



Province of Alberta

The 29th Legislature
Second Session

Alberta Hansard

Thursday morning, November 3, 2016

Day 44

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

Shannon Dean, Law Clerk and Director of
House Services

Trafton Koenig, Parliamentary Counsel

Stephanie LeBlanc, Parliamentary Counsel
and Legal Research Officer

Philip Massolin, Manager of Research and
Committee Services

Nancy Robert, Research Officer

Brian G. Hodgson, Sergeant-at-Arms

Chris Caughell, Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms

Paul Link, Assistant Sergeant-at-Arms

Gordon Munk, Assistant Sergeant-at-Arms

Gareth Scott, Assistant Sergeant-at-Arms

Janet Schwegel, Managing Editor of *Alberta Hansard*

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 | |

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

9 a.m.

Thursday, November 3, 2016

[The Speaker in the chair]

Prayers

The Speaker: Good morning.

Please bow your heads and let us reflect, each in our own way. Today let us strive to ensure that our actions that we take in this House aim to improve our tomorrow. Each day let us be reminded of the pure privilege of being able to serve the people of Alberta. Let us be inspired by our constituents as well as by one another.

Please be seated.

Orders of the Day

Government Bills and Orders

Second Reading

Bill 25

Oil Sands Emissions Limit Act

[Adjourned debate November 2: Mr. Dach]

The Speaker: The Member for Chestermere-Rocky View.

Mrs. Aheer: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I am pleased today to have the opportunity to rise before the House to discuss Bill 25, the Oil Sands Emissions Limit Act. I'm quite confident when I say that this is not new information to anyone in this room, that the government seemingly does not want or feel the need to conduct or release economic impact studies on the radical ideological agenda. Perhaps it's not surprising that when you're imposing long-debunked economic policies, it's tough to find anyone reputable to rubber-stamp whatever – I don't know what this is – policy that the government is deciding to push through on a whim.

As the opposition we're used to asking the NDP to slow down, to study the impact or to at least try and give Albertans the heads-up on the terrible roller-coaster ride that they're trapped on for the next three years, but not today. Today I'd like to take the opportunity to talk to my colleagues about a report released by the Fraser Institute that outlines exactly what the impacts of this policy will be. [interjections] I'm not sure what was funny about that statement, but I will continue. [interjections]

The Speaker: Government members, please allow the member to make her statement. I'm having difficulty hearing her.

Please proceed.

Mrs. Aheer: Thank you. Mr. Speaker, I will be tabling the five requisite copies of the report this afternoon. I have them here if you'd like them.

In August the Fraser Institute released a study analyzing the economic impact that the 100-megatonne cap would have on Alberta's struggling economy. Nobody disputes that this cap is meant to cap future production. Using oil sands production forecasts to 2040 from the National Energy Board, the paper actually estimated future emission levels from the oil sands production and quantified what the prohibited production would cost. Using these production estimates, the Fraser Institute was able to determine that this policy has the potential to reduce cumulative production between 2025 and 2040 somewhere between 2 billion to 3 billion barrels of oil. Let me say that again: reduce the

cumulative production between 2025 and 2040 somewhere in the range between 2 billion to 3 billion barrels of oil.

Most Albertans view this as a serious loss and that it should be avoided, and I'm just not so sure what the government is trying to – maybe they view this as a win. I'm not sure. As a legislator and an Albertan I can honestly say that I don't understand what the members of this government are missing when they speak to their constituents. Every single day I have constituents coming into my office, struggling Albertans, and it's so compelling. I don't know about some of you, but it keeps me up at night. They're desperate for help and work, and they come into my office and they send me e-mails, hundreds of e-mails, phoning me, desperate for help. Just in case you didn't know, Alberta has seen a loss of 104,000 jobs in this downturn in Calgary, and the unemployment rate in August was at 8.6 per cent. Eight point six per cent. It's a hard number to say. I can't get my head around it. That's the highest rate in the province in September since 1994, the highest rate in 22 years.

Unfortunately, the government wants to absolve themselves of guilt by blaming the low price of oil for all of Alberta's woes, but losing billions of barrels of oil production by 2040: that is not a consequence of low oil prices. That is not. That is poor government policy. Those barrels represent somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$150 billion to \$250 billion. How do you get your head around that? [interjections] My goodness. These amounts are the most unimaginable sum of money. I really can't fathom it. The figure represents jobs. It represents numbers of social services. It actually represents and it provides our citizens . . .

The Speaker: Hon. member, the Minister of Advanced Education's volume is just a little louder than normal, and I was having difficulty hearing. I'm sure he will tone it down. Could you continue? Please proceed.

Mrs. Aheer: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I have to say that I don't know about this side, but I find it appalling that the government thinks that these numbers are funny. I think that for every Albertan watching this right now, that is a shameful, shameful display from the government towards the people of Alberta.

As I'd like to say, and I'm going to reiterate just to make it clear: \$150 billion to \$250 billion. That is jobs, Mr. Speaker, that is social services that we provide our citizens, and it represents schools, hospitals, and roads, things that we take to understand that this government and this House actually care about. If you want to talk about cuts to social services, it has to be recognized that this type of backward economic policy that this ideological NDP government likes to pursue will have significant negative impact on our province's ability to care and results in higher taxes and less value for every Albertan dollar. A weak economy does not help the sick, it doesn't help the poor, and it certainly does not help the working class.

Now, the NDP don't like to keep track of what impact their green policies will have on GHG reductions either, and therefore the NDP do not like to keep track of the costs of their policies per abated tonne. The extensive research of the Fraser Institute has produced some estimates of the emissions that could be averted, so this is helpful information. As a result of the 100-megatonne emissions cap policy, they found that the potential emissions averted due to the policy change will be minimal – minimal – in comparison to projected global emissions. Not only are the oil sands a fraction of the per cent of global emissions, and any oil we don't extract here will just get extracted somewhere else – it's not like we can force companies to leave it in the ground. Even if we, even if this

government, if the NDP forces companies here to keep it in the ground, nobody else will.

The Fraser study goes on to note that “if all production from Alberta’s oil sands were halted, the resulting reductions in global emissions would . . . be quite minimal” and that in 2040, when the NEB projects oil sands production will be largest, meaning the emissions from production would be at the greatest point in 2040, the 100-megatonne emissions cap policy will avert – get this – only 25 megatonnes.

9:10

The report adds that the abated emissions, so the reduced emissions, will also come at a high cost per tonne. So with the cost per tonne of abated GHGs beginning somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$863 per tonne in 2025 and then increasing to a staggering \$1,172 by 2040 – let us put that figure into perspective for you. [interjections] And you can laugh all you want. Prime Minister Trudeau wants Albertans to pay a tax of \$50 per tonne of carbon dioxide equivalent by 2022, and that’s just three years later than the NDP’s policy would see Albertans forgoing \$863 per tonne. The difference is astonishing. Estimates on the social cost of carbon do not come anywhere close to justifying this exorbitant rate.

The highest estimated cost, Mr. Speaker, for the social cost of carbon produced by the U.S. government’s interagency working group put 2040 costs of carbon at only \$96. While the paper acknowledges that this is only a first step in attempting to quantify the effects of Alberta’s 100-megatonne emissions cap policy on future oil sands production and related GHG emissions, I would have to say, as an understatement, that its findings are quite startling. I have to speak to how detached this government is from everyday Albertans. The paper’s findings are that their policy has the potential to reduce future oil sands production by a large amount but that the GHG emissions that could averted would be minimal to the projected global emissions. That is not the hallmark of a successful and prudent policy.

Furthermore, the cost of the averted emissions would be so incredibly high that it’s so troubling for all Canadians. Alberta is the economic engine of Canada, and it needs responsible policies to remain so. I believe that in this House that is something we all agree on. As the Official Opposition we are left with serious questions about the choices that this government is making by putting Alberta’s future prosperity at risk. There’s a severe imbalance of costs and benefits that result from this policy. Unsurprisingly, perhaps the NDP have once again failed to consider the broader economic impact of a policy before proposing it.

One cost they may not have considered is lease payouts for the stranded assets. The 100-megatonne cap actually doesn’t even cover the development of leases that we’ve already sold. For example, if prices pick up and everybody wants to develop, some will have to be told no. Will we be paying out leaseholders who are told that they can’t develop their leases that they bought because that would just put us over this artificial cap? You know, just like we are about to pay out the coal companies in an early shutdown, this is a question that we need answered.

