



Province of Alberta

The 29th Legislature
Fourth Session

Alberta Hansard

Monday afternoon, March 12, 2018

Day 2

The Honourable Robert E. Wanner, Speaker

Legislative Assembly of Alberta
The 29th Legislature

Fourth Session

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

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

Party standings:

New Democratic: 54 United Conservative: 25 Alberta Party: 3 Alberta Liberal: 1 Progressive Conservative: 1 Independent: 1 Vacant: 2

Officers and Officials of the Legislative Assembly

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

Executive Council

Rachel Notley	Premier, President of Executive Council
Sarah Hoffman	Deputy Premier, Minister of Health
Shaye Anderson	Minister of Municipal Affairs
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
Sandra Jansen	Minister of Infrastructure
Danielle Larivee	Minister of Children's Services
Brian Mason	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 Community and Social Services
Marlin Schmidt	Minister of Advanced Education
Lori Sigurdson	Minister of Seniors and Housing

Parliamentary Secretaries

Jessica Littlewood	Economic Development and Trade for Small Business
Annie McKittrick	Education

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

Clark	Horne
Cyr	McKitrick
Dang	Turner
Ellis	

Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future

Chair: Mr. Sucha
Deputy Chair: Mr. van Dijken

Carson	Littlewood
Clark	Piquette
Connolly	Schneider
Coolahan	Schreiner
Dach	Starke
Fitzpatrick	Taylor
Gotfried	

Standing Committee on Families and Communities

Chair: Ms Goehring
Deputy Chair: Mr. Smith

Drever	Miller
Ellis	Orr
Hinkley	Renaud
Horne	Shepherd
Luff	Swann
McKitrick	Yao
McPherson	

Standing Committee on Legislative Offices

Chair: Mr. Shepherd
Deputy Chair: Mr. Malkinson

Aheer	Littlewood
Drever	Pitt
Gill	van Dijken
Horne	Woollard
Kleinstauber	

Special Standing Committee on Members' Services

Chair: Mr. Wanner
Deputy Chair: Cortes-Vargas

Cooper	Nixon
Dang	Piquette
Jabour	Pitt
Luff	Schreiner
McIver	

Standing Committee on Private Bills

Chair: Ms Kazim
Deputy Chair: Connolly

Anderson, W.	Orr
Babcock	Rosendahl
Drever	Stier
Drysdale	Strankman
Hinkley	Sucha
Kleinstauber	Taylor
McKitrick	

Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, Standing Orders and Printing

Chair: Ms Fitzpatrick
Deputy Chair: Ms Babcock

Carson	Loyola
Coolahan	Miller
Cooper	Nielsen
Goehring	Nixon
Gotfried	Pitt
Hanson	van Dijken
Kazim	

Standing Committee on Public Accounts

Chair: Mr. Cyr
Deputy Chair: Mr. Dach

Barnes	Malkinson
Carson	Miller
Fildebrandt	Nielsen
Gotfried	Panda
Hunter	Renaud
Littlewood	Turner
Luff	

Standing Committee on Resource Stewardship

Chair: Loyola
Deputy Chair: Mr. Drysdale

Babcock	Malkinson
Dang	McPherson
Fraser	Nielsen
Hanson	Rosendahl
Kazim	Woollard
Kleinstauber	Vacant
Loewen	

Legislative Assembly of Alberta

1:30 p.m.

Monday, March 12, 2018

[The Speaker in the chair]

Prayers

The Speaker: Hon. members, welcome back.

If you could just bow your heads in prayer and contemplation. On this Commonwealth Day I would ask that we, each in our own way, reflect on the deep ties that link the Commonwealth together. In our deliberations today let us strive towards a common future together with our partners across Canada and the Commonwealth. Let us not forget that it is only through exchanging ideas and collaborative work that we can build an inclusive and more peaceful future. As practitioners of democracy let us serve as models for the betterment of the world's human condition.

Hon. members, as is our custom, we pay tribute to members and former members of this Assembly who have passed away since we last met.

Mr. Garth Alphonse Turcott July 30, 1930, to January 11, 2018

The Speaker: Mr. Garth Alphonse Turcott was elected as the first-ever New Democrat member in Alberta and represented Pincher Creek-Crowsnest following a by-election held on October 6, 1966. He served until May 22, 1967. Mr. Turcott received his bachelor of arts and his bachelor of laws from the University of Saskatchewan. He served the community of Pincher Creek faithfully through his law practice for over 30 years. Mr. Turcott passed away on January 11, 2018, at the age of 87, following 65 years of marriage to the love of his life, Joan Turcott, and will be dearly missed by his granddaughter and nillywog, who is sitting in my gallery today and with whom he shared many cherished summer camping trips.

In a moment of silent reflection I would ask you to remember Mr. Turcott as you may have known him.

Hon. members and ladies and gentlemen, we will now be led in the singing of our national anthem by Mr. R.J. Chambers, and I would invite all to participate in the language of their choice.

Hon. Members:

O Canada, our home and native land!
True patriot love in all of us command.
Car ton bras sait porter l'épée,
Il sait porter la croix!
Ton histoire est une épopée
Des plus brillants exploits.
God keep our land glorious and free!
O Canada, we stand on guard for thee.
O Canada, we stand on guard for thee.

The Speaker: Thank you. Please be seated.

Statements by the Speaker

Commonwealth Day Message from the Queen

The Speaker: Hon. members, before we begin, I would like to take a moment to recognize that today is Commonwealth Day. I have a message from Her Majesty the Queen I would like to read. Copies of this message have been placed on your desks for your reference.

We all have reason to give thanks for the numerous ways in which our lives are enriched when we learn from others. Through exchanging ideas, and seeing life from other perspectives, we grow in understanding and work more collaboratively towards a common future. There is a very special value in the insights we gain through the Commonwealth connection; shared inheritances help us overcome difference so that diversity is a cause for celebration rather than division.

We shall see this in action at the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting which takes place in the United Kingdom next month, bringing together young people, business and civil society from across the Commonwealth.

These gatherings are themselves fine examples of how consensus and commitment can help to create a future that is fairer, more secure, more prosperous and [more] sustainable. Having enjoyed the warm hospitality of so many Commonwealth countries over the years, I look forward to the pleasure of welcoming the leaders of our family of 53 nations to my homes in London and Windsor.

Sport also contributes to building peace and development. The excitement and positive potential of friendly rivalry will be on display next month as we enjoy the Commonwealth Games on the Gold Coast, Australia. Contributing to the success of the Games, alongside athletes and officials, will be thousands of volunteers.

Voluntary effort, by people working as individuals, in groups or through larger associations, is so often what shapes the Commonwealth and all our communities. By pledging to serve the common good in new ways, we can ensure that the Commonwealth continues to grow in scope and stature, to have an even greater impact on people's lives, today, and for future generations.

Members' 10th Anniversary of Election

The Speaker: Hon. members, before we introduce our visitors and guests this afternoon, March 3, 2018, marked the 10th anniversary of the election of two members of this Assembly. Firstly, I would ask the hon. Premier if she would join me at the dais. The hon. Premier has represented Edmonton-Strathcona for some time and also has a new job in this place.

I need the steps to be a little taller. It's the only time that that happens to me.

The second member also has served 10 years in this establishment. I would ask that the hon. Member for Grande Prairie-Wapiti please come forward. I must tell you – and I think there would almost be unanimous consent – that this is a very gentle man whom I've had the privilege of meeting.

1:40

I would like to thank both of you and your respective families for the sacrifices they, too, have made to allow you to serve as members of this Assembly. In this 29th Legislature, having spent a decade as an MLA makes you elders of this hallowed hall. I know you both will continue to pass on the knowledge and experience you have gained to all of your colleagues. Congratulations.

Introduction of Visitors

The Speaker: Hon. members, with our admiration and respect there is gratitude to members of the families who shared the burdens of public office and public service. Today I would like to welcome members of the Turcott family, who are present in the Speaker's gallery. Please rise as I call your name and remain standing until all have been introduced: Gabrielle Kirk, Cameron Kirk, and Michael

Lavorato. Thank you for being here today, and thank you for your services.

The Member for Calgary-South East.

Mr. Fraser: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to introduce to you and through you my friend Mr. Stephen Mandel, the newly elected leader of the Alberta Party. Mr. Mandel has had a long and successful career in both business and politics, founding the Mandel Group and serving as mayor of Edmonton for nine years. He has dedicated himself to addressing homelessness, expanding seniors' housing, and engaging with multicultural communities. Stephen is also a dedicated father, husband, and grandfather to his grandson, which I admire the most. I and many Albertans look forward to Stephen's leadership in building up the Alberta Party to be the first choice for pragmatic, responsible government. I'd ask that Mr. Mandel, who is sitting in your gallery, sir, stand and receive the traditional warm welcome of this Assembly.

Introduction of Guests

The Speaker: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Whitemud.

Dr. Turner: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is my distinct pleasure to introduce to you and through you to all members of the Legislature a class from Earl Buxton school, which is in Edmonton-Whitemud. This is Earl Buxton elementary. The students are accompanied by their teacher, Ms Laura Wenger, and a chaperone, Mrs. Jennifer Brayer. I'd ask them to rise and receive the usual warm welcome of this Assembly.

The Speaker: The hon. Minister of Environment and Parks and minister responsible for the climate change office.

Ms Phillips: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to introduce to you and through you to all members assembled a number of dedicated public servants in Environment and Parks. I'll ask them to rise as I call out their names: Mr. Victor Daramola, Ms Zoya Sekhon, Mr. Tychon Carter, Mr. Phillip Phuong, Miss Leah Arnason, Ms Kristine Cariaga, Chantel Danylyshen, Graham Brittain, Cecile Novel, Wenhao Guo, and Ben Branscombe. I want to thank them for their service to this province.

The Speaker: Thank you. Welcome.

The Member for Calgary-Mountain View.

Dr. Swann: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. A great honour for me to rise and introduce to you and through you to the House two committed animal activists, wildlife activists: a biologist, Lisa Dahlseide, and an activist, Laurel Ambrose, from Calgary. Please stand. Thank you. I'm proud to say that Laurel Ambrose is a constituent of mine in the riding of Calgary-Mountain View, a member of Russell's Private Advocacy Group, known as R-PAG, a group dedicated to driving wildlife rehabilitation advocacy initiatives in Alberta. Lisa comes to us from the riding of Calgary-Bow. She's a wildlife biologist advocating for rehab of all wildlife and for science to better reflect wildlife management and policy. These passionate advocates have helped rally thousands of people to sign petitions urging this government to lift restrictions on the rehab of bears and other large wildlife. People like Lisa and Laurel are the environmental conscience of Alberta. They are seated in the public gallery. I ask all members to give them the usual welcome.

The Speaker: Welcome.

The hon. Minister of Health and Deputy Premier.

Ms Hoffman: Thank you so much, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure to introduce some very special guests who are in the members' gallery. I ask that they rise as I introduce them. They are Jayden Strauss's family as well as Kristopher Phillips and his family – please rise – and the Alberta Children's Wish Foundation of Canada team, based here in Edmonton. They're here today to celebrate children's wish month. Jayden's wish was the 25,000th wish granted by this organization. Kristopher will be fulfilling his wish in the near future. We know that granted wishes are beneficial to the psychological well-being of children as well as their families. I'm incredibly honoured to acknowledge the Children's Wish Foundation for their dedication to granting wishes in support of children who are sick and their families. I ask that all of our members please extend the warm welcome of our Assembly.

The Speaker: Welcome.

Cortes-Vargas: It's an honour to introduce to you and through you, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the MLAs from Strathcona county the organization committee of the Sherwood Park & District Chamber of Commerce, the first annual International Women's Day organization committee. On March 8 they set an agenda to press for progress to build workshops to support equality in the workplace, and it's my pleasure today to thank them for their dedication and vision. From the chamber of commerce we have with us – I'd ask them all to rise at once – board president Penny Jennings, executive director Todd Banks, chair of the organization committee Elan Lyles, and all of the rest of the staff that put this day together. Thank you very much. Please extend the warm welcome of the Assembly.

The Speaker: The hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury-Three Hills.

Mr. Cooper: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my absolute pleasure to rise and introduce a good friend of mine. You know, there are people who make politics better and then there are people who do the opposite of that, and this particular individual makes politics incredible. He is the most principled guy that I have ever had the opportunity of working with. He has a knack for knowing what everyday voters care about and are passionate about. He was an incredible, incredible member of our team over a very long period of time, and he's leaving the capital region for the land of opportunity. I invite him to rise and receive the traditional warm welcome of the Assembly, Mr. Evan Menzies.

The Speaker: Welcome.

The hon. Minister of Energy.

Ms McCuaig-Boyd: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have two introductions today. The first one. It's my honour to rise and introduce to you and the Assembly a team of individuals helping to ensure the long-lasting success of Alberta's energy industry. The Energy Diversification Advisory Committee put in hundreds of hours in meetings and policy work, all to determine how best to invest in the value-added downstream sector here in Alberta. The vision of their final report was reflected in Bill 1, the Energy Diversification Act, which will go a long way to achieving a stronger and more diversified energy sector. I know that not all of them could be here to join us today, but I would introduce them and ask them to rise as I say their names: our co-chairs Jeanette Patell and Gil McGowan as well as fellow members Carol Moen, Marie Robidoux, Rocky Sinclair, and Warren Fraleigh. I thank them for all the hard work they did on behalf of Albertans and ask the members to join me in the traditional welcome of this Assembly.

The Speaker: Welcome.

Hon. members, I seek the guidance of the House. We have a number of introductions to be made. Is the House prepared to consider a motion?

The Government House Leader.

Mr. Mason: Well, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Then, I will move to ask unanimous consent to continue till the conclusion of introductions.

[Unanimous consent granted]

The Speaker: The Minister of Energy again.

1:50

Ms McCuaig-Boyd: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I may have the same situation of not all guests being here, but I would like to now present to you and through you some guests joining us here today for the debate on the future of our province. Albertans from all walks of life know that building a pipeline to tidewater is crucial to Alberta getting a better, fairer price for our resources. Workers, communities, indigenous leaders, and industry all understand this to be true. It's my honour to welcome today to hear this debate, Mark Scholz, president of the Canadian Association of Oilwell Drilling Contractors; Ben Brunnen, vice-president of oil sands with CAPP, Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers; Elizabeth Aquin, Petroleum Services Association of Canada; Bill Clapperton, VP stakeholder and environmental affairs, Canadian Natural Resources; Julie Woo, public affairs lead, Canadian Natural Resources; Keri Scobie, public affairs manager for Imperial's Edmonton refinery; and lastly, Scott Wenger, manager of government relations at Suncor. I ask those who are here to please rise and accept the warm reception of this Assembly.

The Speaker: Welcome.

The hon. Minister of Advanced Education.

Mr. Schmidt: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure to introduce to you and to all members of the Assembly two outstanding Albertans. Margaret and Ron Monroe are residents of the humble constituency of Edmonton-Gold Bar. When they were 17, they met as students at Red Deer College, soon to be a university. They fell in love and have been together ever since. The Monroes are lifelong New Democrats who volunteer for me and are dedicated servants of their community. They are also two of the kindest, most generous people that I have the privilege of knowing, and I wish to thank them for all of their support. My guests are seated in the gallery behind me. I ask them to rise and receive the warm welcome of the Assembly.

The Speaker: Welcome.

The Minister of Labour and minister responsible for democratic renewal.

Ms Gray: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure to introduce to you and through you to all members of this Assembly members of the Building Trades of Alberta. The BTA represents 16 unions and more than 70,000 Alberta members who build and maintain our province's roads, bridges, and critical energy infrastructure. As these Alberta men and women have built our province, they are here today to make sure we keep building into the future and hopefully listen to the debate on Government Motion 2. Our partners in the building trades know that we will get this pipeline built together. I'd now like to ask those members to rise and receive the traditional warm welcome of this Assembly.

The Speaker: Welcome.

The Minister of Indigenous Relations.

Mr. Feehan: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure to introduce to you and through you to the rest of the Assembly Chief Billy Morin of the Enoch Cree Nation, who will be joining us to hear about the motion being presented this afternoon. Chief Billy is part of the Enoch Cree Nation, which is a signatory to Treaty 6 and which is bordered, of course, on its eastern side by the city of Edmonton. Chief Billy is supportive of Alberta's efforts to access new markets for its landlocked oil and gas resources and is looking forward to observing the debate on the Trans Mountain pipeline, that we are expected to have later today. I'd like to ask the Assembly to provide him the warm welcome of the House.

The Speaker: Welcome.

The hon. Member for Battle River-Wainwright.

Mr. Taylor: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's great to be back. I'd like to introduce to and through you to all the members of the Assembly Mr. Rob Johnson. Rob, if you could please rise. Rob Johnson is a friend, a really good friend of mine, and a farmer in the heart of my riding, which I would say is the heart of Alberta. Three years ago, however, I narrowly won a nomination contest over him by only eight votes. Would you please join me in welcoming and giving him the traditional warm welcome of the Assembly.

The Speaker: Welcome.

The hon. Member for Peace River.

Ms Jabbour: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Seated in your gallery today are eight board members of the Royal Commonwealth Society of Edmonton. The Edmonton branch was founded in 2005, during the visit of Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II to Alberta. The Royal Commonwealth Society has a long history dating to 1868, and this year marks the 150th anniversary. The theme for this year is Towards a Common Future, which explores how the Commonwealth can address global challenges and work to create a better future for all citizens through subthemes of sustainability, safety, prosperity, and fairness. Our guests are here to recognize Commonwealth Day, which is celebrated annually on the second Monday in March. I would ask that they each rise as I call their names. We have Joe Zasada, who is the chair, commonwealth society of Canada; Rick Stewart, treasurer; and directors Bernie Baker and Kath Baker. I'd ask the Assembly to please give them the warm welcome.

The Speaker: Welcome.

Statement by the Speaker

Rotation of Questions and Members' Statements

The Speaker: Hon. members, I'd like to make some remarks on the rotation of oral questions and Members' Statements before the Assembly proceeds to Oral Question Period. As noted in the procedural memorandum dated February 22, 2018, and sent to all members, I encouraged House leaders to come up with an agreement on these rotations. At 12:09 p.m. on March 8 my office received a House leaders' agreement outlining new Oral Question Period and Members' Statements rotations to reflect the caucus changes since the fall sitting. At the appropriate time I will be tabling the House leaders' agreement.

I have reviewed and accepted the agreement. Accordingly, on March 9 my office sent to all members a chart showing the Oral Question Period rotation and a projected sitting days calendar to

reflect the allotment of members' statements among other things. Concerning the details of the Oral Question Period rotation, the third party will continue to receive question 4. It is also allocated question 11 on days 3 and 7 in addition to days 1 and 5, for a total of 12 questions over the eight-day rotation.

There have been changes at question 6. The Member for Strathmore-Brooks is now allocated question 6 on days 4 and 8, and the Official Opposition receives question 6 on days 3 and 7.

There is a change at question 10 as well. The government caucus is allocated question 10 on each day except for day 5, when the Official Opposition is entitled to ask that question.

Lastly, in terms of changes to the rotation, the Official Opposition is allocated question 12 on each day.

In terms of the total number of questions over the eight-day rotation, the number of questions remains the same for each of the caucuses and the independent member, except for the third-party opposition, which, as mentioned, receives two more questions.

A few changes have been made to the allocation of members' statements. The third opposition is now allocated a member's statement each Thursday.

Furthermore, each of the single-member caucuses and the Member for Strathmore-Brooks retains one statement over the three-week rotation. That statement is allocated on a Thursday. The change is that the Liberal caucus receives its statement on week 1, the Progressive Conservative on week 2, and the Member for Strathmore-Brooks on week 3.

I will implement these rotations starting today, the first day of the Fourth Session of the 29th Legislature. Today is day 1 of the Oral Question Period rotation.

Oral Question Period

The Speaker: The Leader of the Official Opposition.

Mr. Kenney: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As this is my first opportunity to speak in this Chamber, let me begin by thanking my constituents in Calgary-Lougheed for their confidence, the members of my party for the opportunity to serve as Leader of the Opposition, and offering a word of respect to the hon. the Premier and members of her government for their public service. I hope that while we will disagree, we can do it without being disagreeable.

Trans Mountain Pipeline Expansion Opposition Carbon Levy

Mr. Kenney: Now, having said that, it's my job to hold the government to account. I always recall that my grandma used to say that imitation is the sincerest form of flattery. So we were very flattered with the throne speech, seeing the government do a complete one-eighty in accepting the strategy we have long advocated: to fight for our pipelines by being prepared to turn off the taps. The question, Mr. Speaker, is: why did it take so long?

2:00

The Speaker: The hon. Premier.

Ms Notley: Well, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Of course, I'm also very pleased to welcome the member opposite to the House.

You know, at the end of the day, we're not going to take lessons, although from the leader of the UCP, on our energy future. We had Conservatives in Ottawa, we had Conservatives in Edmonton, and we had conservatives in Victoria for nine years, and they couldn't get a pipeline built, Mr. Speaker. No pipeline, no diversification.

They had their chance, and they blew it. That won't happen again. We will get that pipeline built.

Mr. Kenney: They are taking lessons, and we appreciate that, Mr. Speaker. We hope they'll take more of our good ideas. I'm also glad that the NDP has accepted our call for a debate and, hopefully, a unanimous motion where we could all speak to the importance of our resources and against the B.C. New Democrats' efforts to violate the Constitution and the rule of law. I have a very simple question for the government. Will the government accept one of our constructive amendments calling on the federal government to use its clear power to override Victoria's delay tactics by invoking section 92 of the Constitution Act and declaring the Trans Mountain pipeline as being . . .

The Speaker: Thank you, hon. member.

The hon. Premier.

Ms Notley: Well, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I certainly do hope that the members opposite support our motion because I think it's very important for all Albertans to come together and actually get this pipeline built. With respect to the member opposite's motion the fact of the matter is that the federal government already has that authority because the pipeline crosses boundaries. In fact, accepting that motion would somehow suggest that they don't already have that authority. We know they have that authority. They approved the pipeline, and we will get the pipeline built.

Mr. Kenney: Well, Mr. Speaker, it's a constitutional power that we believe the federal government could invoke and stop the New Democrats in Victoria from blocking our resources.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have here an important piece of literature. It's the NDP platform for the last election, and try as I might, I cannot find a single reference to the carbon tax. Right here, page 24: lots of other tax increases but not one reference to the job-killing carbon tax. Months after this platform was presented, the NDP imposed the largest tax hike in Alberta history. My question for the Premier is simple. Why did the NDP mislead our . . .

