



Province of Alberta

The 28th Legislature  
Third Session

# Alberta Hansard

Monday evening, November 24, 2014

Issue 6e

The Honourable Gene Zwozdesky, Speaker

# Legislative Assembly of Alberta The 28th Legislature

Third Session

Zwozdesky, Hon. Gene, Edmonton-Mill Creek (PC), Speaker  
Rogers, George, Leduc-Beaumont (PC), Deputy Speaker and Chair of Committees  
Jablonski, Mary Anne, Red Deer-North (PC), Deputy Chair of Committees

Allen, Mike, Fort McMurray-Wood Buffalo (PC)  
Amery, Moe, Calgary-East (PC)  
Anderson, Rob, Airdrie (W),  
    Official Opposition House Leader  
Anglin, Joe, Rimbey-Rocky Mountain House-Sundre (Ind)  
Barnes, Drew, Cypress-Medicine Hat (W)  
Bhardwaj, Hon. Naresh, Edmonton-Ellerslie (PC)  
Bhullar, Hon. Manmeet Singh, Calgary-Greenway (PC)  
Bikman, Gary, Cardston-Taber-Warner (W)  
Bilous, Deron, Edmonton-Beverly-Clareview (ND),  
    New Democrat Opposition Whip  
Blakeman, Laurie, Edmonton-Centre (AL),  
    Liberal Opposition House Leader  
Brown, Dr. Neil, QC, Calgary-Mackay-Nose Hill (PC)  
Calahasen, Pearl, Lesser Slave Lake (PC)  
Campbell, Hon. Robin, West Yellowhead (PC)  
Cao, Wayne C.N., Calgary-Fort (PC)  
Casey, Ron, Banff-Cochrane (PC)  
Cusanelli, Christine, Calgary-Currie (PC)  
Dallas, Cal, Red Deer-South (PC)  
DeLong, Alana, Calgary-Bow (PC)  
Denis, Hon. Jonathan, QC, Calgary-Acadia (PC),  
    Government House Leader  
Dirks, Hon. Gordon, Calgary-Elbow (PC)  
Donovan, Ian, Little Bow (PC)  
Dorward, Hon. David C., Edmonton-Gold Bar (PC)  
Drysdale, Hon. Wayne, Grande Prairie-Wapiti (PC)  
Eggen, David, Edmonton-Calder (ND),  
    New Democrat Opposition House Leader  
Ellis, Mike, Calgary-West (PC)  
Fawcett, Hon. Kyle, Calgary-Klein (PC)  
Fenske, Jacquie, Fort Saskatchewan-Vegreville (PC)  
Forsyth, Heather, Calgary-Fish Creek (W)  
Fox, Rodney M., Lacombe-Ponoka (W)  
Fraser, Rick, Calgary-South East (PC)  
Fritz, Yvonne, Calgary-Cross (PC)  
Goudreau, Hector G., Dunvegan-Central Peace-Notley (PC)  
Griffiths, Doug, Battle River-Wainwright (PC)  
Hale, Jason W., Strathmore-Brooks (W)  
Hehr, Kent, Calgary-Buffalo (AL)  
Horne, Fred, Edmonton-Rutherford (PC)  
Horner, Doug, Spruce Grove-St. Albert (PC)  
Jansen, Sandra, Calgary-North West (PC)  
Jeneroux, Matt, Edmonton-South West (PC)  
Johnson, Hon. Jeff, Athabasca-Sturgeon-Redwater (PC)  
Johnson, Linda, Calgary-Glenmore (PC)  
Kang, Darshan S., Calgary-McCall (AL),  
    Liberal Opposition Whip  
Kennedy-Glans, Donna, QC, Calgary-Varsity (PC)  
Khan, Hon. Stephen, St. Albert (PC)  
Klimchuk, Hon. Heather, Edmonton-Glenora (PC),  
    Deputy Government House Leader

Kubinec, Hon. Maureen, Barrhead-Morinville-Westlock (PC)  
Lemke, Ken, Stony Plain (PC),  
    Deputy Government Whip  
Leskiw, Genia, Bonnyville-Cold Lake (PC)  
Luan, Jason, Calgary-Hawkwood (PC)  
Lukaszuk, Thomas A., Edmonton-Castle Downs (PC)  
Mandel, Hon. Stephen, Edmonton-Whitemud (PC)  
Mason, Brian, Edmonton-Highlands-Norwood (ND)  
McAllister, Bruce, Chestermere-Rocky View (W)  
McDonald, Everett, Grande Prairie-Smoky (PC)  
McIver, Hon. Ric, Calgary-Hays (PC)  
McQueen, Hon. Diana, Drayton Valley-Devon (PC)  
Notley, Rachel, Edmonton-Strathcona (ND),  
    Leader of the New Democrat Opposition  
Oberle, Hon. Frank, Peace River (PC),  
    Deputy Government House Leader  
Olesen, Cathy, Sherwood Park (PC)  
Olson, Hon. Verlyn, QC, Wetaskiwin-Camrose (PC)  
Pastoor, Bridget Brennan, Lethbridge-East (PC)  
Pedersen, Blake, Medicine Hat (W)  
Prentice, Hon. Jim, PC, QC, Calgary-Foothills (PC),  
    Premier  
Quadri, Sohail, Edmonton-Mill Woods (PC)  
Quest, Dave, Strathcona-Sherwood Park (PC)  
Rodney, Dave, Calgary-Lougheed (PC)  
Rowe, Bruce, Olds-Didsbury-Three Hills (W)  
Sandhu, Peter, Edmonton-Manning (PC)  
Sarich, Janice, Edmonton-Decore (PC)  
Saskiw, Shayne, Lac La Biche-St. Paul-Two Hills (W),  
    Official Opposition Whip  
Scott, Hon. Donald, QC, Fort McMurray-Conklin (PC),  
    Deputy Government House Leader  
Sherman, Dr. Raj, Edmonton-Meadowlark (AL),  
    Leader of the Liberal Opposition  
Smith, Danielle, Highwood (W),  
    Leader of the Official Opposition  
Starke, Dr. Richard, Vermilion-Lloydminster (PC)  
Stier, Pat, Livingstone-Macleod (W)  
Strankman, Rick, Drumheller-Stettler (W)  
Swann, Dr. David, Calgary-Mountain View (AL)  
Towle, Kerry, Innisfail-Sylvan Lake (PC)  
VanderBurg, George, Whitecourt-St. Anne (PC),  
    Government Whip  
Weadick, Greg, Lethbridge-West (PC)  
Wilson, Jeff, Calgary-Shaw (W),  
    Official Opposition Deputy House Leader  
Woo-Paw, Hon. Teresa, Calgary-Northern Hills (PC)  
Xiao, David H., Edmonton-McClung (PC)  
Young, Steve, Edmonton-Riverview (PC)

## Party standings:

Progressive Conservative: 63      Wildrose: 14      Alberta Liberal: 5      New Democrat: 4      Independent: 1

## Officers and Officials of the Legislative Assembly

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

## **Executive Council**

Jim Prentice	Premier, President of Executive Council, Minister of International and Intergovernmental Relations, Minister of Aboriginal Relations
Naresh Bhardwaj	Associate Minister of Persons with Disabilities
Manmeet Singh Bhullar	Minister of Infrastructure
Robin Campbell	President of Treasury Board and Minister of Finance
Jonathan Denis	Minister of Justice and Solicitor General
Gordon Dirks	Minister of Education
David Dorward	Associate Minister of Aboriginal Relations
Wayne Drysdale	Minister of Transportation
Kyle Fawcett	Minister of Environment and Sustainable Resource Development
Jeff Johnson	Minister of Seniors
Stephen Khan	Minister of Service Alberta
Heather Klimchuk	Minister of Human Services
Maureen Kubinec	Minister of Culture and Tourism
Stephen Mandel	Minister of Health
Ric McIver	Minister of Jobs, Skills, Training and Labour
Diana McQueen	Minister of Municipal Affairs
Frank Oberle	Minister of Energy
Verlyn Olson	Minister of Agriculture and Rural Development
Donald Scott	Minister of Innovation and Advanced Education
Teresa Woo-Paw	Associate Minister of Asia Pacific Relations

## STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

### Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future

Chair: Mr. Amery

Deputy Chair: Mr. Fox

Dallas	McDonald
Eggen	Quadri
Hehr	Rogers
Horne	Rowe
Kennedy-Glans	Sarich
Lemke	Stier
Luan	

### Standing Committee on the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund

Chair: Mr. Casey

Deputy Chair: Mrs. Jablonski

Amery	Lukaszuk
Barnes	Mason
Ellis	Sherman
Horner	

### Standing Committee on Families and Communities

Chair: Ms Olesen

Deputy Chair: Mr. Pedersen

Cusanelli	McAllister
Eggen	Quest
Fenske	Rodney
Fox	Sandhu
Fritz	Swann
Jablonski	Weadick
Leskiw	

### Standing Committee on Legislative Offices

Chair: Mr. Jeneroux

Deputy Chair: Mr. Starke

Bikman	Leskiw
Blakeman	Quadri
Brown	Wilson
DeLong	Young
Eggen	

### Special Standing Committee on Members' Services

Chair: Mr. Zwozdesky

Deputy Chair: Mr. VanderBurg

Forsyth	Mason
Fritz	McDonald
Griffiths	Sherman
Johnson, L.	Towle
Lukaszuk	

### Standing Committee on Private Bills

Chair: Mrs. Leskiw

Deputy Chair: Ms Cusanelli

Allen	Olesen
Bilous	Rowe
Brown	Stier
DeLong	Strankman
Fenske	Swann
Fritz	Xiao
Jablonski	

### Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, Standing Orders and Printing

Chair: Mr. Luan

Deputy Chair: Mr. Rogers

Bilous	Pastoor
Calahasen	Pedersen
Cao	Rodney
Casey	Saskiw
Ellis	Starke
Kang	Wilson
Olesen	

### Standing Committee on Public Accounts

Chair: Mr. Anderson

Deputy Chair: Mr. Young

Allen	Jansen
Amery	Jeneroux
Barnes	Luan
Bilous	Pastoor
Donovan	Sandhu
Hehr	Sarich
Horne	

### Standing Committee on Resource Stewardship

Chair: Mr. Goudreau

Deputy Chair: Mr. Hale

Allen	Casey
Anglin	Fraser
Bikman	Johnson, L.
Blakeman	Mason
Brown	Xiao
Calahasen	Young
Cao	

## Legislative Assembly of Alberta

7:30 p.m.

Monday, November 24, 2014

[Mrs. Jablonski in the chair]

**The Acting Speaker:** Good evening, everyone. Please be seated.

### Consideration of His Honour the Lieutenant Governor's Speech

Ms Fenske moved, seconded by Mr. Ellis, that an humble address be presented to His Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor as follows:

To His Honour the Honourable Colonel (Retired) Donald S. Ethell, OC, OMM, AOE, MSC, CD, LLD, the Lieutenant Governor of the Province of Alberta:

We, Her Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Legislative Assembly, now assembled, beg leave to thank Your Honour for the gracious speech Your Honour has been pleased to address to us at the opening of the present session.

[Adjourned debate November 20: Mr. Denis]

**The Acting Speaker:** The hon. Member for Edmonton-Centre.

**Ms Blakeman:** Thanks very much, Madam Speaker. I appreciate the opportunity to respond to the Speech from the Throne.

I want to start out by talking just a little bit about how amazing I think this province is and about what incredible opportunity we have. I know I often end up speaking – mind you, you give me so many opportunities – critically of the government, and that seems like I'm speaking critically of the province, and I'm not. I just cannot speak highly enough of the people that live here, of their integrity, their work ethic, their commitment to family and to the land and to community. A pretty cool place to be born and a pretty cool place to choose to move to or to immigrate to.

Okay. That was it. [interjections] Well, you give me so much to go on. [interjections] You know, the government has just been in too long, Madam Speaker.

You know, people asked me to describe this throne speech, and I said that it was really reflective of the new Premier. It was very suave, very dignified, very reserved, very secretive. [interjections] Yeah, playing those cards so close to his chest, they were somewhere incised into his skin. Just this afternoon I asked some really simple questions: no, no, no, all the way down the line. He wouldn't even give me a teeny little bit of information.

What really frustrates me about this government is that you've got too much money, and it takes away your drive to be innovative, your drive to need to find other solutions. That makes me crazy because this is a creative, innovative province, and I know we can do better.

**An Hon. Member:** But the Liberals want to raise taxes.

**Ms Blakeman:** Yeah, I do want to raise taxes. That's exactly right. I want to see fair, progressive taxes in this province because that 10 per cent flat tax has killed us.

This government chooses to spend 30 cents out of every dollar from nonrenewable resource revenue. You took it out of the ground yesterday, and today you're spending it on operational budgets. That is wrong in so many ways. That's like selling the back 40 to pay your Visa. It has no horizon to it, no clear thinking to it, no planning to it whatsoever. It's incredibly insulting to the people that live here. So, yeah, you make me crazy. You made my hair go red. You see? It got more red over the weekend.

What I want to talk about is what's not in the throne speech. You know, I'm not a mushy kind of person. I'm not a children, family, social services kind of gal. I just am not. Has anybody noticed the portfolios I have not been critic for? Agriculture and children's services and Human Services. I'm just not a gushy kind of gal. But this throne speech had no reference to the social policy framework, and that is a policy that is worked on so hard by so many people in the not-for-profit area, by municipalities. It had buy-in from stakeholders all over the place.

I don't know how many ministers they went through, and every time that committee came back and presented it all over again. Not a g.d. word in here about that. Did you dump it? Is it gone forever? Why would you abandon something that so many people have worked on so hard, that was such a buy-in from so many people? A lot of other people have talked about poverty and children; I'm not a mushy kind of gal. But it is about those social determinants of health, and it is about the fact: how can we possibly have over 140,000 children living in poverty in this province, where we have had multibillion-dollar surpluses in my time in this Assembly, \$6 billion, \$8 billion, \$9 billion in surpluses? Where is it? Where is that money?

Today we have over 140,000 people in poverty, children in poverty. Remember, folks, that children are not Cabbage Patch dolls. They don't sprout out of the ground by themselves. Poor children are coming from poor families, and what are you doing about it? Where is the social policy framework? Pfft. Gone. I'm so angry with you for that. It's such a waste of everybody's resource, and it's such a waste of taxpayer money. Like, how many times do you guys have to be given the studies and the facts and the numbers that show you that an investment in social policy pays off over and over and over again? But, no, you guys want to have more police and more ambulance workers and more prisons, because that's where everybody ends up, when you could be investing on the front end: in children, in Success by 6, in hot lunch programs.

You know, some of the city of Edmonton councillors, God bless them, went and did the hunger thing, where you didn't get anything to eat or you had to live on \$1.25 a day or something. They were having, like, dry oatmeal for breakfast and all kinds of weird stuff. But I'll tell you that every one of those people came back and complained that by midmorning they could not concentrate. They were cranky and argumentative, and they could not hang on to the information that was in front of them. That is what we do in this province with so much money every day. How could that be?

Okay. Social policy framework: I'm a little ticked about that. Poverty and children: I'm a little ticked about that. I'm a little ticked that you've walked away from the housing, the affordable housing, that housing commission that members of this Assembly were participating in. You know, there were 72-some recommendations. If we had implemented those recommendations when they did it, we wouldn't be where we are today, which is once again going: "Oh, gee. Yeah, it's bad. We'll do something." Why did you have people spend all that time going around the province doing stakeholder consultations if you weren't going to do it? Why? Is this a make-work project so that people don't get into – what? – trouble somewhere? I don't know.

Okay. Social determinants of health: poverty, housing, family and peer support, access to education, access to food and food security. You know, I just don't get it. We are not going to change this stuff in 10 years. This is not going to happen in 10 years. This is a generational change. We need to understand that it's a generational change and that we're going to have to work on this. If we want to be in a different place, we're going to have to try

and be in this different place 25 years from now, but it means we're going to have to go through that generational change to get there in 25 years. To be completely different in that generational change, we've got to start now and follow those pegs down the road to get there. But all I see is, "Oh, gee, you know," and nothing happens.

