



Province of Alberta

The 27th Legislature
Fourth Session

Alberta Hansard

Tuesday evening, May 10, 2011

Issue 33e

The Honourable Kenneth R. Kowalski, Speaker

Legislative Assembly of Alberta
The 27th Legislature

Fourth 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

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

Officers and Officials of the Legislative Assembly

Clerk	W.J. David McNeil	Committee Research Co-ordinator	Philip Massolin
Law Clerk/Director of Interparliamentary Relations	Robert H. Reynolds, QC	Sergeant-at-Arms	Brian G. Hodgson
Senior Parliamentary Counsel/ Director of House Services	Shannon Dean	Assistant Sergeant-at-Arms	Chris Caughell
Parliamentary Counsel	Stephanie LeBlanc	Assistant Sergeant-at-Arms	Gordon H. Munk
		Managing Editor of <i>Alberta Hansard</i>	Liz Sim

Party standings:

Progressive Conservative: 67 Alberta Liberal: 8 Wildrose Alliance: 4 New Democrat: 2 Alberta: 1 Independent: 1

Executive Council

Ed Stelmach	Premier, President of Executive Council, Chair of Agenda and Priorities Committee, Vice-chair of Treasury Board, Liaison to the Canadian Armed Forces
Lloyd Snelgrove	President of the Treasury Board, Minister of Finance and Enterprise
Dave Hancock	Minister of Education, Political Minister for Edmonton
Iris Evans	Minister of International and Intergovernmental Relations
Mel Knight	Minister of Sustainable Resource Development
Luke Ouellette	Minister of Transportation
Rob Renner	Minister of Environment
Verlyn Olson	Minister of Justice and Attorney General
Yvonne Fritz	Minister of Children and Youth Services, Political Minister for Calgary
Jack Hayden	Minister of Agriculture and Rural Development, Political Minister for Rural Alberta
Ray Danyluk	Minister of Infrastructure
Gene Zwozdesky	Minister of Health and Wellness
Ron Liepert	Minister of Energy
Mary Anne Jablonski	Minister of Seniors and Community Supports
Len Webber	Minister of Aboriginal Relations
Heather Klimchuk	Minister of Service Alberta
Lindsay Blackett	Minister of Culture and Community Spirit
Cindy Ady	Minister of Tourism, Parks and Recreation
Hector Goudreau	Minister of Municipal Affairs
Frank Oberle	Solicitor General and Minister of Public Security
Jonathan Denis	Minister of Housing and Urban Affairs
Thomas Lukaszuk	Minister of Employment and Immigration
Greg Weadick	Minister of Advanced Education and Technology

Parliamentary Assistants

Evan Berger	Sustainable Resource Development
Manmeet Singh Bhullar	Municipal Affairs
Cal Dallas	Finance and Enterprise
Fred Horne	Health and Wellness
Broyce Jacobs	Agriculture and Rural Development
Jeff Johnson	Treasury Board (Oil Sands Sustainable Development Secretariat)
Diana McQueen	Energy
Janice Sarich	Education
Teresa Woo-Paw	Employment and Immigration

STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Standing Committee on the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund

Chair: Ms Tarchuk
Deputy Chair: Mr. Elniski

DeLong
Forsyth
Groeneveld
Johnston
MacDonald
Quest
Taft

Standing Committee on Community Services

Chair: Mr. Doerksen
Deputy Chair: Mr. Hehr

Allred
Anderson
Benito
Bhullar
Chase
Johnston
Notley
Rodney
Sarich
Taylor

Standing Committee on the Economy

Chair: Mr. Bhardwaj
Deputy Chair: Mr. Chase

Amery
Dallas
Fawcett
Hinman
Johnson
Lund
Taft
Tarchuk
Taylor
Woo-Paw

Standing Committee on Health

Chair: Mr. McFarland
Deputy Chair: Ms Pastoor

Forsyth
Griffiths
Groeneveld
Horne
Lindsay
Notley
Quest
Sherman
Swann
Vandermeer

Standing Committee on Legislative Offices

Chair: Mr. Mitzel
Deputy Chair: Mr. Lund

Bhullar
Blakeman
Campbell
Hinman
Lindsay
MacDonald
Marz
Notley
Quest
Rogers

Special Standing Committee on Members' Services

Chair: Mr. Kowalski
Deputy Chair: Mr. Campbell

Amery
Anderson
Bhullar
Elniski
Hehr
Leskiw
Mason
Pastoor
Rogers
VanderBurg

Standing Committee on Private Bills

Chair: Dr. Brown
Deputy Chair: Ms Woo-Paw

Allred Kang
Benito Lindsay
Boutilier McQueen
Calahasen Morton
Dallas Redford
Doerksen Sandhu
Drysdale Sarich
Hinman Taft
Horner Xiao
Jacobs

Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, Standing Orders and Printing

Chair: Mr. Prins
Deputy Chair: Mr. Hancock

Amery Lindsay
Berger McFarland
Calahasen Mitzel
DeLong Notley
Doerksen Pastoor
Forsyth Quest
Groeneveld Sherman
Hinman Tarchuk
Jacobs Taylor
Leskiw

Standing Committee on Public Accounts

Chair: Mr. MacDonald
Deputy Chair: Mr. Rodney

Allred Griffiths
Anderson Groeneveld
Benito Kang
Calahasen Mason
Chase Sandhu
Dallas Vandermeer
Elniski Xiao
Fawcett

Standing Committee on Public Safety and Services

Chair: Mr. Drysdale
Deputy Chair: Mr. Kang

Boutilier
Brown
Calahasen
Cao
Forsyth
Johnson
MacDonald
Rogers
Sandhu
Xiao

Standing Committee on Resources and Environment

Chair: Mr. Prins
Deputy Chair: Ms Blakeman

Anderson
Berger
Boutilier
Hehr
Jacobs
Marz
Mason
McQueen
Mitzel
VanderBurg

Select Special Ombudsman Search Committee

Chair: Mr. Mitzel
Deputy Chair: Mr. Lund

Blakeman
Hinman
Lindsay
Marz
Notley
Quest
Rogers

Legislative Assembly of Alberta

7:30 p.m.

Tuesday, May 10, 2011

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 16 Energy Statutes Amendment Act, 2011

The Deputy Chair: Are there any comments, questions, amendments to be offered with respect to this bill?

Some Hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Chase: We all wish. It's not you wish; it's we all wish to-night.

With regard to Bill 16, Energy Statutes Amendment Act, 2011, I had already expressed my opinion that for the most part I was supportive of Bill 16. There is concern, however, in our caucus – and it's important to get that concern on the record – that this is such a complex bill that while we've received a certain amount of briefings and we appreciate the briefings that we've received, there are still unanswered questions as to the extent of this bill.

We continue to have concerns with regard to the sequestration aspects of it. We have a good understanding of the value of the coal resource, as I pointed out when I first spoke to this bill, and the idea of the gasification of coal I very much appreciate. The underground process involved is somewhat of a concern based on the sequestration elements involved. The government has chosen to spend \$2 billion on carbon sequestration, which is not an absolutely solid-proof science, but that large commitment of funds is a concern to us. The federal government has kicked in approximately a billion dollars, so we've got \$3 billion worth of taxpayers' funds riding on this, and we don't have a similar commitment from industry. In other words, there isn't a \$6 billion pool out there should things not work as we would hope. Industry to a large extent has been left off the hook on this particular bill just as they're left off the hook when we get to be talking about Bill 10.

Those are the primary concerns that we have. The idea of the regulatory framework is important. Obviously, we need those regulations. We'd like to see the role of the ERCB in terms of the regulatory process strengthened. As I mentioned before, and I don't want to go into detail again: the possibility of the regular gasification of coal as opposed to putting it up the chimney, as is currently the process, and adding to the pollution. Despite Premier Klein's assertions there is no such thing as clean coal. We have cleaner versions of coal in Alberta, but it's a myth to suggest that there is no pollution associated with the burning of coal. Whether it's turned into a synthetic gas or not, there are still emissions that have to be dealt with.

Those primarily, Mr. Chair, are the concerns that I have over Bill 16. The complexity, as I say, will hopefully not come back to bite us at some point in the future.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

The Deputy Chair: Any other members wish to speak?
Seeing none, I will call the question.

[The clauses of Bill 16 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 is carried.
The hon. Deputy Government House Leader.

Mr. Zwozdesky: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and thank you to all members for their support at this juncture of Committee of the Whole on Bill 16. I would move that we now rise and report the Energy Statutes Amendment Act, 2011, otherwise known as Bill 16.

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Mitzel in the chair]

The Acting Speaker: The hon. Member for Whitecourt-St. Anne.

Mr. VanderBurg: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Committee of the Whole has had under consideration a certain bill. The committee reports the following bill: Bill 16.

Thank you, sir.

The Acting Speaker: All those members that concur with the report, please say aye.

Hon. Members: Aye.

The Acting Speaker: Opposed, please say no. So ordered.

Government Bills and Orders Third Reading

Bill 10 Alberta Land Stewardship Amendment Act, 2011

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

Mr. Zwozdesky: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. On behalf of the hon. Minister of Sustainable Resource Development it's my pleasure to move Bill 10, the Alberta Land Stewardship Amendment Act, 2011, for third reading.

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

Mr. Chase: Thank you very much. Bill 10 is the equivalent of trying to stuff the winds back into Pandora's box and then keep them there when they should never have been released in the first place, as was the case with bills 50, 36, and 19. I will give the government credit for trying to repair three pieces of questionable legislation, but this doesn't quite achieve what the government had intended.

I have spoken in praise of the former minister of sustainable resources, who is now seeking the leadership of the Conservative Party, for dealing with land stewardship. Unfortunately, we just got basically to the opening chapters. A previous minister, prior to my time in this Assembly, Lorne Taylor, talked about the idea of water stewardship, the blue gold aspects. He is still sort of in the background in terms of being connected with the location and mapping of underground aquifers, which is part of the whole process of stewardship.

Unfortunately, what has happened is bills like Bill 50, Bill 36, Bill 19 are the equivalent of the cart before the horse because until the actual land stewardship is dealt with we have a series of one-

offs. We have, for example, the one-off that is happening in the Castle-Crown area, and that's the clear-cutting where over a period of 30 years one-third of the Castle will have been decimated with this approach to clear-cutting.

Also, with regard to land stewardship in the north the government continues to approve ever-growing tailings ponds. The new methodology, whether it's the sun-dried, spread-it-out, scatter-it-across circumstances, is not keeping pace with the ever-expanding tailings ponds. This is another concern I have.

Also, the whole idea of land stewardship – the land-use framework is the term that I've been searching for – started off correctly in terms of identifying six regions based on water. Obviously, water has to be our starting point. The current system, where anything goes anywhere at any time, makes the whole notion of the land-use framework of no consequence.

7:40

This is a concern that Bill 10 is attempting to address but still does not provide sufficient relief, I guess would be the word I would use, for individuals concerned about the expropriation of their land. The highlights of this bill are that it allows for a wider consultation process, both before a regional plan is developed and when plans are being amended. It allows for compensation for those who are directly impacted, and it apparently allows for appeals regarding either a regional plan or an amendment to a regional plan.

Mr. Speaker, we're aware that there has to be a balance between private ownership and public good. For example, the Liberal Party believes that the rapid rail, the speed train from Calgary through Red Deer and on to Edmonton, is a very good concept. There are chances that, depending on which route is taken – and of course the people in Red Deer hope it goes by their municipal airport because they've purchased land there to develop a station, hoping that that will be the chosen route. But there is the possibility that individuals along whatever right-of-way is chosen will not necessarily agree with the land price that is being offered by the government.

Under certain circumstances for the good of the entire province expropriation has to happen. It's the scale of expropriation that concerns people, particularly with regard to the utility corridors. There is an awful lot of doubt, particularly with the route chosen from northern Alberta to carry electricity down south, where, despite a slight improvement in the price of gas, the idea of local production of electricity as opposed to lengthy line losses is still a preferable option. People aren't convinced, an awful lot of rural landowners aren't convinced that this isn't just taxpayer subsidized, whether it be \$10 billion or \$16 billion, for the company to export our power down south.

The people in Montana aren't exactly thrilled about what's happening either. We've seen what's happening in terms of Montana and Idaho with bringing up the heavy equipment for the Kearl project. So there are legitimate reasons for people to be concerned about who's benefiting from this Alberta Land Stewardship Act.

We still, unfortunately, create a lot of our energy through coal. It's not the gasified coal. It's the up-the-chimney, polluting variety. In terms of our bitumen processing developments we're putting out an awful lot of chemicals unscreened through the chimneys there. So what's happening is that we are benefiting the countries to whom we export, but we're basically, to use the bird analogy, fouling our own nest, and other individuals are reaping the benefits of our lack of balance.

Now, there is no doubt that we need to expand our exports. There is a concern – and it possibly is playing politics with President Obama – and whether the line down south is not only going to export bitumen but is going to export jobs, it is going to be a circumstance worthy of pursuing.

I believe most members in this House, Mr. Speaker, have seen presentations by Dr. Brad Stelfox where he takes us back to the first oil and gas discoveries, the first development of cities. In other words, he takes us back, rolls the clock back to about 1905, and then with a series of dots he brings us up to where we are in 2011. Then he expands the notion of, if we continue at the pace we're going, what Alberta is going to look like and what places, unfortunately, are going to be overrun if the industrialization continues at the pace it is going.

Land stewardship is about a balance between industrial growth and environmental protection. I think a number of us in this Assembly are either parents or some of us have reached that grandparent stage, and passing on a legacy of value to our grandchildren and our children is extremely important. The Alberta Land Stewardship Amendment Act attempts to make the process more open, more subject to appeal, but this government is going to have to do an awful lot of convincing, particularly in the rural areas affected, that it's acting in the best interests of landowners as well as the best interests of the province in terms of going forward.

