



Province of Alberta

The 29th Legislature
Second Session

Alberta Hansard

Tuesday morning, June 7, 2016

Day 40

The Honourable Robert E. Wanner, Speaker

Legislative Assembly of Alberta
The 29th Legislature

Second Session

Wanner, Hon. Robert E., Medicine Hat (ND), Speaker
Jabbour, Deborah C., Peace River (ND), Deputy Speaker and Chair of Committees
Sweet, Heather, Edmonton-Manning (ND), Deputy Chair of Committees

Aheer, Leela Sharon, Chestermere-Rocky View (W)	Loyola, Rod, Edmonton-Ellerslie (ND)
Anderson, Shaye, Leduc-Beaumont (ND)	Luff, Robyn, Calgary-East (ND)
Anderson, Wayne, Highwood (W)	MacIntyre, Donald, Innisfail-Sylvan Lake (W)
Babcock, Erin D., Stony Plain (ND)	Malkinson, Brian, Calgary-Currie (ND)
Barnes, Drew, Cypress-Medicine Hat (W)	Mason, Hon. Brian, Edmonton-Highlands-Norwood (ND), Government House Leader
Bilous, Hon. Deron, Edmonton-Beverly-Clareview (ND), Deputy Government House Leader	McCuaig-Boyd, Hon. Margaret, Dunvegan-Central Peace-Notley (ND)
Carlier, Hon. Oneil, Whitecourt-St. Anne (ND), Deputy Government House Leader	McIver, Ric, Calgary-Hays (PC), Leader of the Progressive Conservative Opposition
Carson, Jonathon, Edmonton-Meadowlark (ND)	McKittrick, Annie, Sherwood Park (ND)
Ceci, Hon. Joe, Calgary-Fort (ND)	McLean, Hon. Stephanie V., Calgary-Varsity (ND)
Clark, Greg, Calgary-Elbow (AP)	McPherson, Karen M., Calgary-Mackay-Nose Hill (ND)
Connolly, Michael R.D., Calgary-Hawkwood (ND)	Miller, Barb, Red Deer-South (ND)
Coolahan, Craig, Calgary-Klein (ND)	Miranda, Hon. Ricardo, Calgary-Cross (ND)
Cooper, Nathan, Olds-Didsbury-Three Hills (W), Official Opposition House Leader	Nielsen, Christian E., Edmonton-Decore (ND)
Cortes-Vargas, Estefania, Strathcona-Sherwood Park (ND), Government Whip	Nixon, Jason, Rimbey-Rocky Mountain House-Sundre (W), Official Opposition Whip
Cyr, Scott J., Bonnyville-Cold Lake (W), Official Opposition Deputy Whip	Notley, Hon. Rachel, Edmonton-Strathcona (ND), Premier
Dach, Lorne, Edmonton-McClung (ND)	Orr, Ronald, Lacombe-Ponoka (W)
Dang, Thomas, Edmonton-South West (ND)	Panda, Prasad, Calgary-Foothills (W)
Drever, Deborah, Calgary-Bow (ND)	Payne, Hon. Brandy, Calgary-Acadia (ND)
Drysdale, Wayne, Grande Prairie-Wapiti (PC), Progressive Conservative Opposition Whip	Phillips, Hon. Shannon, Lethbridge-West (ND)
Eggen, Hon. David, Edmonton-Calder (ND)	Piquette, Colin, Athabasca-Sturgeon-Redwater (ND)
Ellis, Mike, Calgary-West (PC)	Pitt, Angela D., Airdrie (W)
Feehan, Hon. Richard, Edmonton-Rutherford (ND)	Renaud, Marie F., St. Albert (ND)
Filtebrandt, Derek Gerhard, Strathmore-Brooks (W)	Rodney, Dave, Calgary-Lougheed (PC)
Fitzpatrick, Maria M., Lethbridge-East (ND)	Rosendahl, Eric, West Yellowhead (ND)
Fraser, Rick, Calgary-South East (PC)	Sabir, Hon. Irfan, Calgary-McCall (ND)
Ganley, Hon. Kathleen T., Calgary-Buffalo (ND)	Schmidt, Hon. Marlin, Edmonton-Gold Bar (ND)
Gill, Prab, Calgary-Greenway (PC)	Schneider, David A., Little Bow (W)
Goehring, Nicole, Edmonton-Castle Downs (ND)	Schreiner, Kim, Red Deer-North (ND)
Gotfried, Richard, Calgary-Fish Creek (PC)	Shepherd, David, Edmonton-Centre (ND)
Gray, Hon. Christina, Edmonton-Mill Woods (ND)	Sigurdson, Hon. Lori, Edmonton-Riverview (ND)
Hanson, David B., Lac La Biche-St. Paul-Two Hills (W), Official Opposition Deputy House Leader	Smith, Mark W., Drayton Valley-Devon (W)
Hinkley, Bruce, Wetaskiwin-Camrose (ND)	Starke, Dr. Richard, Vermilion-Lloydminster (PC), Progressive Conservative Opposition House Leader
Hoffman, Hon. Sarah, Edmonton-Glenora (ND)	Stier, Pat, Livingstone-Macleod (W)
Horne, Trevor A.R., Spruce Grove-St. Albert (ND)	Strankman, Rick, Drumheller-Stettler (W)
Hunter, Grant R., Cardston-Taber-Warner (W)	Sucha, Graham, Calgary-Shaw (ND)
Jansen, Sandra, Calgary-North West (PC)	Swann, Dr. David, Calgary-Mountain View (AL)
Jean, Brian Michael, QC, Fort McMurray-Conklin (W), Leader of the Official Opposition	Taylor, Wes, Battle River-Wainwright (W)
Kazim, Anam, Calgary-Glenmore (ND)	Turner, Dr. A. Robert, Edmonton-Whitemud (ND)
Kleinsteuber, Jamie, Calgary-Northern Hills (ND)	van Dijken, Glenn, Barrhead-Morinville-Westlock (W)
Larivee, Hon. Danielle, Lesser Slave Lake (ND)	Westhead, Cameron, Banff-Cochrane (ND), Deputy Government Whip
Littlewood, Jessica, Fort Saskatchewan-Vegreville (ND)	Woollard, Denise, Edmonton-Mill Creek (ND)
Loewen, Todd, Grande Prairie-Smoky (W)	Yao, Tany, Fort McMurray-Wood Buffalo (W)

Party standings:

New Democrat: 54 Wildrose: 22 Progressive Conservative: 9 Alberta Liberal: 1 Alberta Party: 1

Officers and Officials of the Legislative Assembly

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

Executive Council

Rachel Notley	Premier, President of Executive Council
Sarah Hoffman	Deputy Premier, Minister of Health
Deron Bilous	Minister of Economic Development and Trade
Oneil Carlier	Minister of Agriculture and Forestry
Joe Ceci	President of Treasury Board and Minister of Finance
David Eggen	Minister of Education
Richard Feehan	Minister of Indigenous Relations
Kathleen T. Ganley	Minister of Justice and Solicitor General
Christina Gray	Minister of Labour, Minister Responsible for Democratic Renewal
Danielle Larivee	Minister of Municipal Affairs
Brian Mason	Minister of Infrastructure, Minister of Transportation
Margaret McCuaig-Boyd	Minister of Energy
Stephanie V. McLean	Minister of Service Alberta, Minister of Status of Women
Ricardo Miranda	Minister of Culture and Tourism
Brandy Payne	Associate Minister of Health
Shannon Phillips	Minister of Environment and Parks, Minister Responsible for the Climate Change Office
Irfan Sabir	Minister of Human Services
Marlin Schmidt	Minister of Advanced Education
Lori Sigurdson	Minister of Seniors and Housing

STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Standing Committee on the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund

Chair: Mr. Coolahan
Deputy Chair: Mrs. Schreiner

Cyr	McKitrick
Dang	Taylor
Ellis	Turner
Horne	

Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future

Chair: Mr. Sucha
Deputy Chair: Mr. Schneider

Anderson, S.	Hunter
Carson	Jansen
Connolly	Panda
Coolahan	Piquette
Dach	Schreiner
Fitzpatrick	Taylor
Gotfried	

Select Special Ethics and Accountability Committee

Chair: Mrs. Littlewood
Deputy Chair: Ms Miller

Anderson, W.	Nielsen
Clark	Nixon
Connolly	Renaud
Cortes-Vargas	Starke
Cyr	Sucha
Drever	Swann
Jansen	van Dijken
Loyola	

Standing Committee on Families and Communities

Chair: Ms Goehring
Deputy Chair: Mr. Smith

Drever	Orr
Hinkley	Pitt
Horne	Rodney
Jansen	Shepherd
Luff	Swann
McKitrick	Yao
McPherson	

Standing Committee on Legislative Offices

Chair: Mr. Shepherd
Deputy Chair: Mr. Malkinson

Cooper	Littlewood
Ellis	Nixon
Horne	van Dijken
Jabbour	Woollard
Kleinsteuber	

Special Standing Committee on Members' Services

Chair: Mr. Wanner
Deputy Chair: Cortes-Vargas

Cooper	McIver
Dang	Nixon
Fildebrandt	Piquette
Jabbour	Schreiner
Luff	

Standing Committee on Private Bills

Chair: Ms McPherson
Deputy Chair: Mr. Connolly

Anderson, W.	Kleinsteuber
Babcock	McKitrick
Drever	Rosendahl
Drysdale	Stier
Fraser	Strankman
Hinkley	Sucha
Kazim	

Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, Standing Orders and Printing

Chair: Ms Fitzpatrick
Deputy Chair: Ms Babcock

Carson	Loyola
Coolahan	McPherson
Cooper	Nielsen
Ellis	Schneider
Goehring	Starke
Hanson	van Dijken
Kazim	

Standing Committee on Public Accounts

Chair: Mr. Fildebrandt
Deputy Chair: Mr. S. Anderson

Barnes	Luff
Cyr	Malkinson
Dach	Miller
Fraser	Renaud
Goehring	Turner
Gotfried	Westhead
Hunter	

Standing Committee on Resource Stewardship

Chair: Loyola
Deputy Chair: Mr. Loewen

Aheer	Kleinsteuber
Babcock	MacIntyre
Clark	Malkinson
Dang	Nielsen
Drysdale	Rosendahl
Hanson	Woollard
Kazim	

Legislative Assembly of Alberta

10 a.m.

Tuesday, June 7, 2016

[The Speaker in the chair]

Prayers

The Speaker: Good morning.

Hon. members, let us, each in our own way, reflect as we together pass another milestone in the 29th Legislative Assembly. Let us reflect again on the great responsibility it is for each of us to hold public office. As we return to our constituencies, let us reflect on our past decisions, words we have spoken, and, most importantly, listen to the people we serve. Please be safe.

Please be seated.

Orders of the Day

Government Bills and Orders

Third Reading

Bill 20

Climate Leadership Implementation Act

Mrs. Aheer moved that the motion be amended by deleting all the words after “that” and substituting the following:

Bill 20, Climate Leadership Implementation Act, be not now read a third time but that it be read a third time this day six months hence.

[Adjourned debate on amendment June 6: Cortes-Vargas]

The Speaker: Is anyone wishing to speak on the amendment to third reading of Bill 20? The hon. Member for Grande Prairie-Smoky.

Mr. Loewen: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I once again rise in this House to discuss Bill 20, Climate Leadership Implementation Act. Unfortunately, there has been very little leadership and a great deal of ideology shown in this bill. The opposition has been diligent in providing numerous amendments that would see this bill include reasonable measures to ensure transparency and accountability. Once again the government has wielded its majority like a hammer and is banging this act through the Legislature with little regard for any unintended consequences it may bring about.

I’m going to share a quote by a favourite conservative former President of the United States, Ronald Reagan: “Government’s first duty is to protect the people, not run their lives.” This government would be well served to heed that advice.

The opposition has done its very best to ensure that the concerns of Albertans have been heard in this House, and it will be those same Albertans that will ultimately hold this government accountable. Polls show that Albertans in general are split on this carbon tax, and there was a great deal of vocal opposition to this proposed act. Despite the work done by the Leach panel, there are still too many unknowns in this act.

