



Province of Alberta

The 29th Legislature
Fourth Session

Alberta Hansard

Tuesday afternoon, March 13, 2018

Day 3

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
Anderson, Hon. Shaye, Leduc-Beaumont (NDP)
Anderson, Wayne, Highwood (UCP)
Babcock, Erin D., Stony Plain (NDP)
Barnes, Drew, Cypress-Medicine Hat (UCP)
Bilous, Hon. Deron, Edmonton-Beverly-Clareview (NDP)
Carlier, Hon. Oneil, Whitecourt-St. Anne (NDP)
Carson, Jonathon, Edmonton-Meadowlark (NDP)
Ceci, Hon. Joe, Calgary-Fort (NDP)
Clark, Greg, Calgary-Elbow (AP),
Alberta Party Opposition House Leader
Connolly, Michael R.D., Calgary-Hawkwood (NDP)
Coolahan, Craig, Calgary-Klein (NDP)
Cooper, Nathan, Olds-Didsbury-Three Hills (UCP)
Cortes-Vargas, Estefania, Strathcona-Sherwood Park (NDP),
Government Whip
Cyr, Scott J., Bonnyville-Cold Lake (UCP)
Dach, Lorne, Edmonton-McClung (NDP)
Dang, Thomas, Edmonton-South West (NDP)
Drever, Deborah, Calgary-Bow (NDP)
Drysdale, Wayne, Grande Prairie-Wapiti (UCP)
Eggen, Hon. David, Edmonton-Calder (NDP)
Ellis, Mike, Calgary-West (UCP)
Feehan, Hon. Richard, Edmonton-Rutherford (NDP),
Deputy Government House Leader
Fildebrandt, Derek Gerhard, Strathmore-Brooks (Ind)
Fitzpatrick, Maria M., Lethbridge-East (NDP)
Fraser, Rick, Calgary-South East (AP)
Ganley, Hon. Kathleen T., Calgary-Buffalo (NDP),
Deputy Government House Leader
Gill, Prab, Calgary-Greenway (UCP),
Official Opposition Deputy Whip
Goehring, Nicole, Edmonton-Castle Downs (NDP)
Gottfried, Richard, Calgary-Fish Creek (UCP)
Gray, Hon. Christina, Edmonton-Mill Woods (NDP)
Hanson, David B., Lac La Biche-St. Paul-Two Hills (UCP)
Hinkley, Bruce, Wetaskiwin-Camrose (NDP)
Hoffman, Hon. Sarah, Edmonton-Glenora (NDP)
Horne, Trevor A.R., Spruce Grove-St. Albert (NDP)
Hunter, Grant R., Cardston-Taber-Warner (UCP)
Jansen, Hon. Sandra, Calgary-North West (NDP)
Kazim, Anam, Calgary-Glenmore (NDP)
Kenney, Hon. Jason, PC, Calgary-Lougheed (UCP),
Leader of the Official Opposition
Kleinstauber, Jamie, Calgary-Northern Hills (NDP)
Larivee, Hon. Danielle, Lesser Slave Lake (NDP),
Deputy Government House Leader
Littlewood, Jessica, Fort Saskatchewan-Vegreville (NDP)

Loewen, Todd, Grande Prairie-Smoky (UCP)
Loyola, Rod, Edmonton-Ellerslie (NDP)
Luff, Robyn, Calgary-East (NDP)
Malkinson, Brian, Calgary-Currie (NDP)
Mason, Hon. Brian, Edmonton-Highlands-Norwood (NDP),
Government House Leader
McCuaig-Boyd, Hon. Margaret,
Dunvegan-Central Peace-Notley (NDP)
McIver, Ric, Calgary-Hays (UCP),
Official Opposition Whip
McKittrick, Annie, Sherwood Park (NDP)
McLean, Hon. Stephanie V., Calgary-Varsity (NDP)
McPherson, Karen M., Calgary-Mackay-Nose Hill (AP)
Miller, Barb, Red Deer-South (NDP)
Miranda, Hon. Ricardo, Calgary-Cross (NDP)
Nielsen, Christian E., Edmonton-Decore (NDP)
Nixon, Jason, Rimbey-Rocky Mountain House-Sundre (UCP),
Official Opposition House Leader
Notley, Hon. Rachel, Edmonton-Strathcona (NDP),
Premier
Orr, Ronald, Lacombe-Ponoka (UCP)
Panda, Prasad, Calgary-Foothills (UCP)
Payne, Hon. Brandy, Calgary-Acadia (NDP)
Phillips, Hon. Shannon, Lethbridge-West (NDP)
Piquette, Colin, Athabasca-Sturgeon-Redwater (NDP)
Pitt, Angela D., Airdrie (UCP),
Official Opposition Deputy House Leader
Renaud, Marie F., St. Albert (NDP)
Rosendahl, Eric, West Yellowhead (NDP)
Sabir, Hon. Irfan, Calgary-McCall (NDP)
Schmidt, Hon. Marlin, Edmonton-Gold Bar (NDP)
Schneider, David A., Little Bow (UCP)
Schreiner, Kim, Red Deer-North (NDP)
Shepherd, David, Edmonton-Centre (NDP)
Sigurdson, Hon. Lori, Edmonton-Riverview (NDP)
Smith, Mark W., Drayton Valley-Devon (UCP)
Starke, Dr. Richard, Vermilion-Lloydminster (PC)
Stier, Pat, Livingstone-Macleod (UCP)
Strankman, Rick, Drumheller-Stettler (UCP)
Sucha, Graham, Calgary-Shaw (NDP)
Swann, Dr. David, Calgary-Mountain View (AL)
Taylor, Wes, Battle River-Wainwright (UCP)
Turner, Dr. A. Robert, Edmonton-Whitemud (NDP)
van Dijken, Glenn, Barrhead-Morinville-Westlock (UCP)
Westhead, Cameron, Banff-Cochrane (NDP),
Deputy Government Whip
Woollard, Denise, Edmonton-Mill Creek (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
Shannon Dean, Law Clerk and Director of
House Services
Stephanie LeBlanc, Senior Parliamentary
Counsel
Trafton Koenig, Parliamentary Counsel

Philip Massolin, Manager of Research and
Committee Services
Nancy Robert, Research Officer
Janet Schwegel, Managing Editor of
Alberta Hansard

Brian G. Hodgson, Sergeant-at-Arms
Chris Caughell, Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms
Paul Link, Assistant Sergeant-at-Arms
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 |
| Kleinsteuber | |

Special Standing Committee on Members' Services

Chair: Mr. Wanner
Deputy Chair: Cortes-Vargas

| | |
|---------|-----------|
| Cooper | Nixon |
| Dang | Piquette |
| Jabbour | 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 |
| Kleinsteuber | 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 |
| Kleinsteuber | Vacant |
| Loewen | |

Legislative Assembly of Alberta

1:30 p.m.

Tuesday, March 13, 2018

[The Speaker in the chair]

The Speaker: Hon. members, good afternoon. Please be seated.

Introduction of Guests

The Speaker: The hon. Member for Strathcona-Sherwood Park.

Cortes-Vargas: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure to introduce to you and through you to all members of the Assembly Strathcona Christian academy. They're here visiting the Legislature on their grade 6 trip. They're accompanied, of course, by their teacher, Alison Collins, and their many parent chaperones: Nick, Krista, Nicole, and Tracey. I would just ask the Legislature to greet them with the warm welcome of the Assembly.

The Speaker: Welcome.

The hon. Member for Barrhead-Morinville-Westlock.

Mr. van Dijken: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure to rise and introduce to you and through you to all members of the Legislature students from Pembina Valley Christian School. The students are accompanied by their teacher, Janalyn Toews, along with their chaperones, Verle Unruh and Barry Esau. I would ask them to rise and receive the traditional warm welcome of this Assembly.

The Speaker: Welcome.

The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs.

Mr. S. Anderson: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's an honour to rise on behalf of the Member for Fort Saskatchewan-Vegreville to introduce 56 students from the Win Ferguson school. They are accompanied by teachers Ms Sheila Storey, Mrs. Sarah Burgess, Mrs. Cathy Ord, and their chaperones: Mrs. Carilyn Afaganis, Ms Corrie Sidam, and Ms Chrissy MacQuarrie. I would ask if they would all rise now and receive the warm welcome of the House.

The Speaker: Welcome.

Do you have another visitor, hon. minister?

Mr. S. Anderson: I do. Not a school group.

The Speaker: Proceed, then.

Mr. S. Anderson: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's an honour to rise today and introduce to you and through you to the members of the Assembly Carmen Wyton, Wendy Jabusch, and Patrick Shaver from Building Industry and Land Development Alberta, otherwise known as BILD. BILD represents over 1,700 businesses, which, in turn, employ over 180,000 people across our province. I will have the pleasure of speaking at the reception this evening at the Federal Building.

Carmen Wyton is the CEO of BILD, and she is currently chair of the Canadian Society of Association Executives Edmonton and founder of the Women's Health Coalition of Alberta. She has served as a community member on several municipal and provincial government boards, most recently as the chair of the Premier's Council on the Status of Persons with Disabilities.

Wendy Jabusch is chair of BILD Alberta. Wendy has worked in all facets of the residential construction industry and is currently the senior vice-president of Edmonton homes at Brookfield Residential,

which is one of North America's leading land developers and builders.

Patrick Shaver began his career in the land development industry over 25 years ago and has held positions with the city of Edmonton, Enbridge Pipelines, and was a project manager for the aquatic centre for the Sydney 2000 Summer Olympic Games.

Also attending question period today with BILD Alberta representatives is Thomas Djurfors, who is an executive director in the public safety division of Municipal Affairs. They work closely with BILD and myself. I'm happy that Thomas is here with them in collaboration.

I would ask all of them, who are seated in our members' gallery, to stand and please be recognized by the Assembly.

The Speaker: Welcome.

The Minister of Indigenous Relations.

Mr. Feehan: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This afternoon I have two introductions. First, it's with great pleasure that I get to introduce the German choir Liederkrantz. Twenty-nine choirs world-wide gathered in Riva del Garda, Italy, for a four-day music festival and competition. On the final night of the festival the judges presented their evaluations to all the performing choirs in the 3,500-seat sanctuary of San Giovanni Catholic church, and it was Liederkrantz, from Edmonton, Alberta, that gleaned the highest marks from the judges in the seniors' category and were awarded the gold prize. This trip and event was a rewarding experience for the Liederkrantz choir members and their followers who travelled with them. This trip was made possible by the financial assistance of the AGLC. Liederkrantz, by their efforts, have demonstrated to the world the diversity and the cultural richness of the province of Alberta, and the moniker Edmonton, the City of Champions has once again been confirmed. I would ask all the members of the choir to please rise and receive the warm greetings of the House.

The Speaker: Welcome. Allow me to say danke schön.

Mr. Feehan: I have one more.

The Speaker: One more, hon. minister.

