

## Legislative Assembly of Alberta

Title: **Tuesday, March 19, 1991**

**2:30 p.m.**

Date: 91/03/19

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head:

### 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 both our province and our country.

Amen.

head:

### Introduction of Visitors

DR. WEST: Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you and Members of the Legislative Assembly today some dignitaries from the Soviet Union. Following a memorandum of understanding signed by the Deputy Premier, Jim Horsman, in October of '89, Alberta and the Russian Soviet Federal Socialist Republic worked to establish a sports agreement and exchanges of peoples. Members of the delegation, including a biathlon team who are here to participate in sporting activities in Canmore and Hinton, have been discussing that exchange today. We look forward to continued friendship and economic development with that country.

I would ask the dignitaries that are here to rise as I call their names – they are in your gallery – and remain standing until this Assembly gives them their proper recognition. They are Mr. Vasili Machuga, chairman of the republic sports committee; Mr. Alexander Kuznetsov, deputy chairman of the republic sports committee; Mr. Alexander Chumakov, sports co-ordinator of the Council of Ministers; Mr. Victor Kharitonov, director of Gorky Automobile Plant Sports Club. They are accompanied also by the aide to the chairman, Miss Marina Kravchenko, and interpreter, Marina Baturynskaya. Please give them the warm welcome of this House.

head:

### Introduction of Bills

#### Bill 8

#### Livestock and Livestock Products Amendment Act, 1991

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill 8, Livestock and Livestock Products Amendment Act, 1991. This being a money Bill, His Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor, having been informed of the contents of this Bill, recommends the same to the Assembly.

This Bill will allow for the development of a producer-supported financial security program to protect Alberta sellers of livestock from nonpayment.

[Leave granted; Bill 8 read a first time]

#### Bill 2

#### Forest Development Research Trust Fund Amendment Act, 1991

MR. FJORBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill 2, the Forest Development Research Trust Fund Amendment Act, 1991. This being a money Bill, His Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor, having been informed

of the contents of the Bill, recommends the same to the Assembly.

The purpose of this Bill is to clarify the positions and roles of the members of the Forest Research Advisory Council.

[Leave granted; Bill 2 read a first time]

#### Bill 15

#### Alberta Foundation for the Arts Act

MR. MAIN: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill 15, the Alberta Foundation for the Arts Act. This being a money Bill, His Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor, having been informed of the contents of this Bill, recommends the same to the Assembly.

This Bill will greatly simplify arts granting procedures in this province and will generate administrative savings that will be passed on to artists and arts organizations.

[Leave granted; Bill 15 read a first time]

head:

### Tabling Returns and Reports

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to table the Public Contributions Act 39th annual report for the year 1990.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, I wish to file the 15th annual report of the Alberta Council on Admissions and Transfer.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, under section 4(3) of the Election Act, I am tabling four copies of the report of the Chief Electoral Officer on the Edmonton-Strathcona by-election held Monday, December 17, 1990.

MR. McINNIS: Mr. Speaker, I wish to file copies of a discussion paper Toward A New Forest Policy for Alberta. This is the background for the debate this afternoon on forestry.

head:

### Introduction of Special Guests

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Edmonton-Kingsway.

MR. McEACHERN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure today to introduce two groups of students to you and to the Assembly. They are both from the Alberta Vocational Centre in my riding, the Winnifred Stewart campus. There are 14 in the one group with teacher Georgia Ramos and aide Marilyn Baldwin. I would request that they stand. While we're at it, we'll do the other group as well. They are with teacher Roberta Brosseau. I would request that they also stand and receive the warm welcome of the Assembly. I'll be bringing their pictures to them in a couple of weeks time.

MR. ZARUSKY: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure today to introduce to you and through you to the rest of the members of the Assembly on behalf of the Minister of the Environment and myself a group of young people from the International Youth for Peace and Justice. This is a nonprofit organization based on the premise of having young people educating young people, and this year's theme is the environment. They are seated in the members' gallery. They are Roberta Sanders, a supervisor and also a student at McGill University, Montreal; Tracee Diabo from Kahnawake reserve in Quebec; Lara Patwardan from India; Lori Maziarz from Kitchener, Ontario; and Marta Mekonen, originally born in Africa and living in Atlanta, U.S.A. With

them also is Barbara Mikulin, a guide from Lamont, and Janice Fishburne from the city of Edmonton. I ask that they rise and receive the warm welcome of the Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER: Calgary-Mountain View.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure to introduce to members of the Assembly this afternoon a group of grade 10 honour social studies students from Crescent Heights high school in Calgary. They are seated in the public gallery, and I'd like to ask them to please rise along with their teachers Ron Jeffery and Chris Macintosh and receive the acknowledgment and welcome from the Assembly.

head:

### Oral Question Period

#### NovAtel Communications Ltd.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Technology, Research and Telecommunications. There seem to be some very large gaps in this government's story respecting its dealings with NovAtel. I want to focus specifically on what this government knew and when it knew it. On August 10, 1989, this government provided \$340 million U.S., or \$435 million Canadian, in guarantees to NovAtel to cover the indebtedness of NovAtel. Then on January 11, 1991, it increased the amount of these guarantees to \$525 million. Now, my question to the minister is simply this: on what basis did the minister increase the guarantees to NovAtel by \$90 million? There must have been some rationale behind it.

2:40

MR. STEWART: Mr. Speaker, the bulk of the guarantees to which the hon. member refers were to replace guarantees that were previously in existence at the time AGT owned NovAtel, and they were basically with respect to the purchasing and financing program that the company had in place for the United States. The balance of the guarantees related to the operation line of credit for the company.

MR. MARTIN: Well, Mr. Speaker, the minister said the other day that he was not really aware of NovAtel's severe financial problems until March 12 yet in January decided to put over \$90 million extra of taxpayers' money into this company. My question to the minister: didn't the fact that the minister had to increase the exposure of Alberta taxpayers by almost \$100 million tip him off that NovAtel had deep financial problems?

MR. STEWART: Mr. Speaker, the guarantees weren't a cash injection; they were set as an umbrella with respect to NovAtel carrying on the type of operations that had been carried on in the past. That was put into place at the time that the government reacquired NovAtel. On March 12 we received the statement of losses for the current year, 1990.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, it's still increasing exposure for the taxpayers of Alberta.

Let's look at this umbrella that you handed out. According to the province's Auditor General, the amount of money that NovAtel drew on these guarantees increased from \$7 million at the start of 1990 to over \$200 million at the end of 1990. My question to the minister: was he aware of this? If so, why didn't he do something about it instead of just handing out money to this company?

MR. STEWART: Mr. Speaker, no money was handed out. There are fluctuations with respect to the cash required by this company as there are for any other company and particularly, I would say, in a competitive company, a competitive industry. The umbrella was set up. It basically replaced the type of financing that was in place previously. Then on March 12 we got the statement of losses indicating the losses for 1990. That's when we received that advice, and we made it public the very next day.

MR. MARTIN: I wouldn't want you running my personal finances.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my second question to the same minister. The last set of questions and answers shows clearly why we need to get to the bottom of this NovAtel fiasco and get the financial statements from this company. Yesterday the Premier bragged about how open his government is about providing information to the public. If I may quote from *Hansard*, he said:

There's a tremendous amount of information available to the public and the members of this Legislature. We've seen it come in here and go in wheelbarrows full to the hon. members when they request it.

Well, my question to the Minister of Technology, Research and Telecommunications is simply this: will he follow the Premier's commitment and table the full financial statements of NovAtel for the last two years for this hon. member? I'll leave the choice of the particular vehicle of delivery to the minister.

MR. STEWART: Mr. Speaker, there is a customary practice in the House for information requests to be put forward, and I would merely remind the hon. member that he could do so. Insofar as who may be there guiding the financial affairs of these matters, I would merely suggest that a party that is mired in debt like the NDP should question its leadership in that regard too.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, we would have no problem if we were just part of this government. We could come to the minister, and it would be over right away.

The minister may want to say that he's open, but the minister responded to a motion for a return requesting NovAtel's financial statements by tabling a two-sentence document that says that these statements are found in the AGT annual report. Very deceptive. When we pored through the AGT annual report, we found only two lines and a few brief footnotes relating to NovAtel's financial performance. My question is to the minister. Does the minister feel that this paltry piece of information is good enough, especially when we've lost millions of dollars? Is he really telling the people of Alberta that?

MR. STEWART: Mr. Speaker, in the past the financial reports of NovAtel have always been consolidated as part of Alberta Government Telephones. That's been the practice for many years, since its inception. This year, with the privatization of AGT and the Telus Corporation being in the private sector, the financial reports for NovAtel will be filed in the ordinary course in the same manner as the AGT Commission reports were filed.

MR. MARTIN: This is absolute deception, dishonesty, and secrecy, and this is what's wrong with this government. Top it off with mismanagement.

Let me ask this minister a very simple question. Is he aware under British parliamentary democracy that the buck stops with

him? Instead of blaming everybody else but himself, does he realize that he should be taking responsibility for the loss of millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money down the drain, Mr. Speaker? [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Calgary-North West. [interjections] Order please.

Calgary-North West.

MR. BRUSEKER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This government has been quick to blame the auditors, to blame the underwriters, the directors of NovAtel, virtually anyone except itself. However, the facts are there to view. There was a \$300 million loan guarantee originally issued by AGT, and when the government took over, suddenly it sprang to \$525 million. The most recent annual report shows that the total book value for NovAtel was \$117 million. The analysts will tell you it's only worth perhaps \$100 million, yet this government managed to pay \$159 million not three months ago with an option to pay another \$15 million. My question to the Minister of Technology, Research and Telecommunications: will the minister at least take responsibility for paying \$42 million more than what the book value for NovAtel shows?

MR. STEWART: Mr. Speaker, we clearly acknowledged at the time that the put agreement was exercised and the government reacquired the company, NovAtel, that the purchase price as per that agreement was \$159 million, as the hon. member indicates. As the government we had previously received, as a portion of the subscription price from investors – not from taxpayers but from investors – approximately \$118 million, being the pro rata share that related to NovAtel. I pointed out at the time that the difference between those two figures, approximately \$40 million, was the actual premium that was paid to Telus at that time, but because of the fact that we owned 44 percent of the company, the actual cost to the taxpayers was 56 percent of that sum.

MR. BRUSEKER: That's quite a premium to have to pay.

Could the minister confirm whether in fact the inflated price for NovAtel was simply a convenient way to give money to Telus so that Telus could boast of a profit and issue a dividend and support the government's selling of AGT?

MR. STEWART: Mr. Speaker, that particular agreement was important to preserve the integrity of that particular offering, and that particular offering brought hundreds of millions of dollars to the taxpayers of Alberta. In fact, that 44 percent interest that I have just referred to has appreciated some \$120 million even since the time of closing.

MR. SPEAKER: Final, Calgary-North West.

MR. BRUSEKER: My final, Mr. Speaker, refers to the wheelbarrows of information that we'd like to get. The question I would like to put to the minister is simply this: will the minister tell us who is advising him on the restructuring or whatever plan there is, if there is a plan, and will he further table that in the House so that all members can see where we are going with NovAtel?

MR. STEWART: I'm sure again that the hon. member knows the practice of the House in that regard, and I'd be pleased to see the motion for a return tabled. [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

Bow Valley.

MR. MITCHELL: It's hidden in the AGT annual report.

MR. SPEAKER: Bow Valley, not Edmonton-Meadowlark.

### Provincial Budget

MR. MUSGROVE: Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the Treasurer. Albertans and people from Bow Valley in particular are getting a bit anxious about their economic future, so I would ask the minister if he would tell the House a definite date when he's about to bring down his 1991-92 budget.

2:50

MR. JOHNSTON: My colleague is right in identifying the way in which this government has moved the Alberta economy ahead. There's no doubt that Albertans will look forward to the economic message and the statement of the future that will come in the budget. That date, Mr. Speaker, will be April 4 at 8 o'clock in the evening.

MR. MUSGROVE: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister could indicate whether he will be proposing a balanced budget.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, as I said last night in looking at the interim supply estimates, much of what we will say in the budget must be maintained until April 4. I'm sure all Albertans will have an opportunity to look favourably upon the message, but at this point I do not want to give too much of a headline before we get to that date. Therefore, I would respectfully restrict my answer to simply saying that the date is April 4, 8 p.m., and the rest of the message will come at that point.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Jasper Place, followed by Edmonton-Gold Bar.

### Procter & Gamble Sawmill

MR. McINNIS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The forestry management agreements provide the lucky few with an economic benefit in the form of timber for pennies on the dollar, and they keep the competition out. It's no wonder they can be used as collateral in a banking arrangement. Procter & Gamble was provided with an expanded FMA in late 1988 in support of a sawmill at Manning, Alberta. They were going to use the wood chips to expand their pulp operation in Grande Prairie. Now that Procter & Gamble has announced that both those projects have been delayed past the deadlines, I wonder if the minister will indicate if he's going to take back those FMA lands so that maybe we can get it right this time when we develop.