The public consultation engaged in here was done under the guise of climate leadership as opposed to taxing and spending, which is truly what it is. There may have been a completely different discussion had this been clarified. The NDP did not campaign on this carbon tax. At least there was more consultation done here than for the Enhanced Protection for Farm and Ranch Workers Act, which put the cart before the horse and chose to legislate first and leave all consultation for later.

The major flaw with the work that went into this act, however, is the lack of any comprehensive economic impact assessment. This

tax will affect every part of our economy, and there are no external forces dictating that this has to be done for January 1, 2017. We should only be looking at implementing it ahead of our competitors if it genuinely makes sense for our economy, but of course it doesn’t. Just as with other tax hikes and the minimum wage, this government continues to have complete disregard for engaging in a robust review before implementing a significant piece of legislation. We saw it on the Enhanced Protection for Farm and Ranch Workers Act and again with Bill 18, An Act to Ensure Independent Environmental Monitoring. In both instances government chose to ignore numerous reasonable motions brought forth by the opposition and instead relied on what could be construed as ideology over economics, a position that supported their own beliefs despite any sort of economic rationale. Albertans cannot afford to allow a piece of legislation with such huge implications on all aspects of Albertans’ lives to simply be pushed through without the proper economic review.

This government did not even discuss possible trickle-down costs associated with the biggest tax grab in Alberta’s history until the opposition brought it up. Even then they downplayed it as minimal. Will it be minimal when companies faced with huge increases in costs choose to shut down and take the jobs and move to a more business-friendly environment? Several other jurisdictions are already trying to poach businesses from Alberta, and this carbon tax is just one more boost to the antibusiness climate that this government has created. We are experiencing climate change in more than one way thanks to this government.

Businesses simply aren’t going to wait around for these utopian green initiatives to be rolled out in coming years. They have to make plans now based on facts, not platitudes. I can’t help but wonder what this government will do when job losses continue to pile up and they can no longer blame it on oil prices or the failed policies of a previous government. Already we know that the low-price-of-oil excuse for the credit downgrade is not supported by facts. The price of oil has been rising, but the downgrades continue. This government will be held accountable. The people of Alberta will ensure that.

This bill is a poorly considered piece of legislation, fraught with unforeseen consequences. This bill will harm everybody: charities, nonprofits, the agriculture industry, the manufacturing industry, and food processing, just to name a few. Businesses and municipalities have been sharing stories about how badly just the fuel and natural gas increases are going to hit them. Municipalities are sharing estimated fuel and gas increases of a third between 2017 and 2018, and – no surprise – fuel will go up by more than 5 per cent, and natural gas will go up by more than 50 per cent.

The same hikes are looming over job creators in Alberta. Businesses are shelving expansion plans and cannot say for sure just how long they will be able to continue in this less than competitive business climate. National and international businesses that have facilities elsewhere may simply choose to increase production elsewhere and fold up shop here. Others will most certainly have to offset these costs by raising prices or sending more workers to the unemployment lines. Either way, once again Albertans will pay the price. The government will dismiss these arguments as fearmongering, but they are facts. They have chosen to provide no economic assessment of any type to clearly identify what these costs will be. Only time will tell, and if the government is wrong in its decision, as they say, the buck stops with them.

I just can’t see how this government can hang their hat on the belief that the rebates proposed will cover these trickle-down costs, everything from driving your car to buying groceries, and at least 40 per cent of Albertans will see no sort of offset to these costs. Many more will be losing money. The rebate was originally

designed to cover increases to natural gas rates, gasoline, and diesel but ignored the fact that this tax will have a domino effect, hiking prices on everything from electricity to groceries, rent, and goods and services. These costs will be absorbed by the taxpayer, the end-user.

Despite the assurances by the government that rebates are a little higher to help low-income Albertans deal with the costs passed on to them by businesses for goods and services, the government failed to bring up these extra costs before Wildrose started pointing them out. It's almost as if they hadn't considered it. Of course, had they actually completed an economic impact assessment, maybe Albertans would have been given a more accurate notion of how much the so-called levy will really cost.

10:10

Even Mayor Nenshi stated in an April 14 article in the Calgary *Metro* that a carbon tax isn't going to fly. He said:

The City of Calgary fills many, many, many tanks of gas every single day. Our best estimate is that not being rebated the carbon tax on all those tanks . . . that we fill every day, the first year in 2017 will be about \$2.6 million or \$2.7 million, rising to \$6.5 million. To put that in context, that's a half point increase on the property tax – only for paying another order of government its taxes.

Nenshi went on to say:

Unlike the provincial government, the city does not, cannot and will not run a deficit . . . Our goal would be to shave that amount somewhere else, but that's hard to do on fuel. Police cars, fire trucks, garbage trucks and buses have to be out there, so as a result the only thing to do is go to the taxpayer for it.

Imagine trying to run a business in a climate that has already seen hikes in personal and business taxes. Now increases on fuel and natural gas, not to mention how those increases will affect purchases of raw materials and transportation of those goods and services, will further burden an already hurting sector. If this government really believes that there will be minimal trickle-down effects with this bill, then show us the proof. Show us any economic study or report that disproves these costs. Mr. Speaker, the government won't because they can't. Doing so would prove the damaging effect of this tax.

We in the opposition have spoken repeatedly about why this bill is such a bad idea. The Wildrose has gone to great lengths to propose common-sense amendments. It is not too late to take a step back and really consider the consequences for Alberta and to do right by them and reconsider this bill. At the very least, the government should let the people who will be paying this carbon tax, Albertans, make the final call on whether they support this radical change. Hold a referendum in the fall, and if Albertans support a clear question and authorize this carbon tax, I'll willingly move on to discussions on the best method to implement it. As of now you don't have a mandate for this, and neither I nor my colleagues will support it.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Are there any questions of the hon. Member for Grande Prairie-Smoky under 29(2)(a)?

Hearing none, are there other members who wish to speak to the amendment to Bill 20? The hon. Member for Calgary-Lougheed.

Mr. Rodney: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday I asked a question to the hon. member just to my right, if you'll pardon the pun. I asked it in a rather flippant way, but there was something to it. I asked: how much tax could a carbon tax tax if a carbon tax could tax tax? Of course, we're referring to the multiplier effect that this indeed does have. So it sounds like it's funny, but it is not.

I will refer to the words of a different American President. You would think that he was speaking about today. He said:

You cannot bring about prosperity by discouraging thrift. You cannot strengthen the weak by weakening the strong. You cannot lift the wage earner up by pulling the wage payer down. You cannot keep out of trouble by spending more than your income. You cannot further the brotherhood of man by inciting class hatred. You cannot build character and courage by taking away a [person's] initiative and independence. You cannot help [people] permanently by doing for them what they could and should do for themselves.

That's, of course, by Abraham Lincoln.

Now, did I say that this is in direct reference to this bill? I would say that it's in direct reference to this debate and a number of things that have happened in this House and beyond its walls in the last number of weeks. So I'd prefer to not be misquoted on that, Mr. Speaker.

It's been very disappointing that this government has shot down nearly every Bill 20 amendment that has come from this side of the House. It's obvious that the NDP are eager to end the discussion on the carbon tax and get out of the Chamber. Now, sadly, this is not new. We've seen this a number of times before, including as late as last week, when the government left the debate on the medical assistance in dying motion as late as they possibly could. Many believe that this was an attempt to divert attention away from Bill 20. [interjections] You may want to hear this. If it did, that would be fair to some extent since medical assistance in dying is indeed an absolutely critical issue. That being said, obviously, we're here to speak to this motion on Bill 20.

At every turn our PC caucus offered attempts to improve this bill because this bill, as it currently reads, does not serve Albertans. Amendments were brought forward that would have made the bill at least manageable for Albertans and provided much-needed accountability to the legislation, that our constituents have been asking for. For instance, the Member for Calgary-Hays moved an amendment that would have made Bill 20 a revenue-neutral carbon tax. The government said no. The Member for Calgary-North West moved an amendment that would have made the carbon tax more accountable by requiring that the minister and a committee review the impact of the tax. What do you think the government said?

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Rodney: The Member for Calgary-West moved and passed an amendment that will increase the accountability of the government's carbon tax inspectors by requiring that they provide a receipt for any information taken. Thank you, Government, for accepting that motion. You could say yes to this motion as well.

The Member for Vermilion-Lloydminster, the hon. third-party House leader, moved an amendment that would have ensured the strength of the tourism industry, one of our powerhouses right now, one of our few. We know that the government said no to that as well. How about the Member for Grande Prairie-Wapiti, who moved an amendment that would have protected our forestry sector? The answer again: no. The Member for Calgary-Fish Creek moved an amendment that would have provided supports to help small businesses deal with the carbon tax. The same answer. A bit of a trend, Mr. Speaker. These were very well-researched, well-intentioned motions, and I really believe that the government missed huge opportunities.

But it's not just from this side of the House that there are suggestions being made. Just in a quick conversation with a constituent just a couple of days ago – he's well studied; he's insightful. He would have loved to ask the NDP just three questions if he was given the time. Will you simply allocate the projected

revenue from the carbon tax to offset the operating deficit? Will you dial back the number of individuals that are likely to receive credits or exemptions since those only undermine the energy conservation goal of the carbon tax? His third question that he would have loved to ask you is: will you minimize the use of the projected revenue for expensive green energy projects, that are not feasible without significant government money as we've observed disastrously in other countries?

I guess the question is: would the government like to talk to this individual, who happens to be a voter, and/or entertain perhaps a sober second thought on any of the thoughtful, well-researched amendments that have been put forward, considering, of course, the fact that this doesn't take effect until January 1? We know that department officials are scrambling to get the regulations done in time. What is the rush, ladies and gentlemen? Take your time and do it right. That's just a word to the wise. That's not a threat. It's encouragement.

Even though the NDP would not accept our amendments, I would challenge any government members to answer any of the questions I just asked because that member of the public, that voter, would like to hear from you. He really would.

I think it's a shame how the government has approached the discussion on Bill 20. They've tried one of two strategies. First, they've tried to frame the debate on this bill as the full climate leadership plan. Now, essentially, almost every time a government member has spoken, they've referred to the report by Dr. Leach. While there's some excellent work in the report, Mr. Speaker – that cannot be denied – it's certainly not all reflected in the bill. Bill 20 is about the carbon tax, Energy Efficiency Alberta, and mandating the CCEMC to be in complete unison with the climate leadership plan, which is one of the biggest concerns of this side of the House.

10:20

This bill doesn't make reference to their escalated coal phase-out, for one thing, something that's already revealing numerous problems – you can't deny that – that will come to the fore in the years to come. In fact, we're still waiting to hear from Terry Boston. Why don't we wait for his report? How much are coal generation companies going to have to be compensated by the government? We're told that the report will come later this year. Estimates are upwards of an additional \$10 billion that will have to be provided for stranded capital and lost revenue, which will inevitably have to be covered by the taxpayer. And, as I say, that number is not going to be right. If you're saying, "Then don't say it," well, I'm saying that we need to talk about this, and we can't make decisions until vital pieces of information like this are in. It's just wise.

The bill also fails to talk about another key strategy from the climate leadership plan, that was revealed in November 2015, the oil sands emission cap. It's vital that we use technology to reduce emissions per barrel in the future. We've already reduced emissions per barrel by about a third in the last 15 years alone. That's a good-news story. Now, however, using the command-and-control system may not provide the outcomes that the province is actually looking for. As new projects come online, we'll gradually move up to this emissions level. Now, basically, it's saying to investors: "No new capital investment is required in the Alberta oil sands. Go away. We don't need you. We don't want you." I ask: is that the message that you were actually hoping to deliver? Maybe it is. I hope not.

Furthermore, it doesn't talk about the methane reduction strategy. Thus far all we've seen are its goals, a 40 per cent reduction of methane emissions below 2015 levels by 2030, and that's actually my favourite part of the plan. We know that methane emissions are 25 times worse than other emissions, and it's important that we have better reporting and reduction strategies around venting and flaring.