The Speaker: Hon. member, we're going to work on those times together. I'm sure we'll catch it up.

The hon. Premier.

Ms Notley: Well, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. What I will say is that when it comes to our climate leadership plan, the member opposite is actually batting zero. He said that our economy would tank, and Alberta's economy is leading growth in the country. He said that jobs would flee – would flee – Alberta, but last year alone: 90,000 jobs created in Alberta. He said that we won't get the pipeline built, and my advice to him: welcome back to Alberta; never bet against Alberta. [some applause]

The Speaker: Hon. members. Hon. members.

Hon. member, first of all, welcome to the House. I would respectfully ask that you not rise until I ask you to do so. Please proceed.

Mr. Kenney: I was just receiving a standing ovation, Mr. Speaker.

Energy Policies and Social Licence

Mr. Kenney: You know, it shows how out of touch the NDP is. They're talking about happy times when 175,000 Albertans are unemployed, and their high-tax strategy led to one of the biggest and longest recessions in our history.

I want to ask the Premier about her so-called theory of social licence. She told Albertans that if we just pay more for everything, somehow, magically, pipeline opponents will become pipeline supporters and pipelines would get built. But Justin Trudeau vetoed Northern Gateway, killed Energy East; Barack Obama vetoed Keystone XL; and now the B.C. New Democrats are doing everything they can to kill Trans Mountain, so whatever happens . . .

The Speaker: Hon. member.

Ms Notley: Well, you know, Mr. Speaker, speaking of written records, it's quite interesting. The member opposite was in Ottawa for nine years, and the phrase "Trans Mountain pipeline" left his lips once, about three days before he finally left Ottawa. What we actually need is a government that is committed to getting the pipeline built, committed to innovating our energy sector so that we are world leaders and continue to be world leaders. That is exactly the work that this government is doing, and we will in fact succeed.

Mr. Kenney: With 10,000 full-time jobs lost last month, Mr. Speaker, it shows how out of touch they are.

Now, just eight weeks ago the NDP raised their job-killing carbon tax by 50 per cent, and now they're promising to raise it by another 67 per cent. Why? Because Justin Trudeau asked them to, and they're keeping the door open to even higher raises beyond that. Since the carbon tax hasn't done anything to get us a pipeline, Mr. Speaker, my question is: will the Premier stand and commit today that she will not raise the carbon tax by a further 67 per cent just to satisfy her ally Justin Trudeau?

The Speaker: The hon. Premier.

Ms Notley: Well, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. What I would say to the member opposite is that climate denial is, quite frankly, a dead end for Alberta. The UCP wants to walk down that road again. We say no. We say that Alberta is a world energy leader. We say that we need to have those new jobs, like those 90,000 new jobs last year. We need new industries, we need innovation, we need diversification, we need renewable energy, and we need a pipeline to tidewater, all those things that this government is going to get done.

Mr. Kenney: Well, Mr. Speaker, again, the NDP said that their carbon tax would buy us something called a social licence. Somehow it was supposed to turn pipeline opponents into pipeline supporters. That didn't work with Justin Trudeau killing Northern Gateway and Energy East or the B.C. New Democrats trying to kill Trans Mountain or Barack Obama vetoing Keystone XL. Can the Premier name a single government, municipality, environment organization, or political party that has moved from no to yes on pipelines and energy as a result of her multibillion-dollar carbon tax?

The Speaker: The hon. Premier.

Ms Notley: Well, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. In November 2016 the federal government of this country approved the Kinder Morgan pipeline, and when they did it, they did it with specific reference to the climate leadership plan that Alberta brought into place, which is leading the country in helping our country to do its part on climate change while we take our place as the world-leading energy producer.

Mr. Kenney: Mr. Speaker, that's the same federal government, her close allies, that killed Northern Gateway, that killed Energy East, about which this government did nothing to protest.

Energy Policies

Mr. Kenney: I want to ask the Premier: when Justin Trudeau forced the National Energy Board to get into the business of regulating up- and downstream emissions, which lead to the death of the \$16 billion Energy East pipeline, why did this government do nothing to defend Alberta's jurisdiction? The regulation of oil and gas production is a jurisdiction won by Peter Lougheed in the Constitution. Why isn't this government defending that?

The Speaker: The hon. Premier.

Ms Notley: Well, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I think the member opposite knows that the outcome with respect to Energy East had nothing to do with the NEB decision. More importantly, the member opposite should also know that our government spoke up against having downstream emissions considered with respect to NEB decisions, so we did actually do that. But at the same time we are going to also do our part to make sure that we take our place as an energy leader producing sustainable energy that has a strong market across the world, and we will . . .

The Speaker: Thank you, hon. Premier.

Mr. Kenney: Well, I regret to see, Mr. Speaker, how, apparently, our Premier didn't even follow the decision by TransCanada, where the president explicitly said that it was the uncertainty created by the NEB by getting into the business of carbon emissions which resulted in them pulling the project and killing the dream of energy independence for Canada.

Mr. Speaker, recently I visited the Sundre seniors' centre, where they're paying 8 per cent of their small, \$18,000 annual budget on the NDP carbon tax. They may even have to close the place because of it. What message does the Premier have for the Sundre seniors who are thinking of closing their centre just to pay . . .

The Speaker: Thank you, hon. member.

The hon. Premier.

Ms Notley: Well, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. What we can say and have said is that we will be working with community members in Sundre and across the province, quite frankly, to come up with different ways by which we can support nonprofit agencies in increasing their efficiency and reducing their costs. That work, paired with the other work that we have already done to support seniors, to support nonprofits, to support communities, will ensure that those organizations get to move forward and, in fact, are strengthened.

2:10

Mr. Kenney: Mr. Speaker, this government has made a total shambles of Alberta's power policy. Their carbon tax made it uneconomical to produce power in this province, and then a ham-fisted legal strategy by the government forced power companies to court. This government lost, now settling and forcing taxpayers to eat hundreds of millions of dollars of costs as a result of their power policy fiasco. My question for the hon. Premier is: will someone in her government take responsibility for costing taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars by mismanaging power policy?

The Speaker: The hon. Premier.

Ms Notley: Well, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Our government took legal action to protect Albertans from previous governments' misactions. The excess consumer supply that was created by that likely benefited Albertans, didn't hurt them. At the same time, we're very pleased to see that the matter is resolved, and now we look forward to working with all of our industry producers to actually fix what was a broken electricity system and provide cleaner electricity, more stable electricity, more reliable electricity, and greater renewable investment.

Nonprofit Organizations

Mr. Fraser: One of the government's favourite lines is that they are making life better for Albertans. Well, that's also the goal of the nonprofit sector although they do it with fewer resources and less fanfare. That's why it's very troubling to hear that many of the government's actions are having a direct and negative effect on nonprofits across the province. The carbon tax, for example, is hurting their bottom lines and taking away money from those that need it the most. With the carbon tax slated to keep increasing, they're worried about their future and rightly so. To the Premier: will you commit to a carbon tax exemption for nonprofits so that the dollars are going towards the people they're intended to help and not government coffers?

The Speaker: The hon. Premier.

Ms Notley: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. You know, nonprofits truly are the beating heart of Alberta communities, and we will do everything we can to continue the work that we've been doing to support them. When it comes to energy efficiency and the carbon levy, we've created the nonprofit energy efficiency transition program. We have already provided support to more than 100 nonprofits across the province. That's in addition to other things that we have done like, for instance, increasing FCSS funding for the first time in over a decade, by about 25 per cent. These are the kinds of things you do to make life . . .

The Speaker: Thank you, hon. Premier.

Mr. Fraser: Well, Mr. Speaker, the carbon tax is not the only measure this government has taken that's impacting our nonprofits. The increase in minimum wage has been made with good intentions, but the government isn't the one that has to deal with those consequences. The increase in labour costs means fewer staff, shorter hours, or it might mean a nonprofit has to close its doors completely. The effects of this increase could be substantial for the nonprofit sector, and it would be wise of this government to understand what the effects of another hike would look like. To the Premier: will the government commit to a review of the impact of the changes to the minimum wage on the nonprofit sector before introducing yet another increase?

The Speaker: The hon. Premier.

Ms Notley: Well, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. What we know is that in this province, during the recession as well as during the previous booms and now during a time when things are recovering, we absolutely cannot have people go to work in the morning, work for eight hours, and then go home and have to stop on the way at the food bank in order to feed their families. It doesn't matter if they work in the retail sector or in the nonprofit sector or in corporate offices. It is unacceptable. Our government took action to stop that, and we are proud of that.

The Speaker: The hon. Member for Calgary-Klein.

Mr. Coolahan: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Oh, I'm sorry. Second supplemental. My apologies.

Mr. Fraser: It is a long way from here to there, isn't it, Mr. Speaker?

I understand there might be some on the government side of the House that think services in the charitable organizations, that they provide, should come from the government programs instead. Well, Mr. Speaker, I disagree with that notion. While we all agree that these organizations could use some more resources, nonprofits are about Albertans making life better for Albertans, not politicians. The relationship between governments and nonprofits should be a partnership, and that's not how nonprofits feel they're being treated right now. To the Premier: when will this government start treating nonprofits as an equal partner in making life better for Albertans?

Ms Notley: Well, Mr. Speaker, our government has done quite a wide range of work with nonprofit sectors as they provide the important services that they do, and in fact we do absolutely respect the work that they do. As I mentioned previously, one of the first things our government did when we just got elected was, after many, many, many years of asking the previous government, of which the member opposite was a part, to increase FCSS funding after not touching it for years. We did increase it. The Finance minister tells me that it was 33 per cent, not 25 per cent. So we will continue to work with nonprofits because we understand how important they are for making life better for Albertans.

The Speaker: Thank you, hon. Premier.

Now the hon. Member for Calgary-Klein.

Trans Mountain Pipeline Expansion Project

Mr. Coolahan: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Trans Mountain pipeline expansion project is critical to ensuring that Alberta's energy products get to market. Given the recent actions on electricity sales and wine exports it is clear that this project is important to our government and to working Albertans. To the Minister of Energy: how important is the pipeline to Alberta energy jobs?

The Speaker: The hon. minister.

Ms McCuaig-Boyd: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know, the member raises a very important question. He's right to say that this is an important project, not just for Alberta but for everyone in Canada. Recently Scotiabank put out a report suggesting that these delays are costing \$15 billion a year to the Canadian economy. These pipelines create thousands of construction jobs and operational jobs. It's important to all of us that our energy sector is supported. That's why we're not going to stop fighting until this pipeline is built.

The Speaker: First supplemental.

Mr. Coolahan: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We know that Alberta energy products sell at a discount on the open market. To the same minister: how will the Trans Mountain pipeline make sure that Alberta gets a fair price for its valuable resources?

The Speaker: The hon. minister.

Ms McCuaig-Boyd: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know, for a number of years the U.S. was our biggest customer and we enjoyed good dollars in that relationship, but now they're our biggest competitor, so we have to expand our markets to Asia because we can't continue here in Alberta to sell our product at a discount. We made it very clear in the throne speech that this is an important enough project that we're going to do all it takes to get it built, and we are going to get that pipeline built.

The Speaker: Second supplemental.

Mr. Coolahan: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This government has shown it's willing to take action by banning B.C. wine imports, cancelling electricity sales, and maybe even turning off the taps in order to get this pipeline built. Given the opposition to this project by other jurisdictions, to the same minister: how will the Trans Mountain pipeline provide benefits not just for Alberta but for all of Canada?

The Speaker: The hon. minister.

Ms McCuaig-Boyd: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know, as many know, I live in northwest Alberta, and a number of workers who work up my way are actually from B.C. They pay taxes in B.C., and they live in B.C., but they work in Alberta. We're talking 40,000 people in the last while who are from B.C. but work here, so it's a benefit not just to Alberta but to B.C. workers. When I was on holidays last summer, I met people in Nova Scotia who work in Alberta in our economy and enjoy the benefits, so this is important not just to us, not just to B.C.; this is important for all of Canada. This money is going to help pay for the services that we all enjoy in this province.

The Speaker: Thank you, hon. minister.
The Member for Calgary-Mountain View.

Oil Sands Development Concerns

Dr. Swann: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's clear that our oil sands provide incredible opportunities for fossil fuel energy, economic returns, and jobs for citizens across this country. The current impasse with B.C., however, has also highlighted Albertans' growing concerns emphasized by the Auditor General report of two years ago on the growing unfunded reclamation liabilities in the oil sands and its contributions to our rise in greenhouse gas emissions. To the Premier: will you in the public interest commit to establishing a public consultation or summit on the future of oil sands development in Alberta in relation to both the benefits and the risks to Albertans now and in the future?

Ms Notley: Well, thank you very much to the member for his important question. You know, Mr. Speaker, I think that in some ways a lot of that work is already under way. Obviously, through our climate leadership plan, one of the critical components of it, which actually is a very persuasive argument when we talk to folks in B.C., is the fact that we put in place an emissions cap and that industry agreed to that and worked with government. Paired with that, we are supporting industry as they come up with more innovative, safe, sustainable ways to extract that resource, so it's kind of a win-win. That's one piece that's going on. As well, the minister of environment can talk at quite great length in terms of much of the work that's going on with the LARP.

The Speaker: Thank you, hon. Premier.
First supplemental.

Dr. Swann: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, again to the Premier: given that the oil sands operators have set aside a mere 4 per cent of the estimated \$21 billion required for oil sands cleanup, which could be passed on to Albertans if these multinational companies default, when will the Premier require these multinationals to guarantee security for the cleanup?

2:20

The Speaker: The hon. Minister of Environment and Parks.

Ms Phillips: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you to the hon. member for the question. The matter related to development of the oil sands is being captured under the lower Athabasca regional plan and also the new tailings management framework. As we receive the plans from the companies with respect to the tailings management framework, we're looking at our reclamation criteria. We hope to have more to say over the course of this year.

Thank you.

Dr. Swann: Well, again to the environment minister: given the lack of clear public data on our net greenhouse gas emissions and the priority you've placed on climate change, will you commit to annual reporting, including year-over-year trends of Alberta's total greenhouse gas emissions so that Albertans can readily know what progress is being made on our greenhouse gas emissions?

The Speaker: The hon. Minister of Environment and Parks.

Ms Phillips: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member will be pleased to learn that Alberta reports in to Environment and Climate Change Canada, as we always have. We have very robust measuring, reporting, and verification systems in place, in part to safeguard the integrity of the offsets market but also to ensure that we are being transparent with Albertans. We've just gotten our preliminary data back from 2015-16. It takes that amount of time in order to ensure that we've got the verification pieces in place.

The Speaker: The hon. Member for Airdrie.

Carbon Levy Increase

Mrs. Pitt: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Despite the NDP government wanting Albertans to believe that everything is great, Alberta lost 10,000 full-time jobs last month. Unemployment in Alberta is the highest outside of Atlantic Canada. Calgary has the second-highest unemployment of any city in Canada. We also know that many Albertans have given up looking for work altogether. On top of it, this NDP government hiked their carbon tax by 50 per cent on January 1, making life more expensive. Why does this out-of-touch government insist on making it more expensive for Alberta families to make ends meet?

The Speaker: The hon. Finance minister.

Mr. Ceci: Well, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. You know, we have some work to go as a government, as a province to make sure that every Albertan feels the economic recovery that is going on in this province, but it is undeniable that 90,000 new full-time jobs were created over the last year and the unemployment rate fell to its lowest level in two years. Things are looking up in this province. Wages are up in this province. Small-business confidence is up. I can go on and on and on. I don't know why the opposition continues to run down this province. We're turning it around. The economy is coming back.

The Speaker: Thank you, hon. minister.

Mrs. Pitt: Mr. Speaker, I think the Finance minister didn't read his new update.

Given that the latest carbon tax hike makes it more expensive to fill up at the pumps and given that Albertans are paying more for fresh fruit and vegetables at the grocery store because of the carbon tax and given that this NDP government claimed that a carbon tax would buy us a so-called social licence for pipelines, yet that's clearly been a failure, why are Albertans paying more to drive to work and buy their groceries if the carbon tax isn't even doing what they were promised?

The Speaker: The hon. Minister of Environment and Parks.

Ms Phillips: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. More than 60 per cent of Alberta households receive rebates for the carbon levy, and small-business taxes were cut by 33 per cent. In 2018 carbon levy rebates will be provided for \$300 for single adults, \$450 for couples, and \$45 for each child under 18. Over the next three years there will be \$1.4 billion invested in rebates and, of course, investments in green infrastructure and in large-scale renewables, clean tech, bioenergy, and coal community transition.

Mrs. Pitt: Mr. Speaker, the minister responsible for climate change is forgetting about the other 50 per cent that don't receive the carbon tax cheques.

Given that many Airdrie residents commute outside the city to go to work, provided that they still have a job despite the NDP government's policies, and given that the NDP carbon tax makes driving to work much more expensive and given that it's clear that this NDP government is only making things harder for Airdrie residents and the rest of Alberta, Mr. Speaker, when will this government admit that the carbon tax is a sham, stop punishing Albertans, and scrap the carbon tax?

Ms Phillips: Well, you know, curiously, Mr. Speaker, this weekend we learned from the leader of the UCP that Ontario is the big brother of Canadian Confederation. If that's the case, then Preston Manning is surely the granddaddy of Canadian conservatism, and even he supports a price on carbon.

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

Carbon Levy

Mrs. Aheer: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This government claimed that their carbon tax would win the so-called social licence for pipelines. Standing right here less than two years ago the Minister of Economic Development and Trade said that the carbon tax will, quote, get social licence to get pipelines approved and get our product to tidewater. Two years later no pipeline, but the constituents of Chestermere-Rocky View are still paying a carbon tax to heat their homes in winter, and what a winter. Will the government agree to suspend their carbon tax since the so-called social licence argument was clearly a myth?

The Speaker: The hon. minister.

Ms Phillips: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. The climate leadership plan is part of a policy that will ensure that we get pipelines to tidewater, that we build an economic recovery to last, that we diversify the economy, and that we make investments in new, diversified areas like renewables and energy efficiency. We're an energy province, and not just oil and gas. Oil and gas, yes, but also a number of new areas. We'll continue to build and diversify this economy.

The Speaker: First supplemental.

Mrs. Aheer: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Given that a former member of this government's oil sands advisory group recently said of the carbon tax that, quote, it was a false premise to assume that that therefore means it was a bargain for a pipeline. I mean, that's quite the investment. She also said that the carbon tax for a pipeline trade, quote, wasn't going to work from the beginning, and it's not working now. Well, why does this government expect Albertans to believe that the carbon tax will result in a pipeline approval if the government's own advisory panel group doesn't believe it themselves?

The Speaker: The hon. Minister of Environment and Parks.

Ms Phillips: Mr. Speaker, thank you. Of course, on this side of the House we believe that the climate leadership plan will result in a pipeline approval because the climate leadership plan resulted in a pipeline approval. Of course, we heard from the leader of the Conservatives that Ontario is the big brother of Confederation, as I said. But you know who my brothers and sisters are? They're up there in that gallery. They're the electricians, the insulators, the boilermakers, the pipefitters that are all getting back to work as a result of our policies.

The Speaker: Second supplemental.

Mrs. Aheer: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, her brothers and sisters are also paying this carbon tax, so we'll see what happens with that.

Given that this government did not campaign on this carbon tax and given that the carbon tax is failing to produce any economic benefit promised and given that the Calgary area – and to reiterate: 7.9 per cent unemployment, Mr. Speaker. I mean, that's the second highest in Canada. I think the hon. member already mentioned that. Why won't the government scrap the tax and the cash grab? This hurts our not-for-profit organizations, shelters, schools, and other service delivery providers that actually help Albertans.

Thank you.

The Speaker: The hon. minister.

Ms Phillips: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Speaking of Calgarians, of course, we are investing a billion dollars into the green line so that Calgarians can get to work quicker and spend more time with their families and less time on the road. The Conservatives would, of course, endanger the green line and the southeast valley line here in Edmonton by cancelling the climate leadership plan, and that is no way to build this province.

Nonprofit Organizations and the Carbon Levy

Mr. Nixon: This government's reckless carbon tax is hurting Alberta communities. Here's what Leona Bennett from the Sundre & District Aquaplex recently said: we're really getting hit hard; it's not just us that are impacted, it's the community as a whole; our little organizations are what keep Sundre going, and without these facilities in the community, we won't have a community; because of the carbon tax, we had to increase our rates, but we couldn't increase them as much as required because people are also paying the carbon tax. Mr. Speaker, why does this government insist on hurting our communities with their job-killing carbon tax?

The Speaker: The Minister of Environment and Parks.

Ms Phillips: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Of course, we know that the Sundre West Country Centre is a vital recreation hub for local gatherings and community activities. In fact, my office reached out and spoke to the mayor this morning. We are listening to their concerns. We have arranged for an energy efficiency roundtable to be held in the community, and there are a number of other initiatives that I'll be pleased to report to the House in the supplementals.

Mr. Nixon: Well, Mr. Speaker, given that this Sundre community centre, seniors' centre, has been asking this minister to speak with them for months and in fact the Premier's office's only communication back to them was to hold a fundraiser or raise their rates on fixed-income seniors, I'll ask this question: since this government insists on continuing to punish everyday Albertans with their carbon tax, why won't they at least exempt right now community groups from this punishing tax?

The Speaker: The hon. minister.

Ms Phillips: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. We are in fact reinvesting in community infrastructure like arenas and pools and other municipal infrastructure. The Minister of Municipal Affairs will have more to say about that in the coming days.

2:30

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, given that charitable giving in Alberta has declined 10 times faster than the national average and given that the carbon tax makes it more expensive for nonprofit and community groups to heat buildings and buy gas and given that this tax disproportionately impacts rural Albertans, will the government finally do the right thing and exempt groups from their cash grab – yes or no? – or will they continue to stand side by side with their Trudeau allies and punish our seniors, punish our veterans, punish our children, punish our homeless, and on and on?

The Speaker: The hon. minister.

Ms Phillips: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member will be pleased to learn that in Sundre more than 100 homes, businesses, nonprofits, and others are currently participating in and benefiting from Energy Efficiency Alberta programs. We've also provided over \$2 million in grants to repair, renovate, upgrade, or expand community facilities for seniors across the province, including the Rocky Mountain House Pioneer Centre in the member's riding, in Rocky Mountain House. We've also provided over \$200,000 in grants to nonprofit organizations in the member's riding, the Sundre & District Aquatic Society and the Bergen Community Association.