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, I haven't been formally advised whether or not there is any inordinate delay in phase 2 of the Grande Prairie pulp mill. They've asked for an extension, which we've certainly granted to them. They wanted to do more environmental studies and more work before they proceeded, and that seemed reasonable. It's only some rumours that would suggest that they have put it on hold indefinitely. But I have to say one thing: if they do not move ahead with GP 2 by the time lines that have been established, they will lose that wood supply.

They made a commitment which is entirely separate on the Manning sawmill; it was not tied to the Grande Prairie phase 2 expansion. The Manning sawmill was committed to be built,

and they are really not in default yet. They're in anticipatory default, I guess you could call it, because they can't possibly build the mill by the date that they've said they would. But to make it clear: if Procter & Gamble does not follow through on their commitment to build the sawmill at Manning, the wood supply that was allotted to that mill will be withdrawn.

MR. McINNIS: Well, just so I understand what anticipatory default is – I take it that the company cannot meet the deadline. Does that mean that you've now decided to take the timber away? Yes or no?

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: No, Mr. Speaker. We always believe in being reasonable in these situations. [interjections] You can think it's a laughing matter, but the solid wood industry all across North America is in difficulty right now. There are closures that have taken place. The one at Weldwood in the panel board plant is one example, and there have been others. It's difficult times.

The original agreement was that they would build the sawmill by July of 1991, but even if they started today, they couldn't complete the sawmill by that date. That's what I mean by anticipatory default. They're really not in default until July. I'm happy to discuss it with them. If it's reasonable that they need some time to complete the sawmill, fine. But I haven't had those discussions and requests for an extension. I emphasize again: if they do not build the mill that they committed to build, that wood supply would be withdrawn.

MR. SPEAKER: Gold Bar, followed by Calgary-McCall.

#### Family Violence

MRS. HEWES: Thanks, Mr. Speaker. The report of the mayor's task force on community and family violence in Calgary has reinforced everything that we've been saying on this critical issue. The incidence is high and growing and unacceptable. There are some positive interventions that can be made if there is a political will. Today my questions to the Minister of Family and Social Services are on but one facet, one component, of this issue, and that is on shelters. Does the minister consider that 5,376 families seeking refuge being turned away from Alberta shelters last year is an acceptable statistic and a comment on his government's commitment to families?

MR. OLDRING: Naturally we're concerned any time that a family is turned away from a shelter at a time in need. Certainly they don't go without services. We make sure that there is a safe environment for them to turn to in the interim.

As it relates to the statistic of 5,300, certainly the member opposite and I could have some discussions about that in terms of whether that's a valid number. I would say this, Mr. Speaker: from the information that I've been provided with on a provincial basis – and it is a provincewide program; it's not just an Edmonton or Calgary program – we're running at approximately a 75 percent occupancy rate. As a result of that, we are trying to adjust some of the priorities from within, and we're trying to adjust some of allocations from within. Where we have some facilities that are running as low as 30 and 40 percent occupancy, we're taking some of those dollars and we're reallocating them to areas of high need.

MRS. HEWES: Well, this is an unacceptable figure to most Albertans, whether it is to the minister or not.

Mr. Speaker, will the minister commit to provide 100 percent of basic emergency services funding, as the Alberta Council of Women's Shelters has requested?

MR. OLDRING: Mr. Speaker, I'm working very closely with the Alberta Council of Women's Shelters. We meet on a regular basis. We have in the past put one formula in place. The feedback that I've now had from the women's shelter is that the formula isn't working as well as we had initially anticipated, and we're working to see if we can't assess it and re-establish an appropriate working model.

Again I want to emphasize our commitment to this problem that all of us are concerned about, that all of us share. I would remind the member opposite that this government in the last five years has increased our funding almost 300 percent, but we recognize that there's more to be done. We're going to continue to work with the Council of Women's Shelters, and we're going to continue to work with municipalities to find solutions.

MR. SPEAKER: Calgary-McCall.

#### Automobile Insurance

MR. NELSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to ask a question of the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. Over the last year the diminishing number of insurance companies providing motor vehicle insurance in Alberta due to a decreasing competitive marketplace has alarmed many of us.

MR. WICKMAN: Nationalize it, then.

MR. NELSON: Also, many more Albertans are being forced onto high-cost facility insurance. My question to the minister: can the minister inform Albertans what the government is doing to ensure that a competitive and complete marketplace remains in Alberta to insure Albertans properly?

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. member's question, there's no question that the marketplace today in Alberta is competitive. Our rates for insurance premiums have remained low compared to those in other provinces as a result of that competitive marketplace.

He is quite correct in expressing concern, however, over the some \$77 million worth of losses that insurance companies in the province have encountered over the past year. We have been meeting with the industry, with representatives of those companies both here in Alberta and those national companies, and have asked the Automobile Insurance Board to look at ways in which we can ensure that we continue to have automobile insurance that's both affordable and operates in the best interests of Albertans.

MR. NELSON: Mr. Speaker, concern has been raised that Alberta may be forced into some form of government insurance, which I'm sure will upset most Albertans and especially myself. What is the future outlook for this industry in Alberta for affordable insurance for all Albertans?

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, a difficult question. I don't have a crystal ball, and I don't support the move to public insurance such as the Member for Edmonton-Whitemud suggested a minute ago. However, I do believe that we have to now look at the Ontario situation, where we're going to see public automobile insurance and the potential loss of some

players in our marketplace with respect to automobile insurance, and at the increasing number of claims there are in the province. So, in answer to the question, I feel that we have to first look at some ways in which we can reduce claims; in other words, have fewer accidents. We must take a look at the alternatives that are there to make the dollars go further, and our Automobile Insurance Board is doing that. We must, as well, continue dialogue with the industry to make sure that our climate for investment is tough enough to ensure that our citizens have the proper insurance but flexible enough to encourage that investment to continue the viable free marketplace in this province.

3:00

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Strathcona. [applause]

### **Liquor Control Board**

MR. CHIVERS: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Solicitor General. The ALCB's announced closure of its Calgary warehouse will result in the loss of at least 90 Calgary jobs in that facility. Employees have been given reassurance that they will have the opportunity to transfer to other positions within the ALCB. However, they've expressed a good deal of skepticism about the job security that those positions might entail. My question to the Solicitor General is: what assurances can he give these workers and their families that the positions that they are transferred to won't simply disappear with the stroke of an ALCB pen in a few months?

MR. FOWLER: Mr. Speaker, in rationalizing services of the Alberta Liquor Control Board, it was determined that the two major warehouses in Alberta, one being in southern Alberta and one in northern Alberta, were both operating at about 40 percent efficiency. This is no way to run any business, even a government business. We therefore made a decision that one of the warehouses would be closed. The one that's being left open is that attached to the head office of the Alberta Liquor Control Board. The people who have been working in the warehouse in southern Alberta have all been informed that no permanent employee of the ALCB will lose their job. They will be transferred to jobs that are vacant, or they will come to the northern Alberta warehouse.

MR. CHIVERS: Mr. Speaker, it's been reported that there has been a drop in beer sales at the Alberta liquor control outlets in Calgary of approximately 20 percent to 50 percent. This roughly corresponds to the increase in beer sales through the seven private cold beer stores that have been opened in that city. The question is: will the Solicitor General confirm that the ultimate objective of the government is the privatization of liquor retailing and wholesaling in Alberta?

MR. FOWLER: Well, I don't think there's any doubt, Mr. Speaker, that there will be increased privatization as those beer stores already in place continue to expand and increase their sales. We have always had a minor amount of sales in the ALCB stores because they have been handled by the Alberta brewers stores and now by all the hotel outlets as well as by the cold beer stores which are starting out. So, yes, there is a decrease in sales through the ALCB.

Further to that, the union is being kept well advised of these items. In respect to the Calgary warehouse there was a meeting held between management and union people together to assure the employees, that we have a very high regard for, that there is

going to be as little displacement as possible and no displacement of permanent jobs at all.

MR. SPEAKER: Vegreville, followed by Calgary-McKnight.

### **Alberta Terminals Ltd.**

MR. FOX: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Agriculture announced today some details of the privatization of Alberta Terminals Ltd. to Cargill Grain Limited, bragging about only losing \$2.6 million in the process. The minister forgot about something called inflation in his figuring, making the loss in real terms over \$17 million. It's no wonder taxpayers break into a cold sweat every time this government talks about privatization. I'd like to ask this minister: what is he trying to cover up by not releasing the financial statements of this company since 1988 and by not telling Albertans the real truth about the amount of their money that he's lost in this sale?

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Speaker, I think the press release was very clear and explicit. I thought even the Member for Vegreville would be able to comprehend it. It stated that the total investment of this government in Alberta Terminals Ltd. is \$17.5 million. The total amount of money recaptured and returned to Treasury is \$14.9 million. All he's got to do is do a little subtraction to understand what the cost of operating that facility over the 10- or 11-year time period was. I think that when you put the question to any of the producers out there, they felt that the average cost of \$240,000 per year was not unrealistic. In fairness to the operation of Alberta Terminals Ltd., keep in mind that the restrictions we put on their activities so that they weren't competing head-on with the private sector led partly to the \$240,000 a year cost of maintaining that terminal system within the total overall grain handling system.

MR. FOX: This in addition, Mr. Speaker, to the \$4 million of the taxpayers' money they gave to Cargill to build a plant in High River, Alberta.

I'd like to ask the minister why he didn't make every effort to sell this company to an Alberta-based, Alberta-owned farmer co-operative, the Alberta Wheat Pool, instead of making a sweetheart deal with the largest private corporation in North America.

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member is being totally unfair in his opening comment. The Cargill meat packing plant at High River qualified under the Agricultural Processing and Marketing Agreement and was treated in a very similar way to any other meat packing outfit in Alberta that was doing improvements, modernization, or upgrading.

Now, with respect to his specific question, I think that if he checked the process by which we privatized Alberta Terminals Ltd: it was an open bid; the company went to the highest bidder. Again, just to set the record straight for the hon. member, although Cargill is a large multinational trading company in the grain sector, it is not a significant player in western Canada. It accounts for slightly over 8 percent of the marketing of grain in western Canada.

MR. SPEAKER: Calgary-McKnight.

### **Student Food Bank Use**

MRS. GAGNON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It has come to my attention that university and college students in Alberta are being forced to study on an empty stomach. Food banks in

Calgary, Edmonton, Fort McMurray, Medicine Hat, Lethbridge, and Red Deer all report that they regularly have students as clients. The situation has grown so bad that four student associations are planning campus food banks to serve their members. My question is to the Minister of Advanced Education. Does the minister feel that it is acceptable in Alberta that students have to resort to food banks to eat?

MR. GOGO: Well, Mr. Speaker, it's a bit of a unique question. As hon. members know, we have a very, very successful system of postsecondary education with our 28 institutions. With the lowest tuition fee in the nation next to Quebec and perhaps the highest funding per capita in the country, I'm at a loss to explain to the hon. member why students in the various institutions should not be allowed to do what they want to do. I'm puzzled if the hon. member is saying that the government now has the responsibility of feeding the adults who attend the postsecondary system.

MRS. GAGNON: Mr. Speaker, the situation is that over the last seven years student loans have gone down by 20 percent, causing severe hardship for many students, especially single and married students. Will the minister direct the Students Finance Board to increase the guidelines for student aid to acceptable living levels to avoid this type of hardship?

MR. GOGO: Well, Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member may be aware, there was a complete review of the Students Finance Board not very long ago. Student loans were raised some 20 percent. There is provision for grants up to \$2,500 for needy students. I'm confident as minister, even though there are perhaps special requirements related to rent in areas such as Calgary, that our student loans in Alberta are amongst the highest in the nation.

MR. SPEAKER: Redwater-Andrew, followed by Calgary-Forest Lawn.

3:10

### Police Contract

MR. ZARUSKY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On March 31, 1991, the 10-year policing contract with the federal government expires, and to this concern, I and a number of my constituents met with the Solicitor General on March 18 to discuss issues dealing with the RCMP. My question to the Solicitor General is: what arrangements has the minister taken to ensure that the province of Alberta will continue to be policed on April 1 and thereafter?

MR. FOWLER: Mr. Speaker, I did indeed meet with a number of constituents from the questioner's constituency in respect to the town of Andrew and the closing of a detachment there. We are making every attempt to ensure that we have a substation there manned by two RCMP officers, and part of our attempts are to ensure that the officers live in Andrew. The last one, who hasn't been able to find accommodation, has not been able to continue residence there.

