



Province of Alberta

The 27th Legislature
First Session

Alberta Hansard

Monday evening, October 20, 2008

Issue 36e

The Honourable Kenneth R. Kowalski, Speaker

Legislative Assembly of Alberta

The 27th Legislature

First Session

Kowalski, Hon. Ken, Barrhead-Morinville-Westlock, Speaker
Cao, Wayne C.N., Calgary-Fort, Deputy Speaker and Chair of Committees
Mitzel, Len, Cypress-Medicine Hat, Deputy Chair of Committees

<p>Ady, Hon. Cindy, Calgary-Shaw (PC), Minister of Tourism, Parks and Recreation</p> <p>Allred, Ken, St. Albert (PC)</p> <p>Amery, Moe, Calgary-East (PC)</p> <p>Anderson, Rob, Airdrie-Chestermere (PC), Parliamentary Assistant, Solicitor General and Public Security</p> <p>Benito, Carl, Edmonton-Mill Woods (PC)</p> <p>Berger, Evan, Livingstone-Macleod (PC), Parliamentary Assistant, Sustainable Resource Development</p> <p>Bhardwaj, Naresh, Edmonton-Ellerslie (PC)</p> <p>Bhullar, Manmeet Singh, Calgary-Montrose (PC), Parliamentary Assistant, Advanced Education and Technology</p> <p>Blackett, Hon. Lindsay, Calgary-North West (PC), Minister of Culture and Community Spirit</p> <p>Blakeman, Laurie, Edmonton-Centre (L), Official Opposition House Leader</p> <p>Boutilier, Guy C., Fort McMurray-Wood Buffalo (PC)</p> <p>Brown, Dr. Neil, QC, Calgary-Nose Hill (PC)</p> <p>Calahasen, Pearl, Lesser Slave Lake (PC)</p> <p>Campbell, Robin, West Yellowhead (PC), Deputy Government Whip</p> <p>Chase, Harry B., Calgary-Varsity (L), Official Opposition Whip</p> <p>Dallas, Cal, Red Deer-South (PC)</p> <p>Danyluk, Hon. Ray, Lac La Biche-St. Paul (PC), Minister of Municipal Affairs</p> <p>DeLong, Alana, Calgary-Bow (PC)</p> <p>Denis, Jonathan, Calgary-Egmont (PC)</p> <p>Doerksen, Arno, Strathmore-Brooks (PC)</p> <p>Drysdale, Wayne, Grande Prairie-Wapiti (PC)</p> <p>Elniski, Doug, Edmonton-Calder (PC)</p> <p>Evans, Hon. Iris, Sherwood Park (PC), Minister of Finance and Enterprise</p> <p>Fawcett, Kyle, Calgary-North Hill (PC)</p> <p>Forsyth, Heather, Calgary-Fish Creek (PC)</p> <p>Fritz, Hon. Yvonne, Calgary-Cross (PC), Minister of Housing and Urban Affairs</p> <p>Goudreau, Hon. Hector G., Dunvegan-Central Peace (PC), Minister of Employment and Immigration</p> <p>Griffiths, Doug, Battle River-Wainwright (PC), Parliamentary Assistant, Agriculture and Rural Development</p> <p>Groeneveld, Hon. George, Highwood (PC), Minister of Agriculture and Rural Development</p> <p>Hancock, Hon. Dave, QC, Edmonton-Whitemud (PC), Minister of Education, Government House Leader</p> <p>Hayden, Hon. Jack, Drumheller-Stettler (PC), Minister of Infrastructure</p> <p>Hehr, Kent, Calgary-Buffalo (L)</p> <p>Horne, Fred, Edmonton-Rutherford (PC)</p> <p>Horner, Hon. Doug, Spruce Grove-Sturgeon-St. Albert (PC), Minister of Advanced Education and Technology</p> <p>Jablonski, Hon. Mary Anne, Red Deer-North (PC), Minister of Seniors and Community Supports</p> <p>Jacobs, Broyce, Cardston-Taber-Warner (PC)</p> <p>Johnson, Jeff, Athabasca-Redwater (PC)</p> <p>Johnston, Art, Calgary-Hays (PC)</p> <p>Kang, Darshan S., Calgary-McCall (L)</p> <p>Klimchuk, Hon. Heather, Edmonton-Glenora (PC), Minister of Service Alberta</p> <p>Knight, Hon. Mel, Grande Prairie-Smoky (PC), Minister of Energy</p> <p>Leskiw, Genia, Bonnyville-Cold Lake (PC)</p>	<p>Liepert, Hon. Ron, Calgary-West (PC), Minister of Health and Wellness</p> <p>Lindsay, Hon. Fred, Stony Plain (PC), Solicitor General and Minister of Public Security</p> <p>Lukaszk, Thomas A., Edmonton-Castle Downs (PC), Parliamentary Assistant, Municipal Affairs</p> <p>Lund, Ty, Rocky Mountain House (PC)</p> <p>MacDonald, Hugh, Edmonton-Gold Bar (L)</p> <p>Marz, Richard, Olds-Didsbury-Three Hills (PC)</p> <p>Mason, Brian, Edmonton-Highlands-Norwood (NDP), Leader of the NDP Opposition</p> <p>McFarland, Barry, Little Bow (PC)</p> <p>McQueen, Diana, Drayton Valley-Calmar (PC), Parliamentary Assistant, Environment</p> <p>Morton, Hon. F.L., Foothills-Rocky View (PC), Minister of Sustainable Resource Development</p> <p>Notley, Rachel, Edmonton-Strathcona (NDP), Deputy Leader of the NDP Opposition, NDP Opposition House Leader</p> <p>Oberle, Frank, Peace River (PC), Government Whip</p> <p>Olson, Verlyn, QC, Wetaskiwin-Camrose (PC)</p> <p>Ouellette, Hon. Luke, Innisfail-Sylvan Lake (PC), Minister of Transportation</p> <p>Pastoor, Bridget Brennan, Lethbridge-East (L), Deputy Official Opposition Whip</p> <p>Prins, Ray, Lacombe-Ponoka (PC)</p> <p>Quest, Dave, Strathcona (PC)</p> <p>Redford, Hon. Alison M., Calgary-Elbow (PC), Minister of Justice and Attorney General</p> <p>Renner, Hon. Rob, Medicine Hat (PC), Minister of Environment, Deputy Government House Leader</p> <p>Rodney, Dave, Calgary-Lougheed (PC)</p> <p>Rogers, George, Leduc-Beaumont-Devon (PC)</p> <p>Sandhu, Peter, Edmonton-Manning (PC)</p> <p>Sarich, Janice, Edmonton-Decore (PC), Parliamentary Assistant, Education</p> <p>Sherman, Dr. Raj, Edmonton-Meadowlark (PC), Parliamentary Assistant, Health and Wellness</p> <p>Snelgrove, Hon. Lloyd, Vermilion-Lloydminster (PC), President of the Treasury Board</p> <p>Stelmach, Hon. Ed, Fort Saskatchewan-Vegreville (PC), Premier, President of Executive Council</p> <p>Stevens, Hon. Ron, QC, Calgary-Glenmore (PC), Deputy Premier, Minister of International and Intergovernmental Relations</p> <p>Swann, Dr. David, Calgary-Mountain View (L)</p> <p>Taft, Dr. Kevin, Edmonton-Riverview (L), Leader of the Official Opposition</p> <p>Tarchuk, Hon. Janis, Banff-Cochrane (PC), Minister of Children and Youth Services</p> <p>Taylor, Dave, Calgary-Currie (L), Deputy Leader of the Official Opposition</p> <p>VanderBurg, George, Whitecourt-St. Anne (PC)</p> <p>Vandermeer, Tony, Edmonton-Beverly-Clareview (PC)</p> <p>Weadick, Greg, Lethbridge-West (PC)</p> <p>Webber, Len, Calgary-Foothills (PC), Parliamentary Assistant, Energy</p> <p>Woo-Paw, Teresa, Calgary-Mackay (PC)</p> <p>Xiao, David H., Edmonton-McClung (PC), Parliamentary Assistant, Employment and Immigration</p> <p>Zwozdesky, Hon. Gene, Edmonton-Mill Creek (PC), Minister of Aboriginal Relations, Deputy Government House Leader</p>
--	--

Officers and Officials of the Legislative Assembly

Clerk	W.J. David McNeil	Senior Parliamentary Counsel	Shannon Dean
Clerk Assistant/ Director of House Services	Louise J. Kamuchik	Sergeant-at-Arms	Brian G. Hodgson
Clerk of <i>Journals</i> /Table Research	Micheline S. Gravel	Assistant Sergeant-at-Arms	J. Ed Richard
Senior Parliamentary Counsel	Robert H. Reynolds, QC	Assistant Sergeant-at-Arms	William C. Semple
		Managing Editor of <i>Alberta Hansard</i>	Liz Sim

[Errata, if any, appear inside back cover]

Legislative Assembly of Alberta

7:30 p.m.

Monday, October 20, 2008

[Mr. Mitzel in the chair]

The Acting Speaker: Please be seated.

Motions Other than Government Motions

The Acting Speaker: The hon. Member for Calgary-North Hill.

Calgary Urban Infrastructure Planning

509. Mr. Fawcett moved:

Be it resolved that the Legislative Assembly urge the government to consider the feasibility of establishing an urban infrastructure planning organization for the Calgary region to assist local municipalities, boards, and authorities in planning for common needs, co-operating for mutual benefit, and coordinating for sound urban planning of transportation and social infrastructure.

Mr. Fawcett: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm grateful to have the opportunity today to rise and introduce Motion 509, the urban infrastructure planning organization. In a larger sense the point of this motion is to draw attention to the importance of planning to large and growing economies in complex urban communities. Alberta has witnessed significant expansion in recent years, and Calgary itself has seen a massive influx of population, businesses, and investment.

However, as is always the case with growth, there has also been a greater than ever demand for services from both the public and private sectors. I'm sure it's no secret to members of this Legislature that there seems to be a lack of appropriate and sufficient infrastructure in some of our communities. While the municipal sustainability initiative, announcements on P3 schools, and the 20-year capital plan have gone a long way to addressing the needs in our communities, we want to keep looking forward, to be the first to do what many others are talking about. While some want to talk about the challenges of urban development, I want to talk about the opportunities. That's why I brought forward this motion today.

I just want to make a couple of things clear. First, this is not an attempt to discredit any of the work being done by the Calgary Regional Partnership. In fact, it's to build upon the successes of that partnership. I'd like to thank those municipalities involved and the chair of the Calgary Regional Partnership and the mayor of Airdrie, Linda Bruce, for the work that they're doing for the Calgary region.

Secondly, I want to be clear that the reason this motion was brought forward to specifically look at this type of organization in Calgary is because I believe each community has its unique set of needs and opportunities. While I am an MLA from Calgary and have lived all my life in Calgary – I do believe that I know some of those needs and some of those issues – I also don't want to interfere in the process of the growth management plan for the capital region.

Thirdly, some would say that this might add another level of bureaucracy to our processes. However, as we go along and as you'll see through the debate, I think this actually breaks down the bureaucracy and the silos that we currently have within our government in our planning processes.