The Speaker: The hon. Member for Sherwood Park.

Inter Pipeline Heartland Petrochemical Plant

Ms McKittrick: Merci, M. le Président. Diversification is key to ensuring long-term success for Alberta's energy sector. Given the recent release of the Energy Diversification Advisory Committee report and the press release this morning with Inter Pipeline could the Minister of Energy explain the importance of the investment by Inter Pipeline, which is located in my constituency, and building the plant in the Industrial Heartland, and how the petrochemicals diversification program helped Inter Pipeline make the investment?

The Speaker: The hon. Minister of Energy.

Ms McCuaig-Boyd: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again, that's a very important question. Inter Pipeline's investment in the Industrial Heartland is most welcome. They were, as you know, one of the recipients of the first PDP round. You know, we've heard from Albertans all across Alberta through EDAC and others that they're tired of the boom-and-bust roller coaster we've been on for all of my lifetime here in Alberta and that they want a recovery that's built to last. The Inter Pipeline project is one piece in our move to diversifying our economy, and petrochemicals is going to play a big role in that.

The Speaker: First supplemental.

Ms McKittrick: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the same minister: how many jobs in Alberta have been created during construction and for the operation of the plant?

The Speaker: The hon. minister.

Ms McCuaig-Boyd: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know, we know that most projects in construction are between 2,000 and 4,000 jobs, and we know that they create anywhere from about 180 to 250 in operational jobs. We heard this morning from Inter Pipeline themselves that they believe that at peak when they're doing their project, there are going to be 13,000 indirect and direct jobs, and that doesn't count all the services around that expand because of people having work and spending money. We know that this is a huge impact in Alberta, and it's a great move to diversify our economy, something that wasn't done in many years.

The Speaker: Thank you, hon. minister.
Second supplemental.

Ms McKittrick: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Partial upgrading means that companies can ship bitumen through a pipeline without adding diluent, which means that they can ship more bitumen through the same pipeline. To the same minister: does this mean that we don't need pipelines anymore?

The Speaker: The hon. minister.

Ms McCuaig-Boyd: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In our new Bill 1, where we're talking about diversifying the economy, part of it is partial upgrading and allowing products to be created that can go to new refineries, that don't have access to those refineries right now. But one of the other sidelines is that we will be able to increase pipeline capacity 30 per cent. That doesn't mean that we don't need other pipelines, because we're going to grow this economy. Energy is here to stay for a long time, and we're going to need that capacity for new products as we move forward.

The Speaker: The hon. Member for Calgary-Elbow.

Energy Industry Diversification

Mr. Clark: Well, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Economic diversification has long been the dream of governments in this province, for as long as most of us can remember, but the question remains: what is the role of government in encouraging that diversification? This government has not surprisingly taken a hands-on approach, which could mean that it is government, not the free market, that chooses winners and losers. To the Minister of Energy: what assurance can you provide that your plans will not distort the market and put taxpayer dollars unduly at risk?

The Speaker: The hon. Minister of Energy.

Ms McCuaig-Boyd: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, again, you know, the parts of Bill 1 that we introduced today and had a press conference about the next details show that we're taking a competitive approach. We have three areas: petrochemical diversification round 2, partial upgrading, and a feedstock strategy to supply those feedstocks to the projects. With them, there are incentives to build, but in the case of PDP they will not be getting any of those BRIK, or bitumen royalty in kind, dollars until the project is up and running.

The Speaker: Thank you, hon. minister.
First supplemental.

Mr. Clark: It still sounds like government choosing over the private market, Mr. Speaker.

Given that Alberta already has one of the most diverse economies in Canada and given that we don't have as much of an economic diversification problem as we do a government revenue diversification problem, again to the Minister of Energy: can you quantify the problem you are trying to solve? Can you provide data that shows specifically that any investments of taxpayer dollars will be better used to subsidize private investment than they would be funding core services or reducing Alberta's substantial deficit?

The Speaker: The hon. minister.

Ms McCuaig-Boyd: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know, this diversification plan is something that we heard loud and clear from Albertans. They're tired of the boom and bust. When prices are high, everything is good. When prices are low, everybody is getting laid off, and the economy is in jeopardy. So we've launched a diversification plan to do just that. I was just in Houston last week, and I know and saw first-hand how competitive it is. We have a plan, something that hasn't been around since Premier Peter Lougheed. This is a government that's going to lead. We have a plan, and we've put the stake in the ground that Alberta is open for business.

The Speaker: Thank you, hon. minister.

Mr. Clark: Mr. Speaker, given that the Auditor General has recently reported that the APMC, which is the agency which will be responsible for this program, isn't able to prove it is managing the risks associated with Alberta's substantial investment in the Sturgeon refinery and given that this is far from the only area where this government or its agencies have failed to define objectives, track risks, or report either of those to Albertans, again to the Minister of Energy: what specific, measurable objectives will you create for your diversification programs? How will those be reported to Albertans and when?

The Speaker: The hon. minister.

Ms McCuaig-Boyd: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. As we did with PDP 1, it was an open and transparent process. It was a competitive process, and it was reported publicly. We will do the same. We welcome the Auditor General's comments on how we can do better. We're absolutely following up on that. All these endeavours: as we go forward, these processes will be open and transparent. You can check our website. We will be reporting back to Albertans on a regular basis. There will be no secrets.

The Speaker: The Member for Calgary-Hays.

Carbon Levy
(continued)

Mr. McIver: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Given that this NDP government wants Albertans to believe everything is just great again and given that the ATB chief economist recently said that people are making less money and job prospects, when they do exist, are at lower pay and given that Calgary has the second-highest unemployment rate in Canada and Alberta's youth unemployment rate is over 13 per cent, second only to Atlantic Canada, to the Energy minister: with all of this mounting energy against the carbon tax, why will your government not scrap it?

The Speaker: The hon. Minister of Environment and Parks.

Ms Phillips: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Of course, jobs are up. We know that there's more to do, but we've got 90,000 new full-time jobs created over the last year. Of course, RBC is forecasting Alberta to lead the country in job growth in 2018. We're also forecasted to lead the country in GDP growth. Wages are up. Small-business confidence is up. Manufacturing is up. Housing starts are up. Exports are up. We know there's more to do, and that's exactly why we're taking measures to do things like diversifying the economy. But what we won't do is cheer for Alberta to fail as the Conservatives are doing.

Mr. McIver: Well, given, Mr. Speaker, that the minister just demonstrated she seems unaware that 10,000 full-time jobs were lost in Alberta last month and given that she seems also unaware that the carbon tax has failed to produce any of the economic or environmental benefits promised and given that the carbon tax makes it more expensive for all Albertans to heat homes, to fill up cars, and to buy groceries, to that minister: why does the NDP continue to nickel and dime Albertans with a carbon tax that makes everything they buy more expensive and has a net negative environmental impact?

The Speaker: The hon. minister.

Ms Phillips: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's hard to know where to start unpacking that series of statements. So let's just focus on some facts, shall we? The Conference Board of Canada predicts Calgary's economy grew 4.6 per cent last year. Of course, we know that there's more to do, but a good start is where Calgary Economic Development beat their target and has attracted and supported the expansion of 90 companies that have created more than 5,000 jobs in 2017. Compared to a year ago, Calgary created over 28,000 new full-time jobs. Things are looking up. We know there's more to do, and that's why we have a comprehensive diversification strategy in place as well as those pipeline approvals.

2:40

The Speaker: Thank you, hon. minister.

Mr. McIver: Mr. Speaker, given that the minister is a job-loss denier, as she just stated, and given that the Calgary Chamber of commerce reports that 73 per cent of businesses said that their costs will increase because of the carbon tax and given that the Canadian Federation of Independent Business found that 92 per cent of their business owners are not confident in this NDP government and not confident they're committed to increasing the business climate and given that the carbon tax is another obstacle stopping hiring and paying employees, to the minister: why does your government insist upon punishing small businesses through the carbon tax while denying the damage that is so obviously there?

The Speaker: The hon. minister.

Ms Phillips: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Of course, small-business taxes have been cut by a third; \$40 million has gone toward small-business tax reduction already. We've also exempted small and medium-sized Alberta oil and gas facilities from the carbon levy until 2023, saving both large and small oil and gas companies who operate those facilities more than \$2.5 billion over that period. We've also provided between \$1.5 billion and \$2 billion of free carbon offsets to companies investing in methane reduction and invested \$440 million in innovation funding specifically for in situ oil sands facilities. That's all part of the package.

The Speaker: Thank you, hon. minister.

Electricity Power Purchase Arrangement Lawsuit Settlement

Mr. Panda: The government and Enmax have reached an out-of-court settlement over the power purchasing agreement lawsuit. The NDP caused the lawsuit by raising the carbon tax, which invalidated the contracts with the power generators. The settlement means that Enmax will transfer carbon offset credits to the Balancing Pool in exchange for a payment of unknown value. To the Minister of Energy: how much is the government paying to the Balancing Pool to cover the purchase of these carbon offset credits? What's the secret number?

The Speaker: The hon. minister.

Ms McCuaig-Boyd: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know, the government took legal action over two years ago to fight for Albertans' interests. Many parties such as Enmax were involved, but to be clear, that action was against the previous governments. We're pleased to have this final agreement signed off because now it allows us to work together with them and other companies to go forward in our electricity transition, where we're going off coal and into renewables and using natural gas to fill that gap. We're very pleased with that, knowing that we're going to move forward with cleaner air and a better electricity system.

Mr. Panda: Given that the former president of the Balancing Pool, Gary Reynolds, said that the entire situation has been in complete shambles since 2015 and given that the legal action has actually cost consumers hundreds of millions of dollars because the legal action forestalled the Balancing Pool from terminating the PPAs sooner, why hasn't this government taken responsibility for the \$70 million cost to taxpayers each and every month as a result of their mismanagement?

The Speaker: The hon. minister.

Ms McCuaig-Boyd: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know, this agreement does provide for the transfer from Enmax to the Balancing Pool of carbon offset credits as part of their agreement. Many of the details certainly are between themselves and the government. These offset credits are going to allow the Balancing Pool the flexibility in meeting future greenhouse gas emissions compliance obligations. At the end of the day, this is, again, a step we took as government to stand up for Albertans for backroom deals that were arrived at by a previous government. Enmax and other companies were a part of that, and we're glad that all of the agreements are signed so that we can move forward.

The Speaker: Thank you, hon. minister.

Mr. Panda: Mr. Speaker, given that the PPA debacle has cost Albertans millions of dollars because the NDP raised the carbon tax on electrical generation and given that the third-quarter results update shows that the Balancing Pool will need to borrow \$650 billion in debt, which is \$418 million more than the budget, will the minister stand in this House and tell Albertans: how much is the total cost of this NDP PPA debacle?

The Speaker: The hon. minister.

Ms McCuaig-Boyd: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again, we took action on a broken system that we inherited from the previous government. We're pleased that this final agreement has been reached because we are taking action on climate change. We're taking action on fixing a broken system, and now we can work with all the companies to go forward and create a system that Albertans deserve, one that's stable and predictable and, you know, provides predictability for month-to-month bills and not the spikes that we used to see before.

Mr. Kenney: Mr. Speaker, given that one government cannot sue a former government – it's called the Crown; it's not divisible – and given that the government just signed an out-of-court settlement with Enmax and given that the minister has refused to tell us how much it is, I will offer the minister another opportunity to be forthcoming with Albertans. How many tens or hundreds of millions of tax dollars have we lost in this secret court settlement?

The Speaker: The hon. minister.

Ms McCuaig-Boyd: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know, with other agreements as with this one, the agreements are between the government and each of the companies. The broad strokes of this one is that it involves turning back some of the carbon offset credits to the Balancing Pool. But at the end of the day, each agreement is different because each company is different. At the end of the day, we're all going to work together to create a new system from one that was broken, one that we inherited from the previous government, as we go on to a capacity market, renewables, all the different things and creating a more stable system. We're now free to work with all these companies on that. I'm pleased with this arrangement.

The Speaker: Thank you, hon. minister.

Mr. Kenney: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think this will now be the fifth opportunity for the minister to answer the question given that she has not done so yet. This is a matter of clear public interest for Alberta taxpayers on the floor of this Legislature to learn how much the government has just signed away to a power company that it sued and sued wrongfully. So will the minister please disclose: how big is the cheque that it's writing to Enmax from Alberta taxpayers? Will she disclose that, or will it stay a secret?

The Speaker: The hon. minister.

Ms McCuaig-Boyd: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I mentioned, as with all the other companies that we made arrangements with, this one is between the company and the government. At the end of the day, we're pleased that this agreement has been reached. It's been a long two years. Again, this whole court thing was because of backroom deals from previous government, who set up a system of volatility that was hard on Albertans, hard on people's pocketbooks. This is something we are fixing along with our new electricity grid.

Mr. Kenney: Mr. Speaker, given that the government cannot spend public money without the authorization of the Legislature and given that it has to be voted supply to write the cheque to Enmax, Alberta taxpayers and members of this place have a right to know. How big is the bill, and will this minister take responsibility for the fiasco that has cost Alberta taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars? Come clean. How much is the cost? How many hundreds of millions has this government lost us?

The Speaker: The hon. minister.

Ms McCuaig-Boyd: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Absolutely, there will be a budget that all of us will discuss after the 22nd, I believe, when it will be put forward. We'll have opportunity to discuss a number of matters and also with estimates.

But today, again, this is an arrangement that has been reached between Enmax and ourselves. It allows us now that we're complete with all the agreements that we can move on with working with coal communities. We can work with transitioning to renewables and natural gas. We can work on creating a system that's going to be stable, without spikes, and predictable for consumers.

The Speaker: Thank you, hon. minister.

The Member for West Yellowhead.

Geothermal Project in Hinton

Mr. Rosendahl: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Hinton geothermal project will be a unique opportunity to provide heat to public buildings in the town of Hinton. This initiative will be the first in Canada to use one or more repurposed oil and gas wells to heat buildings. To the Minister of Energy: how does this Hinton geothermal project fit into Alberta's climate leadership plan?

The Speaker: The hon. minister.

2:50

Ms McCuaig-Boyd: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you to the member for the question. Certainly, there's a lot of excitement in Alberta about geothermal energy. When we did our Renewable Electricity Act, we included geothermal for that reason, its very low emissions. With more than 80,000 inactive wells here in Alberta, we have an opportunity to look at how we might repurpose some of those wells for geothermal. We're very well positioned, and certainly in the member's riding are extremely well positioned, to look at those higher thermal gradients. There is a particular project in that area that we're looking at very closely to learn from.

The Speaker: Thank you, hon. minister.

First supplemental.

Mr. Rosendahl: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Given the support for this project from municipal leaders, including the mayor of Hinton, to the same minister: what does the funding of this project mean for the local community?

The Speaker: The hon. minister.

Ms McCuaig-Boyd: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know, projects like this will focus on how we can make life better for all Albertans. This is a project that we can learn from, look at how it can work in a municipality, how we can use deep geothermal resources to power our municipalities. We're very excited to watch and see how the community of Hinton manages this and how we can learn to help other communities in Alberta.

The Speaker: Second supplemental.

Mr. Rosendahl: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Given the investment in the project by Western Economic Diversification as well as the government of Alberta and Alberta Innovates what does this project mean for Alberta?

The Speaker: The hon. minister.

Ms McCuaig-Boyd: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know, the fact that we got Western Economic Diversification's interest in this as well shows that it's not just good for Alberta, but it's good for Canada. This is the first type of project like it in all of Canada, where we're going to use operational oil and gas wells to harness heat. As I've said, there's huge potential in learning from this project. We are supporting it because this is a good project that'll help us deal with our climate leadership goals. It's helping the folks of Hinton. It's going to help all of Alberta when we learn from it and are able to move that around to other areas.

Thank you.

The Speaker: Thank you, hon. minister.

Hon. members, we'll proceed with Members' Statements in 30 seconds.

Members' Statements

International Women's Day

Cortes-Vargas: On March 8 we recognized International Women's Day. This year's theme is Press for Progress.

Since the 1800s women have been campaigning for women's rights, yet women are still not equally represented in corporate boardrooms, decision-making tables, and public office. The women that have fought to be treated as equals are our role models as we move forward. We are seeing the paradigm shifts in movements like Me Too, Time's Up. The women's marches speak out about the injustices endured predominantly by women for far too long.

With these changing tides and as we move towards equity, we know that governments must and should respond accordingly. Our government stands with women and families in the prevention and elimination of sexual violence by providing operational funding to sexual assault centres. Our government stands with women in lower income situations by addressing the gender wage gap and increasing minimum wage. Our government stands with women in business when we provide grants to support women entrepreneurs as they take risks and grow our economy.

We see the collective effort to support women in overcoming barriers in the workplace when chambers of commerce like the one in Strathcona county provide workshops to build capacity so that we can address inequities in the workplace. I am proud to see this kind of work being done in Strathcona county and across Alberta.

Lastly, but perhaps most importantly, we are reducing the barriers that keep women from leadership positions. This is necessary to see the aforementioned progress. As such and as the youngest female ever elected in Alberta's Legislature, my story provides hope for others that want to see more diverse representation at decision-making tables. Whether you are young, racialized, female, or part of any other minority group, don't let that hold you back. Press for progress.

Former Member for Fort McMurray-Conklin

Mr. van Dijken: Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to a well-liked, caring, hard-working, true Albertan who rose to prominence, served

Alberta and conservatives, and is now taking a well-deserved and earned leave. I'm speaking about the former Member for Fort McMurray-Conklin, Brian Jean.

After having served the residents of Fort McMurray as their Member of Parliament for nearly a decade, Brian rose to prominence in the 2015 Wildrose Party leadership contest, winning the leadership and subsequently winning 22 seats in the snap general election. Right away Brian knew that a political realignment needed to happen with Alberta's conservative parties. The theme of the party's fall convention that year was Unite the Right People. His dancing shoes were on, and the dance began to unite conservatives at the grassroots level.

Life is never a straight and easy path. Along the way there are personal tragedies that take on greater significance when a person is in the public eye. The death of Brian's son Mikey during the 2015 leadership race drew attention to problems within Alberta's health care system. The loss of Brian's house during the Fort McMurray wildfire showed just how vulnerable even our most prominent citizens are to forces that get beyond human control.

Brian was in the middle of it all and wore the mantle of an everyday Albertan experiencing great personal loss with dignity and grace. Brian's Facebook following exceeded the daily average print and digital circulation of any Alberta newspaper, providing a very powerful platform to communicate to Albertans. He was concerned about Albertans, and they were concerned about him.

Eventually Brian found his dance partner to unite conservatives, but he also found a life partner, marrying Kim Michelutti in the summer of 2016.

Brian, on behalf of your caucus colleagues, thank you for your unlimited sacrifice, dedication, and service to this province, and may God bless you and Kim in all your future endeavours.

Challenge in the Rockies 2018

Mr. Rosendahl: Mr. Speaker, today I rise to talk about the fifth annual Challenge in the Rockies. This fun hockey experience takes place in Hinton and Jasper this year from March 29 to April 1.

The challenge is an inclusive event which allows all youth to participate, from pond hockey, minor hockey, shinny, and ringette, plus any new and returning skaters. The challenge enhances youth sport while helping with fundraising for future programming and other community nonprofits. This affair is a testament to the dedication of the organizers and more than 200 volunteers who support the athletes, families, and coaches participating in venues in both Hinton and Jasper.

Over five days of hockey, with teams from all over Alberta, Saskatchewan, and B.C., more than 600 players play in close to 100 games. This is not a tournament. Players aged four to 18 face off on the ice, with a focus on physical literacy and staying active. The challenge is a Chiefs event hosted by the Hanson brothers. This year we'll be welcoming alumni from the Edmonton Oilers and honouring the late Dave Semenko. All players will be wearing his number on their jerseys.

Over 2,500 people converge in the area, gathering more than a quarter million dollars in revenue for the local hotels and close to a million dollars in business for the region's economy.

I would like to thank the organizers, volunteers, and more than 25 sponsors that make this event possible. Come on out to West Yellowhead and join us in the Challenge in the Rockies from March 29 to April 1 in Hinton and Jasper.

Thank you.

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

Women's Political Engagement

Mrs. Aheer: Mr. Speaker, last Thursday marked International Women's Day. Following a year of unprecedented upswing in political engagement on a global level, I took a little bit of time to reflect on the role that women have played in shaping and driving the conversation.

In the last year women started an international cultural shift with the Me Too and Time's Up movements. Millions of women have bravely shared their stories, prompting a fundamental cultural shift in the way that our societies perceive sexual assault and harassment. This movement gave millions of women a strong and united voice and politically engaged those that may not have traditionally taken an active role. We are so hopeful that this will also lead to an upswing in women running for public office.

There are already many amazing, competent women holding key positions around boardroom tables, women rallying across the world and standing up for what they believe in, and the UCP wants to encourage and see more. Our party is built on principles of inclusivity and diversity, and we want everyone to feel this momentum. All Albertans have a home in our party. Every woman from the home to the boardroom should feel engaged and valued and that they have a voice.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot stress the importance of a continuation of this engagement and its momentum. Despite all of the accomplishments and the momentous past year we still have a long way to go. I know that I feel extremely blessed to live in this country, ruled by democracy, that allows the right to elect our representatives.

3:00

Let us be the ones that inspire increased political engagement, to see more women running for public office. The Member for Airdrie and I are honoured to work with these gentlemen, whom we work with every day. We honour each other's unique gifts and talents and what we all bring to the table. As a woman I feel empowered to speak my mind every day; you can ask them. Let's continue to inspire citizens to be more involved in our political process, to speak out, to get involved.

To all of the powerful women and men out there that are part of the change: thank you, and let's keep it going.

Mr. Mason: Mr. Speaker, I'd request unanimous consent of the House to extend Orders of the Day until the completion of the Routine.

[Unanimous consent granted]

The Speaker: The hon. Member for Fort Saskatchewan-Vegreville.

Volunteer Firefighters

Mrs. Littlewood: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just a few weeks ago I joined the Beaver Emergency Services Commission and Fire Chief Dave Oleksyn for a Thursday night training session in Tofield. After talking with the team about occupational health and safety amendments and the changing communications equipment, we got to work. After trying to pull on 45 pounds of gear in 90 seconds, which is much harder than it looks, we went to the training area to practise transferring a person from the rooftop to the ground using only a ladder and ropes. Then, to practise strength and precision, we played a game of Jenga using a 20-pound piece of equipment similar to the jaws of life, where we pulled two-by-fours out of the tower, grasping each piece out of the middle and – yes, you guessed it, Mr. Speaker – putting it on top. It was exhausting.