However, in respect to the 10-year agreement, yes, it does expire on March 31, and the department is making every effort to get agreement with the federal Solicitor General, the Hon. Pierre Cadieux, to continue a 10-year agreement.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary, Redwater-Andrew.

MR. ZARUSKY: Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again, to the Solicitor General. Can the Solicitor General assure my constituents and also this Assembly that he will do all that is necessary to ensure that a fair and equitable contract will be achieved in short order?

MR. FOWLER: Mr. Speaker, we are one contracting province. There are only two in Canada that aren't. The provinces of Ontario and Quebec do not contract. We do with the RCMP for 1,083 policemen; we're the second biggest contractor with the federal government. There is a civilized dispute going on between the department and the federal people, and I will be meeting next week with my counterpart in British Columbia in order that we can get on track again as soon as possible the discussions between the provincial solicitors general and our hon. federal counterpart. I am assured by him that he is agreeable to meet with us again, and we will have those discussions on track.

MR. SPEAKER: Calgary-Forest Lawn.

### Hub Oil Plant Emissions

MR. PASHAK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Last night and today a number of calls have come into my office and into the offices of the Canadian Western Natural Gas Company complaining about serious odours in the area around the Hub Oil plant in the eastern part of the city of Calgary. Now, these incidents have been occurring with greater frequency over the past two months, but a particularly serious incident occurred yesterday. My question is to the Minister of the Environment. Is he aware of this incident, and if so, what does he intend to do about it?

MR. KLEIN: Well, the Hub Oil plant, Mr. Speaker, has been the source of numerous complaints over the years. I guess when Forest Lawn was a town on its own, it was without the assistance of the hon. member, and it did quite well then too. Hub Oil was in the right place at the right time, but then residential development took place around the plant, and of course pressure was brought to bear to have the plant clean up. Certainly, since 1988 we have given the plant numerous orders, and steps have been taken to clean up the plant. Indeed, as the hon. member points out, on March 18 a number of complaints were received, and investigators were dispatched to find out what the problem was. It was determined that there was a leak in one of the lines resulting in hydrocarbon fumes being emitted into the air. I'm given to understand that those repairs have taken place, and the situation is being monitored.

MR. PASHAK: Thank you. Mr. Speaker, the minister told me in writing last year that his department was doing further investigation of this plant, as well as looking at the possibilities of relocating the plant to a nonresidential area. Given that the minister has so far failed to live up to his commitment in a June 7, 1990, letter to keep me informed, copies of which I now file with the Assembly, my question is this: when will the minister or his department be making a determination with respect to moving the plant from its current residential location?

MR. KLEIN: Well, Mr. Speaker, my recollection of the situation was an outrageous request by the Member for Calgary-Forest Lawn to have the government pay to move this plant outside the city limits.

MR. PASHAK: No, no. To Foothills industrial park.

MR. KLEIN: You wanted the government to pay to have this plant moved. We said that was utter nonsense but that we would investigate and discuss with the owners of the plant what could be done to ameliorate the problems that have occurred in the past and will probably continue to occur in the future until some long-term solution to this situation is found.

#### **Provincial Building in Medicine Hat**

MR. WICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Premier criticized his very good friend the Member for Edmonton-Gold Bar for not doing her research thoroughly. Our very, very thorough research clearly supports that member's position that the building in Medicine Hat that she was referring to does not meet our standards of accessibility. It must be noted that persons using wheelchairs must enter through the parkade to gain access. Let me remind the Premier that this is a government building. This is a brand new building. This is a building that does not meet the intent of the Building Code. My question to the Premier: does the Premier find accessibility through a parkade acceptable by his standards?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, perhaps you'd indulge me while I give the hon. member the information regarding access to the building. Access for the handicapped to the building is gained by the following methods. A drop-off is located directly outside the front door on 3rd Street providing wheelchair access into the main lobby or ramp access to the rear entrance facing 5th Avenue. All these accesses will have signage to prevent parking in these areas. A ramp from 5th Avenue provides discreet access to AADAC and the mental health unit. Assigned covered parking located in the basement parkade provides wheelchair access to Fish and Wildlife, motor vehicles, and to both elevator cores. All levels of the building can be accessed from the elevators. Parkade doors accessing the elevator lobby from the parkade will be equipped with necessary hardware to facilitate handicapped access.

Every level has male and female bathrooms which are specifically designed to meet the criteria for access and use by the handicapped in accordance with the Alberta Building Code. Wheelchairs can be manoeuvred within the bathrooms; water closet stalls sized and fitted out in accordance with the Building Code. Wash basins are designed with faucets designed for easy operation by the handicapped. Clearances under the wash basins allow knee room for the wheelchair user. Drinking fountains which are specifically designed for the handicapped are located throughout the building.

Signage has been prepared by the department of public works, and signs are installed indicating access for the handicapped to the covered parking in the basement. These are temporary signs because the building is under construction. Permanent signage will be completed within the next few months.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. Premier. Perhaps we could have a copy for all members. I think the point is well made. Supplementary, Edmonton-Whitemud.

MR. WICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, it may be the government's intent, and it's a good intent if they do intend to do it. That building, however, was not built to meet the standards that are laid down.

Mr. Speaker, to the Premier: will he give us his undertaking that he will address this concern and ensure that it is done, not just intended to be done?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure you don't want me to repeat the information I've provided. The Minister of Public Works, Supply and Services may wish to make further comments regarding a building which he's responsible for.

MR. SPEAKER: Briefly.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to reiterate one point that the Premier made: this building is not complete. While we have provided for occupation by certain individuals beginning last December, the building is still not complete.

Secondly, this facility is designed to fulfill all of the codes in the province of Alberta and all the requirements for full use and access by the handicapped.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.  
Westlock-Sturgeon.

#### **Farm Family Assistance**

MR. TAYLOR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the minister in charge of women's issues. Madam Minister, yesterday when I was questioning the Minister of Agriculture as to why married couples in a full legal partnership, farming, qualify for only half as much as, say, two men in a legal partnership, he said that they're taking the issue up with the Agricultural Development Corporation board of directors. Does the minister consider that a sufficient answer: that a policy is to be set by a Crown corporation in something that is as vital an issue as the question of rights of married couples on farmlands?

3:20

MS McCOY: Mr. Speaker, I know that the Minister of Agriculture is in consultation with a great many people, including myself, on that very issue. I should think it only appropriate that the board of directors and president of the Alberta Agricultural Development Corporation be involved in that consultation.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, back again to the minister. Is the minister happy in any of these cases where there appears to be discrimination – often in a married couple it'll be against the female side of the marriage – to leave it up to one of the minister's Crown corporations as to whether or not they are putting their full duty and full policy in place for women's issues?

MS McCOY: Mr. Speaker, we are not leaving it up to the corporation entirely. The minister himself is directing the policy-making process. I might add, however, that the Agricultural Development Corporation is a very progressive corporation. It has introduced for its employees an employment equity program and is working on issues of that nature on a day-to-day basis for its own employees. I would hold it up as one of the more enlightened employers in this province.

On the issue, though, that the hon. member raised, let me say again that I've had discussions with the Minister of Agriculture. I know that he has the matter in hand and that it's under review.

MR. SPEAKER: Calgary-Millican.

### Family Violence

(continued)

MR. SHRAKE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As earlier mentioned, in the city of Calgary the report of the task force on family violence was released, and it's a very sad report: regular beatings by husbands, battered women's shelters turning away hundreds of mothers, no support for the natives and the immigrant women, and the list goes on and on. The YWCA, the General hospital, the pastoral institute, and a lot of the good volunteer organizations are trying to help. They've done their best, but there's a need for more. They need more help for these people. The Member for Edmonton-Gold Bar earlier asked the minister of social services to perhaps throw some more money at the problem. I have a different question. Can the hon. minister sit down with his staff, come up with some solutions, a strategy to do some counseling and things in the city of Calgary, and sit down with the people in Calgary and come up with a program, a firm commitment to help with this problem?

MR. OLDRING: Well, I'm very anxious to receive a copy of the mayor's task force report. I personally have been very encouraged by the initiative and leadership that the mayor of Calgary has shown on this issue. For many years I have been saying that if we're going to find meaningful solutions, if we're going to find long-term solutions, it's going to require all levels of government – be it the federal level, the provincial level, the municipal level – working in co-operation with communities and community agencies and individuals. I am hopeful, Mr. Speaker, that by working together in a concerted and focused way, we will come up with some of those long-outstanding answers that Albertans are looking for.

MR. SPEAKER: Calgary-Millican, supplementary.

MR. SHRAKE: Supplementary question.

MR. TAYLOR: Good question, Gordie; go after him.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Don't get started.

MR. TAYLOR: I'm just cheering him on.

MR. SHRAKE: This is a serious question; this is not frivolous. I'm a little disappointed in you.

Mr. Speaker, this spills over into several departments, and I wonder if the minister will confer with the Hon. Elaine McCoy, the minister for women's issues, and the Minister of Municipal Affairs, who is in charge of housing. Will you bring in all these other people and their expertise so that it's not your department, that department, this department going their own way willy-nilly with an ad hoc type of approach to this?

MR. OLDRING: The member is quite right that the issues at hand are very complex ones. They do involve a number of ministries within this government. We recognize, Mr. Speaker, that it's very important for us to work closely together, to work in co-operation and in consultation with each other and, as I said earlier, in consultation, in co-operation with other levels of government as well. This government is committed to do that. We recognize the seriousness of the problem. We recognize that we have made considerable progress, but we also realize that there's much progress to be made. We're committed to being

a part of the solution; we're committed to working together in co-operation with Albertans.

head:

### Orders of the Day

#### Written Questions

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

[Motion carried]

head:

### Motions for Returns

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, I also move that motions for returns on today's Order Paper stand and retain their places.

[Motion carried]

### head: Motions Other than Government Motions

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Jasper Place.

MR. McINNIS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's a real pleasure for me to move on behalf of my colleagues in the New Democrat caucus that the . . .

### Speaker's Ruling

#### Motion by a Private Member

MR. SPEAKER: With due respect, hon. member, you move it on behalf of yourself, not on behalf of a caucus. You're a private member.

MR. McINNIS: Mr. Speaker, we try to work together on things like this.

MR. SPEAKER: That's beside the point. It's the parliamentary system, sir. You move it on behalf of yourself.

MR. McINNIS: It's Motion 208 standing in my name on the Order Paper, is it?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question. Question.

### Speaker's Ruling

#### Decorum

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Perhaps the hon. member would care to take his place, get himself organized. The rest of the House will then be able to proceed. The Chair will sit down for a moment and allow other members to proceed so we can have order in this Chamber. Thank you.

Edmonton-Jasper Place.

MR. McINNIS: Thank you for obtaining order, Mr. Speaker.

### Forest Management

208. Moved by Mr. McInnis:

Be it resolved that the Legislative Assembly endorse a new forestry policy for Alberta which recognizes that the survival of our forests and forest industry depends upon nurturing functioning ecosystems, promoting biodiversity in the forest, empowering Albertans to be informed and to participate in policy decisions, maximizing local processing jobs, and providing a substantive and fair financial return to Albertans.



MR. McINNIS: Now, Mr. Speaker, this debate is really about the future of a third or more of the landmass of the province of Alberta, the communities that are within that forested area and the rest of the province, and it's bound up, I think, inextricably in the entire future of our province. You can't go very far these days without finding some measure of debate on forest policy. In this Assembly so far this session we've had questions virtually every day dealing with forest policy from various angles and various aspects.

I know that members are interested, and I certainly want to commend to them for reading the discussion paper which I tabled earlier but also a number of other documents which are recent and, I think, worth looking at. One is the Report of the Expert Review Panel on Forest Management in Alberta, made public by the minister last July. Another which I think is particularly helpful was published recently by the Environmental Law Centre, by Andrea Moen, *Demystifying Forestry Law in Alberta: An Alberta Analysis*, a very scholarly and detailed analysis of the current state of forestry law in the province of Alberta. Another published quite recently by the Environment Council of Alberta is *Our Dynamic Forests: The Challenge of Management*, which is one of the discussion papers in the Alberta conservation strategy project, one of several excellent papers. Again this one deals specifically with the forest industry. It doesn't take a lot of policy positions but does analyze the situation, the challenges in front of us.

I want to refer to a couple of other documents which are not of Alberta origin but are recent and, I think, extremely instructive. One is a book called *Tree Planning* by Joan E. Vance of the British Columbia Public Interest Advocacy Centre. It's a guide to public involvement in forest stewardship, which is a key element in my remarks today.

