.

So we're expressing these concerns. We have no interest in deep-sixing worthwhile projects, Mr. Speaker, but we have a responsibility to make sure the projects are good projects. And as much as I respect the hon. minister and have never had any reason, and doubt I will have a reason, to doubt his word or question his word, I don't have much faith in this government's word. The hon. minister is a member I trust, but his government leaves me somewhat skeptical. I think we need to see these agreements, we need to have the answers, so we can do our job in this Assembly.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place.

MR. McINNIS: Just to conclude the debate briefly, Mr. Speaker. There have been some interesting references back and forth. But I come back to the process of public hearings over this project, which are to commence, according to the announcement today, within a period of four weeks. I've spent some time this afternoon looking through the terms of reference for the AI-Pac EIA review board process, and I find, slipped in here on page 5, that this review panel is supposed to look at timber harvesting practices as they may affect Indian reserve lands, a significant addition to the terms of reference for the AI-Pac citizens' review panel. For the first time we're going to have some type of environmental impact assessment on logging operations, admittedly only on Indian reserve lands and only because the federal government has responsibility. This government doesn't have the guts to submit the logging plans to an environmental impact assessment. The federal government does though, and it looks like they've had it inserted into the terms of reference that are included.

Now, my point on that would be: how can you review the environmental impact assessment of timber harvesting practices when you don't know what those timber harvesting practices are going to be? Presumably this is being negotiated as part of a forest management agreement, but there's no study of the timber harvesting practices, and I think it would be a difficult thing to study. Are we going to do clear cuts? How big are the clear cuts? How close to streams? How close to watercourses? What steepness of slope? Some very significant questions that are part and parcel of the terms of reference announced by another minister early today. But when we come to seek the state of the art as far as agreements between the government and the forest company involved, we're told that's something we can't look at.

We've got a pretty rigid timetable on these hearings. Within four weeks of the Environment department sending their deficiency review back to the company, this committee is to begin public hearings. They have eight weeks, neither more nor less, to complete their hearings, and within a 12-week period, I

would guess by the middle of October, this whole process is supposed to be over and done with. It puts people who are attempting to participate in good faith in this process -- I don't care who they're friends of -- in a very difficult position: not knowing what it is that the government and the companies have come to agreement with. I think if we have a doubt, we should err on the side of freedom of information. I don't believe there's any error involved in simply letting Albertans in on what you've agreed to. I think that's the bottom line in this case, on a matter of principle but also on a matter of trying to make this ever changing citizens' review process into something that's workable.

I think the Minister of the Environment has made great strides in the last few months. It's been painful for all concerned. We've got this process moving along to the point where it's beginning to resemble something like the kind of open public review process you need on this project, but we're still missing crucial information. Information is the basis upon which informed people come to a consensus, Mr. Speaker, consensus about what the environmental impacts of the project are going to be. Only then does it make sense for the government to make the final decision, yes or no, on the project. I think all they need is the guts to make the information available so that a proper conclusion to these proceedings can be facilitated. Then the government will be able to make a decision knowing that it has the best information at its fingertips. The environment is too important to make a mistake on. Those of us on this side are simply pleading with the government to try to get them to avoid making any further mistakes.

I do wish my friends in the Liberal Party would have entered this debate today to try to help us obtain this information which so many people across the province want. As usual, they're off preening their public image before the news media, and they aren't here doing the job when it really counts.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: All those in favour of Motion for a Return 150, please say aye.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Those opposed, please say no.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: It's lost.

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

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

[Eight minutes having elapsed, the House divided]

For the motion:

Barrett	Hawkesworth	Mjolsness
Doyle	Hewes	Pashak
Ewasiuk	Laing, M.	Roberts
Fox	Martin	Sigurdson
Gagnon	McEachern	Woloshyn
Gibeault	McInnis	Wright

Against the motion:

Adair	Evans	Moore
Ady	Fischer	Musgrove
Betkowski	Fjordbotten	Oldring
Black	Fowler	Paszkowski
Bogle	Gesell	Payne
Bradley	Gogo	Schumacher
Calahasen	Hyland	Severtson
Cardinal	Jonson	Shrake
Cherry	Klein	Sparrow
Clegg	Kowalski	Speaker, R.
Day	Laing, B.	Stewart
Dinning	Lund	Tannas
Elliott	McClellan	Thurber
Elzinga	Mirosh	West

Totals: Ayes — 18 Noes — 42

[Motion lost]

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, as the hon. members will recall with the government motion sometime earlier today, it was the intent of government that motions 150 to 162 were not supported by the government and would be rejected. If the hon. sponsor, the hon. Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place, is in agreement, it could perhaps save all members some time if that question were to be put on motions for returns 151 to 162 inclusive as one motion, and the government would deal with it in line with the hon. Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place.

MR. McINNIS: Mr. Speaker, I have no wish to delay the proceedings at all. It's agreeable to me that we conduct the motion at once. I think the principle has been adequately dealt with on both sides of the House. In respect of all the motions the principle is the same, which is freedom of information about a matter that's very crucial to the future of our province. Maybe this time we'll win.

MR. SPEAKER: There's this request for unanimous consent to deal with motions for returns 151 through to 162. Those in favour of giving unanimous consent, please say aye.

HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed, please say no. Unanimous consent has been gained in the House.