Regardless of the concerns that opposition members will be expressing tonight, this bill will go ahead. The government will pass it, and Albertans are left basically holding their breath and once more, because they don't have much choice until the next election is called, trusting that the government is not going to steamroll their land acquisition.

As I began, Mr. Speaker, we've got bits and pieces. We've got a series of loose ends which are not going to be tied together by Bill 10. The whole land act remains basically on hold, so it's an anything goes circumstance.

Mr. Speaker, I don't wish to hold the floor. I have expressed the concerns I have that Bill 10 does not go far enough in relieving the pressure or providing the stewardship that its name suggests.

Thank you for the opportunity, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. Kang: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My colleague from Calgary-Varsity shed some light on Bill 10, the Alberta Land Stewardship Amendment Act. This goes on to correct some, maybe all of the fears that were created by Bill 36, Bill 19, Bill 50. If we had had Bill 36 done correctly, we wouldn't be here today.

The bill is designed to take some power away from the cabinet, which was originally awarded to it not by a bit but in heaps, and allow compensation for those who were directly impacted by the regional plans. It also creates a public appeals process, all well and good. It also changes "extinguish" to "rescind" in section 8.

However, amendments to this bill do raise some concerns regarding the extent of future regional plans. Will what we see coming forward from regional advisory councils and later the government be too weak or have any real impact in protection of the environment? Is it out of concern that if they're too forceful, the government will face appeal after appeal?

The bill does remove some of the powers that had originally been given to the cabinet, which is a positive move, and it provides for a greater consultation and opportunity for compensation.

7:50

Section 5 requires consultation with respect to the proposed regional plan and requires that proposed regional plans or amendments be tabled in the Legislature. Further on section 14 amends section 19 of the act. This allows the person who is directly or adversely affected by either the region plan or the amendment

plan to request a review again within 12 months. Section 5 requires a proposed regional plan or amendments to be tabled in the Legislature. Will this be debatable as a concurrence motion, for example, or will it simply be tabled, and we move on? There are lots of questions still that have to be answered.

We do not support the expropriation of land without due process, Mr. Speaker, including a public process, a formal appeal process, and appropriate compensation. This bill does address some of these issues, but we continue to have some questions about how.

While the Land Stewardship Act does offer some positive mechanisms for long-term planning for the development of our key resources and our land, this must be done with a transparent public process, and the power should not be exclusively in the hands of cabinet, with decisions to be made behind closed doors. We do believe in the protection of Alberta's Crown lands, sustainable development of our resources, and the growth of our urban communities.

With Bill 16, that we just passed, I don't know what kind of impact those developments in the province are going to have on the environment.

There are so many issues that Bill 16 has created. Even with Bill 10 I don't think we are going all the way. It must provide a fair expropriation process, a transparent process of determining the need for the project. Is it, in effect, for the public good? It must also include fair compensation when land is expropriated. There should be a clear process. With all those issues, you know, we're still not really clear with Bill 10. We still have our concerns, Mr. Speaker.

With that, thank you for the time.

The Acting Speaker: Any other members wish to speak? The hon. Member for Lethbridge-East.

Ms Pastoor: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have some notations that I got from the Red Deer Chamber of Commerce, and I'd certainly like to share them on Bill 10. One of the comments was that the imminent passage of Bill 10 and the proposed process of adopting each regional plan independently represent a potential for significant economic instability which may generate a lack of investor confidence.

I believe what they're getting at here is that there will be long-term, cumulative effects, and if things are done piecemeal instead of looking at what should be anticipated as long-term effects, how these long-term effects would affect different regions.

In the long run, ultimately, the land-use framework will be the overriding legislation that will probably try to draw it all together, but in the meantime many of these regional plans have gone ahead and may well have to be adopted if the land-use framework is the umbrella that would be over top.

In section 19.1, which is the compensation, which is certainly one of the more contentious issues in bills 36 and 10,

according to Section 17(4), the Alberta Land Stewardship Act takes precedence over all other legislation including the Expropriation Act. This is a serious concern for the Chamber of Commerce as this Act gives our government over-arching authority to affect the future value of property and impact property development . . . Simply stated, the government has the power under this Act to impact the value and marketability of real property, both in the short term, and the long term.

It's their opinion that

this section of the Act needs to be enhanced to protect and preserve the interests of the private landholder and interested parties.

Certainly, in Crown land, et cetera, I believe that interested parties are actually sometimes always all Albertans, not just somebody that happens to be within a small radius of a particular problem. That small radius or that problem could well affect us all. I think the woman in Rosebud has already spoken to the United Nations about her problem and the fact that fracking has affected her water supply from the water well. So this is a concern. It should be all Albertans that really understand what's going on in each area and how each area would be affected both short term and long term.

The protection and the preserving of the interests of the private landholder and the other interested parties would recognize injurious affection and the concept of fair market value.

The definition of Market Value does not fairly consider that a forced devaluation is different from a sale [between] a willing seller and a willing buyer. A willing seller would choose the time to sell the property. [But] the case law under the Expropriation Act recognizes this difference and considers "highest and best use" in its deliberations by expanding the consideration beyond what would normally be considered in a market analysis. ALSA attempts to limit compensation to a "fair market analysis." This is a significant variance and places the burden of loss on individual land-owners and those with present or future interests in land, who are negatively impacted by the Plans.

The recommendations that the Red Deer Chamber of Commerce wanted the government of Alberta to consider were

- (1) Delay the third reading of Bill 10 and immediately conduct a thorough review of all other legislation that would be impacted by ALSA, since it is intended to take precedence over any other Act;
- (2) Prior to passing Bill 10, hold a moratorium on all Regional Plans under the Alberta Land Stewardship Act, keeping it open and active until all regional plans have been submitted and all issues related to procedural fairness have been fully set out and codified in the legislation;
- (3) Prior to adopting any of the regional plans, appoint an independent adjudicator to review each and all of the regional plans individually and collectively to ensure that appropriate public consultation has been considered; and
- (4) Prior to adopting any of the regional plans, conduct a thorough assessment of how any one plan may impact or interact with the plan of another region, and how all of the plans as a whole impact investment, development, and competitiveness throughout the Province of Alberta.

As we know, we live in a global economy, and I believe that investment, development, and competitiveness throughout the province of Alberta are important. However, they certainly will reflect, in the end, how we compete in the global market.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Acting Speaker: Standing Order 29(2)(a) is available for anyone who wishes to comment or question. The hon. Member for Calgary-Varsity.

Mr. Chase: Thank you. To the hon. Member for Lethbridge-East. I know there is considerable concern about two situations happening in southern Alberta. One is the potential exporting of electricity to the States and the transmission towers that will be necessary to put in place, that will take up a significant footprint in southern Alberta. Then there is also the concern that has been raised in a number of local papers and by local citizens, and that's the clear-cutting of the Castle-Crown. I wonder if the member would like to comment on those two southern Alberta concerns.

The Acting Speaker: The hon. member.

8:00

Ms Pastoor: Thank you. Yes. The MATL line, which is a private provider line, has been for years trying to get that line to go through Montana. Yes, it will leave a huge footprint.

One of the concerns of the local farmers, of a lot of the potato farmers, is that because of the height of the towers, because the towers go right across their land – and I'm going to diverge for a moment. I've never really quite understood why, when we have road allowances, some of those towers can't go down the road allowance instead of through somebody's farm field when, in fact, it will definitely restrict the ability to be able to use crop-dusters. The planes are not going to be able to dust those crops – they're called crop-dusters – and are not going to be able to get into those fields and get down low enough because of the wires and the big poles. So that's a huge concern to farmers that use that way of protecting their crops from insects, et cetera.

As far as the Castle-Crown goes, I just can't believe that it's even going ahead. I don't think there's a great deal of money to be made. I believe that the government itself will be paid hardly anything for that. Bill 10 is about the Land Stewardship Act, and it is about good stewardship of the land in the Castle-Crown area. I happen to have a place very close to there, and I can assure you that I am one of the first ones to be saying that I really think that this is probably one of the worst decisions that this government has ever allowed itself to be talked into.

Thank you.

The Acting Speaker: Standing Order 29(2)(a) is still available.

Seeing none, any other members wish to speak? The hon. Member for Calgary-Currie on the bill.

Mr. Taylor: Thank you. That's what I wish to speak on, Mr. Speaker, and thank you very much for calling on me to add my voice to the debate on Bill 10 in third reading. In third reading we are essentially debating the impact of the bill, the effect of the bill, to be passed. Now that we have moved it through the committee stage, the stage at which we can go through a piece of legislation clause by clause, section by section, ask questions on particular sections, sometimes even get answers to those questions, and propose amendments, that opportunity has come and gone.

I was in the House for the committee debate on Bill 10, which was conducted under time allocation and which was an interesting exercise in that members of the government caucus, who, I think it can be said, do not often eagerly enter debate at this stage, feel that they've taken government legislation thoroughly through the process – through cabinet policy committee, through their own caucus, et cetera, et cetera – and, of course, think that when a bill arrives on the floor of the Assembly, it's about as perfect as nature itself could make it and that, really, all our job is to rubber-stamp the darned thing.

Normally they don't get too engaged, but they were quite engaged that night, and many of them were taking pretty close to their full allotted time. You know, you got the distinct impression that they were taking part in an effort to run down the clock since we were under time allocation. The overriding theme that we heard from their prepared speeches was that Bill 10 is probably the best thing to happen since your mother gave birth to you, Mr. Speaker, and that anyone who questions Bill 10, anyone who questions the ALSA, anyone who questions Bill 50, anyone who questions Bill 19 is out there rabble-rousing and fomenting fear and panic in the hinterland. If that's the way the government caucus sees it, I think they're going to be in for a surprise on election day.

I imagine that my colleague from Airdrie-Chestermere, when he gets up to speak, not to put words in his mouth but just based on past behaviour, which is the best predictor of future performance, will probably have a little more to say about that, so I won't spend too much time on that.

The other interesting thing about the debate in committee on Bill 10 was that there were a number of amendments proposed by various members of the opposition. There would have been a number of additional amendments proposed had there been time, but of course under time allocation there wasn't. I know that I personally only had time to present two of our proposed four amendments from the Alberta Party caucus, and three others were proposed by other parties. All of them were soundly voted down by the government. In most cases nobody from the government even bothered to get up to debate the merits of the amendments, and since they were so engaged in the debate otherwise, that was a little surprising as well. But they didn't typically get up to debate the merits or the drawbacks of the proposed amendments. They just sat there and voted them down, showing absolutely no interest in engaging in any kind of real, reasoned debate over whether this bill was, in fact, perfect or whether it could be improved upon.

Mr. Speaker, normally when I and I think most people who do what we do for a living feel passionate about having gotten something right and somebody comes along and proposes that we change it, we'll get up and defend our position. We won't just sit there and vote it down. But that's what happened the other night when we were moving Bill 10 through committee stage under time allocation and the clock was ticking down. The government limited debate on Bill 10 in committee to only five hours. That's not a lot of time for 83 legislators to weigh in on making a bill that will affect land use and regional planning province-wide for perhaps decades to come the best that it can possibly be.

Let me go farther, Mr. Speaker, and suggest that it's not only about making it the best that it can possibly be, but given the history around Bill 36, Bill 19, Bill 50 at minimum, given the history around those three bills, the nature and content of those bills, the way in which they were driven through the Legislature, the way in which they were brought into effect, which certainly gave a great number of people in this province the impression that those laws were imposed upon them, with, again, the impression that there was a loss of certain rights, a loss of certain control over their own property and over their own destiny, if I can go that far, given that history it's not only important to make Bill 10, which I think by the government's own admission is an attempt to correct the flaws in Bill 36 – and I think it's pretty obvious that it's an attempt to turn down the political heat that the government has been taking over Bill 36 – the best it can be, but we have to make it be seen to be the best it can be. [An electronic device sounded] Somebody is backing a truck up in here by the sound of things. I hope they don't run over me before my time is up. I operated under time allocation last time, and I don't intend to do it this time.

It's not enough to just get it right now. I think it's important that the government be seen to get it right because there is a loss of trust. Perhaps I could even go so far, Mr. Speaker, as to say a breach of trust, a breach of contract, if you will, between this government and the citizens that it represents in the province of Alberta. If you could put it to a province-wide referendum, would Bill 36 pass in its present form? Would Bill 36 pass? Would the Land Stewardship Act pass as it will be amended by Bill 10? I don't know. But if it did pass, it would be, I'm pretty sure, by a pretty narrow margin, and I know there are some of my colleagues who believe that it would be crushed.

There is a tremendous amount of anger and distrust and despair and disillusionment out there in the real world, once you get out

from under the dome here, related to Bill 36, related to those other bills that I mentioned, bills 19 and 50, and Bill 10 was an opportunity for the government to try and get it right. The government, I think, by limiting debate at committee stage to five hours, by making what sure looked like an effort to burn up the clock during those five hours during debate on the bill itself, showed absolutely no interest in trying to change or amend or even enter arguments as to why the bill should not be changed or amended when amendments were on the floor for debate and discussion. It's clear that the government is not interested in doing anything to fix this bill or doing anything more to fix the Alberta Land Stewardship Act than this bill proposes.