3:30

I would also like to refer to a very large stack of documents prepared by the Truck Loggers Association of British Columbia. The Truck Loggers is the group that represents small- and medium-size logging companies in British Columbia. The term "truck logger" has historic origin which isn't really descriptive of the type of industry they are. They're not the big boys; they're the small- and medium-size players. I think some of their analysis based on living with this system we're bringing into Alberta is absolutely crucial to understanding where we're heading and where we're going to be in the future.

Now, I've said, and I think without any degree of exaggeration, that forestry management agreements, which is the key element in contemporary forest policy in Alberta, are a mistake of historic proportion. It's an unconscionable type of transaction. I also think that referring to the Truck Loggers' documents and briefs shows in many ways the logical extension, the outgrowth of the policy that we've embarked upon in the province of Alberta, but we're involved in what they refer to as timber management rather than forest management. It relates to the extraction of a resource. The harvest levels obtained in that province have been done by a liquidation of mature stocks of timber, not by forest management in the sense that most of us would like to come to believe that it could happen in the province of Alberta. They're absolutely convinced that the waste, the trailing off of the competitive capacity of their forest industry is related to this long-term tenure which is imposed in that province under the name "tree farm licence." You examine a tree farm licence alongside a forest management agreement and you can't find very much to distinguish them at all.

Now, I think this debate that we're having today is about policy which in the broadest sense incorporates the values that we as a province and we as a people want to project onto our forests for the achievement of a vision of a better future. In a shorthand way I think I would describe this debate as a clash of ideals between an old and a new model of forestry. The older model of forestry holds that the purpose of a forest is fibre supply to build and support pulp mills or other forestry operations, whereas the new forestry looks upon the survival of the forest community as being the ultimate goal of forest policy.

The old forestry focuses almost exclusively on development of virgin fibre resources and processing through manufacturing venues in the province of Alberta, whereas the new forestry looks more toward not just intensive forest management but intensive use of forest products: using, reusing, recycling in many cases.

The old forestry looks to a negotiation model between the forest industry, the pulp industry, and the government to determine the key elements of forest policy, whereas the new forestry looks upon not only public involvement but informed public involvement and community control over the forests.

[Mr. Jonson in the Chair]

The old forestry looks to liquidation of the old growth in favour of a more even-aged forest. They look to a rotation period of 90, 100 years, what have you, an evening out of the aged, cutting off the latter 300, 400, 500, or in some cases up to a thousand years of forest growth and eliminating that over a period of time, whereas the new forestry looks to providing the conditions necessary for a natural forest to survive and to be maintained over a period of time.

The old forestry looks to industrial control over jobs and the choice of product line – what's going to be produced – the model where you sit back and see what the industry proposes and then make a decision whether to go or not. That's the model of the old forestry, whereas the new forestry looks much more closely toward the idea of community control, community involvement in planning of the forest.

I think that perhaps summarizes the major elements of this debate, but I think we have to go beyond summarizing the debate and talk in this Legislature about what it is exactly that we want to try to achieve through forest policy. There are five key points in the resolution before the Assembly today, and I'd like to address each one in turn to provide some background information.

The first is the notion of nurturing functioning ecosystems. Now, why is that important? Well, it's important because the forest is not simply a bunch of trees growing somewhere waiting to be harvested. The forest is, in fact, a very complex interrelationship with organisms of all kinds, from microorganisms up to tall trees and major ungulates. Now, the concept of ecosystem in forestry can't be found in Alberta forest law or policy at all. The closest you're going to come is the idea of perpetual sustained yield, which phrase is found two places in my reading. One is in section 16 of the Forests Act, which is the one that allows the minister of forests to negotiate and conclude a forest management agreement, subject to the ratification of cabinet, and the other is within the forest management agreement itself, where you find similar words, similar language stating that the forest is to be managed according to perpetual sustained yield.

Now, it's no accident, I think, Mr. Speaker, that the concept of perpetual sustained yield is not defined in the Forests Act or in the FMA document. There is a code of practice appended to

the FMA document, but it doesn't really talk about ecology and ecosystems. It talks about separating the deciduous stands of timber from the coniferous stands of timber so that the two don't get mixed up. That's considered to be a code of good forestry practice. It doesn't deal with the pre-eminent role of the forest ecosystem. That's the identity of the forest, and if it's disrupted or destroyed, over time the forest cannot survive. The forest can survive a loss of trees, the forest can survive harvesting trees or burning trees, but it cannot survive a destruction of the underlying ecosystem.

Now, this is an extremely crucial point for all members to understand, because there is a tendency in forest policy to remove the native forest ecosystem and to substitute something entirely different, and that relates to essentially cutting off all forests after a certain point in time. The theory is that that's done on a rotating basis. It's like saying to a group of humans, "None of you are going to live past the age of 40." Well, that would give you a certain view of what humanity is all about, but it's not the real story at all. The more you do that, the more you move to that model. Where you eliminate mature forests from the landscape, the more likely you are to get into something that resembles more a plantation than it does a forest. That's something that I think has to be built at a very basic level within the public policy of the province and especially within the Forests Act. I would like to see that concept brought front and centre in the Forests Act: that a primary objective of forest policy is to ensure that we have functioning ecosystems with all their complexity, with all of the things in there that humanity doesn't presently understand. Built within a system has to be a standard of proof, because anyone can stand up anywhere and say: "Well, of course our practices are environmentally sound. Of course they are compatible with ecosystems. What are you being alarmist about?" That would be a debate that would never be answered. What we need is a standard of proof.

I think this is so important for governments as well as opposition parties as well as anybody in society. We have a bottom-line standard of proof, and that standard has to be the same for everyone. There has to be some type of a process to ensure that forestry practice, timber harvesting practice, and anything else that goes on in the forest, whether it's tourism development or whether it's hunting, fishing, guiding, outfitting, mining, oil and gas: any other activity has to be made compatible in that way as well. I'm certainly not picking on the forest industry, but I'm saying that what we need is a clear and legislated approach there, that there is a burden of proof, a standard of proof, and a process to make sure that that takes place.

3:40

Now, turning to the concept of biological diversity, I think that's closely related but a different concept. The concept of biodiversity refers to the abundant variety that you find in nature in all three facets: the variety of different ecosystems, of which there are some 17 in the province of Alberta; the variety of species within each ecosystem and, I would venture, in the boreal forest, for example – there are thousands upon thousands upon thousands of species that make up the biodiversity of the boreal forest – and there is within each species a diversity within the genetic pool. DNA being what it is, it's different from every individual to another, and that difference is a key element in the survival of any species. An individual within the species can be wiped out by a disease, but DNA is such that the others are

able to adapt and learn from that and can survive fairly substantial stress because of biodiversity.

Again, this concept of biodiversity in all three aspects can't be found within the forest policy of the province of Alberta. It's not there in the Forests Act, and it's certainly not there within the FMA document. You might argue, and I'm perhaps anticipating a response here, that some of these instruments that are developed down the road, some of the subsidiary documents have within them this concept of biodiversity, but again I think it's very difficult to prove that, because, you know, if you don't set out in a direction with a goal in mind, how are you going to know that you get there? You might get there by accident or you might not. I think the chances are that you might not.

What we're saying here is that this concept of biological diversity has to be built in there as well in a way that's unambiguous. You know, there are certain forestry practices in Alberta which endanger biological diversity, and I would think that some of those have to be looked at very carefully. Clear-cut technology is dangerous, because what you do in clear cut is cut down everything that's there, and then the trees that are useful for processing are removed from the site. What happens to the rest of the material? Well, in some sites it's left around to rot. In others it's windrowed and burnt, but by and large it may or may not be available to the forest in terms of regeneration. Again it gets back to a situation where you replace the mature forest with an even-aged forest, and if you're doing it by planting trees from seedlings, you're going to get a genetically similar forest, because it's in the nature of the forest industry that they will take the trees that grow the tallest, the straightest, and the fattest. That's what they want out of the forest. They want tall, fat, straight trees that grow quickly.

So they find examples of those, and they bring the pinecones into the Pine Ridge nursery, built by our heritage trust fund dollars, where they're unloaded and processed free of charge to the companies into seeds which are grown into seedlings and then taken back out in the woods and planted in rows evenly spaced so that they will grow straight, tall, fat, and fast. But the straight, tall, fat, and fast may become subject to a disease. If one is attacked, they may all go down because they lack the biological diversity, the genetic diversity that's there in a natural forest in order to overcome those types of calamities that take place. So I think the concept of biological diversity is an absolutely critical one to include within our forest management policy, and that's why it's being put forward.

Now, I think the third major area we have to deal with, and this is going to be somewhat controversial no doubt, is the question of empowering Albertans to be involved and informed so that they can take their part in making decisions. I'd like to read a brief quote from a paper prepared by Mr. Herb Hammond, who is a professional forester operating a company called Silva Ecosystem Consultants Ltd. in Winlaw, British Columbia. It's about the difference between centralized control over resources versus community controls. It goes like this:

Centralized government, centralized education, and single interest control of our forests have, over time, removed responsibility for the local forest from the local communities which depend upon them . . . The forest becomes a computer printout of timber volumes. Neighbours become employment statistics. Problems come in envelopes and leave in envelopes. Responsibility to forests and people is easily abrogated. Community stability has come to mean industrial stability for those people making decisions about the use of . . . forests.

Now, I think those words describe the way that the forests are managed in the province of Alberta as well as they do in the province of British Columbia. When the forest is a data base –

you know, brought into headquarters by a field staff – and when the instruments of forest policy become items negotiated across a bargaining table between the players in the central government bureaucracy and the players in the central forest company bureaucracy, then I think you have that kind of removal from the locus of where decisions are made.

Now, I think the Dancik report, if it says anything to me, says that the provincial government has to do a great deal more to facilitate public involvement in forestry decisions. It calls very clearly for better information to be made available to Albertans about the forests. In some cases this is information which is available and not made public; in other cases it's information which is not available because nobody's gone and done the research. I believe that the minister of forests, to his credit, acknowledged publicly that not all of the research had been done the way he would like to see it done before decisions have been made. The Dancik report states that we better get on with and complete the conservation strategy concepts so we have some idea of what the end result of this is going to be in forestry. They also propose an idea, which I think is an interesting one, for periodic forest management audits by an external agency. In this case I believe they recommended that the Environment Council of Alberta would be a suitable vehicle for that.

Now, I think those are good, broad concepts, but where are we today? What are the initiatives under way in the province of Alberta? Well, you'd have to be deaf, dumb, and blind not to see this is an issue, so clearly the government has been active: July 4 last year announcing a public involvement program in forest management planning; together with a pamphlet called *Planning Together for the Future*, which outlines the opportunities for public involvement in the province of Alberta. Well, these opportunities for public involvement are after the fact. They're not substantially involved with making the key decisions that are made, key decision number one being to negotiate a forest management agreement.

I met not long ago with some people from Fort McMurray who were in the process of trying to become involved in the negotiation of a forest management agreement with Alberta-Pacific. They were told and they believed that the only thing that Al-Pac won back on December 20, 1990, was the right to negotiate. These people, who represent some of the native Indian bands in the area, asked the senior officials in forestry how they could become involved in the FMA negotiations, because this happens to include the area that's their traditional homeland. They were told that actually the terms of this agreement were negotiated some time ago; what was happening at the moment was that the agreement was over at the Attorney General's department having some i's dotted and some t's crossed; that there really isn't a role for you to play in the negotiation of the forest management agreement. So you go to the next step, which is the ground rules, a very important document which will determine such things, if they're observed, as to how close you can log to a stream and a river, how steep a slope: the kind of assumptions that are made in forest management planning.

Now, I know that a key element in the public involvement policy is these so-called forestry liaison committees in which each of the pulp companies is required to set up a committee which will meet from time to time and advise them on forest policy. I do know that the liaison committee for Daishowa attempted to become involved as representative members in the negotiation of the ground rules. Again negotiation, Mr. Speaker. They were given the runaround for a long period of time while this

negotiation process took place. At the 11th hour the liaison committee members were given a draft of the ground rules, and they were told, "You've got to keep this confidential; you can't discuss it with anyone." So the members there had to choose between keeping the confidence of the committee process and keeping the confidence of the people that they were supposed to represent: a devilish dilemma for anyone and one that can't be resolved with any degree of integrity one way or the other. So that exercise proved to be useless. Never mind the fact that the committee itself doesn't have any native people on it. Never mind that it doesn't have any staff or resources to work from. So I think this liaison committee business while it acknowledges that there is a problem has really not resulted in enhanced opportunity for participation of the kind that's required.

Then we look at the environmental review process. Now, from the information I've been given by forest ecologists, I think there's really only one sensible way to go.

3:50

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Excuse me, hon. member. Could we have order over here on the government side of the House, please?

Please proceed.