This visit was important to me, Mr. Speaker, because volunteer firefighters are at the heart of every rural Alberta community. They protect critical infrastructure, control fires, clean up environmental spills, provide emergency first responder services, are often the first on scene at major vehicle collisions, and, when trained, can deliver life-saving naloxone. These brave men and women commit countless hours to training and answer the call while we sleep soundly in our beds.

But, Mr. Speaker, their bravery comes at a cost. Exposure to these traumatic events can result in major consequences to their mental and psychological health as well as increased rates of cancer from exposure. That is why ensuring our first responders have PTSD coverage is so important. That's why I'm so proud of our government's recent announcement to expand workers' compensation benefits for firefighters who contract ovarian and cervical cancer and to reduce the minimum exposure period from 20 years to 10 for compensation for testicular cancer.

Equipping our firefighters properly through training grants, accessing support for communications equipment, and legislation that will better protect all Albertans in an emergency is something I will continue to fight for, Mr. Speaker, because we owe it to them.

Heart Health and Emergency Services

Mr. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, there is something I'd like to get off my chest and get right to the heart of the matter. Six months ago I had emergency heart surgery. This is what happened. Seventeen days prior to that I had chest pains scary enough that I asked my wife to take me to the hospital. My blood pressure was just about off the charts, but through the night the good folks at the Wainwright hospital both monitored my chest pains and got my blood pressure under control. Enzymes that would indicate a heart attack were low, but they knew something was going on.

Ten days later the next step consisted of an echocardiogram, which showed a birth defect, revealing a bicuspid aortic valve, stenosis, and an alarming 5.4-centimetre aneurysm. Once the technician saw the results, she immediately contacted the hospital, came back into the room, and told me to go straight to the hospital: "Do not go home. Don't go for coffee. Go to the doctors; they want to see you right away." At that point the ball was rolling towards surgery.

Over the next couple of days I underwent a CT scan, an angiogram, another echocardiogram, and numerous chest X-rays while constantly being connected to a monitor. By Monday all the tests were done, and on Thursday I was first up for surgery. After the surgery they found that the aneurysm had actually grown to almost seven centimetres, about the size of a baseball, and as a result they told me afterwards that I had had about two days left to live.

Heart health awareness is something we need to be cognizant about all year round. Heart attack signs can include pressure, tightness, pain, or a squeezing, aching sensation in your chest and arms that spreads to your neck, jaw, or your back. Symptoms may include nausea, indigestion, heartburn or abdominal pain, shortness of breath, cold sweat, fatigue, lightheadedness or sudden dizziness. If you think that you're having these things, get checked immediately for signs of a heart attack.

Mr. Speaker, unlike the Tin Man from *The Wizard of Oz*, I didn't need a new heart. A big thank you to the doctors and nurses and staff at the Mazankowski and the Wainwright hospital for the great care that they gave me.

Thank you.

The Speaker: Hon. member, I think we could all listen very carefully to your message, and by the way, on behalf of all of us, it's nice to have you back.

Mr. Taylor: Thank you.

Presenting Petitions

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

Dr. Swann: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my honour to present a petition on behalf of 3,224 Albertans. The petition seeks to urge the Alberta government to allow rehabilitation sites to accept all Alberta wildlife to allow rehabilitation of any injured, diseased, or orphaned wildlife that is not fully capable of surviving in the wild. Omitting sections 4 to 8 of schedule A would be preferable as it is what prohibits the rehabilitation of select species.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Tabling Returns and Reports

Dr. Swann: To follow up again, Mr. Speaker, these very energetic activists I introduced earlier collected another approximately 14,000 signatures from around the world calling on the government to review its policies related to large-animal rehabilitation.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Hon. members, I have one tabling this afternoon. I table five copies of the March 9, 2018, memo and attachments to all members regarding the Oral Question Period and Members' Statements rotations.

Thank you.

The Member for Bonnyville-Cold Lake.

Mr. Cyr: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to table five copies of a regional crime survey that has been done by the MD of Bonnyville; 61.4 per cent of the respondents have confirmed themselves as victims of rural crime.

The Speaker: Barrhead-Morinville-Westlock.

Mr. van Dijken: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have five copies to table of excerpts from Alberta Transportation's project administration manual, October 2006, that outline the developer-pay policy of the government.

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

Mrs. Aheer: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to table the requisite number of copies of a third report that was suppressed from the research committee by Alberta Energy and obtained under FOIP by the Official Opposition. This report is entitled Resource Management & Environmental Stewardship: Integrated Research Strategy, Final Report, February 2, 2016.

Mr. Panda: Mr. Speaker, over the weekend I happened to meet a patriotic Canadian in Vancouver. Her name is Vivian Krause. She did extensive research and produced this report, which is an exclusive summary and introduction and conclusion about the campaign targeting the oil sands. They call it the tar sands campaign. There is lots of good information in this. I'm sure the members in this Chamber will benefit from reading it.

The Speaker: Thank you. I'm sure they will, hon. member.

Mr. Panda: Thank you.

3:10

Orders of the Day

The Speaker: I recognize the Government House Leader.

Mr. Mason: Thanks very much, Mr. Speaker. I request the unanimous consent of the House to waive Standing Order 8(1) to proceed to consideration of Government Motion 2.

[Unanimous consent granted]

Government Motions

The Speaker: The hon. Premier.

Trans Mountain Pipeline

2. Ms Notley moved:

Be it resolved that the Legislative Assembly support the government of Alberta's fight on behalf of Albertans' interests to ensure the lawfully approved Trans Mountain pipeline expansion is built, and be it further resolved that the Legislative Assembly call for the federal government to continue to take all necessary legal steps in support of the pipeline's construction, and be it further resolved that the Legislative Assembly reaffirm its support for the Trans Mountain pipeline expansion as a key component of Alberta's energy future.

Ms Notley: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'm privileged to stand today and move Motion 2.

Mr. Speaker, I'm proud to stand before you today to sponsor this motion, that is, quite frankly, of the utmost importance to every Albertan and indeed to every Canadian. It's a motion that is aimed at sending a clear and unequivocal message to the country: Albertans are united; Albertans are resolved; Albertans are determined. Together Albertans will secure our place as a world energy leader, open up new markets for our energy products, end the land lock, and build the Trans Mountain pipeline.

Now, before I move into the substance of my remarks, I want to start by welcoming everybody back to the Legislature. And to the new Leader of the Opposition: in 35 seconds I wasn't able to fully welcome him, but I do so now. I know that we will have a constructive and vigorous debate over the next many months. But whatever our differences may be, everyone in this Chamber shares a deep love for Alberta and is united in our conviction that Alberta's best days lie ahead.

Friends, we gather today at a very critical juncture in Alberta's history, perhaps one of the most consequential in recent memory. Alberta is just coming through a very difficult and deep recession. Three years ago, owing to a dramatic collapse in oil prices, tens of thousands of Albertans lost their jobs, businesses were shuttered, and many families struggled to keep their homes and make ends meet. Fighting this recession has been the central preoccupation of my government since being sworn into office.

We have moved on all fronts. With interest rates at historic lows, we invested more in modern infrastructure, putting thousands of Albertans to work on projects like the Calgary cancer centre, highways, roads, and transit. We cut the small-business tax to help businesses cope, and we raised the minimum wage to help our lowest paid workers put food on the table. We expanded access to capital for Alberta business, and because an oil price collapse is no excuse to sacrifice our children's future or the health of our loved ones, we protected vital public services that working people depend on. We expanded the child tax credit. We piloted and expanded affordable daycare. We expanded skills training and froze tuition. We cut school fees and built hundreds of new schools. Mr. Speaker, we took these and many other measures as part of a deliberate and considered plan to absorb as much of the shock as possible from the oil price collapse and to put our economy back on stable footing.

Today I'm pleased to report that things are looking up in Alberta. Ninety thousand new jobs were created in the last year, almost every economic indicator is headed in the right direction, and Alberta has the fastest growing economy in the country. Now, are we there yet? No. No, we are not, and we won't be until every Albertan feels the security that comes from a meaningful economic recovery. But I do believe that we're on the right track. With our economy growing, we're taking action to expand and secure a lasting recovery for working people, a recovery that isn't as vulnerable to boom-and-bust cycles in the way that we have been plagued for many generations, a recovery that is more resilient and more diversified, a recovery where every Albertan is lifted up, a recovery that is built to last.

Mr. Speaker, to build that recovery, it's critical that we diversify our energy economy and our energy markets. Here, too, our government has taken aggressive and forward-looking action.

Through the climate leadership plan we've taken steps to spark unprecedented investment in renewable energy. Through initiatives such as the petrochemical diversification program we are incenting billions of dollars in new investment to get more jobs and more value out of our energy products, and with Bill 1, the Energy Diversification Act, which will be debated in this House in the coming days, we are taking action to secure our place as one of the world's energy leaders.

Together, the actions taken to modernize and diversify our energy sector and to tackle climate change have put Alberta at the forefront of energy leadership, and they are why after years of failure Alberta took another major step forward with the approval of the Trans Mountain pipeline, which brings us to the motion that we are discussing today.

Mr. Speaker, Albertans know well the arguments for the Trans Mountain pipeline, but I'm compelled to make them again today in an effort to inform our fellow Canadians again. Because Alberta is landlocked, we are forced to sell our energy products to one customer, the United States, at a discounted price. This geographic fact of life is costing the Canadian economy billions of dollars and tens of thousands of jobs.

Just a few weeks ago Scotiabank reported that that lack of pipeline access to tidewater will cost the Canadian economy \$10.7 billion this year alone, and a new U of C study concludes that the Alberta government is losing \$7.2 billion per year in oil revenues. Think about how absurd that is for just a moment. In Alberta, Canada is home to some of the world's most abundant energy resources, resources that contribute to the well-being of every community in the country. As I like to say, there is not a school, not a hospital, not a road, not a bus, a bicycle lane, or a port anywhere in this country that does not owe something to Alberta's energy resources.

At the same time, the world needs more energy products, but the world can't buy them from us because we won't let them. Quite frankly, it's maddening. I'm hard-pressed to think of another country that so willingly handcuffs its economy in this way, certainly not countries like Norway, which has built one of the world's most prosperous, healthy, equal, environmentally responsible societies in the world using its abundant oil reserves. But in Canada we have been content to sell only to the U.S., take a discounted price, and let the future take care of itself. It makes absolutely no sense. It's an abdication of our responsibility to each other and to future generations, and it must change.

Mr. Speaker, the vast majority of Canadians understand this. The vast majority of Canadians want to see it change, and when this government was elected, the cycle of failure and recrimination that has characterized pipeline politics for too long in this province and in this country began to change. Albertans came together from all

walks of life to help chart a path forward. In partnership with industry, workers, and community leaders we established the climate leadership plan, the most far-reaching response to climate change anywhere in North America. We phased out pollution, invested in energy efficiency, and reinvested in an economy-wide price on carbon into energy diversification. We also capped emissions. This is very important for all Canadians to understand. Because Alberta capped oil sands emissions, a new pipeline to tidewater does not – does not – increase carbon emissions. We also lobbied Ottawa a lot in public and behind the scenes, and we reached out to our fellow Canadians to explain why the new pipeline was so important for our shared future. The change paid off.

In November 2016 Ottawa approved the Trans Mountain pipeline, a historic accomplishment for our province and the country, for which all Albertans deserve credit. At every step along the way our government has made the case to Canadians. In British Columbia I reminded audiences of how important the oil sands are to their economy. It's not all about new condos and inflated house prices. Sometimes economies look different than that.

3:20

In 2013, 44,000 people who lived and paid taxes in B.C. actually worked in Alberta, most of those people in the energy sector. Those British Columbians earned more than \$2 billion, most of which was spent supporting their local economy back in B.C. I spoke about the community benefit agreements that will provide millions of dollars for local priorities and the additional property taxes that will include the local governments of B.C. along the way in the pipelines. I reminded them that getting their energy exports off railroads into modern, well-regulated, well-designed, and closely supervised pipelines would be safer and much more secure. Put another way, our products are going to be shipped one way or another. We can either ship them less safely by rail at a much smaller return to marginally interested customers, or we can ship them safely by pipeline to people who want our product and get much better value for every barrel that we sell.

I also reminded them that every Canadian, including every Albertan, cherishes Canada's coastline and wants to see it protected because it's not only British Columbia's coast; it's Canada's coast. It's also Canada's gateway to the Pacific. Vancouver is one of the world's great port cities, and the people who manage trade through the port are experts in safety and protecting marine ecosystems. Indeed, every year thousands – thousands – of commercial ships travel the coast safely and reliably. In fact, B.C. has been asking for years, for decades, for more resources to make sure that that level of safety is actually increased, and for years that request to the federal government fell on deaf ears, so it bears repeating that with the conversations around the Trans Mountain pipeline, the federal government has also committed \$1.5 billion in ocean protection programs to B.C. This improves the safety of shipping for everybody, of all shipments all along the western marine area. In fact, the completion of the Trans Mountain pipeline actually improves and increases marine safety off our west coast.

I've also reminded all Canadians just how significant Alberta's contribution is to the Canadian federation. One fact stands out, and everywhere that I have gone and given this speech, it is the one that often catches the most attention, particularly in other parts of the country. Mr. Speaker, there are four net contributors to the Canadian federation: Ontario, Saskatchewan, Alberta, and B.C. On a per capita basis the good people of Saskatchewan contribute about \$554 every year to our country beyond what they receive back through federal programs. In Ontario that number on a per capita basis is an average of \$650 per person. In B.C. – great job – an

average of \$886 per person. But in Alberta every man, woman, and child contributes an average of \$5,148 each to our country, six times more per person. All in, Alberta contributes \$22 billion more per year to Ottawa than we receive in return even after the effects of the oil downturn and the recession.

Mr. Speaker, I did not make this point to shame other provinces. I made it again and again to drive one simple point home, and that is this: when Alberta is strong, Canada is strong. When Alberta is working, Canada is working. And when some try to harm Alberta's economy, they are also harming themselves. So it's not actually a hard sell, we discovered. The vast majority of Canadians want Alberta to succeed, and that includes many of our fellow citizens – I would go so far as to say most of our fellow citizens and neighbours – in B.C. It's close, but it's a small majority.

Just let me quote a few British Columbians who have sent us their thoughts over the past few weeks. "I fully support you & your government's stand for the pipeline through B.C. I was born in B.C. & have always lived in our wonderful province. We all need fuel for our cars & need to heat our homes. Keep up the fight." That was from Brenda at Qualicum Beach, B.C. Another one: "We all want to, and can, protect the environment and have well engineered and safe pipelines to bring oil to tidewater and across the oceans. As BC and Canadian citizens we need to get on with supporting our energy industry." That's from Don in Delta, B.C. Finally, Cheryl from Invermere: "We must get our oil to tidewater so we can get top price for it, in order to help pay for health care, education, roads, infrastructure and all the extras that Canadians enjoy."

Mr. Speaker, these are just a few of the hundreds and hundreds of testimonials that we received. Canadians understand the need for a new pipeline, but sadly the government of British Columbia appears not to.

Up until recently B.C.'s case was being heard in the Federal Court of Appeal, the appropriate place for pipeline opponents to be heard. A ruling is expected soon, and I'm confident that Alberta and Canada will prevail. When that happens, what should also happen is that the dispute should end. Canada's decision should be upheld, and we can carry on with construction. But the new B.C. government in coalition with the Green Party has now determined that it is willing to use any means necessary, including unconstitutional ones, to harass and delay the Trans Mountain pipeline.

Let's be clear. That's a change in their strategy. That fact became clear on January 30 of this year. On January 30 B.C. released what's now known as point 5, a blatantly unconstitutional attempt to limit what flows through a federally regulated pipeline. I want to pause for a moment to reflect on what the B.C. government was actually saying with point 5. In essence, B.C. was saying that it had a right to unilaterally overturn a federal government decision made in the national interest; that it did not care that that decision came after the most exhaustive environmental review and consultation process in Canadian history; that it was not bothered by the fact that it would damage the entire Canadian economy, threaten the country's ability to meet its climate change commitments, and cost the economy tens of billions of dollars; that it was happy to pretend that B.C. is its own country, free to make up its own laws to serve its short-term political interests.

To say that this was disappointing was an understatement. This is not how our country was built to operate. It is political game playing at its worst and the most serious of consequences for the livelihoods of working Canadians. At the end of the day, that is who we all are here to serve.

So it demanded swift retaliatory action. Within days of B.C.'s actions Alberta did five things. First, we shut down electricity sales to British Columbia, talks that could have meant up to \$500 million

per year for them. Second, we formed a Market Access Task Force of experts and notable Canadians to give advice. Third, we banned B.C. wine from our shelves. Fourth, we threatened escalating action if B.C. didn't back down on point 5. Finally, we escalated our Canada-wide public education campaign and asked Canadians to show their support for Alberta's position, which tens of thousands of Canadians have since done. I want to pause for a moment to thank Canadians for their support. Albertans know that we are not alone in this fight, and that means a very great deal.

Mr. Speaker, if B.C. didn't see Alberta's response coming, they really should have. You can't pick a fight with Alberta and expect us to walk away. We will act to defend our interests.

A few days after we imposed the wine ban, B.C. did back down. They shelved point 5, and they said that it would go to the courts to see if they have the right to overturn the Constitution. Interesting strategy. For that reason I decided to suspend – suspend – the B.C. wine ban with a clear warning that it would come back if B.C. continues its campaign of harassment and delay. Let me say that the support Albertans showed for the wine ban was overwhelming, and I thank them for it, including the Leader of the Opposition. To retaliate against our fellow Canadians is not an easy decision or one we take lightly. We don't want to hurt B.C. businesses or B.C. workers. We don't want to put at risk the deep economic connections that bind our two provinces.

Let me be clear. Albertans don't want a trade war, but as I've said from the beginning, we won't shy away from doing what is needed. If anyone was confused on that point, let there now be no doubt. We will protect our economy, our workers, our made-in-Alberta climate plan, and our rights in Confederation.

Mr. Speaker, in proposing point 5, B.C. crossed a fundamental line, and it put its cards on the table. Not only did they pick a fight with Alberta; they picked a fight with Canada. In doing so, they took it upon themselves to change the rules of engagement.

As Premier I've reflected on this at great length. From my very first day in this office I together with my colleagues and all Albertans have worked to break the land lock. Every step of the way we have played by the rules, and we have pulled our weight. Our climate leadership plan is second to none. Our energy industry is a world leader in environmental innovation, and it is getting better every day. Our energy workers are the best-trained energy workers anywhere, and Trans Mountain was subject to one of the most exhaustive environmental reviews in Canadian history.

3:30

So how does one respond when a partner in Confederation says that the rules don't seem to apply to them? Let me be clear. I love this country too much to play political games that threaten it. As Premier I have a profound responsibility to uphold its institutions and to act in its best interests. I take that responsibility very seriously. It's a trust that I and everyone on this side in government hold dear. But as the B.C. government's approach to Trans Mountain has changed, so too has ours. The wine ban was but one tactic in a larger strategy that we are executing. In consultation with our Market Access Task Force, my cabinet, and Albertans the government is actively preparing additional measures that can be deployed judiciously and strategically to make sure that the pipeline is built. We're preparing a public awareness campaign aimed at all Canadians to ensure that the loudest and most extreme pipeline opponents are not allowed to dominate the conversation.

We're working closely with Ottawa to align our legal strategies to expedite permitting and construction. The federal government has this power now and must act on it. Invoking additional legal powers such as section 92(10)(c) is not needed on a pipeline that already falls under federal jurisdiction. That section of the

Constitution is designed only to apply national interest status to a project that is completely encapsulated within a province. The federal government already has the power, and the issue is to make them use it. The power exists, and the federal government must assert it to ensure that a decision that it made in the national interest is carried out in the national interest. We seek the support of all Members of this Legislative Assembly to join us in that call to Ottawa.

Finally, in last week's Speech from the Throne our government said that if it becomes necessary, we will invoke similar legislation to that which Peter Lougheed used to defend Alberta's interests almost 40 years ago. Mr. Speaker, in this session we will introduce legislation that will give Alberta the ability to control the supply of oil and gas in order to ensure that we maximize access to markets and benefits for Albertans. It's no secret that I do not relish taking this action, but I have determined that at this moment, under these specific circumstances that we face, in particular an intransigent B.C. government that has shown its willingness to act outside the law and is intent on a strategy of harassment and delay, it is in Alberta's strategic interest to put it on the table.

Let me be clear. Though some want to cut off gas to B.C. this second, for this government it's not a first but a last resort. After all, it will hurt working people on both sides of the Alberta and B.C. border. In the Lower Mainland and around B.C. life is already expensive enough. Affordability is already a huge challenge for people living in B.C.'s Lower Mainland. Two or three dollar a litre gas will cause real hardship and pain for regular working people who are just trying to go about their lives, and here in Alberta we, too, would have to make difficult sacrifices. But if it becomes necessary to help build a pipeline that will benefit, ultimately, all those working people for generations to come, then this government will act.

Mr. Speaker, let me conclude my remarks. As I said at the outset, we are gathered at a historic juncture in Alberta's history. In an uncertain and increasingly volatile world this province is a beacon of hope. We have built a democratic, prosperous, and inclusive society in a beautiful, if at times inhospitable, environment. Alberta stands as a tribute to the idea that we can accomplish so much more working together than we can working alone.

That is why the motion before the Assembly today transcends political divides. It is why today we must speak not as partisans but as citizens committed to our province, our country, and to the larger good of all Albertans and all Canadians. I urge all members to support this motion and stand united. Albertans are counting on us. Canadians are counting on us. Together we will overcome the land lock. Together we will secure Alberta's economic future. Together we will build on the work of generations to build a more hopeful, inclusive, optimistic province and country. My fellow Albertans, my fellow Canadians, together we will get this pipeline built.

I thank the members for taking the time to listen to my remarks. I urge you to support this motion, and I look forward to everyone's contribution to this debate.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. [interjections]

The Speaker: Order, please.

The Leader of Her Majesty's Official Opposition.

Mr. Kenney: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is indeed an honour for me to rise to deliver my first speech in this august Chamber although I will reserve the custom of a maiden speech until my response to the Speech from the Throne tomorrow. Let me begin simply by once again saying to all hon. members from both sides that I am honoured to be serving with you. As the rookie I begin by

recognizing that I have an awful lot to learn in this place, and I look forward to doing so.