8:10

I think that's a problem, Mr. Speaker. I really do think that's a problem because there are some real key issues with Bill 36. There are issues around compensation. There are issues around consultation. There are issues around appeal. Bill 10 certainly does attempt or appears to attempt – the government is at least making it look like they're attempting – to address those concerns, but I don't think they really do address those concerns sufficiently so that, you know, if we pass this bill into law tonight, tomorrow the people of Alberta will wake up and say: "Well, there. Okay. Everything is fine. The land, the water, and all the creatures who live off the land and the water are now going to be protected. This province's natural heritage is going to be protected not only for my generation but for my kids and my grandchildren and generations to come. We now have a blueprint, a road map for orderly development that imposes limits on what you can do on certain parcels of land, but by the same token as a landowner my rights are protected, and I feel like I don't have to worry about anything that this government might try and sneak through the Legislature behind my back and impose upon me later when somebody wants to put a high-voltage power line through my backyard or, you know, whatever comes up."

This is a problem because Bill 10 is a flawed attempt to fix a seriously flawed Bill 36, a seriously flawed Alberta Land Stewardship Act, and the government has shown no interest in making it better or in addressing people's ongoing concerns. That is why I will vote against Bill 10 tonight. Of course, given the government attitude and given the government's majority it doesn't really matter how I vote – does it? – or how my colleagues in opposition vote because we know that Bill 10 will pass as is.

The government expects you and me and all the people of Alberta to sit back and take it. They expect landowners to sit back and take it and stop complaining that they're worried that their rights are being violated. They expect environmentalists to sit back and take it when environmentalists are worried that Bill 10, in fact, weakens the environmental principles in Bill 36. They want city folk to sit back and take it. They want everybody to sit back and take it. They are all-wise, all-knowing when it comes to matters of land use, and what do you little people know about it, anyway?

Well, Mr. Speaker, any good attempt at establishing land-use policy and regional planning has to walk a fine line because it must balance the long-term needs of all the land and the people in this province and all the water with the rights of individual landowners. Any government attempt to protect or conserve or place limits on the use of land risks impacting citizens who use the land or who might use the land in the future for purposes, you know, other than what the regional plan will intend if that regional plan wasn't there.

The only way that land use and regional planning are going to work is if the public buys into it. The only way any law that we

pass in this Assembly works, the only way that it works in the public interest, the only way that it works for the common good, the only way that it's enforceable, Mr. Speaker, is if you have a vast majority of the people in support of that law. There are probably some fairly scientific studies to give you an exact number, but my gut tells me that it's something in the neighbourhood of 80 per cent plus. If it's below 80 per cent, you've got enough non-compliance with the law that it's essentially unenforceable.

The Land Stewardship Act can be a supreme piece of legislation to which everything else is supposed to answer, and the Land Stewardship Act as I believe it will be amended by Bill 10 still has that supremacy, as I understand it. That doesn't necessarily mean that people are going to go along with it. That doesn't necessarily mean that people aren't going to shoot, shovel, and shut up on their own land. That doesn't necessarily mean that people aren't going to get upset at this government and, when they think nobody's looking, pee into the river. That doesn't necessarily mean that people aren't going to find all sorts of ways to violate the regulations and the rules and the laws put into place by our attempt at land-use policy and regional planning because they don't feel like they were listened to, they don't feel like they were consulted, they don't feel like they were respected, and they don't feel like their rights are being respected. They feel like their government is running roughshod over their property.

You know, that's enough to turn an environmentalist nasty. That's enough to turn an environmentalist into somebody who might just shoot that gopher rather than protect it.

About the most efficient way, Mr. Speaker, that I know to ensure that you do not get the kind of public buy-in that is necessary to make the principles, the very sound principles, in our land-use framework in this province work is to impose your will on people. Pretty much every ruler in our history, in the history of British parliamentary democracies and many other western European nations who, you know, have formed part of the heritage of our law and Constitution in this country, pretty much every one of those rulers who has tried the heavy-handed approach going as far back as King John and the Magna Carta, has found out the hard way that it doesn't really ever work to impose your will on the people on something as basic as this.

I'm not sure, Mr. Speaker, that the principles of Bill 36, that the principles of the land-use framework are all that out of whack at all with what we need, but the application is. Thank you.

The Acting Speaker: Standing Order 29(2)(a) is available. The hon. Member for Calgary-Varsity.

Mr. Chase: Thank you. I would be very much interested in hearing from the Member for Calgary-Currie, who attended, along with a number of Calgary MLAs, the Enmax power presentation. While former CEO Gary Holden has gotten into some disrepute based on a rather lavish lifestyle, what seems to have been forgotten, at least by this government, is the importance of locally produced electricity as opposed to power lines coming all the way from the north. I would like to hear from the member his support for locally produced gas-powered electricity and his concerns about bringing wind-powered generation on from the south as opposed to transporting coal-fired from the north.

The Acting Speaker: The hon. member.

Mr. Taylor: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll be pleased to answer that question. First of all, in principle, let me be clear. I don't have a problem with building a power grid that is primarily designed or certainly looks on paper like it's primarily designed to export an overcapacity of electrical generation from our province to Califor-

nia and to keep the slot machines running in Vegas so long as the people in Vegas and the people in California are paying the freight for those lines, not the people of Alberta. We should not have to pay for somebody else's benefit, and that's problem number one with Bill 50 as far as I'm concerned.

Secondly, it only makes sense to generate power as close to load, which is the term that the industry uses for where it will be consumed, as possible. Now, gas-fired power generating stations can be controversial. There's a huge controversy in Ontario in the Oakville area, I believe, about whatever Ontario Hydro calls itself today, their proposal to build a rather large, you know, about the size of the facility that Enmax will build in Shepard, the gas-fired generating plant there. The people of Oakville, Ontario, don't want it in their backyard. I guess that's their call, right? I don't hear a whole lot of opposition from the people of Calgary to gas-fired generating plants being built close to the city of Calgary as opposed to continuing to produce dirty electricity from coal and shipping it halfway across the province to the people who need to consume it.

8:20

Now, on the other hand, wind power compared to coal-fired power is much cleaner. It's not perfect. It has its environmental challenges, too. It's hard on migratory birds. There are concerns about the noise of the vibrations the turbines generate for people in other jurisdictions. We haven't heard those concerns in southern Alberta. There are problems with bats as well. So it's not perfect, but what in life is?

I mean, we attempt to make good law and good policy in this province, I would hope, on the basis of a number of shades of grey and going for the best of all possible alternatives, which is not necessarily perfection. In order to get that wind-generated power from southern Alberta to load, to where the people who need it live, we need high-voltage power lines to bring it from Pincher Creek, to bring it from Crowsnest, to bring it from Fort Macleod, from Taber and Lethbridge and Medicine Hat up to Calgary, where there are a million consumers.

I've never suggested that we don't need to upgrade or modernize our grid. What I've said is that we can do it Toyota class, but they're shoving Lexus class down our throats and making us pay for it, quite possibly so that a bunch of Americans benefit from it.

An Hon. Member: Or maybe a Rolls-Royce.

Mr. Taylor: Maybe Rolls-Royce, yes.

The Acting Speaker: Standing Order 29(2)(a) is still available. Are you on 29(2)(a)?

Mr. Hinman: Sure. Just interested, you know. Again, this Bill 10 being the amendment of Bill 36 seems to be part of a group, and Bill 50 being the root of all of this because they got caught up in the courts – they were spying on the people and felt compelled that, oh, we're in this emergency position – do you have any comment? You talked at length about the government calling closure on this so that we couldn't bring forward amendments and couldn't debate and then speaking on that. What's your thought concerning the way . . .

The Acting Speaker: Any other members wish to speak to the bill? The hon. Member for Calgary-Glenmore.

Mr. Hinman: I guess I wasn't aware of the time left on that question.

I would feel remiss if I didn't get up to address Bill 10 for the last opportunity in this House, especially with the fact that the government brought in time allocation on this a week ago. I'm very, very disappointed in the government for doing this. Albertans are disappointed. As the hon. Member for Calgary-Currie pointed out, it's amazing how once they put in time allocation, all of a sudden they have so much to say. If you look at *Hansard*, they had so little to say, but they used up so much time of the five hours, Mr. Speaker.

I'm extremely disappointed, once again, not only in the bill brought forward by this government but by the behaviour of government members in having the desire to speak on this bill. Here we are now with time limitations to speak to this. I'm very disappointed that we weren't able to get any answers during Committee of the Whole on this because of the time allocation, which the government imposed. It's very disappointing.

It is interesting that just a short year and a half after Bill 36 was rushed through – and what a wonderful bill this was going to be. It would solve all of our developmental problems going forward to the future because what did we have? We had the intellects, the brilliance inside this government to be able to say: we can plan best for industry, for people, for the future, and we'll put all of that trust into a cabinet minister because he has that ability. That, Mr. Speaker, is the crux of the problem with Bill 10 and Bill 36 and why it shouldn't be passed. It's flawed. The main flaw is the idea of central planning and bypassing all of those checks and balances that we had in the past.

I want to just relate that I had an individual today who came into my office who is impacted by Bill 10, directly impacted by LARP, the \$1.9 million study of the lower Athabasca regional plan. This government will get up and say: "Oh, no. At this point it's only a draft. It's only a draft." As I've said before, the draft is in the heads that think that this isn't the plan going forward and the willingness of these government members to just let this draft blow right on through without any thinking, saying that maybe there is a problem here. As the Member for Calgary-Currie stated very eloquently: yeah, take this to the people and see if it passes a referendum. I would say that there would be a resounding no, an in-your-face, slam-dunk rejection. This would be a one-yard-line stance, where they'd be pushed back to the 10-yard line if not creamed out. It's very disappointing, Mr. Speaker, the whole process of how this has come forward, the rush of getting this through.

To go back to LARP and this individual and the problem with central planning, he was assured. He's a geologist. He went out and staked a mine in an area that was outside the original draft and was told: "No need to worry. You go ahead and stake this out." He spent \$675 for the permit on the minerals. That's a very reasonable price that the province lets these mineral leases go for. He didn't even go to the hearings because he was told by SRD: "No. That's outside of the area that we're looking at. You don't need to come and address us."

Lo and behold, a short two years later a huge section was inside the LARP plan. I believe that it was EnCana who approached them and said: we want to put in a hydro dam plan. Again, it's great to see industry come in and use our natural resources, but for some reason there was an amount, it seemed like: we have to make sure that we make this much acreage into a park. So they took another huge chunk.

This individual conservatively feels that he has probably spent \$30,000 in the last two years doing mineral assays and tests in trying to see what potential there is for a mine there, just to have it swept out. SRD is telling this individual: "Oh, no. We'll pay you

your \$675 back.” Whoop-de-do. Big deal. Poke you in the eye. He has probably put out \$30,000.

Bill 10 has this: if there’s a problem of how you’re being compensated for what we’re taking back – rescinding, extinguishing, whatever word the government wants to use – you can make a variation to the minister, and he’ll be happy to listen. We need the court of law. The minister’s office has already very much told him: “You know what? You’re going to get your \$675 back.” That isn’t what it’s about. He has already struggled trying to raise capital to do exploratory mining here in the province.

Again, when mineral leases, mineral permits are rescinded at the whim of the minister, there’s no stability. He says that Alberta is the absolute worst place in Canada to try and open and develop a mine. This is one of the reasons why. It’s because of Bill 36 and Bill 10 and this government’s bulldozing. It’s interesting to use the term “bulldozing” because that’s what his family first did when he was very young. They had a D8 Cat and did bulldoze mining up in the Yukon to expose the rock. [interjection] It would appear that the Minister of Infrastructure wants to make a comment. I will really enjoy his time to get up and comment on this, seeing as how there is a time allocation. You’ll have your 15 minutes. You can answer it or ask me under Standing Order 29(2)(a).

It’s just really disappointing that this government doesn’t understand that there was a turning point in history – and the member brought it up – in 1215 with the Magna Carta where the people, the citizens of the country had had enough of the dictatorship. They wanted property rights, and 1215 was a turning point.

This bill is a turning point, but it’s a turning point in the wrong direction to where people once again no longer have the recourse to the courts. It’s a recourse to the minister, who is going to make his own judgments on his own bias and say: “Oh, no. We’re compensating you fairly. You never should have invested \$30,000 in that mineral permit. Why would you do that?” When his friends went up to the Yukon or Northwest Territories, he said: “No. This government gets it, and I’ve been assured that this is a safe place to try and develop and to get the mining going.” It’s just extremely disappointing that this government doesn’t understand that. It’s screamed to investors throughout the world that it doesn’t in this Bill 10 in the fact that there is no recourse to the courts. It’s explicit in there that there is no recourse to the courts. It’s a recourse to the minister.

8:30

The other thing that they’ve done very, very well and the best legislation – and my computer, lo and behold, when you’re counting on it, won’t open up tonight in here, so I can’t get my notes that I need. There’s an individual out east who looked at Bill 36, and she says that she’s never seen such a well-written piece of legislation that crafts it to say that this is a plan, that this is a government policy. When they craft and use those words in legislation, which Bill 10 fails to amend, what it means is that there is no recourse to the courts because it’s government policy. When it’s government policy, you can’t be compensated through the courts on that. It takes the whole process out of the courts and lands it right in the lap of government and government ministries. At best, cabinet or maybe a few more people will debate it.

I was down in Eckville. I witnessed the government trying to defend this. I guess, you know, to show due respect to the government members who were there, none of us outside of the government MLAs were bright enough to understand that these amendments protect us. People just don’t buy it. If, in fact, we’re all wrong on this, then amend it into language that the common people – those who own property, those who have mineral permits, those who have oil and gas leases – can understand and feel

comfortable with. But the bottom line is that those who want to invest in this province look at it, judge it, and they say: “You know what? There’s a red zone around here.” It’s a red zone.

I remember a conference down in Florida back in 2009. There is a red zone around the oil and gas industry because of the new royalty framework, and that red zone is a communist zone. It’s a five-year plan zone saying that we don’t know which oil and gas companies, which mineral leases, which properties are going to be rescinded by this government and protected from the courts. There’s no recourse to the courts.