Just look at organizations that this government is involved in, like PNWER or TILMA, or the bill that I introduced on behalf of the hon. Minister of Finance and Enterprise today with the passport system for securities. It's these types of organizations that look at

having different jurisdictions with different responsibilities collaborate and break down barriers, not create more.

There are four basic, yet important, values that are the driving force behind this urban infrastructure planning organization. Those are collaboration, holistic planning, fiscal responsibility, and innovation. Let's be clear: this body would not attempt to replace the Calgary Regional Partnership, nor does it attempt to duplicate it. Indeed, the urban infrastructure planning organization looks at planning in a different way.

First, collaboration, like I said, will look at breaking down some of the barriers between governments and local boards and agencies in developing, planning, and building our infrastructure. An example from the Calgary area is the west extension of the LRT. If you look at some of the dynamics involved in that project, it's very complex. You have funding from the provincial government that's going to a municipal government that has planned and designed an LRT to go through a high school. So now you bring in a local school board, and you have the current community involved and a new community where the new school is going to be. This is very, very complex.

I'm not convinced, nor do I think members here can be convinced, that the process we went through exhausted all the opportunities we have, firstly, to build the infrastructure and deliver the services that we need as citizens and, secondly, at the best benefit to Alberta taxpayers. Innovation requires us to look at ways different from the traditional approaches of planning and building urban infrastructure, to envision the possibilities and determine for ourselves new ways of developing our communities with our values that take us in a direction that we all want to go.

Another example in Calgary is the North East Centre of Community, a group in the northeast part of Calgary that has combined with the YMCA to build a large centre of community for the residents in northeast Calgary. However, this project was supposed to be combined with a high school that we know is going to have to be built there in the next several years, yet our processes have turned that decision into one where we have to make the decision of that rec facility separate from the high school. I'm asking myself: well, aren't there some efficiencies in doing it all at once, or is the taxpayer going to be on the hook for even more money in the end game?

That brings me to fiscal responsibility. Another example is the Calgary airport expanding its runway to meet the demands of a growing international and vibrant city. Well, part of that is going to, I guess, combine with some of the plans there to create a situation where we're looking at not allowing a major freeway planned by the city to be free flowing where it was planned. The issue is whether we want to invest in a tunnel now or have to deal with the issues that come from a growing city. Again, I'm not sure that when you have a situation where you're talking about a municipal government, a provincial government, a federal government, and an airport authority, whether there is any formal mechanism to have all these players sit down at the table and say: what is the best way to do this for taxpayers and for citizens?

The other value is a holistic approach. It is one in which we consider the importance of the whole and the interdependence of its parts; indeed, the functional relationship between the parts and the whole. From here we begin to see how the whole may in fact be greater than the sum of its parts and how we can achieve something great out of smaller components. The urban infrastructure planning organization would take this philosophy and apply it to the mechanics, marrying the intangible with the tangible by encouraging all partners involved to create a vision of the future. In bringing everyone into greater alignment, we could keep moving forward in a specific and directed way.

Another example of this is when I had the fortunate or, more likely, unfortunate business when I was on the public school board of sitting through school closure meetings. I can tell you that those school closure meetings, which are directed at a very specific community, are very much interconnected with the larger picture of how the city grows. In fact, many of those schools were being closed because of new schools in developing communities. One of the challenges that we faced when I was on the public school board was that there were enough school spaces; they just weren't where the communities were being built. That's a challenge. That's something that needs to be addressed through collaboration between school boards and municipalities.

Mr. Hehr: That's because they don't build schools in Alberta anymore.

Mr. Fawcett: I would like to dispute that comment. When I was on the public school board, there were a lot of schools opened and a lot of schools closed because of that.

It is often the mechanics where we need to keep in mind both why we're doing something and how we are doing it. So how do we address this? The urban infrastructure planning organization would be able to comprehensively consider and clearly establish the priorities of the Calgary region, accomplishing these four values of collaboration, holistic planning, fiscal responsibility, and innovation. Considering the number of competing interests and priorities that exist, the organization will be able to sit above and assess the appropriate course of action that delivers appropriate infrastructure where and when it's needed for communities and citizens in a manner that is fiscally responsible and sustainable.

7:40

This concept will provide a perfect balance of both detachment and investment. It will be able to determine the best means of collaboration across and among stakeholders, be it school boards, city councils, hospitals, businesses, or other local boards, authorities, and agencies with responsibilities for infrastructure, planning, and urban development. One of the key benefits of all this from the greater perspective of public policy is greater efficiency.

The Acting Speaker: The hon. Member for Calgary-Currie.

Mr. Taylor: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure to rise and join the debate on Motion 509. That motion, of course, as all nongovernment motions, does not really commit anybody to doing anything other than this Legislature urging the government to do that, should we pass this motion tonight.

Mr. Speaker, I must admit – and this will come, I'm sure, as no great surprise to some on the government benches – that I'm confused tonight. [interjections] I thought I'd pause here for the laughter and the heckles. Here's what I'm confused about. On the one hand, the Member for Calgary-North Hill seems to be talking about the need for co-operation among the three levels of government: the municipal level, the provincial level, and the federal level. Yet I don't see any specific reference to that in the motion itself. Absent that specific reference, it looks to me as though we are trying to reinvent a wheel here in which the tire may be a little soft in the air pressure department. Perhaps we could stand to put a little more air in that tire, but the wheel itself is sound. It's intact.

The member made reference to it himself in terms of his reference to the Calgary Regional Partnership, but I think we have in that organization the vehicle for proceeding with the kind of urban infrastructure planning that the Calgary region needs. Let me

explain. The Calgary region is fundamentally different from the capital region in that the capital region is, when it works best, a collaboration, a collection of 25 different municipalities. On the other hand, the city of Calgary, well, since it was recommended in 1956 by the McNally report, has followed the concept of the unicity. In other words, urban development is most efficiently and fairly achieved under one municipal government.

Back in 1956 the metropolitan Calgary area consisted of the city of Calgary, which at that time had about 170,000 people along with a strong economy, a well-balanced tax base consisting of residential, commercial, and industrial development, and a number of surrounding towns and hamlets. The names of many live on today as communities within the city of Calgary – Bowness, Montgomery, Forest Lawn, various others – that all together had a population of about 14,000 people. These were essentially, in many respects, dormitory or bedroom communities of the city of Calgary. They had only a singular tax base, consisting primarily of unserviced residential land and unserviced residential development.

As a result there was a tax poverty that was thought to exist since their tax base could not support the provision of municipal services to the same standards as the city of Calgary. These areas were thought to be inextricably linked to Calgary as one economic and social unit, yet the level of services and development were far behind Calgary. So it followed that given this economic and social union, the most effective and efficient and fair government would be under that one municipal authority in order to level the playing field, level the disparity among the various communities. There were some short-term costs to Calgary, but the need to provide municipal services to the area was thought to make those short-term costs acceptable to avoid the menace of relatively contiguous unserviced residential urban development along with unacceptable social disparities existing at the time.

The McNally principles, really – I mean, they recommended this model. They reflected four interrelated themes: in one metropolitan, economic, and social unit tax-base equity is important; where any business tax base is occurring just outside an urban municipality, the tax base generated from this development should accrue to the same municipality that provides educational and other municipal services to the workers and their families; urban municipalities are entitled to growing space, so they need to expand into rural areas; where areas adjacent to a city take on urban characteristics, these areas are best planned and governed by one municipality. That essentially formed the basis of the recommendations of the McNally Commission, the McNally report. That is the model that the city of Calgary has followed since 1956. That is the unicity model for growth management. It has worked rather well.

It's not exactly something that you can easily plunk down on 25 distinct municipalities within one region, as exist in the capital area. If you could, we probably would have done so a long time ago. Perhaps times were simpler. Certainly, populations were smaller and these sorts of things more doable back in 1956. In any event, Mr. Speaker, I think the result of that has been that with some bumps in the road – no question about it, we've seen some fights over water between the city of Calgary and the MD of Rocky View, around a meat-packing plant, around the racetrack and the mall at Balzac, so on and so forth – the system has worked reasonably well. My feeling is that the Calgary Regional Partnership – which is, I think, with its membership, including Calgary and the surrounding municipalities, well placed to make these kinds of regional planning decisions – should be allowed to continue to develop and evolve as the 21st century version of the regional planning councils that existed in Alberta prior to 1994. By that I mean existed for the Calgary region.

If the desire on the part of the member is to create a regional planning mechanism that not only involves the member municipalities, which I would argue are already involved in the Calgary Regional Partnership, but also brings into play the provincial government, the federal government, as in the case of some responsibility around airport development and things like that and other organizations, then I think the motion should say so. I'm not going to propose an amendment to the motion on the floor tonight, but I would make that point and would invite the member to consider rewording or reworking the motion and bringing it back at a later date. As it stands right now, Mr. Speaker, even though motions are by their very nature supposed to be somewhat vague, I think this one is too vague for me to support.

The Acting Speaker: The hon. Member for Calgary-Fort.

Mr. Cao: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Motion 509 urges the government to consider an urban infrastructure planning organization for the Calgary region. In doing so, it considers important aspects of how our municipalities are affected by growth. It also allows for a discussion on how the government of Alberta is assisting towns in development and co-ordination. I would like to thank the hon. Member for Calgary-North Hill for bringing forward this motion and allowing us to discuss the important role of planning Alberta's continued growth and development.

Specifically, this planning organization would enable the Calgary region to co-ordinate planning for schools, roads, housing, post-secondary institutions, hospitals, businesses, and all other infrastructure and transportation needs that could affect more than one municipality. If carried forward, I believe that the Calgary region could benefit greatly from the support of an urban infrastructure planning organization, as would other municipalities and their growth management plans.

Motion 509 considers this planning and expansion of the Calgary region with four values in mind: collaboration, holistic planning, fiscal responsibility, and innovation. For guidance we need to look no further than the example provided by the capital region and the way in which it is navigating the challenge of managing growth.

7:50

Specifically, the Capital Region Board was created to develop a long-range plan for regional land use and infrastructure and enable the region to successfully manage its considerable growth over the next five decades. Indeed, it is expected that the capital region will double its population by 2041 if the current growth trend continues. Now, this will create a need for collaboration in many municipalities as the borders continue to stretch outwards. In order to face this challenge, the Alberta government commissioned a study on the capital region to determine a plan to address unprecedented growth. It is exactly the report, capital region integrated growth management plan, that leads us to believe that integrated growth management is needed. That's an example that has been successfully attempted in the capital region.

The Alberta provincial government will also oversee much work that is being done by the 25 municipalities in the capital region. Yet there is an important distinction for the role of the provincial government that should be made here. The Alberta government will continue to grant autonomy for municipalities. This is because ultimately it is important that the communities across the province remain self-directed. This provides them with authority to maintain the taxation, billed according to their needs. This ensures that the services that citizens feel are important remain in the hands of local government. Yes, Mr. Speaker, the municipality and the govern-

ment in the region need to work together to provide cost-effective services to the residents in the region.