Mr. Speaker, let me also again thank my constituents of Calgary-Lougheed for the tremendous honour of representing them, being their voice in this Legislature, and my colleagues for their confidence to serve them as Leader of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition.

Mr. Speaker, I'd also like to thank the hon. the Premier for the opportunity to have this debate in this Legislature. The Premier will recall that I wrote to her several weeks ago proposing that the Legislature be called into session shortly following the decision of the NDP government in British Columbia to seek to delay and perhaps kill the proposed Trans Mountain pipeline expansion. My proposal to the Premier at the time was that it would be, I think, helpful to her case as our head of government and to Alberta's interests to demonstrate how we could come together across party lines to put the province's interests ahead of our own respective partisan interests. I regret that I have not yet received a response to my letter. I'm sure it's on the way. Perhaps it got lost in the mail. But I am glad that the Premier has accepted our proposal, in principle, of having a motion before this place.

I did propose in that letter, Mr. Speaker, that I would be willing as Leader of the Official Opposition to work with the government and the other parties and independents to negotiate in good faith a hopefully unanimous resolution that could reflect this Legislature, speak on behalf of Albertans of all political persuasions. To that end, the Official Opposition House Leader, I believe, had discussions with his hon. government counterpart late last week and suggested some constructive amendments – I think three, to be precise – that in our judgment would make this motion more likely to speak for a broad spectrum of Albertans. We would ask the government to give fair consideration to those motions. I think the key thing here is that we all operate in good faith. Let's be blunt. All of us in this place are elected officials. We all have our own partisan and political interests, but at a moment like this it serves us all well, it serves our constituents well if we are prepared to put some water in our wine.

We certainly are prepared to accept the bulk of this motion, which I read into the record. Moved by the hon. the Premier that

the Legislative Assembly support the government of Alberta's fight on behalf of Albertans' interests to ensure the lawfully approved Trans Mountain pipeline expansion is built and be it further resolved that the Legislative Assembly call for the federal government to continue to take all necessary legal steps in support of the pipeline's construction and be it further resolved that the Legislative Assembly reaffirm its support for the Trans Mountain pipeline expansion as a key component of Alberta's energy future.

We broadly agree. The Official Opposition broadly agrees with the pith and substance of the motion, Mr. Speaker. However, we do have some concerns. While we certainly salute the Premier's recent approach to responding to her New Democrat allies in Victoria, we believe the government should be going further and should be taking stronger measures and being more forceful in asking for federal intervention. While we support the measures, essentially our position is that the measures taken by the government to date are necessary but not sufficient.

Therefore, we would humbly request that the government consider an amendment to the first paragraph in the Premier's motion to say, "that the Legislative Assembly support the efforts of the government to fight on behalf of Albertans' interests" because we broadly support the strategy, but we think more should be done.

3:40

Secondly, we would like to propose, as will be done by my hon. colleague the Official Opposition House Leader, that the second

paragraph call explicitly for the government of Canada to invoke the so-called declaratory power of the Constitution Act, section 92(10)(c), which allows the federal government to declare a project as being in the general interest, a provision that has been employed some 400 times in the history of Confederation.

Now, admittedly, the declaratory power has not been used in recent history, but these are not normal times, Mr. Speaker. In recent Canadian history we have not had one provincial government proposing to violate the Constitution, directly undermine federal jurisdiction, in this case over the regulation of interprovincial pipelines, and attack the economic union while also undermining this country's vital economic interests.

Some have referred to the declaratory power, section 92(10)(c), as, quote, the nuclear option. Well, I think it's time, Mr. Speaker, that this Legislature and government call upon Prime Minister Trudeau's government to demonstrate that it is serious about defending Canada as an economic union, defending our Constitution, defending the principle of interprovincial free trade, and defending the country's long-term economic interests by removing any doubt about the federal jurisdiction to override purported B.C. regulations or statutes seeking to block the Trans Mountain pipeline expansion.

Those are two of the amendments that we will put forward formally following my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, let me back up, though, and say that I agree with much of the Premier's remarks. Alberta is blessed to have some of the world's greatest energy reserves. Countries all around the globe envy the position, the blessings of nature that we as Albertans have inherited and developed, and that development has been central to our economic history and our prosperity. Alberta possesses the third-largest oil reserves on earth after Venezuela and Saudi Arabia, before Russia and other countries. If we were able to commodify those reserves at today's current global price of slightly over \$60 a barrel, they would represent a current global market value of some \$11 trillion. Now, that's a lot of money. I don't even think the hon. Finance minister could spend that much although I'm sure he would try if he had the opportunity.

An Hon. Member: Don't tempt him.

Mr. Kenney: No, I won't tempt him. Don't give him any ideas.

But, Mr. Speaker, \$11 trillion. Now, according to the Fraser Institute, Canadian governments collectively owe about a trillion dollars in debts, unfunded liabilities, unfunded health care, and pension liabilities. A trillion dollars collectively. This government is running the highest deficit of any provincial government in Canada as a share of gross domestic product. According to Standard & Poor's they are on track to quadruple Alberta's public debt to some \$86 billion. Their fiscal policies and recklessness have led to six credit downgrades for Alberta's debt, meaning that we have to pay more to borrow more. We have to pay more in interest payments. What does that do? It simply enriches bankers and bondholders and diverts tax dollars from public services.

It's not sensible, but this is unfortunately and increasingly the case across the country. There was a period – they called it the Chrétien consensus – of a good 20 years in the country when governments were committed to trying to stay within balance, but sadly that is no longer the case, neither here nor in Ottawa.

Here is the point. We are now not on the cusp of but in the midst of a radical demographic change in our society. We're fortunate here in Alberta to have the youngest average population in Canada. But overall our population in this country: this province is aging. We need look no further than southern Europe to see the consequences of an aging population. When the bills come due,

when the IOUs have to be cashed in, when the debt obligations have to be repaid to the bankers, if you have a shrinking tax base and a growing population of retirees and beneficiaries and people who are in their acute years of health care consumption, when that happens, governments can go bankrupt. The government of Alberta effectively once did go bankrupt, Mr. Speaker. This is not some kind of an implausible scenario. Developed governments, members of the OECD, have been verging on bankruptcy because of their inability to service their debts in recent years.

Here is my point. If we as Canadians, as Albertans want to avoid a similar fate; if we want to have the public resources and the revenues, the jobs and incomes to handle those future debt obligations to pay back the debt being racked up by this government, to honour our future pension obligations, to pay for increasingly expensive health care with an aging population; if we want to manage those trillion dollars in accumulated public debts and unfunded liabilities; and if we also want to be able to provide the very best of public services to future generations, the highest quality health care and education, infrastructure; if we want to be that generous, caring, and compassionate society that we aspire to be in the future, then we must develop those resources and the revenues that they represent.

Mr. Speaker, according to the International Energy Agency, they project that there will be a growing global demand for hydrocarbon-based energy through at least the year 2045. So for at least the next generation, they claim, there will be a growing global economic demand for the oil and gas that we have here in abundance. The question then becomes for us as Canadians an existential one. Will we, as some say, leave that in the ground undeveloped and will we in so doing assume an opportunity cost of trillions of dollars of future wealth, or will we do what is right for future generations and will we develop those resources in an environmentally responsible way to sell them on global markets?

Mr. Speaker, I maintain that not only is this an existential question for our prosperity, current and future, but it is also a moral question. It is a moral question because the world's other major oil and gas producers, many of them, are amongst the world's worst regimes. Number one reserves: Venezuela, a socialist dictatorship where people are dying of starvation and deprivation of basic health care, where political prisoners are tortured and imprisoned, a disaster notwithstanding having the world's largest oil reserves and, by the way, a government that fuels conflict throughout Latin America and, regrettably, a government that has fans on the other side of this House.

3:50

Then you have the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia: Saudi Arabia, the second largest oil reserves, that treats women like property rather than people and that for the better part of four decades has exported forms of extremism and financed terror organizations in every part of the world. Then you have, Mr. Speaker, Canada, the third largest reserves, and then Russia, Vladimir Putin's Russia, an authoritarian state in gross violation of human rights standards, that as well has fuelled conflict around the world, including the prolongation of the recent Syrian civil war. Then in the top 10 you have other jurisdictions like the emirate of Qatar which, even more than Saudi Arabia, is responsible for bankrolling genocidal organizations like Daesh, the so-called Islamic State in Iraq and Syria, and you have the Islamic Republic of Iran that hangs gay men, that is responsible for stoning women accused of adultery, that through the al-Quds Force of the Iranian revolutionary guard is responsible for projecting terror around the world, a country whose leadership has called for the obliteration of the only Jewish state on earth, a member state of the United Nations, Israel. I could carry on, but

these are the other countries that are together with Canada in the club of the world's largest energy reserves.

[Ms Sweet in the chair]

Here's the question, Madam Speaker. If Canada keeps it in the ground, if the B.C. New Democrats get their way and block the Trans Mountain pipeline, if Justin Trudeau gets his way and effectively prevents any other pipeline application from going to approval because of their Byzantine and ridiculous new process; if Justin Trudeau gets his way and quote, phases out, the oil sands; if the so-called environmental organizations, many of them foreign funded, get their way, like the NDP's friend Tzeporah Berman, and shuts down our industry; if David Suzuki, who was recently paid up to \$50,000 by the teachers' union to come to Alberta, gets his way and keeps it in the ground; all of these fellow travellers of the NDP, if they get their way and we shut down Canada's energy production, I have a question for fellow members. Will Venezuela, Saudi Arabia, Russia, Iran, or Qatar stop exploration, development, and shipment of oil and gas on the global market? Absolutely not.

This is not, actually, an environmental question. This is not a question about global greenhouse gas emissions because as long as there is a growing demand, there will be a supply to meet it. The question, then, is whether or not Canada, primarily Alberta, will be central to that supply, whether or not we will compete with and displace, hopefully, hydrocarbon-based energy from some of the world's worst regimes. I submit, Madam Speaker, that it is not only in Alberta's interests and Canada's interests, but it is in the world's interests that we see more production and shipment of energy from this province that has amongst the world's major oil producers by far the highest and best environmental, human rights, and labour standards on Earth. I submit that this is a question for our economic future, but it is also a moral question. It is not an environmental question insofar as the growing global demand will be met by supply. That is why, I think, Albertans have a growing understanding about the importance of getting our resources to market.

I was proud to belong to a federal government that saw the approval and construction of four major pipeline projects, Madam Speaker, that doubled the capacity to ship oil within Canada, and that approved the Northern Gateway pipeline that would have given us market access to Asian markets. I regret that after the deal done between Premier and Prime Minister on the carbon tax, the federal Trudeau Liberals by fiat arbitrarily vetoed the approved Northern Gateway pipeline, a project that would have had a direct investment of \$9 billion on which, I believe, the proponent had already spent \$800 million.

Then, Madam Speaker, former President Obama vetoed the proposed Keystone XL pipeline, an application by TransCanada PipeLines for a presidential authorization of that pipeline to cross the Canada-U.S. border, against the advice that he had received in two exhaustive studies conducted by his own State Department, the second of which concluded that Keystone XL would actually lower global greenhouse gas emissions because if the Alberta energy did not move by pipe, it would move by rail. Whose carbon footprint is higher? President Obama, for ideological and political reasons, rejected Keystone XL even though he endorsed the Alberta NDP government's carbon tax. So much for social licence.

Then, Madam Speaker, after TransCanada had spent hundreds of millions of dollars advancing the Energy East proposal, it was killed by the National Energy Board, which decided last August to change the rules of the game midstream by indicating that the pipeline application would include an assessment of up- and downstream emissions notionally related to the Energy East pipeline. Now, I

must say, I found this more than peculiar because, first of all, as I asserted during question period, the production of oil and gas is the exclusive jurisdiction of the province in which it is produced. That was established in the Constitution by Premier Peter Lougheed during his negotiations around the repatriation in 1981 and '82. So the National Energy Board, an agency of the federal government, has absolutely no business sticking its federal nose in the regulatory authority of the province of Alberta as it did. Regrettably, this government still to this day has not raised a syllable of protest to this flagrant federal violation of our hard-fought jurisdiction.

Now, during question period, Madam Speaker, the Premier, to be charitable, demonstrated that she has been, let us say, misbriefed on the reasons for the cancellation of the Energy East pipeline route, by the way, a project that represented a \$16 billion capital investment, thousands of direct jobs, potential value to the Canadian economy of hundreds of billions of dollars, and the dream of energy independence. Had that pipeline been built, our friends and fellow Canadians in eastern Canada would no longer be dependent on foreign oil, including from conflict regimes. They could have displaced those imports from Venezuela and elsewhere with ethically produced Alberta oil, but sadly that dream is dead, at least for years to come.

Now, the Premier, as I said, betrayed a misunderstanding, shall we say, about the reasons for which Energy East was killed. Madam Speaker, in August the National Energy Board said that it was changing the approach to include carbon emissions because it had been asked to do so by the federal government. I'm going to quote here from the National Energy Board statement on August 23.

Given increasing public interest in [greenhouse gas emissions], together with increasing governmental action and commitments (including the federal government's stated interest in assessing upstream GHG emissions associated with major pipelines), the Board is of the view that it should also consider indirect GHG emissions in its NEB Act public interest determination for each of the Projects. In considering such indirect GHG emissions, the Board will focus on the quantification of incremental upstream and incremental downstream GHG emissions, as well as incremental emissions resulting from third-party electricity generation.

4:00

So there you have it, Madam Speaker. That was the statement issued by the National Energy Board on August 23 of last year saying that it was going to force TransCanada to take responsibility for notional increases in GHGs associated with the pipeline. That means that for the oil that is produced in Alberta, regulated according to our exclusive jurisdiction, somehow the pipeline company had to take responsibility for that even though the pipeline didn't burn the emissions. By the way, what is this notion of an incremental assessment of downstream emissions? What is that all about? Why should the pipeline company be regulated based on the consumption of the energy shipped through it by the end-user? Bombardier, the construction of whose airplanes we Albertans subsidize through our federal taxes, isn't forced to go through a regulation or an assessment of its incremental GHG emissions that are spewed out of the airplanes that burn hydrocarbon-based energy.

[The Deputy Speaker in the chair]

The Quebec government, incidentally, shortly after this decision by the NEB, cut the ribbon on a new cement factory in Gaspésie with a \$400 million government subsidy. Now, that's the business of the government of Quebec. They're free to engage in corporate welfare if they want. But one has to wonder whether the \$9 billion

in equalization benefits received by the government of Quebec gave them the fiscal capacity to finance the \$400 million subsidy for the cement factory, which will, when fully operational, have a carbon footprint of some 2 million metric tonnes per year, more than most of our Alberta oil sands developments. And guess what, Madam Speaker? That cement factory was exempted from environmental review and exempted from any assessment or regulation of its carbon output.

So we get to subsidize – we're required through our federal tax dollars to subsidize – cement factories and airplane factories that produce massive carbon emissions. They're not regulated for that, but the federal government through its regulator was forcing a great Alberta company, TransCanada PipeLines, to be regulated on the basis of emissions for energy that it does not consume. So the energy consumers are exempted even though we subsidized them, but the energy shippers are hit by these new federal regulations. That is why on September 7 of last year Russ Girling, president and chief executive officer of TransCanada, suspended the Energy East application – I'd be happy to table this, Madam Speaker – and I quote: due to the significant changes to the regulatory process introduced by the National Energy Board. Unquote.

Now, let me just circle back and make sure that we're on the same page here, Madam Speaker. In question period the Premier said that the NEB had nothing to do with the cancellation of Energy East, but the project proponent, TransCanada, said that they cancelled Energy East because of the National Energy Board's regulatory decision. I have enormous respect for our Premier, and I know that she would never – I mean this sincerely – deliberately mislead this place. But I would ask her staff, who may be observing this – is her Energy minister here? I would ask her minister to brief the Premier on the actual statement made by TransCanada saying that, quote, due to the significant changes to the regulatory process introduced by the National Energy Board, TransCanada is suspending the Energy East application. There you are. So what happened?

Now, Madam Speaker, should we be surprised by this? When the NEB said that the federal government's stated interest in assessing upstream GHG emissions associated with major pipelines – when they said that that's why they did this, they were giving us a little bit of a clue. They were telling us that they had been compelled by their bosses in Ottawa to change the rules of the game after TransCanada had spent, I gather, upwards of a billion on this project.

And who would be calling the shots in that federal government? Well, I've got to say that I know the Prime Minister – he was my critic in opposition for a couple of years – and based on my experience, let's just put it this way: I'm skeptical that he understood the details.

Madam Speaker, let me say that perhaps the former executive director of the World Wildlife Fund Canada, Gerry Butts, is the person who pushed this policy onto the National Energy Board that killed Energy East and, I believe, with it the prospect of any major pipeline application proceeding in the future. This, by the way, was made worse by the announcement of the federal government a month ago on the new pipeline assessment process.

Madam Speaker, let me introduce to the House this individual, Gerry Butts. He is the principal secretary to the Prime Minister. He is described as the most powerful and influential person in Ottawa. Mr. Butts was once giving a speech, I think in 2012, not long ago, just five or six years ago, in Calgary – courageously, in Calgary – and he unencumbered himself of his real views. When asked on the question of Northern Gateway, "Do you have an alternate pipeline route that you'd like to propose . . ."

The Deputy Speaker: Hon. member, it's customary to address your remarks through the Speaker; it's also helpful to *Hansard*. If you turn away from the microphone, they can't hear what you're saying.

Please proceed.

Mr. Kenney: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I have to unlearn bad habits from the federal House. I will always accept your correction.

Madam Speaker, Mr. Butts was asked: did he have an alternate pipeline route to propose? He said: "No. No alternate pipeline route. I want to propose an alternate economy, with no hydrocarbon-based energy." This is a man who's arrived at the right hand of the Prime Minister with an ideological zeal to, to quote the Prime Minister, his boss, phase out the oil sands and keep it in the ground.

It is time that we as Albertans called a spade a spade. This federal government is not an ally of Alberta's energy industry, and, Madam Speaker, I contend that Albertans understand that. They see this for what it is, and that's why in the most recent public opinion poll Mr. Trudeau's government was polling at 11 per cent in Alberta. After the national energy program – the Government House Leader is old enough to remember this – his father's party, the Liberal Party of Canada, won 23 per cent of the popular vote, and Justin Trudeau, an enemy of our energy industry and our future prosperity, is at half that level. So who's kidding who here?

That is why I urge our provincial government to understand. Yes, of course they have to work with the Prime Minister and his government – I understand that – but, Madam Speaker, they must not make the mistake of becoming apologists for this government in Ottawa that vetoed Northern Gateway, that did precisely nothing to protest Barack Obama's vetoing of Keystone XL, that has killed indirectly, according to both the National Energy Board and TransCanada PipeLines Limited, the Energy East project, and which now is doing precious nothing to ensure the construction of the last remaining coastal pipeline proposal, the Kinder Morgan Trans Mountain expansion.

Let me turn my attention to that project, Madam Speaker, because it represents, as the hon. the Premier has said, a multibillion-dollar investment, thousands of direct jobs, and potentially hundreds of billions of dollars in value to the Canadian economy, not just the Alberta economy.

4:10

Now, Madam Speaker, let's be clear. This is not a brand new pipeline. Trans Mountain has been in the ground and safely operating for over six decades, for over half a century, fuelling the economy of British Columbia's Lower Mainland, without a single major environmental incident or problem, for six decades, producing indirect economic and fiscal benefits for First Nations along the pipeline route, which is why every First Nation in the immediate proximity of the Trans Mountain pipeline supports its expansion until you get to the coast.

Madam Speaker, if it weren't for that pipeline, how would our friends in British Columbia have run a modern economy for the past six decades? I mean, their cars are not fuelled by pixie dust or good wishes, you know. Their buses and trucks and their industrial basins in the Lower Mainland are fuelled and have been for over half a century by Alberta oil, and for six decades oil tankers – heaven forbid – have safely and regularly exited the port of Burnaby, the Burrard Inlet, and the port of Vancouver to global markets.

Incidentally, not all of the energy consumed in the Lower Mainland comes from Alberta. A growing portion has come from U.S. refineries in Washington state. Madam Speaker, you know where that oil comes from? Tankers, oil tankers that come down the west coast, our Pacific coast, safely, without concern, year after

year, delivering the energy that fuels British Columbia's economy together with Alberta oil.

Moreover, Madam Speaker, Kinder Morgan has already built approximately half of the expanded pipeline. It was already approved several years ago and built without controversy. Most people don't even understand this either, I think, in British Columbia. So this application merely is to complete that project.

Now, this project went through the most rigorous environmental assessment on Earth for a pipeline, through the National Energy Board. All of the opponents had an opportunity to raise their objections and their concerns. The issues around, you know, what happens in the hypothetical scenario of a bitumen spill: all of that has been studied scientifically. The evidence was presented, and the National Energy Board approved this pipeline expansion with conditions, a decision subsequently ratified by the federal Governor in Council. That was done over a year ago.

Now, Madam Speaker, as I said, I broadly appreciate the approach being taken by the Premier in advocating for the pipeline today. I do, however, have to register a reservation that Alberta's NDP government was too late to the party. Shortly after the federal approval of the Trans Mountain expansion our Premier, who can be a very effective advocate, went to Vancouver and issued a press release that she was going to be fighting for Trans Mountain. I thought: that's great; we're going to see our Premier stand up and explain the importance of this and how it's environmentally safe and the benefits for British Columbians and all Canadians. Guess what happened? On that visit, just over a year ago, she had some private meetings at a hotel in Vancouver. She did not give a single interview or deliver a single speech, but she did meet with her NDP counterpart, the then opposition leader and now Premier, John Horgan, who left the meeting and said that our Premier did not try to persuade him – did not try to persuade him – to support Trans Mountain.

Madam Speaker, a year has flown by. The clock is ticking. Kinder Morgan, the project proponent, has spent, I suspect, hundreds of millions of dollars patiently waiting for the rule of law to work. Recently Kinder Morgan's parent company in the United States said that given the uncertainty around this project, they will not be making any major capital expenditures on building a pipeline until that uncertainty is resolved. The opponents of that pipeline, the opponents of Canada's energy industry: many of them are foreign funded, like, for example, Tides Canada. It has received some \$40 million in foreign money over the course of the past decade alone. They are banking on that uncertainty. That is their strategy, to create more uncertainty. Their strategy is death by delay.