Mr. Feehan: A much more personal introduction, this second introduction, because I'd like to introduce the person who is the most responsible of anyone in the world for my being here today, and that is my mother. My mother has been my – Kay Feehan. I should mention her name, I guess. Kay Feehan has been my great protector and teacher and most devoted person behind my campaigns, donating to the maximum in the last year, I just want to point out, and has provided me with all the emotional support that I could possibly ask for. Accompanying her today is Father Albert Sterzer from St. Joseph parish in Grande Prairie, who is a long-time family friend. I'd ask them both to rise and receive the warm greetings of this House.

The Speaker: Welcome to you.

Hon. members, I think I missed a school group. The hon. Member for St. Albert.

Ms Renaud: Thank you, M. le Président. C'est avec fierté que je me lève à la Chambre aujourd'hui pour introduire the students from the very new and beautiful Lois E. Hole elementary school. I would get them to rise. They're with their teacher, Mat Knoll, and their chaperones, Keri-Ann Berga and Leila Devlin. Please join me in extending the welcome of the House.

The Speaker: Welcome.

The hon. Member for Edmonton-Decore.

Mr. Nielsen: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's a real treat to be able to rise today and introduce to you and through you to all members of the Assembly Clare Lazzer and her students from CDI College north campus legal studies program. My office and CDI College have worked together on numerous events such as the upcoming massagathon on May 25. If the students collect over \$1,000 in donations for SCARS, I will once again find myself in the dunk tank to help raise more money for this great cause. At this time I would ask my guests to please rise and receive the traditional warm welcome of this Assembly.

The Speaker: Welcome.

The Associate Minister of Health.

Ms Payne: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise today to introduce to you and through you a group of U of A pharmacy students joining us during Pharmacy Awareness Month. Alberta's pharmacists provide excellent front-line health care to Albertans every day, from medication advice to annual flu shots. We appreciate the important role pharmacists play in our health care system, and I hope my colleagues were able to stop by the heart health clinic downstairs to get their blood pressure checked, particularly in advance of QP. I now ask Jody Johnson, Sean Hanson, and Hannah Kaliel to please rise and receive the warm welcome of the House.

The Speaker: Welcome.

With your permission, I would like to just take a moment to congratulate one of our table officers, Stephanie LeBlanc, who has recently been appointed as Senior Parliamentary Counsel. This year marks Stephanie's 10th anniversary with the Legislative Assembly Office. I think I heard that number of 10 years recently. She was hired as a legal research officer in 2008 and joined the table as Parliamentary Counsel the next year. Stephanie was born and raised in Regina and graduated with a bachelor of law with great distinction from the University of Saskatchewan in 2006, winning the Law Society of Saskatchewan silver medal in her graduating class. Stephanie plays a significant role in the office of Parliamentary Counsel, and many of you will be very familiar with her excellent work, her sound advice, and her pleasant demeanour. Stephanie continues to take on increased responsibility with that office, all while raising two young daughters with her husband. I'd ask, hon. members, if you would please join me in congratulating Stephanie on becoming Senior Parliamentary Counsel.

1:40

Members' Statements

The Speaker: The hon. Member for Athabasca-Sturgeon-Redwater.

Agricultural Safety Week

Mr. Piquette: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise today to recognize Canadian Ag Safety Week and would like to commend the organizers for this year's theme of Supporting Seniors. Farming is more than a job; it's a way of life. Our government took action to make that life better for farm and ranch workers by guaranteeing basic workplace protections so that if they get hurt at work, their families will know that they'll be taken care of.

The proof is in the statistics. Since legislation was introduced, an additional 2,478 farms and ranches now have no-fault insurance coverage. That translates to 8,041 more farm and ranch workers who now have robust workplace protections. That's a lot of rural Albertans that members opposite would leave vulnerable to legal battles and lost income in the event of farm accidents.

However, as essential as WCB coverage may be, it is, of course, much better to prevent farm accidents from happening in the first place. Including farm and ranch workers under basic health and safety rules is critical to this effort, and so are the continued ongoing safety education efforts made by our ag societies and producer associations. This year's focus on seniors is well founded. Fatality rates from farm accidents are consistently higher for adults aged 60 and over, with a fatality rate of 22 per cent.

This is something I've seen for myself. In the last several years I've had two dear friends killed in farming accidents. In May 2014 a beef producer from Colinton was killed by one of his own bulls. In September of 2015 a grain farmer from Newbrook was killed in a silo accident. Both men were in their 70s when they passed away. These men worked hard to support their families and their communities all their lives. Their premature demise is a loss to all. Let us lose no more. Therefore, let us all work together to ensure that our farming Albertans, especially our seniors, have long and healthy lives on the farm and can pass on their hard-won knowledge and skills to the next generation. They deserve no less.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Troy Black

Mr. Panda: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Troy Black was the only child of Patricia Nelson, the former MLA for Calgary-Foothills, an accomplished former minister. Troy died tragically last month in Mexico, where he was enjoying a vacation with his wife, Lindsay, whom he loved dearly. Troy was only 34.

I knew Troy when he was the president of the local PC association in Calgary-Foothills. When we formed the new UCP constituency association, Troy was easily one of the most enthusiastic board members, and I was thrilled when he stepped up to lead our policy committee. I was so proud to have Troy as a key member of our team.

Troy was influenced not only by his mother but also by his grandparents. They taught Troy to live by the motto to thine own self be true. If you are true to yourself, then you'll be true to the world.

At Troy's memorial service his cousin John told us that Troy married the love of his life, his true soulmate, Lindsay, whom he met in grade 3. Troy's cousin John also said that Troy was his mom's best friend. They can split the atom, but if there ever was an indelible, unbreakable bond in the universe, it was the love between Pat and Troy. I can't even imagine the emotional grief that Pat and Lindsay are facing every day. When someone dies unexpectedly, it makes us all reflect upon our own relationships and how we should cherish every moment with our loved ones and make every day count.

Troy Black, you'll be missed, and you will always be loved.

Thank you.

Sexual Assault Services in Lethbridge

Ms Fitzpatrick: Mr. Speaker, as we begin the spring sitting, we must never forget that we are here for the people in our constituencies. As we speak, there are people in our communities dealing with serious challenges. There is a huge need in Lethbridge for programs and facilities dealing with sexual assault, child abuse and sexual assault, and domestic violence, which includes sexual assault. The services we have are bursting at the seams and are unable to address all of the needs. There are an incredible number of good people working on each of these areas, and there are a number of common issues they all face.

We all know that a solution is critical. Perhaps a solution can be found by collaboration and joint utilization of some resources and facilities. Lethbridge is a city that does collaboration very well. I believe it is by working together that we can build a more supportive community for survivors of these types of assault. The challenges faced by those providing services are immense, and we must continue to look at improvements in how those services can be delivered.

That is why the government's announcement last week to provide an additional \$8.1 million for sexual assault services and supports is so important. The government is helping, dedicated and passionate people are working together, and we need to continue to do that. We need to continue to listen as survivors come forward, we need to believe them, and we need to ensure that they get the support they need and deserve. Let no one forget that people striving to make life better for all Albertans are active in every corner of this province. We must do our part to fully support their initiatives, especially within my city of Lethbridge and across Alberta.

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

Immigrants to Alberta

Mr. Gill: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Alberta is a land of opportunity. Roughly 1 in 6 Albertans were born outside of Canada, and hundreds of thousands were born elsewhere in Canada and chose to move to Alberta with the promise of economic opportunity. Personally, I moved here in early 2000 from India and made Alberta my home. Go to Stampede or Eskimos home games when they're playing the Roughriders, and you'll see many, many Albertans originally from Saskatchewan. Doves of British Columbians moved to Alberta after the NDP formed government in the 1990s. Canadians from every corner of our country have ended up in Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, over a million Albertans were born outside our borders. More than a few of us in this Chamber are included in that group. Our rapid growth has been fuelled in part by people flocking to our great province, which is why it is so discouraging to hear some in the NDP and their supporters suddenly argue that those of us who are not born here somehow are, quote, less Albertan, unquote, or not qualified to serve on behalf of Albertans. Some Albertans were fortunate enough to be born here. Many others, including myself, are Albertans of choice because this is the best place to work, live, and raise a family. Every single one of us is an Albertan.

Now, I have no doubt that our Premier is a proud Albertan. I never alleged that she is less of an Albertan just because she spent a few years working for the NDP in British Columbia in the 1990s. While we respectfully disagree with the Premier on policy, we don't doubt her devotion to her province. Albertans are concerned about the future of their province. They want to hear serious debate of the issues, not crude nativist smears.

As we embark on a new era of civility and decorum in this House, I encourage all members to uphold the highest ideals of Alberta, the land of opportunity. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Oral Question Period

The Speaker: The Leader of Her Majesty's Official Opposition.

Carbon Levy Increase

Mr. Kenney: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. How high will they go? When the NDP introduced their job-killing carbon tax originally, the one they didn't mention in the last election, it was at \$20 a tonne.

Then they raised it by 50 per cent at the beginning of this year. They've told us that they're going to raise it by another 67 per cent. Why? Because Justin Trudeau wants them to. But the Premier has left the door open to even further increases, saying that effective carbon pricing acknowledges that as time progresses, it needs to go up. So what's the NDP's real carbon tax price? How high will they go?

The Speaker: The hon. Premier.

1:50

Ms Notley: Well, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. What we will do is exactly what we announced just a few months after we got elected, when our government made the decision to finally, after years and years and years of ambivalence and delay and failed action, actually do something about the challenge of climate change that faces all Albertans. The folks over there want to kill this climate change plan. They don't want to go ahead with the green line in Calgary. They don't want to go ahead with an LRT in Edmonton. They don't want renewable energy, but Albertans do, and that's what we'll deliver.

Mr. Kenney: Well, I'm going to give that another shot, Mr. Speaker, simply because the Premier didn't even try to answer a pretty direct question, so here it is. She's committed to raising her carbon tax by another 67 per cent, from \$30 a barrel to \$50 a barrel, but she's also left the door clearly open to further increases above that. Now, the so-called experts on carbon pricing, like her own expert Professor Tombe, say that it has to be at least \$200 a tonne to meet global climate targets. Environment Canada says \$300 a tonne. Does the NDP have a ceiling on how high they are prepared to go with their carbon tax? Albertans deserve to know.

The Speaker: Thank you, hon. member.

The hon. Premier.

Ms Notley: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Well, as I did in fact answer, we have laid out our plan. It goes over several years, I think about 10 years at this point. You know, I think that's not unreasonable. But when it comes to matters of climate levies or taxes generally, it is really quite interesting because what the members opposite want to do is give a \$700 million tax break to the top 1 per cent of Albertans, so what about that? It's rich. Those folks over there want to give them a tax break. We're going to stand with all Albertans on this side of the House.

The Speaker: Second supplemental.

Mr. Kenney: Yes. Thanks, Mr. Speaker. Now, I'll give it a third shot here to see if the Premier would like to give Albertans any transparency on the NDP's ultimate intentions with respect to a carbon tax. You've got Environment Canada saying that it has to be \$300 a tonne to meet Canada's climate targets. Professor Tombe, her adviser, is saying that it has to be at least \$200 a tonne. It's currently \$30 a tonne. So given that the NDP was not forthcoming with Albertans about the carbon tax at all before the last election, could they be forthcoming now? At what price is she prepared to impose a carbon tax on Albertans?

