

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Title: **Tuesday, August 1, 1989 2:30 p.m.**
Date: 89/08/01

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

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

PRAYERS

MR. SPEAKER: Let us pray.

As Canadians and as Albertans we give thanks for the precious gifts of freedom and peace which we enjoy.

As Members of this Legislative Assembly we rededicate ourselves to the valued traditions of parliamentary democracy as a means of serving our province and our country.

Amen.

head: INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill 252

Pulp Mill Pollution Control Act

MR. McINNIS: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill 252, the Pulp Mill Pollution Control Act.

The purpose of the Bill is to help this government put its money where its mouth is to provide for legislative stepwise reduction in toxic emissions from pulp mills to reach the target of zero by July 1, 2002.

[Leave granted; Bill 252 read a first time]

head: TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table with the Assembly today a report titled Response to the Recommendations of the Tornado Victims' Committee, which is dated July 1989.

MR. FJORBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the response to Question 187, which was accepted by the Assembly on June 29.

MS McCOY: Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure today to table with the Assembly the Alberta Plan for Action for Women: A Proud History, A Bright Future.

head: INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure on behalf of the Minister of Recreation and Parks to introduce to you and through you to the members of the House a group of volunteers who are seated in your gallery. They were here today for the Blue Flame Torch Relay ceremonies, which took place on the steps of the Legislature Building. They're representatives of the city of Edmonton, the town of Brooks, and the relay sponsors. I ask them to stand. The sponsors of the Blue Flame Torch Relay are Mr. Gordon Monk, Northwestern Utilities; Mr. Jerry

Monegre, Northwestern Utilities; and Mr. Gene Zadovny, Canadian Western Natural Gas.

The other persons I want to introduce are sponsors of the Alberta Sport Council and the Alberta Games. They include Ms Sherri Dutton, Mr. Brian Olson, Ms Dianne Young, Mr. Vic Lasko, Mr. Bob Bin-En-Dike, Mr. Sherrold Moore, and Mr. Doug Fulford. I would ask all these volunteers to stand. I want to say on behalf of the minister and all the members here that we're gratified that these people take the time to encourage our young people to get involved in sports. I think we should welcome them with a real warm Alberta welcome.

head: ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Proposed Expansion of Gainers into Quebec

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, to the Provincial Treasurer. Even with all the government support Albertans well know that Gainers owner Peter Pocklington has no particular loyalty to this province. All he cares about is the bottom line, his own bottom line. He owed no loyalty to the hog producers in northern Alberta when he tried to destroy the marketing board. He owed no loyalty to his own workers when he tried to destroy their union. Now Mr. Pocklington has even hosed this government to the tune of \$67 million to cover his existing debt and finance his day-to-day operations. We're now concerned about the news of Mr. Pocklington's negotiations with the government of Quebec and, according to Quebec officials, also negotiations with the government of Ontario. Mr. Speaker, we're concerned obviously about losing what we have here in Edmonton. My question to the Treasurer. Will the Treasurer tell us what he knows about the negotiations between Mr. Pocklington and the Quebec government and/or the Ontario government and the possible implications for this province?

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Speaker, the member has covered a lot of territory, and for me to deal with it in one very brief reply may be somewhat difficult. I note, though, the significant change in consistency in the member's position. On one hand, when we talked previously about the reason for providing the \$55 million loan guarantee and the \$6 million special loan, we argued very vociferously and very strongly that we were protecting jobs, ensuring that diversification took place here. Now the member finds it convenient to take the other side of the question. I hope all Albertans notice that inconsistency in position.

What we have here, Mr. Speaker, is an international company that is in fact taking advantage of the free trade opportunities which will allow industries in Alberta, particularly the agricultural industries, to extend their boundaries both on a national basis and an international basis, and that company is now doing that. With respect to the need to deal with other provinces, obviously a company of this order, already operating in the province of Quebec in this case, is examining all possibilities for expansion in that province.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, what a cavalier attitude. This has implications for this province and our money. By the non-answer from the Treasurer, I take it that he doesn't know what's going on. So that Alberta taxpayers know precisely what we're into, would the Treasurer document and table the documents so we know what obligations Mr. Pocklington has with the people

of Alberta? Will he table those documents here today?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, what I'll do is explain again what we have in terms of our security. First of all, we have taken security against a range of assets which are located all across the Canadian profile in other provinces, head-officed essentially here in Alberta. We have taken a clear and legal position against those assets to protect our position. We did that at appraised values at the time the loan and the guarantee were put in place. I'm making it very clear, Mr. Speaker, that the terms of the master agreement under which the Gainers company, the Pocklington company, operate with respect to our guarantee are such that no money and no guarantee of the province can allow any expansion or extension of that company into another province. So the economic benefits remain here, the strength of the economic growth stays here, and the jobs stay here. Now, that's the fundamental condition under which this agreement is put in place.

Now, secondly, Mr. Speaker, let me make it very clear that it's my understanding in discussions via the minister of agriculture in Quebec that the company, Gainers, has been looking at a variety of expansion options in that province, including using the routine programs which are available to any private-sector enterprise wanting to establish there. Those programs are public. They are job assistance; there's some capital projects. The company itself is looking to that in the same fashion that the company did when it expanded its bacon plant into the province of Saskatchewan. Now, I didn't hear the member . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. Treasurer. Thank you. Order please.

Final supplementary.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, to the Treasurer. Given that the government, when they handed out this money, said that it was for expansion in southern Alberta and expansion here in Edmonton, will the Treasurer now in view of these negotiations give a guarantee to this Assembly that that plant will proceed in Picture Butte and there will be an expansion here at the Edmonton plant? Following up their press release, will he give us that commitment?

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Speaker, now he's calling for additional guarantees. It's difficult here to understand what he's talking about. I've indicated clearly the government's position with respect to how the southern Alberta plant has taken place. Let me make it clear again that any time we make an advance under the term loan provided for in the minister of economic development's budget, we ask the company for a statement, a signed statement, a statutory declaration to assure us that they have not abridged the agreement we have in place, and they gave that to us the last time the money was advanced. We understood clearly the problem they were having with the southern Alberta plant.

Now, the amended agreement, Mr. Speaker, provides very clearly that unless construction has commenced by September 30 of this year, no further amounts will be advanced against that loan. Now, it is a loan, it's repayable, and the first interest payment takes place in October of 1989. If the member has some additional information that he wants to table here to let us know about the condition of that company or he has some new information about how the province of Quebec is responding, he

should tell us. I have answered his question. I have given the information as I know it, and if he has further information, then it's incumbent upon him to advise me so I can take additional action.

Responsibility for Regulating FIC and AIC

MR. MARTIN: Next election you can ask us to table it, Mr. Speaker.

My question is to the Premier. We have Donald Cormie, Peter Pocklington, and the Conservative government. What a threesome. Now, in his attempt to deflect responsibility for his role in the collapse of the Principal companies, the Premier has been hiding behind the Member for Three Hills and just about anyone else he can find. On Friday the Premier said about the November of 1985 memo, and I quote: "The attachment did not call for action by priorities." Well, Albertans would expect that a Premier, the Chair of the priorities committee, would have looked at the serious findings in that report and decided to take action himself. That's what Premiers and leaders are for. They initiate action, Mr. Speaker. They don't administer with a hope and a prayer. My question to the Premier. Now that the Premier has changed his story and admitted that he was aware of the problems at FIC/AIC in November of 1985, why did it take until June 1987 for this government to do something about it?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, there is absolutely no change in the government's story.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, here it is, typical of the leadership from this Premier.

From 1985, when he knew, to June 1987 nothing happened. Meanwhile, during that time more innocent investors were hurt, and now it has cost the taxpayers a minimum of \$65 million to \$85 million. Mr. Speaker, does the Premier really believe that blaming all the problems on the former Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs absolves this government and this Premier from responsibility for this fiasco?

MR. GETTY: Well, the allegations contained in the question are completely false, Mr. Speaker. That is not what I did. As a matter of fact, I was very clear in my statement to the Legislature that I was not blaming the hon. minister but in fact I was dealing with a report from an independent third party to the Alberta court. That is the matter of fact that I made to the Legislature. I've already told the people of Alberta what high regard I hold the Member for Three Hills in.

MR. MARTIN: Well, Mr. Speaker, the question is to this Premier. When is he going to accept some leadership and admit that right from the top down, including him, this government is responsible and this Premier is responsible for the fiasco at Principal?

MR. GETTY: I can only assume, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member was not in the House on Friday or else was not listening or could not read the government's position, because the response covered those matters completely.

MR. DECORE: Mr. Speaker, the Premier has attempted to reconcile two glaring facts in the Code report. In the government response that he read last Friday, the Premier indicated

that he insisted on getting certain facts, that "information was hard to obtain." We now know from two ministers, one saying that discussions did take place in priorities committee and the other, a former minister, saying that had she known she had complete and total charge, she would have taken different action. . . . My question, then, is to the Premier. Accepting that the priorities committee had discussed the issue, according to the evidence of the former minister, who then did the Premier insist on getting the information from?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, maybe you can direct the hon. member, but surely if I understand his question -- a former minister speaking about a priorities committee under a former Premier is somehow a question that I should be answering? Hardly.

MR. DECORE: Mr. Speaker, given that provincial auditors knew most of the facts for years and years on FIC and AIC and were informing the government accordingly, why would you brazenly say that the government or the Premier had difficulty getting information on FIC/AIC?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, it's remarkable that the hon. member, having had the Code report and the government's response and two years of testimony before Mr. Code, is still unable to come to conclusions which Mr. Code was able to come to.

MR. DECORE: Well, we're not getting any answers again, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary question, please.

MR. DECORE: Mr. Speaker, accepting the former Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs' observations, statement that had the minister known she was in total and complete charge things would have been different, what other people, Mr. Premier, were given the responsibility to deal with FIC and AIC? Tell this Assembly.

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, surely the hon. member would know, but maybe because he's a rookie in the House, that obviously we can't reply to some hearsay report that he is providing to the House.

Assistance for Native and Immigrant Women

MR. PAYNE: Mr. Speaker, my question today is to the minister responsible for women's issues. I was pleased by the minister's announcement today of the Alberta Plan for Action for Women. The plan frankly contains many worthy goals and good initiatives which should help to improve the status of women in our province, but I regret that I could find no initiatives that specifically addressed native or immigrant women. Will the minister explain to the Assembly today why the plan does not address these two important groups in our province?

MS McCOY: Mr. Speaker, the goals and initiatives that are outlined in the Plan for Action for Women are designed to benefit all women, whatever their background. As an example, one of the initiatives that we've announced is increased day care subsidies for low-income women and men. That will benefit many who are native and immigrant. We're also providing things

such as increased funding for sheltered women's outfits in the north and also for satellite homes in the north, and those will benefit women in that way. We're also announcing a community-based funding pilot program, and that, too, will combat family violence and again will benefit many, because a proponent of that is going to address cross-cultural needs. I could go on and on, Mr. Speaker, but my point is that many of the initiatives we have announced in this Alberta Plan for Action for Women indeed will benefit all women, including those from a multiversity of ethnic backgrounds.

MR. PAYNE: To a certain extent, Mr. Speaker, I accept her point, but will the minister not agree that immigrant and native women sometimes face special challenges that aren't encountered by women in general?

MS McCOY: I accept that point, Mr. Speaker, but I would also make this point. We have in the past announced a number of initiatives, one we were speaking of yesterday afternoon in this Assembly, and that is our interdepartmental task force on foreign credentials, which will impact most directly on immigrant men and women and is a very important issue for them, as it is for us. That's just one example. I would also mention that about three of the women who were recently appointed to the advisory council have had years of direct experience working with native and immigrant communities. In ways such as that we are expecting to continue working with and for those communities.

MR. PAYNE: Well, Mr. Speaker, given that her document is partly subtitled "a bright future," will the minister tell us today if we can expect to see some future initiatives that specifically address the unique challenges faced by immigrant and native women in Alberta?