151. 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 Daishowa Canada Co. Ltd. or its owners in respect of construction of a pulp mill near Peace River and related forestry operations.

152. 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 Procter & Gamble Cellulose Ltd. or its owners in respect of the expansion of the pulp mill near Grande Prairie and related forestry operations.

153. 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 Weldwood of Canada Ltd. or its owners in respect of expansion of the pulp mill near Hinton and related forestry operations.

154. Mr. McInnis moved that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing a copy of all agreements, correspondence, and other documents relating to the grant of \$200,000 to Alberta-Pacific Forest Industries Ltd. and a copy of the report of the feasibility study pertaining to a pulp mill in northeastern Alberta.

155. 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 Blue Ridge Lumber Ltd. or its owners in respect of construction of a fibreboard plant at Blue Ridge and related forestry operations.

156. 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 Pelican Spruce Mills or its owners in respect of construction of a sawmill and oriented strandboard mill at Drayton Valley and related forestry operations.

157. 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 British Columbia Forest Products Limited or its owners in respect of expansion of the sawmill at Grande Cache and related forestry operations.

158. 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 Northern Forest Industries Ltd. or its owners in respect of construction of a lumber mill near Lac La Biche and related forestry operations.

159. 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 Sunpine Forest Products Ltd. or its owners in respect of a lumber mill near Rocky Mountain House and related forestry operations.

160. 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 Canada Forest Products Ltd. or its owners in respect of construction of a lumber mill at Grande Prairie and related forestry operations.

161. 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 Millar Western Industries Ltd. in respect of construction of a pulp mill near Whitecourt and related forestry operations.

162. 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 Energy Company Ltd. in respect of construction of a pulp mill near Slave Lake and related forestry operations.

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that I ask that the motions be defeated.

One thing I'd like to make just a couple of quick comments about is that any material that isn't commercially confidential, or anything I can't release because it's memos or letters like that that I'm obligated not to release, I don't have any difficulty with seeing that the hon. member, or any hon. member that asks, receives that material, because that certainly isn't anything we want to hide in any way, shape, or form.

The other two comments. One question was raised on why bleached kraft pulp mills instead of all CTMP mills. It depends on the resource in the area and the projects that come forward. The area in the Athabasca region, for example, has a lot of black poplar that can only be utilized under the kraft process. The demand is there for kraft, and the technology now is there. All that information on what the technology is and what technology each one will be using basically is also available.

The other comment was made about recycling of forest products. That is one area we are working very, very closely on. The volume of material isn't here, but hopefully that will be something we will see more of in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that all these motions as stated be rejected.

MR. McINNIS: Just briefly, Mr. Speaker, in concluding debate, I do appreciate the offer that's contained within the minister's statement. He's generally pretty good about giving information where he has discretion to do so, and I've appreciated in the months I've been working on this job the co-operation I have received from the minister.

However, this is obviously a case where the minister doesn't call the shots, where somebody else does, and we're dealing with a situation where the government doesn't want to release the information, and I understand that. But I think it's important to clarify for the record that there's nothing in this series of motions that asks for commercially confidential information supplied by any forest company; there's nothing in any of these motions that asks for internal memoranda between members of the government or members of the civil service and members of the government. It rather asks for understandings that exist between the Crown in the right of Alberta. That's somebody who has authority to make binding agreements for the Crown and the forest companies. In other words, the correspondence, if there is any, would be between the government and the forest companies, not correspondence that's internal to the government or the minister's office or any other such agency. So I think that if

these motions were approved, the minister could still avoid making either of those categories of information available that he wants to.

Those are my comments in concluding debate.

MR. SPEAKER: All those in favour of motions for returns 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, and 162, please say aye.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed, please say no.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

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

[Eight minutes having elapsed, the House divided]

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order.

The motion being proposed is one that was given unanimous consent so that these could be dealt with together. The Chair apologizes for reading each motion for a return individually but feels it's necessary for the sake of the *Hansard* record. The vote that's taking place is with respect to motions for returns 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, and 162.

For the motion:

Barrett	Hawkesworth	Mjolsness
Doyle	Hewes	Pashak
Ewasiuik	Laing, M.	Roberts
Fox	Martin	Sigurdson
Gagnon	McEachern	Woloshyn
Gibeault	McInnis	Wright

Against the motion:

Adair	Evans	Moore
Ady	Fischer	Musgrove
Betkowski	Fjordbotten	Oldring
Black	Fowler	Paszkowski
Bogle	Gesell	Payne
Bradley	Gogo	Schumacher
Calahasen	Hyland	Severtson
Cardinal	Jonson	Shrake
Cherry	Klein	Sparrow
Clegg	Kowalski	Speaker, R.
Day	Laing, B.	Stewart
Dinning	Lund	Tannas
Elliott	McClellan	Thurber
Elzinga	Mirosh	West

Totals:	Ayes	—	18	Noes — 42
---------	------	---	----	-----------

[Motion lost]

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, as hon. members are aware, it's the intention of the government to have the House sit tonight in Supply dealing with the Department of Energy. I would move that when hon. members reassemble at 8 o'clock, they do so in Committee of Supply.

MR. SPEAKER: Those in favour of the motion, please say aye.

Assembly stands adjourned until the Committee of Supply rises and reports.

HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

[The House recessed at 5:26 p.m.]

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed, please say no. Motion carries. The