Ultimately I feel – and I think I speak on behalf of our caucus – that this policy is short-sighted and ignores the fundamental realities of energy demand and economics. This is not funny. This is Albertans. This is families. This is the people we represent and their livelihoods and their quality of life.

Alberta is an extremely environmentally responsible jurisdiction – an extremely environmentally responsible jurisdiction. Our energy industry actively advocates for polluter-pay models. They work hard to innovate, to reduce their water usage, and they are at

the forefront of reclamation technologies and thus often restore their sites to a more pristine state than when they actually began their first extraction work.

As other countries . . . [interjection] Maybe you haven’t been there. You should maybe go check it out. I would go. Or perhaps you’re under the impression, Mr. Speaker, that it’s Mordor. Just to check, you might want to go and dispel this myth that has been prattled on about. As I’ve said, once you see it, once you understand it, there is absolutely no question about what our industry is doing. That doesn’t mean we can’t do better. There is always that opportunity. Here we do it better. Here we want the opportunity to do better. If given the economic environment to do it better, we’re always going to do it better.

As other countries move forward in their development and increase their energy consumption . . .

The Speaker: Thank you, hon. member.

I have a sense that there may be a 29(2)(a) question. Is that correct, hon. member?

Mr. Loewen: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Now, we’ve just heard several good reasons why this emissions cap is not a good idea. Yesterday, I believe, the minister, when she introduced this, said, “We need growth in the oil sands.” It stands to reason that if you want growth in an industry, putting a cap on it doesn’t make sense. She also said that we have justified pride in our industry, but that goes against what the Premier says, that we’re embarrassing cousins. I’m not sure where this pride is that this government is talking about here.

Now, this government always blames conservative governments for no pipelines, but who’s protesting the pipelines, Mr. Speaker? Who’s protesting these pipelines? We know who’s protesting these pipelines: the very people that this government hires and continues to hire. That’s who’s protesting pipelines.

I’d like to ask the member here. We know that we are the most socially, environmentally responsible oil-producing jurisdiction in the world. I would like to hear the government suggest otherwise. The minister just said that we should have justified pride in the industry. I’d ask the member to comment on this, on these different issues that I’ve brought up here about a government that calls us the embarrassing cousin, a government that hires anti-oil activists from across Canada to come here and work and be paid hard-working Albertans’ money, and then they sit there and bring forward job-killing bill after job-killing bill.

The Speaker: The hon. Member for Chestermere-Rocky View.

Mrs. Aheer: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, it seems to me that one of the things that gets flung across the floor on a regular basis is the words “climate denier.” That seems to actually be the only overarching message that comes back to us when we start promoting what we do in this industry. That’s actually the only answer that I can recall that we’ve received, which pretty much – as far as they’re concerned, flinging insults is the way to pivot away from actually speaking about what this industry does, whether, you know, we’re embarrassing cousins or we are climate deniers or whatever manner of slanderous comments and whatnot comes from across the floor. I’m not quite sure.

9:20

As a person who lives in this province, sends her children to school, who breathes the air, who eats the food from this Earth, and who drinks the water out of her tap, I can’t imagine a more insulting comment than to be called a climate denier because automatically that means anybody who’s me and who happens to believe in what I believe in doesn’t care about the earth, air, and water. I do take

offence to that, Mr. Speaker, and as far as I'm concerned, that's probably the biggest issue that I have here.

If we're wanting to talk about facts, I have a few, and these are to be helpful. [interjections] You can laugh. Please. Albertans are hearing you. They're going to hear you laugh, and they're going to understand that those of us who live here, who believe in this industry and also believe that they can do better, also believe that there is policy that needs to come down to create an opportunity for diversity, to create an opportunity to become more environmental. All of those things are not up for question.

However, if the overarching mandate that is coming from this government is to call me and my friends on this side of the House climate deniers, that includes my children, that includes my family, that includes my neighbours, that includes my constituency. I'm sure Chestermere-Rocky View is extremely thrilled right now for those people who voted for me to be called climate deniers, Mr. Speaker. Just to be clear, if that's the mandate, I'm going to continue to explain a few of the numbers, and should this side of the House like to dispute those numbers, that would be fine. Fine. That's great. This is an open discussion to have that discussion.

The Speaker: Thank you, hon. members. You will recall that yesterday there was a point of order with respect to language which may come close under 23(j), so I caution all of the members to be conscious of the words that they're using.

I believe, finally, we now have the Minister of Advanced Education, who wishes to speak. Is that correct?

Mr. Schmidt: No, it's not.

The Speaker: Then I have the Member for Innisfail-Sylvan Lake.

Mr. MacIntyre: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think that one of the worst things that we are dealing with regarding this bill before us has to do with this oil sands advisory group. Albertans were told that the oil sands advisory group's primary focus is to consider how to implement the 100-megatonne per year carbon emissions limit for the oil sands industry. This responsibility is still noted in their mandate, stated on the government of Alberta's website for the oil sands advisory group.

This panel has been riddled with controversy from the beginning due to the selection of Tzaporah Berman, an individual that once referred to the oil sands as Mordor, among many other contemptuous claims.

We noticed another thing, that two members of this panel have ties to ForestEthics, including Berman, and we're not just talking about a basic membership there; we're talking about former senior director and cofounder.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I read an article recently in the *Financial Post* about ForestEthics, and I would like to read it into the record.

New information contained in U.S. tax returns makes clear that a large percentage of the fuss over the Northern Gateway pipeline has been generated by a single, American organization: ForestEthics, based in San Francisco. In its 2012 tax return . . . ForestEthics claims credit for having generated fully 87 per cent of the letters of comment sent to [our] National Energy Board.

That's an astonishing number, Mr. Speaker: 87 per cent of the letters of opposition. These are letters opposed to Canadian interests, letters opposed to Alberta jobs, letters opposed to ending the price discount Albertans receive for our resources.

The *Financial Post* article states:

[ForestEthics'] campaign to halt the Enbridge Gateway pipeline has cemented itself in the Canadian media and citizenry . . . In the last six months of 2012, we amassed more than 25,000 new

supporters for this campaign and helped organize the largest act of Canadian civil disobedience in the history of the pipeline fight.

You hear that, Mr. Speaker? They're bragging about halting one of Canada's most important infrastructure projects.

The article goes on to note:

in August, we submitted to the National Energy Board 4,119 (out of 4,722 total . . .) unique Letters of Comment on the Enbridge tankers/pipeline project.

Those are ForestEthics' own words in its tax return dated September 30, 2013.

So now we've got two people representing an un-Albertan and an un-Canadian viewpoint on this panel. Worse than that, Mr. Speaker, ForestEthics boasted in their filings:

By stigmatizing "dirty" sources of energy, we can make it difficult to finance and sell these products.

It should be noted that California has far dirtier oil than we do, and this ForestEthics, based in San Francisco, makes no mention of that.

Mr. Speaker, this is a claim they make, that they have secured the tanker ban on B.C.'s coast. They are taking credit for that, a foreign organization taking credit for stopping tankers on our coast. That is an infringement on Canada, an infringement on Alberta.

This article states:

Since 2008, ForestEthics has been the workhorse of the Tar Sands campaign, co-funded by the Rockefeller Brothers Fund, the William & Flora Hewlett Foundation and the Tides Foundation. Tides has dispersed more than \$20 million for the Tar Sands campaign, including . . . \$1.3 million to ForestEthics. The origin of these funds is not revealed by Tides.

These are foreign interests, Mr. Speaker, from a country that is seriously advantaged by landlocking Canadian oil, by forcing our product through their refineries, their pipeline infrastructure. As a result, they have left Canadian producers with no choice but to accept a significant discount on prices we are able to demand. In other words, we are stuck on account of this.

The article itself says:

By blocking pipeline and port infrastructure projects, environmental organizations landlock Canadian oil within North America and continue the U.S. monopoly on Canadian oil exports.

The problem with the funding of the Tar Sands Campaign is the secret donors that may have an agenda . . . contrary to Canadian interests.

This government – this government – has clearly stacked this panel with anti-Canadian and anti-Albertan interests, Mr. Speaker. It is reprehensible. This is our oil sands advisory committee. Our government is validating un-Albertan opinions, giving these foreign radicals a voice and a platform, giving these destructive ideas legitimacy in our processes. It would be hard for an elected government to show more disdain than this for the lifeline of everyday Albertans.