Now, I would like to take this opportunity to raise an issue that was recently brought to my attention by my business constituents as part of the recent annexation of land from the MD of Rocky View to the city of Calgary. When my constituents' business properties were in the MD of Rocky View, they had to develop their own water, sewer, electricity, utilities, and roads by themselves. Because the MD did not provide such public services to them, their taxes were minimal. But when this land was annexed to the city of Calgary, the taxes went up tremendously and right away even though no city services have yet been delivered to them. This is just like we are being asked to pay for nothing, for products or services that do not exist. I envision that a situation like this could be rectified by regional planning, that taxes be kept the same and are not increased until the new service is delivered.

Mr. Speaker, as the Calgary region continues to face growth and infrastructure-related concerns, structured planning is required. The Capital Region Board is an example of that. For this reason, I'm supportive of Motion 509. Thank you.

The Acting Speaker: The hon. Member for Calgary-Varsity.

Mr. Chase: Thank you. Hopefully, in the member's concluding remarks he'll give us some idea of the stakeholders that he consulted with. It doesn't appear that those stakeholders were from the city of Calgary. He mentioned briefly the mayor of Airdrie. I would question to what degree there was consultation with the mayor. I'd also be interested to what extent he spoke with members of the municipality of Rocky View.

As has been pointed out formerly by the hon. Member for Calgary-Currie, the regional partnership that has existed since 1956 with few exceptions has worked rather well. When it hasn't worked well, it has been the result of government interference, as this bill proposes to do. It interferes with the local autonomy in the guise of providing a formula for the resolution of regional conflicts. Now, when regional conflicts have occurred, it's because of government interference or lack of being at the table, making comments but not providing funding.

For example, one of the disputes between the municipality of Rocky View and the city of Calgary was Rancher's Beef. Rancher's Beef failed for a number of reasons. One of the first reasons was that it didn't have a particular location with sufficient water initially to get started up. It was proposing to hang out on the edge of the city of Calgary, but there wasn't any water for it. They were hoping to basically receive their water and pump their sewage from the slaughterhouse back into the city of Calgary's sewer system, but there wasn't a whole lot of negotiating. So what they tried to do was basically do an end run and move over about half a kilometre so that they were in the municipality of Rocky View, but they didn't have their act together there. While Rocky View welcomed the potential financial business opportunity and the taxing that went with that developed land, it was poorly thought out.

While the government recognized the need for sort of a made-in-Alberta meat packer solution as opposed to its dependency on the two American plants, there wasn't sufficient support provided. As a result Rancher's Beef basically went belly up because it could not achieve the number of animals being processed throughout its stores. Now, that was a minor, you know, failure that – well, it wasn't minor for the people involved.

In comparison, the megamall at Balzac: here is the greatest example of government interference possible. Whether or not the former minister of finance interfered in the process remains to be

seen, but the Rocky View municipality and the United Horsemen were given at least a verbal statement that the province would back them up and the province would find water for them. Now, considering that the province had already – and thank goodness they did – put a moratorium on the Oldman River and the South Saskatchewan and the tributaries, the Bow and the Elbow, flowing into it, there was a major problem.

Because everybody hadn't done their work, the city of Calgary was being leaned on by the province to come up with a simple solution, and that was: truck some water out to Balzac. When I say truck out, I'm talking about a pipeline, piped out. But the amount that was needed was considered a hardship for future growth and development of Calgary. That's what Motion 509 is all about, trying to impose a formula from outside, taking away the local autonomy of the city of Calgary and the municipalities that surround it.

Continuing on, the Balzac mall was stalled for a great amount of time. The United Horsemen and a number of investors will be lucky to end up with their saddles, never mind their shirts, at the end of this operation because it was poorly planned from the very beginning. Without water you don't develop, so again the government, realizing that they were a part of a problem, tried to come up with a solution. The solution was excess water from the Eastern Alberta irrigation district. There wasn't enough extra water for that mall and the racetrack to operate. What happened was the municipality of Rocky View was given false assurance, expended approximately \$90 million on a sewage system, pipes, and water to the area, but up until that agreement, that got them slightly off the hook with the irrigation district, they had no water to provide.

8:00

This is an example of a colossal imposition and failure of the government, to get involved, make a mess, give out assurances that they couldn't back up, and now we have this large, great land that may or may not end up with a mall, but it's certainly not going to have a full-fledged racing track. Whether it's thoroughbred or standardbred, their needs aren't going to be met.

The whole notion of this Motion 509 resolving a problem: as far as I'm concerned, it's just adding one more interference in local autonomy. Now, the mover of the motion is very familiar with government interference as he is a former trustee with the Calgary board of education. Boy, if you want to know what interference is all about, take on the job of trustee. In 1994 the government took away the power and local autonomy of the board to collect and use at their own discretion basically 50 per cent of their budget in the form of the education portion of the property tax. That education property tax, which was worth 50 per cent at the time, has now been reduced to 30 per cent, but it gets lost in general revenue. Any suggestion that Motion 509 is going to somehow give back a degree of autonomy, whether it's to local school boards, whether it's the city of Calgary or the surrounding regions, is flawed, to say the least.

Now, there are challenges for municipalities working together. The province at some point does have a role in terms of providing infrastructure funding, and to a degree it has a role in terms of collaboration with the local authorities, but it cannot take away that individual responsibility. The closer you are to the problem, the closer you are to the solution. I'm suggesting that in what Calgary has been doing, although the, in quotes, rocky, as in Rocky View, relationship is sometimes stretched, for the most part for the last 52 years they've done an excellent job. Until the government can come up with greater ways of leaving money at the local level and leaving the decision-making process at the local level, magic formulas such as are proposed by Motion 509 are not going to be welcomed.

I look forward to when the mover of the motion in his concluding statements provides us with the detail that I asked for in the begin-

ning, and that's: who was consulted? Who are the stakeholders? Can he name individuals either on the councils or reeves in the surrounding districts who say, "This is a wonderful idea; go for it"? I would be interested in hearing what homework was done because I would give this an incomplete.

Thank you.

The Acting Speaker: The hon. Member for Calgary-Nose Hill.

Dr. Brown: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to speak in favour of Motion 509, brought forward by the hon. Member for Calgary-North Hill. The objective of that motion is to create an urban infrastructure planning organization to co-ordinate urban development within the Calgary region. This region is one which is suffering considerable growth pains over the last number of years. The motion proposes an organization which would promote collaboration of the Calgary regional municipalities, and it would, in my view, bring the Calgary Regional Partnership to another level. It would promote much greater alignment and efficiencies between the various boards, authorities, and municipalities involved in development and infrastructure planning within the Calgary region.

Mr. Speaker, ever since the demise of the regional planning boards, planning has largely been the exclusive prerogative and responsibility of the individual municipalities. To some extent there has simply been a rush to approve residential, industrial, and commercial development on the fringes of the large urban centres to maximize tax revenues for municipalities, and this competition to expand the tax base has had some negative consequences. The result has been a lack of co-ordinated planning around Alberta's largest urban centres without regard in some instances for the best interests of the area as a whole. It has resulted in rapid growth on the outskirts of the city of Calgary, which may not conform to sound long-term urban planning principles, including those regarding the appropriate massing of residential and commercial developments; proper consideration of utility and transportation corridors; proximity of necessary services to the location of workplaces, to the places where people live; and the location of water and sewer services. There are instances where light industrial facilities have grown up along the outskirts of the city of Calgary, particularly on the major roadways leading into the city.

The hon. member has mentioned some of the initiatives which have been undertaken by the city of Calgary and the surrounding municipalities, which are positive, but in my view they don't go quite far enough. It's estimated that within the next 50 years Calgary will grow by around 1.3 million people. This will increase traffic congestion, energy consumption, housing, infrastructure costs, and service delivery, and it's going to mean growth of the city limits into the adjacent municipalities. This growth will pose huge challenges for the city of Calgary and the surrounding region. Surveys from 2007 reveal that infrastructure, traffic, and roads continue to be top of mind for Calgarians along with crime, safety, policing, and other concerns. While the majority of Calgarians continue to indicate that the quality of life in Calgary is good, most also feel that it is declining, having worsened over the past number of years due primarily to the pace of growth.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to briefly allude to the Plan It Calgary project of the city of Calgary. This is an integrated land-use and mobility plan that is based on the premise that there is a relationship between land use, mobility, and sustainability. Some of its principles include the following: the intensity and location of different types of land use affect the form of transportation networks that serve those areas and by extension travel behaviour, and planning and decision-making for land use and transportation need to be more

deeply integrated to promote urban growth that is sustainable for the long run.

The project identifies a number of integrated and strategic key directions to guide long-term sustainability. Included among these are to achieve a balance of growth between established and green-field communities; supporting and ensuring the delivery of essential municipal infrastructure and services, including utilities, transit, recreation, and emergency services, particularly to new growth areas; to ensure that intensification occurs in opportune areas of the city, including vacant, underutilized, and redeveloping sites; and aiming to locate a significant proportion of future Calgarians in currently built areas of the city by providing increased housing choice through infilling and redevelopment.

The plan also provides more choice within complete communities, and it provides an opportunity to leverage growth to manage and direct change that achieves more complete communities. It recommends the provision of opportunities to mix land uses and putting jobs closer to where people live and/or increasing residential populations near existing jobs and primary transit services. It also speaks about direct land-use change within a framework of nodes and corridors. This would include intensifying work sites and residences within walkable distances to transit stations and streets. It would also link land-use decisions to transit, incorporating compact mixed-use development and pedestrian-friendly design to support quality transit service.

8:10

Mr. Speaker, the problems around urban regional planning were also referred to as early as 2003 in a special report from TD Economics, a division of the TD Bank Financial Group, which stated as follows. Population and employment in the Calgary-Edmonton corridor have expanded rapidly, first in suburbs and then in rural areas. Developers are absorbing rural lands at a significant pace. The impact of growth is beginning to strain the region's physical infrastructure. Municipal land-planning strategies could be improved so as not to encourage sprawl. The report also states that the adverse impact of sprawl on society is considerable. Pressure on the provincial and municipal governments to invest in highways and roads to improve traffic congestion may in the long term contribute to increased sprawl in those urban areas.

Since public transit is relatively expensive in low-density suburban areas, sprawl increases reliance on roads, worsening overall congestion. While traffic congestion in Calgary does remain far from the levels experienced in larger cities, such as Los Angeles, Toronto, or Montreal, there is a trend towards increased gridlock, and that results in increased commuting times and loss of economic productivity. It's costly to individuals, to households, to businesses in increased costs for fuel. It contributes to a decline in air quality and to a general decline in the quality of life.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I do support the motion of the hon. Member for Calgary-North Hill. I believe that effective mechanisms for implementing and mandating urban regional planning are needed, and I urge all hon. members to support Motion 509.

The Acting Speaker: The hon. Member for Calgary-Mountain View.

Dr. Swann: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. My pleasure to rise and speak on Motion 509, urban infrastructure planning organization for the Calgary region. I want to congratulate the hon. member for his initiative. Clearly, regional planning, especially in high-growth areas like Calgary, is desperately needed to ensure a long-term vision and goals to guide decision-making and provide co-

ordinated growth policies amongst all levels of government. Regional planning recognizes that in order to accommodate the tremendous rate of growth in certain geographic areas and accommodate future growth potential of communities to ensure their prosperity, guarantee a high quality of life, and maintain a sustainable environment, planning must occur in a co-ordinated and strategic manner.