It's certainly something that the previous government was developing, so we're very glad that the current government is continuing with that great work. Good job. However, the Member for Edmonton-South West has been parading this part of the climate leadership plan in debate on Bill 20 as if it was somehow relevant to what we should be discussing, and it's not. Just because our Prime Minister and the President of the United States have been talking about it doesn't make it any more relevant to the 95 pages that are sitting before us today.

The second strategy that the government has employed is to frame this whole debate, both in question period and during debate on this bill, with whether or not one believes in the science of climate change. Constituents have told me that that's a dirty political trick, and they thought that the government would rise above that. I hoped that they would. All hon. members of this House know that Progressive Conservatives understand that climate change is real and that human activity has impacted how the effects have been felt globally. Some say that the difference on this side of the House is that some here might consider it real and some might consider it just a problem. In any case, Mr. Speaker, we've known this since before 2008, when we were the first jurisdiction in North America to put a price on carbon. Pricing carbon can be effective, and we're on record upholding this fact.

However, Bill 20 is not the right mix. That's the problem. It's not the right balance, and it certainly does not meet the high legislative expectations that Albertans are demanding of us. This bill is about the carbon tax, and it's about setting up the new body to spend revenue on their priorities. In short, this is a tax-and-spend bill. Hon. members, we were hoping that there would be fruitful debate on Bill 20, but all we've had are puppy-monkey-baby answers in retort to serious and thoughtful amendments that would have made a very bad bill a little bit more palatable. This bill shows, with respect – and it's just the nature of time – that the government, this government, is definitely in its infancy. Albertans don't deserve to pay for another \$6 billion rookie mistake.

You know, I've been so honoured to spend 12 years in this Chamber. On the other side it's been closer to 12 months. I certainly am learning things every day; I trust that they are, too. I trust that one thing that can be learned here today is that they can indeed push the pause button. I've seen it before on many occasions. When something was exploding before our eyes, on a number of occasions we actually sent it back out to the real world and found out what was going on. I challenge each of you to do that. I challenge you to be in your constituency offices and talking to people, going to the grocery store, going to events.

Actually, I wish you well because you are going to get more than two earfuls. People are irate. In 12 years, Mr. Speaker, I've never seen them this mad – I thought it was the farmers' situation right before Christmas – and I've heard words like "arrogant" being used like they've never been used before in such a short amount of time. I encourage this government to get back on track – get back on track – do what you came here to do, the best for Albertans, but test it out there. Find out what people are really thinking. Don't pass this. You don't legislate and then do consultation later. That's not how this should work.

By the way, I mentioned \$6 billion. Yes, that's a number that has been thrown out, but as I started out by saying, that's just the beginning of the multiplier effect. I shudder to think what it's going to be. I'm concerned about not just my kids and, perhaps, grandkids one day but about every one of yours and of everyone's beyond these walls. I'm concerned about all the people who built this province who are leaving and/or shutting down their business. When I get calls – and I'm guessing that you get them, too. Grown adults are crying: the family business that we took generations to build is gone.

Am I blaming the carbon tax only? Absolutely not. It has not taken effect yet; I know that. But when you add up, literally add up, all the changes that that side of the House has pushed upon Albertans – read the paper, folks. God bless you, media; sometimes you get it right. The stories are all over all of the papers. I never thought I'd live to see this day in this province, to be really honest with you, sir.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, and many, many more that I wish we had time to go into and, in fact, wish we had a whole fall session to discuss, I will be absolutely voting against this bill. I am happy to vote for any motion to hoist this so that we can do the right thing, press the pause button, do the research, make the necessary adjustments. I'm happy to vote for a bill that has a lot more of these amendments that have come from this side of the House, that reflect the attitudes and actions, the very livelihoods of Albertans. Because I'll tell you that it's one thing for people to say, "I've lost my business," but I'm hearing other people say: "You know that great job that I had for 15 or 20 years? It just got extinguished."

Then it gets worse. I don't know if it's because of my previous portfolio in wellness or as chair of the Alcohol and Drug Abuse Commission, but people are telling me: "You know what? I've turned to a little self-medication. I'm in a lot of trouble," and/or "My spouse and I are disagreeing to the point where there's domestic abuse." You talk to any policeman out there, and they will tell you everything is up, including break and enter. If you shudder and you shake your head, look at it historically. In other places where economics go downhill, so does everything else.

You're here to raise Albertans up. So are we. Let's do this together. When these folks were on this side of the House, they talked about all-party co-operation. We're offering it. Please accept it. It's in the spirit of helping Albertans.

That's all the time I have for now, sir. Thank you.

The Speaker: Thank you, hon. member.

Are there any questions or observations for the Member for Calgary-Lougheed on the amendment under 29(2)(a)?

Hearing none, are there any individuals who would like to speak to the amendment? The Government House Leader.

Mr. Mason: Thank you very much. I just want to briefly respond to the hon. member opposite, who habitually prefaces disrespectful comments with the words "with respect" . . .

The Speaker: You're speaking on 29(2)(a), correct?

Mr. Mason: No.

The Speaker: Oh. Okay.

Mr. Mason: I'm speaking to the amendment, Mr. Speaker.

. . . thereby rendering it respectful, and I find that offensive, Mr. Speaker.

I did want to just correct the hon. member. There's an article here by David Mikkelsen, who writes that Abraham Lincoln did not author a list of maxims, beginning with "You cannot bring about prosperity by discouraging thrift."

One of author Ralph Keyes' axioms of misquotations is "Famous quotes need famous mouths," and the fulfillment of that need has, for the last several decades, put on the lips of Abraham Lincoln words that were not written until more than fifty years after Lincoln's death, penned by an obscure personage whose name is unknown to most living Americans.

The Rev. William John Henry Boetcker was a Presbyterian minister and notable public speaker who served as director of the pro-employer Citizens' Industrial Alliance, a position he held when, in 1916, he produced a booklet of "nuggets" from his

lectures, which included maxims such as "We cannot strengthen the weak by weakening the strong" and "We cannot help the poor by kicking the rich." Boetcker's collection of maxims eventually crystallized as the list of ten now familiar entries . . .

10:30

The Speaker: Hon. Government House Leader, I would encourage you to speak to the amendment. You might have wished to speak under 29(2)(a) because everything I've heard seems to be with respect to the last comment. I urge you to speak to the amendment.

Mr. Mason: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I just felt that since the hon. member had brought in the formidable reputation of Abraham Lincoln to support his arguments, it would be better to show that it was simply humbug, and that's what I was trying to do. Thank you.

Mr. Rodney: That sounded like 29(2)(a).

The Speaker: I determined, in fact, hon. member, that it was not under 29(2)(a). I explicitly acknowledged that, and the member acknowledged it.

Are there any questions to the Government House Leader under 29(2)(a)?

Mr. Rodney: Yeah. Absolutely. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's very simple. Are we here to debate whether a quotation has been misquoted by people throughout time since that time, or are we here to debate this bill and, particularly, this motion? I wonder if the hon. member is aware of so many Albertans who have spoken out on Bill 20 in their confusion and their concern. Have you heard this about the impacts to themselves and their families and their businesses? I wonder if he knows that part of the confusion is due to lumping together pieces of policy that really should not be pushed through as one piece of legislation. Does the hon. member know that we support a tax on carbon, which is the first part of the legislation? But we don't know – no one knows – enough about the second part, the opaque, mysterious, unspecified use of funds on assorted climate initiatives, because the government has not seen fit to outline to us or to Albertans exactly what those will be.

Ms Jansen: But the bill is so perfect that we don't need oversight.

Mr. Rodney: Oh. I've been told the bill is so perfect that we don't need oversight.

Back to 29(2)(a), the government – this is the Government House Leader we're speaking of – has repeatedly stated that additional funding will be provided to researchers and innovators supporting the greening of Alberta's energy economy. To paraphrase, you know, because he has a colleague in his caucus, the environment minister said: although we have a vague idea of what the government intends, we cannot be sure there will be no unintended consequences for overlapping with the existing funding initiative towards energy research and innovation. I'd be interested in an answer to that.

Now, after the summer the bill can be amended so that we can legislate on what this government has marketed this bill as, which is a piece of carbon tax legislation for emitters, by omitting the elements of the bill that have nothing to do with taxing emissions and by thinking thoughtfully about how revenues from the carbon tax can be applied to benefit Alberta and Albertans in a sustainable, revenue-neutral way. I'd be curious to hear what the hon. member has to say about that.

A year earlier the current Premier spoke to an omnibus bill that tied together three pieces of legislation – I remember it very well – just as this bill does in its three schedules. She noted that the general

rule is for each issue to have a separate piece of legislation. I'd be curious to see what the House leader has to say about this from May 8, 2013: "By putting three pieces together, of course, we cut that opportunity [for the time for discussion] by two-thirds."

Now, two years ago his other colleague – I'd be curious to hear what he has to say about this – the Minister of Economic Development and Trade said in his capacity at that time as opposition critic regarding the Condominium Property Amendment Act, which was on the table at the time, that passing legislation but leaving many decisions to regulation left Albertans in the dark as to what the new rules would be. How is this different? Well, it's different in many ways. This is a more than \$6 billion question, for one thing. Again, for me it's not just the dollars; it's the people and their livelihoods that I'm concerned about, and I know that others are as well.

To the Government House Leader, some of the members opposite believe that decisions would be swept into a dark corner – it sounds rather Machiavellian; it's not the way I like to think of it – where they'd be, you know, developed away from the light of day.

This member I was just speaking about stated:

Changes that impact people's homes should happen in the Legislative Assembly through, you know, our robust debate, through different points of view, and through adequate oversight.

He ended with this:

Well – you know what? – nobody said that democracy is the most expedient form of government, but we do live in a new Westminster-style democracy, and details that affect condominium owners should be discussed in the light of day, not behind closed doors in the cover of darkness. That, I think, is a very legitimate concern.

And it always is. It is with assisted dying, it is with this, and it is with everything that comes across our table.

If the minister and the House leader stand by sentiments like this, why are they prepared for this government to do the opposite on issues that are critical to Albertans who happen to use energy, which by last count was every single one of the more than 4 and a quarter million people in this province?

Albertans are asking, respectfully I might say, for a fulsome debate in which the government does not use political expedience to shy away from the hard work that is indeed required or, at the very least, Mr. Speaker, with a government that can provide the time and respect for this House to at least debate amendments brought forward from Albertans who don't necessarily share – and these are their words – the NDP world view. They don't want it just in voice mode. They really don't.

There are other members of this House, and as I've noted all of my career, not any particular party has a monopoly on good ideas. What we saw in the closing hours of debate in Committee of the Whole just a short time ago . . .

The Speaker: Thank you, hon. member.

Are there any other members who would like to speak to the amendment to Bill 20? The Member for Calgary-Mountain View.

Dr. Swann: Could I ask for clarification, Mr. Speaker?

The Speaker: Yes.

Dr. Swann: Will I be able to speak to the bill after this amendment is voted up or down, or is there no further debate after this? The question comes right after? I thought that was the case. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It's my pleasure to stand to speak to the amendment to Bill 20, the final level of debate. I really, really want to support this bill. This is, to me, a sea change that has been so important in my

political life. Of course, I was unceremoniously fired back in 2002, 14 years ago, because a government wouldn't listen to any criticism about the lack of action on climate change. Ralph Klein and Lorne Taylor – Lorne Taylor was apparently in the House yesterday and stayed quiet. Through the security they mentioned to me that he was there. He just was curious to see how the Legislature operates these days, but he didn't come to see me. As a public health officer representing all the medical officers in the province, we had passed a resolution saying that we have to get moving on climate change, and I was looking for a new job the next day.

It's been quite a run. I applaud the government for taking some serious steps towards this important initiative. The carbon tax is an important step towards reducing carbon use and changing behaviour, but it is one tool among many to change human activities. There is no single item in this bill that's particularly egregious, that I would say individually would prevent me from supporting the bill, but the amalgamation of a number of weak points in the bill leaves the bill open to becoming as ineffective as the previous PC attempts at a carbon intensity tax that was roughly \$2.50 a tonne in Alberta and had the predictable outcome of no change. It was business as usual for the last 12 years.