The NDP I Love Oil Sands T-shirts and photo ops aren't cutting it, Mr. Speaker, not when they're appointing people like this from the leave-it-in-the-ground camp. As if that's not enough, Berman is signatory to the Leap Manifesto, co-chair of this committee. She isn't just a member of the panel; she has a significant and influential position.

And it gets worse. There have been unchallenged allegations that participation on this panel is some kind of a reward for companies that agreed to publicly back the NDP climate action plan.

Furthermore, this panel does not represent a true cross-section of our oil sands industry due to the exclusion of small players, Albertan companies, wholly Albertan-owned companies. All but one of these companies are multinationals. They have hedged their bets outside of Alberta. For example, CNRL: they have assets in the North Sea. They are already preying on juniors struggling in this

economic climate to survive this government's radical policies. Statoil: main office? Houston. Assets? Norway, Gulf of Mexico, all over the world, really. Cenovus: Weyburn oil field in Saskatchewan; 50 per cent ownership in two American refineries. Shell: one of the largest resource multinationals, with significant assets on every continent in the world. Suncor: along with assets in a number of other provinces, they operate in Commerce City, Colorado. ConocoPhillips, an American multinational energy corporation: their assets are in Alaska, Latin America, Europe, Asia Pacific, Middle East, and Kazakhstan.

I don't know what all of their motives are, but I do know they are self-immolating their own industry just to get Trans Mountain twinned. This is a shameful thing given that the NEB had already recommended that project. It is disappointing to see the NDP government choosing to appoint extreme anti oil sands activists to co-chair this Alberta panel and stacking the deck. Albertans deserve much better, Mr. Speaker.

9:30

As if all that controversy wasn't bad enough, this House will not even benefit from the advice of this group before being asked to pass the legislation that this advisory group is discussing, for Pete's sake. Without their feedback, here we are today expected to implement a 100-megatonne cap. We've got this mess of a panel, and we're not even going to hear from them. What was the point? Healthy paycheques for left-wing friends? Was that the point of this panel?

During this time of economic uncertainty we need to have a balanced approach on environmental stewardship and ensure the success of our energy industry. Industry members are still very curious about how the 100-megatonne limit will be distributed, how the performance standards for GHG emissions will be crafted. This bill does not clarify any of that, and we are being asked to pass this bill without even knowing the full details regarding how fair this will be across the entire industry. This government continues to fail to see the urgency of clarifying their plans to drastically change the province's energy industry regulations. We've got the bill now, but the details we need to support it: they're not here.

Worse, this government isn't being honest with Albertans about the bill's role in pipeline approval. The NEB has already recommended Trans Mountain for approval after extensive vetting. The NEB has already looked at the GHGs in association with the pipeline itself and deemed them fair. Trans Mountain epitomizes common-sense infrastructure. Most of the right-of-way has already been secured as this was just a doubling. Beyond that, taxation in exchange for pipeline approval: really? A matter of interprovincial transportation as a core component to belonging to a federation is an abhorrent policy. This province has no role to play in pipeline approval aside from lobbying Trudeau to take the NEB, a science-based, evidence-based, apolitical body, and take their recommendations and approve that pipeline.

The whole thing is a charade by a government to push their ideological agenda, their radical agenda. This NDP government has done nothing more than spread misinformation about how pipeline approval really works. Pipeline approval is entirely a federal matter. In the real world when the merits of a pipeline are assessed, they are assessed based on the pipeline itself.

Only a handful of companies will be shipping product through Trans Mountain, not the entirety of the industry. It shouldn't be a radical idea that only the GHGs produced from the pipeline be considered in the approval process.

Beyond that fact, Albertans are sick and tired of listening to the NDP trash the environmental reputation of our energy industry. It is the best in the world, Mr. Speaker. Our industry is the most

environmentally responsible industry on the planet. They do not need a senseless cap that could cost Albertans somewhere between \$150 billion and \$250 billion in lost revenue. Long before the NDP was even a relevant factor in this province, these companies were spending every single day striving to innovate, working to use less water, advancing their reclamation techniques. The NDP did not invent environmental responsibility. Our energy industry has been practising it for 50 years.

The fact that this NDP government thinks pipeline approval should only be given after they've broken the entire industry, only after they've destroyed the industry's profitability, is unacceptable. I will not support this bill.

The Speaker: Are there any questions under 29(2)(a) to the member? Chestermere-Rocky View.

Mrs. Aheer: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you to the hon. Member for Innisfail-Sylvan Lake. I was wondering if I could ask you – you were speaking about a balanced approach. Would you mind giving us some examples from your perspective and potentially helping the government to understand what that balanced approach would look like?

The Speaker: The hon. member.

Mr. MacIntyre: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you, hon. member, for the question. There is a long-standing myth that somehow environmental responsibility and resource development are mutually exclusive, and the fact of the matter is that they are not. That has been simply the mantra of environmentalism for as long as it's been around, that you can't have both.

The fact of the matter, Mr. Speaker, is that you can have both, and our resource industries in this province have proven it year after year after year. You will not find anywhere in the world a resource industry, an agricultural industry, a manufacturing industry that is more responsible than what we have right here in this province.

If this other side over here really had a heart for greenhouse gas emissions and, I'm going to say, pollution in general, they would be trying everything they could to increase Alberta production of everything that we produce in this province, not lessen. Because we have this environmental responsibility ingrained within our souls, everything we produce here is produced with a greater environmental responsibility than anywhere else on the planet. So if you really want to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, stop carbon leakage from leaving our province, cause it to come back the other way, have more products produced in this province, with our environmental record, and you will impact GHG emissions. They will go down as more products are produced here and fewer products are produced in other jurisdictions.

I'll give you just one of many examples. Greenhouses in this province are going to be shutting down on account of carbon taxation. That production is going to go to Mexico, and that produce – peppers, cucumbers, strawberries – is going to be loaded in diesel trucks, cooled and refrigerated by diesel-powered coolers, trucked 4,000 kilometres up the interstates to Canada. In the end, there will no greenhouse gas reductions whatsoever; in fact, it'll go the other way. We ought to be encouraging our greenhouse operators. They should be shielded from Bill 20. They should be encouraged for being the carbon sink that they are.

An Hon. Member: Why don't you believe in local food production?

Mr. MacIntyre: What about local food production?

These are just some of the things. Mr. Speaker, we are the most responsible oil-producing jurisdiction on the planet. That needs to be acknowledged, it needs to be rewarded, and it should not be attacked by this government.

The Speaker: Any other members under 29(2)(a)?

Mr. Schmidt: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Hon. minister, is it under 29(a)(a)?

Mr. Schmidt: Yes, it is, Mr. Speaker.

An Hon. Member: Yeah. He won't give a speech.

Mr. Schmidt: No.

Well, anyway, I had the misfortune, of course, of starting off my morning listening to both the Member for Chestermere-Rocky View, followed by Innisfail-Sylvan Lake. I know that my day can only go up from here, Mr. Speaker.

But I did want to take issue with one thing that the Member for Innisfail-Sylvan Lake said about carbon leakage. Mr. Speaker, of course, the Member for Innisfail-Sylvan Lake is always in error but never in doubt, and again he made a mistake today when he said that if we wanted to reduce carbon dioxide emissions, industry should move here. Of course, if he knew what he was talking about, he would know that Alberta has the highest per capita carbon dioxide emissions of any province in the country except for Saskatchewan. And, of course, Canada has one of the highest rates of carbon dioxide emissions per capita of any country in the world. So, in fact, he is exactly wrong when he's saying that if we want to reduce carbon dioxide emissions, industry should move here.

Mr. Speaker, I think that that should cause all of the members of this House to take everything that that member says with a serious grain of salt because if he's wrong on that fundamental principle, I can only assume that he's wrong on everything else that he's saying.

The Speaker: Any comments under 29(2)(a)?

Mr. MacIntyre: What I appreciate about what the hon. member said just now, Mr. Speaker, is his clarity in his anti Alberta business position. I'm thankful that they've finally had guts enough to admit what we and Albertans have known all along, that they are anti Alberta business; they are antibusiness to the core.

The Speaker: Hon. Member for Innisfail-Sylvan Lake, you referenced a document in your presentation. I request that you table it this afternoon as a part of the Routine.

Mr. MacIntyre: Yes, Mr. Speaker. It's from the *Financial Post*.

The Speaker: The Member for Calgary-East.