Okay. Environment. All hat, no cattle. Sorry, folks. All talk, no action. Once upon a time we had one of you – unless you're gone now? One of you was talking about a 40 per cent reduction with a \$40 levy. Well, that went nowhere. We're still sitting there with a \$15 levy, which everybody on that side likes to pump and say: "Aren't we wonderful? We were first." You guys, that's embarrassing. We were first 15 years ago. This is embarrassing. B.C. is, like, way ahead of us, and they're doing it at the pump, so everyone is involved, and everyone feels they've got a piece of this. Here we put it on intensity of emissions. Oh, come on. Only when they're allowed to pollute so much and only when they pollute above and beyond that are we going to assign them a levy? Really? You can do better than that. You can. We can in this province.

There's too much to say about environment. You know, there's monitoring, AEMERA. We've got oil spills that continue to pump out of the ground. The environment minister was upset when I called it gunk. Well, what do you want me to call it? Oil-induced crap? What is it? It's sludge that is pouring across our land and kills everything in front of it, including the wildlife. So, yeah, I want pictures because I want to show you the pictures so that you understand that the choices you're making have resulted in this.

7:40

We've got the AG talking about – oh, I love this; I can't read my own writing – old versus new records. I think you're abandoning things because we can't even keep track of what we're doing. He was saying that we don't know how we're doing on climate change because we've never measured it appropriately, and we didn't know what we were measuring it against. So we can't tell how we're doing on any of the climate change measurements we've made, and now we're speaking so far ahead in climate change that it's incomprehensible. When we start talking 2040, I mean, a number of us in here will be dead, and a lot more of us will be really old. So why are we thinking about making changes that far ahead in what we're doing? Crazy.

Fear, intimidation, and loathing in Alberta. You know, one of the things that I'm noticing in the environment sector is that there's a chill on people that even come forward with diagnostics and results about reporting what's happening from people that are being tested, that are turning up with strange things in their blood, or they're finding things in the soil or cumulative effects. They don't even want to talk about it because they're afraid of what's going to happen to them.

Urban drilling policy: you have to be kidding me. If we can't understand about an urban drilling policy and how close we're going to allow people to drill to people's homes – that's not in here.

Water is a public good. I'm very keen on that, and you'll continue to hear from me about that because I think it positions water where it should be, where we understand that this is a public good, and it has to be handled that way. It can't be sold or divvied out or given to people or rented in the way that's being considered by the government.

The way we're treating animals: caribou and wolverines and grizzlies. You know, we know that the way we're going to save those caribou herds is by having undisturbed habitat, and what do we do? Give out more leases to go and do drilling. You cannot fool around with Mother Nature. You cannot. Yet what are we

doing? Well, we're not doing well with the caribou, and we won't give them more habitat, so, great, let's shoot the wolves that are going to prey on the caribou. Make that one work for me.

Or – wait – don't work with the trappers. Don't work with the guys that actually could do this in a way they know how to do it and maybe make a little bit of money on the side. No. Let's have helicopters and shoot them from helicopters. Great idea. Or let's take fresh kill and poison the carcass, and – oh, yeah – only the wolves will eat that poisoned food, right? Everybody knows that. There won't be any wolverines or any crows or anything else eat that poison. Yes, of course they do.

What else wasn't in here? Well, things like mental health. I'm still waiting for the children's mental health strategy, which I've heard announced three times. I think they were different strategies, but I could be wrong. I'm still not seeing it. I'm still not seeing the mental health supports in the community. I'm still not seeing the support for the municipalities, who are increasingly taking over the burden of the work. Now you have a number of experts because I know that the previous mayor of Edmonton is not the only municipal person with experience that's sitting in government that could be giving the government some really good advice on what kind of assistance the municipalities have.

I heard somebody here complaining about the reverse, the government complaining that they weren't getting the federal government's fair share on legal aid. It's supposed to be 80-20: 80 for the feds, 20 for the province. Well, suck it up, Sunshine, because that's exactly what you're doing to FCSS. The municipalities have been shouldering the burden of 80 per cent of the cost of those programs for I don't know how long. You know, not that I would wish that back upon you, because I don't think that's what should be happening, but understand that that's what you're doing to the municipalities, and it shows every day.

Municipalities are the ones that are supplying the front-line services. In most cases they're picking up where you guys are leaving off and where you have dropped the ball on things. Think about a new way to give them some revenue sources, think about some way to give them some autonomy, and, for God's sake, give them their own bloody charter. Quit treating the city of Edmonton and the city of Calgary like the blessed places of Claresholm and Camrose and Tofield. They are not the same thing. They need their own piece of legislation to work by.

Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. This has been such a joy.

**The Acting Speaker:** Thank you, hon. member.

We now have five minutes of question and comment under Standing Order 29(2)(a). Are there any members that would like to question or comment?

Seeing none, we will move on to our next speaker to the throne speech, and that is the hon. Minister of Health.

**Mr. Mandel:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. Thank you for the opportunity to address the motion and reply to the speech from His Honour the Lieutenant Governor. I'd like to say that I've been a resident of this wonderful city and this province for 40 years, which makes me a transplant, which makes me part of the tens of thousands of people that have moved here from around this country to make Edmonton their home. My wife, Lynn, and I have raised our two children, Rachel and Adam, in this wonderful city, this wonderful province. Two years ago we were graced by our grandson, Chase, who really is the light of my life, like all grandchildren are to their grandparents.

After 30 years in business I entered politics. I spent 12 years in elected office prior to my election as the MLA for Edmonton-Whitemud. I'm honoured to have been elected. I'd like to speak

about why I entered provincial politics. This is not an easy job. As all of you know, you work long hours. You take on the concerns of the people you represent, and you work with them and for them to make an idea, an initiative, a goal, a policy come to fruition. In no other line of work do you have the opportunity to impact so much and so many people.

If you ask Canadians what defines their country, most will say one thing that defines us most, which is our public health care system. The public health care system has allowed Canadians peace of mind. It has given them a fundamental security that allows citizens to prosper and our economy to flourish. Without that publicly accessible system, in my opinion, that sense of security would be lost.

In my time as mayor of the city of Edmonton I became well acquainted with the socioeconomic factors that impact our health system: homelessness, poverty, addictions, mental health, family violence, plus so many others that drive people away from success and into the arms of health care and the social services system. As Health minister I am proud to take on the responsibility to ensure that those without a strong voice will be taken care of. Our most vulnerable must be treated with respect and compassion.

The delivery of our system rests in the hands of Alberta Health Services and Alberta Health plus untold individuals: physicians, nurses, pharmacists, optometrists, psychologists, front-line workers, maintenance people, and so many more. Their spirit and commitment make the system work. We all should thank them for the passion they have for the health care system.

Yes, our system has some challenges. Our costs are higher than other jurisdictions, but cost reduction is not the only way to improve our system. Better governance, increased accountability, more decentralization, listening to clinicians, and, yes, surprisingly enough, listening to Albertans: those together will make our system more responsive and, hopefully, more cost effective. To help with that process we brought together new leadership to investigate the board structure and cost analysis. We have worked with many rural communities to get their input so that our rural communities feel part of the solutions and the great opportunities for our province.

We also have challenges in emergency departments and acute-care beds, especially in our two largest cities. We must be proactive in dealing with the realities of these problems. Innovation and creativity will only take us so far. Capital investment is needed. Recent problems of overcrowding at the Rockyview, the challenge at the Misericordia hospital, the need for cancer facility upgrades in both Edmonton and Calgary, and the overcrowding situation at the Royal Alexandra hospital, the Peter Lougheed hospital, the Foothills, and the University hospital – we are such a growing province. We should make sure our cities are adequately prepared for that growth and our citizens taken care of in their facilities.

7:50

None of us would be here today without our electorate's support. I'm truly honoured to represent Edmonton-Whitemud. The community is out in force when it comes to supporting a number of events from community projects to fun runs, to playground design, to construction, to recs and advocacy, to arts and culture. This is a cosmopolitan, multicultural, dynamic community. I'm truly blessed and lucky and thrilled to represent such a wonderful, passionate community.

I'm proud to represent the people of Alberta as Health minister. Albertans have high expectations because we've been taught that our health care system should be the best and nothing less, and they see their health care system as fundamental to their quality of life. We want Albertans to live not only a healthy life but with a

focus on wellness in their lives so that they can have the kind of life that makes it such a good place to live.

Most of all, I'm proud to represent Alberta, this government, and be part of leaving a positive legacy for our children and our grandchildren.