It’s unacceptable, Mr. Speaker. We should not be passing this bill. Bill 10 is wrong. Albertans have spoken out throughout this province. I would ask the government, the Minister of SRD now: what other rallies, what other groups have been so outspoken and come forward since Bill 11? I can’t remember which year that was, when they were changing the health care, when people came out by the hundreds, by the thousands to oppose this. Yet this government just bulldozes ahead and says: “Oh, trust us. Trust us. We know what’s best for you.” History has proven time and time again that government doesn’t know what’s best for the people.

You know, we always get caught up in our passion. But if central planning is so wonderful and is the way to go, then why don’t we go to our senior brothers in Ottawa and say: “Oh, you’re more senior. You’re bigger. You’re smarter. Why don’t you look after our planning and tell us what we can and can’t do here in the province?” Better yet, why don’t we go to the UN and say: “You know what? You’re looking after world peace, world interests, and the environment, and you put out these edicts. Why don’t you be the ones to tell us what we can and can’t do here in Alberta?” I mean, is there any purpose in a sovereign nation with that attitude of centralization? I would say no. We’re giving up our sovereignty. The people, the businesses, the entrepreneurs are giving up their sovereignty in this bill to a cabinet minister, who is going to say: we know what’s best.

I kind of get a chuckle out of the idea that, you know, local planners sometimes will say: “You know what? There are not going to be any more bridges built across this river that divides our town in half.” They go through excruciating pain sometimes for 20 or 30 years before they finally admit: oh, well, you know, what we should have said was that there’ll be no more houses built outside this area and only up. But they limit something like a bridge across a river and say: there’ll be no more of those because we want to protect the river. Yet the people keep coming and building.

This bill is going to be the downfall of Alberta. It’s going to crush our economy. The question is: when? How long? Is it going to be death by a thousand cuts, or is this government going to do something drastic, like it did on January 1, 2009, when they implemented the new royalty program? They’d already done two years’ worth of damage to the industry and then said: “Oh, no. It was the economy.” No. It was the rules, the regulations, and the legislation that this government passed with its idea that centralization is best. Central planning hasn’t worked anywhere in the world. We all relate it back to the Iron Curtain countries, where central planners say: “We know what’s best. We’ll tell you what industries to build and what other ones you can’t build.”

We need to go back to the founders. We want peace. We want prosperity. We want pristine wilderness here. How do we do that? How do we create the wealth of our nation? Adam Smith wrote it right back in the 1700s. It’s by allowing those people to develop their resources, to use their intelligence, to have universities, to develop how they want to in a sovereign nation, develop and compete how they want to.

This government is squashing all of that. It's putting the fear factor over the entrepreneur through the individual who raises capital to have a new idea that might be something with new non-renewable energy, or it might be renewable energy. Can we do that? No. The government, again, with its new Premier's council on the future is saying: "We know best. We're going to tax a huge amount to go forward." This is all part of a package – Bill 19, Bill 36, Bill 50, Bill 10 now – of central planning at its absolute worst, which is not going to allow us to recover and to enjoy the peace, the prosperity, and the pristine wilderness that we have here. To step in and to write off a whole area might be the absolute best we have.

What are they going to do with shale gas? How are they going to implement this? There are so many areas, Mr. Speaker, we could and should be looking at, but it goes back to one important point, and that is the rule of law. Are we going to respect the rule of law? Are we going to have a constitutional democracy that protects the individual's life, their freedom, and their property, or are we going to have a government that says: "You know, it's in the best interests of the people that we're doing this, and it's okay to sacrifice a few?" This sounds like a war that's going on. A percentage of those first soldiers: we know we're going to have a loss. There's no reason to have an economic loss.

The Acting Speaker: Standing Order 29(2)(a) is available. The hon. Member for Calgary-Varsity.

Mr. Chase: Thank you. The hon. Member for Calgary-Glenmore has a southern perspective. You farmed, I believe, in the Cardston area. What we have been proposing for a number of years in terms of land-use framework and sustainability is the idea of returning the land in the Castle-Crown, which is relatively close to where you were – it's kind of en route – to a provincial park, the Andy Russell I'tai Sah Kòp park, and the protection of areas, whether it be for parkland or environmental purposes; in other words, establishing a balance. I'm just wondering how you feel about some of the clear-cutting that's going on versus the preservation of parkland. Back in the 1930s this land was part of Waterton park, and I'm wondering how you feel about allowing one-third of it to be clear-cut and other questionable uses. As a landowner in that area how do you feel?

The Acting Speaker: The hon. member.

Mr. Hinman: Yes? Oh, I thought that you were going to give me some counsel or something.

The Acting Speaker: I was hoping you could draw it into Bill 10.

Mr. Hinman: Well, I don't know how I can with that question. Perhaps you could give me some guidance.

Mr. Chase: Land use.

Mr. Hinman: He's saying land use, so I guess, Mr. Speaker, what he's bringing up and what I would point out in relevance to Bill 10 is that that is a watershed area. Again, you know, I think that the South Saskatchewan is going to be the next regional plan that's going to be coming forward.

The important part, I guess, looking at this and relating it back to Bill 10 and the problems that it causes, is that here we're having decisions made in Edmonton rather than by the local people. Those local people should have a far greater impact on deciding what is right and how they want to develop. Probably the most exciting part about having, you know, local regional areas decide

those things is that they might want to try something different. Maybe there's an area further north that does want to clear-cut, and everyone else looks and watches and observes that and says: "Look at the problems that they're having. Let's not do that in our area. Let's have selective cutting. Let's have this boundary area."

8:40

Human nature is that we all want to progress and do better, and we love to live in wonderful, clean environments, but when you have a regional plan that's pushed down on you and they make those decisions, whether it's good or whether it's bad, there's nothing that we can do, and we don't get to try those things. I mean, many people have tried and failed, but others have looked at their failures and have been able to turn that into success. This is the problem with central planning. One area might come up with a new, innovative way or pass new laws or legislation saying: this is how you're going to care for the forest in this area. Then, we're all going to turn our eyes to that and say: wow, that's really innovative, and it really doesn't cost more. We can allow smaller lumber companies to come in and do selective cutting or to do those other areas.

The whole problem with this is the fact that what we're going to have is a central planner deciding everywhere, and what might work great in northern Alberta in a vast tract of 20 million acres for forestry to do some clear-cutting doesn't work down where you have major slopes, running water, fish habitat. Yet that person says, "Well, it worked here," and wants to impose that.

So what we need to do is to go back and respect property owners. We need to respect local people to actually make a decision: this is what we want. Whether they want more or fewer subdivisions, let them decide it, not have it imposed by some bureaucrat or higher government official saying: "Oh, why don't we step down and say that, you know, Calgary and Edmonton can no longer expropriate any land. You live within your borders. Done." That would change a lot on the development and the problems that we're facing if we were to do something like that. So it's just disappointing that we get to that point, that aristocracy where we know best, that we're entitled to make those decisions. That is so backwards. That is so wrong, in my opinion.

So many people have come and talked to me. They're so concerned about whether they're going to make this decision: oh, we need \$16 billion worth of power lines. Why? Because the parameter that they've set up is zero congestion when they don't think we should be paying . . . [Mr. Hinman's speaking time expired]

The Acting Speaker: Any other members wish to speak to the bill? The hon. Member for Airdrie-Chestermere.

Mr. Anderson: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Hinman: It's funny that the government member leaves when it's his opportunity to speak.

Mr. Anderson: Aw, who knows?

You know, I always find it really funny when we talk about this bill and the peanut gallery over there just gets so uptight and chaty. You know, if you have nothing to worry about, if you're not worried about losing your seats or anything like that, why babble? Why chat? Why chirp? Anyway, it's interesting. It's almost like they've got something to fear, and if they don't, they probably should.

There's a huge failure to listen on the part of this government, and a huge failure, in particular, by the rural MLAs to listen to their constituents. There's just a total, utter lack of respect for what their constituents have been telling them for the last months

upon months and months and months and months. It's funny that the former Justice minister from Calgary-Elbow and the leadership candidate, an urban MLA, has actually listened and has actually done the right thing and decided: "You know what? We didn't look at this as closely as we needed to. We made some mistakes on this. We need to go back to the drawing board."

Mr. Hinman: She might actually want to be the Premier.

Mr. Anderson: Yeah, she might actually want to be the Premier. Who knows?

It's just amazing to me that she would figure that out while the peanut gallery over there, the rural MLAs for the government, continue to be the biggest promoters of this act. It is absolutely ridiculous, in my view. We don't have any excuse anymore. From when this bill was introduced to passage, it was done quickly. It was done in just a couple of months. We barely had time to review it.

Mr. Hinman: It was a big, thick bill.

Mr. Anderson: It was a big, thick bill, et cetera, and it was passed.

You know, people can make mistakes. I certainly made a mistake because I sat in this House and supported it. I spoke to it and said that it would adequately protect land rights, as the hon. Member for Livingstone-Macleod still loves to point out. You know what? We all make mistakes, and I certainly did make a huge mistake there. I apologize to Albertans for supporting this bill. That was wrong to do, and I'm more than happy to be accountable for that moving forward.

But I'll tell you: I don't understand why after this year and a half that's gone by since then – I mean, it's almost been two years that have gone by – the rural government MLAs in particular still fail to get it. They're not listening to their constituents. The constituents have passed the verdict. They've gotten educated on it, and they've passed the verdict on the bill. They don't want it. It is too much of a central planning document.

That's what it is. It's a central planning document. Just because you go and talk to a regional RAC that you appoint does not make it a regional document. It's a central planning document, plain and simple. The minister doesn't have to listen to the RAC. There's nothing in the legislation that says that he does. As long as he feels that he has consulted properly, he can do whatever the heck he wants. That is not regional planning. That is central planning. And to say anything otherwise is just completely separated from reality.

I don't understand because I know that there are – you know, it isn't about the intentions. I know that the members over there, particularly the rural government MLAs, are not anti property rights, but they've gotten into this blinder thing where all they can hear is the drivel coming from their bureaucracy telling them that this is the right way to go and from this Premier telling them that this is the right way to go. [interjection] It's drivel, and you should know that, hon. member. You should know that.

I mean, how many times did we sit there and listen about the blue blobs? You remember those conversations we had with the Minister of Municipal Affairs and others about the blue blobs and how that would affect your constituency if they didn't have a veto over those things? You remember that? You were an advocate behind closed doors of that. So why not stand in this House right now and be an advocate for it? I don't understand.

I'll tell you: that's when I became absolutely aware that this was going down the wrong track fast, when we got into the nuts and bolts of actually how this was going to be implemented and who

was going to be forced to join the Calgary regional plan, for example, the Calgary Regional Partnership, and we started talking about how that was going to be possibly imposed on our county, the one that the former agriculture minister represents, myself, as well as the members for Foothills-Rocky View and Strathmore-Brooks.

We started getting into that, and it became very clear very quickly that what was being talked about here was imposing a set of regional requirements, the density requirement that our communities would have to abide by and would have to build according to moving forward if they were forced into the regional plan, otherwise there would be no water for them, and that they were going to be forced to join this. Well, that scared the heck out of me because I knew that my constituents sure didn't want that, my rural constituents. So we talked as a group on that, and it became very clear that that is exactly where the government was headed.

Now, I don't know when they're going to force those counties to join the Calgary Regional Partnership or if they're going to do it before the next election. I don't know. But I'll tell you one thing. That's when I knew that this was a BS document. That's when I realized that this was nothing more than a central planning document that was going to enforce the will of cabinet and the will of the bureaucracy, frankly, on locally elected councils and locally elected officials. It's wrong. From that point on, you know, things started to go downhill. It certainly wasn't more than a couple of months after that that I crossed the floor.

There have been other things since then. In listening to the presentation from Keith Wilson, who I'd never even met till three months ago, when I went to Crossfield to listen to his presentation – I'd never met the guy. He's a lawyer. I went in to listen to him. He knew about property rights, and he's done these transmission bills before. He's been involved in those cases and those hearings before. I went and listened to him, and I'm telling you that is a convincing and compelling case. It is.

It's not just him talking about it. There's Richard Jones, who's going to be running against the Minister of Housing and Urban Affairs in Calgary. Twenty years at the bar, a water rights expert, going to be running here for the Wildrose in the next election. Before he was running for us, he came to us and said, "Do they realize what they are doing here?" and went through the bill and tried to make people understand how this type of government centralized planning was going to affect those with water rights moving forward and the dangers that it presented.

8:50

These are not stupid people. These are people that are leaving huge amounts of money behind to run, to travel the province in Keith Wilson's case. As far as I know, he doesn't have any intention of running, but he's travelling the province on his own dime to get this message out. On his own dime, not paid as far as I know. He's not paid. [interjection] Not paid at all. Very sure.

On top of that, you have the member that is going to run there in Calgary-Acadia leaving a – who knows? – million-dollar-a-year job just basically on this issue because he's so ticked off at this PC government becoming a central planning machine. That's essentially what's happened here. That to me says all I need to know. That's commitment. That's not political. That's commitment. They really believe it, and they're case is compelling.

I know there are arguments on the other side. I understand that. Obviously, you know, not every lawyer and every expert is going to agree. There are arguments to be made on the other side. But just the fact that there's so much uncertainty – at a minimum the government could admit that there's a massive amount of uncer-

tainty out there with regard to this legislation. Even that uncertainty shows that it is a poorly drafted bill, that it hasn't been thought through properly.

If you're going to draft a bill with such reaching implications as this one has, then it makes perfect sense to make absolutely certain that it's put through the proper committee and vetting process in our standing policy committee so that we can have the experts in, so we can make sure that we get it right. Because some of the things in that bill are okay. There are some transferable development credits and things like that. These are tools that we could give to municipalities and so forth to empower them, truly regional planning organizations, give them these things as tools so that they can use them to do their own regional planning. What's happened here is that we haven't given them these tools at all. We've taken over the entire planning process, so the province is going to be implementing these plans across the board. That's not the way we should be doing it. It's not right, and Albertans don't want it.