9:40

Ms Luff: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise today in support of Bill 25, which imposes a 100-megatonne emissions limit on the oil sands annually. This cap is an essential component of our larger climate leadership plan and sends a clear signal that we are very serious about reducing emissions. While we are serious about reducing emissions, we are also serious about creating jobs, about getting our product to market, and about being the most responsible energy-producing jurisdiction anywhere in the world.

Now, I will not or will endeavour to not reduce this argument to insults. I do not deny that anyone in the opposition cares about the environment. I acknowledge that you all do. I think, however, that we share a fundamental disagreement in terms of where we stand in the world and how we're going to move forward.

Today I'm going to outline a few things. I'm going to outline where Alberta stands in the global picture currently, what has been ineffective in the past, and how we are moving forward with our climate leadership plan. The Official Opposition: they talk a lot, but they don't ever seem to talk about the actual issue, which is climate change. They say they care about the environment. They say they care about vulnerable people. However, they continue to not offer any solutions for how to actually tackle climate change. They don't offer solutions for how we're going to get our products to market or how we're going to help our most vulnerable or how we're going to get jobs back here Alberta.

It leads me to believe, in fact, that members of the opposition are perhaps living in a bit of a bubble, one where climate change is not the defining crisis of our time, where the world is not moving towards a carbon-constrained reality, and where business as usual is an acceptable option. Given that they have no real solutions and given that they don't seem to accept the reality of the world that we live in, I'd like to take a little bit of time to talk about Alberta in a global context.

Mr. Nixon: What's your plan?

Ms Luff: I'm getting there. I have a plan.

The world got together in Paris last year, and they decided that it would be a bad idea to allow global temperatures to rise more than 1.5 degrees above pre-industrial levels. This is because if temperatures rise above that amount, it will have catastrophic effects world-wide.

An Hon. Member: Keep drinking that water.

Ms Luff: Here in Alberta that could mean more drought, more storms, more forest fires, more pests, less snow, more climate refugees, and a decrease in biodiversity.

I heard a member from the opposite side say just now: keep drinking that water. I'm sorry; I was trying not to resort to insults, but the fact of the matter is that you just accused me of saying some things that, in fact, are facts that 97 per cent of the scientific community agree on, and you... [interjections] The global community...

The Speaker: Hon. members, I wonder if you might direct your comments through the Speaker, please.

Ms Luff: If I go back, I'd just like to emphasize what can happen in the world if global temperatures rise by 1.5 degrees Celsius, which is, in fact, something that we are on track to have happen; 97 per cent of the scientific community agrees on this. Again, things that could happen: more storms, more forest fires, more pests, less snow, less biodiversity. I want my children to grow up in a world that still has tigers and polar bears and woodland caribou.

The global community – the global community – has decided that these impacts are unacceptable, and we made commitments to act. Canada has made a commitment within this framework to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions to 30 per cent below 2005 levels by 2030, and the federal environment minister has indicated that this is in fact a low ceiling, that we should be trying to do better than this.

Now, in this context, Alberta has a large role to play, as the Minister for Advanced Education has just mentioned. In Alberta we are some of the largest emitters per capita and also the largest overall emitters in Canada. We're responsible in Alberta for 37 per cent of Canada's total emissions, and we only have 11.7 per cent of Canada's total population. The oil sands represent 24 per cent of Alberta's emissions, and they are, in fact, the fastest growing

segment of our emissions profile. This government recognized this reality, the reality that if we didn't do anything, the federal government was going to impose policy on us, and we have seen in the past little while that this is actually true. In creating this climate leadership plan, we're reducing our emissions in a way that takes into account our resource-based economy, our trade-exposed economy. We've created a made-in-Alberta solution in consultation with Albertans and industry so that we can do our part to help reduce Canada's emissions to help us meet our global commitments. The Official Opposition would have us do nothing and let the federal government impose policies on us, and we've seen how effective that's been in the past.

In a global context, then, it is necessary for us to reduce our emissions. Action is necessary. Given that the oil sands have been the fastest growing contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, the cap, in concert with output-based allocations, sends a signal to industry that we're willing to work with them to lower emissions, to get the carbon out of the barrel.

The cap alone is not enough, however. The overwhelming consensus of scientists and economists alike is that the best solution is a broad-based carbon price. The Ecofiscal Commission of Canada, composed of folks like Preston Manning and Jim Dinning, whom the opposition seem to respect very much, has endorsed our plan, stating that "putting a price on [greenhouse gas] emissions is a clear signal to the world that Alberta is adopting sound ecofiscal policies to meet its environmental responsibilities."

The Leach report along with the Canada West Foundation report outline the need to find balance, a policy that shows we care about the impacts of climate change and signals to the world that we are becoming a more innovative place to do business without being so stringent as to cause emissions to simply move elsewhere. The Canada West report states that "Alberta's new climate [change] strategy provides a good example of how to thread the needle . . . The genius of the plan is that it injects competition into the mix . . ."

Mr. Fildebrandt: Point of order.

The Speaker: There's a point of order noted. There's a point of order.

Ms Luff: ". . . at the firm level by [introducing] 'top quartile' performance."

The Speaker: Hon. member, could we wait? There's a point of order raised.

Point of Order Imputing Motives

Mr. Fildebrandt: Mr. Speaker, it's not acceptable for members to say specifically that anyone has endorsed their plan when they most definitely have not. I've seen the reports from the hon. Jim Dinning and Mr. Preston Manning. They have endorsed some form of carbon pricing. They have most definitively explicitly stated that they do not support this government's plan. I ask that the member withdraw the remarks as it is impugning the reputation of the former members of this place that she has talked about.

The Speaker: Hon. member, can you cite an authority for the statement you've just made? I'm searching.

Cortes-Vargas: Mr. Speaker, this is most clearly a matter of debate, much like the opposition's position on climate change. Honestly, he didn't even refer to a standing order that he was

implying that the member went to. I don't believe that there's any point of order here.

The Speaker: I tend to agree that this particular comment – and I have not heard an authority cited.

So please continue, hon. member.

Debate Continued

Ms Luff: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will continue where I left off with a quote from the Canada West Foundation report that states:

Alberta's new climate [change] strategy provides a good example of how to thread the needle . . . The genius of the plan is that it injects competition into the mix at the firm level by [introducing] "top quartile" performance . . . there is an incentive to perform better than one's peers.

Alberta's fossil fuel resources will have lower value if we cannot develop them with a lower emissions impact.

Now, here in Alberta we already have the lowest overall tax burden in Canada, with no sales tax and no payroll tax. What the members opposite don't realize is that the world is changing. We are moving to a carbon-constrained future. Our economy here in Alberta, if we leave it at the status quo, is going to become less viable. Our neighbours know this. Washington, Oregon, B.C.: these are regions we have to work with in order to get our resources to tidewater, and they're all making strides in diversifying and greening their economies.

The Official Opposition want us to slow down and be left behind, and when I think about how far ahead we could be if past governments had chosen to act on this, had chosen to take a different path 10 or 20 years ago, I get incredibly frustrated and incredibly angry. It is astounding to me the extent to which previous provincial and federal governments have dropped the ball on this file. Decades of ignoring the issue have left us without access to tidewater and with a severely tarnished international reputation.

It is absolutely true – absolutely true – that we produce some of the most responsible oil in the world, but you wouldn't know it. You wouldn't know that we produce some of the most responsible oil in the world. You wouldn't know that our total emissions are simply a fraction of the whole. At global climate conferences we won fossil of the year award for nonachievement five years in a row. Five years in a row.

9:50

I recently read an article from *Maclean's* magazine which was entitled *Oil's Worst Enemy*, and, no, Mr. Speaker, it was not talking about me. It was talking about environmentalists, and it was actually talking about our past federal Conservative government. The article quoted several oil industry executives who supported the idea of a price on carbon and, in fact, deemed it necessary. For years, the article argues, we've been heading down the wrong path. To quote it:

Instead of convincing critics Canada could be trusted to develop a carbon-intensive resource in a sustainable fashion, Ottawa instead boasted about Canada's "emerging energy superpower" status, lashed out at environmentalists and thumbed its nose at international climate change efforts, painting a target on the industry's back in the process.

The Official Opposition would have us continue down this path, but our government won't. As an energy-producing province our leadership on this issue can spur innovation and action around the world. I'm so proud to be part of a government that recognizes the scale of the crisis, that is rising to the occasion rather than burying our heads in the sand. There are incredible opportunities here that we need to capitalize on that will benefit all Albertans.