Thank you.

**The Acting Speaker:** Standing Order 29(2)(a). Are there any members who would like to comment or question the Minister of Health? The hon. Member for Calgary-Shaw.

**Mr. Wilson:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I do appreciate the opportunity. Congratulations to the member on his election as the representative from Edmonton-Whitemud.

I would like to ask the hon. member if he would care to comment on his time as the mayor of Edmonton and his relationship with some of the rural counties around the city of Edmonton, how his role now as the representative for Edmonton-Whitemud is going to be impacted by some of that history and how he'd like to see the government of Alberta move forward with some of the rural counties who neighbour this capital city.

**The Acting Speaker:** The hon. minister.

**Mr. Mandel:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. That's a great question. During my tenure as mayor of Edmonton there were two substantial groups of people that we interacted with. There were northern mayors and reeves, which was a group of people from all over northern Alberta. There were counties and cities that came together quarterly. We got together to discuss opportunities and options for their communities and how we could work together. It was a wonderful group of people that brought to the table a tremendous perspective on all different issues of northern Alberta: the challenge of growth, the challenge of needing more physicians, the challenge of the problems of just dealing with growth in a community that has not the kinds of facilities they should have to meet those needs.

In the city of Edmonton in our capital region I was also part of a capital region caucus. We felt that that was a vitally important part of how we could grow and how we could come together. You know something? It was a great experience. There were 26 of us who were estranged from each other in the beginning but over a period of time began to work together. Yes, we had some differences, and we didn't always see eye to eye, but at the end of the day, for the most part, our region was moving forward, moving forward together because collectively we saw that as a region we were much stronger together. Weakness came when we started fighting and arguing over issues that really no one cared about. So as a result of our Capital Region Board and the commitment of the provincial government working with us, we created ties together that will allow us to move forward as a region in a much more effective way.

As the Minister of Health I believe I understand many of the challenges that are faced within our region and within northern Alberta as well as the other parts of Alberta that I've had an opportunity to visit in the last several weeks. We have a lot of challenges in our province because of growth. We have a lot of needs in our province. We do have restrictions on how much money we can spend on any one issue. We need to work hard to meet the needs of our province, to meet the needs of each of our counties and smaller municipalities in our region, but by working together, we can find solutions. I'm very excited that my experience in both northern Alberta and with our capital region will serve me well in dealing with the issues that I'm being faced with as the Minister of Health.

I hope that answers your question.

**The Acting Speaker:** Thank you, hon. minister.

There are still two minutes left. Is there anyone else that would like to ask a question?

Seeing none, we'll move on to our next response to the throne speech. The hon. Member for Edmonton-Beverly-Clareview.

**Mr. Bilous:** Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. It's my honour and privilege today to rise and give my response to the Speech from the Throne. I'm going to go through and highlight several of the issues that were raised in the Speech from the Throne, but I just wanted to comment briefly on my constituency of Edmonton-Beverly-Clareview.

This has really been a landmark year for the constituency. As members might recall, in the spring I brought in guests from the Beverly historical society because this year Beverly celebrated its centennial year, celebrating 100 years of being an incorporated community, which is quite significant. The community really came together around a number of events, Madam Speaker. I mean, there was an incredible street parade with over 54 entries. I can tell you that I participated in that parade, and it was incredible to see the streets packed several rows deep with people all out to celebrate the community and its history. There was a street concert, a family picnic, educational activities, and an interpretive centre, all empowered by volunteers, which is fantastic. I've been a huge advocate of the community and working toward revitalizing our community and showing that Beverly is an incredible place to live, to work, to raise your family. So I'm quite honoured to represent that community.

I just want to mention briefly the fact that Beverly was selected this year as the community to receive a replacement school. Now, you know, unfortunately, the deal was to trade three schools for a replacement school, which, with a heavy heart, means letting go of community schools. I'm a very big fan of children having the ability to walk to school, getting to know their neighbours, living and participating in their community.

I do want to say, Madam Speaker, that this is the first new school since about 1967 that the community of Beverly is getting. I think it's only fair that not only do our new, flourishing communities receive new facilities but that we also remember and respect our mature neighbourhoods. I'm very happy to have played a small role in that as far as promoting the public meetings and community participation. You know, I am quite thrilled that the community was selected, and I look forward to working with Infrastructure, with Edmonton public schools, and all the community partners. I must say, though, that the one tiny concern, that's already been raised, is that the original timeline of fall of 2016 has already been bumped to January of 2017, but we'll keep watching that with a diligent eye.

The second part of that, Madam Speaker, is the fact that we will have three empty schools in the community, or three empty facilities, and I've had a number of constituents, community groups, cultural groups all in desperate need of space. So I am going to take a second just to lobby on behalf of my constituents. The fact is that we have these buildings that exist. They may need some repurposing, but I would very much like to see them serve the community in the best way possible. I had a meeting with the Minister of Infrastructure, which I'm very grateful for, and raised those points in really ensuring that our facilities serve the needs of our communities and how to best do that. I'm looking forward to that discussion and those discussions moving forward.

I do want to raise one of the concerns, and I'm glad to see the Minister of Education here to relay the point that, unfortunately, right now in some of the Catholic schools they're still waiting on modulars, modulars that were promised back in September, which

have yet to be delivered. I can tell the minister first-hand that one school at least, Anne Fitzgerald, has been having to have classes held in makeshift classrooms. They've had to use the gym and other places to teach because there simply isn't enough space. To reiterate, these modulars were promised to be delivered in September, and they are still not delivered, so something to be aware of.

**8:00**

The last issue within my constituency at the moment, again quite exciting. The Clareview rec centre has been getting an addition put on and some renos, which is fantastic to see. But I do need to share some of the concern I'm hearing from my constituents, and that is accessibility and affordability to this revitalized facility. That's because at the moment the Clareview rec centre is designated as a tier 1 facility because of its size. Now, the concern and the challenge, Madam Speaker, is that means that the user fee is at the top tier to be able to access this facility. I will urge members on the other side to be aware of the different incomes that many of the families have who live in the area. Charging top tier to access this community facility will quite simply be out of reach for some families. So although I'm thrilled the government has invested in Clareview, I would like to bring that issue forward and hope that they will be aware that this may be a barrier for some families.

Madam Speaker, moving on to the Speech from the Throne. You know, something that my colleague the hon. Member for Edmonton-Strathcona brought up, which is a point that I think needs to be reiterated, is the fact that the Premier was elected through a by-election – on that note, I do wish to pass my congratulations on to the Premier, the Minister of Health, the Minister of Education, and the Member for Calgary-West on their victories in the by-elections – and the reason the Premier is the Premier and not the leader of an opposition party is because of a platform that his party put forward in 2012. Unfortunately, as many Albertans have seen, most of the promises that were made in 2012 have in fact been broken. Those of us on this side of the House are still waiting for some of those commitments to come forward. I mean, really, there's a laundry list from full-day K to, I believe, 140 family care clinics, which were promised but have been squashed, along with we're still waiting for the deliverables when it comes to education.

I appreciate the Premier and the Minister of Education promising new schools and more schools. Albertans are eagerly anticipating them. I do want to remind members of the House that part of the reason, and a large part of the reason, we're in the predicament we're in is because of a failure to invest in new schools for many, many years and the fact that our population continued to grow and this government dragged its feet on investing in infrastructure.

You know, a reminder is what just occurred at the Misericordia, which is a hospital that is ready to fall down for numerous reasons. Opposition members, including my colleague the Member for Edmonton-Calder, who has been a tireless advocate, were calling on the government to act before some kind of catastrophe happened. That did in fact happen, and there have been numerous examples of issues with the Misericordia and other hospitals and infrastructures around the province.

It just needs to be stated that the Premier has a mandate that was given to him or passed down to him from Albertans in the 2012 election. That cannot be ignored, Madam Speaker, and there are many promises that need to be fulfilled. Our leader, the Member for Edmonton-Strathcona, has been at the forefront, advocating on behalf of children, on children in care, on holding this government's



feet to the fire when it comes to acting on reducing child poverty. We saw a report that came out today that was quite disheartening, quite frankly. You know what? For too long Albertans have heard promises of action and seen committees struck and consultation yet little action.