MR. McINNIS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's very important when we work out a model of forestry that truly involves Albertans, in the sense that this land is our land, it's not the government's land, it's not the forest company's land, that we have to proceed first with an information base, secondly with a decision on creating some forest reserves. Now, it's a key recommendation of the Dancik report that some 10 percent of the forest land be set aside in order to protect the biological diversity of the forest purely from an economic management point of view. Never mind the spiritual, emotional, aesthetic, and other values in an old-growth forest. It's very clear in Dancik that that should be done. Now, I don't know that there's any magic in the 10 percent figure, but I do know that it has to be done, and it has to be done before you start planning the timber harvest. We got it the other way around. It seems to me that the ground rules provide that there could be some forest reserves set aside later on, but that question is not going to be addressed until after the harvesting is planned. Now, that's completely backwards. You have to set aside your reserves first before you start doing the plan of attack on logging the forests. We've sort of got the sequence of things backwards, so it's small wonder that the opportunities to become involved aren't there and aren't going to be there for some period of time.

I also have to say that the experience of the Al-Pac project, the EIA review board where that board was given the responsibility of investigating the timber harvesting practices of the company to see how they would affect forestlands, proved to be a bitter, bitter disappointment. The problem was that the more the board members tried to find out what the timber harvest practices would be, the tighter things clammed up at both ends. The company filed documents saying basically: "In LeRoy we trust. We're going to tell the minister of forests what our management plan is; we're not going to tell you, the Al-Pac EIA Review Board, or you, the public who are involved in that process." To this very day those questions remain unanswered.

Following upon that, the board attempted to get officials from Forestry, Lands and Wildlife to share their information, and they were, I guess boycotted is not too strong a term to use, by the Ministry of Forestry, Lands and Wildlife. So that information didn't become available either.

Again, we have no legislation which requires public involvement in forest management, so it tends to be that that doesn't happen. I think we have to look toward guarantees of information, toward opportunities to become involved which are legislated and, again, which give to Albertans the power to have the claims and counterclaims heard before decisions are made to have the forest reserves set aside before the liquidation of the forest takes place, an absolutely crucial provision.

The fourth area I'd like to deal with is the question of a fair return and a substantive return to the people of the province of Alberta. I think every member of this Assembly knows about the \$1.4 billion that was pumped into these latest development projects. What they don't know is that the stumpage that's going to be paid on this timber is worth no more than 12 cents on the dollar. I'm not talking about just stumpage but the ground rent, the fire protection charges, the reforestation charges. Twelve cents on the dollar is what the average FMA holder pays compared with what the forest ministry says that timber is worth on the open market. That has to change.

The question of jobs. You know, I've been asking everybody I've talked to in forestry over the past several years why it is that a country like Sweden, which has a forest the size of Alberta, most of it north of the 60th parallel, can get 250,000 jobs out of their forests. Alberta? After all this expansion, after it's all over, we're going to be looking at 15,000 jobs. Now, how can they get 250,000 jobs out of their forests when we can only get 15,000, including the 4,000 that's claimed here? These projects on average give you four-tenths of one job for every thousand cubic metres of wood cut. That's an enormous pile of wood for four-tenths of a job. The Canadian average is 1.7. It goes way above that in other countries. I would like the minister to answer why Sweden can get 250,000 jobs out of their forests and we're looking at 15,000. I think it has to do with the fact that we have a very narrow product base, a very limited vision of what the future of this industry could be, and we're in the process of cutting off our options.

So I think we've got a situation here in which we have unconscionable transactions, destructive forestry practices, enormous levels of subsidy built into the industry. I think we should use the authority given us by the people of Alberta to cut through that and develop a new forestry policy which embraces these values, and I think we should do it now.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The Member for Rocky Mountain House.

**MR. LUND:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It gives me great pleasure to have the opportunity to rise this afternoon and discuss Motion 208. As everyone knows, all Albertans have become very concerned about the environment, about our forests and the whole ecology, what's going on in our province, not only the environmental impact of things like the forest harvesting and the pulp mills but the recycling and the conserving strategies that we must implement in order to preserve and protect this wonderful province that we have. Of course, in recent years the expansion of the pulp and paper industry has really heightened this awareness of the need to be concerned about our future, about the generations that are going to be looking at us and observing what we did to protect our forests and the province of Alberta.

Albertans at the same time recognize the vital role that our forest industry plays in the economy of our province. We just heard some numbers thrown out about jobs. Well, Mr. Speaker,

the industry is currently employing about 11,000 people directly and another 20,000 indirectly. When all of the projects are on stream and going, we will see about another 12,000 jobs created and an annual payroll of some \$2.3 billion, a very substantial amount of money and opportunity for people in this province. Of course, the spin-off effects, the ability for small contractors and individuals to become contractors is enhanced substantially with these developments.

I'm not sure if the hon. Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place thought about the various ways that the timber management is handled in the province. I'm talking of the quota system, the ability for small operators to bid on stands, and then, of course, the FMAs that we have out where the larger blocks of timber have been allocated. The spin-offs from some of these – for example, the Al-Pac proposal: we're talking about 80 percent of the money that's spent on this project will be spent right here in the city of Edmonton for supplies and servicing to that mill.

4:00

We as a government feel that it is very important that we have this regional economic growth, because economic growth means growth for all Albertans. Of course, we're also very aware of the very fragile forest that we're dealing with. In many cases the growth is slow. In some cases it's very difficult to replant and get regeneration. I'm thinking particularly in the northern area with the white spruce in very wet lands. As we move out into the higher country, to regenerate some of the soils with a lot of rock and steeper slopes that are dry, the whole thing is of a very tenuous nature. But, Mr. Speaker, with the FMAs and the need that the companies and Albertans see in maintaining this as a sustainable development, I believe we will be able to continue to have an annual allowable cut that will support all our plants that we have operating.

The hon. Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place talked about some of our practices and how the clear-cutting doesn't allow for biological diversity. Well, Mr. Speaker, it's too bad he doesn't go out and have a look. If he did, I'm sure he would find that in many of the situations that he talked about where we have a monoculture, we have that naturally. I wonder about an explanation from him as to what fires do. If that isn't more destructive than clear-cutting, I'm afraid he hasn't seen it.

**MR. PASZKOWSKI:** Jasper Place doesn't have forest fires.

**MR. LUND:** Well, that's true.

The ability to harvest an area that has this monoculture and then have the timber come back at a much faster rate of growth – I guess I often compare it to farming. If we were going to do the things that he's suggesting, probably our farms would have great difficulty feeding the people in the province of Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, the process that we're using in the FMAs is of course one where Alberta was a leader, starting back in 1956, and it's based on the sustainable development concept. First, before a company can even go and cut a tree, they must have negotiated, set out their objectives and the ground rules through the FMA, then signed it. The first thing they have to do is put in a management plan, and in that plan, of course, they have to demonstrate how they are going to meet their objectives and how they're going to be able to reforest in order to continue to have this sustainable development.

Of course, the amount that a company is allowed to cut in an FMA in any given year cannot exceed the amount of timber that is grown in that year, the amount of fibre that is grown each year. The public involvement that an FMA requires now

becomes very extensive. These plans have to be upgraded on a regular basis. The annual cutting plan has to go before the public advisory committee and get approval from Forestry, Lands and Wildlife. This takes into account all the other users of the forest, and I'm thinking not only of the human users but the ungulates, all of the wildlife that might be found out there. As a matter of fact, it's very interesting when you see what companies like Weldwood are doing. They even go to the extent of listing every species that is out there, even to things like three different kinds of bats. They look at the habitats these animals require and make sure they're available so that we're not upsetting that whole balance of nature.

In order to ensure sustainable development, the government adheres to about four main principles. The first of these is the secure land base. Alberta has a green area policy, and that policy covers about 83 percent of the province. That means that that land base is secure. Of that total land base only about 53 percent will ever be harvested. There are a number of other ways that we preserve that land, and of course setting aside reserves like the Kootenay Plains in my own constituency, also in the Rocky constituency the White Goat wilderness area, and the Siffleur wilderness area. Provincial parks are set aside. There are ecological areas that will never be harvested. I'm not sure where the hon. member was coming from when he indicated that we were going to be out there cutting and destroying the whole of the forest area. That's just simply not the case.

A second main principle that we adhere to is the commitment to integrated resource planning. The Alberta government was one of the first to have integrated resource management plans. Now, when we talk about public involvement, those plans had public meetings, public hearings. They have to be upgraded on a regular basis. Those go through public hearings. All the various users have an opportunity for input. Their ability to use that area is always taken into account. I know that certainly in some of the areas in the Rocky constituency, among the highest use we've got campers. Of course, there's a lot of hunting, fishing, the harvesting of the timber. We've got grazing leases: multiuses. It's important that we keep that balance for all of the stakeholders.

The third principle is that we are committed to forest renewal. I talked briefly about the sustainable development that's developed through the FMAs. That's a key principle that this government has been adhering to. Then, of course, another principle through the Department of the Environment is that what we do must be environmentally sound, using the best technology in the world insofar as the plants are concerned. In the harvesting of the forest we always are extremely concerned about things like erosion, the effects that the harvesting has on our water. One of the greatest natural resources we have in Alberta, of course, is our tremendous amount of fresh water, the quality of it unsurpassed in the world.

4:10

[Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair]

To meet the needs of the forestry sector conservation strategy, we have some key points that I want to mention. I just briefly mentioned the integrated resource management plan. Those plans are a program that consider the different resource users in managing and allocating the forest resources. A program for forest renewal and protection, the Free to Grow program that the minister has just lately implemented: a tremendous program, some of the toughest standards in the world. They are standards that will for sure see that we continue to have

adequate fibre to supply our plants. It's interesting to note that the Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place talked about the monoculture that we're developing through this planting. Well, Mr. Speaker, that is not so. If you go and have a look, you will find that in an awful lot of these reseeded areas, not all but in an awfully high percentage, you don't have a monoculture. The aspen grows; the willows grow; we have all kinds of grasses coming. It comes back much similar to the original forest and certainly provides tremendous habitat, increased habitat for many of the ungulates.

We have the strategy that demands that the operating ground rules will minimize the impact of the harvesting on the environment. I mentioned erosion earlier, the importance that our fish habitat is maintained and to make sure that we don't silt over the spawning beds: those types of things. Then the system of land designation that protects certain areas from resource development – in our integrated resource management plans we even go one step further. We will have more focused plans. I think particularly of one that's just been completed in the Rocky constituency, and that's the David Thompson corridor plan. In that plan we look at what are called nodes, possible nodes for development. We look at the impact of tourism, how that will affect the possibility of taking out some timber that is overmature if it's going to start becoming a hazard instead of an asset. Those kinds of things are looked at in that plan. Once again, public involvement. That public involvement is becoming another key in our strategy.

I heard mention of the Daishowa advisory committee. Well, I guess it depends who you talk to, but I have talked to some people from that advisory committee, and what we heard a few moments ago is certainly not what they were telling me. I talked to one individual who made his living off trapping and guiding and outfitting. Now he's sitting on this advisory committee as the consultant for tourism. It all ties together. It all works when you involve all the various sectors and plan the harvesting and cutting around the needs of each one of those.

We also heard a comment or two about a return to the province. Well, Mr. Speaker, when we really start taking a look at the fees in Alberta versus, say, B.C. or other provinces, that's only one component of this whole equation. We've got to look at things like who is responsible for reforestation, who is responsible for fire protection, who is building the roads, and how are those things all tied in. Reforestation is a very interesting one. We talk about providing Albertans with opportunities. Because of our very, very stringent standards we are going to be requiring about 103 million seedlings a year once all these plants are up and running. What does that mean? It means there is tremendous opportunity just on the seedling side for entrepreneurs to get involved. Not only that, but think of the employment that's going to create as those seedlings are finding their way out and into the ground in order to provide wood for the generations down the way.

I think it's important that we note in Alberta that the FMA holders are responsible for that. I can't think of a better way of doing it. The experience from other provinces where government has gotten involved and government has been responsible for it – of course, government being the way they are, the job isn't done as efficiently or as effectively as it is in Alberta.

I just want to come back for a moment to the public involvement in the local advisory committees. The reason I want to do this – I had quite a lot of experience at the time the Shell development at Caroline was being developed. We set up a local advisory committee to advise the oil companies, bring the concerns of the citizens, figure out ways that this could be done

better. Let me tell you that that committee had far greater impact on what finally happened down there than the ERCB hearings and the EIAs that were done. They never changed much of anything, but the involvement of the committee changed a whole lot of things. You go down there and talk to that community now; they are extremely happy with what happened.

I have a real problem when I hear people calling for EIAs on the forest. The forest is a living thing, and how on earth do you study that in a snapshot situation? It can't be done. I think it's pretty much a waste of time and money to do that.