I have heard from members opposite that we on this side do not see or do not understand that people are suffering in our current economy. This is fundamentally untrue. I have friends, immigrants from Korea, who came to Canada and spent their life savings on a small restaurant in downtown Calgary. Because of the downturn people are not coming to their restaurant as much as they used to. [interjections] Let me continue, please. They work the restaurant themselves. Minimum wage is decidedly not a factor. So due to the downturn they're having to work other jobs. They're having to be a dishwasher and a liquor store clerk to continue to make ends meet. Fewer people in offices mean fewer lunch customers. I understand, and I'm acutely aware, but the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that all of the tax cuts in the world will not refill the office towers in downtown Calgary.

The price of oil is low. It's low right now, and it's going to rebound much more slowly than it has in the past. Our economy is changing. When I talk to friends who are engineers or I talk to the good people at Calgary Economic Development, they know that we ignore climate change and economic diversification at our peril. However, they are hopeful. They know that we can capitalize on opportunities in clean tech, renewable energy, and energy efficiency to create good jobs now and into the future.

Our climate plan is working to capitalize on these opportunities. I hear from constituents that there is a desire for programs to increase energy efficiency, to increase access to public transit, and to help individuals and communities install solar power. Currently in my office I have approximately 200 signed postcards from constituents who want to be included in our energy transition, people who want to focus on community renewable energy. Albertans want to contribute to a green energy future, and programs under our climate leadership program will help them do just that.

Until very recently Alberta was the only jurisdiction in North America without an energy efficiency program. Fortunately, we've established Energy Efficiency Alberta, and it has recently announced its first three programs. The direct install residential program will offer direct, no-charge installation of low-energy products to residences such as lighting, water, and heating. The residential consumer products program will offer point-of-sale rebates to residential customers at retail outlets with products such as lighting, insulation, and appliances. The business, nonprofit, and institutional rebate program will offer incentives for high-efficiency products and installation of electric and gas-based products. These are the first three programs from our energy efficiency program, that will all help to incent jobs, will help to reduce people's carbon emissions, and will help to move Alberta forward.

We are doing many additional things that are only the beginning of programs that will help to create jobs across Alberta, good jobs in clean, greener economies. We're working with school boards to put solar panels on 36 new schools as they're built across the province. This will have the dual effect of reducing costs for school boards and educating students about renewable energy. To quote the vice-principal of Sir John A. Macdonald school in Calgary, which has 40 panels:

It's important [that we] teach our kids about the realities of climate change. We expect many of our students, using the knowledge they learn about solar energy and other renewable . . . solutions in the classroom, will help lead Alberta as we transition to more sustainable energy.

We're also investing in farms to help them become more energy efficient. Through granting programs farmers will be able to lower emissions and costs. The Schuurmans, who are dairy farmers near Millet, said:

The energy-efficiency programs offered by the government gave us the incentive to move ahead with installing solar power on our

operation. In addition to the environmental benefits that energy efficiency and solar power provide, we have found that by investing in solar power we have been able to lower our dairy operation's power consumption by over 60 per cent.

Emissions Reduction Alberta is currently seeking new technologies that can help us achieve our methane reduction targets. They've earmarked \$40 million to help us advance technologies that reduce methane. The president of Seal Well Inc. supports this investment.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Thank you, hon. member.

Are there any questions under 29(2)(a)? The Member for Chestermere-Rocky View.

Mrs. Aheer: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to thank the Member for Calgary-East. It's interesting. In 2011 the hon. member was protesting against pipelines and was calling Alberta oil dirty, so I'm not sure whether to say that it's hopeful that maybe there's an attitude change on that side. There seems to be some contradictory information that came from over there.

Needless to say, there are a few things that I'd like to comment on if I may. One of the things that you had mentioned in your speech was: where do we stand in the world? This side, our caucus, the Wildrose caucus, has made it very clear that anything that needs to happen has to be in lockstep with other jurisdictions in the world. I don't believe, at least I have not heard so far, that the Americans are putting in a carbon tax. Maybe I'm mistaken.

I'd like to understand how it is that in order for us to create good, clean energy in this province, which, in my understanding, would require an environment of investment, an environment to bring folks in to create an environment of industry that is able to go forward to innovate with green technology – we have some of the best technology in the world. Wouldn't it be wonderful if our technology was touted by government not only provincially but federally to go across the seas to all of these other jurisdictions, to be the ones in place to help those folks get their emissions under control? That would actually be a real solution. If you're asking for solutions – because I wrote this down, that we evidently don't have the solutions – I don't recall if I could count how many times that we in our caucus have presented that as a solution.

We are in the province with the answers. I don't pretend to stand up here to understand everything that goes on, but thank goodness I live in a province where every single expert lives. If I need expertise, guess what? I'm surrounded by some of the most intelligent, thoughtful, common-sense, and forward-thinking people in this industry that not only wish to do better but are doing better given the opportunity by government, by good policy. I'm very interested to find out – we have a lot of policy coming from this side, and potentially the outcomes are similar, but really good policy will actually produce an outcome that we could all agree on.

Mr. Speaker, I would like the member across the way from Calgary-East to explain to the House about the global community and what it is that this government is trying to do in order to make sure that the global community is in lockstep with the rest of us.

I'd like to just say one other thing before the question is answered. As other countries move forward in their development and are increasing their energy consumption, our global energy demand is only going to grow. There are needs for new emerging markets for energy products that will be met, and they will be met by other countries that can supply them with fuel. I would love to see us be competitive in that aspect. They are not trying to stagnate their country's economic growth.

The Speaker: Hon. member, why don't we give the member a chance to answer?

Mr. Nixon: Point of order.

Mrs. Aheer: Well, I'm just going to finish my comments if you don't mind, Mr. Speaker, and then I will get to my question.

The Speaker: I believe there's a point of order.

10:00

Mrs. Aheer: Energy is at the heart of production and development, and cheap energy is an integral part of economic growth and is central to Canada's success. With respect to the emissions, I mean, it doesn't matter whether it's Canadian or Iranian supplies that meet the growing global demand; there is a demand for energy, and that demand is going to be met. It is inelastic. Energy is in demand and is going to result in emissions, so if we're talking in lockstep and doing a global outlook here, if those barrels of oil are going to come from anywhere, would you not prefer that they came from here and that we have some sort of understanding of what those emissions actually look like? We're actually the only ones that already know what that looks like. You actually said the numbers yourself. You actually said the numbers yourself, so if you look at your own numbers . . .

The Speaker: I sense that the point of order was withdrawn. Is that correct?

Mr. Nixon: Absolutely, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: I believe that the hon. Member for Calgary-East mentioned some documents in her statement as well. I would ask, same as mentioned earlier, that they are tabled today in the Routine. The Member for Calgary-North West.

Ms Jansen: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, where to begin? You know, every time we enter a debate, which is, I guess, what we're calling what we're seeing here this morning in this Chamber, I always think about people at home watching and saying: "Huh, I'm looking forward to a debate on the Oil Sands Emissions Limit Act this morning, and I want to hear some salient points from the government, and I want to hear some equally salient points from the Official Opposition." What we've heard this morning is none of either, and one of the problems I have with that is that when we're dealing with an issue this serious that affects people in this province, reasoned debate is critical.

On one side we're hearing: have reasoned debate. You know, with all due respect, when you're screaming it, it's less effective. On the other side, every time someone brings up a point on this, you yell: climate change denier. In fact, a point of order was called, and you couldn't even answer the point of order without again yelling "climate change denier," and that really doesn't help the conversation either.

We have a whole lot of people watching this, Albertans, who are not seeing reasoned debate on either side of this House. Albertans are looking for balance here, and they're not seeing it. To the argument, I think, that came from the government side about tigers, bears, and woodland caribou: you know, we're actually talking about an Oil Sands Emissions Limit Act. Like, come on. We're talking about the possibility that people are going to lose jobs in this province.

Here's where I want to go into that. This bill actually creates an artificial scarcity in emissions without creating corresponding resources or incentives to innovate to reduce emissions. There are lots of people in the industry and people who write about the

industry right now who are looking at this and saying: "What argument are you actually making for this beyond coming at it from a purely marketing point of view? What is the idea here?" Well, the idea is that we'd like to see a greater co-ordination with other jurisdictions. We'd like to see a greater co-ordination within Alberta to incentivize innovation, and we want a greater transparency in the process around oil sands regulations, and we're not seeing that either. You know, here's the government that was going to do things differently. The transparency piece is, frankly, very hard to see.