Ms Notley: Mr. Speaker, I actually believe that I've answered that question now twice, so I think that's good.

What I will say is that the members opposite need to back away from their position of climate denial, their position of walking away from the climate leadership plan, the instability that creates in the nonrenewable energy sector as well as the energy sector, and the instability it creates for people in Calgary and Edmonton who are

looking forward to finally getting the support that they need for public transit, that hasn't been there for so many years. We need to move forward with this, we need to stop making people scared of things that don't really exist, and we need to get the job done.

The Speaker: Thank you, hon. Premier.

Mr. Kenney: Well, Mr. Speaker . . .

The Speaker: Hon. member.

Mr. Kenney: . . . we're not climate deniers; we're climate tax deniers. For the third time the Premier didn't answer the question.

The Speaker: Hon. member, please proceed. Thank you.

Pipeline Approval and Construction

Mr. Kenney: Now, it's interesting that for months she told Albertans that we had to punish consumers, making it more expensive to heat their homes and fill up their gas tanks in order to get this so-called social licence from her New Democrat allies in British Columbia. Well, that hasn't worked out. In fact, the other day the Premier said: quite honestly, I don't know that B.C. would care one way or another if we scrapped the carbon tax. If that's the case, Mr. Speaker, then why did they choose to punish Alberta consumers with this multibillion-dollar carbon tax?

The Speaker: The hon. Premier.

Ms Notley: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Well, first of all, the climate leadership plan secured the approval of the pipeline from the federal government. I know the members opposite hate that little fact. It was not something that they were very happy about. It was a very inconvenient fact for them, but in fact that is the fact. The other thing that the member opposite fails to recall is that 60 per cent of Alberta households actually receive a rebate, so the fact of the matter is that the carbon levy is designed to reduce emissions and also give the vast majority of Albertans a rebate. It's a win all around.

Mr. Kenney: On pipelines, Mr. Speaker, yesterday I was a bit surprised to hear the Premier say that the outcome with respect to Energy East had nothing to do with the National Energy Board's decision, but TransCanada actually suspended Energy East on September 7, saying that they did so "due to the significant changes to the regulatory process introduced by the NEB", specifically forcing them to get into up- and downstream emissions. Why has the Premier and this government never objected to the National Energy Board's intrusion into our jurisdiction over regulating the production of oil and gas?

The Speaker: The hon. Premier.

Ms Notley: Well, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. As I said yesterday, in fact, our government, our Minister of Energy, and subsequently me, specifically articulated that the proposed plan of the NEB, which has not been put into effect yet, to look at downstream emissions when considering the appropriateness of projects was incorrect, that it was inappropriate. We might as well do the same kind of analysis for the auto industry in Ontario. No one was interested in doing that, so why would they do that for the energy industry? It makes no sense. That point is something that we made very clear on behalf of the energy industry, on behalf of Albertans, and we'll continue to do that.

Mr. Kenney: Mr. Speaker, the Premier and I agree on the question of downstream emissions being inappropriate for the National Energy Board, but she avoided the question again. Why did she not object to the National Energy Board getting into the business of upstream emissions, which is clearly this province's exclusive regulatory jurisdiction thanks to Peter Lougheed's success in getting section 92A in the Constitution Act? Now, every Alberta Premier has jealously defended this critical jurisdiction. Will she join with her predecessors in defending provincial jurisdiction over the production of oil and gas and telling the federal government to get their nose out of our jurisdiction?

The Speaker: The hon. Premier.

Ms Notley: Well, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. You know, when it comes to defending Alberta's oil and gas against Ottawa or other people in Ontario, our government has worked very hard on it. Ministers all along here and other members have been across this country standing up for pipelines, going into rooms filled with environmentalists, going into Montreal, talking to workers about how important the pipelines are. Meanwhile, the member opposite was in Toronto last weekend speaking to Conservatives, and he didn't mention the word "pipeline" once. You know what? I think we all need to come together to stand up for our pipelines and our energy industry here in Alberta.

Mr. Kenney: Mr. Speaker, I didn't have to pitch . . . [interjections]

The Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Kenney: . . . Conservatives who already support the pipeline to do so. I was celebrating the fact that Ontario Conservatives join us in opposing the Trudeau carbon tax, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Third main question.

Energy Policies and Social Licence

Mr. Kenney: Perhaps this Premier instead could go to her federal New Democrats, her B.C. New Democrats, the New Democrat mayor of Burnaby, the New Democrat mayor of Vancouver, New Democrats all across the country who have supported the Leap Manifesto, who want to keep it in the ground, and who have been attacking our energy industry. If she wants to talk about partisan friends, why can she not persuade her own fellow New Democrats from coast to coast to support our energy industry?

The Speaker: Thank you, hon. member.

The hon. Premier.

Ms Notley: Well, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. The fact of the matter is that I think that the rubber hits the road when you go into rooms where you're promoting a position that's not popular. That is exactly what this government has done on behalf of the people of Alberta across this country – in Vancouver, in Toronto, in Montreal, all across the country – because we know it is the right thing for working people. If the member opposite can't even go into a friendly room and utter the word "pipeline," how can we expect him to stand up for us at all? [interjections]

The Speaker: Order.

Mr. Kenney: Mr. Speaker, I proudly do so all across the country, including in Toronto last week at an event with cultural communities.

When Kinder Morgan's Trans Mountain was approved, this Premier went to Vancouver, had some private meetings, talked to

John Horgan, her former NDP colleague with whom she worked in the Legislature, and he came out of that meeting and said that she did not even try to persuade him to support Trans Mountain. Mr. Speaker, supposedly the carbon tax was going to persuade the antienergy NDP across the country. It hasn't happened, so will she admit the carbon tax social licence thing is a total failure?

Ms Notley: Mr. Speaker, what I will do is talk about how hard our government has worked to position our province as a sustainable, progressive, forward-looking energy producer on a worldwide stage. We have succeeded on that, and we are succeeding every day as we diversify our energy industry more and more. We also got approval for a pipeline to tidewater from the federal government that isn't them. I know it's very hard for the member opposite to deal with that, but that's a whole different story. The reality is that the pipeline will get built.

2:00

Mr. Kenney: Mr. Speaker, yesterday I asked the Energy minister: how much is the secret deal with Enmax in the legal settlement that was signed last week? This government through its carbon tax created panic in the energy markets, they made a bad situation worse with their ham-fisted legal manoeuvres, and now they've signed a secret settlement. Albertans deserve to know: how much is the damage? How much did NDP incompetence cost taxpayers in this secret settlement?

The Speaker: The hon. Premier.

Ms Notley: Well, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. What we can say is that we had to take action to stand up on behalf of Alberta consumers as a result of some very bad deals made many years ago by the member opposite's predecessors. That being said, I will say that the resolution with Enmax will have no impact on taxpayers. Absolutely none. What it will do is that it will allow us to work together with Enmax to accelerate the good work that we've already been doing to restructure our energy system, to protect consumers from price spikes, and to support renewables going forward, and Albertans deserve no less.

The Speaker: The hon. Member for Calgary-Mackay-Nose Hill.

Coal Strategy

Ms McPherson: The health and environmental benefits of phasing out coal-generated power are undeniable. However, there are concerns. The government is eliminating carbon emissions from coal by shuttering Alberta's thermal coal industry, which will affect thousands of workers on top of thousands of oil and gas energy jobs that are now gone forever according to ATB economist Todd Hirsch. To the Premier: could you please quantify the return on the government's investment in phasing out coal in terms of net jobs affected, revenue, and carbon emissions?

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

Ms Phillips: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Of course, 12 of Alberta's 18 coal plants were in fact scheduled for phase-out under the regulations of the previous federal government, of which the Leader of the Opposition was a part, but there was no plan for coal-to-gas conversion regulations or any plan for workers. When we took office, we noticed that that was a glaring absence, so now there is a \$40 million transition package for affected workers. There are also coal-to-gas conversion regulatory changes.

Ms McPherson: The coal community transition fund and the coal workforce transition program were promised to help Albertans and communities survive the government's energy policies, yet coal communities continue to worry about their future. According to StatsCan unemployment in Alberta has increased from 144,000 people in May 2015 to 165,000 in February 2018. What specific jobs do you expect coal workers to retrain for, and how have you partnered with local communities to ensure workers have all required supports?

The Speaker: The hon. minister.

Ms Phillips: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Interestingly, it was our government that negotiated coal-to-gas conversions under federal law, something that, certainly, Conservatives couldn't be bothered to do when they had the chance, so that is part of the workforce. Another part of the workforce is looking at opportunities in renewables. We've had very productive conversations, which we will continue to have, with Hanna and the Special Areas Board around opportunities in those communities, and the renewable energy program will be delivering jobs to southeast Alberta as well.

Ms McPherson: The AER estimates that there are 91 billion tonnes of coal resources at a suitable depth for mining. There are an additional 2 trillion tonnes of coal at depth in the Alberta plains that may be suited for coal-bed methane exploration, for example. Alberta now produces less than 30 million tonnes of coal per year. There must be some way for Albertans to profit from this vast natural resource. To the Premier: what progress can you report on developing an Alberta coal innovation cluster comparable to our food and wireless clusters?

The Speaker: The hon. minister.

Ms Phillips: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Of course, Alberta does have a number of metallurgical coal interests and will continue to develop those. Of course, coal-bed methane and extraction of natural gas in that way is an undertaking that's been happening for some time in southeast Alberta, delivering good jobs to communities there. The fact of the matter is that burning thermal coal results in a tremendous amount of pollutants and air quality concerns. That is one of the reasons why it's being phased out in addition to the greenhouse gas emissions it generates.

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

Supervised Drug Consumption Sites

Mr. Malkinson: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I hear a lot of noise from certain individuals in the House about how supervised consumption sites are a blight on our communities, so I personally visited the site of the Sheldon Chumir centre near my riding. It was clean, well run, and nondescript. My question is for the Associate Minister of Health. What measures have we taken to address this crisis, and what has informed those measures?

The Speaker: The hon. associate minister.

Ms Payne: Thank you, Mr. Speaker and to the Member for Calgary-Currie for the question. In addition to the supervised consumption services offered at the Sheldon Chumir centre in Calgary, we've also opened a supervised consumption service in Lethbridge which has been supporting patients for nearly two weeks and has already saved many lives. Additionally, when we learned of a tragic spike in overdoses in the community of Stand

Off, AHS was able to act within days to set up a mobile overdose prevention site in the community to help save lives.

The Speaker: First supplemental.

Mr. Malkinson: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I know it's very important that we rely on the expert knowledge of those who are experts in these areas rather than knee-jerk judgments on those in need of supports. Who have we consulted for solutions regarding treatment?

The Speaker: The hon. associate minister.

Ms Payne: Thank you. Our approach is guided by the Opioid Emergency Response Commission, which draws on the expertise of physicians, researchers, law enforcement, front-line workers, and people with lived experience. We know that ideology should never come before people's lives, and for anyone to suggest otherwise and argue that we should deny medical, life-saving care to Albertans struggling with substance use is unacceptable. The Lethbridge chief of police has said that we can't arrest our way out of this crisis, and he's right. That's why our comprehensive approach includes harm reduction, wraparound health care services, education, and enforcement.