Mr. Speaker, we're also very concerned about the education of our young people in this whole scenario. They are the people, of course, who in a few years are going to be taking over and looking after this. One of the things this government has done is set up the Junior Forest Wardens program. It's in its 26th year now, a very, very effective training program. It's so interesting to note that about 70 percent of the people who have gone into that program have ended up as professional foresters taking up that as their lifelong career. It's geared to boys and girls in the six to 18 years age group, a very, very good, effective program.

Of course, we are setting up some interpretive centres that will help in this whole education program. We are putting out information for the schools that hopefully will be used to promote and enhance the understanding that people have of what really is going on.

I also want to comment on the fact that the Alberta government has on staff some 70-plus biologists, and I'm not sure of the number, but into the hundreds of professional foresters. When you talk to those people, you very quickly learn that the forest is their life; that's what's their whole life evolves around. If anyone thinks that those people are going to be advising us of how we can destroy that forest, they're wrong; they're dead wrong. Those people are concerned. They're professionals. They know what can be done. They know what is right, and the government is following their recommendations.

4:20

The idea that the companies out there are going to absolutely destroy – I've even heard comments about making a desert. Well, with the FMAs in place where they have a secure tenure, why on earth would they destroy their future? That is not going to happen. There's no question that you can't have this kind of development and have everything exactly the same, but I've got to come back again to nature, and I guess fire is something that's natural. What happens when a fire cleans the whole country? Certainly in the Rocky area that whole area was burned totally back in the late 1800s. That's why when the settlers came to that area there were no ungulates. They disappeared in the fires; that's what happened to them. We're making sure through our management and working with the companies that this is not what's going to happen to our forest. It's going to be a whole forest. It's not just a tree farm, like some like to talk about. There are going to be all kinds of opportunities for people in the future to enjoy what we currently are enjoying.

With that, I'd like to thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MITCHELL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to support Motion 208 presented by the Member for Edmonton-Jasper

Place. I support it in particular because I believe that it shows a much broader understanding of forests and the kind of forest policy that is required to promote the survival of those forests. It also is true that it addresses a very significant and important issue in this province today. That, I believe, is that the government's forest policy, as pervasive as its impact is on the environment of this province, is very, very limited in its perspective, that somehow this policy has been reduced to a single assumption with a corollary. That is that at any cost we must "harvest" those resources, the corollary being that all those trees are, in some sense, an economic resource. There appears to be very little recognition of the broader implications of a forest as an ecosystem, as a home for a variety of wildlife, and very little recognition of the importance of ecosystems like those forests for the sustained livelihood not only of animals and wildlife but ultimately of us as people in this world and on this planet.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest to the Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place that while this motion, I believe, demonstrates a great deal of breadth of understanding of the issue and a good deal of sensitivity to the important implications of the government's forest policy for our ecosystems, I would like to draw his attention to a very important model that has been explored and utilized with a great deal of success, a model for an ecosystem approach to an issue such as forestry management. This model is one that was set up by the international joint commission on the Great Lakes in reviewing the very, very severe environmental problems being experienced in that region of our country. They set up three expert committees: one societal, one economic, and one ecological. The strength of this particular model is that it presumes and makes the assumption that there is a very important relationship beyond the specific ecosystem to social systems, to economic systems, and it emphasizes the interrelationships of those three very important features of a broader view of a relationship between the environment and the people and the systems that are very dependent upon the strength and the health of that environment.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this motion is particularly timely, because we can see, by not having to look in a particularly difficult way, what I believe to be an almost totally inadequate forest management policy on the part of this government or in some cases a forest management policy that is literally coming apart at the seams. If this government and this minister weren't alarmed in the fall, many Albertans were when the minister himself actually said that he could not assist the federal government in overcoming the problem of Canfor, via Daishowa, and ultimately Daishowa logging in the Wood Buffalo national park because he simply didn't have any forests left over that he could give Canfor in return for preserving the forests in Wood Buffalo national park. That is a stunning admission on the part of this Minister of Forestry, Lands and Wildlife. Surely in this northern Alberta of ours with the extensive forests that we have, had he not been obsessive about giving away our forest resources, as he would term them, to a variety of multinational companies, he would have at least had some forest reserves that he could have exchanged to preserve the Wood Buffalo national park.

We only have to look at the fact that a government report prepared in 1988 by a Mr. Drew working for this government in this minister's department stated very clearly that it will require \$100 million to \$200 million simply to meet the backlog of reforestation requirements in this province already. We do not see that kind of commitment on the part of this minister either, one, from his own budget, which is not an acceptable solution ultimately or, two, from any kind of levy that he would impose

upon an industry which is doing nothing but profiting from our forests.

Mr. Speaker, last week in a media release I raised the issue of Canfor, a major forestry company, three times in December and January breaking, violating the government's own forestry regulations by, among other things, encroaching upon buffer areas which should have existed between logged areas and rivers, streams, and lakes. Three times it was recommended that something be done: a \$500 fine in one case, a \$1,000 fine in another case, absolutely paltry sums of money for a company the size of Canfor of course. But even at that, this government commuted those particular fines to nothing but a warning. How the minister can say that he has a forest management policy that is effective, that is a deterrent from doing what shouldn't be done – that is, from violating these regulations – when there is nothing but a paltry sum of money levied on huge multinational corporations whose resources would make that amount of money negligible, when in fact they don't even have the courage or the determination to implement anything more than a warning . . . Does it work? Obviously not. This company thumbed its nose at this government three times in December and, most recently, January alone.

This minister boasts of his Free to Grow regulations, and yesterday, in fact, we saw that the president of the Alberta Forest Products Association, the industry itself, has said that they don't believe the government has allocated sufficient funds to uphold its responsibilities under these Free to Grow regulations. One can only wonder how it would be that the minister with credibility could expect the industry to uphold its obligations if the government itself cannot provide adequate leadership in fulfilling the government's obligations.

4:30

We see that the minister in announcing his Free to Grow regulations indicated that the government would provide interim funding for small companies to meet these regulations, the surveying and the replanting and so on and so forth. It was very interesting that the minister failed to note in his press release that he would also be funding on an interim basis – interim being about five years – a good deal of reforestation obligation on behalf of major corporations. One that comes immediately to mind is Daishowa, whose 35,000 hectares of quota lands will be logged over the next five years. Who will pay a good portion of the money to reforest that area? Not Daishowa, with the multi millions of dollars that it has at its disposal, certainly not; no, the government of Alberta. It's very telling that the minister is afraid, neglects to mention in his press release that in fact he will be supporting not just small companies on an interim basis but major corporations, as if we need in this province to subsidize another major corporation, Mr. Speaker.

We see the failure of this government's forestry development, forestry management policy when we understand that there are no environmental impact assessments of forestry management agreements before they are signed. In fact, there is no public review of any kind for forestry management agreements before they are signed. The Member for Rocky Mountain House proudly made the point that, well, we couldn't begin to have environmental impact assessments of forestry management areas, which is, of course, in direct contradiction of his own minister's commitment that we will have environmental impact assessments of this given year's logging area. That is to say that we do an EIA of an area that is to be logged this year. Well, do we see any such environmental impact assessments? No. Isn't it interesting that the minister on the one hand would say that he

would be prepared to do that, and on the other hand he has a prepared speech, undoubtedly presented by his Member for Rocky Mountain House, that says, "No, we couldn't possibly do an environmental impact assessment." Of course we could, Mr. Speaker; it's just a question of political will.

We have in fact no significant commitment on the part of this government to setting aside vast portions of our northern boreal forests and other ecological systems in a way that will preserve them unscathed, untouched for future generations. Finland, as we know, Mr. Speaker, has made a horrible error. What they have been reduced to aren't large reserves of forests but forest museums, where they put through a raised wooden walkway so that people won't disturb the minuscule amount of their forest ecosystem that is in fact left. We speak to the Minister of Recreation and Parks time and time again, asking if he will make a commitment under the ecological reserve system to setting aside not just the minuscule and minimal amount that he is committed to doing but in fact enough to preserve these vast and important areas of forestry ecosystems that must be preserved, particularly in light of this obsession of this minister and this government to hand off vast tracts, if not practically all, of our northern forests to foreign firms who have demonstrated very, very little regard and sensitivity to the desires, the needs, the concerns of Albertans.

I only need point out that Daishowa, to whom we have provided something like \$75 million in infrastructural support, for whom we are going to pay millions of dollars to fulfill their reforestation obligations, that very same firm, has asked Canfor to go and log within the Wood Buffalo national park. That demonstrates profound and sensitive commitment to the people of Alberta, does it not, Mr. Speaker?

I would say, Mr. Speaker, that what these points add up to is a clear indication that we do not have an adequate forest policy in this province and that it is very, very important that a motion of the nature presented by the Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place, broadened perhaps to consider this three-pronged joint commission model that I pointed out, is essential if we are to preserve, protect, and, to use the government's language, to be stewards of this very, very important, priceless gift that is a gift for all Albertans, our northern forests.

Mr. Speaker, if we are to have a proper forestry policy, it must have a number of components. A number of those components could be grouped into something that I would call proper processes, and of course at the top of the list of a proper process would be environmental impact assessments into FMAs. The government's own review, paid for by the government, undertaken by a Professor Dancik at the University of Alberta, laid out a very important, a very thoughtful process of public participation in the development of any new forestry management agreement. I'm going to list the four-point sequence that Professor Dancik and his task force outlined. I should point out as well that of course the government's own appointed Al-Pac review panel had indicated that it would be essential to have environmental impact assessments, baseline studies, of forestry management agreements before that project in particular went ahead.

What Professor Dancik calls for is something like this: the forest service, fish and wildlife division, and the parks division should together develop the initial proposal. Secondly, this proposal should be brought forward to public meetings so that citizens of the area and interest groups can comment on the basic framework and suggested land use. Three, a proposed "resources department" should modify the proposal, then prepare a report which should include detailed inventories of the area

and zoning according to the various objectives of management. Four, interested applicants would be invited to submit proposals, and the resource department would then compare proposals of the competing applicants. I'm not saying that we subscribe specifically to that kind of an approach, but it has elements that are important. It should be very embarrassing to this government that they themselves, having asked for this report, have completely disregarded it.

I would like to mention an experience that I had that underlines how inadequate, in fact how offensive, the government's approach is to public meetings. The minister talks about these 40 public meetings that they had in northern Alberta at some point for some FMA. I went to a Daishowa public meeting in Peace River a year ago. This was an extremely offensive process. The company, because it's reduced to having to do this and perhaps has no other alternative, has batteries of experts at the front of the room. There's some coffee off to one side, possibly a few doughnuts. There are more glossy overhead projection slides to promote the company's view of this particular project, and we, the residents of Alberta, are reduced to sitting in a crowd and watching this proposal. The company can tell us whatever they want to tell us. We can sit there and have to take that. We don't have any particular resources to assail that, nor should we have to make our case to the company. That kind of process is nothing more than an information process, and a very limited information process, because of course the company is going to tell us what they want us to hear. I'm sitting here as an Alberta citizen, sitting in that meeting saying to myself: what is this, some kind of colonial process where some multinational company comes into Alberta, is kowtowed to by a government, and then we the residents, the citizens of this province, have to sit without any recourse and be told what they're going to do?

Mr. Speaker, it is fundamentally inadequate, it is offensive, and it is the height of obsequiousness for a government to grovel at the feet of a company like that and do whatever it is that they in fact would like us to do. Not only that, but actually pay them \$75 million so they can do it, and when that isn't enough, turn around and offer to provide interim funding for them to get through some sort of a five-year process where the government will handle their reforestation responsibilities – a company like Daishowa. When does it stop, Mr. Speaker?

4:40

We need baseline studies of those forest areas so that we know what wildlife there is and what features of that ecosystem they depend on and what they're going to do when their forests are cut down. There are species of wildlife, Mr. Speaker, that will be lost forever if we do not handle that process properly. We need integrated resource plans, not ones that simply view forestry policy as nothing more than cutting down a resource, than harvesting trees, but one that understands that there is a much broader view of what needs to go into a forestry management policy. We need to account for sensitive watersheds, for special wildlife populations, for heritage rivers, for the grazing needs of certain species, and so on and so forth.

We must review cutting techniques. It's very interesting to note that Germany, where clear-cutting was, shall I say, invented, is now rethinking how they have done that, because they are finding that their reforestation processes – that is, their process to establish not forests but tree plantations – that those tree plantations do not sustain themselves forever because of the loss of important organic matter. They are maybe getting two or three "crops" out of that kind of reforestation policy. We must

consider while we are planting trees in some cases today – not in all cases, because the minister will tell you that he's got a huge backlog of yet to be reforested areas – in this kind of climate, this kind of environment, as it were, no accounting is being made for what the environment may in fact be like in 25, 30, 40, 50, 100 years. This government fails to come to grips with the issue of the greenhouse effect and the profound impact that may have on our reforestation techniques and processes in this province.