We look at Bill 25, and a lot of experts are looking at Bill 25, and we're not talking about party experts. We're not talking about think tanks that represent one side or another. We're talking about people who are actually looking at this piece of legislation, and they're saying that it's going to strand a significant portion of oil sands resources and limit Alberta's economic growth. Now, how is it going to do that? Well, it's going to do that by preventing responsible development once the emissions cap is met.

Now, I know that you've got some key players here who are coming to your defence, and they're saying: this is fantastic; we're going to get right behind it. You're forgetting about the lifeblood of this province, that is the smaller companies, that are going to be shut out of the process. Those companies are people with families, with children, with mortgages, with kids to put through university. I appreciate the woodland caribou and the tiger argument, but come on.

The bill also favours current players by artificially limiting the size of Alberta's oil sands market, and you can't deny that that's going to be the case. It stifles competition, and it creates unnecessary barriers.

Now, when someone stands up to say that – and I think I've been on record as saying that I believe there should be a price on carbon. I believe that we need to reduce our emissions. I want to sit at the table, as do my caucus colleagues, and have a conversation about how we make that happen, but that's not a conversation that happens when every time we bring up points, you yell "climate change denier" or "your government had an opportunity to do something, and they did nothing" or any of that rhetoric because you know in your heart that that's not true. The holier-than-thou attitude that you represent on the other side is not actually helping.

There are people who want to have this discussion, and we want to talk about: what are the unintended consequences? Now, I remember standing up here on Bill 20 a number of months ago and saying that our caucus presented a number of thought-out amendments that we had spent considerable time working on, and one of them, the one I brought forward, was an opportunity to look at the unintended consequences of Bill 20. I'm sure that we could probably do the same for this and say: a year after its implementation, what are the unintended consequences of this bill? The response that I got from the other side was: this bill is so good, it doesn't need oversight.

To me, when you ask for reasoned debate and people ask to talk about the oversight piece – and in the past number of months we have heard from people who are seriously concerned as well about GHGs, who are seriously concerned about the environment but also concerned about jobs in this province – and they want to have a conversation about what this whole picture looks like, how it comes together, the idea that they're not even allowed to come to the table and tell the government about the consequences of their legislation is just wrong. It's wrong.

You know, when you create, as you're doing here, two classes of regulated oil sands emissions, those from facilities whose first business occurs before December 31, 2015, and that are going to be capped and those from new or substantially upgraded facilities

whose first full business year occurs after December 31, 2015, you are in fact creating two tiers of business in this province. Now, I see the nodding, so I see that you get that that's the case.

The disadvantages of this – and I'm going to bring up OSAG for a minute because I think that a lot has been said about the makeup of this panel. I had said before to a round of attacks on right-wing media that I didn't have a problem with who you put on that panel because I think that if you have dissenting voices from both extremes – and you have extremists on this panel, and I don't think anyone will argue that – somewhere in the middle you'll find some balance. Now, I'm not sure you've found a balance, but I don't think people should be afraid to have extremists sit down at the table for that conversation because the folks who are pushing for responsible development in the oil sands in Alberta just have to have a better argument. That's what I would say: come to the table with a better argument.

10:10

I will say that the OSAG consultation and the regulation-making process is not transparent. When you do that, when you put together that kind of a contentious panel and then you don't make the process transparent, what's the first thing people are going to say? Let's face it. You don't come to the table.

I remember when I got my master's, a number of years ago – I specialized in issue and reputational management – the first thing we talked about was: who do you bring to the table when you want to make an argument? You bring to the table your highest credibility sources. Let's be honest here, and I say this gently: you're not bringing to the table your highest credibility sources when some of the folks that you have over there are environmental protesters. So, yeah, not really. You know, this is a problem. You actually have to come to the table and do better and make the process transparent, and you haven't done that. I appreciate the effort. I think you need to come to the table with more transparency, and I think you also have to understand that when people talk to you about creating a two-tiered process and putting some of these smaller companies in jeopardy, you have to listen. You have to listen to those companies.

Finally, I will say to the comment – I did really roll my eyes right back in my head when I heard this – that all of the tax cuts in world will not refill the office buildings in downtown Calgary: they won't. But you know what? Showing the energy industry that you support them and the work they do and showing the rest of the world that you support the energy industry in Alberta will help refill those buildings.

I'll tell you what. During Stampede week I had more than 50 meetings with different oil and gas businesses in downtown Calgary. You know what that week is like. We meet a lot of people. I didn't hear one of those groups say that they encountered an open door when they came to you with their problems, and that is not acceptable. You need to listen. You need to pay attention. You need to appreciate the unintended consequences and have a seat at the table for people who want to come to you with their concerns. I don't see that happening here, and it's deeply concerning.

The Speaker: Hon. members, before giving the opportunity for 29(2)(a), I just want to underline again the principle under 29(2)(a). It's intended to give questions and comments, brief questions and comments, and not to allow any member on any side of the House to simply make another speech. I've also checked and looked at precedent. That seems to have been the past practice on a consistent basis, so I just want to remind you of that.

Is there anyone wishing to speak to 29(2)(a)? The Member for Drumheller-Stettler.

Mr. Strankman: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Member for Calgary-North West and I have disagreed on many occasions, but I did enjoy in this rendition her use of the words "unintended consequences." I was just wondering if she could expand upon the unintended consequences that this policy may bring forward as she sees it.

Ms Jansen: Well, I'd like to thank the member for that question and talk about the idea that this bill favours existing leaseholders – and that's problematic – by limiting the size of the oil sands emission market. Any time you limit a market, there is going to be a segment of the population that is affected by that. Now, certainly, your larger companies are going to be a little more flexible, and that's not going to be problematic for them, but when you create an unregulated market for oil sands emissions, when you add new costs to the consumers and the idea that you lock out new entrants into the industry, that is problematic. What you're doing is limiting the opportunity for business and investment in this province. That's an unintended consequence. And when you do that, you create an unlevel playing field.

We don't even know what the other ones are. That's why I think, as we did on Bill 20, that to have an opportunity a year down the road to meet the stakeholders who will be affected – and we may not know all of them right now – and give them an opportunity to present their case to the government about the results of policy or legislation that is harmful, maybe in an intended way, is an extremely important piece of the process.

We wanted this for Bill 20. We didn't get it. We would like to see some more thought put into the unintended consequences of this. Listen to experts. Listen to economists. Listen to people who have spent 20 or 30 years writing about oil and gas issues. Have a conversation with them, and talk about what those unintended consequences are. Let's remember the idea that we're not going to know the half of it until something like this is put in place, and there has to be an opportunity for those people to come to the table at some point in the future, too. It's our responsibility to make sure they have the mechanism to do so.

The Speaker: Thank you, hon. member.

The Member for Chestermere-Rocky View under 29(2)(a).

Mrs. Aheer: Thank you. I also wanted to thank the Member for Calgary-North West. Some of the ideas that you did bring forward in Bill 20 were excellent. One of the ones that the member brought forward was about metrics and about accountability measures within this policy. As much as I may have been more passionate and lighting my hair on fire – and I apologize if I sounded like I was yelling; that's not my intention – I'm just a little passionate about this particular bill.

You had mentioned artificial scarcity. This is a very, very important aspect of what's going on with this bill. Would you mind, please, explaining a little bit more about that?

Ms Jansen: Thank you. Well, you know, I think we have a situation here where, when you limit industry's ability, when you limit people's ability to create businesses in the energy industry, you create an artificial scarcity. One of my concerns is that when you limit the oil sands emission market, you create an environment – and I've said this before – and you put limitations on it that shouldn't necessarily be there because they don't actually fit your end goal. I mean, you look at the idea. The Oil Sands Emissions Limit Act: I think it's a laudable effort. The thing, though, is that you're doing it, and industry is telling you that it's flawed. Here's the problem. When you create a piece of legislation that is designed

to speak to your base, there is an inherent tendency to be tone deaf to the other people who are affected by this.

Let's be honest here. You've got a base of supporters in the NDP who want to see lots of legislation that keeps the oil sands from working. I mean, you can't deny that. You can't deny that you've got a lot of folks who are saying, "We'd be happy just to shut down the oil sands tomorrow," and if you could do that, good God, your base would be in heaven. The thing is that you've got to find balance, and the problem here is that when you create something like this, there's no balance.

The Speaker: Thank you, hon. member.

The hon. Member for Calgary-Mountain View.