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

Mr. Malkinson: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Elaine Hyshka from the University of Alberta's School of Public Health says that supervised consumption sites are also critical for connecting people with treatment and health care. To the same minister: what would the impact of closing down these services or reducing these services be?

Ms Payne: Mr. Speaker, without supervised consumption services Albertans would be at an even higher risk of overdose and death. In the first three months since supervised consumption was open at the Sheldon Chumir centre, there have been more than 90 overdose reversals. That's 90 lives saved because Calgarians had medical supervision and support, 90 Albertans with the opportunity to take the next steps into primary care, supportive housing, employment, and treatment, all of which they can be connected to through this service. We believe in keeping Albertans alive so that they can make another decision tomorrow, and we stand with families in doing that.

The Speaker: Thank you, hon. minister.
The hon. Member for Vermillion-Lloydminster.

Dr. Starke: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to welcome the Justice minister back and congratulate her and her husband on the safe arrival of Wren.

Rural Crime Prevention

Dr. Starke: While we're all happy for the minister, concerns over rural crime continue to grow. After months of brushing off this issue and insisting that everything possible is being done, the government finally took some action last week and announced that they're going to hire an additional 39 RCMP officers and 40 support staff. Now, while that's encouraging, that response is so anemic that it's like taking a water pistol to a four-alarm fire. To the minister. There are 113 RCMP detachments in Alberta. Which lucky 39 get boots on the ground?

The Speaker: The hon. Minister of Justice and Solicitor General.

Ms Ganley: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and thank you to the member for the very important question. We've heard from Albertans throughout the province that they are concerned about rural crime moving forward, and that's why we've taken action. We were able to work in concert with the RCMP, asking them: what do you need in order to help address this? In addition to those boots on the ground, I think one of the fantastic things about this plan is that it allows front-line officers who already exist to spend more time on the front lines doing that important work.

Dr. Starke: Well, Mr. Speaker, given that the minister has also announced funding to hire up to an additional 10 Crown prosecutors and given that the Crown Attorneys' Association has pointed out the challenges of recruiting prosecutors to serve in rural offices and that these offices see a high level of turnover, with 21 prosecutors leaving in the past 12 months, and given that the Crown prosecutors in Edmonton average 800 files each while those in the St. Paul regional office are handling upwards of 2,000 each, what measures will the minister take to reduce the turnover among rural Crown prosecutors and address the discrepancy in caseload between urban and rural offices?

2:10

The Speaker: The hon. minister.

Ms Ganley: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member is correct. There are some concerns with file caseloads in rural areas. That's why we've taken action. One of those things that we've committed to is to increase the number of rural Crown prosecutors. We thank the association very much for working with us and for making that case to us, and we'll be moving forward in concert with them.

Mr. Speaker, the member is correct. We do have some turnover of some professionals in those areas, and we will continue working with the association on strategies to ensure that we have appropriate resources in place.

Dr. Starke: Well, Mr. Speaker, given that the government's announcement of 39 new officers for Alberta's 113 RCMP detachments means one additional officer for every third detachment and given that faced with a similar rural crime issue, last year the government of Saskatchewan responded by putting 258 additional officers, an average of over two per detachment, into rural crime enforcement, to the minister: why is our government's response to this pressing issue so pusillanimous when compared to that of our neighbours to the east?

The Speaker: The hon. minister.

Ms Ganley: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. This government is proud to continue supporting rural policing and policing throughout the province. This province provides more to municipalities to support them in policing than any other western province, and we're very proud to do that. But we know there are still concerns, and that's why we're taking action moving forward.

I think it's important to note that it isn't just about putting those new officers in place. It's also about using strategic intelligence, leveraging those resources we already have in place, and ensuring that we have civilian officers to take some of the paperwork off the plates of our front-line officers so they can be visible in the communities, because that's what we're hearing they need.

Electricity Power Purchase Arrangement Lawsuit Settlement

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, just a few moments ago, in response to a question from the Leader of the Official Opposition in regard to PPAs, the Premier blamed the previous government when the opposition leader was asking about how much the secret deal with Enmax was going to cost. The problem with that is that Gary Reynolds, the former Balancing Pool president, said that the government of Alberta trying to put blame on past governments is completely ridiculous because it was specifically their action in increasing the carbon tax in 2015 that created this whole mess. Enough games, enough blame. How much is this secret agreement costing the Alberta taxpayer?

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

Ms Phillips: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Of course, there is no question for any Albertan who ever opened an electricity bill for the last 15 years that there was a mess to clean up – and it was a Conservative mess – when it came to electricity deregulation. This settlement has no impact on Alberta taxpayers. It's an arrangement between the two parties. It is time to move forward, as we are, with Enmax on a number of different initiatives related to renewables and efficiency and as we are with Capital Power as well, who also settled this matter. Now they are moving forward with a massive new investment in renewables.

Mr. Nixon: Well, Mr. Speaker, again blaming the previous government.

Given that Gary Reynolds, the former Balancing Pool president, said – and I quote – that the NDP's legal action has actually cost consumers hundreds of millions of dollars because that legal action forestalled the Balancing Pool from terminating the PPAs much earlier than this, again, Mr. Speaker, the question is very simple. To the environment minister: how much is this secret agreement with Enmax costing the taxpayers of Alberta?

The Speaker: The hon. minister.

Ms Phillips: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Once more, this settlement has no impact on Alberta taxpayers, so it is time to move forward. It is certainly the case that this government will not take lessons from Conservatives. Their deregulation schemes on electricity left people on a price roller coaster. We are building a stable electricity market. Prices are capped. Predictability is being restored.

Thank you.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, it's embarrassing to watch this government over and over not answer questions.

Given that this decision, from this government's incompetence and inability to manage the situation, has resulted in a significant lawsuit being settled and given that the government will not present that to us despite the fact that it will become public at some point, one has to ask on behalf of the constituents of Alberta: what is this government hiding, what is the amount, and what is the cost to Alberta taxpayers as a result of this secret agreement with Enmax? A simple number, please, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: The hon. minister.

Ms Phillips: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. This settlement has no impact on Alberta taxpayers. It's a settlement between the two parties. Certainly, it contains a number of commercial considerations

for Enmax, as did the settlements with Capital Power and with AltaGas.

You know, the fact of the matter is that the Conservatives don't have Albertans' best interests in mind. We entered into these actions in order to protect consumers. We will continue to do so, Mr. Speaker. Certainly, what we won't return to is the price roller coaster the Conservatives put Albertans on for over a decade.

Thank you.

The Speaker: The Member for Calgary-West.

Rural Crime Prevention (continued)

Mr. Ellis: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. After trying for months and months and months to get this NDP government to even hear the desperation of rural Albertans about the shocking amount of crime that is occurring on a daily basis in their communities, this government finally acknowledged it last week, but what did we get? Smoke and mirrors. So let's get specific. The RCMP is already understaffed, not even close to meeting their minimum staffing requirements. That's one of the reasons for this crisis. Minister, how long before the new officers will be working to protect rural Albertans?

The Speaker: The hon. Minister of Justice.

Ms Ganley: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and to the member for the question. Well, I think that working with the RCMP, we've managed to come forward with a strategy. That strategy includes seven prongs. It includes new boots on the ground. It includes new civilian staff. It includes new crime reduction units. One of those crime reduction units, that was piloted in central Alberta, is already having an effect. So I think that this is what the experts are telling us we need to do, and that's how we're going to move forward.

Thank you.

Mr. Ellis: Face it, Mr. Speaker. Smoke and mirrors. So please allow me to explain. Given that the RCMP has a time-consuming process with multiple levels of planning and approvals at the federal level and then recruitment and training and strategic deployment for those officers and given that it's not like there are recruits in depot just waiting for assignments in Alberta, Minister, realistically, when will rural Albertans see these officers in their communities?

The Speaker: The hon. minister.

Ms Ganley: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and to the member for the important question. Well, we've been hearing from rural Albertans that this is something they needed, and that's why we decided to move forward with concrete action. Unlike the opposition, who said that they need over a year to develop a plan around rural crime, we think that rural Albertans can't wait, and that's why we've moved forward with a plan right now. Those crime reduction units are already in the process of being formed, and we're ready to move forward. The RCMP and many rural politicians are very excited.

Mr. Ellis: We identified this issue a year ago, Minister.

Given that the Alberta MP for Lakeland has a motion coming before Parliament directing that the standing committee on public safety undertake a comprehensive review of rural crime in Canada and given that Alberta urgently needs this study as it will allow us to understand the resource challenges our provincial police, the

RCMP, are facing, Minister, will you commit to endorsing this motion today for the good of Alberta?

The Speaker: The hon. minister.

Ms Ganley: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. As the member has noted, I know that the Official Opposition feels that this issue needs more study. We've been hearing from rural Albertans throughout the province that the time for study has passed. They need action now, and that's why this government is moving forward. That's why we've committed to taking action. We have a seven-point plan, unlike our opponents, who have chosen to say that they need a year to come up with a plan. Rural Albertans don't have time to wait.

Privacy Commissioner Investigation

Mr. Cooper: Mr. Speaker, this government is incapable of being transparent with Albertans, whether it's hiding the costs of their lawsuits or refusing to be honest with the details. Last fall, when the Official Opposition brought to light political interference by the Premier's former chief of staff, the government denied any wrongdoing despite evidence in their own e-mails which raised many red flags. Does this government still believe that there was no wrongdoing or political interference?

The Speaker: The hon. Minister of Children's Services.

Ms Larivee: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We certainly welcome the commissioner's investigations, and our officials will be co-operating fully. We take Albertans' right of access to information very seriously. That's why we've turned around times for FOIP requests and we've proactively shared more information with the public than ever before. Since day one we've been working to make government more open, transparent, and accountable to Albertans. In fact, we're the first government in Alberta's history to post the salaries and contracts of all Premier and minister office staff.

Mr. Cooper: Mr. Speaker, given that this is another new investigation, I recently received a letter from the Privacy Commissioner that states, "Considering the serious allegations that have been raised by the UCP . . . and my own concerns, I have decided to conduct an investigation," and given that oral hearings like this have not been done in Alberta for decades, to the Premier: are you still confident in your chief of staff's actions on your behalf, that they did not break the law?

The Speaker: The hon. minister.

Ms Larivee: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again, absolutely. We're fully prepared, and all of our officials will be co-operating fully with the commissioner's investigation in this. We do without doubt take access to information very seriously. To be clear, the FOIP Act does allow third parties named in a request to review information before it's released. It would be inappropriate to comment further on the matter as it is under investigation at this time.

The Speaker: Second supplemental.

2:20

Mr. Cooper: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Given the confidence that the government has shown in the former chief of staff's actions and given that this government has made all sorts of claims about how they are the most open, the most transparent, and the most accountable government that the world has ever seen, will they

commit today to Albertans that they will ask the Privacy Commissioner to hold Mr. Heaney's hearing in public?

The Speaker: The hon. minister.

Ms Larivee: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to thank the member for echoing the fact that we do consider ourselves absolutely to be very open, very transparent, and we do take Albertans' access to information very seriously. I will certainly take the member's suggestion under consideration as we go forward, and we'll continue to be one of the most transparent, open governments in Alberta's history.