My other colleagues have alluded to the failure of some of the issues in the Balzac area, and I won't reiterate those. However, it's important to note that the Calgary Regional Partnership is based on a city growth model that is that of a unicity, not a collection of municipalities working together, and this could be a barrier to the formalized process suggested here, such as that followed in Edmonton.

The city of Calgary, like Edmonton, is obviously the biggest player in any formal mechanism, but it would be constrained from participating as an equal partner with an equal say, as other members do, due to its own growth policy. This would need to be addressed fundamentally with all the partners, especially Calgary, before a true regional partnership could be formed.

May I make a friendly proposal? A better solution for dealing with the regional issues may be to work through the Calgary Regional Partnership, perhaps giving it more support and a stronger mandate instead of attempting to impose a formal planning organization on the area similar to that of the capital region. A friendly amendment might urge the government, then, to consider the feasibility of working with the existing Calgary Regional Partnership to determine a more formalized process to assist the municipalities, boards, and authorities in planning for their common needs, co-operating for mutual benefit, and co-ordinating for sound urban planning of transportation and social infrastructure. This may be a better way of dealing with the regional growth pressures in the Calgary area, recognizing the unique growth policies already in existence in the city of Calgary.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Acting Speaker: Any members wish to speak? The hon. Member for Calgary-*Buffalo*.

Mr. Hehr: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It's a pleasure to stand up and discuss this motion that is being put forward tonight. Many of the reasons have already been given for why some of these elements of this are really good ideas, yet I have some hesitation on other notes. A couple of good things. Regional planning for the Calgary region is needed as the area grows. However, you know, we also have to recognize that Calgary and the surrounding area is essentially a very different place from what has evolved in Edmonton with the various jurisdictions in the outlying areas and the way they have developed here in Edmonton.

I think, you know, regional planning and what it does, which is recognize that in order to accommodate tremendous growth rates in certain geographical areas and to accommodate future growth potential the communities in especially the Calgary area need to develop in a reasonable and a rational manner that incorporates things like water and resource use and LRT lines and moving people from work to school to wherever they're going and having those transportation hubs and schools in correct places: those are no doubt laudable goals of what the hon. Member for Calgary-North Hill is proposing in this thing.

I have alluded to this earlier: Calgary is sort of a model of a unicity. It reminds me almost of, as I was discussing with the leader of the third party, the beginning of the episodes of *Welcome Back, Kotter* when I grew up. It always said: Brooklyn, fourth largest city

in America. I'm assuming that since I've been in New York now and I no longer saw that sign when I went into Brooklyn, it is, too, under a unicity model. It was the leader of the third party that made me aware of that. I'm sure that some of the planning mechanisms, maybe, in New York are similar to Calgary. However, I digress simply because I liked *Welcome Back, Kotter* so much, sir, but now that I have that there, I can move on.

So we see the unicity model as having developed Calgary. You know, another thing sort of to put on the record that worries me about this in that it may be creating another bureaucratic layer despite what my friend from Calgary-North Hill says is the fact that the city of Calgary has broken away from the AUMA. Clearly, it sees itself as different and distinct from many of the smaller players, maybe some of the Airdries, the Okotoks, the Claresholms, and the other areas like that, as they didn't find that process particularly working for them. It seems like this process smells a little bit like that process that they were involved in with the AUMA, which clearly from their perspective wasn't working for them.

Like my hon. colleague from Calgary-Varsity, I would like to hear who the Member for Calgary-North Hill has discussed this with as Calgary representatives, hear what they had to say and whether their planning departments, their aldermanic bodies were in support of this. If they were, I'd feel much more comfort in speaking in favour of that motion.

On that note, as a couple of my colleagues have already alluded to, this may be something that can just be accomplished with the Calgary Regional Partnership as it already exists. It already has, you know, some credit built up between the various organizations. I'm assuming that all of the players already exist within that organization so that with a little bit of fine tuning these organizations under this rubric that already exists could manage just fine without us up here in Edmonton maybe telling them what to do.

Those are my thoughts, and thank you very much for allowing me to speak on this issue.

8:20

The Acting Speaker: Any other members wish to speak?

I invite the hon. Member for Calgary-North Hill to close debate. You have five minutes.

Mr. Fawcett: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate all those colleagues that entered in on debate on this very, very important issue. I want to conclude by talking about a few things.

One is that I will admit that this is a lesson as a new member that wording matters, and I do want to suggest that a significant portion of the members that stood up to speak to this motion missed the sort of essence of what it was intended to do. This is not intended to refute anything that the Calgary Regional Partnership is doing. In fact, I support one hundred per cent what they are doing. I guess maybe people are hung up on the words "establishing an urban infrastructure planning organization for the Calgary region to assist" – and this is where the key is – "local municipalities, boards, and authorities." Right now we have no co-operation between municipalities that have a huge amount of influence on urban infrastructure, planning, and development in the boards and agencies that also have a huge influence.

Example number one. I know that the Member for Calgary-Buffalo mentioned that we were not building schools in new places. The simple fact is that the municipality was building residences where the schools weren't. I don't know how that is the fault of this government. I'm not saying that it's the fault of the municipal government either. What I'm saying is that there is a clear disconnect in our planning in our cities.

Second example. The planning of a major freeway in Calgary through the middle of the airport runway expansion. Again, how does that happen? The reason is that there is no formal mechanism between the planning of the municipalities and the agencies. The Airport Authority is doing their little thing over here, planning a runway expansion. The city is doing their thing over here and planning a freeway right through the middle. So now what's going to happen is that the freeway is going to stop. How does that serve the citizens of Calgary or the taxpayers of Calgary? That's what the essence of this motion is, so those that maybe missed the essence and were speaking against it might want to change their position on this.

Another example, Member for Calgary-Varsity, is that I sat through school closure meetings. I sat through school closure meetings in your community, and I tell you that those were hard decisions. The reason they were hard decisions is that right across the city there was a lack of holistic viewpoints on the planning. I sat in those meetings where parents stood up and said, "We are revitalizing our community; we're growing it," and then read two weeks later that that community is opposing the transient-oriented, high-density buildings in those communities. There's a disconnect right there.

Again, people, this is about holistic planning, getting these different agencies to collaborate. It is about greater efficiency. It is about cost-effectiveness. Ultimately, this is the heart of where I see the urban planning organization going. It's clear vision combined with clear strategy, delivering results for communities and taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, this is an example of some of the things that happen out there in the community. I got this on my desk today, and this has to do with creating infrastructure for child care spaces.

I must mention my frustration and concern with trying to deal with two levels of government when it comes to timelines . . . Right now the provincial government is providing us with a creating spaces grant but for most of us in this industry in Calgary the timelines we need to deal with at the municipal level do not allow us to access the grant.

It goes on to say:

It is our hope that something can be put in place so that all levels of government are working together in order to provide a win/win situation for everyone especially the children and their families. By all levels of government not being on the same page it is ultimately the children that lose out and we believe that it is more than enough cause to make our concerns heard and to press for change.

Again, these are normal, everyday Calgarians. Member for Calgary-Varsity, that's who I consulted with. I'm bringing forward their issues to this Assembly.

[Motion Other than Government Motion 509 carried]

Government Bills and Orders Committee of the Whole

[Mr. Mitzel in the chair]

The Deputy Chair: I'd like to call the committee to order.

Bill 8 Climate Change and Emissions Management Amendment Act, 2008

The Deputy Chair: Are there any comments or questions or amendments to be offered with respect to this bill? The hon. Member for Calgary-Mountain View.

Dr. Swann: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I'm pleased to speak at Committee of the Whole on Bill 8, the Climate Change and Emissions Management Amendment Act, 2008. We've had

considerable opportunity to look at it and make comment on it in the past. Some elements of insight have changed over the last while, and I guess fundamentally it's fair to say that this is the issue of our generation: climate change and how we manage it. It's probably the issue that got me into politics. I care deeply about this issue specifically and how it reflects on a government that has lacked a commitment to good science, lacked the leadership to take charge of the needs of our province and our country and our planet and show real leadership in the country and work together with the federal and provincial governments to establish a consistent, comprehensive approach to climate change.

This particular amendment to Bill 3, the original climate change act, will authorize a delegated authority to manage some aspects of climate change and to manage the emissions management fund: \$15 per tonne imposed upon any large emitters who fail to drop their intensity target year over year. It also allows the director to designate who is on this authority and to specify those intensity limits for a specific operation.

The two problems that I struggle with as an elected member of the Legislature are a 15-year history in this government where climate change has been ridiculed, denied, and then a pretense to action has been taken. Targets and timelines within Bill 3 allow a progressive increase in emissions to 2020, and there has been considerable misinformation in the public about what that means in terms of our contribution to climate change in this country and leadership on the planet.

Thirdly, the Auditor General's report just recently reported that there's no clear connection between the goals in the plan – that is, intensity targets – and the absolute targets which they are purporting to try to achieve in the next 30 or 40 years, with no clear measurement of the impacts of the existing technologies that are being promoted, including the ad hoc decisions to invest in carbon capture and storage of \$2 billion and another \$2 billion for public transit. Without the capacity of this government to actually measure and monitor and effectively predict whether we're going to achieve these targets, we're playing a shell game, Mr. Chairman. That makes it very difficult to just stand by and go through an amendment as if everything is fine and this is going to make a significant difference when the whole strategy is flawed and weak and fails to show the leadership that Canadians and especially Albertans are looking for. Having said that, what do I do as a conscientious member of the Legislature and opposition member? Albertans expect me and expect this government to act in the public interest for the long term.

This amendment will help us to move toward the deliberations around and disbursement of this fund. We have to move that forward. Clearly, we've got \$60 million; we have to do something with it. This allows the minister to make decisions with this money and to move through the delegated authority to make appropriate use of this carbon tax which was put on in the last 12 months.

8:30

If the goals and strategies are weak but the amendment enables the process for allocating it, then we must support it. I do support this reluctantly, based on the comments that I made before. The designated authority, however, should not reflect this government's interests, though. It should be clearly and transparently identifying people from the scientific sector, from the nongovernment sector as well as the government sector and industry sectors so that we use this fund, this \$60 million, for the best possible outcomes, not simply rubber-stamp more for carbon capture and storage or simply rubber-stamp more for public transit. We have to invest in energy efficiency. We must invest in renewables. We must move this province towards less dependence on fossil fuels. That is what Albertans want. That is what is considered real leadership.

Ultimately, at some point Albertans' cries for real leadership on this issue, especially young people and those in the scientific community that have come to the conclusion that this government will not or cannot act in the long-term public interest, are going to make that demand so crystal clear that this government will get out of the way and allow for a full approach, a comprehensive approach, that includes regulations, that includes renewables, that includes energy efficiency and better management of our existing infrastructure.

With those comments in mind, Mr. Chairman, I will take my seat and offer it up to others. Reluctantly I do support this amendment. Thank you.