Dr. Swann: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. A pleasure to rise to speak to Bill 25, Oil Sands Emissions Limit Act. I appreciate the really vigorous conversation around these issues. As many of you know, I got into this political game, if you want to call it that, or political role, political vocation, around climate change back in 2002. The then environment minister, out of Medicine Hat, ensured that I was fired in 2002 for criticizing the Klein government over its lack of action on climate change. Lorne Taylor was the nominal environment minister, but many of us called him the anti-environment minister.

I feel very strongly about the issue, obviously. It's about our children. It's about our grandchildren. It's about our global community. It's about leadership. A lot of the rhetoric I've heard today, especially from the Official Opposition, relates to what amounts to, really, a denial of the seriousness of this issue on our planet, a real lack of understanding that this is the most serious, most complex global challenge in our lifetime. It may not hurt us in Alberta for the next 25 or 30 years, it may improve agriculture in Alberta for the next 25 years, but it is a serious threat to the rest of the planet and indeed to Alberta and Canada in the long term.

10:20

If you believe the science, if you believe that policy change is essential to reducing our greenhouse gas emissions and their connection to warming and extreme weather events and new pests and new infectious diseases, then you have to believe that bold leadership is needed, because we have done almost nothing. We have made no progress on this globally.

Now, Alberta is not to blame for it all, of course, but we have a really important role to lead as a primary energy producer, as a wealthy western democracy. Who else is going to show leadership on this if we can't? So I applaud the government for putting a cap on emissions. Where else are we going to start to say, "There's a limit to what the environment can take"? We can't just improve efficiencies and expect people to drive less. "Oh, my gasoline engine now only burns one litre per 200 kilometres, so I can drive more." That's part of what happens when we improve efficiency if we don't add a limit on what we're going to actually put into the environment.

If we believe the science, we have to be bold. Tinkering with technology is not going to get us there. We respond to prices, mainly, as human beings. Consumers and producers respond to cost, and if we can make it more costly to do the less environmentally friendly thing, then we can start to move people in the right direction. This is really bold. What this government has done, to put a price on carbon and to put a cap on emissions, is bold. There's no question. It is going to cause some suffering, and it is causing suffering. We see that. We have to be measured about it. We have to be listening. We have to be looking at alternatives. I'm glad to see that cogeneration is given a special dispensation in this.

Cogeneration is the most efficient way of producing energy while we're transitioning to a low-carbon economy. It makes a lot of sense to me.

[The Deputy Speaker in the chair]

We're at 400 parts per million now in our atmosphere, the highest in 10,000 years. If we don't say that there's a limit in Alberta, why would anybody else say that there's a limit on the global emissions? We have to say that there's a limit beyond which our environment simply cannot recover. Even today we know that in our lifetime we will not see any lowering in the carbon emissions in our atmosphere. It takes a hundred years to reduce the amount of carbon that's currently collected up there.

Both the Liberal government and the Conservative government in Ottawa failed us. They simply were not willing to take a bold step and see this as the most serious threat to the planet and requiring leadership. Again, Canada, as one of the most privileged, wealthy, and scientifically capable countries in the world, must show the leadership. Yes, we're going to have to pay a little more than other parts of the world. Yes, we might suffer a little more than other parts of the world because they are suffering immensely with extreme weather events, resource depletion, water problems, flooding. Let's get serious about trying to find the way forward. I hope this government is listening to the industry and finding that balance.

But we have been subsidizing the fossil fuel industry for decades. We have been subsidizing it in billions. Let's start providing the same level playing field for the renewable and clean energy sector. Why should we force the clean energy and technology sector to compete with current low prices of coal and carbon fuels when they have had all their infrastructure paid for, all of their accelerated capital cost allowance benefits, and all the research benefits that governments have poured into it for the last 50 years? Suddenly we're telling the renewable and clean tech: compete with what we have now; don't expect subsidies. Well, I'm sorry. That is simply untenable given the over 50 years of subsidies we've been giving to the industry.

Sector-by-sector standards under Stephen Harper haven't brought us to where we need to be. Cap and trade is difficult to monitor and to prove that sharing or trading credits between those who are planting trees and those who are burning fossil fuels is a responsible or a verifiable way of measuring. So a carbon levy is the way to go. It's simple; it's cheap; it's enforceable. It treats consumers and producers equally, and we're all going to have to pay if we want our children to have a better future. That's just the reality.

I believe that a cap on emissions is important. I believe that the larger industry, as the Member for Calgary-North West has said, is in an advantaged position. The larger industries are going to benefit more from this cap than the smaller industries, that are going to struggle. But I see this government is starting to pay attention to the smaller industries, the new industries that are coming on, and providing them with a little bit less of an impact from this cap. I see, again, the cogen, which I think could be a really interesting opportunity with the oil sands to provide the waste gas into a cogeneration facility and actually reduce the net emissions from our SAGD and even our mining operations substantially. It would actually keep our electricity prices at a reasonable level while we transition.

On balance, I look forward to some of the debate around Bill 25 and some of the very specific issues that are not at all clear. For example, the cabinet can approve exemptions for methods that result in low emissions such as small experimental projects and

primary production. I'm wanting more clarity around what kind of flexibility, what kind of judgments cabinet is going to make around specific projects. I think we need to know more about that.

I'm also concerned about being clear. What constitutes cogeneration, how is it different from combined heat and power, and how much cogeneration? If an oil sands plant is providing its own cogeneration to heat and electrify some of its own facility, does that constitute the full contribution that it's going to make to the province, or is it simply taking its own advantage of this exemption, where cogeneration gets exempted with a separate 10-megatonne limit? I would like to see that apply to contributions to the grid, the general grid, rather than just in-house benefits to the company itself. Those are some questions that I hope we can see more explicit details on.

We in the Liberal caucus have been calling for a hard cap on emissions for at least a decade. I for one welcome that, and I look forward to hearing more details, then, about what exceptions, what exemptions this government is looking at and how that could be misused, in my view, to allow favourites, picking winners and losers and not being transparent and clear with Albertans about why they're getting exemptions and how it's in the longer term best interests of carbon reduction and climate change management.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The Deputy Speaker: Questions or comments under 29(2)(a)? The hon. Member for Grande Prairie-Smoky.

Mr. Loewen: Thank you, Madam Speaker, and thanks to the independent Member for Calgary-Mountain View for his comments. I want to thank him also for voting with the opposition here against the carbon tax when the government brought that forward. That's good.

But I did want to ask him kind of one question. He talked about cap and trade being very difficult, but he seems to suggest that cap is fine. So I just wanted him to maybe explain himself, how a cap is fine and cap and trade is difficult.

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member.

Dr. Swann: Thank you, Madam Speaker. That's a good question. To me, what I see happening here is the best of both worlds. It's difficult to enforce, in my view, and provide adequate oversight for companies that, for example, trade a credit for a cap in this province with some other province or some other industry, whether it's tree planting or no-till farming that gets credits for doing what they're doing. Just how do you measure that, and how valid is that? I have not been a supporter of cap and trade because it's so difficult to verify the tonnage and the benefits, for example, for certain tree-planting operations or a renewable wind energy project that doesn't actually work because of various technical problems or wind issues.

On the other hand, a tax provides a very clear message to all of us that we have to change our ways. The producers have to change. The consumers have to change. In fact, then, a cap on emissions is saying to everybody that we have reached the limit. Four hundred parts per million is beyond what is recognized as a safe limit for the atmosphere; 350 is considered to be something that we could live with and have some stability in our climate. Four hundred, where we're at now, is clearly pushing the very edge of what is sustainable.

10:30

So putting a cap on it is actually recognizing, for all of us, that our combined activities now at 400 parts per million has to be the limit that we try to strive for. If no sector, especially our largest carbon-emitting sector and our least clean fuel, our most energy

intensive fuel, the tar sands, if we can't put a cap on those, how do we actually move beyond that?

Mr. Yao: Oil sands. Oil sands.

Mr. McIver: Really? Tar sands? Aren't you from Alberta? You're not even from Alberta talking like that.

Dr. Swann: Oh, I see. Okay.

To me, it's a combination of a serious, bold commitment to leading on climate. It's going to be difficult. I think there are lots of negotiations that need to go on. We need to listen to each other, not hammer each other, because we're all in this together, and our children and our grandchildren are going to pay the price for whatever we do, good and bad, losing jobs on one hand, gaining jobs in another area.

I certainly would like to see more greenhouse operations, food production, around Alberta. Given the benefits of solar and wind and our natural gas resources, why aren't we growing more food throughout the year, and not having this large transportation from South America and California for all our goods when we could employ people, we could develop our own more sustainable food security right here in Canada? Tremendous opportunities.