Fundamentally, there has been no indication so far that the government has actually identified the benefits as well as the costs associated with this important change. The carbon tax is an important step, and it seeks to achieve the change in industry and individual activities to reduce carbon and other greenhouse gases. It seeks to reduce, in fact, through coal phase-out, human health impacts, which is a laudable, important goal that I think future generations if not this generation will applaud. But the devil is in the details. Process matters. Details matter. It's not entirely clear what the goals of this, besides carbon reduction and greenhouse gas reduction, are.

10:40

There's no indication of the impacts on electricity pricing in this province, on jobs, on small and medium-sized business. We've heard questions around the nonprofit sector and charitable foundations and what impact this is going to have. A cost-benefit analysis, even though it would be preliminary, even though it would be open to a lot of uncertainties, would give us some sense that there's been some thoughtful analysis about where we might expect to see extra costs, which we all must pay if we're going to have a change, and where we would expect to see benefits.

There's a lack of performance targets for this government to evaluate itself against. I've referred to some other legislative business goals. No amendments requiring accountability, therefore, on this sweeping bill were supported, not even a commitment to an independent review of value for money, which, yes, the Auditor General could do, but he has many things to do. This may not be a priority for the Auditor General in the next three to five years, depending on how many resources he has and where his priorities fall.

This is supposed to be an incentive program to change behaviour, but there don't appear to be incentives for two-thirds of the population. We're giving them back whatever they have to pay in extra costs. I don't understand why someone of middle income, up to \$100,000 a year, should get a rebate when we're trying to incent them to actually change their behaviour, not just get more money for carrying on with the same old, same old.

Lastly, perhaps most importantly, the bill is not revenue neutral such as the B.C. model, which I have some affinity for. Instead of returning the tax expenses associated with the carbon tax, it's giving a pot of money to government to spend where and when it chooses. It's not clear to me what's in and what's out. I was unable to get

any clarity around what would not be acceptable funding for this carbon levy. It provides a pot of cash to be disbursed at the government's discretion.

I must say that this is a new government. They're trying to do the right thing. I don't know about the next government, though. What are they going to do with a pot of money that's \$3.6 billion in a year? We're basically trying to think not only about this government but the next government and whether there are checks and balances in place, whether there is accountability. [interjection] Yeah. That's why I'm really concerned. You guys might get this in three years, and then we're in real trouble.

The intentions are good; I have no doubt about that. But circumstances change. We've seen the government have to roll back on its commitment to a debt ceiling, for example. It's not enough to say: just trust us. There are too many variables. There are too many uncertainties at play.

I and the Liberal Party, then, have been calling for a carbon tax for years and a real carbon fee that provides incentive for reduced carbon fuel use, but putting a price on carbon is just not enough. On behalf of all Albertans we deserve a plan that includes explicit goals, performance measures, monitoring, a reporting commitment that's independent and that ensures that whether it's a New Democrat government or not, there's full accountability to Albertans, who are being asked to pay for this.

It's with a heavy heart that I must say that I cannot support the bill at this time. I can only hope that future sessions of the Legislature will be able to refine and remake significant portions of the Climate Leadership Implementation Act.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Are there any questions or comments to the hon. Member for Calgary-Mountain View under 29(2)(a)? The hon. Member for Calgary-North West.

Ms Jansen: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think I want to take a moment as well under 29(2)(a) to thank the Member for Calgary-Mountain View for fighting for a carbon tax and fighting for the environment all these years. I think it's got to feel especially bittersweet to get to a point where there finally is a plan and the plan doesn't measure up. It's like waiting 20 years for Christmas, and then when it finally comes, you open the present and there's nothing inside.

An Hon. Member: Except coal.

Ms Jansen: Or coal. That's right.

I want to thank the Member for Calgary-Mountain View because I think he has shown leadership on this issue for many, many years. I think it certainly deserves our admiration.

I want to ask as well: you know, when we talked about oversight and we brought up amendments and we looked at ways – frankly, I was very happy to have a conversation about a carbon tax because I have no problem with it at all either. I was just concerned about the oversight. Well, there were a few things that I was concerned about, but I was concerned about the oversight picture and what that looked like. I thought we had a pretty good amendment there, but even if it wasn't to everyone's liking, I would like to ask the member what he envisioned in terms of oversight that might have been a better option than what we're seeing now, which is basically to trust the government; they know what they're doing. I think that's the gist of what we got.

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

Dr. Swann: Thanks very much. Thanks for the question. I guess the bottom line is: independence, clear goals, and measurable outcomes. This is what I think all of us want in any program, whether it's a social program, an economic program, or an environmental program. Who does that best? I know of no one better than the Auditor General to look at value for money, based on criteria which, one would hope, had been created in the bill. The criteria that we want to evaluate this bill on should be explicit. Then the Auditor General can either agree or disagree with those criteria and add more, but he can at the very least monitor and evaluate the outcomes on those indicators that have been identified as part of the goals of the bill and then report independently to the Legislature.

He's an independent officer of the Legislature. I trust his team. I trust his abilities to assess value for money. It would give, I think, all Albertans some comfort in saying: "Yes. This is a reasonable plan. We are willing to pay the extra money to do this, to start shifting our culture towards a lower carbon future." We have a man or woman, depending on who the Auditor General is at the time, who's going to report on this on an annual basis to say where we could tweak the thing and make some different decisions around where the money is going, what kind of value we're getting in energy reduction, energy efficiency, conservation, education, just exactly what we are looking for.

Thank you.

The Speaker: The Official Opposition leader.

Mr. Jean: On the bill, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: We're still under 29(2)(a), hon. member.

Any other members with comments under 29(2)(a) to Calgary-Mountain View?

The Leader of the Official Opposition.

Mr. Jean: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To be respectful, I won't be taking all of my time this morning, but I do have some things to say, and certainly there are a lot of people that want an opportunity to speak about this bill because it is something new.

I did have an opportunity to hear the PCs earlier suggest that they've been waiting for some period of time for the carbon tax, and I know that if they had another 44 years, they probably would have got it done. Certainly, that didn't happen. I don't know why, Mr. Speaker. I'm still wondering why everything else didn't happen that they were planning on getting done, and here they are today supporting the NDP on this bill and on many other previous bills on a consistent basis. It's quite shocking that they would do that at this stage, after they've lost power, but they have done it.

I know that I'm fairly excited about this carbon bill because I think it's going to hurt our economy a lot. That's why I will be opposing it and, of course, all the Wildrose members will be opposing it. There could be a possibility for a carbon tax sometime in the future, Mr. Speaker, but I can't see me ever supporting a carbon tax at all, ever, that would be out of step with the rest of the world and certainly out of step with the rest of our country and North America as a whole.

The other thing, Mr. Speaker, is that I noticed that the PCs, you know, liken this carbon tax to Christmas and to waiting for an opportunity to sit around the tree and be with family and open up the presents. I always liked that. My kids love opening up presents at Christmastime, but opening up a coal tax that's going to take, you know, at least \$1,000 out of every single family's pockets during the next year is not what I'd call a Christmas present. I'd call it more like coal in the stocking.

10:50

Unfortunately, we're not going to be able to provide coal in the stocking anymore either because, of course, the NDP has banned coal, so we're going to have to import coal from China or the United States in order to put it in our stockings. Now, that is, of course, something else, and only the NDP could come up with a plan like that, of course, with the support of the PC Party.

I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that there are three particular parts of this bill that do cause me some stress. The most important one – and that's why I put it first – is the hurt to families. Although we hear the PCs talking, you know, on the side there about families, they don't seem to care about the fact that this is actually going to pull at least \$1,000 from every household in Alberta.

Now, they say that it's only going to be about \$300, Mr. Speaker, and that 60 per cent of Albertans are going to get a full rebate. Well, you know, by the time you calculate that out – \$3 billion, one million households in Alberta – any way you look at it, that's \$3,000 per household. When you calculate it out, it's \$3,000 a household. Now, we've said \$1,000 because we might have large emitters and there might be some rebates, but the truth is that every single household in Alberta is going to have a thousand-dollar bill that they are going to have to pay out of their current earnings while they're being laid off, while they're receiving wage reductions of 10 or 20 or 30 or 100 per cent, as the case may be. They get an extra, added Christmas present. It's not even Christmas, but they get it from the NDP by way of a carbon tax. I don't think that's helpful.

That's why, Mr. Speaker, we're so adamant against it, because this carbon tax will make heating more expensive. Yes. Just the very fact that you heat your home in Canada, in Alberta: it's particularly cold here, and over Christmastime they are going to receive a higher heating bill. Maybe that's the Christmas present that they're talking about with this carbon tax.

Or maybe they're talking about the Christmas present of clothing. For every family member that receives clothing during Christmas, those clothes are going to be higher. Now, they say: "Oh, no. It's not going to affect that. Those are indirect costs that aren't going to happen." Well, Mr. Speaker, transportation is a big part of our economy, and when you increase prices of gasoline and diesel and all of the other things that go with transportation, that increases the cost of doing business for those companies, and they pass that on to consumers. Maybe that's the Christmas present that they were talking about. Maybe the Christmas present is that clothes are going to be more expensive, so people can't afford as many clothes.

Or maybe it's the fact, you know, that everything they buy at Christmastime is going to cost more money. That's because this is a tax that is going to hit every Albertan – every Albertan – on everything. That's what happens when you transport – 90 per cent of our goods are transported by truck in Alberta, and we manufacture very little here. That means that everything we buy, whether it's a television set, whether it's clothes, whether it's a suit, whether it's this binder – not to use props, Mr. Speaker, but I like yellow highlighters, and this yellow highlighter is going to cost a lot more money because we import them. That's what people forget. When we make our oil and gas sector and our economy less competitive, people have less money to buy things.

Another reason that I'm so upset about this, Mr. Speaker, is because it's not just hurting families, especially young families that are on fixed incomes and are living month to month. They don't know, sometimes, if they've lost their job, and they don't know if they're going to be able to afford something, even as much food. I went to the food bank here in Edmonton just a couple of weeks ago, and I had an opportunity to take some food from Edmonton's Food Bank up to Fort McMurray just late last week. The number of

people that were coming to the food bank here, locally, in Edmonton and in Fort McMurray was unbelievable. Now, Fort McMurray is a bit of an anomaly right now because we do have some problems, but the number of Albertans relying on food bank resources is unbelievable. I'm worried about that. Ultimately, it comes down to families hurting, and our families are hurting. The fact that Albertans have to go to the food bank is just unacceptable.

That's because the economy has been managed badly. There's no question that we have low oil prices, Mr. Speaker – and I fully accept that – although they are a lot higher than they have been in a long time. You know, it might come as a surprise to the NDP, but Saskatchewan's oil is sold at the same price as Alberta's oil, and there are still companies, international and multinational conglomerates, that are investing in Saskatchewan. They're just not investing in Alberta because it's not competitive.

We do compete with Saskatchewan, North Dakota, Texas, Pennsylvania. When we bring in a carbon tax – and people may not realize it, and they want to do their part for the world, which I do, of course, and I think that we need to be in lockstep with the rest of the world and, certainly, in lockstep with the rest of Canada and North America – for 4 million people that makes us totally uncompetitive in the oil and gas sector, that means that nobody is going to buy our oil and gas. Nobody is going to invest in the oil and gas sector in Alberta, and our competitiveness ultimately is going to be judged on the basis of whether people want to invest in North Dakota or Saskatchewan or British Columbia or Alberta. Right now, Mr. Speaker, it's totally evaporated.

They're not investing in Alberta not because of low oil prices but because of the policy decisions made by the NDP government. Mr. Speaker, I don't think it's any surprise because everybody has agreed to that. You know, they have said that there are low oil prices, but everybody also acknowledges the fact that investment has not dried up in Saskatchewan. Husky has invested just this year in Saskatchewan in the oil and gas sector, but nobody has invested in Alberta. Very few people have, and very few people will continue to invest in Alberta as long as the policies that this government puts forward are so antipipeline, are so anti oil and gas sector, and make our resources uncompetitive.