Something just to segue into the Speech from the Throne: nothing to address the fact that there is a shortage of affordable housing. When this government struck the plan to end homelessness, they played a shell game with dollars that got moved from housing to the initiative for homelessness. Because of it, there has not been enough housing that's been built. Again, the population of Edmonton, the population of Alberta is swelling. You know, we have numbers passed around of around a hundred thousand people moving to the province. We need to invest in infrastructure. We needed to invest in infrastructure 20 years ago, so we're playing the game of catch-up. The irony is that when you put it off for 20 years, your costs continue to go up, where schools, roads, and hospitals would have been much cheaper 20 years ago because of inflation, wages, and the cost of materials. But according to this government that's neither here nor there.

Something that I find interesting out of the Speech from the Throne – I've kind of broken mine into five different categories, and I'm going to have to move a little quicker here. The first one was a commitment that the Premier made to maximizing the value of our natural resources. Now, that sounds really great, and I love the phraseology of that. But when we actually dissect it, you know, it's the Alberta NDP who have been the most vocal advocates of adding value to our resources. We're talking about upgrading and refining much of the bitumen that's extracted in this province, and that is a way to ensure that the quality jobs stay in this province. Building pipelines provides short-term, temporary jobs and ships all the quality jobs down to the refineries and upgraders elsewhere. I would think that the government of Alberta should be acting in the best interests of Albertans, but clearly this PC government is not, so shipping jobs is the way to go. This is where I disagree with the Premier.

I can say that, you know, in the Alberta NDP we aren't opposed to diversifying our markets. We recognize that when you have one buyer, you don't set the price; the buyer does. What we would do as government is ensure that we're upgrading more of our unprocessed bitumen here in Alberta. I completely recognize that we don't have the capacity to upgrade everything that is extracted, and that's not where we're going. But, again, we're looking at extremes right now. We're upgrading a pittance and shipping more raw bitumen than any other jurisdiction in North America. Madam Speaker, quite simply, we are selling ourselves out. Clearly, this government seems unconcerned by it or is just too far into the pockets of the industry that benefits the most from upgrading in other jurisdictions.

I do want to mention as well that the NDP recognizes that small business is the largest economic driver in our province. We were the only party in the last election who proposed a small-business tax cut, proposing a tax cut by one-third. Again, we realize the value that small businesses contribute to our economy.

When we talk about some of the ways that we would fund some of the social programs, infrastructure, etc., where I get frustrated, Madam Speaker, is the fact that this government absolutely refuses to have a discussion on the second half of the coin. We've got spending on one side of the coin; we have revenue on the other side of the coin. Many Albertans that I've talked to – and I'm not talking about just my constituency but around the province – understand why they pay taxes, understand the value of taxes.

Infrastructure doesn't fall from the sky. Hospitals don't poof into existence, and neither do schools. They cost dollars. But

Albertans want to see their dollars working for them. So the issue of a progressive income tax is not something that the majority of Albertans are opposed to. Again, a progressive income tax can be scaled so that, you know, whether you're looking at a small tax increase for households earning over \$200,000 a year, for example, we're actually talking about saving dollars for middle-income families, where in Alberta they actually pay more than other jurisdictions when you do comparables.

We're looking, again, at having a competitive royalty regime and a competitive corporate tax rate. Right now Alberta undercuts itself so much. You could adjust our corporate tax rate and our royalty rate modestly so that we are still a competitive jurisdiction with other parts of Canada yet the government would bring in a few billion more.

I see I am running out of time shortly. I do want to touch on education, our cities, and health, so if I do get cut off, we'll see if I have opportunity to pop up again.

As far as education, again, like I mentioned, I'm glad to see we're starting to make promises to build schools. We still haven't fulfilled Premier Stelmach's promises from 2011. We are far from fulfilling former Premier Redford's promises in 2013.

**The Acting Speaker:** Thank you, hon. member.

Standing Order 29(2)(a). The hon. Member for Calgary-Shaw.

8:10

**Mr. Wilson:** Well, thank you, Madam Speaker. I appreciate the opportunity to ask the Member for Edmonton-Beverly-Clareview a quick question. I'm wondering, regarding the modulars in your constituency that you brought up earlier on in your speech, if you've told the parents impacted by the lack of action on those modulars that perhaps they should write a letter or two to the Minister of Education to perhaps get some action.

**The Acting Speaker:** The hon. member.

**Mr. Bilous:** Thank you, Madam Speaker, and I thank the hon. Member for Calgary-Shaw for that question. Yeah, it's something that we've been, you know, advocating on behalf of. Quite frankly – and it may shock many members of this House – up until maybe two months ago there were actually 54 fully built modulars sitting in a field waiting to get shipped to schools. When asked – it wasn't on the company; they fulfilled their contract with Alberta Infrastructure – the government played the blame game on the school boards: “Well, that's their fault. They need to transport this to their own schools.”

I found that very disingenuous. I found that quite frustrating, that we have classrooms and teachers teaching in broom closets, on stages, in libraries, in staff rooms because there is simply not enough space, and here you had 54 modulars built, and very well built – I toured them myself – and sitting in a field and not being delivered because the government passed the buck and said: well, that's not our responsibility to deliver. It's shameful. The buck stops with the province of Alberta. They are responsible for education in this province.

Keeping on the theme of education, a message to the members on the other side. Again, I'm happy to hear promises of infrastructure, of buildings being built, but please recognize that school boards will need the dollars to staff these schools. There is a shortage of staffing. We're talking about, you know, classrooms that are more diverse than they've ever been. We've got English language learners. We've got new immigrants, new Canadians, kids coming over whose command of the English language is not at the same level as their colleagues at the same age, in the same grade. We have children with special needs. We have lots of different challenges

that teachers and other students face, and if we do not adequately resource our classrooms, we are doing a disservice to our students and they will not be able to compete in our global context.

As I've said before, you know, the people of this province are our greatest asset, and we need to invest in them. The best way to do that is ensuring that our children have the best education possible. I would argue – and I've said this to teachers before – that the reason that Alberta has the best education system is because of the teachers and the workers who work in our system. It is not because of this government. They work despite the barriers and obstacles that are put up in front of them. You want to talk about teacher workload? You want to talk about class sizes? It is unbelievable, hon. members, that 25 per cent of teachers in the first five years leave the profession. I hope that number causes some of you to raise an alarm and to ask: why is it that one-quarter of teachers in the first five years leave the profession? It's an alarming statistic, and that shouldn't be the case.

In my last couple of minutes I want to talk about the fact that, you know, the Alberta NDP has a vision for our cities to be vibrant cities and vibrant communities. Time and time again Edmonton and Calgary have asked for a specific big-city charter. All that they've gotten in this document, this Speech from the Throne, is a framework agreement. We need to recognize that the issues and challenges facing Edmonton and Calgary are very different from those of a hamlet somewhere or a summer village, yet at the moment all 349 municipalities have the same tools at their disposal to provide for differing needs of service. That is shameful, especially on the other side with the former mayor of Edmonton being in the front bench, and this should be acknowledged. We're past the time for talking, and action is here.

We talk about stable, predictable funding, the fact that MSI should be expanded and continued. Transportation: cities are looking for new dollars. I would love to see a GreenTRIP 2.0 come out from this government. Again, I talked about housing. We look at child care. The fact that Albertans pay more than most other provinces for child care is shameful. That would encourage people to get into the workforce. Now you have more income being made, which means that the government gets more revenue from taxes. The fact that we need to acknowledge... [Mr. Bilous's speaking time expired]

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

**The Acting Speaker:** Thank you, hon. member.

Are there any other members who wish to reply to the throne speech? The hon. member for . . .

**Mr. Dorward:** Just a quick question: what else . . .

**The Acting Speaker:** I'm sorry; 29(2)(a) is done. He used up his five minutes, sir.

I'm looking for any other members who wish to respond to the throne speech. The hon. Minister of Human Services.

**Mrs. Klimchuk:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would now move to adjourn debate.

[Motion to adjourn debate carried]

## Government Bills and Orders

### Second Reading

#### Bill 1

#### Respecting Property Rights Act

[Adjourned debate November 19: Mr. Denis]

**The Acting Speaker:** Are there any members who wish to speak to Bill 1 in second reading? The hon. Member for Calgary-Mountain View.