You know, aside from everything else, right or wrong – is my legal argument wrong; is the government's legal argument right, et cetera? Take all that aside. Albertans don't want it. Rural Albertans don't want it. And I'm telling you that if you don't think that this is going to be an election issue, you're smoking something really good. It is going to be a huge election issue. Huge. And there will be multiple MLAs on that side of the House that will lose their seats just based on this one bill. One bill, and Bill 50 as well.

Ms Notley: And 19.

Mr. Anderson: And 19. But Bill 36 is really the big one. Really the big one.

An Hon. Member: That's three times as many.

Mr. Anderson: That's right. It's three times as many. You know what? Maybe if it was just one, it would be only a few, but it's these multiple land-use bills.

You don't understand the effect that you've had. I'm just still waiting for people to stand up on that side of the House and show the courage to speak out against their own government. For those of you who think that this is something your constituents want, I don't know where you're getting your information. I mean, the best information we can have is talking to people. The best information we can have is obviously doing a lot of polling. I've done both, and I know what the people are saying out there. They're certainly not saying they want this legislation. They want it back to the drawing board. They want regional planning – no doubt about it – but they want us to go back to the drawing board and get it right. They do not want centralized planning.

People are going to lose seats. Good people in here are going to lose seats because of that huge mistake that they've made in that regard, misjudging the public's anger, particularly in rural Alberta where it will have the biggest effect.

Now, everyone in here, I think, agrees with the need for better regional planning. The question is not do we need better regional planning, but how do we accomplish better regional planning? The Wildrose, as I'm sure the other opposition parties have done, have put out some alternatives in that regard. How can we have better regional planning? Well, step one, you can immediately repeal the Alberta Land Stewardship Act and pass an Alberta property rights preservation act. When private property is used for a genuine public need, there absolutely must be full, fair, and timely compensation with recourse to the courts. There's step one. Let's get the legislation right. Let's go through the proper process and put landowners first.

Step two, honour existing deals. Grandfather existing leases and licences and establish conservation areas or no-go zones before issuing leases. Investor confidence in the Alberta economy depends on it. After you've issued a licence as a government, you cannot go and just take it away and then say: we're going to pay you back what you paid for it originally. That is banana republic stuff. It is absolutely not the way to do business, and on top of the old royalty framework debacle it's just another step that this government has undertaken to make our province less competitive and really hurt investor confidence when it comes to investing in Alberta.

Step three, use what we've got. Let Alberta Environment perform cumulative effects analysis on impacted areas. They've got the experience and expertise, so let's put them to work. That's what the Department of Environment is for, to oversee the provincial environmental regulations, et cetera. Why on earth can we not empower the Ministry of Environment to oversee cumulative effects management? We all agree it's needed. Why can't they do it? They should be able to do it.

Step four, let the Water Act work. The law has allowed for a stable water supply for those with water licences in Alberta for decades. We need to get it out from under ALSA and promote it. There are many tools within the Water Act – they're there – for the transfer of water licences and the use of water. They're there. But so many can't be approved right now because they're waiting on the land-use framework, particularly the South Saskatchewan regional plan. So they've got all these people that want to do transfers using these tools under the Water Act that can't right now. They're not allowed because they can't get approval from Alberta Environment because everything is being held up by this blinking central planning document, which is the whole problem with overregulation. This is not a Conservative thing we're doing here. We're slowing down commerce, agriculture, business, et cetera, residential, commercial development because we're just not using the tools that are in the Water Act. It's becoming burdensome and full of red tape.

That brings us to step five, cut red tape. Find the best models for a streamlined regulatory framework that is balanced by Alberta Environment's authority over the stewardship of air, land, and water. And I'm glad to see the government is looking into that with Bill 16. We've had some debates on that, and that's good. Very much too late in the game, but it's better late than never. You know, it's like this bill. You could repeal it tomorrow if you really wanted to – better late than never – but I don't think you will.

Step six, the last one, involve the community. Invite locally elected officials, landowners, industry stakeholders, and other regional and government representatives to work together to guide regional development in a sustainable way. Recognize that central planning does not work. This goes back to my first point. These RACs, these – what are they called? – regional advisory councils, are appointed by the government, by the minister, I believe. So, first of all, that's not democratic at all. Who knows what special interests and what favours are being paid back there, okay?

Mr. Hinman: Kind of like the Hunter report.

Mr. Anderson: Yeah, that's right. Exactly. Kind of like the Hunter report with the royalties, very similar.

The point is that you have these people appointed by the government to give counsel on these regional plans, and even if it was a perfect mix . . . [Mr. Anderson's speaking time expired]

The Acting Speaker: Standing Order 29(2)(a) is available. The hon. Member for Calgary-Varsity.

Mr. Chase: Thank you very much. A couple of questions. You talked about the Calgary regional plan and the loss of local autonomy. You mentioned centralization quite a bit. Now, Okotoks, for example, wanted to set boundaries; they didn't want to expand. They saw the problems associated with gobbling up land. They also saw their water limitations and so on, and they were trying to restrict development. They've done some very smart things in terms of solar housing, very smart things with regard to 10 inches of topsoil because it holds the water. I'm just wondering how the Airdrie-Chestermere area is feeling about potentially being gobbled up by larger concerns as Calgary expands its 1.3 million. Is that a concern?

Also, because of your legal background, several government members seem to be very worried about courts being involved in the legislative process. So from your legal background, the relationship between courts and legislation: if legislation is done right, then courts shouldn't need to interfere and turn it over.

I'd be interested in your perception: regional planning, beating up on local areas, and legislation versus legal action.

Mr. Anderson: Thank you for that. I would say to the first part that, yeah, I am concerned about the loss of regional autonomy. It goes back to what we were talking about when that conversation was happening behind closed doors with regard to how we move forward to possibly force the counties of Rocky View, Wheatland, and Foothills into the Calgary Regional Partnership. Think about that for a second.

9:00

One of the reasons that the counties didn't want to get involved is because—for example, a place like Langdon in my constituency. There are about 4,000 people there. If they join the Calgary Regional Partnership, they would have to build to eight units per acre. In Langdon, okay? Now, if anybody knows about density requirements at all, that's insane. That means you'd have to have apartment buildings in Langdon, lots of them, in order to build towards eight units per acre. It's not reasonable, but that's what Rocky View county would have to sign on to if they are forced to join the Calgary Regional Partnership because that's what the CRP is saying: in order to get water out of the CRP, you need to build eight units per acre.

We all want better planning, and we at least want to limit urban sprawl. I don't think we all want to live in cookie-cutter houses that look the same. If I wanted that, I'd go live in Calgary. No offence to Calgary; Varsity is a very nice area and not really a cookie cutter. But if I wanted to live in Calgary, in a cookie-cutter house in suburban Calgary, I would. But that's not why people live in Airdrie, and it's not why people live in Langdon, and it's not why they live on acreages, and it's not why they live on farms. The point is that variety is good. We don't want complete urban sprawl. We want to protect the eastern slopes, for example. That's not a good place to have urban sprawl. I agree that we don't want to go any further west with urban sprawl.

Put protected areas in, do something, but why would you force communities to join this Calgary Regional Partnership, have the province force them to do so, and then have the province come forward and force those communities to build to a certain density and decide that this is what you will build to? How is that not central planning? How is it not? It is central planning in the worst possible sense.

Mr. Hinman: And how is it good?

Mr. Anderson: And how is that good? You know what? It's un-Albertan, frankly. That's what it is. It's got this Big Brother

knows best, we're going to tell you how you can develop your land, we're not going to leave it to local people that, you know, have an actual stake democratically or with regard to property rights in the area – it's a top-down, centralized, quasi-socialist system, and it's wrong.

With regard to the legal question about letting courts decide land-use issues, I don't think anybody in here, as far as I know, is a legal expert on water rights or land use. That's why we need to bring people into these committees and actually listen to the experts. Imagine that. That's tough to understand, isn't it? That we're not experts on this. [interjection] I've never claimed to be an expert, hon. member. Never, ever. Quote me. [interjection] When did I? Exactly. Once again, you don't know what you're talking about. Revisionist history. That's clear. Anyway, it's just sad to see.

The Acting Speaker: Any other members wish to speak?

The hon. Member for Edmonton-Strathcona.

Ms Notley: Thank you. It's a pleasure to be able to rise and add my comments to the debate on Bill 10 in third reading. This is an interesting piece of legislation because it's one that is intensely political and not one that comes from good policy planning or development. It's not a bill that comes forward in response to any sort of genuine outcry on the part of the public. It's not a forward-looking bill that represents sort of the best of good governance. It really is a slap-happy attempt to respond to a political crisis, some of which is quite legitimate and some of which is not entirely legitimate, in my point of view.

Nonetheless, it's an attempt to create an impression of responding to that political crisis, yet it doesn't respond to that political crisis, either the real one or the alleged one. It doesn't deal with the real issues that have been raised by a number of people around the concerns with respect to this government's approach to land development generally over the course of the next many years in Alberta.

I want to say that I approach this concern from the perspective of one of these, you know, scary socialists that's been referred to by colleagues in the opposition.

Mr. Anderson: I didn't call you a socialist.

Ms Notley: I think there's been reference to my being a socialist, but they've never actually called me scary, although I think it's implicit in some of the comments they make.

Nonetheless, what I think has happened with Bill 36, which Bill 10 is designed to amend, or with the Alberta Land Stewardship Amendment Act, 2011, and with Bill 50 and with Bill 19, because I see them all as being actually quite linked in certain ways, particularly as it relates to the politics, which I believe is the underlying rationale for this particular attempt at changing the Land Stewardship Amendment Act, is that this government has really given a bad name to thoughtful, consultative, responsive, community-based planning on behalf of the public interest as a whole.

Maybe that's wild socialist language that I'm talking about there, but that's what I believe in. I believe that when you're talking about land and economic development and environmental development and growing into the future, there's nothing wrong with actually planning. In fact, it's kind of a good thing in the long run. To do it thoughtfully in a well-informed way with reference to the environmental science and the demographic plans and the economic needs of the province is a wise thing. To do it in full, open, transparent settings in consultation with the people of Alberta where your primary mandate is one and one thing only, which is

the overall public interest of the people of the province, is a good thing.

I think that some of the people that began to contribute, in particular, to the Alberta Land Stewardship Amendment Act might have actually had those objectives in place as they worked on it, but the act itself did not meet those objectives. Certainly, the act in combination with Bill 19, the Land Assembly Project Area Act, and Bill 50, the We're Going To Try and Make Sure Nobody Ever Has To Question Us on the Public Interest Around Building Transmission Lines Again Act – when you put them all together, what we've done is we've bastardized the goodwill that I think we were attempting to achieve, or some people in government might have been attempting to achieve, when we first approached the concepts inherent in Bill 36.

The Land Stewardship Amendment Act was designed to do some good things, but even when it came forward a couple of years ago, the NDP did vote against it. We voted against it for a number of reasons, probably the most important of which was that we were very concerned that the cabinet, as with all pieces of legislation that this government passes, was given an unprecedented amount of power under the act. It gave the cabinet complete control over the regional plans, and it did not provide for the type of accountability and transparency and sort of completion of the consultation or feedback loop with Albertans that was necessary in order for the kinds of decisions that were authorized under this act to be done truly in the best interests of Albertans after genuinely responding to their contribution to the discussion.

The act did not adequately, in short, reflect the land-use framework's commitment to public input and community involvement because, of course, the document, the land-use framework, preceded the land stewardship act. The land-use framework was quite genuine about public commitment. The piece of legislation that followed was a great deal more superficial in terms of the guarantees that were provided with respect to the public consultation that we were looking for. It allowed cabinet to create and amend regional plans without ever creating a regional advisory council, for example, the kind of thing that means that it was really mostly a lot of window dressing. Certainly, in what little we've seen happen under the authority of Bill 36 since then, we have seen that regional advisory councils are indeed hand-picked and that the reports are greatly massaged. Way too much happens behind closed doors, and it's way too vulnerable to behind-closed-doors lobbying to cabinet members that the public just doesn't see. The government is not held accountable for that kind of process.

Ultimately we didn't believe that Bill 36 actually provided adequate environmental protection in terms of what it required the government to do. It simply required a plan to describe a vision for planning and then to state one or more objectives for the planning region. It didn't actually identify the public interest, or it didn't identify preserving the environment. It didn't identify these things as mandatory components of regional plans.

9:10

At the time the NDP put forward a number of amendments to Bill 36 and focused particularly on efforts to honour the land rights of Albertans and also to improve the consultative processes that existed under the act. They were unfortunately rejected. So then what happened is that we had this sort of political firestorm that was developed through an analysis of Bill 36 and Bill 19 and Bill 50. The government decided to come up with Bill 10 and bring that forward and then say: "Look. We've addressed all of your issues." As I say, it's a highly superficial response, and most people who have evaluated Bill 10 and assessed whether in fact it deals with any of the issues that were originally raised around the

concerns with Bill 36 have concluded that it doesn't really relate to almost any of them.

In terms of even dealing with the concerns that it did fundamentally impact property rights: really, truly, just superficial amendments there, so not addressing those issues. Then, of course, those people who particularly address property rights and who were concerned about property rights also always identified the combined authority that the government has given itself not only through Bill 36 but through bills 19 and 50.

You know, I mentioned Bill 19, or I sort of heckled Bill 19, and one of the members opposite suggested that that had nothing to do with this, but I think it really does. What I would have liked to have seen is the government come back and address some of those significant concerns because those are really the concerns that I think are probably the most substantive in many cases to the greatest number of property owners. In this case, I'm not thinking about potential industrialists. I'm thinking about Joe Average Albertan who currently owns property, maybe a bit of farmland, maybe an acreage, whatever. These are the folks that I'm thinking about.