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

Seniors' Facility Resident and Family Councils

Dr. Turner: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The passage of Bill 22, the Resident and Family Councils Act, last year was welcomed by the many residents living in seniors' accommodation in Edmonton-Whitemud. The Bill 22 preamble says that the government "recognizes that a residential facility is the home of its residents, and . . . residents should be involved in matters that affect their daily lives." To the Minister of Health, who sponsored this legislation: please update this House on progress in implementing the councils across Alberta.

The Speaker: The hon. Minister of Health.

Ms Hoffman: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and to the member for the important question, which we know matters to residents and their families throughout this province. Today over 70 per cent of our facilities have some type of council in place, supporting residents in having a voice and ensuring that it's heard in their care. We've been working with operators, support agencies, health care providers, residents, their family members, and members of the PDD community to help us develop the tools to implement these councils where they don't exist and to improve them where they're needed. This spring we'll be releasing a tool kit to help this work be done in further detail.

Dr. Turner: Thank you, Minister. This reflects what I've heard from my constituents who are residents or who have family members living in a residential facility. Given that in Edmonton-Whitemud there are several examples of life lease residential facilities and that many have instituted councils but that there are life lease facilities that have resisted instituting councils and given that life lease facility residents should be involved in matters that affect their quality of life, will it be possible to extend the regulations of Bill 22 to cover all life lease facilities in the province?

The Speaker: The hon. minister.

Ms Hoffman: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and to the MLA for my great-aunt Alma, who happens to be one of these residents living in one of these buildings. He certainly has been a strong advocate for the residents in this specific type of facility, and since he brought this to my attention, my officials have been working with Service Alberta to look at potential possibilities for residents living outside of supportive living facilities who also see the value of these councils. We look forward to working with the member and both of our offices to develop an effective solution to support residents in life lease situations.

Dr. Turner: Thank you very much, Minister. What recourse does a resident of a residential facility have if he or she believes that the operator is not meeting its obligations under Bill 22?

The Speaker: The hon. minister.

Ms Hoffman: Thank you again, Mr. Speaker. To a resident or a family member who feels that an operator isn't acting in a council's function in the way outlined in Bill 22, please reach out to Alberta Health. We'll connect them with a complaints officer. They're listed on the website, but you can call my office or directly to the Alberta Health main switchboard, and a complaints officer would be the best place to direct that. Also, I want to assure everyone that when health inspectors are in these facilities on a regular basis, in these people's homes, they are going to be monitoring that as well. We want to ensure that every Albertan living in a facility where they receive care has a voice and feels like a true partner in their home, and that includes having resident and family councils.

Carbon Levy and Rural Education Costs

Mrs. Aheer: Last week in Edmonton trustees from Chestermere-Rocky View and across the province met at the Rural Education Symposium. They had questions about the impacts of the NDP's carbon tax on their bottom line. They were met with rhetoric from the Deputy Premier about light bulbs and solar panels. Minister, what is your government actually doing to help these schools struggling to absorb the impacts of your disastrous policies, or are these just concerns that the Premier says don't really exist?

The Speaker: The hon. Minister of Education.

Mr. Eggen: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you very much for the question. I was also at the Rural Education Symposium. In fact, I was chairing it. We had a number of very good questions from rural school boards across the province in regard to the carbon levy and education around this as well. We had lots of interesting stories of how people have been working hard to help to educate their kids about the importance of fighting climate change and the way by which they can do that with practical additions to their school, to their curriculum, and so forth. Certainly, it was a very worthwhile . . .

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

Mrs. Aheer: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't think that answered my question. I'll try a different one.

Given that small cities like Chestermere are seeing huge increased costs for school buses due to the carbon tax – maybe that's part of the educational piece – and given that my trustees asked for answers about the \$306,000 tax grab after they were told that their schools were not meant to be impacted and that it would take time to address the issue, Mr. Speaker, how long are our schools supposed to struggle until the government figures this out and scraps this brutal tax?

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

Ms Phillips: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Of course, there are a number of energy efficiency investments that this province has made and continues to make. We've been working in partnership with school boards, who have talked to us about a number of different initiatives that we can undertake as a province. I certainly will have more to say about that tomorrow, in fact. As for school funding, we have ensured that school boards receive stable and

predictable funding. What would not help is a 20 per cent across-the-board cut. What would not help is leaving classrooms without the resources they need. What does help is ensuring that . . .

The Speaker: Thank you, hon. minister.

Mrs. Aheer: Mr. Speaker, what does not help is telling families that light bulbs and solar panels are going to help their problems with carbon taxes.

In fact, rural schools right now are seeing a decline in students, but their operating costs are skyrocketing due to the carbon tax. Given that the per-student funding is declining due to fewer students and massive hikes due to this cash grab, I would really like to understand how this government is going to reconcile disastrous policies with the real people that they're impacting every single day.

The Speaker: The hon. Minister of Education.

Mr. Eggen: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Certainly, it's very important for us to talk about carbon and climate change in the schools. In fact, that's the very heart of where this conversation should lie because not only is it important for students – they need to and want to know about the effects of climate change and building a more diverse economy – but, also, it's their future generation that will be more impacted by these very climate change issues. Certainly, I'm working with school boards every step of the way. What's not helpful is when you hear inflamed rhetoric like that when, in fact, we are having civilized conversations between school boards and ourselves about finding solutions.

The Speaker: Thank you, hon. minister.

Carbon Levy and Northern Albertans

Mr. Loewen: From the start the carbon tax has always particularly disadvantaged rural and northern Albertans. The tax on gasoline, diesel, and natural gas is far more costly when there are longer distances to drive as part of everyday life and temperatures tend to be colder. Despite the intent of the government's carbon tax, my constituents in Grande Prairie-Smoky won't stop heating their homes in the winter to reduce emissions and they won't quit their jobs so that they don't have to drive. They're just being forced to pay more to do it. Why does the government think it's fair to disproportionately punish rural and northern Albertans with their carbon tax?

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

Ms Phillips: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Of course, two-thirds of Albertans receive a rebate on the carbon levy. If you're a couple who makes less than \$95,000, you're getting a \$450 rebate. If you have two children, you'll get \$540. We also have a number of different energy efficiency programs in place, the total of which added up to about \$300 million worth of energy savings for Albertans in the first eight months of those programs. It's really quite interesting and amazing what can happen when you actually take on the issue of energy efficiency and . . .

The Speaker: Thank you, hon. minister.

Mr. Loewen: Given that that didn't answer any questions about how it affects northern Albertans and given how out of touch this government is with the needs of northern Albertans and given that this government's previous response to carbon tax concerns was that Albertans should consider, quote, taking a bus or walk and

given that these are simply not options for many rural Albertans, why does this government insist on making it more expensive to make ends meet for those living in rural Alberta?

The Speaker: The hon. minister.

Ms Phillips: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know, there are 32 indigenous communities across this province who are now undertaking renewables and energy efficiency programs to save their communities money. There are hundreds of farmers that have availed themselves of the energy efficiency and renewables programs. There are several municipalities, hundreds of projects across the province, and nonprofits as well who are availing themselves of energy efficiency. That's creating good jobs. It's putting people back to work when they need it the most. It's also saving Albertans money on energy, and they can redirect those funds to other things.

Thank you.

2:30

Mr. Loewen: Given that the MLA for Peace River said this about fuel costs in northern Alberta:

at any given time we pay on average 20 cents more per litre than the rest of the province. Not only does that impact our personal travel costs, but the increased costs of transporting goods and services are passed on to us in higher prices for everything,

and the carbon tax will only add to these costs and this out-of-touch government's suggestion was to change the car you have, which is unrealistic on northern rural roads, and given that the carbon tax has not attained the fabled social licence for pipelines, why won't the NDP government make life better for Albertans and cancel the carbon tax?

The Speaker: The hon. minister.

Ms Phillips: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know, there are so many interesting success stories. For example, the Westerner Exposition society in Red Deer received \$16,000 to replace old light fixtures. Their assistant general manager has indicated that they're going to save money on their electricity bill and also install new fixtures. The Calgary Rotary Challenger park received an \$8,000 rebate, and they have indicated: most importantly, in the long term we will save large amounts of money. The Crowchild Twin Arena Association received an \$18,000 rebate for a number of fixture changes. The Calgary Urban Project Society received . . .

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

Economic Indicators

Mr. Barnes: Last month the Minister of Finance published the government's fiscal update. According to the minister it was rainbows, full steam ahead. He said, quote: this third-quarter report shows a solid rebound; Alberta continues to improve. Not so fast, say businesses. The president and CEO of Edmonton's Chamber of Commerce says, quote: some might say the tide has turned, that we're on our way back to prosperity, but that's not what I hear; things on the ground appear to be still as much a struggle as ever. To the Minister of Finance: who's telling the truth, you or the Edmonton chamber?

Mr. Ceci: What I can clearly tell the member opposite is that our economy is looking up. Jobs are up, and the deficit is down \$1.4 billion. Our plan is working, Mr. Speaker. The economy is growing in this province again. We're the fastest growing economy in

Canada. Drilling is up, retail sales are up, manufacturing is up. More than 90,000 full-time jobs returned to this province in 2017.

Mr. Barnes: Mr. Speaker, given that Alberta businesses have faced nothing but tax increases from this government, something that this side of the House warned the government would result in lower tax revenue, it is not hard to see why Alberta businesses are not buying this government's rosy talk. Given that despite this government increasing our corporate taxes by 20 per cent, corporate tax revenue has actually fallen by 22 and a half per cent as this economy declines, to the minister: will you admit that your government's tax-and-spend policy has failed and commit to reducing taxes, reducing regulatory burden so Alberta businesses can prosper . . .

The Speaker: Thank you, hon. member.

Mr. Ceci: You know whose tax policy has failed? It's the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker. What we won't do is to take advice from that side or the province of Saskatchewan, that increased taxes on new construction 6 per cent. Our economy grew by 4.5 per cent. Saskatchewan's is lagging. They want to go down that road? Go. [interjections]

The Speaker: Order, please. Order.

Mr. Barnes: Mr. Speaker, also, given that as of January 1 the United States has reduced their corporate taxes by 40 per cent, from 35 to 21 per cent, and given that Alberta has seen its tax competitiveness drop drastically since this government took office, from most competitive in North America to 15th, and that, more importantly, Alberta has fallen behind every single large oil-producing state in the United States, to the minister: if this government's plan is working so well, why do job creators keep leaving?

The Speaker: The Minister of Economic Development and Trade.

Mr. Bilous: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I believe that the premise of the hon. member's question is patently false. There are a number of indicators that economists have said – this isn't coming from the government of Alberta; this is coming from the Conference Board of Canada, RBC, TD Bank. Alberta led the country in 2017 in economic growth with 4.5 per cent. This year, 2018, we are poised to lead the country for a second time. There are a number of significant investments, including Suncor's announcement of their massive, multibillion-dollar investment here in our province. Because of our PDP program we have a \$4.5 billion investment by Inter Pipeline. Amazon is here, Google DeepMind is here, Cavendish Farms are . . .

The Speaker: Thank you, hon. minister.