The Deputy Chair: The hon. Member for Calgary-Varsity.

Mr. Chase: Thank you. As I said before during Committee of the Whole, this is one small step. As the hon. Member for Calgary-Mountain View pointed out, it's a rather piecemeal approach. Fifteen dollars a tonne, for example, is half of what Europe values emissions at. We could at least get together with the rest of the world in coming up with a common value.

Bill 8, Climate Change and Emissions Management Amendment Act, needs to take a holistic approach, look at cumulative effects and a comprehensive strategy, instead of just being as it is, an isolated one-off dealing with the proposed and hoped-for capture of emissions. Bill 8, unfortunately, doesn't have a timeline to it, and we need timelines. For example, SRD put a timeline of three years: in three years we're going to start dealing with six watersheds. But unless we've got a timeline and costs and accurate science and technology to back Bill 8, I'm concerned that it is potentially doomed to a rather expensive failure, as the Auditor General pointed out, at a \$2 billion price tag for the prompting of sequestration and another \$2 billion, which I am more hopeful of, in terms of improving transportation and the greening. That is an objective that is much easier to meet.

What concerns me, though – SRD talks about three years for getting water management into effect. This act deals with only one problem of a much larger problem. It doesn't deal with water. It doesn't deal with accusations of dirty oil because it's only theoretical. It doesn't deal with our massive tailings ponds, which contribute to Alberta's negative sort of notation from our most important trading partner down south. Until we deal with the tailings ponds, the leaching into the Athabasca, until we deal with the fouling of our watersheds as well as the fouling of our air, we're going to continue to have this negative reputation. If we don't act promptly, others will act for us, and decisions will be made outside of our borders.

Governor Schwarzenegger is already talking about limiting the export of our oil. Senator Obama, should he be elected President of the U.S., has similar reservations about our oil and gas production. Yes, maybe the economic reality and the greed versus green will take over, and it will be to a degree business as usual. But what is affecting Bill 8 is the slowdown of our economy. We've already had large companies decide that they can no longer continue with the upgraders. We've had large oil sands companies say that they have to put major projects on hold. So it may turn out that it's the economy that controls our emissions by reducing intensity, by reducing production. Of course, that's a rather passive way of solving the problem. I much prefer an active approach, which Bill 8 to a small extent purports to achieve.

However, unless the government of Alberta provides both some stewardship to the land and some direction for industry, we are rather going to be relegated to the scrap heap of the world in terms of our dependency on nonrenewable exports, as the Member for Calgary-Mountain View pointed out. We have to sort of set the stage. Compared to Saudi Arabia we have the second-highest

potential for the clean development of what is still an important resource, but it has very much a shelf life attached to it. If we don't basically take some direction, slow down, invest in the innovation and technology to get it right the first time, all we're going to have are large holes, polluted water, and it will not just be dead ducks but a dead economy based on this one-trick pony of nonrenewable resources that will face us.

Bill 8 attempts to deal with intensity of emissions, but unless you have the absolute tools and the science to back it up and a timeline to accomplish the various suggestions of what Bill 8 purports to achieve, we're just simply adding to the emissions that are already out there and not coming up with a definitive solution to the climate change problem.

Thank you.

The Deputy Chair: The hon. leader of the third party.

Mr. Mason: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Well, I want to speak a little bit about Bill 8, which will provide an amendment to the Climate Change and Emissions Management Act. I want to indicate that that act was established in 2002, and it created a climate change and emissions management fund. In July of 2007 there were requirements established for oil sands facilities, coal-fired power plants, and others to reduce the intensity of the greenhouse gas emissions by 12 per cent, and it set out that this could be done through offsets, real reductions, or paying \$15 per tonne into the fund.

8:40

Bill 8 makes it possible for the minister to appoint a committee that will decide how to spend the fund. The committee will invest in projects and technology to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in Alberta. Now, the concern here is that this committee, which is a paid committee, by the way, Mr. Chairman, will consist of industry representatives entirely. We understand that the government is now in the process of establishing that committee. In its simplest form the industry pays \$15 per tonne to emit beyond the emissions intensity, and then the industry gets paid to sit on a committee that will decide how to spend their \$15 per tonne less the salaries that they're paid.

There are, I guess, a number of issues that come to mind with respect to this. It seems to me that you're really setting the fox to watch the henhouse in respect to this, Mr. Chairman. The industry pays – I can't really go much further without touching on the deficiency of the entire approach of emissions intensity as a way of trying to control greenhouse gases. This, of course, was a concept developed by the Bush administration in Washington in order to permit the continued increase in CO₂ production. The world's climate is not sensitive to the intensity of emissions that are emitted; it is sensitive to the total amount of emissions. That is, the total amount of CO₂ is what actually affects the climate, not the intensity of particular sources of emissions.

The approach suits the government very well because as the Premier said with respect to tar sands development, he will not touch the brake. That means that there will be and there have been massive increases in the number of projects in the tar sands. By imposing an emissions regime on that, it means that as long as their efficiency increases, there's no limit on the number of new plants and, therefore, the total emissions released into the atmosphere as a result of this development. It's a way of setting things up so it looks like you're doing something, but in actual fact you are permitting massive increases in the total amount of CO₂ into the atmosphere, which, of course, is what the changes in climate are driven by. The

changes in the climate are driven by the total amount of CO₂ in the atmosphere.

Now, we're going to charge on the basis of operations that cannot meet the goals of intensity. They can increase their total output because they're multiplying the number of plants that are producing the emissions, but if they can't meet the intensity targets, then they get to pay \$15 a tonne. Then the same people are put in charge of spending it. I question whether they are the appropriate people to make those decisions and whether they will make those decisions in the best interests of the climate, in the best interests of all Albertans, and in the best interests of the environment, or whether they will make those decisions in their own best interests, which may not coincide with the best interests of the people of Alberta or of the planet.

Now, I want to talk a little bit about one of the issues with respect to this Climate Change and Emissions Management Amendment Act. We were in touch with some environmental groups on matters raised in this bill, including the Pembina Institute. The concern is – and we share this concern – that this committee may in fact be used to pay payments with respect to nuclear power. There is a real concern, I think, across northern Alberta, throughout Alberta, and particularly among those people who are involved in the environmental movement. The government seems to be moving in the direction of nuclear in this province, and the concern that we have is that this fund may be used to finance nuclear power in the province.

Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment, which I'm prepared to ask the pages to distribute.

The Deputy Chair: Hon. members, we'll mark this as amendment A1.

Please proceed, hon. member.

Mr. Mason: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Well, I guess I'll move it first. I move that Bill 8, the Climate Change and Emissions Management Amendment Act, 2008, be amended in section 2 as follows. Do you need me to read the whole amendment?

The Deputy Chair: Yes.

Mr. Mason: Okay. Section 2 is amended, the proposed section 10, by striking out clause (a) and substituting the following: (a) under subsection (3) in clause (c) by striking out "alternative energy and" and by adding the following after clause (g):

- (h) paying salaries, fees, expenses, liabilities or other costs incurred by a delegated authority in carrying out a duty or function of or exercising a power of the Minister in respect of the Fund that has been delegated to the delegated authority, if authorized by the regulations.

If I may speak to that, Mr. Chairman, the existing Climate Change and Emissions Management Act, which Bill 8 amends, establishes a fund in section 10, and the fund is held and administered by the minister in accordance with the act. Subsection (3) says, "The Fund may be used only for purposes related to reducing emissions of specified gases or improving Alberta's ability to adapt to climate change, including, without limitation, the following purposes," and it goes through a number of things: energy conservation, new technologies, gas capture, removal of specified gases, measurement of the natural removal and storage of carbon, and climate change adaptation programs.

It's (c) that gives rise to some concern, and that says that the fund can be used for the following purposes: "demonstration and use of new technologies that emphasize reductions in . . . gas emissions through the use of alternative energy and renewable energy sources."

8:50

Now, Mr. Chairman, it is our concern that with this particular amendment in this bill, the Climate Change and Emissions Management Amendment Act, the fund could be used in order to support the development of nuclear power in the province. That is not something that we support nor do we think most Albertans support, and particularly people in the regions where this is under consideration have a great deal of concern.

By amending this in clause (c) by striking out “alternative energy and,” it would in our view preclude the use of this fund to support nuclear energy in our province, something which is yet to be proven to be safe and yet to be proven to significantly contribute towards alternative energy that is nonpolluting and noncontributory to climate change.

That, Mr. Chairman, is the amendment and the reasons for saying so, for putting this forward. I would urge all members to not only speak to this but to vote in favour of it. Thank you very much.

The Deputy Chair: On the amendment the hon. Minister of Environment.

Mr. Renner: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to just very briefly address the amendment that we have before us. The member, I think, is being quite creative in suggesting that by talking about renewable energy, the government is referring to nuclear power. I think what he’s suggesting is akin to throwing out the baby with the bathwater. It may well be that he has issues with respect to nuclear power, but by passing this amendment, not only would you preclude nuclear power, but you would preclude the opportunity for a host of other renewable energy sources that make perfectly good sense.

I have been quite up front with the public, with industry in indicating that it’s the intention of the government to manage this fund on an approximately sectoral basis so that those industries that pay into the fund would have some opportunity to take advantage of technology that could be developed as a result of the fund. The nuclear energy industry is not a contributor to this fund, so I don’t see the tie-in at all. I don’t see how the member is suggesting that this fund would be used to develop nuclear power because, frankly, this fund is all about greening the industry that we have in place and dealing with specified emissions, and, Mr. Chairman, specified emissions are very specifically CO₂.

The Deputy Chair: On the amendment the hon. Member for Calgary-Varsity.

Mr. Chase: Thank you. I think that possibly what would assist is if the government introduced an amendment to clearly define what it means by alternative energy because river run, solar, and geothermal wind are all alternative energies, but they do not produce emissions. The whole point of alternative energy is to not produce emissions.

In terms of the nuclear concern, if you want to put it out of the minds of people and not have it as a lingering issue, then define alternative so that it excludes nuclear, and in that case the need for this motion would be reduced if not eliminated because there would be clear definitions.

There is great concern not only by the people living in the Peace River area, where this proposal for nuclear energy has been suggested, but there are concerns Alberta-wide and nation-wide about reintroducing nuclear energy after a 40-year basic moratorium, and where it’s proposed is on a fault line. The absolute worst circumstance we could possibly have is adding a radioactive situation to the tailings ponds. The tailings ponds in themselves are an issue that it’s going to take years to overcome, but if there’s a potential of even the smallest of nuclear meltdowns, then there’s a concern.

There is also a concern – and we’re talking emissions – with how uranium is mined and produced in order to be used for nuclear energy. There are a tremendous number of emissions that result. Also, there is a very finite limit of uranium that is available for extraction, meaning that for nuclear energy in terms of any kinds of large-scale production, whether it be a series of plants in Alberta or in other areas of the world, we don’t have the uranium to provide the power sources. You can only use enriched uranium so many times before its value is limited.