It is the same strategy as the B.C. New Democrats, as the NDP mayor of Vancouver, as the NDP mayor of Burnaby, as – oh, I think there's a bit of a trend here, right? – their friends in the B.C. Green Party. Their strategy: death by delay, a thousand little cuts, a regulatory consultation here, a court challenge there, a protest over here, an illegal protest over here. Yes, it's almost like they read the foreword to that Greenpeace book about civil disobedience, that was co-written by our environment minister, Madam Speaker. An action a day: that's what we're seeing.

The Deputy Speaker: A point of order? Go ahead, Government House Leader.

Point of Order Factual Accuracy

Mr. Mason: Madam Speaker, the hon. Leader of the Official Opposition is misrepresenting the situation with respect to the

minister of environment. She did not co-write any book with respect to that matter, so I think that the hon. member should correct his historical record that he's trying to place before this Assembly.

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member.

Mr. Nixon: Well, thank you, Madam Speaker. First of all, I would point out that the hon. Government House Leader did not even provide a citation, so at this point I think we may as well go forward. But to be clear, this is a matter of debate. The Government House Leader knows that. If – if – anybody is confused about who wrote the foreword to that book or not, the hon. environment minister's name is on that foreword. I mean, quite frankly, it can't be any more clear than that. Without a doubt, the Government House Leader knows this is a matter of debate, and he's just interrupting the Official Opposition leader's speech before this House. He should stop that behaviour, and we should continue on.

The Deputy Speaker: Any other members wishing to speak to the point of order?

Mr. Nixon: What's the citation?

Mr. Mason: Standing Order 23(h), (i), and (j).

The Deputy Speaker: Standing Order 23(h), (i), and (j). I will give the hon. Government House Leader the benefit of the doubt on the citation. I think we understood what it was.

Did you wish to comment on the point of order?

Mr. Kenney: No.

The Deputy Speaker: No.

I just would like to really caution the House to be careful. At times, yes, it is a difference in how we understand things, but we have to be careful, when we make a statement, that we can back it up with accurate facts. That helps to keep the tone of the House civil and respectful.

Go ahead, hon. member.

Debate Continued

Mr. Kenney: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Speaking of NDP environment ministers, her counterpart in British Columbia, it was recently disclosed, spent an evening – I think it was on Hornby Island or one of those places – hanging out with a so-called hive of environmental activists, all of them devoted to shutting down this pipeline and our energy industry. This has all been reported. Documents have been leaked from that group. They were talking about organizing swarms, they called it – their word, not mine: swarms – of these organizations to engage in lawbreaking protests.

Let me be clear, Madam Speaker. I am an advocate of freedom of speech and absolutely support lawful protest. It's a necessary part of our democracy. But these are people talking about planning and executing the blocking of trucks trying to enter the Kinder Morgan work site in Burnaby or trying to create an illegal marine cordon around the Kinder Morgan site. These are the same people that created an illegal camp on Burnaby mountain last year in flagrant violation of a court order, seeking successfully to delay seismic work related to the Trans Mountain pipeline. These are the people that the B.C. New Democrat environment minister is hanging out with. Let's not pretend that there's good faith going on here. We're talking about a minister of the Crown knowingly collaborating with people talking about breaking the law to attack this province's economy. This is unacceptable.

4:20

That is one of the many reasons, Madam Speaker, why I have called, since day one of the NDP government in British Columbia, for a serious fight-back strategy, because the NDP came to office there on a promise to use every tool in the tool box to stop Trans Mountain. Like, it's not as though they were ambiguous about this. I was quite intrigued recently to hear our Premier say that she didn't understand the degree of opposition that would be coming from the New Democrats in British Columbia. How could they have been more clear? Do you think they would have had the support of the Green Party in this B.C. coalition if it weren't for a sotto voce commitment to do everything possible to stop the Trans Mountain pipeline? The B.C. New Democrats have been refreshingly transparent about their motives and intentions. Regrettably, for most of the past nine months our government has been, to be kind, naive and passive in response to that hostility.

Let's just be clear. Constitutional law 101: interprovincial pipelines are the exclusive regulatory jurisdiction of the federal government. Nobody should really dispute this. What we have in the Horgan government in Victoria is a pretense that they can somehow manufacture regulations or pass statutes to interfere with that federal regulation, and they cannot. This is black and white in constitutional law, Madam Speaker. But they don't care if they're going to win in court or not. What they're trying to do is death by delay. It's to create enough uncertainty, with the protesters that they're talking to over here and the NDP government in Burnaby refusing to grant permits for construction here and NGOs taking the project to court over here, all of this together, a co-ordinated strategy to say to the investors in Kinder Morgan that this thing is just too uncertain. Now, heaven forbid it ever comes to that, but that's exactly their strategy.

That is why we advocated tough action from the get-go, from last July, the coming to power of the British Columbia New Democrat government. Even then, Madam Speaker, since last July I have articulated a fight-back strategy. I have said, first of all, that we should be calling upon the federal government to invoke the declaratory power under section 92(10)(c) of the Constitution Act to obviate any dilatory measures by the British Columbia government.

Secondly, I said that we should prepare an entire suite of potential economic reprisals, saying that if they start a trade war, they'll have to learn that Alberta will finish it. I talked, Madam Speaker, last summer about symbolic measures like perhaps not buying B.C. wine through the ALCB or not entering into future contracts for the purchase of B.C. hydroelectricity from their Crown corporation.

I talked about doing an assessment of all of British Columbia's major exports to and through Alberta and suggested that perhaps, you know, if they're going to pretend they have the constitutional authority to block this pipeline, we could assert a constitutional authority to impose tariffs on some of those products or maybe stop some of them for rigorous safety inspections. I know that my hon. colleague from Drumheller would be happy to volunteer to engage in some of those safety inspections at the border – sometimes I find he can be very slow moving when needs be – because he knows something about running stuff across the border, let me tell you, Madam Speaker. I've also raised the following question: why would we allow British Columbia to ship its natural gas through pipelines in Alberta to U.S. markets toll-free if they block, effectively, the shipment of our oil to British Columbia and global markets?

Finally, since last July I said that if push comes to shove, if absolutely necessary, we must have as an ultimate remedy what I call the Lougheed strategy. In 1981 Premier Peter Lougheed

announced in this place that Alberta would reduce its production and shipment of oil to the rest of the country, forcing a significant increase in consumer prices, forcing the federal government of Pierre Trudeau to come to the table and renegotiate better terms around the infamous national energy program. Now, when he did so, Madam Speaker, he was acting as a true visionary and a statesman. I guarantee you that Premier Lougheed – I'm sure his phone in this building rang off the hook, with energy executives in Calgary saying: "Peter, what are you doing? You're killing my share prices over here. You're undermining the short-term financial interest of my company." But Premier Peter Lougheed understood that the role of a Premier is to defend the vital strategic economic interests of the province and its economy and not somebody's short-term shareholder value. So he did the right thing. He showed us the pattern.

That is why I have explicitly advocated that we publicly announce our willingness to follow that approach in this dispute with the New Democrats in Victoria, but when I did so, Madam Speaker, guess what? This Premier mocked and ridiculed me. It's true. [interjections] I know. Say it ain't so, but it's true. I was shocked – shocked – to hear the hon. the Premier suggest that I was acting like, quote, Donald Trump, that I wanted to build a wall around Alberta and make B.C. pay for it, by adopting exactly the same policy that she announced in the throne speech last Thursday. You know, she accused me of having a temper tantrum, said that a temper tantrum by the opposition leader wasn't going to build a pipeline, for advocating exactly the same policy that she adopted five days ago.

Well, that's fine. You know, Madam Speaker, that's okay. I understand that the NDP didn't want to really get into a serious fight with their brothers and sisters in the British Columbia New Democrats. I understood there was a degree of professional and partisan courtesy here. I understand that they would have preferred that this whole thing would be like one of those World Wrestling Federation matches, one of those choreographed fights. That's what we saw going on for several months there.

But, lo and behold, they had a conversion on the road to election day, Madam Speaker. They called this by-election down in Calgary-Lougheed, and they ran a great, qualified candidate. The Premier and half their cabinet went down there. They talked tough, and they called me all sorts of names. Oh, no: the NDP vote fell in half. Oh, ouch: the newest political party in Canada, the United Conservatives, won the largest number of votes ever cast for a single candidate in Alberta by-election history, and that was with a weak candidate. [laughter] You're not supposed to laugh.

So here's the thing. They're looking at this, and they're looking at public opinion, and they realize: my goodness, maybe we actually have to drop the pro wrestling antics and demonstrate to our New Democrat friends in British Columbia that Alberta means business. I commend them for doing so, Madam Speaker. You know, I think it was Ralph Waldo Emerson who said that a foolish consistency is the hobgoblin of a little mind, so I'm glad that the New Democrats are not being foolishly consistent about this, that they've demonstrated an openness of mind, a willingness to take good advice. I hope sincerely that this is the beginning of a pattern, their willingness to take good advice.

When in the throne speech the other day Her Honour the Lieutenant Governor said that the government is prepared to replicate what Peter Lougheed did in 1981 – thank you and full commendation to the Premier and the government for hearing the message. But it is not enough, Madam Speaker, because when they were in the pro wrestling part of this, their fake dispute with Victoria, the Premier brought in, I thought, a pretty good starting point – it was an attention-getter – and that was the de facto boycott

of B.C. wines. Like the Premier, I enjoy and I certainly understand – like the Government House Leader, I enjoy a good British Columbia Chardonnay although I'm more of a beer man myself. But, you know, B.C. wine is a great Canadian product. We all appreciate it, and we love our friends and family over in British Columbia. But we had to get John Horgan's attention somehow. That was, I thought, a sensible first step but symbolic, to demonstrate that we were going to represent our interests.

4:30

But here's the problem, Madam Speaker. It was hardly proportionate. Albertans buy about \$70 million of B.C. wine per annum, and we sell them billions of dollars of oil, and we're hoping through Trans Mountain to sell the world hundreds of billions of dollars of oil. So it was not in any way proportionate, but it was a symbolic attention-getter. Regrettably, the government dropped even that measure when Premier Horgan said that he would take his proposed regulations on Alberta bitumen shipments to a judicial reference.

Now, in my judgment, that was a transparent delay tactic, Madam Speaker. We already know what the law is on this. By the way, the last time that a British Columbia government did a court reference, it took nearly four years to be finally resolved at the Supreme Court of Canada. It was on the polygamy reference. Now, admittedly, that started at trial court and then went to the B.C. Court of Appeal and the Supreme Court of Canada. But we don't know. I think it's possible that Premier Horgan will start at the B.C. trial court and then, if he doesn't like the answer, go the B.C. appeals court and the Supreme Court. This could take years for that reference to come to a resolution.

Secondly, I have to ask why our Premier did not insist – because let's be honest; we're all grown-ups here, Madam Speaker. We all know that our Premier's chief of staff was John Horgan's chief of staff. So we all know that there were phone calls happening and . . . [interjections] Is that not true? The last one. Okay. The connections are so tight that I get confused. We all know they're buddies, and we all know that they were talking to Victoria as well they should. There should be back channel conversations. There's nothing wrong with that. But I wish that our Premier had said to her friend John Horgan: "Listen, John. Okay. We understand you're going to make this reference, but in Alberta we have to be part of drafting the question. We want to make sure that it's a fair, balanced, neutral question, that it's not stacked in B.C.'s favour." She apparently didn't do that. She has given or the Premier of B.C. is taking the full discretion to write his own question, which can help to create a certain outcome.

If you don't believe me, Madam Speaker, just look at the court reference done by Premier Lougheed back in the early 1980s on the shipment of Alberta gas and on the taxation question. He wrote some very loaded questions and got the answers he wanted from the Alberta appeals court. So I think it was a tactical mistake to give John Horgan a blank cheque on the reference, but it was, in my judgment, a strategic mistake to back away from the wine boycott because now the B.C. government can say: well, they're not really all that serious over in Alberta.

So, Madam Speaker, you know, all of these comments are to say that we are prepared in the Official Opposition to support our Premier and this government in whatever measures they take that strongly defend our interests – I think all Albertans are prepared to do that – but we continue to have questions about the seriousness of this government. We are glad that they've accepted as their policy suggestions that we have been making for the better part of a year, but we want to see those ideas turned into actual policy.

That is why, again, we call upon the government to encourage the federal government to declare Trans Mountain as being in the national interest under section 92 of the Constitution. It is also why we call upon the Alberta government to demand that Ottawa, in its new statutory package around pipeline regulation, exclude any assessment of up- or downstream carbon emissions by the new regulator, the son of the National Energy Board, the Canada energy regulator. We ask that the federal government remove the temptation to get into the regulation of upstream production, which is our exclusive constitutional jurisdiction, and not repeat the catastrophic decision of the NEB with respect to up- and downstream emissions. If the government takes measures like that, Madam Speaker, we will fully support this government and this Premier. All of us are in this together as Albertans. This is about our vital economic interests.

I will close with this. Madam Speaker, our quarrel is not with ordinary British Columbians. The polling indicates consistently that a plurality of British Columbians support the Trans Mountain pipeline expansion and environmentally responsible resource development. Our quarrel is with an ideological government in Victoria that is doing everything it can to attack our vital economic interests, Canada's prosperity, and the economic union promised in the Constitution.

This is not just about Alberta; this is about what kind of country we live in. I believe this is the only Legislative Assembly in Canada that proudly displays the flags of all 10 of our provinces and all three of our territories. Madam Speaker, that is a reflection of our patriotism as Albertans. We are proud to have shared hundreds of billions of dollars of wealth created in Alberta with our fellow Canadians across the country. We are generous and are proud to have shared some of our wealth when times have been good here but bad elsewhere. But in recent years the opposite has been true. As we continue to contribute to the rest of the federation through equalization, through the entire system of federal transfers, hundreds of thousands of Albertans have been out of work. Thousands of people have lost their businesses and their homes, their dreams, and their life savings.

We all know Albertans who have gone through personal and family crises as the human consequence of this. I met people going through adversity every day on the road, putting 150,000 kilometres on my pickup, going to over 900 events in communities across the province, people barely hanging on. It is our responsibility collectively, on both sides of this place, to speak and to fight for those proud, hard-working Alberta women and men who ask for nothing more than a fair chance. They ask for nothing more than opportunity. They ask for nothing more than basic fairness in this federation. They acknowledge that our province and our previous governments, as this government, have been generous with the rest of Canada. Now it is the time for us as Albertans to ask Canadians from coast to coast to stand up and to say: "We embrace a future of prosperity. We embrace a world where Canada, with the highest human rights, environmental, and labour standards, plays a growing role in global energy markets so that the world can be less dependent on conflict regimes."

Madam Speaker, this is the cause for Canada. It is time that all of us put aside to the greatest extent possible our partisan differences, our regional differences to come together in the defence of our country's future prosperity and to demonstrate that we will not relent in that fight for our future.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Mr. Clark: Well, thank you very much, Madam Speaker. My apologies to my colleagues in the House and to those watching that, unfortunately, standing orders will not allow me to speak for the same length of time as the Leader of the Official Opposition and the Premier. I know that you would love to hear me for the better part of an hour, but unfortunately my time here is limited, so I will dive into my . . .

Mr. Mason: Point of order.

The Deputy Speaker: Point of order.

Point of Order Speaking Order

Mr. Mason: Madam Speaker, it is customary in this House that on bills and other matters like motions we alternate between the government and the opposition in the speaking order.

4:40

The Deputy Speaker: Any other members wishing to speak?

Mr. Clark: If I could cite Standing Order 16, I believe, on a member rising to speak, which says, "Every Member desiring to speak is to rise in his or her place and address the Speaker." And Standing Order 17: "When 2 or more Members rise to speak, the Speaker calls on the Member who, in the Speaker's opinion, first rose in his or her place."

The Deputy Speaker: Any other members wishing to comment on this point of order?

Seeing none, it is absolutely the Speaker's decision who they choose to recognize to speak, and it so happens that the only individual I saw standing to speak was the hon. Member for Calgary-Elbow.

Debate Continued

Mr. Clark: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'll continue. I appreciate that. Speaking about Government Motion 2, am I upset with the B.C. government's repeated attempts to block the lawfully approved Kinder Morgan pipeline? Of course I am. I'm a proud Albertan, and I will always stand up for the best interests of my home province.

I can also tell you that my constituents are angry not only with the attempts of B.C. to block the lawful construction of the Kinder Morgan pipeline but also about the failure of Energy East and of Northern Gateway and all of the barriers big and small that have been put in the way of the development of Alberta's energy industry. I can tell you that I've had many conversations with my constituents, most recently this Friday, a constituency day, in a coffee shop in my constituency, where it was made abundantly clear to me that my constituents are very upset with the repeated attempts to block lawful access for Alberta's natural resources to global markets. It's especially frustrating when our neighbours to the south continue to grow their energy production and steal Alberta's market share while supporting many of the protests that have stalled energy development in our province.

Now, we all know about the story of growing energy production in Texas and North Dakota. The growth in shale oil has made the U.S. a net exporter of crude. But a constituent pointed me to the extent of urban drilling in one of the most densely populated locations in the United States. Do you want to guess where that is? Los Angeles, California. Over the past 125 years L.A. has produced 9 billion barrels of oil and still today pumps 12 per cent of

California's oil, with nearly 80,000 people working directly or indirectly in that industry. There's a refinery, the El Segundo refinery, that is the state's largest, processing 269,000 barrels of oil a day. The Wilmington oil field in L.A. has over 1,200 wells right on the coast of Long Beach. There are many other producing wells all throughout greater Los Angeles and some even in beautiful Beverly Hills.

In 2015 a California government report showed that many grades of California crude have substantially higher carbon intensity than Alberta oil sands crude and, in some cases, twice as much. Some blends of other countries' crude, Venezuela and Nigeria in particular, are three or even four times as carbon intense as Alberta's crude.

So why do I bring all of this up? Because compared to what happens in the United States in one of the most dense urban areas of the country where there is substantial oil production, for our neighbours in British Columbia to attempt to block a single pipeline, which is a twinning of an existing pipeline, it would be laughable if it wasn't so tragic and frustrating. It's frustrating to my constituents, Madam Speaker, and it is incredibly frustrating to me.

What is just as frustrating is to witness the ham-fisted way that Alberta's NDP have made the case for pipelines. Yes, we know there is economic benefit from pipelines. Alberta, by a recent report, loses \$7.2 billion a year as a result of lack of market access. The federal government loses a direct \$800 million a year. Private investment is constrained by \$5.3 billion a year. The overall cost to Canada's GDP from lack of market of access is \$15.6 billion a year. That is a substantial, substantial amount of money.

In addition to the economic benefit, we know that the science is rock solid, that pipelines are by far the safest way to transport Canada's products to market. This includes those double-hull tankers that use not only the latest GPS technology but also pilot ships to ensure they safely navigate the inner harbours on the way to open ocean. By the way, in the 62 years – 62 years – that tankers have been transporting crude oil from the Vancouver port, there have been zero incidents. That's zero incidents of tankers spilling, absolutely none, in all the years since 1956, when GPS wasn't even science fiction.

But in addition to the safety and the economic benefits of pipelines, there is a strong environmental case to be made. This government has let our province down because they haven't told British Columbians that we share their desire to address climate change. Alberta's and B.C.'s interests are and should be aligned. British Columbians should know that Albertans share their desire to reduce carbon emissions, or at least some of us on this side of the House share their desire to reduce carbon emissions, which is exactly what the Kinder Morgan pipeline expansion will do. How? Alberta innovators, including government, academia, industry, and more, are working to reduce carbon emissions from oil sands. The Clean Resource Innovation Network, which includes COSIA and many others, is finding ways to reduce and maybe even remove carbon from Alberta's oil sands from extraction to end use. How many people in B.C. know about the carbon Xprize? It's a \$20 million incentive to move new and emerging CO₂ technologies from the lab to real-world demonstration. To translate: Alberta is leading the charge to a low-carbon future.

If we apply some of the economic gains realized from attracting global prices for a product that's still in demand – we've heard repeatedly today and we know that even with the emergence of electric vehicles, global energy oil demand will continue to grow. We know that if we can attract global prices for that product – economists have said that there is a strong case to be made for investing the revenues that we will derive from the legitimate, safe,

and legal economic activity of producing oil and gas in this province – if we invest some of that in reducing carbon emissions, we will have tremendous environmental and tremendous economic benefit. These investments would not only reduce carbon emissions from hydrocarbon production and use but would allow Alberta entrepreneurs to do what Alberta entrepreneurs do best: to create the companies and technologies to address a problem the world is grappling with, to attract capital to our province, to diversify our economy, to innovate and create those technologies that we can sell to the rest of the world.

Now, the crude shipped through the Kinder Morgan expansion will also displace higher carbon crude produced in places like Venezuela and Nigeria, and I can promise you that neither of those countries' environmental or social standards are anywhere near Alberta's. Let me be absolutely clear. Alberta's energy industry has the most socially and environmentally responsible energy production in the entire world. Our regulator is second to none anywhere in the world. We export our regulatory expertise around the world. The world is trying to produce oil and gas in the same way that Alberta does, in the safe and socially responsible manner. Having worked in that industry, I can tell you, Madam Speaker, that I have seen it first-hand. It's absolutely true. That is the story that we need to be telling our neighbours in British Columbia and telling the world.

But in addition to making this case to British Columbians, we need to ensure that Ottawa steps up. This is a project that has been approved after thorough vetting by one of the if not the very best energy regulators in the world. The pipeline is safe, it is in the public interest, and it absolutely must be built. The federal government must step up and aggressively send that message to B.C. And the Alberta government needs to step up and aggressively send that message to Ottawa, that Ottawa needs to invoke section 92(10)(c) of the Constitution, that this is a project in the general interest of our country. While it is okay, as this motion says, to urge the federal government to take action – and I will give this government credit for some what I would call gentle nudging of Ottawa – they have pushed, but they haven't pushed nearly hard enough. The NDP needs to be very specific about what they want Ottawa to do. They should declare loudly that Ottawa should employ their powers under the Constitution to declare this Kinder Morgan pipeline a project in the general interest.

4:50

In the end the Alberta Party caucus will likely support this motion. We look forward to seeing the amendments that come forward. We do think that there are some areas and opportunities for improvement. But it's not nearly good enough for the Premier to talk about just the fact that there is a carbon tax in an attempt to gain social licence for building that pipeline. It is not enough for this Premier or this government to simply make the economic case for pipelines. And it is not enough for this government simply to threaten another trade war. Alberta's and B.C.'s interests are much more closely aligned than we think. It is up to this government to make that case and to ensure that the Kinder Morgan pipeline is built.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The Deputy Speaker: Any questions or comments under Standing Order 29(2)(a)?