Creativity is needed, balance. As the Member for Calgary-North West said: let's listen to each other; let's not hammer each other. I think we all want the same thing – the best for our kids, the best for our planet, leadership – and it's going to cost us something, so let's negotiate, not beat each other up over what's considered to be ideological.

We call each other ideological. That's not getting us anywhere. If we're listening to the evidence, if we're listening to each other, if we're looking for better ways, hopefully, we will bend and change when we hear a good argument. That, to me, is the hope for this Legislature and for my session here. I feel much more positive than I have in years in working with a government that wants to do the right thing, doesn't know all the answers but with constructive debate I think will make some of the changes that are reasonable, that are rational, that are evidence based.

Thanks, Madam Speaker.

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. Member for Lac La Biche-St. Paul-Two Hills.

Mr. Hanson: Sorry; under 29(2)(a)?

The Deputy Speaker: Yes.

Mr. Hanson: Yeah. The problem that I have with this bill – and I'd just like you to comment on it – is a bill that looked for support from the major emitters. Now, if somebody came to me if I was a major emitter and offered me a policy that was going to give me the ability to gobble up my competition, my smaller competition . . .

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. Member for Calgary-Foothills.

Mr. Panda: Madam Speaker, since we are going to stop at 10:45 for Remembrance Day celebrations, I mean, after hearing both sides of the argument . . . [interjection] Sorry. Are we stopping?

Mr. Nixon: No. You're good. Keep going.

Mr. Panda: Okay. After hearing both sides of the argument . . .

Mr. Schmidt: You changed your mind.

Mr. Panda: I didn't change my mind. I mean, I respect the Minister of Advanced Education, being a fellow member of APEGA. As you

all know, members like us are the ones who actually help to bring oil out of the sands. Those are the ones, those scientists and engineers, that are going to help take the carbon out of the barrel, not the politicians on either side of the aisle.

After hearing both sides of the argument this morning, I'm thinking that we should have more debate because the oil sands advisory group is still working on their recommendations, how to allocate the remainder of the 100-megatonne emissions quota. I have a motion to move here, and if you permit me, I would like to do that.

The Deputy Speaker: Hon. member, if you could just wait for a moment until I've seen the amendment.

Mr. Panda: Sure. I have copies here for distribution.

I would like to move that the motion for second reading of Bill 25, Oil Sands Emissions Limit Act, be amended by deleting all the words after "that" and substituting the following:

Bill 25, Oil Sands Emissions Limit Act, be not now read a second time but that the subject matter of the bill be referred to the Standing Committee on Resource Stewardship in accordance with Standing Order 74.2.

Madam Speaker, for the reasons that I explained before, I rise in opposition to Bill 25, the Oil Sands Emissions Limit Act, in its current form. If members opposite agree to move it to committee for fulsome discussion, we'll be happy to participate in that, but in the meantime I want to put some facts in front of every member here. In 2014 Canada's GHG emissions were 1.6 per cent of the global total despite being a coal country with the second-largest land mass. Alberta's oil sands make up 9 per cent of that 1.6 per cent, or .144 per cent of the global total, not even two-tenths of 1 per cent, Madam Speaker.

The NDP's 100 megatonne per year cap on emissions still means 50 per cent growth of those emissions over 2014 levels. This means that Alberta's oil sands greenhouse gas emissions will be allowed to rise to .216 per cent of the global total, so barely two-tenths of 1 per cent. But to keep the oil sands from going a little further in its fraction of 1 per cent, this government is placing a cap on Alberta's resources that will cost us \$150 billion to \$250 billion.

It's big money, Madam Speaker. To put that into perspective, that's about five to seven years of running this entire provincial government. That's how much wealth you're keeping in the ground. After hearing these numbers, I don't know how Avi Lewis or Naomi Klein are going to react once they figure this out. With \$250 billion do you understand how many zeros there are after 250? I already see some of the supporters of the Leap Manifesto raising their eyebrows once they see that number, \$250 billion.

You know, with that money you can actually implement your social agenda of building schools and hospitals and so many good things.

Mrs. Pitt: You could build everything. Everything.

Mr. Panda: Yeah. So maybe now, after hearing this, you may want to join me in opposing this piece of legislation. You still have time.

The numbers show that the increase in greenhouse gas emissions is negligible, 72 one-thousandths of a per cent. For that, the NDP is going to put thousands of jobs at risk and the livelihoods of families just trying to get ahead. As my colleague from Calgary-North West explained, so many livelihoods are going to be impacted. That is the unintended consequence of your policy. This 100-megatonne cap is an arbitrary number. We don't know what the science is behind that number. Why not at 150? Why not at 70 or 50? We don't know.

Mr. Schmidt: Now you understand science?

Mr. Panda: I studied science like you. I was on record in this House . . .

10:40

Mr. Clark: Point of order, Madam Speaker.

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. Member for Calgary-Elbow on a point of order.

Point of Order Decorum

Mr. Clark: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. You know, I sat this morning and listened to the debate in my office while doing some work. I know it got heated, and I know it does get heated, but it's happened too many times, when the hon. Minister of Advanced Education fires barbs across at the Official Opposition. I understand the Official Opposition will do the same to the government side. But, frankly, it does not further the debate.

So under Standing Order 23(j) I would respectfully request that the Minister of Advanced Education would refrain from taking shots at the opposition side and, equally, that the opposition side would refrain from taking their shots at the government. It does not further the debate. Frankly, it makes things a lot worse for this House and does not further the interests of this province. I would encourage the hon. minister of the Crown – I remind you that notwithstanding the fact that he doesn't sit on the front bench, regardless of that fact, he is a member of Executive Council. I'd encourage him, Madam Speaker, to behave accordingly.

Thank you.

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

Mr. Bilous: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. First of all, I'll address one of the comments that was recently made, where it was an unnecessary shot at a minister, in his point of order doing exactly that, to create disorder by insulting a minister.

What I will say, Madam Speaker, is that we do appreciate the fact that in this House parliamentary tradition is that heckling is a part of this process. Now, I appreciate the fact that we do want to allow all members of all parties when they are up speaking – they do have the floor, and we do recognize that. I don't think that this is a point of order. I think, again, in the process of debate within this House that members do make comments while others are speaking. Again, you know, we recognize that we want to ensure that all members have an opportunity when they rise and are acknowledged by yourself, by the Speaker, that they do have the floor.

However, I do want to emphasize the fact that comments, whether they're heckles or otherwise, do come from all sides of the House and that a member jumping up on a point of order versus one member in one instance is not an accurate portrayal of comments that come from both sides of the House during an exchange.

What I can offer to the House is that I would encourage all members to be aware of the comments that they make and try to respect the Speaker when they have the floor.

Thank you.

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. Member for Lac La Biche-St. Paul-Two Hills.

Mr. Hanson: Thank you. I'd just like to point out that this is the second time that the hon. minister has been reprimanded this

morning for speaking out of turn, and then when he was offered the opportunity by the Speaker of the House to join the debate, he refused. So the only time the hon. minister would like to speak is when other people are speaking.

Thank you.

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

Mr. McIver: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Listen; I understand the reason for the point of order, but do we really want to say that there's no heckling in here? I mean, who are we kidding, folks? I don't think there's a point of order. There was probably a crack that wasn't required; there are cracks that aren't required constantly. Occasionally I author them myself. The fact is that this isn't Sunday school. This isn't a quiet meeting of contemplation. It's a public discussion – it's a public discussion – contemplation over public policy, and the public needs to hear it. While I have

some sympathy for the mover of the point or order, really, who are we kidding?

The Deputy Speaker: Thank you, hon. members. I would just remind all hon. members that maintaining decorum and order in the House is the responsibility of the Speaker, and while I certainly appreciate feedback from members and reminders from time to time, that responsibility will continue to rest with this chair.

There is no point or order. But again I would caution members to please be respectful in the way that they heckle and keep the volume to a level where we can all still hear what's being said by the individual who has the floor.

I've been advised that we are at 10:45. Pursuant to Government Motion 24, as agreed to on November 1, 2016, the Assembly stands adjourned until 1:30 this afternoon.

[The Assembly adjourned at 10:45 a.m.]

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|------|
| Prayers | 1677 |
| Orders of the Day | 1677 |
| Government Bills and Orders | |
| Second Reading | |
| Bill 25 Oil Sands Emissions Limit Act | 1677 |

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