The whole business of dealing with the waste. Never mind, you know, the suggestion of terrorism. Never mind the idea of plant failures. We have to deal with the question of: what do you do with the spent rods? What’s the plan? We’ve talked about sequestering CO₂ emissions, but you don’t sequester rods, at least not terribly successfully to date.

I understand the leader of the third party’s concerns, and I would hope that someone from the government side can come forward with a clarification of the definition of alternative which would allow the discussions to continue. Failing that, if this motion does not succeed, then I think a motion to send this to committee to deal with the wording and to deal with a more cumulative approach would be in order.

I am speaking in favour of the amendment because I, too, would like to see a definition of alternative which excludes nuclear.

The Deputy Chair: Any other members wish to speak to the amendment? The hon. Member for Calgary-Mountain View.

Dr. Swann: Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman. I, too, welcome the opportunity to speak to the amendment and to in general support the tone of it. I think that if the word was not “alternative” but “renewable,” one could accept the notion that this is a bill that is trying to incent alternative renewable energies and isn’t a covert way of moving towards other forms of energy, which the hon. member has raised concerns about and that many of us have concerns about, not only from the point of view of its environmental and health impacts but the economic impacts. These are massive costs associated with nuclear energy. They are very often publicly supported for unknown reasons except that no corporations and no banks seem to want to cover the liability costs of this industry.

I would think we would all be satisfied if we simply switched the word from “alternative” to “renewable.” Since nuclear energy is not renewable, it would completely quash any concerns about this, which I hadn’t considered before hearing from the hon. member. I don’t know if that’s a possibility at this stage. I have difficulty supporting it without making those changes.

9:00

The Deputy Chair: The hon. Minister of Environment.

Mr. Renner: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just want to make it clear that the wording in the bill currently reads: “alternative energy and renewable energy sources.” A prime example of throwing the baby out with the bathwater is that an alternative energy is cogeneration. It’s not renewable; it’s alternative, but it significantly reduces CO₂ emissions because it replaces other kinds of energy that are generated through fuel. So we can’t throw out “alternative energy” and think that we’re improving the bill because we simply would not be. I urge all members to defeat this amendment.

The Deputy Chair: The hon. Member for Calgary-Buffalo.

Mr. Hehr: Thank you very much. It pleases me to rise and speak to the amendment. I just listened to the hon. Minister of Environment. Nonetheless, I am somewhat concerned that in this bill as it’s

written, alternative energy could be used to fund some sort of nuclear alternative energy program at some time in the future that should, if we go down that path as Albertans, be covered as a joint project between industry and government on new spending initiatives or whatever. It should be totally clear that this fund is set up to reduce emissions but through other means, like renewable energy. I just heard your explanation on the other method of reducing emissions that obviously is an alternative energy. Nonetheless, I would feel more comfortable with this if the amendment just said "not nuclear." If that even was included as an addendum at the bottom, that would be fair enough, and we could go on from there.

Thank you very much for allowing me to speak on that amendment.

The Deputy Chair: The hon. leader of the third party.

Mr. Mason: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I just want to respond to the minister's comments of a moment ago when he cited cogeneration as an alternative form of energy production which would be excluded if the amendment were passed. But let me just review for a second what the clause that we're proposing to amend in the existing act actually says: "demonstration and use of new technologies that emphasize reductions in specified gas emissions through the use of alternative energy and renewable energy sources." So it says both in the existing clause. Our amendment would take out "alternative energy" and leave "renewable energy" in.

Now, to deal with the minister's point. I guess I don't want to quibble about definitions and semantics, but the minister talks about cogeneration as an alternative form. Well, cogeneration is merely using existing traditional sources of energy – could be boiler, could be gas turbine, something like that – and using the energy from that more efficiently. Subclause (a) of the same clause of the bill deals with "energy conservation and energy efficiency." So I would submit, Mr. Chairman, that the example cited by the minister is certainly covered by (a) of this clause, and it would not be necessary in order to make sure that the fund could be used with respect to those types of developments.

It's pretty clear from the way this is laid out and the wording of (c) that alternative energy means nuclear power. I believe that we need to clearly either strike it entirely or put in some alternative language which would allow non-nuclear alternative energy if that is not already covered by the other clauses of the bill.

So, Mr. Chairman, I don't think the minister has dealt with this concern to my satisfaction, and I would still urge members to support the amendment.

The Deputy Chair: Any other members wish to speak to the amendment?

I'll call the question on amendment A1 as proposed by the hon. leader of the third party.

[Motion on amendment A1 lost]

The Deputy Chair: Back to the bill. Any other members wish to speak? The hon. Member for Calgary-Buffalo.

Mr. Hehr: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I rise tonight to speak in favour of this bill as it is at least a step forward for this government on a road to eventually, hopefully, meeting our commitments to future generations of Albertans as well as future generations of citizens of this world. I say that in all sincerity because it is, actually, quite a leap from only four short years ago, when this government would not even recognize global warming as an actual, real phenomenon that was threatening future generations of Albertans like my nephews, Marshall and Jackson, who are three and one, who I look

at as one of the reasons I'm involved in government, to try to make our Alberta a little bit more environmentally friendly.

From what I've seen to date, this bill at least gets us sort of along that path albeit a long way from where it should be. Part of the reason I say that is that this bill, this amendment is set up on what is called reducing intensity emissions. Let's face it. Reducing the intensity of oil: sure, that's all great, that's well and good, but it simply has no impact on climate change if you look at the full-scale development we are doing here in Alberta. What intensity targets mean is that, yes, you have to reduce the intensity of your production on a barrel of oil, but simply put you can keep developing as many barrels of oil as you see fit and keep doing it indefinitely. That's what, in fact, we have done here in Alberta.

While we say we're reducing through this gesture – I'll call it a minimal gesture at best, this 12 per cent reduction in intensity target – it really doesn't do anything to solve our climate change problems. In fact, it actually exacerbates it. We here in Alberta are simply producing more and more oil. I realize we're sitting on 20 per cent of the world's stock, but needless to say we've got to have actual reductions to what we're going to produce. I don't know. I don't have all the answers. Nonetheless, I know that if industry out there were significantly pressured into doing something, they could do a much better job at it than we're currently doing.

What are governments put in place to do? Well, they're put in place to shape markets, okay? I realize the \$15 a tonne on targets that can't reach the intensity reductions, yes, is one of the methods this government has chosen to shape the marketplace. However, I would suggest that it's still not enough. We should be looking at really putting some teeth into this amendment and into this bill in general which will get the industry using its powers of ingenuity in the right direction and reducing their actual emissions and getting on with the business of making our Alberta and this world a more environmentally friendly place.

9:10

Simply put, if you read the vast majority of literature out there, climate change is the biggest hurdle that is facing humanity in the future. [interjection] Well, I realize that there's an economic component to this, too, as the hon. minister across said. I realize that. I don't want to live in a tent, either. But I tell you what. Forty years from now I don't want to be looking at people and saying: "Hey, I guess it was right. All those tree huggers or whatever, they were right, yet we continued to produce and produce and produce. Sure, many of us got to take two and three vacations a year to Hawaii on big jet planes. Some of us even got to go on cruises that were really nice, and some of us went and did this."

Hey, I like doing that stuff, too. But let's face it here. We live three times better than our grandparents did as a society if you look at the overall amount of consumption that we have. If we're looking at everything in an economic argument, I'll tell you what: my dad grew up in a 800 square foot house with six people living in it, and guess what? He thought we had lots of room. Now, those same six people believe they need 2,400 square foot houses. So do we think we're living better? Well, probably not. Do you know what I'm saying? It's just a bigger house. It takes more heat, more fossil fuels.

I'll leave it that economic arguments do factor in, but it's not the be-all, end-all when you really look at the way humanity has existed, the way our climate has gotten along as a viable ecosystem for many millions of generations. Now, over the last 100 years we have decided to change how that planet, to put it in economic terms, has done business, okay? We are messing with the way our ecosystem does business, and breaking everything down to an economic argument is simply silly. At least, that's from my point of view.

Nevertheless, that's the reason why I actually am in favour of this. It gets us on with the business of the day of trying to set an appropriate price to carbon. Maybe at some point in time we'll revisit this legislation as we do have some sort of mechanism whereby we can change the price of this. We can change from intensity targets to actual limits, and it won't be such a foreign concept to this government. We can move on with actually making the world a better place.

Things cannot always be broken down to economic arguments. There have to be other arguments, and we're smarter than just saying: if this impacts the economy, we won't do anything. Well, if it impacts the way humanity is going to survive, I tell you what: we'd better include other arguments besides the economic one, despite what the hon. minister mentioned.

Anyway, I digress. I'm done speaking about this amendment. Thank you.

The Deputy Chair: Are you ready for the question on Bill 8?

Hon. Members: Question.

[The clauses of Bill 8 agreed to]

[Title and preamble agreed to]

The Deputy Chair: Shall the bill be reported? Are you agreed?

Hon. Members: Agreed.

The Deputy Chair: Opposed? That's carried.

The hon. Deputy Government House Leader.

Mr. Renner: Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman. I move that the committee now rise and report Bill 8.

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Mitzel in the chair]

Mr. Olson: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has had under consideration certain bills, and the committee reports the following bill: Bill 8.

The Acting Speaker: Does the Assembly concur in the report?

Hon. Members: Concur.

The Acting Speaker: Opposed? So ordered.

Government Bills and Orders Second Reading

Bill 27 Funeral Services Amendment Act, 2008

[Adjourned debate October 16: Mr. Johnson]

The Acting Speaker: The hon. Member for Calgary-Varsity.

Mr. Chase: Thank you very much. I rise to debate Bill 27, which is a good bill, and I'd like to go over some of the reasons why it's such a good bill. It compels funeral service businesses to cancel prepaid funeral contracts if requested to do so by persons named in the act. So it gives people an opportunity; if they're not pleased with the package that initially they paid for, it gives them an out, which is a very good consumer protection item. It also has legislation in it

that any income earned on trust deposits from prepaid contracts must be kept in trust until the funeral is performed or the contract is cancelled and the money refunded. Another consumer protection item.

It involves authorizing the director of funeral services to designate trust corporations. It prohibits the solicitation of consumers for the purpose of transferring prepaid contracts. It permits the director to sanction funeral service businesses by placing conditions on their licences, and obviously that type of regulating an industry that could get very creative, as we've seen in the States, is extremely important.

It revamps the appeal provisions by specifying the conditions that must be met; adding a filing fee; requiring the appellant to pay charges for preparing documents in advance; setting up an appeal panel clarifying, updating, and separating the inspection and investigation process in the legislation. And you know how supportive we are of legislation. It authorizes the director to publish information relating to disciplinary actions taken against funeral service businesses, allowing the same information to be disclosed to other jurisdictions, allowing the director to publish a list of persons licensed under the act.

Again, this is all about consumer protection not only within the community but, as it notes, in other jurisdictions. A person can't simply take up residence in another jurisdiction and carry on what had been an unsatisfactory act, so people are protected.

It authorizes the director to levy administrative penalties for contraventions of the act or regulations. Again, if something is done poorly, it needs to be pointed out, and there have to be consequences. It strengthens the liability protection given to the Alberta Funeral Services Regulatory Board and extends the liability protection to members of the appeal board.