**Dr. Swann:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. It's my pleasure to rise and speak to Bill 1, Respecting Property Rights Act. Bill 1 would repeal the Land Assembly Project Area Act, which was never proclaimed and came to the House in 2009, as many will remember. It's interesting that this would automatically be repealed next year if it hadn't been proclaimed, by virtue of a previous enactment, as will the Land Stewardship Act if we do not see that altered as well.

The original Bill 19 aimed to designate corridors for infrastructure projects such as transportation utility corridors – and who could argue with that? – but protecting property rights has become the central theme of a major debate in Alberta since Bill 19 was brought forward. The Member for Rimbey-Rocky Mountain House-Sundre has become famous and infamous for his rallying around Bill 19 and the constituents who stood up against what was felt to be a draconian and unresponsive bill with respect to compensation appeal mechanisms for land confiscation. It would have placed unlimited and indefinite restrictions on landowners' rights, with serious fines and potential prison time as penalties for failing to comply.

At the same time, however, the Liberal caucus has concerns around another bill that relates to this, and that is the Responsible Energy Development Act, which created the Alberta Energy Regulator. Although the Responsible Energy Development Act is outside the scope of Bill 1, the Liberal caucus's concerns could have been incorporated into the Premier's premier bill.

The Liberal caucus is concerned about who is granted standing in hearings on proposed development projects, where only those "directly and adversely affected" get to participate. This is specifically sections 32, 34, and 36. If the regulator determines that no one filing a statement of concern is directly and adversely affected, there is no hearing. This ignores the property rights of landowners who are indirectly and adversely affected, and it ignores, obviously, the concerns around public lands and groups such as the Alberta Wilderness Association and their concerns about developments on public lands, whether in the north or in the south. Restriction also creates First Nations consultation issues, particularly if traditional land is at issue. The Premier could have addressed the Responsible Energy Development Act in terms of property rights and First Nations, but so far he has chosen not to.

Starting in 2016, the Statutes Repeal Act, as I mentioned, will start a process of repeal with any unproclaimed legislation, and we're concerned that that may affect what was a very positive direction in terms of the Land Stewardship Act, which we almost unanimously supported in this House and still is not in full force.

**8:20**

Our position hasn't really changed on Bill 19. We're pleased to see it being repealed since it failed to address some of those key concerns around compensation and appeal process. Clearly, there must be a guarantee that a landowner get fully compensated and that the appellant – there should be appellants – can take the government to court to get full compensation in the event that it appears and is in reality unfair.

With respect to the Responsible Energy Development Act what the minister failed to do is to recognize that individuals and groups don't necessarily live in direct proximity to developments and can still be significantly impacted. We find it short sighted when environmental issues are confined to an artificial neighbourhood

boundary where the impact of an oil spill not only affects that community but downstream communities as well.

It appears that the government again is working in favour of development and in favour of an expedited application process and denying meaningful public participation in this way, which is part of our international and national loss of reputation. It's absolutely essential for Alberta to improve its credibility on the environment if our primary energy industry is going to develop the credibility and marketability beyond our borders. We're seeing the results of that failure today.

The Alberta Energy Regulator has already denied public hearings on an application by CNRL and its Kirby expansion based on statements of concern filed by nine different parties, including First Nations groups. Clearly, this cannot go on. Alberta Liberals are therefore calling on the government to amend section 32 of the act to make these hearings truly open and accessible to all Albertans.

Again, that relates to the opportunity that's before us, Madam Speaker, in addressing the repeal of Bill 19, and I look forward to this government taking on a real leadership role in terms of property rights and environmental rights, ensuring respect for not only those indirectly affected but also, obviously, including our First Nations.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

**The Acting Speaker:** Thank you, hon. member.

Standing Order 29(2)(a) doesn't kick in at this point in time. We wait till the third speaker. So if you have a 29(2)(a), you'll have to wait till the next speaker to address that issue.

Are there any other members who wish to speak? The hon. Member for Cardston-Taber-Warner.

**Mr. Bikman:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. Since 2010 the erosion of property rights under various bills passed by the PC government has been a major issue in rural Alberta. We talked about that earlier today. After promising during his leadership race to resolve this in his first piece of legislation, Bill 1 came forward. It repeals Bill 19, the Land Assembly Project Area Act, in its entirety. This act, amended under political pressure in 2011, allowed the government to plan for future expropriations by placing restrictions on development of land it might want to expropriate in the future. It was controversial because of the potential to radically undermine the value and use of large tracts of land without any guarantees that the land would ever be used for public purposes. Additionally, it granted significant discretion to cabinet, which was only partially ameliorated in the 2011 amendment act.

Bill 1 says nothing about any of the other controversial bills, in particular Bill 36, the Alberta Land Stewardship Act. This act, like others, did not offer adequate compensation options to affected landowners. The bill was never proclaimed, never mind used. As with Bill 50, while it may take significant political damage before repealing a bad law, eventually the PC government sometimes does the right thing. Surprising, I know, but we're grateful. We always encourage the government to take our lead. Evidence once again that Wildrose is where real leadership is in Alberta. The cons of this are that by only repealing this act that the government has never used and not amending the far more significant ALSA, this act is actually a bit of an insult to property rights.

At least the government could have repealed the other offensive act that they never used, Bill 24, by which the government claimed ownership of pore spaces and gave itself powers to control when and who had access to pump CO<sub>2</sub> under the land of rural Albertans. ALSA has numerous amendments that it needs.

The Responsible Energy Development Act has a couple of amendments that it also needs.

This act, Bill 1, addresses virtually none of the property rights concerns of Grassroots Alberta, that thought they were making some progress by the comments that the Premier had made and by his receiving their suggestions.

The government really hasn't fixed the Land Stewardship Act in response to property rights concerns, just partially but only after a long grassroots political campaign. Bill 36, the Alberta Land Stewardship Act, in particular still gives cabinet the power to rescind water licences, grazing leases, oil leases, and many more rights and permissions without guarantees of compensation or the right to appeal the compensation offered. The bill stipulates that if a designated minister determines a particular action necessary, the bureaucracy must initiate a management response. This is referred to as a Henry VIII clause, which effectively shifts the law-making power from the Assembly to the cabinet.

My colleague that moved Motion 501 earlier today outlined some of the specific clauses that still remain that really do undermine property rights. Do we support it? Of course, because it's a step in the right direction. It's the beginning of repealing the first of the draconian bills that have been referred to numerous times in here. We can only hope for more.

Thank you.

**The Acting Speaker:** Thank you, hon. member.

Now we have Standing Order 29(2)(a). Are there any members interested in asking a question or making a comment?

Seeing none, the hon. Member for Edmonton-Beverly-Clareview.

**Mr. Bilous:** Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. It's my pleasure to rise and speak to the second reading of Bill 1, Respecting Property Rights Act. I'd like to say at the onset that the Alberta NDP and myself, obviously, support Bill 1 and its repeal of the Land Assembly Project Area Act.

Now, when this act was first introduced, the NDP opposed it because initially, you know, the act was a very heavy-handed approach to land assembly. Although we recognize that large amounts of land are, obviously, necessary for infrastructure projects, the bill put government convenience over the rights of landowners. It also allowed the government to limit the development that was allowed on someone's land without a timeline for when the project the land was being saved for would begin or without requirements for compensation for the prohibition of the development of the land which the owner owned.

Now, though it was amended in 2011, Madam Speaker, it wasn't sufficient to address all the concerns that were raised. The amendments improved on areas of concern such as compensation and access to the courts; however, there remained concerns about the consultation process, and many of those details were left to the regulations. The bill still concentrated power within the hands of the government, which, as you know, has been a major concern of my caucus ever since I was elected in 2012. Many of the bills that we've seen in the last two and a half years are moving power into the hands of cabinet, the ministry to make sweeping decisions without consulting the very stakeholders that are involved in these decisions. The Land Assembly Project Area Act is an example of the arrogance of this current government as they prioritized their own convenience and blatantly disregarded the property rights of Albertans. Today Bill 1 attempts to remedy some of the previous PC government's problems or the problems that this PC government created.

Now, we support this bill as we opposed the Land Assembly Project Area Act when it passed in 2009. Madam Speaker, I just want to make a point here that although we're supporting this current piece of legislation, it is clear that Bill 1 is another example of PC broken promises. I'll remind members of the House that throughout his campaign for leadership the Premier committed himself and his party to addressing the limits on property rights that have been put in place by previous PC governments.