MS McCOY: The answer, Mr. Speaker, is yes. This document is designed as the government strategy, and it will in that regard help all Alberta women. It is our belief that if government helps women, they will help themselves, and we are truly going to support them in their efforts. We think that based on the past efforts that women in this province have made for years and years now and continuing that partnership, strong women will build stronger families and communities, and therefore we will all be better off. So the answer, Mr. Speaker, to the member's question is yes, absolutely.

Cost of the Principal Collapse to Taxpayers

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Attorney General and concerns the Principal fiasco and my continued attempts to see what, if anything, his department is doing about it. In particular I refer to the agreement of August 21, 1987, between the trustees of the Principal Group of Companies and certain members of the Cormie family. I'll file copies of this for the Assembly, Mr. Speaker. The Attorney General will recall that the purpose of that agreement was that in consideration of the Cormie people retaining assets worth some \$10 million, they gave up all claim on the remaining assets of the group. So my question to the Attorney General is this. He will recall that the defence of the Cormies to the attachment of those assets was destroyed if they were obtained by fraud. Given the contents of the Code report, what efforts is the department making on behalf

of the hard-pressed taxpayers of Alberta for relief by at least sequestering those assets?

MR. ROSTAD: Mr. Speaker, I believe this is déjà vu. We've been through this, although not specific to the particular document the hon. member refers to. The assets of the Cormie family have been, through an undertaking from one solicitor to another solicitor, tied up, and I understand that there's even some of the documentation to that which I'm not able to table before the House. But the assets are, in fact, secure.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary question.

MR. WRIGHT: Yes. Dealing with another aspect then, Mr. Speaker, in relief of the hard-pressed taxpayer, what attempts will be made to throw back upon the malefactors in this disaster the very large costs of the Code inquiry, again in relief of the taxpayer of this province?

MR. ROSTAD: Mr. Speaker, I informed the House some time ago and the Premier in his comments also said that the full force of the law will be taken against any of the parties that are culpable in this particular matter. On a criminal basis the RCMP are investigating, and on a civil basis a number of actions are being planned, not only by the investors but by the government.

MR. WRIGHT: Cost usually means legal costs, Mr. Speaker. My final supplementary is to the Treasurer. Another big item of costs, of course, are the costs of the trustees, receivers, and managers. What vigilance is the Treasurer exercising to ensure that the costs of these people are not excessive and therefore a further indirect drain on the taxpayers of the province?

MR. JOHNSTON: All vigilance, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Calgary-Buffalo, followed by Rocky Mountain House, then Calgary-Mountain View.

MR. SIGURDSON: The same way you followed the regulators.

MR. SPEAKER: Calgary-Buffalo. Thank you very much, Edmonton-Belmont.

Responsibility for Regulating FIC and AIC (continued)

MR. CHUMIR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Premier. The hon. Member for Three Hills has recently stated that she didn't realize she was in total control when she was Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, yet she alone has been made to pay in terms of her reputation and job when it's clear that senior ministers and Premiers were calling the major shots. It's just not right that those who are equally or more responsible are not accepting their share of the blame. So I'm wondering whether the Premier could tell us: what was the role of the two priority task forces which he disbanded in November 1985, if the minister, the Member for Three Hills, was supposedly calling all of the shots?

MR. SPEAKER: Is the member not aware of *Beauchesne* 411? Carry on, Mr. Premier, but I think the Chair is concerned. At

least two members today, both of them lawyers, seem not to know anything about *Beauchesne* 411(2).

Premier.

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, the government's response to the Code report has been full and detailed and was given on Friday.

MR. CHUMIR: Well, the fact is that the Premier has not been answering this question, Mr. Speaker, and I'm wondering whether the Premier is prepared to admit that these task forces which were set up in 1984 and 1985 and which he disbanded were to ensure that no major action took place with respect to financial institutions without the approval of either former Premier Lougheed or the former Provincial Treasurer.

MR. GETTY: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CHUMIR: Well, perhaps the Premier is prepared to tell us why the Member for Three Hills is being singled out when there is so obviously responsibility falling on himself and on the Provincial Treasurer and former Premier Lougheed? -- Why just the Member for Three Hills?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, as I already said today to the House, the matter of the Member for Three Hills was dealt with on Friday, and it was the case of Mr. Code's findings. I wanted to make it very clear that blame is not being placed on that minister by me or the government.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

The Chair also points out to the Member for Calgary-Buffalo another reference in *Beauchesne*, which is 409(7):

A question must adhere to the proprieties of the House, in terms of inferences, imputing motives or casting aspersions upon persons within the House or out of it.

The Chair points out that the former Premier of the province was not called by that inquiry. Therefore, the question is indeed out of order.

The Chair recognizes Rocky Mountain House.

Surcharge Program for Victims of Crime

MR. LUND: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question today is to the Solicitor General. Many of my constituents and I have been very concerned that victims of crime don't get any help after being victimized. I'm very pleased that the Conservative government in Ottawa has seen fit in their wisdom to follow through on their promise that they would not forget the victims in the revision to the Criminal Code. Has the province of Alberta been involved in the development of the victim surcharge program that becomes effective July 31, '89?

MR. FOWLER: Mr. Speaker, the Solicitor General's department and the Attorney General's department have been involved in conferences with all provinces and the federal government since this matter came on the conference agenda a year or so ago. So the answer is yes, we have been involved.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary.

MR. LUND: Thanks, Mr. Speaker. To the Solicitor General. When will this House address the matter of provincial legisla-

tion so that the funds that will be generated can be passed on to Alberta-based organizations?

MR. FOWLER: Mr. Speaker, we require legislation in order to disburse the funds that are starting to be collected today in the courts. The legislation came into effect yesterday. As of today the surcharge will be made in all the criminal courts in Alberta, a surcharge of 1 to 15 percent, or a \$35 minimum where in fact there is no fine. But legislation is required. That will be developed for the next session of this Assembly.

MR. LUND: Mr. Speaker, I'm wondering: why are we waiting until next year to deal with this matter?

MR. FOWLER: Mr. Speaker, as of today the particular fund has no dollars in it at all. We have no certainty as to the number of dollars that will be available. We will have to, in fact, make a study and consult with those groups that are already in the field of victim assistance to make a decision precisely what is going to happen with those funds when we find out what groups we will be dealing with, as well as how much money we will be dealing with.

MR. SPEAKER: Calgary-Mountain View, followed by Edmonton-Meadowlark.

Responsibility for Regulating FIC and AIC (continued)

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday the Provincial Treasurer told the Assembly that "the fundamental regulatory responsibility [for FIC and AIC] was here in this province." In essence, by this admission he let regulatory agencies in other provinces off the hook, but at the same time he said Alberta would keep its right to sue, along with those FIC/AIC investors, "all third-party participants" including those other provincial regulatory agencies. In short, by acknowledging Alberta's responsibility, he took away its bargaining position and undermined the basis of any claim Alberta might make on those other governments. To the Provincial Treasurer. On what basis does the Alberta government believe that actions against other regulatory agencies in other provinces can possibly be successful now that Alberta has accepted "fundamental regulatory responsibility" for this fiasco?

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Speaker, I've heard some mish-mash statements before, but this is going to receive the award of the day at least, if not the award of the year. That just isn't what we have said at all. The member knows full well what it is we said, and I've explained that time and time again. If necessary, to allow it to penetrate his cranium, I'd be glad to go back over it, but he's going to have waste another question.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Well, Mr. Speaker, given that the admission by the Provincial Treasurer is found on page 1118 of *Hansard*, if he wants to look it up, that that admission has given those other regulatory agencies a strong basis on which they can enjoin with their citizens to sue Alberta, on what basis does the Alberta government believe they can defend themselves from investors and regulatory agencies outside Alberta when, after all, the Provincial Treasurer has acknowledged that it's Alberta that had the fundamental responsibility in this fiasco?

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Speaker, again the member has asked me for at least five legal opinions over the course of the few minutes that he's confused me, confused the government, confused Albertans, and confused the issue. Clearly what we have said, and we will say it again: should the settlement be provided to the contract holders and should they agree to give up that right, we would enjoin with them in any and all possible actions against all third parties. Now, that's a very clear statement; that's not a legal opinion. That's a political statement that we intend to pursue wherever possible all other third parties.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the fact that we have said that we were the fundamental regulator, because you know those companies were Alberta-based companies and you know that other provinces were depending on us for some regulatory efficiency, we have agreed to pay up to 75 percent by paying 18 cents on FIC and 15 cents or so on AIC. That's not admission of any guilt. That's an admission that we're going to do a fair deal, an equitable deal, one which the consumers across Canada will understand and which will bring strength back to the financial markets of this province. It's much broader than a legal opinion, and the narrowness of the member's view is well understood by everyone in Alberta as of today.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Mr. Speaker, given that Alberta's likely to join with investors in other provinces to sue their governments and they in turn are likely to respond by suing the Alberta government right back, will the Provincial Treasurer now admit that his government's strategy will only lead to a highly unusual and bizarre situation that will only highlight how badly this government has mishandled the Principal fiasco from start to finish?

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Speaker, I know the opposition, with the blues syndrome that they like, don't like to see the government operate in a fair manner, being received across Alberta as being a reasonable government, having looked at the evidence of the Code inquiry, having taken the time to reflect upon the choices available to us, and making a sound decision. Now, the opposition doesn't like to see that, but that in fact is what has happened, and that in fact is what the opposition knows has happened. Albertans are in the process now of weighing carefully what we have done, and I think it's safe to say that the vast majority of Albertans agree with our position. That's unfortunate for them; I understand that.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Meadowlark, followed by Calgary-Millican, then Edmonton-Belmont.

Responsibility for Water Management Projects

MR. MITCHELL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The government committed \$4 million last year to mitigate damage to fisheries habitat caused by the Oldman River dam. Now Public Works, Supply and Services has undertaken a habitat project on the Crownsnest River which, believe it or not, has ruined the trout habitat it is supposed to improve. Here's the situation. We have the Department of the Environment with 520 people and a huge amount of money planning and operating dams which would more appropriately be done by the department of public works. On the other hand, public works is undertaking fishery habitat projects which more appropriately fall within the mandate of the Minister of Forestry, Lands and Wildlife. To the minister of

forests. Why is it that public works is doing a fisheries habitat project which would more appropriately be done by his department?

MR. FJORBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, on the whole area of the Oldman River we committed ourselves to no net loss of recreational and fishing opportunities. Part of the work that needed to be done now -- and I want to make sure the record is accurate, not inaccurate -- as far as the fisheries mitigation project on the Oldman River dam, there is in-stream enhancement work now under way. That'll take place in two periods, in the spring and in the fall. The construction activity, you know, temporarily results in a high silt load. It's temporary; it doesn't damage the fish. It does damage the recreational fishing opportunities while that takes place. But it's short-term pain for a very short time in order to significantly enhance the fisheries habitat that's there, and my Fish and Wildlife staff have been very closely involved in making sure that everything is properly done.

MR. MITCHELL: I wonder whether it would be much better done if in fact it were done by the professionals in your department.

To the Minister of Public Works, Supply and Services. Why is it that the Department of the Environment is supervising \$85 million and 520 people in water resource management projects including dams, when this would more appropriately be transferred to his department and, in fact, the Minister of the Environment made a commitment to transfer that activity to the public works department?

MR. KOWALSKI: There are several questions, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps what's important at this point is to make sure that all members of the Assembly are up to date with respect to the fisheries mitigation plan that was raised in the first question. I'll make it very clear that the program currently under way in the Blairmore area was developed in consultation with Alberta Environment, the Fish and Wildlife division of Alberta Forestry, Lands and Wildlife, the local advisory committee, the Fish and Wildlife Subcommittee of the municipal district of Pincher Creek. As well, we had input from Trout Unlimited and representatives of the Oldman River Canoe and Kayak Association. What is happening, of course, is a cap of expenditure, Mr. Speaker. What we're doing is enhancing the fishery within the Oldman River dam. It's a project that was clearly advertised to all citizens in the area some time ago, and it's one that's clearly understood as to what we're doing, and it meets with the overall commitments of the government.

MR. SPEAKER: Final.

MR. MITCHELL: Yeah. It would be nice if he answered my question to him.