The final part that I want to talk about, Mr. Speaker – and why I left it to last is because it's so shameful. I've been involved in the nonprofit sector for many, many years, and the very fact that we would put forward good amendments, solid amendments, amendments that make a lot of sense – one particular amendment was to remove charities from this tax to give them an opportunity to not have to worry about gas when they, for instance, provide shelter, to not have those added heating bills. When they take Meals on Wheels around to people that are needy, the most vulnerable in our communities in Calgary and Edmonton and other places, that live on the streets, those people will not be able to afford to drive as far to put those meals to those people without added expenses.

Mr. Speaker, this money does not grow on trees for charities. I know that. I've talked to a lot of charities because I'm involved in charities, and charities are having a very tough time right now. They've been having a tough time since 2008. The number of charities that have gone bankrupt in Canada since 2008 would stagger most people's reality. It's shocking. This means that these groups, that do so on a totally nonprofit basis usually, just don't have the money anymore. That's why I just can't believe that this government is being so mean-spirited as to not provide an exemption for charities and nonprofits in Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, we have a homeless problem in Alberta – and I applaud some of the different innovative solutions that have come forward from different communities in Alberta – but whether it be homeless shelters or women's shelters, these groups need special

attention. This carbon tax, that's bringing in a tax on everything for everybody, is just simply not helping those people, the most vulnerable, and the people that help those people.

Ultimately, there's only one taxpayer. Even though this \$3 billion carbon tax, that is taking money out of our economy, is going into the coffers of the NDP, the truth is that they're not going to efficiently get that back to the people, and they're going to take a cut out of it. That's right. Every piece of money, every bit of money that comes in the government here takes a piece of to administer it, and usually governments don't do that very effectively or efficiently.

We would suggest leaving more money in people's pockets, making sure that some of these exemptions do actually happen, whether they be for charities and nonprofits or even schools, Mr. Speaker. Like, why are we taxing schools? Why are we adding taxes to schools? It does not make sense. We think there should be an exemption, obviously, for nonprofits, for charities, for schools, for hospitals, for municipal buildings, for municipalities, for all of these things because they're just taking the money from one side and putting it to another in their own slush fund, and we don't think that's helpful.

Now, in the interest of time and, Mr. Speaker, to show respect to all the other people that are here today, I just want to say that we will be voting against this carbon tax. We don't think it's helpful for Albertans. We think it's going to be very, very tough for charities and for the not-for-profit sector, especially now that the economy is so bad. We're just saying to this government right now: please, this is not the time. There's a time for everything, every season, but this is not the time to punish Alberta families with higher taxes that are ultimately going to take money out of our pockets and make life much more expensive and less easy to afford than it has been.

Thank you very much.

The Speaker: Are there any questions under 29(2)(a)?

Ms Jansen: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm just curious, and I would like to ask the Leader of the Official Opposition: when he said that the bill was mean-spirited and unhelpful, on a sliding scale is it mean-spirited and unhelpful like not having any of your MLAs walk in a pride parade is mean-spirited and unhelpful? Or is it mean-spirited and unhelpful to take off your Wildrose pride T-shirt because it affects your brand? Just maybe you could clarify for us.

Mr. Jean: You know, Mr. Speaker, I really appreciate the leadership candidate for the PCs. If I had a PC membership, I would vote for her, and I encourage all Conservatives to vote for her because then, obviously, they'll only have one choice of a conservative party in Alberta.

11:00

What I'd like to talk about is the mean-spiritedness during this time – and that's what I was referring to – when people are out of work. I don't know, Mr. Speaker. I'm sure you're aware that there are over 100,000 people in the oil and gas sector that are out of work. You probably know that since the NDP formed government a year ago, 80,000 Albertans have lost their jobs. That's what I call mean-spirited, when people are losing their jobs by the thousands. In March 82 jobs every working hour were lost; 82 Albertans lost their jobs. What is their solution? Let's give a \$3 billion carbon tax to Albertans. That's not a solution; that's mean-spirited.

The Speaker: Under 29(2)(a)?

The hon. Member for Calgary-Elbow.

Mr. Clark: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I rise to speak on the amendment to Bill 20, the Climate Leadership Implementation Act. I want the House to know that I believe in a carbon tax. I believe climate change is real, it's human caused, and Alberta should take leadership on this file. I support a carbon tax, but I cannot support this carbon tax.

This carbon tax should be revenue neutral. It's been very clearly shown that the impact of a carbon tax can be best offset not through big rebates for two-thirds of Albertans but through cuts to personal and corporate income taxes so that Albertans can keep more of their hard-earned money, so we can create an attractive investment climate for our province. As other successful provinces have done with their carbon tax, like our friends in British Columbia, we ought to make this carbon tax revenue neutral.

In doing that, Alberta can and must lead on innovation, innovation to abate the impacts of climate change. We have in this province some of the best engineers, some of the best scientists, some of the best academics, some of the best finance people of anywhere in the world. What we have more than anywhere else in this world, anywhere else in the country, is the entrepreneurial spirit that ties all that together. In this province we can address climate change by creating companies and technologies that we can sell to the rest of the world to help the world mitigate and deal with climate change. In so doing, we will diversify our economy and we will enable the continued success of our core industry in oil and gas. That is what's possible from a properly structured carbon tax.

Sadly, Mr. Speaker, that's not what this is. We on this side of the House, myself included, certainly tried to bring amendments to make this bill better. I believe in the Alberta Party that our job is not just to tear down the government. Our job here in opposition is not just to oppose for opposition's sake. Our job is to propose ideas, and we have proposed ideas. I brought amendments to gradually phase in revenue neutrality, to allow the government some time to transition and to create some technologies, but they rejected that amendment. I brought in an amendment to exempt carbon-neutral or carbon-negative companies from the carbon tax, but that, too, was defeated. I supported amendments from this side of the House, several different amendments, to add performance measures to the carbon tax bill so that Albertans know whether or not it's being successful, to support a formal review after a year to ensure that we're not ending up with unintended consequences from the carbon tax bill. But, again, those were all rejected.

There are too many gaps in this bill, Mr. Speaker. Albertans don't know what the \$645 million allocated to Energy Efficiency Alberta over the next five years will be spent on. Is it going to be home efficiency tax credits? Is it going to be low-emission vehicle credits? Is it going to be geothermal heating? Is it going to be transit passes? We don't know. Is it going to be none of those things? We have no idea. It's very difficult, impossible frankly, to support a bill that I want to support in principle without that information. There are too many gaps.

What about the \$3.4 billion allocated over the next five years to, quote, unquote, other initiatives? That's a blank cheque, Mr. Speaker. What is that money going to be used for when you compare it to the \$3.4 billion that's going to be spent to build Health infrastructure over the next five years, where we know there are 50 projects and we know where they're going to be built and we know when they're going to be built? There's total transparency. This carbon bill is a blank slate. What initiatives is this government not going to fund with \$3.4 billion? They couldn't even tell us what they're not going to fund. That's disappointing and unacceptable from a government that claims to be ready to govern.

It is important to have a plan. Any opposition party – any opposition party – that aspires to govern, any party that expects

credibility from Albertans ought to tell Albertans what their plan is. I challenge the Official Opposition: what would you do? If you were government tomorrow, what is your plan to address climate change? What would you do? They've been silent on that. We know what they're against. We have no idea what they're for.

The Alberta Party presented a very clear climate plan, Alberta's Contribution, because I believe Alberta has a contribution to make in addressing climate change. We can reduce our own carbon emissions. We must reduce our own carbon emissions. But just reducing Alberta's carbon emissions does not solve global climate change. Alberta's best contribution to global climate change abatement is Alberta ingenuity, Alberta entrepreneurs, Alberta technologies to help the rest of the world address climate change. That's what's possible in Alberta. If we do it right, if we allow the market forces to operate, we can succeed. That will diversify our economy, create great Alberta jobs, support our existing energy industry, get pipelines built. That's what's possible from a proper carbon tax.

Now, I'm not cheering against this government. I don't want the NDP to fail, because if this government fails, Alberta fails. I wonder about other opposition parties, whether they in fact want this government to fail. I think they do. I don't. I want you to be successful because if you're successful, it's good for Alberta. Unfortunately, we just can't know. We don't know enough from this carbon tax, whether or not you're going to do that.

There are simply too many questions, Mr. Speaker, with this carbon tax. I support a carbon tax, but I cannot support this carbon tax.

Thank you.

The Speaker: Hon. members, are there any questions for the Member for Calgary-Elbow under 29(2)(a)?

The Government House Leader. Are you speaking to the amendment?

Mr. Mason: No, Mr. Speaker. I would like to request unanimous consent of the House to set the bells on the hoist amendment at one minute.

[Unanimous consent granted]

Mr. Mason: Mr. Speaker, I have one further request of the House. I'm requesting unanimous consent to revert to Introduction of Guests.

[Unanimous consent granted]

Introduction of Guests

The Speaker: The hon. Premier.

Ms Notley: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday was a bit of a significant day in Alberta in that at our Provincial Operations Centre, up in northwest Edmonton, we officially dropped the operations level from the highest level of 4 to 3. This by no means, of course, means that the work is over or that in fact the work in any way is any less urgent, but what it does mean is that as a province we are moving out of the emergency response phase of the Fort McMurray fire.

Over the last month or so, Mr. Speaker, many people have spoken about the extraordinary response of government to the horrible disaster that we saw in Fort McMurray. While there are many people to thank – and there will be many thanks over the course of the next few months, and indeed we all know that we owe a tremendous gratitude to the first responders who live and work in Fort McMurray – I'd like to take this opportunity today, as we are

moving from that level 4 to that level 3, to actually also thank and make special note of some key people who have led the provincial government's response to this emergency in a way that has earned our province, I believe, international recognition for the good work that has been achieved.

11:10

It's a tremendous honour for me to introduce to you and through you to all members of the Assembly a number of very special people. Alberta is blessed with an extraordinary public service, women and men who have devoted their careers to making Alberta a better province. We ask a great deal of them, and they deliver even more in return. This is never truer than when our province is facing the most dire of circumstances.

Today we are privileged to be joined by five public servants who have been key to organizing the province's response to the wildfires in Fort McMurray. Experts in their fields, they went above and beyond the call of duty. Let me begin. Bruce Mayer is the assistant deputy minister in the Department of Agriculture and Forestry, who was instrumental in co-ordinating the government's firefighting efforts. This is never an easy job, and during a hot and dry spring like we've had, it's a Herculean effort. Every day there are new wildfire starts, and every day Bruce's team meets them head-on.

One member of his team is Chad Morrison, the senior manager of wildfire prevention and someone who is known now to many Albertans simply as Chad the Fire Guy. Chad has done an extraordinary job briefing me, briefing my cabinet, and briefing members of the media and through them hundreds of thousands of Albertans about wildfire behaviour, fire weather, and how you go about fighting a fire that seems impossible to fight, that has become a beast. It's been a first-class education.

We also have with us today Scott Long, the executive director of provincial operations at the Alberta Emergency Management Agency. Many of you who have seen the press conferences that were held by our government over the course of the fire wouldn't know that Scott Long is the executive director of provincial operations at the Alberta Emergency Management Agency except that every time he stood up to answer a question, he would say: Scott Long, executive director, provincial operations at the Alberta Emergency Management Agency. Every single time. As well, with him is his boss, Shane Schreiber, the managing director of the Alberta Emergency Management Agency. Shane briefed our cabinet and our wildfire task force every morning for the last several weeks and has co-ordinated and been a constant source of information for me personally.

Together Scott and Shane co-ordinate a team of people that springs into action when disaster strikes. They partner with all government departments, regional or municipal emergency operations, other partners such as the RCMP, the Canadian armed forces, and the Red Cross. They kept the government and the opposition fully briefed on events that were moving at incredible speed. There wasn't a single question you could ask them about what was going on in Fort McMurray that they didn't know the answer to.

Finally, Sonya Perkins, director of emergency social services. In a devastating crisis people are vulnerable, and they have unique and special needs as they cope with circumstances beyond their control. Sonya and her team stepped up, providing the kind of care and support that Albertans deserve from their government when they need it most.