Perhaps one of the most glaring oversights and one of the most glaring arrogances of this government is to say that we're going to use these resources for our generation. We're going to have the pleasure and the profound significance to us as human beings, to our culture, of viewing those forests and of enjoying those forests, but we're not going to worry too much about future generations and the loss that this management policy of the government may incur for them. Mr. Speaker, how blind they are that this minister cannot prevail upon his Minister of Recreation and Parks to set aside proper ecological reserves in the face of this onslaught of forestry proposals and projects which he has brought to bear upon this province.

Mr. Speaker, it is also true – and I believe this very, very strongly – that this government in its obsession to promote forestry products has literally lost its financial senses. Stumpage rates have not been increased in this province since 1975. For 16 years, Member for Rocky Mountain House, we have not increased stumpage rates. It is almost impossible to contemplate that that is the case. How many times have they increased health care rates? How many times have they increased taxes? How many times have they increased who knows what burdens that have to be borne by the people of Alberta? But I'll be darned if they're going to increase stumpage rates for Daishowa, for Procter & Gamble, for Weldwood, or for any other number of multinational firms.

Mr. Speaker, how is it that we get them to stop subsidizing major corporations like Daishowa? The great irony is that Daishowa gets \$75 million for infrastructural support from the people of Alberta, and the owner of Daishowa very soon after that buys an \$82 million or \$83 million painting. I would be ashamed, if I were the Minister of Forestry, Lands and Wildlife, to face my backbenchers, the Member for Rocky Mountain House in particular, and say, "Hey, we just bought this guy a painting." What a wonderful company to subsidize. And if that isn't enough, let's do their reforestation for them. Darn it; they may not be able to afford to do that, Mr. Speaker.

Finally – not finally; I don't want to quit yet. Mr. Speaker, we must secure the money and commit money to reforest that \$100 million to \$200 million backlog. The minister keeps telling us that his reforestation is working. Seventy percent, we're told, of previous reforestation may be working. At least 30 percent of it, and maybe more – and his own reports are saying it – isn't working. Where are we going to see the \$100 million to \$200 million? Why would it be that government should provide that funding? It should not. The taxpayers of Alberta should not have to provide that funding. Let's see this minister levy the industry which is going to benefit and profit – it already has, from some of that – and has the moral obligation if not the economic incentive to pay for that. Mr. Speaker, I see a minister and a government that simply have lain down in front of this industry and groveled at their feet to allow them to do whatever they would want to do. One wonders who exactly they are representing; you have to ask that question. Does Daishowa vote for them? Nope. Does Weldwood vote for them? Nope. Does Procter & Gamble vote for them? No. The people of



Alberta do, but not much longer, and the reason for that is because they have long since stopped representing the interests of the individuals, the people of this province.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we need among other things a system of bonds. Let's have these companies put up a bond so that if their reforestation doesn't work, as was the case with Canfor in the Naylor Hills-Keg River area, we don't end up paying, one, for the study to find out why it didn't work, which we paid for, and two, we don't end up paying the \$3.8 million that it's going to take to fix the drainage so that maybe sometime in the future forests can begin to grow there again. We need some bonds that these companies put up so that if they fail to meet their obligations, we have some money with which we can ensure that their obligations are met – not our money; their money.

Mr. Speaker, it's also very important that we understand that any kind of forestry projects in this day and age have to look at markets in the reality in which they exist. Germany, European countries are now starting to say, "Hey, if Alberta is going to treat its forests the way that it is treating its forests, if Alberta is going to threaten to abuse the environment the way that it is abusing the environment with these kinds of forestry projects, then maybe, just maybe, we're not going to buy that kind of pulp to produce whatever kind of paper it produces." You cannot take for granted that what markets exist today will exist 10 or even 15 years from today, given that people's assessment and understanding of environmental issues is changing so profoundly and that there is becoming a sensitivity across the world in places like Europe that this government thinks they can sell our paper or our pulp to. There is a sensitivity there that's saying: "Wait a minute. We have a moral obligation not to encourage that kind of encroachment upon ecological systems and environments; not just ours but those of other people halfway around the world."

It is very important for this government to understand that markets can change, and it is very important for this government to look west to B.C. and east to Saskatchewan to see that they are already figuring this out. Meadow Lake, Saskatchewan; Chetwynd, B.C.; Stewart, B.C.: zero effluent pulp mills. Why is it that we must become the bleached kraft pulp polluting capital of the world when Saskatchewan's already figured out that they're not going to allow Alberta Energy Company to build the same kind of pulp mill they built in northern Alberta? They're going to make them build one without effluent. B.C. has figured out that maybe you can do it in Chetwynd with a different system and you can do it in Stewart with a different system: zero effluent.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud Motion 208, presented by my colleague from Edmonton-Jasper Place. It shows a tremendous amount of sensitivity. It addresses an issue that is a fundamentally important and pressing issue in this province today. It is only too bad that this government hasn't the sense to embrace and support this motion in the way that it's been presented.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Member for Athabasca-Lac La Biche.

4:50

MR. CARDINAL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased also to rise to speak against Motion 208. I have a number of reasons why I speak against this motion. The forestry sector represents a high percentage of the constituents I represent in northern Alberta, an area where we desperately need to properly manage and utilize our resources. Motion 208 would appear to suggest

that our current forest management practices and policies ignore most of the issues surrounding our forest industry. I think something we should expand a bit more on is why we need to harvest some of the resources we have out there and why we need forest management policies.

Ideally, if we can have a world or a province or a country that could sustain a high standard of living without harvesting any resources, then I think that would be a perfect life. We don't have that. We don't have that opportunity. We do harvest resources in other areas. In agriculture we do it very well; in the oil and gas industry we do it very well. There's no reason why we can't do the same with forestry, and I know that we are doing it.

A lot of people say that maybe native people, for an example, should go back and live off the land. Well, we did at one time. I've done it as a young person. It's not a very comfortable life-style. I always dreamt of a time when we'd have running water in our home, we'd have a decent home to go home to, a decent education, and the things that people in cities like Edmonton and Calgary enjoy on a day-to-day basis. You know, the reason that standard of living is here in Edmonton and Calgary is because people manage to live off the resources of the land. I know the native people in northern Alberta are no different than anyone else. We want a reasonable standard of living. Native people want the jobs where we live, and I think we deserve the jobs where we live. For once, the government has come up with policies that will develop jobs where the people are and still benefit the rest of the province, the rest of the country, and the rest of the world and will change the life-style of many, many people in northern Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, our government I think is ahead of most governments across Canada in providing programs and services in forest management and planning. I want to list a number of these issues we deal with. They've been dealt with by a number of different people at different times, but I think we should list them, because they're very, very important.

We have public involvement in forest management planning. We have forest management agreements, thinning projects in forestry. For example, in my community there's 20,000 acres of reforested area in that particular region of the province. It employs a lot of native people in tending a reforestation program. We have Free to Grow, which again has created a lot of jobs and will continue to create a lot of jobs in the future. Silviculture training programs, the tree seed program at Pine Ridge Forest Nursery, upgrading and expansion at the Pine Ridge Forest Nursery – that's another project that will create a lot of new jobs – growing opportunities for Alberta nurseries: again, new opportunities and jobs across the province and across Canada.

Forest fire suppression: we have one of the best in the country, and it employs a lot of northerners. The Junior Forest Wardens program, Alberta vegetation inventory program, Alberta Forest Research Advisory Council, a computer-assisted lumber grading program. An all-Alberta glue-laminated beam called Westlam, a new opportunity for Alberta producers to target the treated wood market. Alberta pine roof shakes; small sawmill operators program, some financial assistance and planning for small sawmill operators. The integrated resource planning program worked very well, and it involved communities, individuals, and municipalities in the region actually sitting down and assisting forestry in determining and planning how our land use could be developed in that area compatible with the people that live out there. Natural area programs. We have Indian reserves, Metis settlements. Fifty percent of Al-Pac's FMA, for

example, is presently not harvestable. It contains muskeg, rivers, lakes, road networks, Indian reserves, and parks.

Mr. Speaker, Motion 208 calls for a forest policy which is already in place. In fact, present policies I believe go beyond Motion 208. During 1989 and 1990, 16,704 square miles mostly in the white area were mapped using the Alberta vegetation inventory specifications. The inventories contain information in support of timber, wildlife habitat, and recreation management. The information is now being used to improve management of Crown lands as the map production is completed. Industry and government biologists in association with Dr. Jim Beck, a University of Alberta professor, have been successful in creating wildlife habitat maps from this inventory. Weldwood of Canada, Hinton division, will use their models to modify three harvesting plans to meet objectives for a number of game and nongame wildlife species throughout the forest rotation.

The techniques pioneered in the Weldwood FMA should be adaptable for other uses in other parts of the province. This method of logging, the clear-cut logging, is the removal of all merchantable trees within a defined cut boundary. Experts have determined that this method of logging is best suited for Alberta, as our stands of trees are primarily evenly aged and have specific regeneration requirements.

MR. McINNIS: What experts?

MR. CARDINAL: A lot of experts out there.

However, I would like to point out that Alberta's clear-cut blocks are relatively small in comparison to those in B.C., where the government places no restrictions on clear-cut operations, and in Ontario, which allows clear-cut blocks up to 20,000 hectares. The average size of all cut blocks is just under 20 hectares in Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, while selective logging is not suited for the majority of our province, I am pleased to report that this innovative process of logging is being used in Alberta. Selective logging is the partial removal of merchantable or unhealthy trees within a given area. This year Weldwood of Canada in Hinton began experiments using selective harvesting in tree buffers along streams. Their method of selection has been to remove approximately 20 per cent of the volume within the buffer by marking and harvesting trees that are merchantable, unhealthy, and those which infringe on growing species of younger trees.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure you are aware of one of our recent initiatives, the Free to Grow reforestation standards campaign. In 1955 juvenile stand surveys conducted on a number of cut blocks older than 10 years determined that government reforestation goals were not being met in some areas. In response, the government has initiated the Free to Grow standards which are presently in effect. The Free to Grow standards measure numbers, distribution, and height growth of new trees. Site responsibility has been extended to 14 years.

5:00

Mr. Speaker, long-term management plans are developed for each administrative unit. The plans include specific management objectives and define the areas where actual harvesting operations will take place throughout the rotation of the forest. The annual allowable cut or sustainable harvest is calculated for each forest management unit. General development plans and annual operating plans based on long-term forest management plans are also developed by the forest industry and approved by government. If I may draw your attention to the report *Forest Management in Alberta: Report of the Expert Review Panel*,

this expert panel concluded that our methods of calculating the annual allowable cut are sound and that there is no reason to fear that Alberta will run out of wood.

Mr. Speaker, the government encourages Albertans to be informed and to participate in policy decisions. The government of Alberta and industry recognize that successful management of our renewable forest resource requires extensive discussions with the public to ensure that management in forest management agreement areas is sensitive to public needs. The policy for public involvement in forest management planning states that involvement by the public is mandatory in all forest management plans.

As part of a public involvement program for FMA planning, companies must meet five criteria. Number one, they must provide legitimate opportunities for public participation in the planning for forest resource of FMA lands. Two, they must provide increased information exchanges amongst forest resource managers and the public at large. Three, they must promote increased public awareness of forest management practices. Four, they must make a record of information concerning the public's feedback. Five, they must develop forest management plans which address public needs wherever possible.

As my colleague pointed out, five companies are presently involved in these public processes. All of these plans include public meetings, open houses, and the establishment of forest environment liaison committees. Mr. Speaker, the Alberta Forest Products Association recently launched a campaign asking all Albertans how industry self-regulation can address environmental concerns. This association represents 70 Alberta-based companies involved in the forestry industry.

Maximizing local processing and jobs. Mr. Speaker, the government is currently involved in the small sawmill program with smaller businesses better able to compete in their traditional markets. To encourage the success of plans such as the small sawmill program, the forest industry development division is in the process of finalizing a tripartite agreement with the industry and the federal government which will help fund and co-ordinate the overseas market development of Alberta's industry. The formalization of this process will be called the western Canadian co-operative overseas marketing development program.

Majestic Forest Products, located at Nisku, approached the forest industry development division with an idea to manufacture and market roof shakes. After completing an evaluation report and inspection by the Alberta Research Council, Majestic is now operating, exporting to other parts of Canada, and has made some initial contacts in the States. Expansion plans are under way. This should create an additional 26 jobs. Western Archrib, an Alberta glue-laminated beam manufacturer located in Edmonton, worked with the Department of Forestry, Lands and Wildlife to determine how to reduce operating costs by substituting spruce and pine lumber for Douglas fir in smaller beam production. Within one year the company produced a new product called Westlam from western spruce and pine. The product has been so well received that the company plans an expansion for Manitoba.