To the Minister of the Environment. Would the Department of the Environment not be better able to assess the environmental impact of dams and other water resource management projects from an objective point of view if in fact his department did not have such a huge stake in the planning and operation of dams and water resource management projects in this province?

MR. KLEIN: It's really quite simple, Mr. Speaker. The Department of the Environment conducts an environmental impact assessment prior to the construction of the dam to determine its

environmental worthiness, and after the dam is constructed under the irrigation headworks and main canals program, the Department of the Environment takes charge to make sure that there is efficient and proper delivery of the water. That's quite simple.

Impaired Driving

MR. SHRAKE: Mr. Speaker, we've just had released from Statistics Canada information on impaired drivers. It appears that Alberta's one on the thing. My question to the Solicitor General. We've got 756 out of every 100,000 people in this province charged in 1988 with impaired driving, and I'd like to know what the Solicitor General is going to do to try to correct this problem.

MR. FOWLER: Mr. Speaker, I've responded to this question a number of times in this session. However, I'm pleased to advise the member again that the Solicitor General's department has initiated 42 different programs this year to attack the problem of impaired driving in this province. Of course, if the programs are successful, it only stands to reason that we are going to, in fact, catch more of those people that are on the road driving either impaired or drunk, and it's my hope that over the next few years we will continue to lead the list in Canada, which will be adequate proof to myself that we are doing the job that we want to do in this area.

MR. SHRAKE: Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the fact that the Solicitor General's got 47 programs out there, but what I want to know is: there are wrong numbers here suggesting that Alberta's got a major problem with impaired driving.

MR. FOWLER: I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker; I didn't catch the question.

MR. SHRAKE: Okay. Sorry, Mr. Speaker; I'll put it a little different.

MR. SPEAKER: More loudly too.

MR. SHRAKE: With the 47 programs you've got, the raw numbers still come back that we have a major problem in this province, and I would like to know what we are going to do to reduce these numbers and if you have some new initiatives, I guess.

MR. FOWLER: It's because of that rate and the record in Alberta that these programs are in. They cover enforcement, they cover research, they cover education, and they cover the whole range of things. I would be pleased to supply the package to the member in order that he can review them and possibly give us suggestions in the department for other programs that we can bring in; in fact, we are looking at other programs. However, we want to view carefully those programs that are already being implemented to see if they bring about the desired result. It is never expected that they will bring us to a zero rate.

MR. SHRAKE: Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. We've raised the fines and the amount of punishment and so on. Has the Solicitor General considered one final initiative, and that is

to have fines and punishment for those, including hotels or if a person at a private party, that serve the booze and allow the guy to go out on the road impaired and maybe kill somebody?

MR. FOWLER: Mr. Speaker, there has never been criminal liability laid upon the supplier of a legal substance, and I don't think there will be here. There may well be civil liability. The member brings up an increase in fines and suspensions that was passed by this Legislature one year ago, and I remind the member that the figures he is looking at are not for the immediate year on which these fines have newly been implemented and increased. Those figures will be available to us next year.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Belmont.

Proposed Changes to Unemployment Insurance Act

MR. SIGURDSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My questions today are for the Acting Minister of Career Development and Employment. In the week of September 11 the House of Commons committee on unemployment insurance will be in Edmonton to hear submissions on the proposed changes to the Unemployment Insurance Act. The deadline for requesting the opportunity to meet with the committee has been moved back from today to two weeks from today, and it's still important to try and get notice in as soon as possible. My question is: can the minister assure the Assembly that the Department of Career Development and Employment will be making submissions to this committee on behalf of all Albertans?

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, the position of parliamentary democracies is that ministers talk to ministers. The position of the province of Alberta with respect to changes in terms of unemployment insurance and/or the like coming out of Ottawa: those submissions will be made directly to the responsible minister in Ottawa.

MR. SIGURDSON: Mr. Speaker, given that 12,000 Albertans are going to lose all of their benefits and that a further 73,000 Albertans stand to lose approximately \$1,300, I'm sure that Albertans would like to know either why the government is acting so negligently in not allowing them to have input or, in fact, what is going to be contained in the submission that is going to be before the committee.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, the specific information provided by the hon. member in his question I think is of considerably questionable merit. The changes, basically, that are being proposed by the federal government will have some impact in terms of eligibility for unemployment insurance and also will deal with fraudulent cases with respect to unemployment insurance. At the same time, there are going to be increased and improved benefits for maternity leave, positions that this province and this government have been advocating for some period of time: the positions of our government with respect to parental leave and illness leave. As well and most importantly of all, Mr. Speaker, the required need to take some of these dollars and put them into training programs for long-term, viable jobs is extremely important to this province. I would add as well that the unemployment levels in our province have decreased dramatically over the last several years, when we had unemployment in this province as high as 13 percent. We now have un-

employment in Alberta at essentially less than 7 percent.

MR. SIGURDSON: Mr. Speaker, the welfare rates are up almost 100 percent over the last four years as well.

Given that response from the Acting Minister of Career Development and Employment, let's try the Minister of Family and Social Services. Given that almost half of those affected by these cuts will have incomes of less than \$10,000 per year, will the minister tell us if the department has any plans in place to provide the estimated 5,200 Albertans who are going to be affected immediately come January 1 -- what provision is there for those Albertans who are going to need assistance right away?

MR. OLDRING: Mr. Speaker, as is so often the case, they take a very narrow perspective on how they evaluate situations. What the member fails to take into consideration is the number of jobs that have been created in this province last year, the number of jobs that are being created in the province this year. I can only say that we're very fortunate to be having to face the consequences of the changes to UIC here in Alberta at a time when our economy is on the upswing. I would also, Mr. Speaker, want to leave the hon. member with the assurance that this department will continue to meet those basic needs of Albertans who come to us requiring social allowance, and we will continue to make sure that housing, clothing, food, dental, optometric care are all provided for. We've done that in the past, and we'll continue to do that in the future.

MR. SPEAKER: Westlock-Sturgeon, then Wainwright.

Locating of Hydrocarbon Plants on Prime Farmland

MR. TAYLOR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just north of here a battle to protect number 1 and 2 farmland is being fought at Carbondale by residents who have had a 1,500 name petition ignored by the county council and the Minister of Municipal Affairs, who won't even try to stop construction of a gas plant that's moving in on number 1 and number 2 farmland. Meanwhile, of course, the Minister of the Environment, who's responsible for reclaiming land, will do nothing to stop the plant until the land is ruined first so he can reclaim it. Then we have the Minister of Energy, Mr. Speaker, whose department is reported by an MD councillor as giving orders that gas plants should be able to locate where they want, number 1 farmland or not, because the government needs the money.

MR. SPEAKER: Now the question.

MR. TAYLOR: To the Premier, Mr. Speaker. What kind of an outfit is he running here, where number 1 and number 2 farmland cannot be protected, no matter if going to four different ministers? The Minister of Agriculture, by the way, has said it is not his responsibility.

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, projects such as gas plants proceed through a regulatory process where all matters are taken into consideration.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, given that the Premier knows so little about it, let me move over and ask the Minister of Energy something. Will he give orders to the ERCB, or the Energy Resources Conservation Board -- some people call it the energy

resources exploitation board -- that from now on no hydrocarbon plant is to be located on number 1 and number 2 farmland? Just no, no, no. Can he give that order?

MR. SPEAKER: Might we have unanimous consent to finish this line of questioning?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed? You mean there was no "no, no?" Okay.
Minister of Energy.

MR. ORMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Premier just answered that question adequately. There is a regulatory process in place through the ERCB. If the hon. member had a concern, I would suggest that he should have intervened at the hearing, particularly if he's the MLA and he has a concern about the construction of this plant in his constituency. I'm surprised he's bringing it up here now.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, given that there is no authority to the ERCB -- and I challenge any minister across there, any of those bright-eyed I don't know what you want to call them, to come out and show me one line where any regulatory body in Alberta has the right to stop industrial development of 1 and 2 farmland. I challenge them. This to the Premier. Would he go and would he contact every one of his . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Thank you.

MR. TAYLOR: Would the Premier ask each of his cabinet ministers . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. TAYLOR: I have to spell it out, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Could we turn off the gas plant, please, hon. member? Thank you very much.
Premier.

MR. GETTY: The answer's no, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Time for question period has expired; however, point of order, Calgary-Buffalo.

MR. CHUMIR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was called to order on a matter arising under 411(2) of *Beauchesne*, which provides that

a question may not . . .

- (2) seek information about matters which are in their nature secret, such as decisions or proceedings of Cabinet...

et cetera. I'd simply suggest that I was seeking from the Premier information with respect to the role of several task forces which he disbanded, and I hope the Speaker is not suggesting that the role of these task forces would be considered to be cabinet secrets, particularly after the matter was dealt with so

extensively by the Code report.

The second item. Section 409(7) of *Beauchesne* provides that

a question must adhere to the proprieties of the House, in terms of inferences, imputing motives or casting aspersions upon persons within the House or out of it.

I would note, Mr. Speaker, that my references were with respect to the political figures', ministers and former ministers, having made mistakes. I would assume that if these kinds of references were considered to be within the intention of that rule and not part of question period or a debate in this House, then we'd have nothing to talk about and might as well go home.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, with due deference, hon. member, the last comment is really ill-advised.

The matter with regard to the Chair calling the hon. Member for Calgary-Buffalo to order, the question was asking the role of two priority task forces. The Chair was just giving admonition that that was indeed infringing upon that reference in *Beauchesne*, the one that was cited -- I'll find it here -- 411(2). At that time of intervention the Chair also pointed out that the hon. Member for Edmonton-Glenarry's first question was along a similar nature. We've had a number of those questions in the last few days, and the Chair's bringing it to the attention of the House that all hon. members will indeed craft their questions a bit more carefully in that regard.

The admonition with regard to the former Premier. Having looked at the first draft of the Blues, in this case I would agree that the Chair was a bit too fast on the draw on that one, so that would be seen as an apology to the hon. member on that one.

The Chair would also like to point out, though, for all hon. members that perhaps they'd like to review the Blues and *Hansard* tomorrow and see, for example, that the first two questions as raised by the hon. Member for Calgary-Mountain View were out of order with respect to *Beauchesne* 408(1)(c), 409(3), and 410(13). The third question, the final supplementary, was indeed out of order according to *Beauchesne* 409(11) because it was just seeking an opinion. Again, the Chair realizes from past experience in the House that it's very difficult to craft questions from time to time, but it is incumbent upon the members to look at *Beauchesne* from time to time to see that they are indeed working according to the rules.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

head: WRITTEN QUESTIONS

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

[Motion carried]

head: MOTIONS FOR RETURNS

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, I further move that all motions for returns appearing on the Order Paper today, except for motions for returns 200, 207, and 210, stand and retain their places on the Order Paper.

[Motion carried]

200. Mr. McInnis moved that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing a copy of the final engineering report on the Oldman River dam.

MR. McINNIS: Mr. Speaker, I filed this motion on June 18. On the same date the minister sent the very same document to the Leader of the Opposition. He was kind enough to share it with me, so I'd like to withdraw the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: A request has been made by the hon. Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place to withdraw Motion for a Return 200. That requires unanimous consent of the House. Those in favour, please say aye.

HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

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

207. Mr. Mitchell moved that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing a copy of the letter sent to the manager of Alberta-Pacific Forest Industries Inc. by the Minister of the Environment to which the minister referred during Oral Question Period on July 13, 1989, outlining that Alberta-Pacific Forest Industries Inc. would commence construction at this time at its own risk.

MR. KLEIN: Mr. Speaker, it's my intention to reject this motion. If I may, I'd like to initiate some debate on this particular matter. The letter that the hon. member refers to is clearly a private communication between myself and the manager of Alberta-Pacific, and it's as simple as that. I don't think I want to get into the business, nor do I think that any minister of the Crown would want to get into the business, of sharing private communications with any member of the Legislature unless, of course, permission was granted and it was agreed to by both parties involved. In this particular case, I believe it's a private communication, and I think it would be imprudent to release that letter at this particular time.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

The Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place.