Thank you. Bruce, Chad, Scott, Shane, and Sonya are here, and I would ask that they rise and receive the warm welcome of this Assembly. [Standing ovation]

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Guests, it's really a privilege to see TV stars in our House and particularly TV stars who are heroes. On behalf of all of the Assembly – I think they would have stood for another 10 minutes had I let them – thank you very much.

Government Bills and Orders

Third Reading

Bill 20

Climate Leadership Implementation Act

(continued)

The Speaker: Are there any other individuals who wish to speak to the amendment? The hon. Member for Calgary-Fish Creek.

Mr. Gotfried: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm happy today to rise to speak to this amendment on Bill 20, the Climate Leadership Implementation Act, a.k.a. the carbon tax. No one can or should dispute the fact that climate change is a serious issue about which we should all be concerned, and this concern should result in responsible government action. Now, this is the tricky part, where many of us in the House have differing opinions.

The government will tell us that Bill 20 is a be-all and end-all in terms of addressing climate change in Alberta. They will say that they must implement every piece of this bill as it is written because the previous government simply sat on their hands and did nothing. I'll come back to that in a minute.

As I was reading through this bill, I looked for ways to offer constructive feedback based on my personal and professional background and, most importantly, what I've been hearing from my constituents, and there was one section which stuck out to me right away. On page 93 this bill amends the Climate Change and Emissions Management Act. This act, of course, governs the Climate Change and Emissions Management Corporation, or the CCEMC.

This fund was created to serve as a key part of Alberta's climate change strategy, with the money being directed towards a stronger and more diverse lower carbon economy. I noted that this government must be a fan of the fund because they are including it as a key piece of the puzzle within their climate change strategy. Now, you might ask: was this fund created after May 2015? It must be, right? If not, then the tales of the previous government sitting on their hands and doing nothing about climate change must be false.

Well, if you take a quick peek at the CCEMC website, you will note in their About section the following:

In April 2007, Alberta became the first jurisdiction in North America to pass climate change legislation requiring large emitters to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. Two years later the Climate Change and Emissions Management Corporation (CCEMC) was created as a key part of Alberta's Climate Change Strategy and movement toward a stronger and more diverse lower-carbon economy.

The CCEMC is an independent organization that supports and builds on the strategic direction established by the province.

Well, Mr. Speaker, therein lies some pretty good work done while the government was apparently sitting on its hands doing nothing.

Now back to the CCEMC as it is amended within Bill 20. The amendments to this piece of legislation ensure that the spending parameters of the fund align with programming in the climate leadership plan. These new parameters now include education and outreach, new partnerships, and administrative costs associated with the implementation of the climate leadership plan. Here is where I begin to have some grave concerns. I have concerns that monies paid and directed into the fund by industry will be redirected

towards outreach, which by any other name might be called PR or maybe even spin. Is that where your doctors of climate change science will reside given that recently a noted Alberta political scientist stated – and I'm paraphrasing – that the climate leadership plan has been a triumph of PR but certainly gives us no confidence in any measured success with respect to greenhouse gas reductions?

I am concerned that these monies will be used to sell this government's plan to Albertans instead of being directed towards initiatives which actually reduce our emissions. It seems clear that it is okay to use the science of stone cold facts to justify this legislation, but there has been little appetite to use science in the clear rejection of many amendments directed at true accountability in the verification of the outcomes promised. Accountability should be something that this Assembly and all Albertans come to expect from us, from this Legislature and from this government, but alas this is not the case with the rejection of so many well-reasoned and legislation-improving amendments from the PC caucus and others on this side of the House.

Next, I am concerned that the administrative costs associated with the implementation of the climate leadership plan will also be paid for by the CCEMC fund. This essentially means that industry will be funding the government's operations because they could not or would not find the money to do so within the department of environment. If this plan is so important, I would think that this government could find the money, albeit from within the buckets of red ink they've planned to spend on the shoulders of Albertans, within the department's existing budget to pay these costs.

Additionally, new partnerships are listed as a funding priority here. What does that really mean? What kind of partnerships, with whom, and with what goals in mind? If you're going to spend money, you better have measurable outcomes in mind and measure them before you get there.

Now, this fund will provide \$175 million to other investments under the climate leadership plan, but there are no grants to the corporation. This begs the question: will the fund still have the ability to provide grants to initiatives that the corporation suggests and that have been vaguely referenced in the legislation despite our attempts to tighten some of those clauses up, or will all of the decisions now go through Energy Efficiency Alberta or the climate change office? If the control over how grants and monies are distributed is taken away from the CCEMC, Mr. Speaker, that would be a tragic mistake.

11:20

This fund has been able to partner with a variety of different stakeholders, and through this work they have received over a 5 to 1 return on investment, with 425 and a half million dollars being turned into a \$2.2 billion total value in projects. The work done will result in an estimated 11.8 megatonnes of GHG reductions by 2020. In six years of operation there were 10 rounds of funding, which have resulted in 13 projects funded to completion, 16 biological projects, one biological program, three adaptation projects, and 109 clean technology projects amongst a variety of other successes.

It would seem that the fund is quite effective and efficient in how they operate already, which is why I do not understand why this government seems intent on giving a great deal of control over this independent organization to the minister of environment. Mr. Speaker, the minister's control of these mechanisms and independent initiatives, quite frankly, frightens me. I would suggest that the accountability and independence to do the right thing in working with industry and on behalf of Albertans may well be lost. Nothing against our current minister, as this will be the case on an ongoing basis, subject to the perhaps misguided terms of this

legislation giving inordinate latitude without accountability to the seat occupied by just one individual.

Much of the success within this fund has been through industry-based partnerships, which leads me to my next point. When you phase out an industry, you phase out the research that goes with it. As this government has waged a war on coal, the investment and research dollars in this area have and will continue to dry up. Why would someone continue to invest in a moribund industry or, sadly, in the towns and regions where that industry has been a driving economic engine? Why would anyone or any corporation in their right mind want to spend money on coal technology when they know that even if they develop the most innovative and groundbreaking technology the industry has seen on this planet to date, they would still be phased out?

If the government were to allow the six newer plants to operate to 2050 and beyond, as allowed and approved by federal legislation, the government could then partner with industry. Interesting proposition. They could give them an emissions target and a timeline and tell them that if they do not meet this ambitious target within the specified time frame, they would have to cease operations. I think it's a challenge Albertans are up to. This gives industry the chance to innovate because it gives them a reason to.

Right now, with this plan and this bill, there is no reason to innovate in the coal industry or perhaps in any other hydrocarbon-based industry as nobody really knows who or what sector of the industry might be targeted next. For example, will we one day live within the Kathleen Wynne view of natural gas in this province? There are lobbying forces and manifestos from this government's friends across the country that would make it so.

Did this government ever think that if we could develop world-class, industry-leading clean-coal technologies, we could then export this technology and tie it to high-quality Alberta coal export contracts to meet that demand around the world? Like it or not, 40 per cent of the world's electricity comes from coal. Developing countries continue to use coal because it is cheap and it is reliable. Four hundred million people in India do not currently have electricity, and they aren't building windmills today, that I know of, to meet that demand. Two thousand new coal plants are planned to be built around the world, and we have now said that we will do nothing in the way of technology and innovation to help the global community protect that global environment. Is that responsible action, as we also kill Alberta jobs and communities, Mr. Speaker?

In recent conversation with the Chinese consul general it is clear that China could be a strategic partner in such an inspired endeavour. Is this not what economic diversification and valuing our scarce natural resources should look like, those partnerships that you reference so clearly in your legislation? If we were able to export this technology around the world, it would have a real, significant, and measurable impact on greenhouse gas emissions on a global scale. A novel idea, indeed. I hope that is undoubtedly the real target here, unless I am seriously confused by the climate leadership plan. Developing, patenting, and exporting technology fits really well into a lower carbon, knowledge-based economy, things this government claims to be a champion of.

Mr. Speaker, I guess that in closing, I would just like to ask that this government look at the bigger picture, respect our rich natural resources, balance environmental stewardship, give Albertans what they desire – a vibrant, healthy, and sustainable economy – and come to the table with industry to work towards promoting Alberta as a hub of balanced and responsible industrial innovation, which will absolutely align with what, I am confident, reflects Albertans' desire for impactful leadership on a global scale.

I beg of this government, Mr. Speaker, please, please do what I am hearing Albertans say. Yes, protect the environment, but let's

be balanced and responsible by also fiercely defending and rebuilding the Alberta advantage, which past governments, PC governments, have so often been blamed for creating. Was it really such a bad thing? Let's allow Albertans the stone cold facts that they need in the years ahead to judge the outcomes of your unamended climate leadership plan – oh, sorry; one amendment; thank you to the Member for Calgary-West – as it takes hold with both the intended and, sadly, with the many unintended consequences. You owe that to Albertans, and our future depends on it.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Are there any questions or comments under 29(2)(a) for the Member for Calgary-Fish Creek?

Seeing none, the hon. Premier.

Ms Notley: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is a pleasure for me to be able to rise and speak to some extent on this bill. I was here until early last night, or, I guess, early this morning, but I didn't get the opportunity to speak to it then. I had a little bit more to say than what I normally get to say in answer to questions, in 35 seconds. So it is a pleasure for me to be able to take, my House leader tells me, roughly 10 minutes to speak to this.

I want to say that I'm extremely proud of this piece of legislation and extremely proud of this government's climate leadership plan. Action by this government with respect to climate change is one that is long, long, long overdue in this province. It is an action that we committed to Albertans we would take in the last election.

Albertans told us in the last election that they were worried about climate change, that they were worried about the state of the environment, that they were worried about Alberta's reputation internationally and nationally, and that they were worried about their future as a result. At that time we said: "We will take action on climate change. We will develop a balanced plan. We will consult with Albertans. We will go on the basis of the best evidence, and we will have that work done to present that plan to the climate change leadership conference in Paris in November." And, Mr. Speaker, we delivered.

This spring, as a result, we are now in a position of being able to bring in the enabling legislation for large parts of our climate change plan, but let me just talk a little bit about that plan. As much as we've heard the opposition here debating whether climate change is real or whether, in fact, it's just a product of I believe it was unicorn farts at one point, as one person suggested, the fact of the matter is that climate change is real, and we need to act. Leaders around the world understand that we need to act. So that's why I'm so pleased that already our climate change leadership plan has received the endorsement from a number of key people, not only in Alberta, not only even in Canada, Mr. Speaker, but from around the world.

I was very pleased to meet yesterday with the governor of the Bank of England, who indicated that he was pleased that Alberta was taking action and showing leadership on our climate change plan. As many members have already heard us talk about, Michael Bloomberg, the former mayor of the city of New York and also a chair of an international committee which is dealing with the financial effects of climate change world-wide, also said that Alberta was not only introducing a good leadership plan but that, in fact, we were leading the way with this climate leadership plan.

Experts on this issue from around the globe who are worried about the state of climate change believe that by Alberta's action to put a price on carbon across the economy as also a nonrenewable energy leader, a province which remains committed to promoting sustainable growth of our nonrenewable energy product, we have

shown a level of leadership that has not been seen in many places across the world. So we should be proud. Not only should we be proud, but what it does is that it is fundamental to repositioning our nonrenewable energy sector, our oil and gas sector, as a progressive, sustainable producer world-wide. It allows us now, Mr. Speaker, to have conversations with people we were not ever able to get in the room with. It allows us to have conversations with allies across this country and across the world, that weren't prepared to listen to us before, because now we are acting.

11:30

We are working, in fact, very collaboratively with industry to ensure that not only will we, when this plan is fully enforced, be continuing to export our nonrenewable energy product to other jurisdictions and to a greater diversity of markets but that we will also export a level of technological expertise that is driven by producing barrels of oil with less and less carbon in each barrel. We will lead the way in reducing the carbon in each barrel because we have a plan to work with industry in a co-ordinated, well-funded fashion. This will actually help transition our economy to not only being a leader in producing that product but also in how to produce that product and in the technology associated with producing that product in a more environmentally sustainable and responsible way. So I'm very proud of being able to do that and having been able to work with the energy industry on that part of our climate change leadership plan, Mr. Speaker.