It adds some regulation-making ability to allow the minister to identify administrative penalties, the amounts, and when they'll be imposed. I would very much like a committee of the Legislature to be involved in advising the minister on the types of regulations in the way of administrative penalties, the amounts, and when they'll be imposed, and hopefully we'll have an advisory role.

Also, it sets out procedure for disbursing unclaimed trust funds, establishing fees for appeals, specifying items to be placed in a casket or with cremated remains, and modifying licensing requirements for funeral directors and embalmers in the event of a pandemic. We hope that never happens, but given the bird flu and the SARS, we need to be prepared for such a circumstance. Hopefully, it will never take place, but forewarned is forearmed.

Therefore, I support the bill, and I would move adjournment at this time.

[Motion to adjourn debate carried]

9:20

Bill 28 Jury Amendment Act, 2008

[Adjourned debate October 16: Mr. Hancock]

The Acting Speaker: Do other members wish to speak? The hon. Member for Calgary-Buffalo.

Mr. Hehr: Well, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It gives me some pleasure to rise in support of this amendment to the act as it appears to make things a little bit clearer and a little bit better for our jury system. This act has the effect of excluding some members who have been convicted of a summary offence – that's a less serious charge under section 787 of the Criminal Code of Canada with a maximum prison sentence of six months and a fine of no more than \$2,000 – that could be eligible to serve on a jury.

The amendment changes this to exclude them unless they have obtained a pardon. In essence, this eliminates some of the people

who could formerly take part in our juries and who may possibly not be ready to serve on a jury or to take part in a jury in a perfect sort of state of being able to analyze the criminal justice system and to pass judgment on their fellow peers. It does provide a mechanism by which those individuals are not permanently excluded from participating on a jury as they can obtain a pardon at a future date should they wish to be allowed to serve on juries in the future.

I support this motion as it will ensure the smooth operation of the courts and will allow for, I believe, a more productive jury pool to go forward and be able to judge people who have been involved in various civil and criminal trials that go on from day to day in our province.

As we're aware, Mr. Speaker, the selection of juries is not an everyday occurrence. Let's face it; I think this is one of those safety mechanisms that we put in place to ensure that people who are going through a trial are given the opportunity of having their case heard by individuals who are both competent and understand what they are being faced with and have no biases for or against the jury deliberation process.

I am in favour of the bill, and I thank you for the opportunity of speaking in favour of it.

The Acting Speaker: Under Standing Order 29(2)(a) a five-minute period is available for comments or questions.

The hon. Member for Calgary-Varsity.

Mr. Chase: Thank you. My esteemed and, I might note, young, inspiring colleague from Calgary-Buffalo has pointed out the benefits of Bill 28 in clearly clarifying who should be on a jury, what restrictions apply to individuals serving on a jury, and the fact that if an individual for some reason is not able to participate at a particular trial, they are not excluded from future opportunities. So we have another example of a very forthright bill which clarifies positions and improves the system of justice. Therefore, I would call for adjournment on debate over Bill 28 at this time.

[Motion to adjourn debate carried]

Bill 30

Alberta Evidence Amendment Act, 2008

[Adjourned debate October 16: Mr. Bhullar]

The Acting Speaker: Do any members wish to speak? The hon. Member for Calgary-Buffalo.

Mr. Hehr: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I gives me great pleasure again to rise and speak for this amendment to the Alberta Evidence Act. This act will amend the Alberta Evidence Act through the addition of a new section, 26.1. This addition introduces the effect of an apology on liability. For the purposes of this act "apology" means an expression of sympathy or regret, a statement that one is sorry or any other words or actions indicating contrition or commiseration, whether or not the words or actions admit or imply an admission of fault in connection with the matter to which the words or actions relate.

Some lawyer got paid probably in the midst of a certain amount of a large sum to make that wording.

Nonetheless, it is what we otherwise call living in a civil society. I think this is a great amendment to the act that allows, for instance, that individuals who have been in a car accident can turn to each other and say, "Jeepers, I'm sorry this happened," or in the case of the medical situation where a doctor or a nurse or some other practitioner has made an error, they can say to an individual, "Jeepers, I'm sorry," without it being used them against them in a

court of law. We can see that this is more allowing for human empathy and emotion in such a way that although we're not often, if we've been in a car accident or in a situation like that, maybe admitting guilt, we are still feeling compassion and still feeling empathy for the individual who has been involved in these circumstances.

On that note, I really think that this is a move in the correct direction. It allows for health care professionals to deal openly and honestly with their patients and their families to improve patient safety. I also think that it just helps in other situations of life where people should not be afraid to express apology for being in a situation even if it's not their fault, just something that has happened. It can really help individuals acknowledge harm that they have either accidentally done to a person or that has been done to them and just move on with their day. I think it makes it a lot easier.

9:30

From being involved in the legal system as a lawyer, I know that many times clients simply say: I'm in it for an apology. You know, sometimes that apology could be administered earlier rather than later. It may actually save some time and reduce people's expenditures of hiring a lawyer and also may just help people understand and respect people as individuals.

Further, I also note that this is being done in other jurisdictions, and it has been recommended by Canadian law reform groups.

I believe it's a very good amendment, and I'm glad that Mr. Bhullar is bringing it forward. Again, I will be supporting this amendment. Thank you very much.

The Acting Speaker: The hon. Member for Calgary-Varsity.

Mr. Chase: Thank you very much. I congratulate the government. Tonight you've hit three out of the park, three in a row. I also want it noted in *Hansard* that when you propose good legislation, debate is simple. It's a matter of agreeing and moving on. However, I just want to tell you why it's good. It addresses . . . [interjection] Yeah, it's hard to run around the bases when you've got the minister of health grabbing onto your ankle and, you know, preventing you from getting from second to third.

The reason I support this legislation is that it's one of the closest approaches this government has come to whistle-blower legislation. This is something that the Liberal caucus has been in favour of because it creates a climate of transparency and accountability. We'll talk about some of the areas where it creates this climate. What it does is allow a person to apologize without fear of the apology being used against them when their claim may reach the courts. That's the whole point of whistle-blower legislation. You've made a mistake, admit it, get on with it. Let's get to the healing process as opposed to recriminations and court confrontations. Simply, it allows for the ability to offer a sincere apology without legal consequences. Apologies, we know, can take away hard feelings, help resolve disputes, and reduce the number of lengthy, costly lawsuits. This is one manner in which this can be fostered.

A central reason for this amendment is to serve the health care community. It would allow health care professionals to deal openly and honestly with their patients and their families and improve patient safety. That's what the Calgary health region has been trying to accomplish over the last number of years. They've had public forums where formal apologies have been given and explanations as to how the mistakes that were made would be prevented in the future. We've managed to move on and have a more appropriate response in the future because of admissions made in the past. It should all be about moving forward.

In addition, this bill would allow individuals and organizations such as hospitals and other public institutions to apologize for an

accident or wrongdoing without it being used as evidence. It would help victims to acknowledge that while harm has been done to them, there was no intent, and there is true sincerity in the apology. It would improve transparency and accountability because of the frank interaction/discussion between patients and health care providers. It gives the person who has been wronged a legitimate voice, and it gives the person who by accident did the wronging an opportunity to make immediate amends. It enhances the affordability and speed of the justice system by fostering the resolution of civil disputes and shortening or avoiding litigation. As the Minister of Justice has pointed out, it's much better to resolve the situation through a collaborative, consultative method than to bring it to trial. Trials are costly, extremely time-consuming, and sometimes the different jurisdictions have trouble with each other in terms of court rulings.

We have a precedent. This type of legislation has already been passed in many other jurisdictions, including the government of Canada. Ontario, B.C., Saskatchewan, and Manitoba all have a version of an apology act. Most Australian states and over 30 U.S. states have passed some form of an apology act. In Ontario their apology act was supported by the nurses' union, the Ontario Hospital Association, and the Ontario Bar Association. To the people most directly affected, including the lawyers who are quite often demeaned and it's suggested that they're ambulance chasers or looking for an opportunity to make a buck at someone's circumstance, it proves that that is a false precept. It's a false precept that I know my brother, a lawyer, and my son-in-law, a lawyer, would greatly appreciate. So everybody's needs are resolved; they're met with this move. I am pleased to see that Alberta is following in the logical footsteps of other provinces that have formerly passed this legislation.

I would therefore, Mr. Speaker, move for adjournment on Bill 30, the Alberta Evidence Amendment Act.

[Motion to adjourn debate carried]

Bill 32 Meat Inspection Amendment Act, 2008

The Acting Speaker: The hon. Member for Battle River-Wainwright.

Mr. Griffiths: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to rise today and move second reading of Bill 32, the Meat Inspection Amendment Act, 2008.

The amendments will enable the transfer of inspection responsibility for mobile butcher facilities to Agriculture and Rural Development from regional health authorities under Alberta Health and Wellness. The two ministries have agreed that Agriculture and Rural Development should assume responsibility and enforce authority in respect of mobile butcher facilities. A mobile butcher facility is where a mobile butcher will be able to prepare, package, and store meat from an animal that has been slaughtered on the owner's premises, in a provincially licensed abattoir, or in a federally registered establishment.

The bill sets a basis for regulatory changes. It will deal with licensing and inspection of mobile butcher facilities. A mobile butcher is a provincially licensed person who slaughters an owner's animal on the owner's premises. Currently, meat inspection legislation administered by Agriculture and Rural Development only provides authority for licensing mobile butchers as individuals. Regulatory oversight of mobile butcher facilities comes within the scope of the food regulation administered by Health and Wellness.

Amending the Meat Inspection Act to enable licensing and inspection will bring mobile butcher facilities under Agriculture and Rural Development's legislative authority. The proposed amend-

ment will reduce administrative duplication while promoting a consistent approach to food safety. The transfer of responsibilities will address gaps recognized by the Auditor General of Alberta in the delivery of food safety programs within the province.

With the passage of Bill 32 Agriculture and Rural Development will be responsible for inspecting the meat processing facilities of mobile butchers. Agriculture and Rural Development will work with mobile butchers to facilitate a smooth transition so there is little or no disruption to their operations, Mr. Speaker. These amendments will not affect the ability of mobile butchers to slaughter animals on the animal owner's property for consumption by the members of the household.

Bill 32 is evidence that the Alberta government is committed to the goal of continued excellence in food safety. The transfer of the meat processing facilities promotes an integrated approach to inspection that will help to ensure food safety, Mr. Speaker. Ag and Rural Development currently works with all provincially licensed abattoirs to ensure that safe meat-processing practices are in place.

9:40

Similarly, Agriculture and Rural Development will work with mobile butchers to promote consistent application of meat facility standards and food safety practices. Ag and Rural Development does not anticipate that the changes in the regulatory requirements will create undue financial burdens for mobile butchers. The department recently completed an assessment of mobile butcher facilities. The proposed amendments will help to further enhance good food safety practices, including the introduction of written procedures on food safety processes.

There is a very small percentage of meat facilities that will require improvement in construction standards, Mr. Speaker. The department is prepared to work with those operators to facilitate upgrading the meat facility to achieve construction standards. As well, the department will continue to work with Health and Wellness and regional health authorities to ensure that enhanced quality food safety services are available for Albertans.