MR. McINNIS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is true that a minister of the Crown is entitled to make a private communication with someone and doesn't need to share that with the Assembly or the public on all occasions, but this is a little bit different in that the minister did refer to the matter in the Assembly in response to a question. Now, he's fairly close to the bounds of the rules of the Assembly; section 495(1) of *Beauchesne* states:

A Minister is not at liberty to read or quote from a despatch or other state paper not before the House without being prepared to lay it on the Table.

That's a relatively well-established principle. There's a reason for it. I mean, to cite a part of a document or some reference to a document without revealing the document puts the minister in a state of relative advantage compared with other members of the Assembly referring to a matter. How do you debate a document like that or an event like that without having to share the information? He probably would argue -- and that's the reason I'm not raising this as a point of order -- that he merely referenced the document rather than quoting from it directly. But it does seem that if the minister feels it serves his purpose to

cite the existence of a letter, of correspondence to buttress an argument -- in this case I think the argument was that Alberta-Pacific would not take advantage of the loophole that exists within the existing legislation under the Clean Air and Clean Water Acts to do some site preparation work prior to having their environmental impact assessment approved. This, of course, was the loophole which the Daishowa company used to spend a fair amount of money and have a fair amount of impact on the environment at Peace River, to commence construction activity on their project before the environmental impact assessment was concluded.

The minister, as I recall, on the date in question, July 13, said that he had written to Alberta-Pacific instructing them not to commence work and not to take advantage of the loophole that exists, given that the county had previously issued a development permit to them and said that site preparation activities could go ahead. So for the minister to claim that it's private correspondence is a little bit beside the point, because he took it out of the realm of private correspondence right here in question period. He said: "Look what I'm doing. I've written to the company and I've said that they ought not to do site preparation work before the EIA process is completed." So I think he's taken it out of the category of purely private documents. He's made clear reference to it in the Legislative Assembly. Therefore, he has really defeated his own position. He was the one who brought the thing up in the first place. It wasn't anybody on this side because, of course, we didn't know of the existence of it. Now that we do, now that he's made reference to it, he's under some moral obligation, I suggest, to table it.

However, we have a clear question before the Assembly now, which is for a motion for a return seeking a copy of the letter so that the circumstances of this particular aspect can be known prior to the commencement of the hearings. I believe the minister no longer has a claim to privacy in relation to this matter, and for that reason I urge members to support this particular Motion 207.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Strathcona.

MR. WRIGHT: Yes. Mr. Speaker, one of the major defects in the Clean Air and Clean Water Acts is in fact the loophole referred to by the hon. Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place; namely, that it is possible to do hundreds of thousands, even millions of dollars of site preparation before ever there's a need for the environmental impact assessment to be accepted or passed because of the peculiar interpretation put on the word "construction." That was what hon. members were dealing with, Mr. Speaker, and in defence of his position he adduced an agreement with a company, with the company involved of course, which he says justified what they were doing. It's an extremely important point. This is not just a minor matter. It's a major matter that goes to the very heart of the efficacy of the environmental impact assessment system as at present constituted under those Acts, and yet the minister now says that he will not produce it so that hon. members can see the terms and conditions that he alludes to. It's public business; it should be publicly done. It is just beyond the reasonable scope of doing public business to make a suggestion of this sort, that the very justification for proceeding on such an important matter in the manner referred to by the minister will not be produced so we can look at it, check it out, talk about it, and debate it.

MR. SPEAKER: Calgary-North West.

MR. BRUSEKER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would rise in support of Motion 207 and heartily agree with the comments made by my two colleagues in the NDP caucus. I would simply like to point out to the Minister of the Environment that should he table such documentation as a letter to the manager of Alberta-Pacific Forest Industries and similar kinds of documents as has been requested in previous motions, then perhaps a lot of the contention that is arising between one side of the House and the other side of the House could in fact be eliminated. Because now that we do not have the documents before us, it leaves us to merely speculate, and much speculation could be eliminated simply by the tabling of the document. The document has been prepared, as I understand, by the minister, by his department. He has signed it and sent it. And since he is acting in his official capacity in dealing with a company that is working in a relationship with the government, I believe this is a public document and should be made available and would eliminate much of the contentiousness of this issue. So I would strongly support this motion and urge the minister to respectfully change his mind.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Meadowlark.

MR. MITCHELL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise, of course, to urge the minister to release this document. I would like to begin by thanking my three colleagues for their support of my motion for a return.

I would like to make a number of arguments against the minister's case, such as it is, not to release this document. He has based his response and argument against releasing the document on the notion of privacy. I question that notion, as did my colleague from Edmonton-Jasper Place. Once the minister has referred to this document or any other document in the most public of institutions in our province, it is very, very difficult for him to argue with credibility that it is any longer a private document. Compounding that observation, I argue, is the fact that he used it for advantage in debate, in a debate which hinged upon . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, hon. member. I was not in the Chair on July 13. I have called for copies of *Hansard*. The hon. Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place came perilously close to trying to raise a point of order on a point of order that had already been dealt with by the House, and now, hon. member, you are in breach of that yourself. It was ruled at that time that it was not a direct quote, and in my review of *Hansard* I do not see it as being a direct quote. So please continue with your remarks.

MR. MITCHELL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I accept the point of order. I'm arguing as to whether or not it conforms directly to what *Beauchesne* would dictate as his having to . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. member. That's arguing with a point of order that's already been decided by the House.

MR. MITCHELL: Fine. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, there is a moral obligation, once having used that particular document, for us to be able to see it, to evaluate it. This is a particularly important point. Orders of the Depart-

ment of the Environment such as an approval under the Clean Air Act or an approval under the Clean Water Act would without question be public approvals. This particular circumstance, this direction to the company, amounts to, constitutes, an order under the Clean Air and Clean Water Acts. Because it is those two Acts that give the minister the authority to say, as he said, presumably, in this letter: "Do not start. If you do so" -- start construction, that is -- "it will be at your own risk." That is an order for which he has authority under the Clean Air and Clean Water Acts. If we called it an approval or a lack of approval, if there were a document issued under the Act specifically giving approval, that would be a public document.

The point here, Mr. Speaker, is that this is a very, very important communication with this company. And it's not as though this minister has had a track record of success in communicating his wishes to this company; he hasn't. He asked this very company to delay its public hearings process, and they refused to do it. It is all very well and good for the minister to say it's at the risk of the company if they begin construction. One can only ask what, possibly, he would do to them if they began construction. And, in fact it isn't the company's risk; it's our risk. It's our risk if they begin to do things that are irreversible without the proper approvals, if they inch us inexorably to an approval which this government will find it increasingly difficult to withstand if they in fact do at some point in this process find that they shouldn't proceed with that particular project.

The minister said he couldn't release it without the approval of the other party. I would ask him, and encourage him if he hasn't: has he talked to the other party? Has the other party a concern with releasing this letter?

I believe that it is extremely important that we have an indication from this minister as to how he worded the direction to the company, important because it hinges upon a point made by my colleague from Edmonton-Strathcona. The point is this: that construction and the definition of construction is everything in whether or not that company can proceed. The definition of construction in the permit issued by the county of Athabasca was very, very cynical. It said that certain kinds of construction are construction; other kinds of construction aren't construction. The Minister of the Environment could write an extremely strong letter, an extremely strong order to this company if he said: "I do not accept the manner in which the county of Athabasca has defined construction. This is how I define construction: to include excavation and clearing, site preparation. And you cannot by law proceed with construction of that nature until such time as you have approvals. You do not have approvals." That would be a very different kind of message to a company than saying, as he has done here, in fact giving that company a choice: "You can proceed, Alberta-Pacific. You can proceed, albeit at your own risk, but you can proceed."

The other way, which he has the authority to state under his Act, is to define construction to include site preparation and excavation, which by any other name or word is construction, and then say very clearly under the Act "You cannot proceed." I would like to know that that kind of assurance is included in that letter to this company.

[Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair]

I believe that we in this Legislature and the people of Alberta, given the track record of this minister in dealing with that company, have a right to see that piece of correspondence. I am

concerned that the minister, in his reluctance to give it to us when it is such an obviously easy thing to do, may be hiding something in that letter that in fact he does not want the rest of us in this Legislature and in the public to see. I believe that this is once again, Mr. Speaker, an argument for proper freedom-of-information/access-to-information legislation in this province. And it is unfortunate and disappointing that this minister simply wouldn't be forthcoming to show us a letter which he says isn't a problem.

[Motion lost]

210. Rev. Roberts moved that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing the equivalent information for 1987-88 as was contained in tables 1 to 3 and schedules A to E of the 1986-87 annual report of the Department of Hospitals and Medical Care.

MRS. BETKOWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I accept Motion 210.

[Motion carried]

head: **MOTIONS OTHER THAN
GOVERNMENT MOTIONS**

209. Moved by Mr. Mitchell:
Be it resolved that the Legislative Assembly urge the government to place a moratorium on construction of pulp and paper projects in northern Alberta until
- (1) an environmental impact assessment process is implemented which is objective, comprehensive, and subject to full public input, and
 - (2) technology is available and put in place to assure that emissions to water and air from these projects will have a negligible environmental impact.

MR. MITCHELL: Mr. Speaker, Motion 209 is a motion which calls the government to place a moratorium on the construction of pulp and paper mills in northern Alberta, or anywhere else in Alberta for that matter, until such time as two things occur: one, we have a proper environmental impact assessment process that, among other things, is objective, comprehensive, and subject to full and proper input and public inquiry; and secondly, that we are assured, on the basis of the information that that assessment will provide, that there is technology to adequately mitigate the environmental impact of these projects, "adequate" meaning negligible environmental impact.

I would like to structure my argument, Mr. Speaker, by arguing and making some points to emphasize the huge environmental impact that pulp mills proposed in the north will have on our environment and to emphasize my concern about that impact to the extent that it has not been assessed properly in any one of the cases, in any one of the mills proposed or proceeding at this time. Mr. Speaker, there are profound environmental impacts. History and experience in British Columbia, elsewhere in our province, elsewhere in the world with existing pulp mills indicate that pulp mills are perhaps one of the most aggressive polluters of our environment of any industrial kind of complex.

Air emissions from the Alberta-Pacific project, to use that as an example, will amount to eight tonnes of sulphur equivalents per day being spewed, emitted into the air in that section of the province. The prevailing wisdom, the technology that will be

utilized to mitigate that environmental impact, is simply a high smokestack which will see that it's spread not in the immediate area but that it falls elsewhere. Nevertheless, no matter where it falls, it still has a detrimental environmental impact, and in fact it has a detrimental health impact. We have always known and been concerned that sulphur equivalents do have a health impact. Recent studies at the University of Alberta indicate that in fact that impact and the negative health consequences of sulphur equivalents are much greater than we had previously considered.

In addition to these air emissions there will, among other things, be 115,000 cubic metres of wastewater per day funneled into the Athabasca River. That will be water which has been processed with chemicals and with wood waste. Amongst the chemicals we know about that will be a part of that wastewater will be dioxins and furans, some of the most toxic chemicals known to man. In addition, there will be wood fibre, which has an impact on the oxygen content of rivers such as the Athabasca and can, in fact, ultimately reduce oxygen levels in a way that will be detrimental to the health of fish and wildlife in that river. In addition, the kind of fibre that is emitted in that wastewater becomes a silt which can cover breeding grounds and can have a detrimental impact on the future generations of fish in that area.

There are social impacts, Mr. Speaker, in a project of the nature of the pulp mill projects being considered. In the Athabasca case we've heard a great deal from the Member for Athabasca-Lac La Biche, who is very concerned about his native people, and true enough, he should be. Of course, we have no guarantees that this will be particularly advantageous for native people. We do not see, in the process of assessing that project, that we have made a condition that there will be a signed agreement between the company and native bands and Metis bands to ensure that there will be employment and the nature of that employment, to ensure that the native people will have benefits under that employment. None of those things have been considered, for all we know. Certainly none of those things have been considered in a formal manner, in a way that they can be reviewed in the public.