My last point, Mr. Speaker. I believe we have an excellent return to Albertans in our forestry products. Over the past years there have been major investments in Alberta's forest industry. Once the new mills are operational, the next stage will be downstream capital. Daishowa, for an example, plans to build a paper mill, and Alberta-Pacific is also committed to building a paper mill. This will be a major investment incentive for both the publishing industry and companies wishing to build paper finishing plants. The saw wood producers of Alberta have been

targeting higher value markets and searching for new applications for their products. An example of the diversity within the lumber industry is the recent utilization of sawmill waste by the pulp mill industry. Today wood chips being used by pulp mills are adding \$40 million in revenue for Alberta sawmills. Sawmills also produce wood waste in the form of sawdust and shavings. In 1987 Blue Ridge Lumber established Canada's first medium-density fibreboard plant. It's a board that's made entirely of wood chips and sawdust.

Mr. Speaker, northern Alberta businesses will benefit by more than \$600 million from Alberta-Pacific during construction of its \$1.3 billion pulp mill. Eventually the Edmonton area alone will get \$480 million in business. From these points it is clear that the government is meeting the needs of Albertans in the forestry industry. I'd just like to point out that one of my colleagues here mentioned that Sweden had so many people working in the forestry industry. I think most people realize that Sweden is a little over half the size of Alberta; it has over 8 and a half million people. Sweden alone has 57 pulp mills compared to the seven in Alberta, so you can see why they would have so many people working.

Now, the other issue that was brought forward – this keeps cropping up quite often, as the Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark mentioned – is foreign ownership, multinational companies. I'd just like to clarify one thing: these days we are in a world economy. I think we should face up to the fact that, you know, if we turn the clock back, say, 200 years, I don't know how many people would be here, because most of you people would be in a foreign country. I think that's not a fair statement. We need to move forward with open minds and start working together and developing a decent standard of living for our people in Alberta.

Thank you very much.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. Member for West Yellowhead.

MR. DOYLE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I gladly stand in support of Motion 208 on behalf of my colleague the Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place. I believe I'll be quite brief because I didn't have the opportunity to have a prepared speech from the minister's office, as the two Conservative members did who spoke before me, the Member for Rocky Mountain House and the Member for Athabasca-Lac La Biche. I'll speak . . . [interjections]

5:10

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. DOYLE: Mr. Speaker, I remind you the clock's running while the Conservatives have a great time laughing about the seriousness of the forestry industry in the province of Alberta.

[Mr. Jonson in the Chair]

The Member for Athabasca-Lac La Biche talked about the great things that Weldwood did in the riding of West Yellowhead, mainly in the Hinton area. Mr. Speaker, I well know about the amount of jobs that Weldwood produces from their mill in the town of Hinton and the surrounding area. It is not their fault that these trees are not coming back at the great rate that this government says they should come back. It's the policies of this government, not the management of Weldwood, that has killed the growth of the trees in the Hinton area. You

just have to go on the forestry road between Grande Cache and Grande Prairie, and you'll see the devious manner in which this government has allowed major companies to rape the forests in hidden areas, away from the highways and away from the sight of people. They have a habit of giving FMAs in areas – I would only surmise that the government would suggest that they do not cut along highways in the same way that they cut on the back roads in Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, I also would like to remind the members of the Legislature of the \$5 million that the forestry department put into a debenture to Fletcher Challenge under the name of Grande Cache Forest Products. That particular debenture was written off. Of course, it saved some jobs, but I felt that the company should have repaid that \$5 million to the taxpayers of Alberta. It's just another example of the amount of taxpayers' dollars that go into forestry, and then the company walks out and leaves the taxpayers hanging on the hook for it.

Weldwood has been so grateful as to take the Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place and myself, with various people from the communities surrounding their FMA, on a tour of their transplanting. The transplanting areas that we saw were down on the Elk River and some north of Hinton. It was quite amazing to have five adults down on their knees in a field that was cut some 10 years ago, trying to find a tree that was supposed to be growing at some great length. Another area last weekend, Crooked Lake in the Whitecourt riding: I can't help but notice how far and remote that is from the main highway, and whatever company is foresting in that area has cut the trees right down to the north shore of the lake.

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

The Member for Rocky Mountain House talked about farming and forestry being one and the same. At least, that's the way I understood it when he said it. I'm not sure whether the minister is in favour of tree farming, or is he in some other farming operation, or is he into restocking our forests? The Member for Rocky Mountain House seems to think that after the minister and some 11 or 12 Tory backbenchers went to Hinton a week ago to have a short tour and put on a dinner that would only attract 12 or 15 more local Tories, they had done their thing for forestry in our area. Well, it was something short of that, Mr. Speaker. The people in the area well know that the policies of the forestry department have not allowed our forests to regenerate at the rate that the people in the area would hope. In no uncertain terms I would say that it's not the forestry companies that have to clean up their act; it's this provincial government that has to clean up its act and make sure that the right policies are in place. The Member for Edmonton-Jasper Place has laid out a policy in his Motion 208 which addresses these situations.

Mr. Speaker, there's no reason in this world why the taxpayers of Alberta should be responsible for roads to resources in the forestry industry. There have been some tremendous accidents, with loss, with death, on some of these forestry roads, and the companies don't seem to be putting many dollars into roads; rather, the taxpayers of Alberta are spending that money.

I do appreciate the Member for Rocky Mountain House mentioning the Junior Forest Wardens program. It has been a great program. In fact, one of my daughters was in that program.

Mr. Speaker, I think if Albertans just looked around – and they have; they can fly over or drive around Alberta – they'd see the devastation of our forests. One way or another some government of some day is going to have to come to grips with

this, and they're going to have to come to grips with it very quickly. If you're a fisherman like I am, you cannot fish in the Athabasca River because of the filth from pulp mills, from the sediment that comes in from too much forest being cut.

Mr. Speaker, I think the minister should take a very serious look at this Motion 208 from the Member for Edmonton-Jasper and put it in part of his forestry policies and correct the imbalances of the past.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

The Member for Drayton Valley.

MR. THURBER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I enjoy joining in this debate because I've listened with a great deal of interest. Our opposition members, as always, assume that none of us knows anything, we're not able to read, and we don't become informed on the issues of the day, particularly in the forestry caucus. We are informed, and I say to all members of the opposition: if they could find a plot that they knew was 10 years old, then they could see that the trees are already growing. Sometimes if you go out in that area, it's a little difficult to find your way around, and anybody without any expertise in that area may not know north from south. They may have gotten mixed up and talked about the wrong plot when they were down on their hands and knees trying to find these little trees. I've been out there, Mr. Speaker, as have many of the people with an interest in this, and I would invite anybody, any and all of the citizens of Alberta, to go out and look at some of these responsible forest management areas.

The hon. member from the opposition referred a lot to B.C. In B.C. there's a vast difference in the size of the cut-block areas. In Alberta the industry has determined that the clear-cut areas are better for the forests and better for the economics of the area. We looked at clear-cut areas, and we looked at wood that had come from burnt areas. When you compare those, Mr. Speaker, you find that in the same length of time, over a period of 25 or 26 years, on the burnt-over areas where they were allowed to reseed by themselves and grow back, you had a lot of garbage growing. The trees were somewhere around two and a half or three inches in diameter. You could go right next door to that, where places had been logged and farmed and looked after properly, as most of these forest operators do, and the trees were up around eight to nine to 10 inches in diameter. I find it hard to believe that somebody can go out there and say that they're doing a poor job. There are areas, certainly, that their reforestation hasn't worked because of certain soil things. In these areas the forest companies go back and they go back and they go back, and they try and do things to that particular small area. Eventually they get the trees to reforest and catch on.

We've talked about trying to maintain the ecosystem, the whole inventory that belongs in a forest. I watched as the biologists made up maps. They had gone over them, and they took care of things such as owls and mice and squirrels. They planned their cutting of their timber and the reforestation around the habitats of these very minute animals, little spiders and things. They look at them all. They've planned that. They have areas out there where they don't cut. It's an elk calving area: they don't go in there. There's not allowed any cutting in that area. They have areas where the caribou move. They plan their cutting and their reforestation all through that. They plan around the ecosystems that are there. They've built up inventories in one particular area at Hinton over 26 years, 28 years, and these inventories contain information in support of the

timber, the wildlife habitat, and recreation management. We talk about the structure of the roads, the infrastructure that we as a province and this government have seen fit to do, that we have put into those areas. There's a lot more traffic on those roads than just the forestry. If you go back in there and you spend a little time and look at it, you'll see that oil and gas, mining, tourism, skiing, skidoos, wildlife, and all these things thrive. They live harmoniously in the same area, and they will continue to do that.

5:20

We have set aside areas for a variety of recreation participation that goes on in this province all through the forested areas. They say we've cut down all the trees. I defy you to go out there and have a look at it. You may find a 15-acre piece or a 20-acre piece that's cut down in one chunk. If you look next to it, Mr. Speaker, you'll find that the trees are healthy, and they're 20 feet high. The forest companies go in, and they actually thin these trees to make sure they've got the freedom-to-grow aspect with them, where they have to reach a certain height in a certain number of years.

We talk about pollution in the rivers. One hon. member talked about pollution in the Athabasca River. I don't know if he's aware, but he should be, that that pulp mill in that town handles the water for the town; it also handles the sewage from the town.

MR. DOYLE: With an \$8 million grant . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. THURBER: Where do they pick up the pollution from? Are you sure it's from the mill, Mr. Speaker, or could it be coming from the town itself? It's always been my impression that the cities in this province are the biggest polluters of land, air, and sea that we have. There is some pollution that takes place from time to time, but in Alberta, under the leadership of our Premier and our minister of forestry and the Minister of the Environment, we have made rules and set down guidelines for these people to operate under that will come very close to this zero pollution that the hon. member in the Liberal caucus talks about.

I've heard this expounded from time to time when we talk about zero pollution. I'm afraid, Mr. Speaker, that I'm from Missouri, and if you're going to talk about zero pollution, what are you going to do with the cow herds? What are you going to do with the guy that drives down the road and changes his oil? What are you going to do about fertilizing the food that these people eat that want no pollution? It's an impossibility. We have very minute measurements as of the last few years. The technology has advanced to where you can find a very minute amount of pollution, but I say that's not a reasonable thing for us to expect at this time. That's not to say that we shouldn't strive for that. I think we have to do it.

One of the hon. members talked about stumpage rates being so low, and they hadn't been changed since 1975, I believe was his figure. Mr. Speaker, there are new requirements going to the lumber and forest industries every day and every year from this government. They are required to maintain their forests as a renewable resource. They have to look at it; they have to farm it, basically. My colleague from Rocky Mountain House spoke of farming the forests, and that's what we have to do. The forest fires come in and take out probably 14 times as much

timber in one year as all the pulp mills would if they were all operating to capacity.

Don't tell me that it's the pulp mills that are devastating the province. We have to have our tree nurseries in order to reseed and take care of the burnt-out areas. The burnt-out areas are just as important as the clear-cutting of the forest. That has to happen. We need government involvement in those areas. In the rest of the areas we need to go to private enterprise. It's the philosophy of this government and most of the people that sit on the government side that private enterprise should be the ones that get involved in this and take care of it.

Mr. Speaker, I'm sure it's been mentioned before, but I would just like to stress that when we talk about the acres and the cutting down of our rain forest, we know one or two timber outfits that have gone in on the sides of rivers and small streams and they've done selective logging with horses, which not only takes out the trees that are mature, that are going to fall down pretty quick, and they're going to be of no use for anything – they take those trees out. This protects the healthy young trees. It gives them more air; it gives them more light. It also protects the watershed. I'm sure there are instances, as one colleague mentioned, where they have logged down to a lakeshore. There was either some reason for it or there were no regulations in place at that time. We need to carry on with this type of a philosophy. This government tries to stay on top of it. We have the best regulations and rules in all of Canada and in a lot of cases in all of the world.

One hon. member mentioned that Germany is finding that over a long period of time it's not working. I'd like to see proof of that under the system we have here today. Under the leadership of our Premier and our ministers that have been in charge of forestry in this province, we've done a good job.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask that we do not support Motion 208. I think it's already in place. It has been in place for some time. As the industry develops and the technology develops, we'll continue to put things in the best technological advantage that we can for this province.

In light of the hour, Mr. Speaker, I'd move that we adjourn debate.

MR. SPEAKER: Having heard the motion, those in favour, please say aye.

HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

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

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, the business of the House tonight will be second reading of the Appropriation (Interim Supply) Act, 1991, Bill 16. If there's time, the House would return to debating the throne speech.

[The Assembly adjourned at 5:27 p.m.]