Carbon Levy and Postsecondary Education Costs

Mr. W. Anderson: Mr. Speaker, the effects of this government's disastrous policies on communities across the province have been devastating. When this government brought in its carbon tax, little thought was given to the effect it would have on postsecondary institutions. With the tuition freeze going into its fourth year, institutions are being forced to look at their books and make cuts. Now they're forced to turn over millions of dollars to the government for a carbon tax they were never consulted on nor benefit from. To the Minister of Advanced Education or whomever is representing him today: when will you admit that these policies will eventually damage the institutions' ability to provide quality education here in Alberta?

The Speaker: Hon. minister, go ahead.

Ms Phillips: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Of course, in the first instance, stable and predictable funding to our postsecondary institutions, just as to our health care system or to our education system or to the many, many municipalities or community services, has been job one as we have ensured that we have moved Alberta out of the recession. As we invest in energy efficiency, that's also creating thousands of new jobs. Of course, there are a number of investments that are also happening in the postsecondary sector, but job one for this government was stability and not making reckless cuts during the recession.

Mr. W. Anderson: Mr. Speaker, given that institutions have increased the tuition rates for international students to off-load their operational costs, eventually this could affect all students and future foreign students and future enrolment. Is this how you expect these institutions to offset the disastrous effects of the NDP carbon tax?

The Speaker: The hon. Minister of Education.

Mr. Eggen: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you very much for the question. You know, institutions in advanced education have been working very hard in close concert with our government to look for solutions to reduce carbon emissions. There's a lot of research that's going into this very area as well. Postsecondary institutions are meant to lead not just in terms of education but in terms of advancing and diversifying the economy, and that's exactly what our advanced education institutions are doing in regard to carbon. We're very proud of the partnership they're providing to work with us.

The Speaker: Second supplemental question.

Mr. W. Anderson: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Given that the carbon tax on postsecondary institutions is really a tax on taxpayers' dollars, public funds which are allocated to these institutions are being clawed back through the NDP carbon tax. Can the minister then explain: why is this government taxing these institutions' operational dollars?

The Speaker: The hon. Minister of Education.

Mr. Eggen: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know, these sorts of questions display a misunderstanding of exactly part of why the carbon levy is in place, which is to provide efficiencies. When you look at public institutions and the literally hundreds of buildings and energy uses that you have in postsecondary institutions across our province, they're making ways by which we can provide efficiencies in those same places and actually save money over time. It's important that postsecondary institutions participate in the carbon levy, and we're looking for ways in which this can be a constructive process that can be both educational . . .

The Speaker: Thank you, hon. minister.

Educational Curriculum Review

Ms Fitzpatrick: Mr. Speaker, as you know, our government has been dedicated to ensuring that students in Alberta are receiving high-quality education. We know that students in Alberta are some of the highest academic performers in the country and that we have one of the best education systems in Canada. This is due to our talented teachers and our emphasis on a common-sense curriculum. Can the minister provide some information on the curriculum review?

The Speaker: The Minister of Education.

Mr. Eggen: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Certainly, the curriculum process has been very interesting, and we have engaged literally tens of thousands of parents, students, teachers, and so forth in working on the six different core areas and all subject areas, too. In fact, we had a response of more than 40,000 people to surveys, and we're building a curriculum that will focus on and emphasize language, mathematics, critical thinking and help to have our young students participate constructively in a more diverse economy here in the future.

Thank you.

The Speaker: First supplemental.

Ms Fitzpatrick: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We know that Alberta's economy is dependent on important, technologically driven industries like the oil and gas sector. We also know that more students are interested in science, technology, engineering, and math and that our students perform very well in these areas. Computer coding is becoming more popular and plays an important role in industry development. Within the curriculum review would the minister identify what role computer coding will play?

2:40

The Speaker: The hon. minister.

Mr. Eggen: Well, thank you for the question, and thank you, Mr. Speaker. Certainly, we've been engaging with postsecondary institutions and teachers and schools across the province and looking at other jurisdictions and how they're using computer coding as an integral part of not just that very process but the critical thinking skills that go along with that, the math, the science, the social studies, and so forth. Yes, definitely, we are looking for these contributions, contributions from industry: the energy industry, forest industry, agriculture, the financial sector. This is one of the biggest, probably, engagement processes to build a sound curriculum for the future that's ever taken place here in the province.

The Speaker: Second supplemental.

Ms Fitzpatrick: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Our government is committed to ensuring that students are prepared for our diversifying economy. Career and technology studies programs play an important role in preparing students for a variety of careers. We also know that there have been exciting transformations in the career and technology studies programs across the province. Can the Minister of Education tell me about some of the CTS programs that he has visited in the last year?

The Speaker: The hon. Minister of Education.

Mr. Eggen: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thanks so much for the question. We have many creative and innovative school boards around the province who are taking full advantage of expanding the scope of CTS programming here in the province of Alberta. I just want to thank the Lethbridge Chamber of Commerce and the colleges there for helping to work with school boards in Lethbridge in regard to building dual-credit programming. We put in a five-year stable funding formula, that is really catching fire across the province, for dual credit, where kids are able to go and take high school courses but also get credit for colleges. This opens the door for lots . . .

The Speaker: Thank you, hon. minister.

Hon. members, in 30 seconds we will continue with Members' Statements.

Members' Statements (continued)

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

Friends of Confederation Creek

Mr. Coolahan: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to give the Assembly an update on a member's statement that I did last April on the Rally in the Valley, a gathering of Highland Park residents and other citizens concerned with a proposed high-rise development on a former nine-hole golf course.

Since then the community group Friends of Confederation Creek was formed. They work to preserve, protect, and restore Confederation Creek in the Highland Park golf course. Many members live in the area. Some have for decades, and they have seen the valley change. They understand this complex environment and that it's a natural drainage area for several small creeks and prone to flooding. This group has put in hundreds of hours of volunteer work going through and documenting what they find in old city maps and records as well as documenting what's occurring in the valley on a regular basis.

Mr. Speaker, a drainage study was recently completed, and it concluded that the valley is a natural drainage area for several creeks and that it may be difficult for some areas to be developed. So the update really should be that the community did its homework, and they were right. While the results of the study have created new challenges, there's now a better understanding of the area.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to share this truly great example of community engagement that reached out to work with all levels of government. They are proof of why input from the local level is invaluable to all levels of government.

Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to thank the Friends of Confederation Creek for all the work they've done. It's given me and many others a better understanding of what the area was built on and that this just might be a rare opportunity to unvault a new type of development.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: The hon. Member for Drayton Valley-Devon.

Carbon Levy

Mr. Smith: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Legislature has been entrusted by the people of this province with overseeing and managing the economic and social resources of this province and to do so in such a fashion as to meet the needs and the desires of the people that we represent.

I received a phone call the other day from a constituent. He was having a hard time understanding the actions of this government with respect to the implementation of the carbon tax. He made several telling points. Firstly, he correctly identified the nature of the carbon tax when he called it a selective sales tax. A sales tax is a tax on just about every product that is sold. Since every product and service that is produced is the result of some expenditure of carbon, it is reasonable to conclude that the carbon tax is a sales tax by any other name.

Why do we have this carbon sales tax? Well, to appease Prime Minister Trudeau and to purchase the social licence necessary for the federal government to approve and push forward pipeline access to coastal waters. Well, we can see how much social licence a carbon

tax has provided for the people of Alberta, just a lot of pain for Albertans. How much pain? Well, this constituent drew my attention to the gas bill that he received and to the budget line on his gas bill that revealed that the small gas co-operative he purchases his gas from paid \$89,688 in carbon tax, \$89,688 that he and his fellow gas consumers paid, \$89,688 that could have been spent by consumers at the local restaurant, grocery, or liquor store before they closed their doors in his small community over this last year. Now these constituents have to drive to Drayton Valley to buy groceries or to celebrate a special occasion, increasing – you guessed it – their carbon footprint because of our infamous carbon tax.

This government passed the carbon tax over and above the objections of the majority of Albertans, and now it is the majority of Albertans that are suffering.

The Speaker: Thank you, hon. member.

Tabling Returns and Reports

The Speaker: Grande Prairie-Smoky.

Mr. Loewen: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Given the Government House Leader's objections to our leader citing the minister of environment's role in Mike Hudema's book, *An Action a Day Keeps Global Capitalism Away*, I'd like to table excerpts from the book. In one quote, referring to the minister, Hudema says, "It would not have been possible to put this book together without her. She pushed me to write it, edited my work, and contributed to its content . . . I owe her a heavy debt."

The Speaker: Let's table it.

Orders of the Day

Government Motions

[The Deputy Speaker in the chair]

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.

Mr. Nixon moved that the motion be amended as follows:

(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"; (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 interests pursuant to section 92(10)(c) of the Constitution Act, 1867" after "construction."

[Debate adjourned on the amendment March 13]

The Deputy Speaker: Any other speakers wishing to speak to the amendment to Motion 2? The hon. Member for Calgary-West.

Mr. Ellis: Well, thank you, Madam Speaker. Certainly, it gives me great pleasure to rise and speak to the proposed amendment to Government Motion 2. As the Leader of the Opposition has made clear, our UCP caucus supports the government's efforts to stand up for this lawfully approved Trans Mountain pipeline expansion. I mean, how could we do anything else? After all, in the very beginning, when the Premier bragged that the shovels would be in the ground shortly, we offered the best wishes that this would in fact start quickly. But we also knew that hurdles would arise because we see this happen on a regular basis. The NDP should have also known that protests would pop up because, you know, many of their own supporters in Alberta, including some in this Chamber, have expressed opposition to any kind of action that would allow for the economic expansion of Alberta's oil sands.

But let's leave that aside for the moment. Like I said, we expected to see opposition in British Columbia to this crucial pipeline expansion, and we warned the Premier and her colleagues on the government benches not to take its progress for granted. Nevertheless, they did, and once again we saw that if firm action by the federal government and our provincial government did not occur, the pipeline could go sideways.

2:50

That's exactly what happened when the hon. Member for Calgary-Lougheed offered well-intentioned advice in August. He suggested: take a firm stand, and do not let B.C. play games. He said: do not let the Prime Minister off the hook; do not let Albertans down. This past August, of course, the now Member for Calgary-Lougheed, as I stated, said, "If the government of British Columbia purposely undermines the rule of law and our ability to safely export products from Alberta, then there will be repercussions." "Trade is a two-way street." I'll repeat that last part because it is so very, very important. "Trade is a two-way street."

The hon. Member for Calgary-Lougheed went on to say, and I quote: if I were the Premier and the government of British Columbia were blocking one of our prime exports, we would find ways to respond in kind that would be an economic response. Unquote.

What kind of response did he get for that common-sense advice? Dismissive mocking, ridicule. The Premier called our now leader, quote, an isolationist, unquote, and insisted that he was building a wall around Alberta. Then just two weeks later the Premier assured Albertans that, quote: the B.C. government has stopped talking about stopping the pipeline, and instead they're talking about ensuring that it meets high standards. Unquote. Well, that sounds positive, doesn't it? Except that it wasn't. B.C. had plenty of ideas up its sleeve to delay, delay, and further delay, with hopes of scuttling the pipeline no matter how long that takes. Frankly, for them, the longer the better.