Next, there will be tremendous impacts on lost economic opportunity cost. Nobody has assessed whether or not we will jeopardize tourist development in that area. It stands to reason that there is a logic to the fact that we will, in fact, jeopardize tourist development. We can see in the case of the Oldman River dam, where we have serious questions about whether environmental impact assessments were done properly, that now we are undertaking a project through the public works department to mitigate fisheries' impact. Given that the impact originally hadn't been done properly, given that mitigative procedures and projects haven't been assessed properly, we now find that we may be damaging fisheries in the Crowsnest River in an effort to mitigate the impact of the Oldman River dam. We have no way of knowing, because we have not properly assessed the environmental implications of these projects, whether in fact there will be similar kinds of consequences in the case of the Athabasca pulp mill and the other pulp mills in northern Alberta.

Another huge area of concern, of course, is the forestry management agreement and the physical area that those agreements will cover. We've heard much about the geographical breadth of the forestry management areas. We can only surmise as to what the impact will be because, again, we haven't seen data or information, properly constituted studies. There will be roads cut through sensitive wildlife and habitat areas. Migratory pat-

terns of wildlife may be disrupted: no studies of that particular consequence. There will be clear-cutting techniques, which are used and permitted in this province, that experience in British Columbia, for example, tells us can be extremely detrimental to the environment and to the health of forests affected by clear-cutting techniques. We see vast tracts of land where trees have been blown down because forests have been clear-cut to a threshold level which now makes it more difficult for forest development and the actual continued existence of certain forests to be sustained. Again, none of these impacts have been assessed properly, and in fact, quite the contrary. We get the impression from this government and from this minister that they are avoiding the assessment of those impacts and only inching along in an environmental impact assessment process to the extent that they have to by public pressure, never giving enough, never responding aggressively or progressively enough, only responding to the extent that they think they can get away with.

Mr. Speaker, there are these environmental, health, social, and economic opportunity cost problems, or potential problems, which any reasonable person would agree must be assessed properly. Compounding that logic is the fact that there simply has not been adequate assessment. We have seen a process that started as a whim of the Minister of the Environment. It should be pointed out that there is no legislation in this province that requires in any way, shape, or form that there be an environmental impact assessment for a pulp mill project. That is strictly at the discretion of the minister.

We have seen that as the case progressed with respect to the Athabasca project, we got tidbits; we got reaction. We didn't get an encompassing environmental impact assessment process. The first step was that the Minister of the Environment, three days into an election, said that he felt concerned about -- he said, "Well, we will structure an environmental assessment board in the case of the Athabasca project." It took three or four months after that before we could determine who would be sitting on that board and what process would be undertaken to appoint that board. Once we determined that and the appointments were made, there was serious question, which hasn't been answered to this point, about the quality, the nature of the people who were appointed. In fact, three of the eight people who were appointed as a designate or an alternate to that board actually admitted, to their credit, that they encountered conflict of interest, and resigned. The minister himself admitted several weeks ago that he had made a mistake, that he had bungled the process of structuring and appointing that environmental assessment board for the Athabasca project.

What is disconcerting is that only three-eighths of the problem to which he admitted has been fixed, and five-eighths of that mistake remains. We have seen no positive action to restructure that board in a way consistent, for example, with the guidelines utilized by the federal government, which place an emphasis on expertise and an emphasis on impartiality. We have seen no effort on the part of this minister to undertake to appoint members consistent with those guidelines despite the fact that he himself, the minister, has admitted that he made a mistake. This process simply is inadequate, and the board that he has structured does not meet the concerns that we have raised. It simply is not good enough, Mr. Speaker.

There are other problems with the process in the case of the Athabasca project. For example, yes, there may be public hearings, but they have come in a very, very rushed time frame. Public groups will have very little time in which to analyze and

structure their public input. There's been serious question about the objectivity with which money has been allocated to public intervenors, and in fact one of the most vocal and interested groups, the Friends of the Athabasca, has not been allocated any money for that purpose. The process, to this point, does not include the forestry management agreement which will encompass 28,000 square kilometres of northern Alberta. There has been no assessment or no provision to assess the economic trade-offs. Maybe we could put the kind of money that we're putting into that project into tourism and get longer term, better jobs. There has been no assessment of the "What if we don't do it at all?" option and what other benefits there could be from that. There has been, Mr. Speaker, no assessment of the nature of the jobs, whether those are quality jobs. There has been no assessment of the social impact, whether this company is prepared to put money to mitigate that social impact.

Mr. Speaker, this is an extremely weak process, and this minister has done very, very little beyond the political, beyond the public relations of it, to try and improve that process. But -- and this is an important "but" -- at least there is a process of some kind with respect to the Athabasca project. The same cannot be said for Daishowa; the same cannot be said for the Alberta Energy Company project in Slave Lake; it cannot be said for Weldwood; it cannot be said for the forestry management agreements. When I asked the minister last week in the House how it is that on the one hand he can say yes, we have to have federal involvement in the Athabasca project; yes, we have to have a public board to hear, to supervise public hearings in the case of the Athabasca project; but no, we do not have to have that kind of structure in these other projects -- every bit as huge and every bit as significant to the impact on the environment in this province as the Athabasca project -- do you know what he said? Do you know what his answer was? He said, "I don't have to do that because my predecessor, the Minister of the Environment, only set up a board for the Athabasca project."

Well, the minister astounds me with a response like that. So what? It's still his discretion; it is still within his prerogative and his mandate and his power to set up for all these other projects boards like that or any other kind of board -- hopefully, better boards -- to perform that function, the function that the one in Athabasca's performing for that project. To do otherwise is to not only not assess what's going on in those projects, but also to give us no confidence in whatever information and material and arguments are made by this government or proponents of that mill. It weakens the process; it gives none of us confidence or assurance that we are proceeding properly and that mitigative measures that should be undertaken are, in fact, being undertaken.

Mr. Speaker, the conclusion that I would like to draw and emphasize is that we simply do not know what we are getting in these pulp and paper projects. We have heard things like we have the highest standards in the world, and then we see that of course we don't have the highest standards in the world. Sweden's are higher; British Columbia's are higher. We know, in fact, that the standards for sulphur emissions in our own gas mills are higher than they are for pulp mills, a profound inconsistency with consequences that go beyond some short-term political horizons, some short-term political initiative. We are not saying do not build these pulp projects, Mr. Speaker. We are simply saying that if we are going to do them, let's do them right. There are risks involved in these projects, and everybody in this province has a right to know what those risks are and to

be able to make the decision and, as members of the public, have input to this Legislature into that decision as to whether or not we should proceed and, if we should proceed, under what conditions and what contingencies we would determine to proceed.

We haven't had these pulp mills for the last 80 years that we have been a province. These forests have been here for eons; they will be here for many eons more if this government doesn't ruin them. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that if we had to wait a year or two years or three years, we would find, I believe, that it would be well worth that wait. We do not need to rush. The consequences of rushing are too great. Mr. Speaker, I ask this government to uphold the sentiment of this motion and to vote in favour of Motion 209.

MR. PASZKOWSKI: Mr. Speaker, over the past few weeks debate over the issue of environmental impact assessment has bounced back and forth from one side of the House to the other, somewhat like a tennis match. Might I suggest that your neck might even be getting sore from moving back and forth across the House. I must say that the Wimbledon matches which concluded last month provided far greater entertainment than what we see here, since at least there I saw an opposition that changed its strategy once it realized its tactics were failing. Here at the Legislative Assembly we have repeatedly heard the same arguments regarding the objectivity and the comprehensiveness of this province's environmental impact assessment process, as well as with respect to the public's capacity for input and participation.

As a member from a northern Alberta constituency, Mr. Speaker, I have listened with care and concern to each of these arguments. Nonetheless, because the Minister of the Environment has responded to each of these questions with a measure of patience that I have come to admire, I rise to speak today against Motion 209 on the grounds of its second provision.

The first provision has been clearly dealt with a dozen times in a dozen different ways. The second provision, however, which suggests a moratorium on pulp and paper projects in the north until

technology is available and put in place to ensure that emissions to water and air from these projects will have a negligible environmental impact

has been batted about much less. It is the matter of the adequacy of the technology used in environmental protection which must be addressed today, and so, Mr. Speaker, it is the matter of the adequacies of the technology and environmental protection which I am going to speak to.

The pursuit of the most advanced methods of producing pulp and paper has been a goal of this province for several years. Members of my constituency have always been concerned with economic development that will undermine the health and beauty of this province's environment. Such interest led the government to its 1988 investigation into the technological options available to further reduce emissions into water and into the air. For several months, Mr. Speaker, the government evaluated the success rate of technologies and effluent treatment systems throughout jurisdictions in both North America and in Europe. This research demonstrated to the government how, through the use of the newest technologies, emissions from pulp mills can best be controlled well beyond the levels that can be attained by the conventionally used methods. What all of this has meant in practical terms for Alberta is that all new and ex-

panding pulp and paper mills will be operating under more stringent environmental standards achievable by implementation of this new technology.

On December 2, 1988, the former Minister of the Environment announced these new standards. They will serve, Mr. Speaker, to place Alberta pulp and paper mills amongst the world's leaders in controlling the production of dioxins and other organic compounds and in minimizing and eliminating where possible their release into the environment. The government, in its commitment to ecological protection, will regulate pulp mills to the best achievable levels possible, and will exceed the most stringent of international standards. The technologies which make this possible include the new process of extended delignification, oxygen delignification, and chlorine disulphide substitution, which serve to reduce dioxin formations of kraft mills. Extended delignification means that the digester or cooker used in treating the wood chips . . .

MR. WRIGHT: Point of order.

MR. PASZKOWSKI: . . . will be more efficient in removing the lignins from the wood.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Strathcona rises on a point of order.

MR. WRIGHT: Yes. I forget the citation in *Beauchesne*, but it's there right enough. Perhaps the hon. member could look up once in a while, while he's reading.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Smoky River.

MR. PASZKOWSKI: Mr. Speaker, if I may, I'm addressing the Speaker, not the hon. member, and it is my objective to keep addressing the Speaker and not the hon. member, if that is acceptable.

MR. TAYLOR: You're still not supposed to read, even to the Speaker.

MR. PASZKOWSKI: I'm speaking to the Speaker, not reading to the Speaker, if that is permissible, hon. member.

The fewer the lignins that are left in the wood, the less chlorine bleaching is required. Oxygen delignification will then provide an additional step from removing these lignins.

Finally, Alberta pulp mills will use the new chlorine dioxide substitution system in order to reduce dependence on chlorine bleach. This bleaching process is a stage in which the environmentally hazardous organic halogens, specifically dioxins, are formed. Studies indicate that up to 70 percent substitution can be made through this new process. The Daishowa plant at Peace River, for instance, will be installing and commissioning each of these three new technologies from the day for actual startup of the mill. Even though Daishowa has only been required to use conventional methods, in other jurisdictions where it operates Daishowa has further publicly committed that it will be meeting effluent goals of 1.4 kilograms per tonne -- 1.4. Remember that number. Some European countries have set similar emission goals for their pulp mills, but these will not be enforced until the year 1992 -- not today, not next year, but 1992.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, Alberta will actually be exceeding the most stringent of international standards that are being used in

Europe. For example -- and I'm sorry to have to use these technological terms, but after all, this is what we are here to discuss -- Alberta will specifically regulate standards for absorbable organic halides to levels below European standards. Existing mills in Alberta will also be required to incorporate the most advanced methods available to reduce these organic halides. Neither Japan nor British Columbia requires in-plant extended delignification, oxygen delignification, or chlorine dioxide substitution. Sweden requires some. But Alberta, Mr. Speaker, requires a full-scale use of all of this technology.

Regarding effluent treatment, Sweden requires partial application of the latest technology, and British Columbia requires it fully at only one stage. At only one stage, hon. member; are you listening? [interjections] Are you listening? One stage. But Alberta makes it mandatory at both stages. Because there are no operating mills with all the technologies that Alberta requires, we have no model to base our standards upon. Daishowa has already committed itself to the 1.4 kilograms per tonne, and the Department of the Environment will be reviewing the operations once it starts up to see if these can even further be reduced. Other kraft mills in the province will be treated in a similar manner. Sweden, although they use different tests, hopes to achieve approximately 2 kilograms per tonne by 1992. Ontario will try for 2.5 by 1991, and British Columbia will be aiming for 1.5 by 1994. Alberta has achieved it now, Mr. Speaker, because it knows the technology is available now.