In addition, what we are also doing is that we are moving towards incenting fundamental behaviour changes throughout our society because Albertans know that we need to take action on this issue. They know that we cannot continue to do things exactly the way they were done in the past, as much as the opposition would like that to be the case, but that we need to reposition ourselves for the future responsibly and reduce the degree to which we create emissions across our province.

So where we once were a province – in fact, we were the only province in the country – without a co-ordinated, thoughtful, well-researched, well-funded energy efficiency plan, we will now, through this plan and through this act, move into the forefront in this country, Mr. Speaker, with a robust, thoughtful, well-researched, well-funded energy efficiency strategy that will support small business, charities, low-income families, school boards, hospitals, and businesses as we all work together intelligently, thoughtfully, on the basis of the best evidence towards reducing our emissions as a province, as a community, as an economy, Mr. Speaker.

What we also have been able to do, notwithstanding the comments of those opposite, is that we have been able to develop a plan where we will be able to slowly phase out of coal, Mr. Speaker, and that is something that is long overdue in this province. We produce more emissions from coal in Alberta than the rest of the country combined. The fact of the matter is that the science is unequivocal. It is not good for our health. We need to find a way to phase out of that particular way of producing energy, and that will produce significant reductions in emissions in this province. To be clear, we are only doing that which is going on around the world. It is, again, time for us to understand that we need to take action, that we need to show leadership, that we need to be bold, that we cannot simply look backwards, cross our fingers, close our eyes, and hope that the world doesn't change around us. That is not leadership, that is not standing up for Albertans, and that is not giving them the kind of government that they voted for and have been desperate to have for many, many years.

One thing that we haven't spoken a lot about, of course, is our methane reduction program, another element of our climate

leadership plan. Our methane reduction program, which I'm sure members opposite will recall, formed the basis of the conversation between Prime Minister Trudeau and President Barack Obama when they met a couple of months ago. They talked about a methane plan that will be introduced and adopted continentally based on the model developed here in Alberta, Mr. Speaker. In fact, you know, a couple of weeks ago – maybe it was a month or two or three weeks ago; I can't remember – when I visited Washington, I heard from the President's special adviser on the environment and I heard from high-level government officials across Washington that they understood that that methane reduction program was Alberta's methane reduction program. In fact, they are moving forward in terms of a significant public policy move based on the work of the people of this province as a result of the broad, thoughtful, intelligent consultations led, of course, by the minister of environment and also by Dr. Andrew Leach and his fabulous panel, who did so much work for us last summer.

So, Mr. Speaker, there is so much in this plan to be proud of. There is so much in this plan that will ensure fairness, that will ensure low-income and middle-income families are protected as we move towards a transition, that will ensure a responsible, clear, economically sustainable path to economic diversification and energy diversification and, at the same time, buy that ever so important social licence for our nonrenewable sector to diversify our markets. All of that is wrapped up in this plan. It is one of the most ambitious policy agenda items of any government in this country for decades, and I'm so proud that our government has been able to bring it in for a partial landing today, a mere 12 months and two weeks into our mandate. We have more to come, but let me just say on behalf of our whole caucus that we are very, very proud to be voting on this bill today.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Are there any questions or comments to the Premier under 29(2)(a)? Calgary-Fish Creek.

Mr. Gotfried: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There's just one comment I have. Again, there's no disputing that climate change is a serious issue, but what I wonder is this. If we're demonizing hydrocarbon here in Alberta, what makes it okay to ship that product around the world and to the Third World so that they can take that demonized product and use it freely?

The Speaker: The hon. Premier.

Ms Notley: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't believe that we are demonizing any product. We're simply acting responsibly. As I've said before, we're working very closely with many leaders in the nonrenewable energy sector, and we'll continue to do so.

The Speaker: Anyone wishing to speak to the amendment to Bill 20 as proposed by the Member for Chestermere-Rocky View?

I see none.

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

[Several members rose calling for a division. The division bell was rung at 11:37 a.m.]

[One minute having elapsed, the Assembly divided]

[The Speaker in the chair]

For the motion:

Aheer	Hanson	Rodney
Anderson, W.	Hunter	Schneider
Barnes	Jansen	Smith

Clark	Jean	Stier
Cooper	Loewen	Strankman
Cyr	MacIntyre	Swann
Drysdale	Nixon	Taylor
Ellis	Orr	van Dijken
Fildebrandt	Panda	Yao
Gotfried	Pitt	

11:40

Against the motion:

Anderson, S.	Hinkley	Notley
Babcock	Hoffman	Phillips
Carson	Horne	Piquette
Ceci	Jabbour	Rosendahl
Connolly	Kazim	Sabir
Coolahan	Kleinstauber	Schmidt
Cortes-Vargas	Littlewood	Schreiner
Dach	Loyola	Shepherd
Dang	Malkinson	Sigurdson
Drever	Mason	Sucha
Eggen	McKitrick	Turner
Feehan	Miller	Westhead
Goehring	Miranda	Woollard
Gray	Nielsen	

Totals:	For – 29	Against – 41
---------	----------	--------------

[Motion on amendment to third reading of Bill 20 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 11:44 a.m.]

[One minute having elapsed, the Assembly divided]

[The Speaker in the chair]

For the motion:

Anderson, S.	Gray	Nielsen
Babcock	Hinkley	Notley
Carson	Hoffman	Phillips
Ceci	Horne	Piquette
Connolly	Jabbour	Rosendahl
Coolahan	Kazim	Sabir
Cortes-Vargas	Kleinstauber	Schmidt
Dach	Littlewood	Schreiner
Dang	Loyola	Shepherd
Drever	Malkinson	Sigurdson
Eggen	Mason	Sucha
Feehan	McKitrick	Turner
Ganley	Miller	Westhead
Goehring	Miranda	Woollard

Against the motion:

Aheer	Hanson	Rodney
Anderson, W.	Hunter	Schneider

Barnes	Jansen	Smith
Clark	Jean	Stier
Cooper	Loewen	Strankman
Cyr	MacIntyre	Swann
Drysdale	Nixon	Taylor
Ellis	Orr	van Dijken
Fildebrandt	Panda	Yao
Gotfried	Pitt	

Totals:	For – 42	Against – 29
---------	----------	--------------

[Motion carried; Bill 20 read a third time]

The Speaker: The Opposition House Leader.**Mr. Cooper:** Mr. Speaker, I briefly request unanimous consent of the House to revert to introductions.

[Unanimous consent granted]

Introduction of Guests*(reversion)***Mr. Fildebrandt:** Mr. Speaker, I just want to take a very brief moment and acknowledge some of the Wildrose caucus staff here who have worked incredible hours to make this possible for us. Please rise as I call your names: Cole Kander, Maureen Gough, Hannah Storvold, Tricia Velthuisen, and Megan Brown. We owe them a great debt of gratitude for all of the work they've done today. Thank you.**11:50****The Speaker:** Are there any other guests to be introduced? Yes, hon. member.**Mr. Rodney:** For the sake of time, respecting the other members of this House and beyond, just a similar thank you to all the members of our staff. We have incredibly dedicated, conscientious people who do wonderful research and are very passionate about the past, present, and future of our province. I would like to also thank all of our staff members and supporters of the Progressive Conservatives. Thank you so much.**The Speaker:** The hon. Government House Leader.**Mr. Mason:** Mr. Speaker, I would now like to advise the House that pursuant to Government Motion 6 the business for the sitting is now concluded, and the House stands adjourned.**The Speaker:** Hon. members, pursuant to Government Motion 6, agreed to on March 9, 2016, the Assembly stands adjourned until Monday, October 31, 2016, unless otherwise ordered.

Please be safe.

[The Assembly adjourned at 11:51 a.m. pursuant to Government Motion 6]

Bill Status Report for the 29th Legislature - 2nd Session (2016)

Activity to June 07, 2016

The Bill sponsor's name is in brackets following the Bill title. If it is a money Bill, (\$) will appear between the title and the sponsor's name. Numbers following each Reading refer to Hansard pages where the text of debates is found; dates for each Reading are in brackets following the page numbers. Bills numbered 1 to 200 are Government Bills. Bills numbered 201 or higher are Private Members' Public Bills. Bills numbered with a "Pr" prefix are Private Bills.

*An asterisk beside a Bill number indicates an amendment was passed to that Bill; the Committee line shows the precise date of the amendment.

The date a Bill comes into force is indicated in square brackets after the date of Royal Assent. If a Bill comes into force "on proclamation," "with exceptions," or "on various dates," please contact Legislative Counsel, Alberta Justice, for details at (780) 427-2217. The chapter number assigned to the Bill is entered immediately following the date the Bill comes into force. SA indicates Statutes of Alberta; this is followed by the year in which it is included in the statutes, and its chapter number. Please note, Private Bills are not assigned chapter numbers until the conclusion of the Fall Sitings.

1 Promoting Job Creation and Diversification Act (Bilous)

First Reading -- 5 (Mar. 8, 2016 aft., passed)

Second Reading -- 732-36 (Apr. 20, 2016 aft.), 685-91 (Apr. 20, 2016 morn.), 749-60 (Apr. 21, 2016 aft.), 825 (May 5, 2016 aft., passed)

Committee of the Whole -- 1019-24 (May 18, 2016 aft., passed), 987-95 (May 18, 2016 morn.)

Third Reading -- 1172 (May 25, 2016 eve.), 1174-79 (May 25, 2016 eve., passed on division)

Royal Assent -- (May 27, 2016 outside of House sitting) [Comes into force May 27, 2016; SA 2016 cP-26.3]

2 Appropriation (Interim Supply) Act, 2016 (\$) (Ceci)

First Reading -- 96 (Mar. 10, 2016 aft., passed)

Second Reading -- 162-67 (Mar. 15, 2016 morn., passed on division)

Committee of the Whole -- 239-49 (Mar. 16, 2016 aft., passed)

Third Reading -- 251-59 (Mar. 17, 2016 morn., passed on division)

Royal Assent -- (Mar. 23, 2016 outside of House sitting) [Comes into force Mar. 23, 2016; SA 2016 c1]

3 Appropriation (Supplementary Supply) Act, 2016 (\$) (Ceci)

First Reading -- 156 (Mar. 14, 2016 eve., passed)

Second Reading -- 201 (Mar. 15, 2016 aft., passed), 157-62 (Mar. 15, 2016 morn.)

Committee of the Whole -- 239-49 (Mar. 16, 2016 aft., passed)

Third Reading -- 259-66 (Mar. 17, 2016 morn., passed)

Royal Assent -- (Mar. 23, 2016 outside of House sitting) [Comes into force Mar. 23, 2016; SA 2016 c2]

4* An Act to Implement a Supreme Court Ruling Governing Essential Services (Gray)

First Reading -- 180 (Mar. 15, 2016 aft., passed)

Second Reading -- 285-88 (Mar. 17, 2016 aft.), 349-66 (Apr. 5, 2016 aft., passed)

Committee of the Whole -- 399-409 (Apr. 6, 2016 aft.), 378-84 (Apr. 6, 2016 morn.), 415-28 (Apr. 7, 2016 morn., passed with amendments)

Third Reading -- 450-55 (Apr. 7, 2016 aft., passed), 428-33 (Apr. 7, 2016 morn.)

Royal Assent -- (May 27, 2016 outside of House sitting) [Comes into force May 27, 2016, with exceptions; SA 2016 c10]

5 Seniors' Home Adaptation and Repair Act (Sigurdson)

First Reading -- 398 (Apr. 6, 2016 aft.)

Second Reading -- 455-56 (Apr. 7, 2016 aft.), 532-38 (Apr. 12, 2016 aft., passed), 491-505 (Apr. 12, 2016 morn.)

Committee of the Whole -- 570-77 (Apr. 13, 2016 aft., passed), 539-56 (Apr. 13, 2016 morn.)

Third Reading -- 577-83 (Apr. 13, 2016 aft., passed)

Royal Assent -- (May 27, 2016 outside of House sitting) [Comes into force on proclamation; SA 2016 cS-7.1]

6 Securities Amendment Act, 2016 (Ceci)

First Reading -- 447 (Apr. 7, 2016 aft., passed), 447 (Apr. 7, 2016 aft.)