When I think about Bill 19, you know, what did we have concerns about and what did many Albertans across the province – what were their concerns with Bill 19? Well, landowners whose land is part of a project area that can be identified through that bill don't get any compensation for the development restrictions that are placed on their land. Is that addressed through Bill 10? No. Could it be? Should it have been? Yes, because it's all part of the same discussion that generated this. [interjection] It doesn't matter. It's all part of the same political discussion.

My point is that Bill 10 is a superficial response to a political discussion. But the real substance in there as well included the concerns around bills 19 and 50. It also allowed the government to cancel project area orders at any time or without penalty. It allowed the government to choose the appeal body that a property owner might seek to have their rights assessed under. It allowed the government to impose an injunction where someone appeared to be about to commit an offence. It ultimately defined a public project without including the need for it to have any relation to the public good.

That's particularly interesting when you then combine it with Bill 50 and the fact that with Bill 50 – once again, part of this overarching theme of not consulting with Albertans, just as they don't with Bill 36 but also with Bill 10 – they've removed significant obligations on the part of the government to consult with Albertans. We've heard today about how power lines are going to be increasingly expensive. They are not in the public interest. Most Albertans would say that we don't want them, yet through Bill 50 the government has removed their obligation to consult with Albertans on it. They have given themselves more power to take it behind closed doors and have it addressed in cabinet.

This was probably the most significant complaint of Albertans. If this government thinks that this little Bill 10, this teeny-weeny little superficial bit of a bill that casually makes ever so minor amendments to Bill 36, is going to address the significant problems and concerns that have been raised by Albertans across the province with all three bills – with Bill 19, with Bill 50, and with Bill 36 – they are sorely mistaken.

They are going to, I think, suffer the consequences of that when it comes time for people to be campaigning about it in the next election. In every case they've taken the control away from the citizens of Alberta. They have given themselves the opportunity to make those decisions behind closed doors, and they will not give Albertans an opportunity to have public hearings about these very things which ought to be considered in their best interests, in the

open, with them having every opportunity to insist upon accountability throughout the process. That's what we don't get from this bill.

So where are we left with Bill 36 and the Alberta Land Stewardship Amendment Act? Well, I do want to put it on the record that the principle that is underlying that act is something that the Alberta NDP supports. The notion of understanding that there are competing interests, both collective and individual, around the future development of our land is a wise decision. But the question becomes: how do you address those competing interests, and how do you do it in a way that is most responsive to the best interests of the greatest number of Albertans? You don't do it by taking the whole thing behind closed doors. You absolutely do not. That's what still happens under Bill 36. That's what's happened with the two regional plans that we've seen so far. Most of the substantive discussions around what has happened with those plans have happened behind closed doors.

Then in the midst of that, we've got the situation where the Premier had his little panel come out and start talking about water markets and advocating water markets, when we still haven't managed to find a way to deal with the regional plans that are currently in stasis. You know, they're just basically on hold because the government doesn't give itself the resources to actually move forward with the regional plans, nor are they prepared to consult with Albertans adequately on these regional plans. So decisions around water are pending the land-use framework. Meanwhile, they're waxing poetic about the value of water markets, and it's just creating a ridiculous amount of confusion in a very important area, one of great importance to Albertans.

At the end of the day my concern is that the principles underlying the Alberta Land Stewardship Act have been abandoned for the most part by this government. They haven't been properly resourced. The staff resources necessary to do the work, to do the science, to do the consultation, to keep it out in the open, to provide adequate opportunities for Albertans to genuinely respond: none of that has been done. The secretariat for the land stewardship framework has been underfunded since day one. The Ministry of Environment: don't even start me on how completely underfunded and inadequate it is.

We haven't moved forward on this. We haven't moved forward on the good stuff, but at the same time the government has retained for itself a tremendous amount of power to do things behind closed doors. With that in mind, I can't support Bill 10.

I'd like to move the following amendment, and I'm wondering if I could just have a break in my time so that I could distribute this amendment to my colleagues in the Legislature.

The Acting Speaker: Okay. We'll pause for a moment.

Hon. member, please proceed. This is amendment A1.

Ms Notley: Yes. The amendment that I'm putting forward is that "Bill 10, the Alberta Land Stewardship Amendment Act, 2011, be not now read a third time but that it be read a third time this day six months hence."

Do I have time to speak to it?

The Acting Speaker: No. I'm sorry.

The next speaker, please. The hon. Member for Calgary-Varsity.

9:20

Mr. Chase: Thank you. Speaking in favour of the amendment, what it does is give the government a further six months to get it right. Bill 10 could not correct the wrongs of bills 19, 36, and 50. I agree very much with the hon. Member for Edmonton-Strathcona

that Bill 36, the Alberta Land Stewardship Act, in terms of the balancing of divisive interests was very well intended. Unfortunately, we've had Bill 19 and Bill 50, which have torn apart the whole land-use framework process. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that this government has no desire to see the land-use framework ever developed because then there would be an overriding principle that would govern all further land usages. We still have this piecemeal approach, where we're doing a variety of conflicting interests in various parts of the province.

Now, the main point of amendment A1 is that this bill not now be read a third time but be read a third time this day six months hence. As I say, I think it's a very good idea. It allows time for individuals to be consulted. It allows time for public forums to take place. While it does not potentially direct it towards a particular committee to call forward witnesses and experts, it does allow for the government to set up this type of consultative, collaborative circumstance, which currently is not the case.

A problem that I see, Mr. Speaker, is that this government has suggested that six months from now we're not going to be having a fall Legislature. That's what the government rumour mill has suggested, and the government has also suggested that we're likely not to have a legislative session next spring either. So, in fact, what this hoist bill would do is give the government a reason to actually have a session six months from now, to continue with the governance of the province instead of abdicating their role by shutting down the parliamentary system for the better part of a year. If only for that reason, six months hence would require the session to be on and the opportunity to discuss and debate, which is not likely to occur if we have no fall session or spring session.

My big concern and what A1 is suggesting is that we have to get the land-use framework right. We can't keep putting Band-Aids on bad pieces of legislation. What we need is not a Bill 10; we need a tourniquet. We need a land-use framework instead of the bits and pieces that go around the central issue, and that involves the land-use framework. So I'm extremely supportive of the call for sober second thought. I look forward to having further discussions with greater public input six months hence.

I'd like to thank the hon. Member for Edmonton-Strathcona for taking the time out that is necessary as opposed to what we've seen. We're on day 32 of our spring session. That's hardly sufficient time to do justice to either the land-use framework or this attempted correction in the form of Bill 10, the Alberta Land Stewardship Amendment Act, 2011. It just falls short.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Acting Speaker: Any other members wish to speak to the amendment?

Mr. Anderson: I'd love to speak to this amendment on the bill, the amendment to hoist it. [interjections] Absolutely. Absolutely, hon. member. You know what, hon. member? You should really try to see this thing pass because this is going to help you in your re-election. It'll make a big difference.

Mr. Ouellette: I think that you should worry about you, and I'll worry about me.

Mr. Anderson: Are you sure we can't share those polling numbers?

Mr. Ouellette: You can show them all you want.

Mr. Anderson: The point of this, Mr. Speaker, is that we do need to show some sober second thought here. [interjections] I see that I've gotten into the head of the hon. minister. I'm sorry about that.

The Acting Speaker: Airdrie-Chestermere has the floor.

Mr. Anderson: It's all right. There's lots of time to campaign, hon. minister. The problem is that we do need that sober second thought.

One of the things that I remember after the 2008 election is hearing the Premier talk about these new standing policy committees and how these were just going to be great. You know, they would be part of his transparency agenda, which surely has not transpired. They did set up the committees. They do pay us a very large amount of money, and we have done very, very, very little in them. Certainly, I don't think the taxpayer has gotten their due out of it, has not gotten good value for money out of it because we don't do many substantial things in those committees.

There are a couple of little tweaks here and there on a couple of pieces of feel-good legislation or easy, agreeable legislation, but when it comes to real tough stuff like this or like Bill 50 or like Bill 19 or like what we were doing before we decided to centralize all the regional boards into the health superboard or before we passed, you know, Bill 24 to expropriate pore space from peoples' titles – before we did all that, it would have been nice to put those things into a committee because in committee it's a great opportunity for all the experts to come in.

You know, if you were to put Bill 10 or Bill 36, bring it up, and the bureaucracy and the minister do the best that they can, and you introduce the bill in the spring. Okay? Then at the end of second reading you pass it kind of in principle in the spring, and then you put it into the committee for the entire summer. Then let the MLAs earn their money and do their work with regard to legislation and go through it with a fine-tooth comb. Make sure experts are invited in, the whole bit. Talk to Albertans. Talk to your constituents. Get feedback from them, all that stuff over like a five-month period in the middle there. If we did that and then we came back and got real amendments together, and we polished up the bill or realized that the bill was just a bad idea and we're not going to go further with it, then you come back in the fall and either reject it or pass it with the appropriate amendments.

I think that if that was the process that this government actually used for their standing policy committees, we may actually have some very good legislation. I would also venture to guess that things like the royalty framework wouldn't have happened. Things like this Bill 36 wouldn't have happened. Or if they did, they would have been changed to essentially make them into actual regional planning documents instead of central planning documents. So many mistakes would have been avoided.

And I would venture to guess that the four MLAs sitting right here wouldn't be here right now because there wouldn't be a reason for us to be because you would pass good legislation that Albertans actually wanted. [interjections] Hon. minister, we will take advantage as much as we can. Absolutely. Through the chair.

The point of this is that if you want good legislation, you have to work for it, and this government doesn't work for it. They have the bureaucracy draft it. Then they get it, they run it through their little caucus procedures, which are a farce, and then they pass it in the House, a lot of times just cutting off debate on anything substantial. So what this would do, Mr. Speaker, is that it would allow us to put this legislation into a committee and actually really get down and try, if it is possible, to fix Bill 36. Or maybe we turn this into a repealing of Bill 36. Or maybe we change Bill 36 enough, using Bill 10, to turn Bill 36 into something that Albertans actually want.

Then the Minister of Transportation can keep his job at the next election. I want him in here because he's entertaining, Mr. Speaker. I want him in here. I want to hear him answer these questions.

But his constituents aren't going to re-elect him, partly because of this bill if we don't repeal it. I'm trying to help him because I like him so much. But, alas, I don't think that's going to happen.

9:30

I think that what we need to do is spend all the time and effort we can to get this legislation as right as we can, and we're not able to do that if we just ram through another piece of legislation like this. That's what we've done here again.

You know, I think of the process of how Bill 10 has come forward. I know the Premier named members and was sanctioned for doing so, people who weren't there for second reading of this bill when we were clearly told that we weren't going to have second reading of this bill. After his estimates they passed through four bills, including Bill 10, the most controversial piece of legislation during the session, when the opposition wasn't here. They used that politically to say: oh, look; the opposition wasn't here. How many times have we ever seen him for any votes? So we basically didn't have any debate at second reading, basically none. No debate at second reading.

Mr. Ouellette: Well, that's because you left.

Mr. Anderson: That's right. You're absolutely right. We did. [interjection] Because you're so ethical, very ethical, very democratic, incredibly democratic.

Anyway, the point is that we didn't have any debate in second reading, Mr. Speaker. [interjection] I'm really in the Transportation minister's head. I apologize. [interjections]

The Acting Speaker: Hon. members . . . [interjections] Hon. members, are you done? The hon. Member for Airdrie-Chestermere has the floor. He's directing his comments through me. If you have any comments, any other members, direct them through me as well.

Mr. Anderson: Okay. Maybe we could release the Transportation minister to go door-knocking. He'll feel better if he gets out there defending this bill. [interjection] Oh. He doesn't need to door-knock? Interesting.

What we need to be doing going forward is making sure that we get this legislation right. It's not right. We don't have it right. Albertans know that it's not right. I just cannot understand why, when the people overwhelmingly don't support something – I'll tell you what Premier Klein would have done. He would have stepped off this snake so fast. It wouldn't even have been two seconds. He would have left. He would have gotten off it because he listened to the people. You may not agree with everything he did, but the man listened to the people when they spoke out. That has not been the case here.

We had no debate in second reading – no debate – not even from the government members. "Oh, if you cared, you would have been here." It's not like any of the members here debated it in second reading either. Then it went to Committee of the Whole, and before we had even debated – we hadn't even begun Committee of the Whole – the government brought in closure, five hours of debate for closure. They spoke for half of it. Then they said: "Well, it's democratic. We've got to have our turn." Well, then why bring closure? Why not let every member over here speak to the bill? Why not let every member in the House speak to the bill – that would be fair – at least once? Maybe they could have brought closure in that way. That way we could have had at least had a good, thorough debate in that regard. But, no. They just pressed on forward, blasted it through.

Now we're in third reading, and we're going to actually get full time in third reading to debate it. But we can't go to the clauses. We don't have time. We introduced two amendments as the Wildrose. I know the Alberta Party introduced two amendments. Did the New Democrats introduce any? I don't know. Anyway, there were amendments introduced. I don't think you would have had time, frankly. There was no time to do amendments. It's such a slap in the face to the democratic process the way this is run.

One of the things that I know the Wildrose will be doing if we are lucky enough by the grace of the people of Alberta to be government after the next election is that we will absolutely change the way that we pass legislation. We will introduce it in the spring, go into committee in the summer, come back and pass it or reject it officially in the fall, making sure that all legislation is properly vetted throughout the process, that the opposition parties have full input into the discussion, that we hear the stakeholders out, slow it down, especially on major pieces of legislation like this, making sure that we do a thorough and good job, openly and transparently. And you know what? That's only going to benefit the government of the day. It's only going to benefit them and the people of Alberta because when government passes good legislation, the people of Alberta are happy, and when the people of Alberta are happy, they support the government. That's why I don't understand the self-defeating things that this government does.