In light of these technological advancements that permit the government to demand stricter environmental protection, Alberta can now lay claim to being the leading edge of technology in this field and consequently at the leading edge of environmental protection. It is with a sense of accomplishment and pride that I can discuss with my constituents the promise that Alberta has made in this field. Technological advancements are changing in the face of pulp and paper industry in a number of ways. When proponents of a pulp and paper project undertake the preparation of an environmental impact assessment, they can gather data through the use of equipment that has only recently become available. In the same way, the Department of the Environment is now armed with better tools in performing their periodical tests of the pulp mills to determine whether indeed the standards are being met.

For example, Alberta and its two existing kraft pulp mills have already conducted a dioxin survey of the mills' effluents, of sludge, and of the river. Generally, mill sludges exhibit dioxin levels in parts per trillion and mill liquid effluents in parts per quadrillion. These amazingly ultratrace detection limits have only technologically been possible in the last few years and are already in full use in Alberta.

With regards to water quality monitoring activities, this province employs three types of testing for pulp mills. Industrial compliance monitoring of mill effluents is done by a company in question. Monitoring of mill discharges is done by Alberta Environment to ensure licence compliance, and both companies and the department conduct background and impact monitoring of river water quality, sediment, and biota. The department is also engaged in ambient monitoring, which is done throughout the length of the river in question. In order to check an achievement of water quality objectives, these tests determine dissolved oxygen, nutrients, metals, major salts, colour, conventional organic compounds, and 50 or 60 other trace organic compounds which are specific to specialized industrial developments such as pulp mills. The department has been per-

forming expanded monitoring along the Athabasca River, the Peace River, and the Smoky River systems in order to check the efficiency of wastewater treatment systems of these mills.

Alberta again uses three different methods for testing performance of kraft pulp mills, those being source and ambient monitoring done by the company, fugitive transient emission monitoring by the company, and source monitoring performed by Alberta Environment. The department further conducts stack surveys of various air contaminants from compliance assessment as well as audits to the company's continuous emission monitoring systems for ensuring the quality of the data and for quality control purposes. Technologies are also available for checking into long-term trends of sulphur emissions. Consequently, in addition to advanced technologies being introduced into the pulp mills themselves, the Department of the Environment is increasingly able to perform highly refined testing of both general state of the environment and pulp mill compliance with department standards.

Now, Mr. Speaker, with these advanced monitoring activities undertaken by the Department of the Environment, I would also like to say a word about enforcement, since the opposition has tended to suggest that nonlegislated standards are insufficient. Mr. Speaker, the capacity of the minister and department to set standards and regulations comes through legislative authority; namely, the Department of the Environment Act and the Land Surface Conservation and Reclamation Act, as well as the Clean Water Act and the Clean Air Act. Instrumental at the disposal of the Department of the Environment to stop pollution are control orders, stop orders, and finally, prosecution. Noncompliance with environmental legislation is not tolerated, and the full force of the law can be and is used to achieve compliance with standards set by the department.

If this does not assure the Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark that the minister and the department possess sufficient authority through the appliance and enforcement of these standards, perhaps he should remind himself of the case of Weldwood of Canada at Hinton. Routine monitoring by Alberta Environment of the effluent outfall showed on January 10 of this year that pH levels were lower than the 6.5 minimum allowed. A control order was issued, and the pulp mill remedied the situation. Millar Western in Whitecourt was issued a water quality control order on February 25. The effluent treatment system had not been operating as required, so the company was ordered to reduce the biological oxygen demand and total suspended solids from the treatment plant by installing an activated sludge system and a secondary clarifier. As a result of ongoing emission evaluations by the Department of the Environment, both the existing mills have also been required to conduct special fugitive transient emission studies to determine the source of the emissions and to decide upon the necessary remedial action.

Mr. Speaker, in light of what I have discussed today, I'm not sure what the member opposite is looking for when he says that pulp projects must be better technologically to ensure negligible impact on the environment. What I can tell him is that this government has sought out the most advanced technologies available and has, then, strict environmental standards that are in accordance with the new technologies. What I can tell him is that these standards ensure that Alberta's environment is among the world's best protected. I must also remind him that the industry and the jobs are created in these areas where they are most needed. I am baffled by his desire to impose a moratorium

when it is clear that both the concerns of the environment have been met and that the validity of the numerous northern communities is at stake. If he is pursuing this motion to score political points, since I can see no other reason for it, he must remember the people who are counting on the jobs that these mills are creating. The Daishowa project alone, for instance, will create over 600 jobs in its area, and Alberta-Pacific will employ over 1,300, put 1.300 people to work.

Mr. Speaker, I honestly find Motion 209 to be a pointless argument. Not only do these facts clearly contradict its purpose, but it's terribly ambiguous. It suggests that these mills should go ahead when technology is better, when environmental impact is negligible. I ask this House: when, according to Motion 209, will technology have been developed enough, and according to what yardstick will the impact be considered negligible? I cannot believe that the Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark wants to shut down these works in progress because, in his mind, Alberta technology is not good enough, although in the mind of the rest of the world our technology and our environmental standards are superior. For instance, Alberta met the Canadian Pulp and Paper Association's recommendations for environmental protection with its new standards. A recent article from the *Globe and Mail* states, and I quote:

Alberta led the country this winter when it announced that, effective immediately, all new or expanding pulp mills in the province are required to install three chlorine substitution systems recommended by the CPPA: bigger digestors for extended cooking, chlorine dioxide generators, and oxygen delignification systems.

The province is the first to legislate the use of the expensive and highly effective oxygen-bleaching process, which environmental groups -- and the few Canadian companies that use it -- argue is the only sure way to cut chemical pollution to levels that will soon be required in Europe.

But are not there today.

This bleaching system, which requires that other pulp equipment be replaced or adopted, costs up to \$100 million.

I suppose the member opposite will let us know when he is satisfied that technology has reached its appropriate level of advancement for those projects to go ahead. At least, I hope he will. But actually, Mr. Speaker, I take that back. The member opposite will never say he is satisfied, because that would not serve his political purpose. This government has made great advances and accomplished something good, so he is left with little to criticize, and all he can find to say is that it's not good enough.

I am proud to stand here today on behalf of this government and my constituents to speak to the Assembly and to the constituents of the environmental advancements that have been made in our province's pulp and paper industry. Not only do these advancements achieve this province's ecological goals in a manner that is the envy of jurisdictions from around the world, but the mills create jobs where jobs are needed and stimulate local communities and greater provincial economy.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, Motion 209 is, indeed, meaningless. Our technology is there and is available. We are using it, and it is being put into place in an acceptable fashion. It will ensure the Alberta environment remains the best protected today and well into the future.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place.

MR. McINNIS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, too, would like to thank the previous member for his beautiful speaking voice. He reads those words very well.

This is very much as my colleague from Vegreville refers to as déjà vu all over again, in terms of this debate. We've been talking about environmental impact assessments and pulp mills continuously since the beginning of this session on June 1. Unfortunately, I don't think we're getting through to the government on this issue, judging by the remarks we've just heard. How they love the comfortable lie that we have the world's best technology, that we're the envy of the rest of the world in terms of pulp mill technology. How they love that comfortable lie. But it is just that. The evidence is in, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of the Environment released selected copies of the study *Water Quality in the Wapiti River-Smoky River System Downstream of the Procter and Gamble Mill, 1983*. This was released in 1989, just a few days ago.

I'm surprised, frankly, that the Member for Smoky River has to say some of the things he has to say about the record on pulp mill pollution in the province of Alberta. River flows monitored in 1983 where mill effluent constitutes between .2 and 6 percent of the flow of the Wapiti River system -- a relatively modest proportion of the Wapiti River system: between .2 and 6 percent of the river flow. [interjections]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. McINNIS: Yet you find within the river system

2 orders of magnitude higher concentrations of sodium, chloride, colour, phenols, tannin and lignin, chemical oxygen demand, dissolved organic carbon, and fecal coliforms.

[interjections] Now, I appreciate the members opposite don't want me to read this into the record, but I'm going to, and you'd better get used to it

It goes on to say:

It was about 1 order of magnitude higher in potassium, sulphate, dissolved solids, biochemical oxygen demand, odour, ammonia, total kjeldahl nitrogen, total phosphorus, manganese, zinc, total coliforms, and . . . 3-5 times higher in calcium, silica, hardness, cadmium, copper, iron, and lead.

The record speaks for itself.

Now, it may be difficult for some members to appreciate what all of that means in practicality. I understood, after looking through this report, why it took six years to produce it. It took that long to torture the language so that it would be difficult for people to understand what it all means. But I think it's summarized rather well on page 84. I would like to read one paragraph into the record with the indulgence, or otherwise, of hon. members.

The non-compliance observed above may have some negative effects on water use. The quality does not meet drinking water guidelines and therefore is not suitable for direct use, although such use is likely rare or non-existent and surface waters are not expected to be potable without some treatment. Nonetheless, local domestic usage could be impaired by the effects on colour, phenol, Mn, odour, and bacteria. The suitability of water as supply to a municipal treatment plant could be impaired since the colour, phenol, and manganese effects would likely necessitate more intensive treatment measures. The town of Peace River dealt with similar problems in 1980 by avoiding the Smoky River plume and moving their intake to the left bank of the Peace River. Future municipal usage of the Wapiti-Smoky rivers downstream of the pulp mill is not known.

In other words, the town of Peace River found that they ran this water through their water treatment system and they still couldn't get it to the point where it could be fit for human consumption. They had to move their intake into a different river system so that they could even treat the water in order to be usable for human beings.

So the record on this matter does speak for itself, and when the previous member talks about Alberta being the envy of the rest of the world, I can't imagine who he might be referring to. Who would possibly envy a record like that? And if this is indeed, as the member indicated, a tennis match, I believe he just double-faulted on that one.

MR. WRIGHT: He should go to Smoky River and try and find out.

MR. McINNIS: Perhaps the people of Smoky River would be interested in discussing this matter further with the member when he's up there next time around.

So we've got some problems in terms of dealing with this industry. I know there's a lot of the discussion -- and I do this myself, talk about dioxins and furans because of the publicity around it. But scientists have so far identified about 300 different compounds which exist in bleachery effluent from bleached kraft pulp mills, and that's what we're talking about for the most part in this debate. And consider this number to be only a portion of the total on the list. Chlorinated phenols are there. Chlorophenols are in the process of being phased out in all commercial use because of their high toxicity and persistence in the environment. Other identified compounds include chlorinated solvents, chloroform, and carbon tetrachloride, in addition to the compounds referred to by the hon. member.

So, why are we in this province messing around with more bleached kraft mills? I think the only answer I've been able to find -- and perhaps somebody in this debate would like to illuminate it further -- is in a letter that the Premier signed dated March 17, 1989, in which he says:

The type of mill proposed to the government is at the discretion of the private sector.

It seems like this government sort of waits passively for somebody to come along with an idea of how to develop our resources and then makes a decision yes or no. I think people in our province expect a little more from their government. I think they expect that if you're going to allocate basically all of the green zone in the province of Alberta and turn it over to the management and control of somebody, that you would give a little more thought to what type of technology, what type of economic development model is to be employed, rather than simply producing a glossy marketing document, sending it to a few selected international pulp industries whom the government knows need more bleached kraft mills to support their existing papermaking operations and say, "Well, what have you got for us?" And of course, they come back and say, "Well, we've got bleached kraft pulp for you." And then it's up to them and I guess all of the rest of us to decide whether or not we want to go along with that. And that's, I think, really the root of the problem that we're in today.