**8:30**

On the leadership campaign trail the Premier appealed to his background as a property rights lawyer, saying that he had negotiated fair settlements and respected property rights. He promised to restore balance between the rights of landowners and the interests of industry. In the Speech from the Throne, Madam Speaker, the Premier highlighted private ownership of land as a fundamental and essential principle of our democracy. These are the very promises Bill 1 fails to meet.

It does not adequately address the problems with property rights created by previous PC governments. It only addresses one of three controversial pieces of legislation, which some of my colleagues on this side of House have raised and which we'll raise again so that members on the other side of the House will fully understand the issues and the challenges that we have with the current piece of legislation. Three pieces of legislation that it does not address: the first is Bill 19, Land Assembly Project Area Act; the second is Bill 36, the Alberta Land Stewardship Act, which created seven regional plans that trumped all other legislation and concentrated the power to do this in the hands of the cabinet; and Bill 50, Electric Statutes Amendment Act, 2009, which allowed the cabinet to define what was considered essential infrastructure.

Now, we don't believe that this bill goes far enough. Many of the commitments our party made regarding land rights five years ago remain unaddressed. We're especially disappointed that the Electric Statutes Act, amended by the controversial Bill 50 in 2009, has not been addressed. By failing to address this bill, the government continues to prioritize the interests of industry, in this example electricity, over the rights of Alberta landowners. Bill 50, the Electric Statutes Amendment Act, allowed cabinet to define what was considered essential transmission infrastructure. This cut out the Alberta Utilities Commission, which, along with other organizations, developed a process for project assessment decisions in order to ensure they were done in a fair and scientific manner. These processes have now been bypassed, and the power to make a decision rests with cabinet.

We sounded the alarm bells years ago, Madam Speaker, of the dangers of putting this much power into the hands of a few. Again, to this day we see that the power doesn't rest in the masses, in Albertans, which is where it should be. The fact is that you have a cabinet, a handful of individuals, that is making decisions that affect millions of Albertans but hundreds if not thousands of landowners.

When introduced, we opposed this bill because it failed to protect consumers from the overbuilding of unnecessary transmission lines, the cost of which would be passed on to Albertans. We also opposed this decision because it resulted in a reduced voice for consumers and for Albertans, consumers who, as a result of massive overbuilding of transmission lines, would be paying for the very decisions they had no say in.

In response to Bill 50 we made the following commitments: all utility projects would be subject to full public scrutiny and a full regulatory process, power customers must not be required to fund

utility projects by for-profit companies, and the protection of power consumers' interests and an end to electricity deregulation.

This government many years ago promised that deregulation would pass savings on to Albertans. Well, that's quite funny, Madam Speaker, because the opposite happened, where Alberta went from one of the most competitive jurisdictions for electricity rates to one of the most expensive through privatization and decentralizing our electricity.

Since the passage of Bill 50 it's become clear that many of the issues we feared would occur as a result of the legislation are coming to fruition. Again, as I said, costs have been rising in Alberta. Between 2002 and 2011 there was a 384 per cent increase in transmission prices for consumers. Over a two-month period in 2011, between September and November, transmission prices rose by a whopping 42 per cent. In 2011 Edmonton and Calgary had the highest electricity bills of all major Canadian cities. In April 2011 a monthly bill for 1,000 kilowatts a month was over \$250 before tax. In Edmonton it was approximately \$240. In 2011 Albertans paid \$60 more for 659 kilowatts in 30 days than people in Saskatchewan and Ontario and almost \$100 more than in B.C. As you can see from these examples, we've yet to see the advantage to the deregulation and privatization of our electrical grid.

On March 20, 2012, the NDP tabled a document recounting the struggles of Albertan families to pay their mounting and in many cases extremely high electricity bills. Well, here's something interesting, Madam Speaker, just a nice little juxtaposition. While Albertan families struggled to pay for their electricity bills, the CEOs of Enbridge and EPCOR made millions. Here's an example. In 2012 Enbridge's CEO made over \$12 million, in 2012 TransAlta's CEO made \$5.6 million, and in 2009 EPCOR's CEO made \$2.6 million.

In 2012 two companies applied for approval to export energy to the U.S. Alberta was already planning on spending over \$16 billion on transmission, \$11 billion more than Ontario and \$12 billion more than B.C., despite having a smaller population and lower electricity generation.

So, Madam Speaker, there's evidence that overbuilding of transmission lines is occurring, and this can be tied directly to Bill 50, which this PC government has continued to fail to address. We've seen the effects of the deregulation of electricity and the overbuilding of transmission lines done through this act and many others on electricity bills in Alberta.

The bill represents more broken PC promises. Despite considerable commitments made by the Premier during his leadership campaign and the Speech from the Throne, Bill 1 only begins to scratch the surface of issues pertaining to property rights that previous PC governments created. By failing to address other property rights issues like Bill 50, this PC government's new management continues to put their corporate friends ahead of Albertan families. For us, again, Madam Speaker, this bill, although a step in the right direction, is far from adequate in addressing some of the failed pieces of legislation which, to be honest, have an enormous impact on Albertan families, on the cost of electricity on their monthly bills.

It's for those reasons that very reluctantly will I support Bill 1. I believe that there will be amendments coming forward to try to strengthen this and address some of the other bills that, quite honestly, Madam Speaker, have utterly failed Albertans.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

**The Acting Speaker:** Thank you, hon. member.

We have Standing Order 29(2)(a). Are there any members interested in questioning or commenting?

Seeing none, I'll move to our next speaker, the hon. Member for Rimbey-Rocky Mountain House-Sundre.

**Mr. Anglin:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise in support of this bill. I'm not going to marginalize the necessity and the importance of this bill and how thrilled I am that this government now has brought this bill forward. This is a good bill. It is a just bill.

I want to make it absolutely clear that probably 15 out of the 17 Wildrose Party MLAs that were elected in 2012 were elected on a kill Bill 19, kill Bill 36, kill Bill 50 platform. You can still go out in some of those ridings today and see the signs: kill Bill 19, 36, and 50. You can go down to Medicine Hat and see those signs in the rural areas. You can go out into the various corners of this province, and you will see those signs. So to stand up here and say, "that's not good": I can't agree with that. That, to me, is disingenuous. I travelled this province on "kill Bill 19," and I'm going to explain in a minute what it means.

The other members have been bringing up a number of different bills, particularly the Member for Calgary-Shaw. I'm going to tell you something. When that member voted for Bill 2, that member voted to remove a landowner's right to notification. He voted to remove the landowners' right to be informed and have an opportunity to get the relevant information from an applicant doing oil and gas drilling on their property. He also voted in that same bill to remove a landowner's right to cross-examine and to remove a landowner's right to a hearing, never mind that the public interest test had been removed from legislation in that bill. Thank you very much. So when that member stands up and says that he stands up for property rights, I don't agree. I think you missed the boat.

8:40

But I will tell you that these members who say that somehow Bill 36, the Alberta Land Stewardship Act, overrides this don't understand how these bills work or what these bills were designed to do. Let me explain. There were two bills that actually caused some harm. Maybe only one bill. That would be the Electric Statutes Amendment Act, when we overbuilt the electricity system. All consumers are now paying more. That's an issue unto itself.

The other bill is Bill 24, the carbon capture and sequestration. That is an interesting bill because it categorically just removed all the pore space below the surface of all lands and gave that ownership to government. Now, did that cause harm to any property owners? That's a debatable issue. The fact is that what should happen is that if we are going to go through with carbon capture and storage, which I disagree with, then we should take issue with how we're going to do it and take it case by case versus this arbitrary bill that just took ownership of all the pore space below everybody's land.

I'll talk about that bill later if somebody asks me questions, but what I want to talk about is why Bill 19 is important. This idea that it was not proclaimed is moot, is a ridiculous argument. This government has no record right now of abusing anybody with these bills other than the overcharging for Bill 50. Even the Land Stewardship Act. What we know about the Land Stewardship Act is that the government cancelled some oil leases. But what we don't know and what we don't have any evidence of is: were those companies justly paid for losing those leases? We don't know. What we do know when we look at Bill 19 and Bill 36 is that they gave the government the power to abuse. The fact that the bill had not been proclaimed is a moot point in the sense that that bill is law. Just because the government had not put it into force yet doesn't change anything. It had to go.