Seeing none, I'll recognize the hon. Minister of Energy.

Ms McCuaig-Boyd: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm pleased today to rise in support of this motion to support the Trans Mountain pipeline expansion and to call on the federal government to live up

to its responsibility to support the pipeline that it has approved. You know, I've spoken before in this Assembly about the personal, deep roots I have with the energy sector. Many of my family members have worked and continue to work within the sector. I've also bragged many times about where I live in Alberta, which is northwest Alberta, which is currently a growing centre for oil and gas activity. Many of my constituents in Dunvegan-Central Peace-Notley work in the industry, as do neighbouring constituents. This is not a phenomenon confined to the Alberta side of the border, either. A lot of folks on the B.C. side of the border also work in this sector.

People in my area travel back and forth. It's something that's been going on for many, many years, and it's something that people mostly take for granted up my way. In northwest Alberta we don't have differences with our neighbours on the B.C. side of the border. We share common economic interests and a common understanding of the value that the oil and gas sector brings to the well-being of our communities. So make no mistake. This is not a dispute between the people of Alberta and the people of B.C. This is a disagreement between governments about the best way to develop our economy and protect our environment.

Here in Alberta we're protecting our environment and the future of our economy through an ambitious, nation-leading climate leadership plan. It's a plan that phases out coal-fired electricity by 2030. It's a plan that helps households, businesses, farms, communities, and not-for-profits reduce their greenhouse gas emissions and their costs through new energy efficiency programming. It's a plan that already has made history for achieving the lowest prices for renewable generated electricity, and it's a plan that has placed a hard cap on oil sands emissions. That plan helped to secure the federal government approval for the Trans Mountain pipeline expansion and for line 3. That plan is the reason why we have a pipeline approval to defend at all. That plan is our answer to those who claim that Trans Mountain will increase greenhouse gas emissions. Simply put, Madam Speaker, it won't. Alberta now has a hard cap on emissions from the oil sands. We've given industry the time and room to innovate, to develop new technologies that will enable them to reduce their carbon footprint, but there is a cap in Alberta beyond which the oil sands emissions cannot exceed.

We know the Trans Mountain expansion won't increase greenhouse gas emissions, but what are the benefits? Why is our government so determined to get this pipeline built to tidewater? The answer, Madam Speaker, is very simple. Our biggest market historically has been the U.S. For decades Alberta has been able to sell its oil to our neighbours to the south and make a bit of a tidy profit. Today, however, the U.S. is not just our biggest customer; it is our biggest competitor. In recent years U.S. oil production has skyrocketed, and Americans are now energy self-sufficient. The result? Alberta producers are now selling our resources at a discount. It is estimated that through the course of 2018 the gap between the average U.S. price and the average western Canadian price will average out at more than \$21 a barrel. Imagine the impact of that price differential on one Canadian energy company, particularly on players that have already been ravaged by the oil price shock of recent years. Imagine how much harder that lower oil price is making it for many operators to stay competitive, maintain production, and keep people working. Now imagine the impact of that across the entire industry and the damage that it is doing to our Canadian economy. It's certainly not small.

Indeed, in a recent study by Scotiabank, which has been referred to a couple of times today, the cost alone in 2018 could be more than \$10 billion. Madam Speaker, a loss of that magnitude will inevitably impact jobs and incomes for working families. A loss of

that magnitude will make its impact felt in government revenues that support public services like health care, education, social programs, and environmental protections. The same study suggests that the price differential may ease somewhat as more oil finds its way onto the rail system, but there are economic costs to that scenario as well as oil competing with other products such as agricultural products on our rail system. And, of course, there are safety concerns with transporting more oil by rail.

Madam Speaker, no government that cares about working families, as this government does, could fail to act. In the Speech from the Throne on Thursday our government made it very clear just how far we will go to defend Alberta's right to get a fair price for our resources. As I've said, the single biggest threat to our competitiveness is the current lack of Canadian pipeline capacity to global markets. The Trans Mountain pipeline expansion project will go a long way to solving this problem, and our government has been clear from day one that we will do whatever it takes to get it built.

When the government of B.C. tried to overstep its constitutional authority and regulate something it has no right to regulate, our Premier and our government stepped up. We shut down talks on expanding electricity trade, banned B.C. wines from Alberta shelves, and brought together a task force, Madam Speaker, of experts and notable Canadians to provide us with the best advice. Those measures were effective in getting British Columbia to back away from the illegal point in their plan and effective in making sure that all Canadians knew our resolve.

But in the face of continued threats we need to be prepared to take further steps to protect our workers and protect our industry, and if that means invoking legislation similar to the bold action taken by Premier Peter Lougheed when our energy industry was under attack in the past, we will not hesitate. Let me be perfectly clear, Madam Speaker. Our government understands that taking such action, even if absolutely necessary, could have consequences for our energy sector. We sincerely hope it doesn't come to this. Make no mistake. Our government has no desire to take this step, but it's important that B.C. and the country know that we will do whatever it takes to make sure our constitutional rights are respected as partners in Confederation. If we are forced to take this step, we will not do it lightly, and we will do it with open lines of communication with all our energy stakeholders.

Madam Speaker, one of the most gratifying parts of our work on Trans Mountain has been the support we've received from Albertans from all walks of life, people like the members of the Market Access Task Force, who I want to thank for their incredible work. We're talking about people like Frank McKenna, Anne McClellan, Jim Carter, Peter Hogg, Peter Tertzakian, Trevor Tombe, Ginny Flood, and Janet Annesley. Every one of them is making an enormous contribution to Canada, and I want to thank them all for the work they have done. I also want to thank members of Building Trades of Alberta for their presence here today, representing the thousands of working men and women who work every day in our sector in jobs that are hard, demanding, and crucial to the well-being of Alberta's economy and to the Canadian economy.

I want to note some of their words of support, a quote from Terry Parker, executive director of Building Trades of Alberta.

The Trans Mountain Expansion is a project that would not only benefit many skilled trades workers . . . but also would encourage additional investment in Alberta, to the benefit of all of us . . . We support the work of the Alberta Government standing up for the people of Canada. It is critical that all our provinces – all citizens of Canada – recognize that for Canada to prosper, we must work together.

There are many others, Madam Speaker, but I want to continue because I have some other good words to say.

I also want to acknowledge and thank the indigenous leaders who have been in attendance today, upon whose traditional territory this Legislature meets. I want to thank them as well for their participation in this fight and for their words of encouragement to me and my colleagues. You know, Madam Speaker, there's a tendency sometimes in debates like these for some people to speak on behalf of indigenous people instead of respecting that they have their own diverse voices and can speak very well for themselves.

5:00

I want to provide a quote from Chief Ronald Kreutzer from the Fort McMurray First Nation.

The Kinder Morgan Trans Mountain Pipeline is essential to the viability of the economic engine of Canada, the Alberta Oil sands [, and First Nations]. Fort McMurray #468 First Nation relies heavily on the responsible development of the Oilsands to provide the necessary economics to be a self-sufficient Nation for the next seven generations.

We have another quote, from Chief Arthur Rain of the Paul First Nation, who wrote:

Kinder Morgan and its representatives have been engaging Paul First Nation leaders and membership for several years. Through these years we have worked hard to develop a relationship of deep trust and mutual benefit.

Finally, Madam Speaker, I want to thank the many leaders from the energy industry with whom I work every day and I've gotten to know over the past three years, many of whom my staff and I have spoken to in recent days.

You know, my government colleagues and I take very seriously the responsibility to this industry and the working women and men that this industry employs. We know the decisions that we take have direct bearing on their future and the ability of hundreds of thousands of Canadians to make ends meet. It has shaped our work implementing the climate leadership plan, a plan which brought the approval, as I mentioned, of Kinder Morgan as well as line 3. It has motivated our plan to provide leadership to support energy diversification in the form of partial upgrading of our bitumen, more petrochemical development, and better access to the natural gas liquids that our industry needs to grow. Our goal, Madam Speaker, is to foster a more resilient economy and a recovery that is built to last.

Finally, it has underpinned our determination to fight for better market access and to get our resources to new markets, to close the gap between the price we are forced to accept for our resources and the price we deserve. It is why we do not take lightly our decision to provide ourselves with all the tools we deem necessary to defend our industry and to defend our province's right to get a better price for our resources.

We know that if we were to act precipitously, we run the risk of inflicting short-term pain on an industry and on a group of workers that have already suffered more than their fair share in recent years. That is why I'm so gratified, Madam Speaker, by the many words of encouragement that I have received from industry leaders in recent days. People have told me repeatedly that while they worry about the short-term consequences for themselves and their workers, we do need to step up and take this step if necessary.

People like Mark Scholz from the Canadian Association of Oilwell Drilling Contractors has stated publicly: we are very supportive of the Premier; she has shown some incredible leadership on this file. End quote.

Mark is just one of the people showing his support and solidarity in the gallery here today. We are joined by others: Ben Brunnen from CAPP, Elizabeth Aquin from PSAC, Bill Clapperton from CNRL, Julie Woo from Canadian Natural Resources, Keri Scobie from Imperial Oil, and Scott Wenger from Suncor. And there are

others who have spoken on our behalf to the media or stand ready to do so if called upon today.

I am gratified by the trust that so many have put in us, trusting that we will not act precipitously; trusting that we will not take action simply to grandstand but only when it is truly necessary; trusting that as we understand that our actions have real consequences for real people, we must be measured, mature, and responsible as well as firm and decisive. Madam Speaker, it is an honour to be the beneficiary of that level of trust, and I know that my colleagues and I strive to be worthy of it every day.

Albertans from all walks of life are unified and united: workers, community leaders, many indigenous leaders, industry. They stand together in calling for fairness, in calling for respect for the rule of law and the constitutional authority of the federal government, in calling for Alberta's right to defend our workers, to defend our economy and our right to get a better price for our energy.

Madam Speaker, Albertans stand united. The members of this Assembly should stand united as well. I urge my colleagues in the Legislature to show that unity here today and to support this motion unanimously.

Thank you.

The Deputy Speaker: Questions or comments under Standing Order 29(2)(a)? The hon. Leader of the Official Opposition.

Mr. Kenney: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'd like to thank and commend the hon. minister for her remarks and agree with much of what she has said. I have a question, though. One of the reasons that Trans Mountain has become so important, that the stakes are so high, is because of the failure of other coastal pipelines, including Energy East. Given that TransCanada pulled its application on Energy East because of the NEB's decision to get into the regulation of up- and downstream carbon emissions, will the hon. Minister of Energy join with me in calling on the federal government to prevent the regulator from looking at the issue of up- or downstream carbon emissions in future pipeline applications?

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. minister.

Ms McCuaig-Boyd: Thank you, Madam Speaker. In fact, I think I'm on record for letters we have transmitted giving our feedback on the process with the NEB on the overreach. I can say from my conversations with TransCanada that their decision was also based on financial reasons.

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. Minister of Indigenous Relations.

Mr. Feehan: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I am very interested to hear the minister speak for a moment about the indigenous representations with regard to the Trans Mountain pipeline.

I also want to take a moment to acknowledge the presence here of Chief Billy Morin from the Enoch reserve, who's been very interested in this conversation that we have been engaged in this afternoon.

I also want to take a moment to just ask a question of the minister. I know that while the pipeline is the focus of our conversation this afternoon, there's been a very clear message to us from the indigenous community, which I would like to relate and have the minister reflect on, and that is, simply, that moccasins come in pairs. While we are speaking of the pipeline and the importance of the jobs and the economic benefits that come from these kinds of endeavours in this province and in this country, the First Nations communities have consistently been behind and have asked to be participants in and have clearly indicated to me their desire to have the pipeline move ahead.

They've also indicated that their support for that kind of pipeline has been very much contingent upon the fact that we are also doing the other thing, wearing the other moccasin, and that is that we have a climate leadership plan that is taking care of the environment. What they are consistently saying to me is: we want to participate in all that is good in Alberta and benefit from the economic goodness that comes from our natural resources; we also need to make sure that we pass on an environment to our children and our grandchildren that will allow them to live their lives fully and in the traditional manner, which requires that the environment be taken care of. So they have very clearly tied the success we have had with the climate leadership initiative and particularly the indigenous climate leadership initiative to their support for projects such as the Trans Mountain pipeline.

You know, I'd just like to acknowledge that right now there are 124 projects under the climate leadership initiative that are going through the process – 38 of them are already in the process of being built, and the rest of them are in the process of being okayed – that demonstrate the indigenous community's firm commitment to the climate leadership initiative. So they are there saying: we want to work on the pipeline; we want the pipeline to benefit all Albertans. They are simultaneously saying, "We want to ensure that we have a good environment," and that requires that we have a climate leadership plan that is based on our carbon levy.

I would like to ask the minister if she sees how the indigenous community sees the intertwining of these two projects and whether or not she as the Minister of Energy supports the indigenous community in their requests for both the pipeline and the climate leadership initiative.

5:10

The Deputy Speaker: Any other members wishing to speak to the motion? Rimbey-Rocky Mountain House-Sundre.

Mr. Nixon: Well, thank you for recognizing me today on this important motion. I'd like to start off first by reiterating what the hon. Leader of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition stated so clearly in his speech this afternoon, and that is that the United Conservative caucus in this House generally supports this motion. We support the need to stand up for this pipeline going to the Pacific coast through the province of B.C. In fact, Madam Speaker, as you well know, we have stood in this House over and over and over raising concerns on this issue and, in fact, articulating concerns on the lack of action from the government that is across from me today. So today, first of all, I celebrate the fact that this NDP government finally seems to be moving on this important file. It's disappointing for me, though, that it has taken this long for us to get to this point.

Madam Speaker, I am today going to move an amendment on this important motion to make it stronger, to make it clearer that the federal government has a responsibility to use its powers to step in, to get the government to agree with us that their Trudeau allies in Ottawa have to stand up and do the right thing to make sure that this pipeline gets built.

Now, Madam Speaker, we have talked about this in this House for a long time. We have talked about this in question period and in debates, and over and over and over members across the way, members of the government, have stood up and guaranteed that this pipeline would be built, guaranteed that there would be no problems going forward, have belittled and made fun of in some ways the opposition many times for even raising this important issue in this House. Something changed magically over the last few days. I was excited to sit in the Chamber and listen to the throne speech from the Lieutenant Governor and finally see some language in there that

shows clearly that we will start to take steps to stand up for this great province.

You know, before he was a member of this place, I had the privilege of campaigning across much of the province with the hon. Member for Calgary-Lougheed as he campaigned for the leadership of this party. I can tell you that at every stop along the way this issue was discussed. It is probably one of the most important issues that we heard from people across the province on, and every time the hon. Member for Calgary-Lougheed took the podium, he spoke about this issue. He spoke about this issue.

In fact, if you want to hear some of the things that he said along the way, you could probably read sections of the government's throne speech because they took a lot of his comments across the way. They saw the light. The problem, Madam Speaker, though, is that it took this government too long to get there. My constituents and the people of Alberta don't have time for this government to continue to take six months or a year or longer to get to the right decision, which is to protect them.

Across my constituency of Rimbey-Rocky Mountain House-Sundre people are out of work. The economy has still been tough. Things are rough still. You know, a good friend of mine in Rimbey, Shawn Hatala, a great, great guy, has been out of work. I talked to him on the way up here on Sunday night. He's been out of work for over a year, looking to get back to work. Shawn does not have time for this government to take six months or a year every time to see the light.

So we are going to move an amendment to the motion today that will help us to hopefully see that through. As such, I have the appropriate copies for the pages, and I will wait for you to tell me I can continue, Madam Speaker.

The Deputy Speaker: We'll refer to this as amendment A1.

Go ahead and continue speaking to it, hon. member.

Mr. Nixon: Thank you, Madam Speaker. My amendment is to move that Government Motion 2 be amended (a) in the first recital by striking out "the government of Alberta's fight on behalf of Albertans' interests" and substituting "the efforts by the government of Alberta to fight on behalf of Albertans' interests" and (b) in the second recital (i) by striking out "continue to" and (ii) by adding ", including putting before Parliament a declaration that the pipeline is in the national interest pursuant to section 92(10)(c) of the Constitution Act, 1867" after "construction."

Madam Speaker, I move this amendment for the reasons already articulated by the Leader of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition in the House today to make it clear that we want to support this government's efforts. It has taken a long time for the government to finally put serious efforts forward on this important issue, but this side of the House, as opposition, and, I hope, the whole House will support the government's efforts to advocate for and to fight on behalf of Albertans to get this pipeline built.

The second portion makes it clear that we expect this government and this House to make a clear statement to Prime Minister Justin Trudeau and the federal Liberal Party up there in Ottawa that it is their responsibility to do something, that no longer will we accept paper approval of this project. It's time for the Prime Minister to stand up and finish what he promised the Premier and what the Premier, in turn, promised this House would happen, and that is that we would get this pipeline built. As long as the government continues to avoid that issue, to avoid the confrontation and to avoid standing up for this province with the federal government and insisting that Justin Trudeau take concrete action to get this pipeline built, we may still be here in six or seven months. This is important, Madam Speaker.

I will tell you that the hon. Member for Calgary-Lougheed – I'm just getting used to not being able to say his name in the House because it was said so much last time that we were here – said on November 10, 2017: well, in 1982 Peter Lougheed shut off the taps of Alberta oil and gas to central Canada to get the attention of the federal government on national energy policy; you know, perhaps we should consider doing the same thing with respect to current shipments of oil throughout the Kinder Morgan pipeline, that existed for 60 years and that fuels much of the Lower Mainland economy; B.C. needs to understand that its economy is partly dependent on Alberta oil and gas, and if they want to violate the rule of law and violate free trade in Canada, there will be consequences.

Now, Madam Speaker, what did the Premier say in response to Mr. Kenney? I quote: I think that some of the suggestions that have come from Mr. Kenney are a very isolationist view of how Alberta should engage with the rest of the country; you know, I honestly won't be surprised if he's essentially saying that what we should do is build a wall around Alberta; I wouldn't be surprised if tomorrow he comes out demanding that B.C. pay for it, and then the next day he'll come out and wonder why it is that we can't get a pipeline built. Madam Speaker, that was the response from the Premier to the then candidate for Leader of the Official Opposition.

This Premier is now doing the exact same thing that the hon. Member for Calgary-Lougheed advocated at that time. How can Albertans trust this government? What has changed? There's no answer to that. I'm glad it's changed. But we need them to go all the way because the people in my constituency, the people across Alberta cannot afford anymore for this government to take forever to make solid decisions on behalf of this province.

You know, we've been promised by this government that as a result of the carbon tax we'd be gaining social licence, that it would be okay, that pipelines would go to the coast in the future because we brought in this carbon tax. It was okay for the people across Alberta to pay significant amounts of tax out of their hard-earned income because that's what they're going to get. Here are the facts. I disagree with that completely, but at least this government could have delivered on that promise. Madam Speaker, my constituents have been paying the carbon tax for a couple of years now – in fact, it was just raised in January by 50 per cent, I believe – and still no pipeline is being built.

In question period today I asked the environment minister about my constituents, about some of the social agencies that work in my constituency. In fact, I referred to the aquaplex, which is a swimming pool that a nonprofit organization runs inside the community of Sundre so our children and other people can utilize the swimming pool, you know, to recreate. A very important issue. She responded, in turn, by talking about a seniors' centre that was in danger of shutting down rather than talking about the aquaplex, which was fine, and seemed to indicate that now everything was going to be okay, that they're finally reaching out to that seniors' centre to get them some funding.

5:20

Well, here are the facts, Madam Speaker. The Leader of the Official Opposition and I were visiting the seniors' centre just a few short weeks ago. Do you know what they got back from the government? They were told: "Have a fundraiser to pay for your carbon tax. Raise the rates on your fixed-income seniors to pay for your carbon tax." That's the social safety net of my community, a small seniors' centre that helps the people that built our community recreate, that gives them a place to go in their senior years to be able to enjoy a great place. In fact, when the hon. leader and I were there, they were trying to teach us how to dance. I have to say, Madam Speaker, that it's pretty hard to teach a guy with size 16 feet how to

dance, so I don't think I did very good at it, and I think the leader actually beat me at darts.

The point is that this government told that seniors' centre: "Take all this pain. We'll get you a pipeline built." The reality is that no matter what, we will not get social licence to work on this issue. It's been proven. It's time for the government to walk away from that.

It's time for the government to take concrete action, demand that the federal government stand up. Madam Speaker, you have heard me talk in this Chamber, in questions to the ministers and to the Premier across the way, about paper approval from Justin Trudeau. We can see what paper approval from the Premier's ally Justin Trudeau is worth. We see what it is worth right now. It ain't worth the paper it's printed on. It ain't worth nothing. It is time for the Premier and her ministers to call up the federal Liberals and say: "You must do this. This is in the national interest of our country. Actually do what you said that you would do."

By amending this motion, we're giving an opportunity to the government, who has now given us an opportunity – and we appreciate it – to be able to show that we support them on the importance of this pipeline, to show that they are truly serious about this motion, that their change of heart that has happened in the last 72 hours or in the last week or so on this important issue is true and that they support a simple amendment, a very simple amendment, that will then allow this whole House to be able to send a clear message to B.C. that this is not acceptable and also to the federal government that it is not acceptable for them to continue to provide paper approval, to say one thing when they're in Edmonton and to say another thing when they're on the other side of the country. That is completely not acceptable.

I hope that the government will have a serious look at this amendment. I will say, Madam Speaker, for the record that we did reach out to the government in advance on this amendment. In fact, I met with the hon. Government House Leader just before I headed home for the weekend, so this is not an amendment that has just been put on the floor as a surprise. We are negotiating in good faith. We do hope that the government does what they said that they would do with this motion, which was to work with this entire Assembly to make sure that we have a solid motion that this House can send to this country that makes it clear where we stand and that we will not accept this behaviour anymore and that there will be consequences if it continues.

Thank you very much, Madam Speaker.

The Deputy Speaker: Questions or comments under Standing Order 29(2)(a)?

Seeing none, just before I recognize the hon. minister, a reminder, hon. member, that even when quoting, we don't use names.

The hon. Minister of Transportation.

Mr. Mason: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Interestingly enough, that includes mentioning your own name in the House, which has happened.