Now, the member made quite a bit of comparing the standards that he believes will be employed in the new pulp mills proposed with standards that are being brought in for existing pulp mills in other parts of the world. Now, I believe that if he had read the speech more than once before he delivered it, he

might have realized that there's something wrong with comparing what he believes is going to come out of the pipe of a proposed mill compared with what another government says has to be achieved from an existing mill. They're two entirely different things. He cited Ontario, British Columbia, and Sweden, all of which have brought in very clear legislated standards on a time frame to get basically down to zero for existing pulp mills. We don't have any such standards at all in the province of Alberta; none whatever. In fact, the standards as they exist for pulp mills are whatever is negotiated between the company and the government.

Could you imagine for a moment the Solicitor General, who happens to be in the Chamber, saying to police officers, "Well, if you stop somebody who appears to be inebriated when they're driving their car, you should negotiate with them over what's an appropriate level of blood alcohol for them"? The guy says, "Well, I can hold my liquor, so I should be able to get away with .15 because I can handle that." And the policemen say, "Well, no, you look like you can't; it should be .06." Well, that's not the way the law works as far blood alcohol effluent is concerned. We have a standard, and if you violate the standard, the Solicitor General's going to come down on you. Isn't that right?

AN HON. MEMBER: Maybe.

MR. McINNIS: I believe that he will, because that's what he said in this Assembly. But when it comes to pouring effluent into the bloodstream of the province, the river systems, we simply negotiate. "Well, you know, this is a robust river; it can handle X, Y, or Z." That's where we're at, and that's especially where we're at with Procter & Gamble, which has done the damage that I've already referred to.

The minister said the other day that he had asked the company to come up with an action plan on how they're going to deal with this problem in the future, and then they would negotiate. He used the word "negotiate" in terms of what the compliance level would be. I think the analogy holds in this particular case. What we're doing in the case of Procter & Gamble is leaving it up to them to propose something. Then the minister and the other politicians around the table are going to decide what's reasonable, and they're going to negotiate. What we need -- and I hope we do get an opportunity to debate this proposal in the Assembly -- is a clear time frame for everybody, so that all of the pulp mills will know when they have to get down to zero, when they have to get to the 2.5 level, when they have to get to the 1.5. And it applies to existing mills every bit as much as it does to the newly proposed pulp mills which may or may not be built. So much for the argument from Smoky River.

I think the motion itself has a considerable amount of merit. It seeks primarily, in my reading, to obtain a better environmental impact assessment for the people of Alberta, and I think that initiative is worthy of support. I mean, what can you say about an environmental impact assessment process conducted by a government which refuses to reveal what it has agreed to with the companies? We had a debate here in the Assembly, we had a standing vote, and the government members decided that the public of Alberta is not to be allowed to see the agreements as they exist, the undertakings that have been made by the government, undertakings that have been made by the companies in respect of these new deals. I really think that in the advertising held for any of the public meetings, any of the public hearings,

any of the proceedings under the environmental impact assessment process, there should be a warning similar to what you see on a cigarette package that says, "These hearings will proceed despite the fact that the Alberta government has voted against releasing copies of the agreements with the pulp companies." If that warning were there in all the proceedings, then I think all the innocent people who partake in these proceedings would be much better served, because then they would understand the true context in which these agreements are being made.

I've been really struggling trying to understand what it is within these agreements that the government is so concerned about releasing, and I think I finally hit on it when I did some research into the economics of recycling industries versus virgin fibre pulp industries. The fact is that more and more people in our province and our country and throughout the world are interested in recycling used paper products or waste paper in order to avoid having to cut down forests excessively, in order to avoid excessive effluent poured into river systems and into the air we breathe. People do go out of their way to participate in recycling by collecting their paper in blue boxes and putting it out for collection. There are just so many signs that people in our society are ready to participate fully. But the stone-cold reality of it is that the economics are very dicey because it's so cheap to cut down trees and run them through one of these mechanized bleached kraft pulp mills.

You know, the paper industry frankly is set up to run bleached kraft pulp through their various processes. All the research and development, all the investment in the United States and Japan in particular is built around a certain quality of product which they would like us to produce in Alberta. The way I put it was: cheap trees are the enemy of the recycling industries. In fact, if we want to do what the Minister of the Environment suggests he wants to do, which is to create a recycling strategy for the province, he may end up having to subsidize recycling industries so they can compete with the subsidized forest industries, especially the pulp industries developed in this province. Of course, the minister of forests denies that. He says, "No, there are no cheap trees." Well, I ask him and anybody in the government to get up in this debate or any other time and deny this: when the price is set on stumpage for trees, it's set according to what the companies say they can afford to pay. That's the negotiation that goes on. They say, "Well, we can only afford to pay pennies per cubic metre," and the government says, "No, no, you've got to pay a whole bunch of pennies per cubic metre," and they have a battle of the computer printouts and a battle of the experts and come to some figure that's in the middle, but it's always based on what the companies can afford to pay.

I've had this discussion privately with the minister and with a lot of other people in the industry, and there's absolutely no question that when you have a negotiated stumpage price based on the FOB delivered price at the head office plant, you end up with cheap trees, because they simply work back what they can afford to pay. What they can afford to pay is what it takes to keep recycled products off the market, keep them from competing on a fair basis or on a competitive basis with the virgin fibre products. That's the whole thing that I think unlocks the key to why all these agreements have to be secret. Because don't forget, a part of what's being promised in these new bleached kraft pulp mills is that we're going to have papermaking machines. Daishowa has promised a paper machine in phase two. Alberta-Pacific, representing the Mitsubishi and the Honshu pa-

per company of Japan, is promising a paper machine all in phase two. There's an awful lot, I suggest, that we don't know about papermaking in Alberta, about the economics of papermaking, about the degree to which the companies are actually committed to do those things.

You know, I have some thoughts about whether we should be making paper in proximity to these pulp mills or whether it should be made somewhere where we're in proximity to a supply of used newsprint and other types of paper products. You know, the argument is often made, "Well, we can't force these companies to recycle because it will cost too much to ship the paper up to Whitecourt or Athabasca or Peace River or whatever." If that's the case, why not make paper here? The pulp's already being shipped out. It's being shipped right now from Procter & Gamble to Cincinnati. It's being shipped from Weldwood to their head office. It's going to be shipped from Daishowa up to their company. By the way, the argument that has always been used by Daishowa against any alteration in their design process is simply that their parent company is familiar with one type of product, and that's what they're going to make, what's familiar as their product. So we're already shipping the stuff out. We can easily move it to a place in proximity to where they have a supply of consumer waste paper which can be used in recycling.

We need improvements in the environmental impact assessment process in the area of cumulative impacts. I know that's been thrown into the citizen advisory committee's public hearings. The Minister of the Environment has promised some type of background study. We'll be looking with interest to see whether that comes and how thorough the review of the impact of all these particular projects will be and, indeed, what the government is prepared to do about that. We definitely need improvements in the public hearing process, especially in the area of intervenor funding.

I'd like to read into the record a short quotation from a speech delivered by the Hon. Ralph Klein, the Minister of the Environment, to the Lethbridge Community College 32nd annual convocation on Friday, April 28, 1989.

Those who demand public hearings, and who have in some cases filed action in court to force the issue, have, by these very actions, indicated they do not trust the Government to live up to our commitments. Quite frankly, that disturbs me. During my years as Mayor of the City of Calgary, my continuing number one priority was to give the people of Calgary an open and honest government that earned their trust. It involved a great deal of listening, a great deal of compromise, and a great deal of communication. Certainly, it involved a great deal of trust, on both sides; an electorate that trusts a government to do what it says it will do, and a government that trusts that citizen dissent will be based on reason, and not passion.

I wonder where that "reason, and not passion" came from. Perhaps a different incarnation by the hon. minister. But he goes on to say:

It's easy to be cynical about government, just as it is easy for government to grow cynical about some special interest group. But this mutual cynicism accomplishes nothing. It stands in the way of the fundamental relationship that will be required if both sides are to accomplish our goals, and that is a relationship based on trust. I am not saying that we must always agree, but certainly, we cannot continue to fundamentally disagree on the matters before us. As Minister, I intend to place the highest priority on bridging that gap between those who are concerned about the environment, and those who manage Alberta's environment. The people who are concerned about the

environment are not some fringe on the outskirts of society.
[interjections]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. Order.

MR. McINNIS: Thank you for protecting me, Mr. Speaker.

This is the same Minister of the Environment who, when it came time to consider the question of intervenor funding, without a shred of proof make a blanket accusation against all environmental groups in the province. He said they had some hidden motivation and categorically refused any funding to the Friends of the Athabasca or the Friends of the North, organizations that represent over 300,000 Albertans and who have legitimate concerns. Now, if that isn't treating such people as if they're some fringe on the outskirts of society, I'd like to know what is. I think the minister did incredible damage to his stated desire to bridge that gap in that particular action. By that one action he probably undid the effect of countless hours of traveling and meeting and things he did in what he refers to as his public relations skill to attempt to bridge the gap. I really think we should all be friends of the environment in some way or the other and should try to come to a view. You know, the business community has moved ahead of the politicians in this government in recognizing that they have to talk to environmentalists and have to speak to environmental issues. I really think this government has some distance to go before they can catch up even with the leaders of the business community in our society in that regard.

Finally, in respect of the environmental impact assessment process, I think there has to be something in law that relates to the outcome of the process. If you have an environmental impact assessment that deals in detail with the impact on the environment, there has to be something that ties the outcome of that process to the final decision, and we don't always have that. We can have hearings where some people say they have concerns, other people say they need the jobs for their community, and they're sort of like ships passing in the night. Then along comes the government and says, "Well, we've got these people over here and those people over there, and we're going to go with those people because that's politically expedient to us." That's not of the nature of an environmental impact assessment. There should be something at the end of it that says the project has to conform to the principles of sustainable economic development and growth before it can go ahead. I think that's another deficiency in our process. We don't have that link or the thing that brings the environmental impact assessment back to the decision-making process at the very end of it.

I also believe it's very important that Albertans have the opportunity to assess the type of timber harvesting technology and practices that are going to be employed in these projects. The Minister of Forestry, Lands and Wildlife is nothing if not steadfast in his refusal to entertain that suggestion, even though, as I pointed out previously, the Minister of the Environment has signed an agreement and issued a ministerial order putting timber harvesting practices into the environmental impact assessment insofar as it affects native Indian reserve lands, but not the rest of it. I think some of the pertinent facts on this should be brought into this particular debate.

About one-fifth of Alberta's green area will be mowed down over the next 60 years, and people like Ray Rasmussen say that unless logging is done with great care and planning, the very things that make Alberta special will fall in a chain-

saw massacre of the forests.

That's a quotation from the *Edmonton Journal*, March 12, 1989.

According to the government's own information, 85- to 90-per-cent of the saleable timber in Alberta has already been committed to harvesting agreements.

Eighty-five to 90 percent is a pretty high margin.

There's another quote I found especially interesting from the *Edmonton Journal*, March 12, 1989.

They (the government) have often run into problems when they've come forward with these things as a fait accompli -- everybody gets upset...

I think they would be much better off, for getting the right information and doing the right thing, if they had sought that (public) input ahead of time.

The speaker is Bruce Dancik. Bruce Dancik chaired the public meetings on forestry held by the Environment Council of Alberta in the 1970s and authored a report which suggested exactly this type of public discussion and dialogue before any more forest management agreements are signed or committed by the government. What's interesting about it is that Mr. Dancik has since been hired by the government to review some of the information that was gathered at open houses and coffee parties during the election campaign and just prior to it.

I think Mr. Dancik has hit the nail absolutely right on the head. You run into problems when you're afraid to gather these types of concerns and the input from the public before the decision is made. This government's got it completely backwards. They make a decision, make a commitment, make an announcement, and then go out and try to gather information, and then they wonder why some people get upset with them, why some people occasionally call them names, why some people call the process into question, and why they get resolutions like this coming from MLAs, calling for a moratorium on development. I don't think there's any mystery to it at all. I think the mystery is why the government would believe that somehow they can make these commitments ahead of time and then deal with the public input process after the fact.

So I'm hoping the government will make some amends in the environmental impact assessment process. And I like the words contained within the motion, suggesting an "objective, comprehensive" process "subject to full public input" would fill the bill, because we have no legislated rules for public involvement in the assessment of major projects. What passes for public participation is often a public relations exercise orchestrated by companies proposing developments and by ministers of the Crown who have instructions to try to get things done according to a predetermined time frame.