Why not take the time to pass the right piece of legislation, and then you're not up you-know-what creek without a paddle. This wouldn't happen to them. The Wildrose Alliance wouldn't even exist if they did it that way – imagine that – instead of being neck and neck with the government in the polls. [interjection] That's right. Fine. Neck and neck: that's all I'll say. [interjection] Oh, hon. member, I will miss you.

Anyway, that is really an issue that we need to get through our heads, that as a government our job, our role is to pass legislation that is good for the people of Alberta. That's what we need to do, and we haven't done our due diligence. And you know what? I don't even blame the members for getting it wrong the first time. How can I? I got it wrong the first time. I don't blame them for that on any bill. If you're going to pass a bill and you get two weeks to look it and you've had no time to go to your constituents or ask any experts about it, you're going to make mistakes. Absolutely.

If you're going to make mistakes, it's fine to make mistakes on the first draft. That's why we have drafts. But then we go to committee. We have the experts in, and we listen to those experts. We make sure that the legislation rolls out the way that it was intended to, that it has the effect that was intended and so forth. But we haven't done that in this Leg., and because of that, mistakes were made. Instead of correcting them, we have gone forward with it, and now we have a government in its death throes. I love using that language, death throes. It's a good word.

It's a problem, and there's no reason for it. I think it's too late now, unfortunately, for this process to be reversed because I don't think there's a will. I hope I do see some indication. You know, there are at least some mumblings from the next leader, but of course the next leader always starts that way. That's the way the Premier started. [interjection] Yeah, one candidate.

The point is that I hope that whoever the next leader is, for the good of the province, will use this amending formula, these committees to make sure that we get the right legislation passed for Albertans, that we're not concerned with speed and getting it done right away and just making it happen, that we're more concerned about getting it right. Get it right: somebody should use that as a slogan. Get it right. If not the first time, get it right the second or

the third time, and you can do that if you have a proper legislative drafting process.

But this government has gotten lazy. They've gotten too used to doing things the way they've always done things, which is ready, shoot, aim.

Mr. Hinman: No, it's fire.

Mr. Anderson: Ready, fire, shoot? I said "shoot" instead of "fire." [interjection] Come on, man; be supportive.

Mr. Chase: Cut twice; shoot once.

Mr. Anderson: That's right. Cut twice; shoot once.

Anyway, if we're very careful, if before we cut, we make sure we measure twice – there you go; I think I got that one right – then we would make far fewer mistakes in this House.

Again, I will say that this bill is a mistake. The people of Alberta don't want it. Every poll I've seen on this particular question is clear. I mean, it's like three-quarters of Albertans don't want this piece of legislation, meaning Bill 36. It's bad, and in rural areas it's worse. You're not winning here, government, so fix it by repealing this, by repealing Bill 36, and starting over at the drawing board, putting those great minds of yours together with the opposition minds in the committee. Get those stakeholders in. Let's not have the bureaucracy run our province completely. Let's at least try to have a little political check on the situation.

9:40

The Acting Speaker: Any other members wish to speak?

Mr. Hinman: Well, this truly is an A1 amendment. I thank the Member for Edmonton-Strathcona for bringing this forward. Once more, being a friend of the government, I say: look; here's the problem, and here's the solution. What's the solution here with this A1 amendment? To bring it back six months hence. We have the mechanism in place, Mr. Speaker, to do something with this.

The rumblings out there are incredible. Why do we have to wait for a tsunami? Why do we have to wait for an earthquake? Man, where are your political antennas to listen? It is our job as elected representatives to listen and say: "You know what? We really shouldn't push this through."

It's funny. I've been a long-time advocate of recall, accountability 24/7, and this is exactly the type of bill where people say: "Oh, we can't have recall because we couldn't push through bills like this. People would then have the power to do something to stop us. But if we can do this and push this through, in six months or in four years, if we do it early, they won't remember then, and we'll have other things." This is about accountability. It's been brought up.

The policy field committees: it's a solution for something like this. Why do you want to have the destructive fighting within that's going to go on during the leadership campaign? Should we toss it? Shouldn't we? This will really actually be quite an interesting phenomenon for me to watch, to see the leadership campaigns become divisive.

Mr. Anderson: Gary Mar spoke out against it.

Mr. Hinman: Yeah, I know Gary Mar spoke out against it. I know Alison Redford has. [interjection] Oh, I can't believe it. I got conned into that. The hon. Member for Calgary-Elbow has spoken out against this and realized: let's go back and listen to the people. It's always the best thing to do when we're trying to pass divisive legislation, to take the time, and 32 days isn't time. Five hours of debate isn't time.

Like I say, it's just embarrassing to realize that here we are in third reading, and everybody can only get up and speak once, yet the government is not compelled to do so. When they had closure in five hours, they limited the opposition. Not even all the opposition members were allowed to speak during that opportunity, let alone bring forth our amendments. I was one of them because one of my colleagues really wanted to speak badly to it, so we almost had to draw straws on who gets to. Why? The government in all of its wisdom says: oh, we're going to limit debate on this because we can. They didn't speak during second reading. They didn't speak in Committee of the Whole until closure came in, which was the first thing they brought in, and then for some reason they were so compelled to speak, and we couldn't.

You know, perhaps the most important thing that can be allowed is to let the opposition speak if that's what they feel compelled to do. If they think that it's so bad, let us open our mouths and remove all doubt by speaking foolishness.

Mr. Lindsay: You're doing that now.

Mr. Hinman: Instead, what do they do? "No. It's closure. Let's not allow them to speak. Better yet, we'll all get up." They'll open their mouths and remove all doubt. The hon. Member for Stony Plain seems to think that that's what I'm doing, so I'd encourage the Member for Stony Plain to get up and open his mouth. When was the last time, since you got shoved to the backbench, that you've done anything to help the people of Alberta? It's very disappointing, Mr. Speaker, extremely disappointing, yet he'll yap now and say: that's what you're doing. Get up and do something. Speak about Bill 10. Tell us how wonderful it is for your riding and all the industrial use that wants to go on there. It's pathetic, truly pathetic.

Why no speakers tonight? They don't care anymore. They brought in closure. That was all they wanted to do. They didn't want any amendments coming forward. They didn't want any debate coming forward.

Here it is: policy field committees. It was the right thing to do when Premier Stelmach came in, but has he done the right thing with it? Oh, twice. I apologize: the hon. Premier. I apologize, Mr. Speaker. We get a little bit passionate here, and sometimes we forget that we have multiple names when we're in the House and when we get into the committee and things.

The problem is that this bill is upsetting to Albertans, and on that alone it should be going to the policy field committee. We should be going through this. If they're so convinced that it's so great, why did we have Bill 10, which is nothing more than an amendment to Bill 36, when they said: it's perfect; no amendments necessary? Yet here it is, again under a very quick time frame, pushing this through so that their regional plans can be implemented and not challenged. That's what this is about. It's about eliminating the challenge of industry, of landowners who say: "This is wrong. This isn't in my best interests." It's about the challenge of saying: "You know what? The parameters that you are setting up and are therefore making the decision that we need billions of dollars of power lines needs to be protected here." That's what Bill 10 does. It allows Bill 50 to go forward. There isn't the challenge there. It's just wrong.

Like I say, this is an ideal opportunity, but I don't think there are enough people listening or thinking here, as was mentioned earlier. If everybody is thinking the same, then it's highly likely that there is nobody on that side that's even thinking because they don't have any divergence of thought. It's just all the same: "That's what we're going to do."

We need to put the brakes on this. It's not a good bill. We already see with LARP the problem that it is. I've asked four times of the government: just tell us what the mineral leases have brought to the government's coffers. They talk about the \$2.6 billion in land sales. Tell us what it was, the land sales that are being rescinded by LARP. They won't do it. It's very disappointing. Obviously, they have the numbers. Or worse, they don't even have the numbers, and they don't want to look at it.

I had an individual today with \$675 in permits, \$30,000 in investments, and he's basically been told by the department: "You know what? We're not going to recognize that, but go ahead and bring forth your best case." And why not? The minister gets to decide. It's faulty. It's wrong. It's unacceptable. It's un-Albertan. Why are we pushing this through? Vote for this amendment. It's an A1 amendment. That means top notch, A1. It's great. Let's do it. This is our opportunity to say: let's have that second thought; let's open it up."

One of the real problems is that this government – and I'll go back to the Hunter report. I mean, it was selected by government ministers. These are the people to do it. The hon. Member for Edmonton-Highlands-Norwood took my other pamphlet today – and he hasn't brought it back – on the Premier's council. What's that new one called? [interjection] Everything's been taken from me. I'm in shambles. He took it tonight, and he didn't bring it back.

The Premier's Council for Economic Strategy. The problem is that they pick these people, but they don't do what we do in a policy field committee, where we allow people to come in and present both sides. Yes, they've heard some presentations and this and that, but it's inside, where we don't get to make the full presentation, to have the debate.

This bill needs to be hoisted for six months. This is an A1 amendment. Let's grab it, and let's run with it. We're just being bamboozled here. I'm not sure by whom. Is it by bureaucrats? Is it by a Premier who says, "This is going to be a wonderful legacy that I've set up"? I don't know what Kool-Aid they're drinking, or maybe it's vodka in their Kool-Aid that they're drinking, and therefore they're not able to think clearly. [interjection] This isn't Jonestown. The lemmings are all just going to run off the edge because that's where their leader leads them and says that this is the way to go.

This is a very sad day for Alberta that we're going to pass this again. We brought forward Bill 10 to try and correct Bill 36. We're not doing it. They don't bring in both sides to listen. As the Leader of the Official Opposition says, they deny; they dodge. But what they actually do is duck and deny and deny and deny. It's 3-D dimensional. [interjection] There we go: 3-D demented.

This is an opportunity to say no to this bill and to come back six months hence, to say: let's have that sober second thought; let's actually listen. Why are we so uninterested in listening to the experts out there, in pointing out and saying why we don't need to pass this bill, this central planning bill, this empowerment of one individual to say, "This is my dream, my vision of Alberta" and squash one area or do something foolish in another area. We're not going to have our best potential here when you have central planning.

As I said earlier, you know, you need that entrepreneurial spirit. You need those different regions that are unique to say: yes, maybe that works up in northern Alberta, but it doesn't in southern Alberta. Even with the water: very different aspects of how much water we have in northern Alberta yet how little we have in southern Alberta. What we do with that resource is absolutely phenomenal. Allow the different development in those areas in how we're going to utilize our resources in our different regions, whether it's wood, water, crops, minerals.

9:50

What are we going to do? This is not going to solve what we're going to do. This is going to compound the problem of how we're going to be innovative, how we're going to reach out and do that next step. Again, just thinking of renewable energy, when you think of windmills, solar panels, all of those, the number one element that we need are rare-earth elements, yet this province is so against mining. It's so difficult to raise it. You know what? If we're going to drill and actually mine the ground for oil and gas, why would we not allow it for the rare-earth elements, that we've found are so wonderful in electronics and what we can do with them? This government doesn't have the vision to say: "Well, let's explore. Let's find. Let's raise the capital. Let's have those flow-through shares go as we're trying to develop our mining industry in the province." We could do it, yet with LARP we're reaching and grabbing out of an area saying: oh, no; we're going to protect this area. For what? What's the purpose?

The area that they've reached in and grabbed wasn't even supposed to be part of LARP, but because they caught the vision of possibly having a large hydro facility, "Oh, well, we'll grab the next section over there and just lump it in here," without doing their homework. That's what is wrong and why we need to hoist this bill for six months, come back with a lot more information, and do a better job.

This is going to hurt the Alberta advantage. It's going to hurt our future. It's going to hurt development. It's not going to allow that entrepreneurial spirit to reach out and to come up with a new idea. A regional plan could be such that they're going to say: "You know what? We don't want any more windmills." Yet some area in central Alberta says: "You know what? We've got a great opportunity. We're going to grow the biggest windmill farm anywhere." But the regional government could say that it's only going to happen in southern Alberta and put a block on it. What can they do? The problem with central planning is that it's flawed. It doesn't allow progress to go forward except in the vision of one or a few powerful individuals who had that responsibility land on their shoulders and their decision-making.

I will plead with the government to do the right thing, be all individuals and stand up and vote for the hoist of this bill to bring it back in six months. Let's send it to the policy field committee, where we can hear all the pros, all the cons, and know that at least we're going to be informed when we make this decision and not just take that attitude of: "Oh, I don't want to hear it. Oh, I don't want to see it. I don't want to speak it." Hear no evil; see no evil; speak no evil: that's just what this bill is all about, it seems like. We can't have that open discussion. We can't bring in the experts. We won't listen to them. We're just going to rush this through, be done with it, and we'll let it come back here, whether it's in eight months, 12 months, two years, and deal with this after we've done a lot of damage, after we've hurt our industry again.

Just like the new royalty framework. Two years of chaos, of inconsistency, wondering: what's the government going to do? Then we had to put everything on a fire sale and actually lose more. Had we just left it at a sustainable level, a good level, we would have been far better off. But we had to put in extra incentives to bring the industry back, and that's what we're going to have to do again here. We've slammed the door shut: "Out of business. Don't come here. Don't raise capital. We're not interested in your money. We know what's best. Don't try and do it."