What was the end result of the government's, quote, everything is fine, unquote, tactic? Well, the Premier finally took the advice of our now leader to impose some trade consequences. What did our leader do in response? Did he mock the Premier? Did he criticize her? No. He supported her. He supported her position so strongly that he even lamented the moment when she took the wine boycott off. He encouraged her to stay the course and be firm. This is the position of the United Conservative Party. We applaud the government when it is doing well on behalf of Albertans, and that is all we continue to ask when it comes to this motion.

We do wish, however, to strengthen it together with all members of this Chamber. Our House leader has proposed two amendments that strengthen it. The Premier has bowed to our leader's advice a few times already when the Trans Mountain pipeline has faced repeated barriers from British Columbia, and now we are asking

that this government take his advice again. He has clearly proven that he knows what Albertans need to do, and we all appreciate the Premier following his recommendations.

That brings us to a key element of the amendment; that is, the addition of this clause to the motion: including declaring the pipeline in the national interest by using section 92(10)(c) of the Constitution. Clearly, this is critical. How so? Well, let's parse it out, Madam Speaker. Is there any question that this pipeline is in the national interest? Even the Prime Minister, who is not normally deemed a friend of Alberta, has made that statement. Although we disagree with the Prime Minister on very many policy fronts, we certainly support that one. We display this nonpartisan support because it is in the best interest of Albertans to do so. Today we are asking the NDP to do so as well when it comes to strengthening this motion.

We are not challenging the NDP's belief that this job-creating project is in the best interests of Canada and the Maritimes and Ontario and Quebec and western Canada and British Columbia, but it is time to see and hear it, not just for us but for all Albertans. Supporting the amendment to this motion will allow all residents in this province to see that this whole House is on the side of Alberta. The Premier has taken our leader's advice in the past, and we are hoping she does so again.

The second part of the amendment, which includes "[declaring] that the pipeline is in the national interest," involves the use of section 92(10)(c) of the Constitution. By now, thanks to, of course, the Member for Calgary-Lougheed, every single member of this Chamber knows what this section is, which is something that in the past may have eluded some members of this Chamber. All we are trying to do through this amendment is to get the Prime Minister to use it. Is that too much to ask when a province is obstructing a project that is in the national interest? It can't be too much to ask because that is the reason the clause exists in the first place, Madam Speaker.

We are asking this government not to reject our leader's well-intentioned, well-reasoned advice just because we are on different sides of the House. On this issue we are together, in solidarity. Let's show Albertans that we can work in their best interests because it's the right thing to do, Madam Speaker.

Thank you for this time.

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

Seeing none, any other speakers to the amendment? The hon. Member for Calgary-Elbow.

Mr. Clark: Well, thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I'm going to stand today and I'm going to do something that I think doesn't often happen in this Assembly, something that I think that, as I've talked to constituents and I've talked to Albertans, they say that they'd like their elected leaders do a lot more often, and that's admit when we're wrong. Yesterday I was talking a lot about the declaratory power and speaking in favour of the Official Opposition's amendment to invoke section 92(10)(c) and encourage or ask the federal government to use their declaratory power.

After the Leader of the Official Opposition very kindly quoted me in a tweet, I got into a long and fascinating discussion with some folks on Twitter, and one of those people on Twitter is a noted constitutional law expert at the University of Ottawa, Carissima Mathen, vice-dean academic. Now, I had done some research before I made my comments yesterday, which I hope we would all do, and I actually had seen Professor Mathen quoted on 92(10)(c), from an article midway through 2017, and implying that, in fact,

this would help move the Kinder Morgan pipeline forward, that the federal government could in fact use this declaratory power.

But then I did some further research, prompted by some comments and questions that were asked of me on Twitter, and it was Professor Mathen herself who responded that, in fact, the declaratory power in this case is not relevant. Not being a lawyer and having never gone to law school, let alone being in any way the constitutional expert that Professor Mathen is, I can assure you that she's absolutely right and that I am incorrect. That also makes the Official Opposition and the Member for Calgary-Lougheed incorrect in their assessment of how 92(10)(c) could be used.

In doing my research, Professor Mathen was on a radio show, Rob Breakenridge's show, I think it was last week, and I just want to read out a few of the quotes from her on this particular point. Quote: when you actually look at how our Constitution works, it's a redundant move in talking about using that declaratory power. She goes on to say, quote: it would be highly disruptive; it is more of a rhetorical tool than something that has present-day, real legal utility. She then says that the federal government has exclusive authority over the projects that cross provincial boundaries.

This whole situation reminds me of that famous quote erroneously attributed to John Maynard Keynes: when my information changes, I change my mind. In this case the information has changed. I know I have changed my mind on this particular point. As an evidence-based party the Alberta Party believes that when you find new information, it's only the responsible thing to do to acknowledge that, put that on the record, and change your view on a particular point.

3:00

Having said all of that, I do still support the other aspects of the amendments brought forward by the Official Opposition, and I do still believe that our provincial government should push harder to ensure that the federal government pushes this project forward with more force and enthusiasm and applies their existing legal rights to ensure that projects that cross provincial boundaries, that are within legitimate federal jurisdiction, do in fact go ahead. So let my correction of my understanding of what federal powers are not be mistaken in any way for weakening our resolve on the importance of building the Kinder Morgan pipeline. It is absolutely in not only the urgent public interest of the province of Alberta; it is in the urgent national interest that we build this pipeline, that we get Alberta's products to market, and that we do so in a way that is environmentally beneficial, that is as safe as possible.

Pipelines, especially modern pipelines, and shipping, especially modern shipping, are incredibly safe. Incredibly safe. If this government, as I was saying yesterday, had made more of a case to align Alberta's interests with the interests of British Columbia – in fact, I believe our interests are aligned with the interests of British Columbia. We care in this House about ensuring that British Columbia and Canada's coastline is safe.

I did my university education on the west coast, on Vancouver Island, and it reminds me of two stories. One, it is a gorgeous, remarkable, beautiful place. Any of us who have been to the coastline of British Columbia, I promise you, not a single one of us wants to see that coastline fouled with any sort of effluent, any sort of accident from any oil tanker. I can assure you that if I felt that was in any way a risk and a remote possibility, then I wouldn't be supporting the expansion of Kinder Morgan, but I do because I believe that the methods for shipping crude oil to market, for which there is still a substantial demand, are absolutely fundamentally safe.

I have to say that back in – it was a long, long time ago, Madam Speaker – the early 1990s, which some in this House, more on this than that side, would remember, we were protesting. We were

protesting, as good university students who cared about our environment did then and still do now, the fact that the city of Victoria dumped raw sewage into the Pacific Ocean. It was an outrage in 1992 and – you know what? – it's still an outrage in 2018 because they still do it. It actually defies belief that that is still something that goes on in that province. So I think that our friends in British Columbia ought to look in their own backyard if they want to tackle a pressing and urgent environmental issue that relates to their coastline. I would encourage them, please, to work on cleaning that up. It just stuns me that that happened so many years ago and happens to this very day.

So I will be supporting the first two of the three amendments brought forward by the Official Opposition. I will not be supporting the third because I think that it's important that we do continue to press the federal government to act in Alberta's and Canada's interests, to use the lawful powers that they have to put forward a strong case to British Columbia and to all Canadians, the importance of this pipeline not just from an economic perspective but from an environmental perspective as well.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Mr. Mason: Yes, please, Madam Speaker. Well, I want to thank the hon. member for admitting his mistake and talking a little bit about the leading constitutional expert who has weighed in to suggest that this particular clause, section 92(10)(c) of the Constitution, is redundant in this case.

I will just add another authority to that argument. This person says that local works and undertakings such as of the following classes, that are wholly situated within the province, are before or after their execution declared by the Parliament of Canada to be to the general advantage of Canada or to the advantage of two or more provinces. The authority went on to say:

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 [also] 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.

That authority stood in this place yesterday and made those comments, hon. member.

Mr. Clark: That authority wouldn't have been you by chance, would it?

As I was talking about with my hon. colleague here, *Hansard* is forever, so it's important what we say here. Yes, I will acknowledge, of course, that it's there in black and white. While I absolutely trust the hon. Government House Leader, Madam Speaker, I trust but I verify, so I have gone out and I have made sure that in fact his words were true. You know what? Rare as it may be, it turns out he's right, so we'll acknowledge that fact.

Again, using this as an opportunity to remind us all why we're here and the importance of this particular motion is absolutely vital. While we can have a little fun with each other catching one another out when we're not correct on something, it is absolutely urgent that we remember why we're debating this motion. That is to ensure that a lawful piece of infrastructure that is to the benefit of our entire nation is absolutely safe, that it in fact has a strong environmental benefit in terms of displacing higher carbon crude from sources of crude like Nigeria and Venezuela – in fact, by building the Kinder Morgan, we will help reduce global carbon emissions. I'm happy to stand here and say that because I know it to be true. We will support

the research and development that's already under way in Alberta's remarkably responsible and innovative oil and gas sector, which is actively working today to not only reduce carbon emissions from oil sands production but outright decarbonize the barrel from production to end use.

That's a big goal. That's Alberta's moon shot, Madam Speaker. That is the kind of work that's going on in this province. That is the kind of work that is going to be supported by the building of the Kinder Morgan pipeline. Far from it being something that we should be ashamed or embarrassed of; it is something that we ought to be in this province fiercely proud of. That is something I'd like to hear our federal government say.

Thank you.

The Deputy Speaker: Any other members wishing to use Standing Order 29(2)(a)?

Seeing none, any other speakers to the amendment? The hon. Member for Calgary-Foothills.

Mr. Panda: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise to speak to the amendment to the government motion. Like our leader mentioned before, our caucus is broadly in support of the motion, but our intention of moving this amendment is to strengthen the government motion. Now I'm hearing that there is some legal opinion about 92(10)(c). I have to do a little bit more research on that in the next couple of hours.

In the meantime, Madam Speaker, I would like to focus on the big picture that our hon. Leader of the Official Opposition eloquently explained to all of us yesterday. Alberta is sitting on a resource of \$11 trillion, which is a God-given gift. Some people want to leave it in the ground, but if we get our act together, like the Premier asked for yesterday, and if we act as one nation and leverage that resource for the benefit of all Canadians – Albertans and Canadians are counting on us to get to that point.

3:10

To talk about how we got here, I just want to take us back in time. Kinder Morgan got the approval for Trans Mountain almost 18 months ago. They received the paper approval 18 months ago and, as in the Official Opposition, have been saying: time is money. Time is of the essence. We can't lose time. Let's get these shovels in the ground. We raised that consistently in this House, and we have been asking the Premier to champion the construction. For over a year every time we asked about that, we were mocked, and they said, "We got two pipelines approved; we got two pipelines approved," the front line there. Every day that's how they answered for any question we asked about the construction delays, about the legal issues, about the blockades. The answer was: we got two pipelines approved.