I experienced a pretty good example of this. I think the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon was at the same meeting in Grassland at the beginning of the public participation process by Alberta-Pacific. They began with almost an hour-long presentation of purely, I'd say, dangling contracts in front of the audience: so many pickup trucks, truck tires, two things that come to mind for some strange reason. There was a whole list of things that they suggested to people in the audience they could participate in supplying, which is a good thing. The company obviously has an interest in making a sales pitch for its project, but you can hardly equate that with the type of public input process sought by the mover of this resolution. I think there are many, many things we need to improve the environmental impact assessment process. I've spoken on that previously, so I'm not going to repeat that speech today.

I also think, though, the other side to this coin is making sure

we have legislated standards for the control of pollution from pulp mills, not just proposed pulp mills but existing pulp mills, so we can be proud of the bloodstream of our province and hand it over in good shape to generations to come.

Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Banff-Cochrane.

MR. EVANS: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'm very pleased to have an opportunity to rise and speak against this motion. I'm not going to challenge the motivations or the sincerity of either the mover, the hon. Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark, or the hon. Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place, who have spoken in favour of this motion. I believe they are sincere in their perceptions of what's going on in this very important economic and, even more importantly, environmental field. But with due respect, Mr. Speaker, I'm very concerned that they are not listening to what is being said by the Minister of the Environment, nor are they listening to what is being said by those hon. members who live in the northern communities.

[Mr. Jonson in the Chair]

To imply that the members who live in these northern communities have no interest in their communities and in the long-term well-being of those communities other than jobs for now is completely contradictory to logic. It makes . . . [interjection]

MR. McINNIS: Point of order, Mr. Speaker. After saying that he did not intend to impute motives, he proceeded to do exactly that. I'm not going to sit here and allow you to impute those motives with impunity. Impute somewhere else, thank you.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I'm not imputing motivations to the hon. member. I'm absolutely not doing that.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: If we could just proceed with the debate.

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

I would like to make a couple of brief comments before I look at the motion in general. I'd like to make a couple of brief comments about two of the matters that were raised by the hon. Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark. The first is his concern about the loss of tourism opportunities in northern Alberta. With respect, Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest that perhaps because of the pulp and paper focus and because of the opening up of those areas, there may be a very good opportunity for development of tourism opportunities. I say that recognizing that the commitment of our hon. Minister of the Environment is that these projects will go ahead only if they are environmentally sensitive. Therefore I see no inherent conflict between tourism potential and its development in the north and the development of a pulp and paper industry which will help to diversify the economy of this province and assist, in a very meaningful way, with the severe unemployment problems in northern Alberta.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to briefly discuss the issue of clear-cutting or block-cutting or whatever we want to call it. I appreciate the hon. member's concern for the concept of block-cutting or clear-cutting. Clearly, in the past clear-cutting was not done in an environmentally sensitive manner. We can look

to the province of British Columbia. All of us have had the opportunity to drive through the province of British Columbia and see historical examples of clear-cutting done without recognition of the loss of soil, the loss of habitat, and various other negative impacts that can occur from clear-cutting. However, under our hon. Minister of Forestry, Lands and Wildlife the department has taken the position that, yes, clear-cutting or block-cutting can continue to exist but only in much more limited circumstances. It is not strictly a matter of going onto a piece of land and eliminating forage. It is a matter of recognizing that there is an overall concept that must be recognized. That overall concept recognizes that there is wildlife in the area, that you must contour -- depending on the geography, the topography, that you're dealing with -- and that the issues of soil loss and rejuvenation must be taken into account. I feel comfortable that the initiatives that have been brought forward through our forest management agreements, and in particular through the department, are addressing those concerns. So with all due respect to the hon. member, I don't think we have to have an historical approach to the term "clear-cutting" or "block-cutting." We have to recognize what that means in today's world and in particular what it means in Alberta today.

Moving on, Mr. Speaker, to the motion itself. The hon. members across will recognize, I'm sure, that I'm not speaking from a prepared text and I am dealing with issues of philosophy. Firstly, I want to commend the hon. Member for Smoky River, who did such an excellent job of dealing with the technical aspects of pulp and paper development and the technology component to Motion 209. It's very, very difficult for individuals in this Assembly, those who are not expert in the field, to have even a working knowledge of the terminology used in the pulp and paper industry. I think it is a very positive comment that the Member for Smoky River knew his restrictions, his limitations. He was prepared to have a reference, Mr. Speaker, and I think he did an exceptionally good job in his presentation.

I'd like to look in particular at the first part of the motion, numbered (1), which attempts to justify a moratorium on construction of pulp and paper projects in northern Alberta until an environmental impact assessment process is implemented. The hon. member has made mention of three different components: firstly, that it be objective; secondly, that it be comprehensive; and thirdly, that it be subject to full public input. Well, with respect, Mr. Speaker, I think the issue of objectivity has been addressed by the hon. Minister of the Environment. Environmental impact assessment in Alberta requires that the proponent initiate and pay for the EIA with their own funds. I think this ensures objectivity. That process to determine what the criteria are for the process is dealt with through the government, through our Department of the Environment. It's a process which is not solely initiated by the proponent. It's a process where our Department of the Environment has an opportunity to identify certain areas that must be addressed. The proponent will then pay for and process the EIA, and then that EIA is reviewed by our Department of the Environment.

Comprehensive. I don't know whether the hon. member is talking about comprehensive in the sense that he wishes all EIAs to be uniform. I don't think that's realistic. I think comments have been made on that previously, but I'd like to just reiterate a few of them. Depending on the extent of the project, Mr. Speaker, it would not be realistic to require as full an EIA process as it would on other projects. Pulp and paper mills obviously are significant projects requiring significant EIAs, but I

don't think it's appropriate to argue that we should have, if I understand the hon. member correctly, a comprehensive EIA process that would apply to all types of development.

Subject to full public input. Well, this is an initiative that the hon. minister has indicated time and time again in this House is one of his priorities.

MR. MITCHELL: Then why isn't it happening, Brian?

MR. EVANS: At the Al-Pac project we have an advisory committee being appointed. That advisory committee has a certain term of reference, and it will report back to the government. That process will be reviewed, and nothing will happen until that review process takes place.

That's not to argue that we have the best process right now. It's not to argue that. Clearly, the hon. Minister of the Environment has not argued that. On the contrary, he said: "I don't stand up here and say that we have the best process right now, but what I am doing is having a thorough review of the process so we will in the future try to get as close to 100 percent or as close to perfect as possible. We're working on that." That is what the process is all about.

However, there is public input. It is paid for by the Department of the Environment, and I think it's a very positive development in this field. It's dealing with the current application of Alberta-Pacific and the Athabasca. When we talk also about public input -- and whether you want to talk about it in that category or whether you want to talk about it as comprehensive, we have to look as well at the Daishowa plant.

We have to look a little bit historically as well, Mr. Speaker. On December 2 of last year the then minister of the Environment indicated a very stringent technological requirement for pulp and paper mills. At that particular point in time Daishowa indicated that they were intent on developing that same kind of technology into their project, but they didn't feel they'd have the opportunity because of technology and the hardwood they were using in their project. They didn't think they would have that on stream by 1990 when they intended to open. An indication of the good faith of that operation and the hard work of the department is that there was an announcement recently by Daishowa that they would be able to implement that technology when they open the doors on July 1, 1990. That again, Mr. Speaker, indicates something of the comprehensive nature of the process, and also I daresay indicates that we are dealing with companies that are responsible, that take their responsibility to the province and to the people who live in the areas they are impacting and affecting -- they take that seriously.

If we take a look at this first part of the motion, we get the impression again that we don't have objectivity, we don't have a comprehensive system, and we don't have a system which is subject to full public input. I would respectfully submit, Mr. Speaker, that we have a process which is growing and which is going to allow for economic development of the north yet providing the safeguards and the safety net that we require in the north.

I'm concerned about the suggestion that we have a moratorium on the entire process until such time as various things are done here, as suggested by the hon. member. My concern, I must admit, is basically economic. I don't think it is realistic or reasonable to assume that we can hold industry for a long period of time, without having good justification for doing so, on a rope just waiting for, finally, some type of approval that

may not come tomorrow, may not come next week, may not come next year.

The standards we have in this province address the issues that, with all due respect, the hon. Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark has raised in this House. They address those issues by forcing the proponents to meet the standards we have imposed for either an upgrading of existing facilities or new facilities. These standards are either comparable or better than the standards anywhere in the world. When the hon. members across indicate, for example, that Sweden intends to impose new standards by the early '90s, I won't argue that point, but what I would appreciate the hon. members across contemplating is the fact that Alberta's standards are going to be changing over time as well.

The hon. Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place spent some considerable time reviewing a 1983 study. Now, in 1983 the technology was definitely different. We have much more stringent technology today. We don't have that technology of 1983, and I think it's important to recognize that we are moving forward. Technology is providing more and more safeguards because we are addressing all the issues that were raised in that study. But again, I must repeat that this is 1983. Now, these were the standards that were available in 1983. We have a new process; we have a minister who is committed to protecting the environment of this province. We have a government that is committed to sustainable economic development.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that sustainable economic development recognizes both economics and environmental considerations. I believe that this government is firmly committed to not just today and not just tomorrow but to the future and to our future generations. I believe that the processes we have in place today -- for example, the 1.4 kilograms per tonne of effluent. It's a very high standard. It may be moved even higher in the future, but it's a very high standard today. I believe that all those factors taken into account will convince the inquiring minds of the average Albertan that our environmental impact assessment process is in fact objective, it is comprehensive, and it is subject to full public input.

In conclusion, I'd just like to say that this is a continuing process. We have a minister who is committed to upgrading the process, and I'm very pleased to be able to work with that minister as the chairman of the environment caucus committee to try to identify issues that are relevant not only to particular mills or particular environmental issues throughout the province but to the province in general.

Now, I'm sure that other members will want to get in on this discussion, Mr. Speaker, so I will end my comments at this point in time, but I would again just ask that the hon. members opposite please take an overall view to what is being accomplished and the goals of the Department of the Environment. I think that if they do, they will recognize, as Albertans recognize in general, that this is a very responsive and responsible government.

Thank you.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Olds-Didsbury.

MR. BRASSARD: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I move that we adjourn this debate.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Having heard the motion

to adjourn debate, all those in favour, please say aye.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: The motion is carried.

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

[Eight minutes having elapsed, the House divided]

[Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair]

For the motion:

Adair	Evans	Musgrove
Ady	Fischer	Oldring
Anderson	Fowler	Orman
Betkowski	Gesell	Paszkowski
Black	Gogo	Payne
Bogle	Horsman	Rostad
Bradley	Hyland	Severtson
Brassard	Johnston	Shrake
Calahasen	Klein	Sparrow
Cardinal	Kowalski	Stewart
Clegg	Laing, B.	Tannas
Day	Lund	Thurber
Dinning	Main	Trynchy
Drobot	Mirosh	Weiss
Elzinga	Moore	Zarusky

Against the motion:

Chumir	Hawkesworth	Mjolsness
Decore	Hewes	Pashak
Doyle	Laing, M.	Sigurdson
Ewasiuk	McEachern	Taylor
Gagnon	McInnis	Woloshyn
Gibeault	Mitchell	Wright

Totals: Ayes - 45 Noes - 18

[Motion carried]

MR. GOGO: By way of information, Mr. Speaker, it's the intent of the government this evening that the House sit as Committee of Supply to deal with the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund capital projects division, with the following departments: occupational health, workers' compensation, Advanced Education, Recreation and Parks, Public Works, Supply and Services, and the Department of Energy. Following that we would go into Committee of the Whole to deal with various Bills on the Order Paper.

Mr. Speaker, I move that when members reassemble this evening at 8, they do so in Committee of Supply.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Having heard the motion of the hon. Deputy Government House Leader, all those in favour, please say aye.

HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

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

[The House recessed at 5:19 p.m.]