Second Reading -- 519-27 (Apr. 12, 2016 aft., passed)

Committee of the Whole -- 527-32 (Apr. 12, 2016 aft., passed)

Third Reading -- 583-85 (Apr. 13, 2016 aft., passed)

Royal Assent -- (May 27, 2016 outside of House sitting) [Comes into force May 27, 2016, with exceptions; SA 2016 c13]

- 7 Electoral Boundaries Commission Amendment Act, 2016 (Ganley)**
First Reading -- 518 (Apr. 12, 2016 aft., passed)
Second Reading -- 585-86 (Apr. 13, 2016 aft.), 682-84 (Apr. 19, 2016 aft., passed), 649-51 (Apr. 19, 2016 morn.)
Committee of the Whole -- 820-24 (May 5, 2016 aft., passed)
Third Reading -- 902-903 (May 12, 2016 aft., passed)
Royal Assent -- (May 27, 2016 outside of House sitting) [Comes into force May 27, 2016; SA 2016 c6]
- 8 Fair Trading Amendment Act, 2016 (McLean)**
First Reading -- 568 (Apr. 13, 2016 aft., passed)
Second Reading -- 669-71 (Apr. 19, 2016 aft.), 684 (Apr. 19, 2016 aft., passed)
Committee of the Whole -- 824-25 (May 5, 2016 aft., passed)
Third Reading -- 903-904 (May 12, 2016 aft., passed)
Royal Assent -- (May 27, 2016 outside of House sitting) [Comes into force May 27, 2016; SA 2016 c8]
- 9 An Act to Modernize Enforcement of Provincial Offences (Ganley)**
First Reading -- 568 (Apr. 13, 2016 aft., passed)
Second Reading -- 640-49 (Apr. 19, 2016 morn.), 728-30 (Apr. 20, 2016 aft., passed)
Committee of the Whole -- 979-81 (May 17, 2016 aft., passed)
Third Reading -- 1180-81 (May 25, 2016 eve., passed)
Royal Assent -- (May 27, 2016 outside of House sitting) [Comes into force on proclamation; SA 2016 c11]
- 10 Fiscal Statutes Amendment Act, 2016 (Ceci)**
First Reading -- 599 (Apr. 14, 2016 aft., passed)
Second Reading -- 671-82 (Apr. 19, 2016 aft.), 730-32 (Apr. 20, 2016 aft., passed on division), 691-703 (Apr. 20, 2016 morn.)
Committee of the Whole -- 950-51 (May 17, 2016 morn.), 1041-49 (May 19, 2016 morn.), 1103-13 (May 24, 2016 aft.), 1115-23 (May 24, 2016 eve., passed), 1077-81 (May 24, 2016 morn.)
Third Reading -- 1124 (May 24, 2016 eve.), 1197-99 (May 26, 2016 morn.), 1263-85 (May 30, 2016 eve., passed on division)
- 11 Alberta Research and Innovation Amendment Act, 2016 (Bilous)**
First Reading -- 773 (May 2, 2016 aft., passed)
Second Reading -- 907-908 (May 12, 2016 aft.), 971-79 (May 17, 2016 aft, passed)
Committee of the Whole -- 1012-18 (May 18, 2016 aft.), 1024 (May 18, 2016 aft., passed)
Third Reading -- 1068-69 (May 19, 2016 aft., passed)
Royal Assent -- (May 27, 2016 outside of House sitting) [Comes into force on proclamation; SA 2016 c4]
- 12 Aboriginal Consultation Levy Repeal Act (Feehan)**
First Reading -- 802 (May 3, 2016 aft., passed)
Second Reading -- 904-907 (May 12, 2016 aft., passed)
Committee of the Whole -- 985-87 (May 18, 2016 morn., passed)
Third Reading -- 1069 (May 19, 2016 aft., passed)
Royal Assent -- (May 27, 2016 outside of House sitting) [Comes into force May 27, 2016; SA 2016 c3]
- 13 Veterinary Profession Amendment Act, 2016 (Gray)**
First Reading -- 872 (May 10, 2016 aft., passed)
Second Reading -- 965-71 (May 17, 2016 aft., passed on division)
Committee of the Whole -- 1024-25 (May 18, 2016 aft., passed)
Third Reading -- 1069 (May 19, 2016 aft., passed)
Royal Assent -- (May 27, 2016 outside of House sitting) [Comes into force on proclamation; SA 2016 c15]
- 14 Health Professions Amendment Act, 2016 (Hoffman)**
First Reading -- 872 (May 10, 2016 aft., passed)
Second Reading -- 983-85 (May 18, 2016 morn., passed)
Committee of the Whole -- 1076-77 (May 24, 2016 morn., passed)
Third Reading -- 1077 (May 24, 2016 morn., passed)
Royal Assent -- (May 27, 2016 outside of House sitting) [Comes into force May 27, 2016; SA 2016 c9]
- 15 An Act to End Predatory Lending (McLean)**
First Reading -- 901 (May 12, 2016 aft., passed)
Second Reading -- 1062-67 (May 19, 2016 aft., passed)
Committee of the Whole -- 1153-57 (May 25, 2016 aft., passed)
Third Reading -- 1172 (May 25, 2016 eve., passed)
Royal Assent -- (May 27, 2016 outside of House sitting) [Comes into force on various dates; SA 2016 cE-9.5]

- 16*** **Traffic Safety Amendment Act, 2016 (Mason)**
First Reading -- 921 (May 16, 2016 aft., passed)
Second Reading -- 1067-68 (May 19, 2016 aft.), 1071-75 (May 24, 2016 morn., passed)
Committee of the Whole -- 1157-63 (May 25, 2016 aft.), 1219-23 (May 26, 2016 aft., passed with amendments), 1197 (May 26, 2016 morn., adjourned)
Third Reading -- 1223-25 (May 26, 2016 aft., passed)
Royal Assent -- (May 27, 2016 outside of House sitting) [Comes into force May 27, 2016, with exceptions; SA 2016 c14]
- 17** **Appropriation Act, 2016 (\$) (Ceci)**
First Reading -- 950 (May 17, 2016 morn., passed)
Second Reading -- 1025-29 (May 18, 2016 aft., passed), 995-1000 (May 18, 2016 morn., adjourned)
Committee of the Whole -- 1070 (May 19, 2016 aft., passed), 1031-41 (May 19, 2016 morn.)
Third Reading -- 1096-1103 (May 24, 2016 aft.), 1113 (May 24, 2016 aft., passed on division)
Royal Assent -- (May 27, 2016 outside of House sitting) [Comes into force May 27, 2016; SA 2016 c5]
- 18** **An Act to Ensure Independent Environmental Monitoring (Phillips)**
First Reading -- 964-65 (May 17, 2016 aft., passed)
Second Reading -- 1125-35 (May 25, 2016 morn., passed on division)
Committee of the Whole -- 1191-97 (May 26, 2016 morn., passed)
Third Reading -- 1199-1205 (May 26, 2016 morn., passed on division)
Royal Assent -- (May 27, 2016 outside of House sitting) [Comes into force June 30, 2016; SA 2016 c7]
- 19** **Reform of Agencies, Boards and Commissions Compensation Act (Ceci)**
First Reading -- 1011 (May 18, 2016 aft., passed)
Second Reading -- 1153 (May 25, 2016 aft., passed), 1135-40 (May 25, 2016 morn.)
Committee of the Whole -- 1171-72 (May 25, 2016 eve., passed)
Third Reading -- 1173 (May 25, 2016 eve., passed)
Royal Assent -- (May 27, 2016 outside of House sitting) [Comes into force May 27, 2016; SA 2016 cR-8.5]
- 20*** **Climate Leadership Implementation Act (\$) (Phillips)**
First Reading -- 1095 (May 24, 2016 aft., passed)
Second Reading -- 1163-70 (May 25, 2016 aft.), 1173-74 (May 25, 2016 eve.), 1181-90 (May 25, 2016 eve.), 1311-21 (May 31, 2016 aft.), 1338-56 (May 31, 2016 eve.), 1288-98 (May 31, 2016 morn.), 1405-07 (Jun. 1, 2016 eve., passed on division), 1357-72 (Jun. 1, 2016 morn.)
Committee of the Whole -- 1408-24 (Jun. 1, 2016 eve.), 1458-61 (Jun. 2, 2016 aft.), 1425-42 (Jun. 2, 2016 morn.), 1479-91 (Jun. 6, 2016 aft.), 1493-1541 (Jun. 6, 2016 eve., passed with amendments)
Third Reading -- 1541-43 (Jun. 6, 2016 eve.), 1545-57 (Jun. 7, 2016 morn., passed on division)
- 21** **Modernized Municipal Government Act (Larivee)**
First Reading -- 1310 (May 31, 2016 aft., passed)
- 22** **An Act to Provide for the Repatriation of Indigenous Peoples' Sacred Ceremonial Objects (Miranda)**
First Reading -- 1219 (May 26, 2016 aft., passed)
- 23** **Miscellaneous Statutes Amendment Act, 2016 (Mason)**
First Reading -- 1454 (Jun. 2, 2016 aft., passed)
Second Reading -- 1478 (Jun. 6, 2016 aft., passed)
Committee of the Whole -- 1478 (Jun. 6, 2016 aft., passed)
Third Reading -- 1479 (Jun. 6, 2016 aft., passed)
- 201** **Election Recall Act (Smith)**
First Reading -- 92 (Mar. 10, 2016 aft., passed)
Second Reading -- 119-32 (Mar. 14, 2016 aft.), 303-304 (Apr. 4, 2016 aft., defeated on division)
- 202** **Alberta Affordable Housing Review Committee Act (Luff)**
First Reading -- 92 (Mar. 10, 2016 aft., passed)
Second Reading -- 305-16 (Apr. 4, 2016 aft.), 470-73 (Apr. 11, 2016 aft., passed)
- 203** **Fair Trading (Motor Vehicle Repair Pricing Protection for Consumers) Amendment Act, 2016 (Carson)**
First Reading -- 280 (Mar. 17, 2016 aft., passed)
Second Reading -- 481-83 (Apr. 11, 2016 aft., referred to Standing Committee on Families and Communities), 473-81 (Apr. 11, 2016 aft.)

- 204 Alberta Tourism Week Act (Dang)**
First Reading -- 468 (Apr. 11, 2016 aft., passed)
Second Reading -- 616-30 (Apr. 18, 2016 aft., passed)
- 205* Pharmacy and Drug (Pharmaceutical Equipment Control) Amendment Act, 2016 (Ellis)**
First Reading -- 707 (Apr. 20, 2016 aft.)
Second Reading -- 839-50 (May 9, 2016 aft., passed)
Committee of the Whole -- 924-31 (May 16, 2016 aft., passed with amendments)
Third Reading -- 931-34 (May 16, 2016 aft., passed)
Royal Assent -- (May 27, 2016 outside of House sitting) [Comes into force January 1, 2017; SA 2016 c12]
- 206* Post-traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) Awareness Day Act (Goehring)**
First Reading -- 902 (May 12, 2016 aft., passed)
Second Reading -- 1241-49 (May 30, 2016 aft., passed)
Committee of the Whole -- 1249-55 (May 30, 2016 aft., passed with amendments)
Third Reading -- 1255-57 (May 30, 2016 aft., passed)
- Pr1 Bow Valley Community Foundation Repeal Act (Westhead)**
First Reading -- 447 (Apr. 7, 2016 aft., passed)
Second Reading -- 1171 (May 25, 2016 eve., passed)
Committee of the Whole -- 1197 (May 26, 2016 morn., passed)
Third Reading -- 1219 (May 26, 2016 aft., passed)
Royal Assent -- (May 27, 2016) [Comes into force May 27, 2016]

Table of Contents

Prayers	1545
Orders of the Day	1545
Government Bills and Orders	
Third Reading	
Bill 20 Climate Leadership Implementation Act	1545, 1554
Division	1556
Division	1557
Introduction of Guests	1553, 1557

Alberta Hansard is available online at www.assembly.ab.ca

For inquiries contact:

Managing Editor

Alberta Hansard

3rd Floor, 9820 – 107 St

EDMONTON, AB T5K 1E7

Telephone: 780.427.1875