I do want to thank the hon. House leader of the Official Opposition for his amendment and for his comments. I think that they're very, very interesting, and I'm going to talk about those specifically a bit later. I want to correct an impression that the Leader of the Official Opposition and his House leader have been leaving with the public and with members of the House. I think it was the hon. Leader of the Official Opposition who suggested that somehow we've had a conversion on the road to Damascus on this issue. The Opposition House Leader just said, you know, that we're recent converts to this. Madam Speaker, I don't think anything could be further from the truth, and I want to take a moment to try and set the record straight with respect to that.

The government established the climate leadership plan, and it's generally recognized as one of the foremost plans to deal with climate change. Now, the opposition has of course dealt just with what they like to call the job-killing carbon tax, but that, of course, is just one component of a much broader program to help Alberta reduce its emissions to make significant contributions to that issue. The opposition seems to forget, when it talks about the job-killing carbon tax, that, in fact, climate change and carbon emissions are a real and existential problem in the world that the world as a whole is trying to come to grips with. I think that it's important to recognize that it's not a trivial matter. Whether a carbon tax, at whatever level, is in there or not, the point is that we need to take some real action to deal with climate change, and the opposition tends to just ignore that fact and gloss over it.

As a result of the climate leadership plan, the federal government in November 2016 approved the Trans Mountain pipeline. That was November 2016. That's well, well over a year ago, Madam Speaker. We worked very hard, this government worked very hard with the federal government not just on the climate change plan but to secure approval for the pipeline. We were hard at work almost from the outset of this government's term in order to not only deal with the important question of climate change but also to secure support for the pipeline.

Now, the Leader of the Official Opposition has suggested that we haven't really followed through on that, but when the British Columbia government and British Columbia municipalities brought forward actions to challenge and to delay the Trans Mountain pipeline, the government of Alberta stepped up and intervened and actively defended that. We were not idle, Madam Speaker, as they would like to suggest. We have had a consistent policy of aggressively defending Alberta's interests.

When the B.C. government undertook unconstitutional means to try and delay the pipeline, we also responded very strongly and appropriately by cancelling negotiations for power agreements with respect to the site C dam and then eliminating B.C. wine from the listings from the current gaming control board. When we took that action, Madam Speaker, the results were effective. The results were extremely effective in the fact that the B.C. government withdrew its contentious extralegal attack on Alberta's industry. Only then did the Premier suspend the wine boycott.

Now, the Opposition House Leader suggested also in his remarks that, in fact, it was only after the climate leadership plan was adopted that the Northern Gateway pipeline was cancelled. He's suggesting in that that it was our climate leadership plan that in some way led to the demise of the pipeline through to Kitimat, the Northern Gateway. But, you know, the facts couldn't be more different. In fact, it was the actions of the federal government, of whom the Leader of the Official Opposition was a key member, that led to the cancellation of that project by the courts.

I can tell you a little bit about what the courts had to say about the federal government's work with respect to the Northern Gateway pipeline. The Federal Court of Appeal overturned Enbridge's controversial Northern Gateway project after finding that Ottawa failed to properly consult the First Nations affected by the pipeline. "We [find] that Canada offered only a brief, hurried and inadequate opportunity... to exchange and discuss information and to dialogue." It goes on to say: "It would have taken Canada little time and little organizational effort to engage in meaningful dialogue on these and other subjects of prime importance to Aboriginal peoples. But this did not happen."

5:30

The Court of Appeal ruling says that the standard for consultation doesn't have to be perfection but whether reasonable efforts to

inform and consult were made. The judges found that the federal government had not met that standard. This is again a quote from the ruling.

The inadequacies – more than just a handful and more than mere imperfections – left entire subjects of central interest to the affected First Nations, sometimes subjects affecting their subsistence and well-being, entirely ignored. Many impacts of the Project – some identified in the Report of the Joint Review Panel, some not – were left undisclosed, undiscussed and unconsidered.

For the Leader of the Official Opposition to attempt to suggest that this government's climate change policy was responsible for the cancellation of the Northern Gateway project is beyond stretching the truth, Madam Speaker. It is, in fact, very contrary, directly contrary, to the actual facts that it was the negligence and neglect of the federal government, of which he was a member, that resulted in the courts cancelling that project. If that is the standard of veracity that we can expect from the Leader of the Official Opposition, then I am very, very worried indeed for the future of politics in our province.

Now, the other claim, equally dubious in my view, is that we are somehow now just following behind the UCP on this issue. Well, I don't think that that's any more accurate than the rest, Madam Speaker. While the Premier was touring Canada, speaking to the Calgary Chamber of commerce, speaking in Toronto, speaking to the Vancouver board of trade, building a national consensus on the Trans Mountain pipeline, we had the Leader of the Official Opposition, newly elected, having yet to take a seat in the House, sabre rattling and making bellicose threats to the British Columbia government and to the people of British Columbia.

That's not what we have done. What we have done is move deliberately and judiciously. When legal challenges were launched, we responded legally. When extraconstitutional threats were made, we responded appropriately and effectively. That's the difference between being in government and being a responsible government and being in opposition and having the luxury of just saying whatever it is you want.

Now, Madam Speaker, I spent a lot of time in opposition. The Leader of the Official Opposition spent a lot of time in government, but I think he's going to spend a lot of time in opposition. I know that being in opposition is ever so much easier than governing a province. That's one of the first things I learned after the last election. I want to suggest to all hon. members over there that, yes, you can say whatever you want in opposition, but you may in fact do harm. You may in fact worsen the situation. I suggest that's exactly what's been happening, and that's what the Premier has been talking about. There's a difference between taking appropriate action when it is time to do so, when you have exhausted your other options, your other tools, and making empty threats. That's the difference, I think, between this Premier and that Leader of the Official Opposition.

Now, let us deal a little bit with the amendment that we've seen from the Official Opposition. They propose to do a couple of things; first of all, not to support the government's fight but to support efforts by the government to fight. In other words, they're suggesting that what the government has been doing may not be very effective. Madam Speaker, that is where we fundamentally disagree. This government has been extremely effective in defending Alberta's interests and is going to continue to do so and has sent clear signals to British Columbia and across the country that we're going to continue to do so. So that part, I think, just weakens it. It suggests that the government has been remiss, and I don't agree with that for one moment.

Then there's this interesting thing that they've included as part of their amendment that says: including declaring the pipeline in the national interest by use of section 92(10)(c) of the Constitution. Now, that's a very interesting thing. I know that Senator Black from Calgary has introduced something in the Senate along the same lines, but I think we should take a close look at what that section actually says. Section 92 says, "In each Province the Legislature may exclusively make Laws in relation to Matters coming within the Classes of Subjects next hereinafter enumerated; that is to say," blah, blah, blah. But section (10) of that says, "Local Works and Undertakings other than such as are of the following Classes." And (10)(c), which this amendment specifically refers to, says, "Such Works as, although wholly situate within the Province, are before or after their Execution declared by the Parliament of Canada to be for the general Advantage of Canada or for the Advantage of Two or more of the Provinces."

Now, there's the thing, Madam Speaker. This clause is intended to be used to exert federal authority in a case of national interest in something that is entirely within a province, because sometimes things within provincial jurisdiction may be in the national interest. That's what the clause is there to do. But in regard to interprovincial matters such as pipelines the government clearly has the constitutional authority to act. It does not need this clause, nor does this clause apply to interprovincial matters such as pipelines.

The opposition wants us to pass this so that they can look like, you know, they're really toughening up the positions, but in fact they're introducing an amendment that invokes an entirely irrelevant section of the Constitution and pretending that that somehow adds something to the debate. It doesn't, Madam Speaker.

For those reasons, there's no reason for this House to support that part of their amendment either because it clearly refers to things entirely within provincial jurisdiction. Every Albertan knows already that this is a matter of interprovincial trade and is clearly within the jurisdiction of the federal government. We don't need this. In fact, it may muddy the waters, so I think that the House should reject it.

Just in conclusion, Madam Speaker, this government has worked very hard to protect the jobs and the security of Albertans, and we're going to continue to do so.

The Deputy Speaker: Under Standing Order 29(2)(a), the hon. Opposition House Leader.

Mr. Nixon: Madam Speaker, not on debate, but the table officers asked me to point out on my amendment that I would like to request that this amendment be voted in three separate votes, those being part (a), part (b)(i), and, finally, part (b)(ii).

My colleague would like to speak under 29(2)(a), I believe.

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

Mr. McIver: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I appreciate that. I was interested to hear the Government House Leader's comments. He covered quite a bit of ground, and I'm not sure I can really comment to him on everything in the five minutes allotted, but I'm going to start. I have to say that he spent some time talking about being effective. Well, I would say to the hon. Government House Leader, through you, of course, that the definition of effective is getting other people to do things that need to be done and things that you say need to be done.

I would submit to you, Madam Speaker, that the hon. Premier and Government House Leader were largely sitting on their hands on these issues until the Leader of the Official Opposition became a factor and made his views known. Suddenly the government's entire focus shifted based on that, including the throne speech.

Broad sections of it could have been written by this side of the House and, in particular, our leader.

Now, I would submit that if there is any definition of being effective, that is it, when you, being the leader of a party in the minority in a Legislature, can get the government to do a whole range of things that they absolutely were sitting on their hands about and refused to do until you showed up on the scene, and suddenly they're spending all of their time trying to look as if they were the Leader of the Official Opposition by copying all the things that they had made fun of ever so recently, beginning with the idea of the legal challenge.

5:40

Now, in fact, Madam Speaker, I'll say that the government themselves can't quite get their story straight. The Premier today had said of the idea of raising section 92(10)(c) that the government already has that power, so it's not necessary. Now the Government House Leader has said that, in fact, the section won't be used. So the government, I would suggest, probably needs to have a huddle and get on the same page. The Government House Leader and the Premier aren't even on the same page, let alone all the other private members on the government side.

The other thing, too, is that we and our leader have been quite supportive, frankly, of the Premier and the government when they have done the things we've suggested, getting B.C.'s attention. We were even supportive of the Premier and the government when they put on the wine ban. In fact, we kind of agreed with the Premier and continue to agree that that got the B.C. government's attention. We're a little more disappointed that they folded their tent after about a week and left the impression – I know it's not exactly a week. Somebody will quibble over whether it was two weeks or one. Nonetheless, they folded their tent and left the people of B.C. and, in particular, the government of B.C. to have the impression that Alberta has nailed it in, they're all done, and they're not interested anymore.

What you have here is a government pretending – pretending – to have cared about this issue but that really only woke up from the blissful slumber after the Leader of the Official Opposition started speaking publicly about this, even from the time before he was the Leader of the Official Opposition. So I think it rings pretty hollow to me when the Government House Leader is trying to leave the impression that they actually were making an impression and working hard. I would add as additional evidence to that the fact that when the Premier a year ago went to see the person who's now the Premier of British Columbia, that person, now Premier Horgan, made it clear to the media – you don't have to take my word for it. He told the media that the Premier didn't even press him on the pipeline issue. So when the Government House Leader is trying to say that they're not, that they haven't been converted on the road to trying to get re-elected, I think no one will believe that because the evidence is all to the contrary. All to the contrary.

Further, it is true that, frankly, the government's friend Prime Minister Trudeau was part of killing Energy East through the National Energy Board. I don't think there's any doubt about that. This is the same Prime Minister that in one breath – of course, I would caution the government to be careful about whom they make friends with because they can't . . . [Mr. McIver's speaking time expired]

The Deputy Speaker: Any other members wishing to speak to the amendment? The hon. Member for Chestermere-Rocky View.

Mrs. Aheer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Again, I'd like to reiterate what the Leader of the Opposition said earlier and

commend the government on moving forward with this. I think that's something that we can all agree on.

It's interesting because when I think back to when the Minister of Energy and I both started out on this, we were both starting at a sort of similar level with – I can't speak for her but for myself, anyway – quite a limited understanding of just what an immense resource we have in this province. The language around how we are perceived, whether that's globally or within our province or within our country, requires some teeth. It requires people who truly believe in resources and understand the privilege that we have in this province in bringing those resources forward, especially the amazingly incredible manner in which we do it, in the responsible way that we develop resources here.

I think back to that time as a new MLA and the way that the energy industry just sort of opened up their arms and educated me in understanding what was important. It became very clear to me at that point in time that Alberta needed people to take that stance and bring forward all of the positive things that were already being done in previous governments and then things that would come forward in this government as well but, mostly, just understand Albertans and the mentality here and the fabric of who we are in this province. We are job creators, not governments but actually people, the industry. That's the fabric of who we are in this province.

If you talk to anybody on the street at any time – and I wear my I love Alberta oil sands T-shirt pretty much everywhere I go. Believe me; I've gotten into some interesting conversations as a result of that. But the more important thing about it, Madam Speaker, is actually having that conversation. I think, to the credit of our House leader on this side, that's what he's talking about when talking about strengthening this bill and strengthening the language that's in there. It's not just about saying it. It's about saying it and meaning it and feeling it and putting it across in a way that everybody around you is inspired by what you're actually doing here, not the rhetoric, not the stuff that we hear all the time. It's about actually feeling at a visceral level the privilege of what we have in this province. I mean, the Leader of the Opposition said it very, very well.

One of the things that you have to think about is that carbon leakage aspect. One of the things that continuously doesn't get spoken about in any meaningful way and that needs to be continued is that no matter what we do here – no matter what we do – there is so much more oil that is going to be produced and other products in the world that will provide for other countries what it is that we can already do way better than anybody else. Nobody can dispute that in this House.

Truthfully, I remember when I was first starting out in understanding the industry and trying to figure out sort of what was going on. Everywhere we went, when we were talking with people who were trying to understand what the government was doing, all we heard were negative things about our resources. I can attest to that. Honestly, since I've been in this House, we've done nothing, on this side anyway, except to try and promote the industry. And it came up against one attack after another: you're a climate denier; you're this; you're that, whatever names could be called to people that actually were standing up for resource development in this province. Really?

I have a very, very difficult time believing that all of a sudden the government has just made a turn. I mean, I'm grateful. I hope it continues. I would love nothing more than to support that. But the language needs to be inspirational. It needs to alter the way that – I mean, when the minister of environmental change was in Paris the first and the second time, I don't recall seeing anything in the news where she actually stood up and talked to people that were in Europe saying that we are the tar sands, that we're dirty oil. There

were no articles coming from the minister on that side or Minister McKenna, for that matter, saying what great producers we are here, that people in the world should be taking a leaf out of our book, that they should be looking at what we're doing here. Not one.

I looked because I thought by the second or third time that if people in the government actually believed that we in this province are the best at what we do in the world, the language would have changed. But no. All of the articles were saying that we're still the dirty tar sands, that we're these massive producers. Okay. Yes, we are carbon intensive. Nobody is suggesting the latter. However, if you actually want to learn how to do this right, we are the best. We should be using that language, especially when it comes to B.C.

I mean, what I found interesting is that there was another piece that came out where they were saying something about the Leader of the Official Opposition, that somehow the way that he was speaking was going to cause issues with investment here and that's because he was anti climate plan or something along those lines and that we shouldn't be looking at suing the federal government because it would cost too much money for Albertans. Yet the government had no problem doing that with PPAs, no problem suing themselves, no problem suing Enmax or anybody else to the tune of \$2.6 billion but isn't willing to at least look at it from a different perspective and see what constitutional rights we have with respect to the federal government. I find that extremely frustrating.

5:50

I can understand the difficulty. You know, the government is catching all sorts of grief – right? – on the carbon tax, that they didn't campaign on, to rebate, to not rebate, free light bulbs. Then the Prime Minister told them that within their plan, pipeline expansion was possible. Really? On one hand, the provincial government is saying that it's interprovincial trade, and then on the other hand, they're saying that it's federal jurisdiction. My understanding is that it's federal jurisdiction. The things that are happening with B.C. are being empowered not only by the federal government but by inaction from the government before that.

Again, I love the fact that we're making this turn. This is fantastic. I fully support the motion and fully support making it stronger because the B.C. government now stands in the way. On top of that, we have the likes of Tzepporah Berman and Karen Mahon, who were hand-picked by that minister to be on the oil sands advisory panel, who are now actively campaigning against pipelines – actively – and the Alberta taxpayer paid for those two to be on that panel. So we haven't bought social licence.

To tell you the truth, Madam Speaker, my understanding of social licence was that the NEB or whatever arm's-length group that was involved in this particular situation – social licence is actually working with the groups that are impacted by disturbance. For example, in Trans Mountain pipeline there's a small percentage – I think it's 11 per cent disturbance – that is changing, because the pipeline is already there. They're doubling it. I think there's about – I'm not sure if my numbers are correct – 11 per cent disturbance. My understanding of social licence was and always has been that folks that are along the pipeline, anybody that's going to be impacted, no matter who you are, whether you're a farmer, First Nations, or anybody else, has to be able to be, by the NEB, constantly in contact, updated on changes, made sure that they understand. Those are social licence things. Those are actually ingrained or were ingrained in the NEB previous to this situation.

My understanding is that it was already there. I didn't think it was something we had to purchase or bargain for. I think the words, the term, the sentence has been misused. We already had a process that was extremely, extremely well rounded and thoughtful. Yes, there

have been mistakes made – I have no doubt about that – but that was not a reason for cancellation. That was a reason to look at it and see how we could do better. At least, that was my understanding. That's what social licence was supposed to deliver. When mistakes have been made, that's the whole point. That's why it exists.

You know, Tzeborah Berman made an interesting comment. She said: we need pipelines for a climate plan is like saying we are selling cigarettes to people to get them to stop smoking. It's an interesting conflation – isn't it? – comparing basically the prosperity of Canada, who we are, down to cigarette smoking. I mean, doesn't that tell you something about the people that we've engaged to come into our province to work on the oil sands advisory panel? Then they go back out into the world and fight with this kind of language. I mean, where is ours? Where is ours? That's why this legislation needs a little bit more teeth, in my opinion, for whatever it's worth.

Senator David Tkachuk had a recent article that he was speaking in, and he said that British Columbians think they can kill pipelines because they know Ottawa doesn't care. Why is that, do you think? Why do you think Ottawa doesn't care? If that's the truth. The language isn't there to inspire, to see what is actually possible here about prosperity because nobody is speaking up for that. Are we that risk averse that we're not willing to take a stand and step forward and, you know, take a little bit of it? I know. I realize it's difficult, especially when you've sold a climate action plan as being the reason to get social licence, to get pipelines and that it's not working out as you had planned. Madam Speaker, I understand that. I think anybody would have difficulty with that.

Having said that, you have to take a step back and understand: what is it that we're actually trying to accomplish here? We're trying to make sure that those of us who have the privilege of being in here are speaking on behalf of Albertans, and Albertans – we all know this; we all have the privilege of speaking to them all the time – love this province. They come from all over the world to work in this province and not for any particular – there are a lot of different jobs. There are a lot of different things that spin off as a result of energy jobs, mostly because we had the opportunity to provide them with that, with a life, a way of life that is second to none.

You know, it's interesting. When we talk about the National Energy Board and the Trans Mountain pipeline, did you know, Madam Speaker, that the project had a 29-month review from the National Energy Board? In fact, they actually said that the pipeline was in the public interest. Even more interesting is that it has an environmental assessment certificate already done. It's worth about \$7.4 billion just as it is.

I mean, I think we can all agree in here that B.C. is being reckless.

The thing is that when a province or anybody, for that matter, feels empowered to move forward and feels like they have the upper hand, they're going to do that. They're going against this approved process. That's, again, something that we can all agree on in here. Kudos to the Premier for standing up. That was great to see.

Here's an interesting thing. We've got ballooning deficits, and as we know, we're losing investment to the United States because it's a much more efficient and better place for people to invest in right now. So how do we make it better here? Well, for one thing, we have to be the biggest proponents of this industry. We have to be the ones that – everything that you show, that goes forward is this tremendous amount of pride in our industry, not just saying it, but really, really believing it.

As the minister had said earlier, so much advancement has been made. The industry is doing a phenomenal job, and Albertans do hold them accountable. If there's anybody in here who truly believes that anybody, industry or otherwise, does not care about their earth, air, and water, I challenge you to talk to anybody in this province. The families that work in these areas send their kids to school right down the street from where these projects are. Please don't tell me, Madam Speaker, that they don't care about their earth, air, and water. That's completely disrespectful and should never be said out loud.

You know, we have the deficit. Did you know that in the first 20 years of the Trans Mountain pipeline's opportunities we could generate \$18.5 billion in fiscal benefits? This is coming from the Senator. Just to be fair, too, the pipeline has passed and surpassed all regulatory pieces. Again, can you imagine – just to give an example, like, we have, potentially, Trudeau doing a tanker ban on the west coast, another thing that I think we need our government to stand up and expressly say: that is not okay.

The Deputy Speaker: Under Standing Order 29(2)(a), Calgary-Hays.

Mr. McIver: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I appreciate that. I just wanted to talk to the hon. member. She talked about social licence. I'm interested if she would agree that when the government promised social licence and the Premier of B.C. is fighting against them on this pipeline and the Prime Minister of Canada essentially has caused, through the National Energy Board, Energy East to get cancelled – would you not agree that the government has been pulled over . . .

The Deputy Speaker: I hesitate to interrupt, hon. member, but pursuant to Standing Order 4(2) the House stands adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

[The Assembly adjourned at 6 p.m.]

Table of Contents

Prayers.....	7
Mr. Garth Alphonse Turcott, July 30, 1930, to January 11, 2018.....	7
Statements by the Speaker	
Commonwealth Day Message from the Queen	7
Members' 10th Anniversary of Election.....	7
Rotation of Questions and Members' Statements.....	9
Introduction of Visitors	7
Introduction of Guests	8
Oral Question Period	10
Trans Mountain Pipeline Expansion Opposition, Carbon Levy.....	10
Energy Policies and Social Licence.....	10
Energy Policies.....	11
Nonprofit Organizations.....	12
Trans Mountain Pipeline Expansion Project.....	12
Oil Sands Development Concerns	13
Carbon Levy Increase.....	13
Carbon Levy	14, 16
Nonprofit Organizations and the Carbon Levy.....	14
Inter Pipeline Heartland Petrochemical Plant.....	15
Energy Industry Diversification	15
Electricity Power Purchase Arrangement, Lawsuit Settlement.....	17
Geothermal Project in Hinton.....	18
Members' Statements	
International Women's Day.....	18
Former Member for Fort McMurray-Conklin	18
Challenge in the Rockies 2018	19
Women's Political Engagement	19
Volunteer Firefighters	19
Heart Health and Emergency Services	20
Presenting Petitions	20
Tabling Returns and Reports	20
Orders of the Day	20
Government Motions	
Trans Mountain Pipeline	21

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