I'm very mindful of the need to support and where possible enhance food safety, Mr. Speaker. The issue of food safety has received a great deal of media attention lately, and Bill 32 was under development long before the recent listeria outbreak in federally inspected meat facilities in Ontario came to light. The listeriosis outbreak reinforces the importance of Bill 32 and its focus on ensuring a consistent approach to food safety in Alberta. We're working toward a single delivery system under the authority of Agriculture and Rural Development which will ensure that mobile butcher facilities operate according to approved food safety standards.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I encourage all members of this House to support Bill 32 at second reading. With that, I'd like to adjourn debate.

[Motion to adjourn debate carried]

Bill 33 Agriculture Financial Services Amendment Act, 2008

The Acting Speaker: The hon. Minister of Environment on behalf of the hon. Minister of Agriculture and Rural Development.

Mr. Renner: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On behalf of the Minister of Agriculture and Rural Development I'm pleased to move second reading of Bill 33, Agriculture Financial Services Amendment Act, 2008.

The Acting Speaker: The hon. Member for Battle River-Wainwright.

Mr. Griffiths: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I've been involved in the development of Bill 33 in my capacity as parliamentary assistant to the hon. Minister of Agriculture and Rural Development. I'm pleased to provide members with an overview of the two key recommendations put forward by Bill 33.

Firstly, the amendments will provide authority for the Agriculture Financial Services Corporation, also commonly known as AFSC, to deliver a livestock insurance program.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, the bill will move the financial limitation at section 29(1). The maximum amount for loans or guarantees to or for a single entity will be moved from the act to the Agriculture Financial Services regulation.

As background, AFSC draws its legislative authority from the Agriculture Financial Services Act and the Agriculture Financial Services regulation that supports it. AFSC is a provincial Crown corporation with a private-sector board that provides loans to farmers, agribusinesses, and other small businesses and also crop insurance and farm income stability programs. AFSC has provided Alberta farmers with hail insurance for the past 70 years and has grown into a diverse corporation, Mr. Speaker.

Bill 33 will provide authority for AFSC to offer livestock insurance programs in addition to the crop insurance programs it currently offers. Currently there are limited options for managing major livestock risks. Livestock producers are seeking industry risk protection. This legislation, Mr. Speaker, will allow AFSC to better respond to the unique needs of all Alberta's producers with agricultural product insurance, an already well-understood concept.

I've been closely monitoring the state of the livestock industry. As you know, on June 5 our government announced the Alberta livestock and meat strategy. The strategy is designed to create a competitive and sustainable environment that helps Alberta's livestock industry successfully manage change and cope with the challenges currently beyond its control. A key component of the strategy is a cattle price insurance, a made-in-Alberta solution tailored for Alberta cattle producers. There are no private or public products available in Canada that directly address price and market risk for livestock producers, including the difference between U.S. and Alberta cattle prices. CPIP was initiated by Alberta beef producers and was developed through a partnership between industry and government. Alberta is the first of its kind to offer this kind of product to add sustainable strategic capacity in protecting livestock businesses from price and market risks.

CPIP will provide a price guarantee at the time the policy is purchased, a payout that occurs if the Alberta price is lower than the guarantee. Premiums would vary according to the policy length and the price guarantee level selected. Producers would be able to purchase insurance for various time periods between 12 and 36 weeks. CPIP will help support long-term industry stability and growth, further reducing reliance on short-term income support programs that are typically provided by the government.

As mentioned, the bill also proposes to move the financial limitation in subsection 29(1). The maximum total of loans or guarantees outstanding at any time to any individual or any single entity will be moved from the act to the Agriculture Financial Services regulation. The maximum loan amount will be increased also from \$2 million to \$5 million when enacted in this regulation.

AFSC is seeking regulatory flexibility and an increased lending limit to address the Premier's mandate to enhance access to capital through AFSC. With escalating construction costs and land values, labour shortages and general tightening of credit by other financial institutions, Mr. Speaker, current lending limits for AFSC are not

sufficient to meet the needs of its customers. Moving the maximum loan or guarantee amount to the regulation will grant AFSC greater flexibility to respond quickly in meeting the increasing loan capital requirements of producers and other services by AFSC.

I look forward to hearing the comments and receiving support from all members on the second reading of Bill 33. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

With that, I move to adjourn debate.

[Motion to adjourn debate carried]

Bill 34

Employment Pension Plans Amendment Act, 2008

Dr. Brown: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to move second reading of Bill 34, the Employment Pension Plans Amendment Act, 2008.

This is the act which governs and sets standards for private-sector pensions in Alberta. The current reciprocal agreement with the federal pension regulator in other provinces was drafted in 1967 and no longer meets the needs of government regulators. The Canadian Association of Pension Supervisory Authorities, of which Alberta is a member, has developed a new multilateral agreement to replace the existing reciprocal agreement, and this bill will allow the implementation of such agreement. I will address the implications of the bill in further detail at a later date.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would move adjournment of debate on Bill 34.

[Motion to adjourn debate carried]

Bill 36

Land Titles Amendment Act, 2008

Dr. Brown: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to move second reading of Bill 36, the Land Titles Amendment Act, 2008.

The purpose of this bill is to create a searchable database, the pending registration queue, for documents that have been submitted to but not yet processed by the Alberta land titles office. This will allow the public to view registrations that are pending against the property they are dealing with so that they can make an informed decision on whether to proceed. In addition, the bill will clarify that in Alberta the assurance claim coverage for nonfraudulent purchasers begins as soon as an instrument is registered, a position that has come into question as a result of some recent court rulings in other jurisdictions.

Mr. Speaker, I will address in more specific detail the provisions of Bill 36 but at this time would move that the Assembly adjourn debate on Bill 36.

[Motion to adjourn debate carried]

The Acting Speaker: The hon. Deputy Government House Leader.

Mr. Renner: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Given the hour and the good work that we got done this evening, I would like to move that we stand adjourned until 1:30 tomorrow afternoon.

[Motion carried; at 9:50 p.m. the Assembly adjourned to Tuesday at 1:30 p.m.]

Table of Contents

Monday evening, October 20, 2008

Motions Other than Government Motions	
Calgary Urban Infrastructure Planning	1407
Government Bills and Orders	
Committee of the Whole	
Bill 8 Climate Change and Emissions Management Amendment Act, 2008	1412
Government Bills and Orders	
Second Reading	
Bill 27 Funeral Services Amendment Act, 2008	1417
Bill 28 Jury Amendment Act, 2008	1417
Bill 30 Alberta Evidence Amendment Act, 2008	1418
Bill 32 Meat Inspection Amendment Act, 2008	1419
Bill 33 Agriculture Financial Services Amendment Act, 2008	1419
Bill 34 Employment Pension Plans Amendment Act, 2008	1420
Bill 36 Land Titles Amendment Act, 2008	1420

COMMITTEES OF THE ALBERTA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

Standing Committee on the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund

Chair: Mrs. Forsyth
Deputy Chair: Mr. Elniski
Blakeman
DeLong

Denis
Johnston

Kang
Notley

Olson

Standing Committee on Community Services

Chair: Mr. Rodney
Deputy Chair: Mr. Hehr
Benito
Bhardwaj
Chase

Doerksen
Johnson

Johnston
Lukaszuk

Notley
Sarich

Standing Committee on the Economy

Chair: Mr. Allred
Deputy Chair: Mr. Taylor
Amery
Bhullar
Blakeman

Campbell
Marz

Mason
McFarland

Weadick
Xiao

Select Special Ethics Commissioner Search Committee

Chair: Mr. Campbell
Deputy Chair: Mr. Marz
Blakeman
Lukaszuk

Lund
MacDonald

Mitzel
Notley

Webber

Standing Committee on Health

Chair: Mr. Horne
Deputy Chair: Ms Pastoor
Dallas
Denis
Fawcett

Notley
Olson

Quest
Sherman

Swann
Vandermeer

Standing Committee on Legislative Offices

Chair: Mr. Mitzel
Deputy Chair: Mr. Lund
Bhullar
Blakeman
Campbell

Horne
Lukaszuk

MacDonald
Marz

Notley
Webber

Special Standing Committee on Members' Services

Chair: Mr. Kowalski
Deputy Chair: Mr. Oberle
Elniski
Hehr
Leskiw

Mason
Rodney

Snelgrove
Taylor

VanderBurg
Weadick

Standing Committee on Private Bills

Chair: Dr. Brown
Deputy Chair: Ms Woo-Paw
Allred
Amery
Anderson
Benito
Boutilier

Calahasen
Dallas
Doerksen
Fawcett
Forsyth

Jacobs
MacDonald
McQueen
Olson
Quest

Sandhu
Sarich
Swann
Xiao

Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, Standing Orders and Printing

Chair: Mr. Prins
Deputy Chair: Mr. Hancock
Amery
Berger
Bhardwaj
Calahasen
DeLong

Doerksen
Forsyth
Johnson
Leskiw
Liepert

McFarland
Notley
Oberle
Pastoor
Rogers

Sherman
Stevens
Taylor
Zwozdesky

Standing Committee on Public Accounts

Chair: Mr. MacDonald
Deputy Chair: Mr. Griffiths
Benito
Bhardwaj
Chase
Dallas

Denis
Drysdale
Fawcett
Jacobs

Johnson
Kang
Mason
Quest

Sandhu
Vandermeer
Woo-Paw

Standing Committee on Public Safety and Services

Chair: Mr. VanderBurg
Deputy Chair: Mr. Kang
Anderson
Brown
Calahasen

Cao
Jacobs

MacDonald
Notley

Sandhu
Woo-Paw

Standing Committee on Resources and Environment

Chair: Mr. Prins
Deputy Chair: Dr. Swann
Berger
Boutilier
Drysdale

Griffiths
Hehr

Mason
McQueen

Oberle
Webber

If your address is incorrect, please clip on the dotted line, make any changes, and return to the address listed below. To facilitate the update, please attach the last mailing label along with your account number.

Subscriptions
Legislative Assembly Office
1001 Legislature Annex
9718 - 107 Street
EDMONTON AB T5K 1E4

Last mailing label:

Account # _____

New information:

Name _____

Address _____

Subscription information:

Annual subscriptions to the paper copy of *Alberta Hansard* (including annual index) are \$127.50 including GST if mailed once a week or \$94.92 including GST if picked up at the subscription address below or if mailed through the provincial government interdepartmental mail system. Bound volumes are \$121.70 including GST if mailed. Cheques should be made payable to the Minister of Finance.

Price per issue is \$0.75 including GST.

On-line access to *Alberta Hansard* is available through the Internet at www.assembly.ab.ca

Address subscription inquiries to Subscriptions, Legislative Assembly Office, 1001 Legislature Annex, 9718 - 107 St., EDMONTON AB T5K 1E4, telephone 427-1302.

Address other inquiries to Managing Editor, *Alberta Hansard*, 1001 Legislature Annex, 9718 - 107 St., EDMONTON AB T5K 1E4, telephone 427-1875.