This bill, Bill 1, makes that now a moot point. It is gone. That is a good thing for landowners, and landowners can take some sort of comfort that that bill now is gone.

Now, let's explain what was actually in that bill. What did Bill 19 do? Well, actually, what it was creating was utility corridors. I'm actually in favour of utility corridors, but that bill went so far overboard as far as I was concerned. I went around this province. I debated the Minister of Energy. I debated the Minister of Transportation. I debated the Minister of Municipal Affairs and many other ministers who are not here today on this very bill. Kill Bill 19.

So what did it do? Why should the public have been concerned about it? Well, what it did is that Bill 19 usurped or overrode section 5 of the Government Organization Act, something that dealt with restricted development areas. It was already in law. They were called RDAs. What those RDAs did is that they took land in the public interest. When the government took responsibility for those restricted development areas, there was a mandate – and it still is in law right now – that the government had to protect the aquifer, that the government had to protect the natural state of the land, that the government had to protect deterioration of the property. So there were all these protections built into this section 5 of the Government Organization Act when the government implemented restricted development areas.

Bill 19 was introduced, and what it did is basically say that for the purpose of this act – and this is in interesting definition, Madam Speaker – a project is a public project if the project is "designated by the Lieutenant Governor in Council as a public project." That thing just goes around in a circle, around and around and around. It's like: what the heck are we talking about?

Basically, what happened is that they took the various sections of that restricted development area in the Government Organization Act, and no longer did the government have a mandate to protect the land. What the government actually did by twisting a few words around was that it said that it could control, restrict, prohibit, or approve any kind of use on a land. It said that it could control, restrict, prohibit, or exercise any kind of power referred to in regulations. It said that it could control, restrict, prohibit, or approve the dumping, deposit, or emission of any substance, a complete change over the language of the restricted development areas. That is significant on landowner rights and protecting their land if their property is taken for a utility corridor.

More importantly, what happened in that bill is that property owners lost the ability to be notified. That got removed from the act under Bill 19, and more importantly the government gave themselves the authority to act as if it was the Queen's Bench. Where it once had to take an enforcement order to court, it no longer had to do that. It could issue an enforcement order as if it were a judgment of the Queen's Bench, and that enforcement order could carry with it a \$100,000 fine and two years in jail. The interesting thing about the act is that it specifically stated initially that the Expropriation Act will not apply.

Now, all these various sections are very similar to the various sections you would find in the Land Stewardship Act, but as the government has stated, when we go to committee, we are going to be able now to address some of these issues because that is what the Property Rights Advocate has asked the government to do in its report. So hopefully, we are actually on the right track. I've got no evidence to suggest that we are not at this very moment in time. The best thing that can happen for property owners is that Bill 19, the Land Assembly Project Area Act, is finally killed. Bill 1 kills it. That is a good thing, and the thousands of Wildrose Party members that signed up to the Wildrose Party for this very reason need to know that, that this new Premier has finally listened, has

finally heard, and has finally acted. I have to tell you that after so many years up there arguing against Bill 19, after just two years in here arguing about Bill 19 and these many other acts, I do not marginalize this. This is a good thing for property rights. I'm going to support this bill, and I'm going to vote yes for this bill each time it comes up for a reading, and I'm not going to be hypocritical about it whatsoever.

When we get down into talking about the Electric Statutes Amendments Act and what that has done, I will tell you something here right now. They know nothing about it like most people in this Assembly know nothing about it. It is an act that caused us serious pain as far as the rates we're paying, but it is a complicated piece of legislation in what it did technically.

With that, I fully hope that when we get into committee, we deal with Bill 24 and the carbon sequestration. I think it is absolutely possible for the minister and for the Premier to actually kill that bill also because, one, I really don't think carbon capture is going to get off the ground. When you actually take a look at the amount of money we're going to spend on that, I just don't think that's worth half the money that we're going to spend. What we need to do is actually reduce our CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, verifiable reductions to make some sort of statement to the world, and when we do that, what we should do is take a look at this overreaching project and say: "You know what? That is really not worth it." There are other ways that are far more effective, that are cheaper, that cost a whole lot less, that can do what we need to do, and if we can have a policy that gets us into renewable energies, we don't need that act whatsoever. That is one act that can be removed.

Unfortunately, the Land Stewardship Act cannot be repealed without causing great harm to the public, I believe, right now. Just like we repealed Bill 50, but the lines are built. Unfortunately, we're going to pay for that. The money has been spent. So to tear down those towers today would just be adding on to the waste. To repeal Bill 36, the Land Stewardship Act, today would cause tremendous complications because we have created the land-use framework and we have applied the Land Stewardship Act to bring that into force, and there are so many factors and so many other bills that have been amended as a result. The only possible, feasible thing to do with the Land Stewardship Act is to revisit the various sections of the act that absolutely need to be changed to give something very simple that the public wants, due process. This is all about process.

**8:50**

Landowners understand that property will be taken for various public interest projects. Nobody wants to give up their property to a power line. Nobody wants to give up their property to a road. But people with common sense – and a whole bunch of Albertans have common sense – understand the necessity in the public interest. What they want is a fair and just process, that they are treated and compensated in a just manner. That's it. They need that process.

If we have the opportunity to look at Bill 36 and amend section 9(2), to amend section 11(1), to basically repeal section 13, to amend sections 15(1), 15(3), 15(4), 17(4), 19, and 26 of that bill, that party will have taken the wind out of that party and taken back the rural areas. That's something that I hope you will pay attention to because the Premier has said that he wants to take property rights and make that a fundamental shift and a fundamental change. This is

the map on how to do it. Address these bills, address the inconsistency in these bills. Give property owners due process. Give them a fair process. Make them whole if their property is taken. That's all they want. They want to see it in law. If you give that to them, you will have them supporting you. That's how it works. Killing Bill 19 starts that process right now, today.

I am going to stand up, and I am going to vote loud for this bill. I will tell you this. There can be giggles in here, but I've spoken to thousands of Albertans – and I mean thousands of Albertans, Madam Speaker – and I have seen the halls line up with people buying Wildrose Party memberships as a direct result of talking about this bill. Now this is going to be gone when we finally get done third reading, and these people and all Albertans need to know that this is a major step forward in turning this government around. I'd like to think the opposition had a lot to do with it. I think we did have a lot to do with it. But it's absolutely clear to me that when this new Premier came in, this new Premier was listening to Albertans. He did hear Albertans talk about this, and he's acting about this.

**An Hon. Member:** They're not going to take you.

**Mr. Anglin:** You know, I can take the jiving from the Wildrose, but I will tell you something . . . [interjections]. Thank you very much. Well, nobody recorded my meetings out there, I don't think. Otherwise I'd be showing them.

The fact is that this bill is not a small step. It is a major step. I understand how the process works. I know members over there supported this bill, and they voted for it. But I also know that two Wildrose Party members were over there when they voted on this and supported it. I also know the history of who voted for what and who actually stood up for property rights. There were many nights out there that we discussed this bill.

**An Hon. Member:** How much?

**Mr. Anglin:** How much? I'll tell you how much. In the two years prior to the Wildrose getting elected, I spoke in 91 communities and I did 266 town hall meetings, and that doesn't even count the years before that.

**The Acting Speaker:** Thank you, hon. member.

We now have Standing Order 29(2)(a). Are there any other members who wish to make a comment or ask questions to the hon. Member for Rimbey-Rocky Mountain House-Sundre?

Seeing none, are there any other members who wish to speak to Bill 1 in second reading?

**Mr. Oberle:** I call the question, Madam Speaker.

[Motion carried; Bill 1 read a second time]

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

**Mr. Oberle:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. In consideration of the hour and the progress made this evening, I'm happy to move that we adjourn until 1:30 tomorrow afternoon.

[Motion carried; the Assembly adjourned at 8:55 p.m. to Tuesday at 1:30 p.m.]

**Table of Contents**

Consideration of His Honour the Lieutenant Governor’s Speech..... 137

Government Bills and Orders

    Second Reading

        Bill 1   Respecting Property Rights Act ..... 142

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](http://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