Once again, I plead with the government members to open their eyes, put on their political antennas. I realize that you've got a leadership campaign on. Let's deal with it later, not rush it through now as supposedly some sort of fancy legacy, you know: "Look at

the socialism that we've brought in here. Look at our wonderful Premier's Council for Economic Strategy. We'll force this down. We'll tax the people and put these resource revenues into a political slush fund. We'll shove this other stuff out here and tell you what industries to invest in. Whether it's windmills, solar panels, nanotechnology, I'm just really encouraged that government's going to know what to do best."

The Acting Speaker: Any other member wish to speak to the amendment? The hon. Member for St. Albert.

Mr. Allred: To the amendment, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to just raise the question: what does the opposition think Bill 10 is intended to do? It's intended to clarify some issues that they raised over Bill 36. It enhances property rights. It strengthens property rights, the very thing they've been crying about for the last number of months. I could also ask: what is this amendment going to do? If this amendment is passed, Bill 10 dies. Then we revert to Bill 36, which they thought was flawed. Is that what they want? I would suggest that their intentions are flawed in this. It would probably be great if we went back to Bill 36, and then they would have what they didn't want in the first place.

That's all I have to say, Mr. Speaker.

The Acting Speaker: The hon. Member for Calgary-Currie on the amendment.

Mr. Taylor: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On the amendment, in response to the Member for St. Albert, I think if the member had been listening to what every member of the opposition, the combined forces of the opposition – well, should I use the term "coalition of the strange"? No, I won't. We joke sometimes among ourselves that we are the coalition of the strange. Here you have one caucus representing a party that represents the right of the political spectrum, another caucus that represents a party that represents the left of the political spectrum, another caucus, a caucus of one, that's steadfastly committed to the centre, and another caucus that's still trying to find its way – I'm not naming names – yet we are all speaking with one voice on this, not necessarily because we all agree that the problems that we see in Bill 36 and in Bill 10 are the same but because we do see problems. Paramount is that the problem we see with Bill 10 is that it does not do enough to clarify. I think we've been pretty consistent on that throughout the limited time that we have had to debate Bill 10, and it has been limited. There was virtually no debate at second reading. There was time allocation put on, only five hours of debate at committee.

An Hon. Member: They took half.

Mr. Taylor: The government members took half or thereabouts. I wasn't running an actual timer on it, but they took a substantial portion of it.

Now here we are at third reading, where there is no opportunity to fix this bill, this flawed legislation on the floor of the House, so now we're dealing with a hoist amendment, an amendment that says that Bill 10 be not read a third time now but be read a third time this day six months hence. You know, that doesn't necessarily have to kill the bill. Yes, usually a hoist amendment is designed to kill a bill. If this amendment passes, there is the opportunity for the Premier or the Minister of Sustainable Resource Development to do the right thing. I'd like to see the Premier do it because everything that I'm hearing is that the Premier is the one who wants this bill passed before we adjourn this session because he wants it as part of the legacy.

Now, I'll concede what the Member for St. Albert has said. Bill 10 certainly addresses some of the major flaws in Bill 36. I suppose if Bill 10 were to die, we'd be left with a worse piece of legislation on the books than if Bill 10 were to pass and amend Bill 36. But it's degrees. It's degrees of badness. It's degrees of toxicity. It's degrees of failure and flaw. Bill 10 doesn't go far enough. That's the point that we have been trying to make in the opposition with those amendments that we were actually able to put on the floor in the time allowed. We had more amendments, but there was no time.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the opposition has done its job to the extent that we've been allowed to do our job. We've done our job, our collective job, on this bill in that we have attempted to make it better than it was when it hit the floor of this House. We've attempted. We've failed. We failed to engage the government members in debating our amendments. We failed to engage most of the government members in Bill 10 debate tonight because they just want this thing passed.

10:00

I mean, it's been a beautiful day, Mr. Speaker. I think it got up to 22 degrees today. It's forecast to go to 23 degrees tomorrow. I think Edmonton is the hot spot in the country right now. Everybody wants to get out and golf or just get out of here. It's like the last days of school, you know? You know you're a couple of days away from the last day, and you spend your entire day gazing out the window. Whoever designed this particular classroom we're in made sure that we didn't have access to windows to gaze out of, and it's probably a good thing because attention, I think, has been waning anyway. But that's kind of the way it feels. Everybody just wants to go home, just wants to get on about their leadership campaigns or get on about their golf game or get on about their travel plans or get on about fundraising for the next election because Lord knows, it's going to be a bigger fight than it was the last time around for a lot of you folks in here.

That's where we're kind of at right now, but it hasn't been for lack of trying on our side. We've tried to engage the government in a full and fair and reasoned and spirited debate about the merits and the drawbacks of Bill 10, which is designed, after all, to turn Bill 36 from a sow's ear into a silk purse, or maybe the best we can hope for, given what we have to work with is – I don't know – a polyester purse, something like that. We have tried, and we have failed. This is our last attempt to try and make this a better bill than what exists right now, make it a better bill than what we're about to vote on.

This is an attempt to not read Bill 10 a third time now, and this gives an opportunity to the Premier, to the government to do the right thing and refer this legislation to the Standing Policy Committee on Resources and the Environment and let them do what these policy field committees were designed to do: to solicit submissions from interested parties, to hold public hearings, to get input from everyone, from the experts to the man on the street, the woman on the street, and let the people of Alberta be heard. Then craft the kind of land-use and regional planning legislation that we need. The kind of land-use and regional planning legislation that we need, Mr. Speaker, clearly puts limits on what can be done on this piece of land versus that piece of land. That's what land-use policy is all about.

We have the land-use framework. We went after developing a land-use framework in this province because during the boom every square inch of land in this province and every square inch of water surface was subject to competing uses from competing interests, and you just can't go on that way. You need to bring some order to chaos.

Now, my hon. colleagues in the Wildrose Alliance like to raise the spectre of central planning, and I understand why they're doing

it in this case. Because the application of a land-use framework in the legislation that we have dealt with so far and, quite frankly, the application of a lot of principles in a lot of legislation that we've been dealing with in this House over the last – what's it been now? – almost three years has had a whiff of central planning to it. But land use, land-use policy, and regional planning does not need to be central planning. In fact, if it's done right, it should be done as close to the local people as possible. [A timer sounded] We need to pass this amendment.

Thank you.

The Acting Speaker: I'm sorry. Your time wasn't up, hon. member. That bell was incorrect.

Mr. Taylor: Thank you. I thought that seemed like an awfully short period of time.

The Acting Speaker: Six minutes left.

Mr. Taylor: Thank you, sir. I will pick up where I left off, which is saying that we need to pass this amendment. We do need to pass this amendment because we need to go back and get this right. The concept, the principles behind land-use policy and regional planning, is of fundamental importance to the province and people of Alberta going forward. If we don't get this right, we're in a lot of trouble, but we need to do it in a way that gets it right. I'm not sure that I want to go so far as to argue that we're better off without any land-use framework and any regional planning than we are with Bill 36. I think if I felt that way, my participation in this debate around Bill 10 would have taken a very different tone, and I would have said: "You know, what are we wasting our time with this for? Why don't we just rescind Bill 36?"

Certainly, there have been some people, including at least one and I think more PC leadership candidates, who have suggested that we do need to go back to the drawing board. We need to kill Bill 36 and start again. Maybe they're right. We certainly need a bill that expresses land-use policy and creates a good regional planning process because if we don't have that, it's back to the gold rush days, the gold rush environment, the gold rush atmosphere that we had going on here during the last boom and that we have with every boom: you know, everybody grab just as much of the resource as you can in as short a time as you can, and sell it for as much money as you can because we all know this gravy train ain't gonna last because the price of oil always goes down and booms are short lived. In booms it can get real ugly because everybody is grabbing for their piece of the pie, and people and environments get hurt that way. So we need land-use policy. We need regional planning. We just don't need it the way it's being done.

We have an opportunity here to put Bill 10 on hold and over the summertime and perhaps into the fall let the policy field committee do its work, fine-tune this bill, come up with recommendations to make it better and bring it back to the floor of the House this fall. Presuming – and I'm going to presume because I'm going to assume for a moment that the government actually wants to do the right thing here rather than the politically expedient thing. I'm going to assume there actually is a fall sitting of the Legislature because it would be the right thing to do. Passing amendment A1 gives us, in fact, the opportunity to do that. It doesn't give us the opportunity to do that on the opposition benches; it gives the Premier, the government, the cabinet the opportunity to refer this bill to the Standing Committee on Resources and Environment and let that committee do its work, which is to seek public input, to seek expert input, and to get this bill right.

This bill right now, Mr. Speaker, is not right; it is wrong. It is perhaps less wrong than the bill it seeks to amend, but it doesn't fix

the problem. It doesn't fix the massive credibility gap that exists between this government and its people. It doesn't restore the trust that's absolutely fundamental to making land-use policy and regional planning work. It doesn't restore the trust that the people need to have in their government, that their government is actually out to operate in the public interest and, in fact, is not out just to get them. It's designed to make it look as though it does that, but when you drill down into it, it doesn't do that at all. That's why we need to pass amendment A1, and that's why I'll be voting in favour of it.

Having gotten that on the record, Mr. Speaker, I'll sit down and make room for anybody else who cares to join the debate. Thank you.

The Acting Speaker: Any other members wish to speak. The hon. Member for Lethbridge-East.

10:10

Ms Pastoor: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe that there certainly has been a great deal of discussion prior to this, and I will not try to repeat many of the arguments. However, I would like a few comments on the record. From my personal experience – and certainly I have been hearing from people: letters, phone calls, e-mails, and by just attending different events. These people are ticked off. They are ticked off with Bills 19, 36, 50, and now Bill 10, and they are ticked off partly because they really do not trust this government. But interestingly, they're not sure that they trust the other side either, because they really don't understand it. They feel that even with the government road shows that go to these different large events where, in fact, the government gets booed and heckled in a public place, which isn't always probably the best thing for the government, these people are really, really unhappy. They just don't trust, and when the people don't trust the people who are governing them, we're in trouble. We're in big, big trouble.

I think the reason that this should be put off for six months is to give a chance for this conversation to calm down, to try to eliminate some of the rhetoric, to allow people to listen, and to allow people to perhaps understand. But the government would have to listen. Not just listen, they have to really hear what people are saying.

One of the last comments that I would like to make is that I believe that passing this amendment will be the smartest political move that this government could possibly do.

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

Mr. Kang: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will be brief, too, with my comments on amendment A1. I urge the members to pass the amendment. I think Bill 10 is trying to fix the flaws of bills 19, 24, and 50. I believe that to quell all the fears on property rights, we should approve this amendment and send the bill back to Albertans because Albertans are not on board with the government or with what the government has been trying to do. Let's have open houses. Let's have gatherings like at Eckville, and let's put those fears away for good so that Albertans have a say. Albertans know what is happening with their property rights, and Albertans know what the government is trying to do here. The fear that the government is coming through the back door: that fear will be taken away.

For those reasons, I think it wouldn't hurt, like, if we wait for another six months to pass this bill. Let's do it right. Let's not have another bill trying to fix Bill 10 in the fall session, if we're going to have a fall session. Let's send the bill to a policy field committee. Let's do a proper hearing, and do it right so we don't have to come back and say: oh, this bill is coming to haunt us, and let's bring another amendment bill to fix Bill 10 now. It will be a

good idea to send the bill back to the policy field committee, take it to Albertans, and get it right.

With those comments, Mr. Speaker, I will be supporting this amendment. Thank you.

The Acting Speaker: Any other members wish to speak?

I'm going to call the question.

[The voice vote indicated that the motion on amendment A1 lost]

[Several members rose calling for a division. The division bell was rung at 10:14 p.m.]

[Ten minutes having elapsed, the Assembly divided]

[Mr. Mitzel in the chair]

For the motion:

Anderson	Kang	Swann
Chase	Notley	Taylor
Hinman	Pastoor	

Against the motion:

Allred	Doerksen	Morton
Benito	Fawcett	Olson
Berger	Fritz	Ouellette
Bhardwaj	Goudreau	Rogers
Bhullar	Groeneveld	Sarich
Blackett	Horne	VanderBurg
Dallas	Jablonski	Zwozdesky
Danyluk	Lindsay	

Totals: For – 8 Against – 23

[Motion on amendment to third reading of Bill 10 lost]

[The voice vote indicated that the motion for third reading carried]

[Several members rose calling for a division. The division bell was rung at 10:27 p.m.]

[Ten minutes having elapsed, the Assembly divided]

[Mr. Mitzel in the chair]

For the motion:

Allred	Doerksen	Morton
Benito	Fawcett	Olson
Berger	Fritz	Ouellette
Bhardwaj	Goudreau	Rogers
Bhullar	Groeneveld	Sarich
Blackett	Horne	VanderBurg
Dallas	Jablonski	Zwozdesky
Danyluk	Lindsay	

Against the motion:

Anderson	Kang	Swann
Chase	Notley	Taylor
Hinman	Pastoor	

Totals: For – 23 Against – 8

[Motion carried; Bill 10 read a third time]

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

Mr. Zwozdesky: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. An incredible night of great progress, and on that note I would move that the Assembly now stand adjourned until 1:30 tomorrow afternoon.

[Motion carried; the Assembly adjourned at 10:40 p.m. to Wednesday at 1:30 p.m.]

Table of Contents

Government Bills and Orders

Committee of the Whole

Bill 16 Energy Statutes Amendment Act, 2011 1071

Third Reading

Bill 10 Alberta Land Stewardship Amendment Act, 2011 1071

Divisions 1089

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.

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

Subscription inquiries:

Subscriptions
Legislative Assembly Office
1001 Legislature Annex
9718 – 107 St.
EDMONTON, AB T5K 1E4
Telephone: 780.427.1302

Other inquiries:

Managing Editor
Alberta Hansard
1001 Legislature Annex
9718 – 107 St.
EDMONTON, AB T5K 1E4
Telephone: 780.427.1875