We wasted precious time in not acting on this file in the interest of Albertans and Canadians. What's the result of that? Every single day of delay is costing \$70 million to \$90 million in revenues for Kinder Morgan. Their president, Ian Anderson, is very clear about that. He said that the company is watching and that they don't want to invest any more into this project unless they're crystal clear about getting the full approval, and they wanted the Prime Minister and the Premiers to remove the blockades because the ground realities are different. Here we can sit and talk. I was there on the weekend in Vancouver to support and show my solidarity with the couple of hundred Canadians that wanted this pipeline to be built. Who are they fighting against? There were 5,000 more protesters there who don't want this pipeline. They just want it not built. They want to leave it in the ground. No amount of persuasion, facts, science:

doesn't matter. They are very clear about that. They say leave it in the ground. Those are the types of people we are dealing with here.

All of us have been acting in good faith so far. I know why the Premier and the cabinet haven't done enough when we were insisting. You know, paper approval doesn't mean anything. There has to be a start date, middle date, end date, and this construction schedule is not working. What are you doing? How are you helping that? They kept mocking: no, no; we got two pipelines approved.

In that one year we heard so many other reports. The Premier herself quoted the Bank of Nova Scotia's report recently: lack of pipelines is costing \$15.6 billion a year, which is almost \$43 million a day. That money could have been used for schools, hospitals, for everything we wanted, infrastructure projects, but we were not taken seriously. Our leader, the new leader, has been saying that you have to be proactive. We can't wait. We can't dither on this. The Prime Minister, his point is: "Okay. We approved. We finished our job. Now, B.C. and Alberta, you sort it out. You fight it out." We kept saying: no; only federal government has the jurisdiction.

That's why we brought in this amendment, 92(10)(c). Now, I heard what the Government House Leader has to say and the Member for Calgary-Elbow has to say. We'll go and find out. But that's one person, one constitutional expert. Albertans and Canadians want to hear how it can be done, not how it can't be done.

When we are dealing with the government in British Columbia – at all levels of the B.C. government that happens to be NDP. It's an NDP mayor in Vancouver. It's an NDP mayor in Burnaby. It's an NDP Premier and an NDP federal leader. Those are the people who are saying that, you know, for them to survive as the B.C. government, because they signed a deal with the Green Party – three members of the Green Party, three legislators, are controlling the balance of power there. Our Premier and the cabinet here are naive enough to think that, oh, John Horgan will actually agree and give them social licence. They should have come to Vancouver over the weekend. They would have seen 5,000 people saying: no matter what, we won't let it get built.

Those are the kinds of eco radicals we are dealing with, and in good faith this cabinet brings in people like Tzeporah Berman and Karen Mahon and gives them positions on the oil sands advisory council. The result is delay. Just delay. That's why we are frustrated. We are asking them to use every tool available to clear the roadblocks of this project.

The money we are talking about here is big, Madam Premier, \$11 trillion of assets. If we leverage that asset and develop the oil sands in an environmentally responsible manner, we can work for the benefit of all Canadians. Like our leader said yesterday, that \$1 trillion debt we have together as all governments in Canada can be cleared. We can be debt free. Canada can be debt free. Albertans are not selfish. We have been sharing our prosperity with all Canadians.

We don't have time here. People are looking for jobs. There were some in this House that we introduced. A few hundred people looking for work showed up last year, and they're all still looking for work, because I know those people. I used to work with them. I see them in Calgary, in Edmonton, in Fort McMurray, and they're saying: we're still looking for work. They don't have time.

The Premier is saying: oh, okay; 92(10)(c) is irrelevant. But, come to that, if our talks in good faith continue to fail after six months, we come back to that. That's what they have been doing. When the Leader of the Official Opposition said, "Act tough; convey to B.C. that there will be consequences," he was mocked. In that process we lost more than a year doing nothing. If we rely on this Prime Minister, nothing gets done. Nothing gets done, Madam Speaker.

He happened to be in India two weeks ago. We all know he came back empty handed. Within a week the President of France was in India, and he could go and sign \$16 billion worth of deals with India. Countries like India, China – the Prime Minister was also in China. He couldn't get that trade deal with China. He just came back empty handed because he went there to lecture them on labour standards and other stuff, which for their country – I mean, they look at what's good for them. So that is the Prime Minister who happens to be leading on this file and who happens to be the close ally of this Premier, and both of them are not able to get anything done.

We are here saying, "We are with you, and these are the tools you can use," but they don't want to do that. Albertans don't have time. Canadians don't have time. People looking for jobs don't have time. Time is money. Every day of inaction is costing Canadians billions of dollars. That's why we asked for this amendment to be included, to strengthen the government's motion. It's up to them whether they accept it or not.

3:20

Yesterday the Premier was saying that we all should act together and send one message. Then why can't she accept the suggestions from us? She has been doing that. The throne speech reflects our input. Whether she gives us credit or not, we don't care. As long as something good is done for Alberta, we are happy. Whether she acknowledges our contribution or not, we are not worried about it. But don't reject good ideas or delay and come back after six months: okay; we'll do this. That six months is another billion, 2 billion, 3 billion dollars of money we could use for development activities in Alberta.

That's where we are at with this government motion. We'd like to support it, but we want our amendments to be considered and not to be rejected just based on ideology or political opposition. Don't do that. You did it enough. That's why investments are fleeing. If she wants to send that positive message to investors, then she has to work with the opposition and act timely. We are very grateful that they have accepted our suggestions and included some of our suggestions in the throne speech, and we are hoping that good common sense prevails here and that they'll take our suggestion of these amendments.

I strongly ask the Government House Leader to take the opinion of other legal experts, not just one. There may be ways to use that, and that's why I actually started a petition together with our local MP asking Albertans to sign that petition so that the Prime Minister can use it. If not 92(10)(c), he'll find something else. But once we express our will that we want him to act and not dither and not let this project die, he should get that message. That's why we started that petition. That's why we are asking this amendment to be considered. Don't tell how not to do it. Tell Albertans how you can do it.

People don't have patience. People don't have confidence in this government now. Those protests: I mean, if you trace them back, there are some people in this House who wrote – today our Member for Grande Prairie-Smoky actually tabled a document. The minister of environment contributed to a book which is telling those protestors how to blockade things. Those protestors are getting oxygen from the front lines of this House.

The Deputy Speaker: Any questions or comments under Standing Order 29(2)(a)? The hon. Member for Bonnyville-Cold Lake.

Mr. Cyr: Thank you, Madam Speaker. You know, this was very interesting. I'd love to hear some more about that specific document that he's referring to.

Mr. Panda: Thank you. I'm talking about a book written by Mike Hudema, who is very active with Greenpeace, and the minister of environment has contributed to this book. I don't want to waste my time speaking about that, but I can give a copy of this to you and to other members in this House. They can read that. But the point I'm trying to make is that we can't wait. We have to do something about this. We have to rise above partisan politics here, and if this Premier is serious about taking all opposition together with her on this fight, we are here to work with her.

We don't need any more proof of what we are saying. There is a lady I met, Madam Speaker, in Vancouver. Her name is Vivian Krause, a very patriotic Canadian. She has been doing great research work in digging up information on how foreign funds are coming here to help these environmental activists who simply want to leave it in the ground.

You know, if you say, "Okay; there is 1 and a half billion dollars to protect the coastlines," they say: "No. It doesn't matter. We don't want that." You tell them: "Okay, We'll ensure that there won't be any spillage. If there is something, we have all these backup plans." You give them evidence, you give them reports that that's how it will be handled, and they say: "No. We don't want that oil to come out. We want it to be left in the ground." They're very determined about that. No amount of logic, reason, science, fact is going to help.

That's why the federal government, which has the jurisdiction, has to, you know, invoke that 92(10)(c) and then implement that. Otherwise, this Premier will be dreaming that her ally in Ottawa will do something. He'll say that, yeah, he will do it, but then another year will pass by, and Canada will be losing billions.

Madam Speaker, you know, like our leader said yesterday, the international demand for fossil fuels is growing. There is a demand, so when there is a demand, there will be a supply. If we are not supplying, someone else will supply. Or, if we are producing, CAPP is saying that our production here will grow from 4 million to 5 and a half million, so an additional 1 and a half million barrels will get to the markets. Maybe we'll ship it by trains, which is not safe. Is that what the opponents want? Do they want a reliable, safe pipeline system to bring prosperity to Canadians and Albertans, or do they want us to use whatever means it takes and grow the emissions? Supply will be met with demand from other countries, which don't have the same human rights or environmental standards. If that's not what we want, then we should make sure that we build this pipeline.

This pipeline, Madam Speaker, is only adding 600,000 more barrels, but there is a gap of 1 and a half million barrels of pipeline capacity, so that means that we have to build another pipeline to the east or west or south. Sending to the south doesn't make sense because we are selling at a \$30 discount per barrel, so that means that we are to ship it either east or west to fill that differential, to not lose money on the differential. That means we have to build another pipeline. This pipeline, if and when it is built, is only for 600,000 barrels, but we need another million barrels of capacity on the pipelines, so that's why this government motion is really important. That's why we're all excited about it, but we want our amendments to be considered.

The Deputy Speaker: Any other members wishing to speak to the amendment? The hon. Member for Calgary-Klein.

Mr. Coolahan: Thank you, Madam Speaker. It's an honour to speak to the amendment to Government Motion 2. I think that yesterday the Government House Leader spoke for all members on this side of the House about the significant concerns that we have about parts of the opposition's amendment, particularly with the

first part, (a), in which it wants to change the wording to essentially say that this government has not been fighting for pipelines. Nothing could be further from the truth.

However, I will indicate that we are prepared to support one part of their amendment, that being the request that the phrase “continue to” be struck out as it relates to the federal government’s use of all necessary legal steps to see the pipeline built. You know, what’s needed is for the federal government to use those tools. As outlined by the Premier, you know, in sponsoring this motion, we want to send a clear and unified message to the country that Albertans are united in our resolve to get this pipeline built, and to that end we can support the second part of the amendment, specifically being part (b)(i).

3:30

I’ll speak a bit mostly about, right now, why we’re not going to support the rest of the amendment. Quickly on part (b)(ii), the House leader spoke to that just shortly before, and that it’s really not necessary to put that in there is the gist of that.

You know, it has become clear over the last day and a half that we are unanimous in this Assembly that getting the Trans Mountain pipeline built is a critical project for Alberta’s energy sector. All Albertans and, in turn, all Canadians will benefit from a new pipeline to the west coast. Of course, this debate is good to have. It allows us to come together, share our ideas, make amendments, and ensure that we can get on the same page and, ultimately, get this pipeline built.

At this stage of the process, Madam Speaker, what’s required is to have the B.C. government recognize the importance of this pipeline to the economies of both provinces and all of Canada. We need the B.C. government to honour the fact that this pipeline was approved and its Premier to recognize that pipeline approval is federal jurisdiction.

We also need the federal government to send a strong message to them as well. In November 2016 Ottawa approved the Trans Mountain pipeline. This was a major step forward, but more work needs to be done to get the pipeline built. As outlined by the Premier, the federal government already has the legal power to assert that this project gets done, which was approved in the national interest and should be carried out in the national interest. Ultimately, Madam Speaker, we need the B.C. government to stop delaying construction.

Madam Speaker, I just want to go back to what I said earlier about the fact that getting a pipeline built is a process. As much as I said that we’re all in agreement in this Assembly on the criticality of the Trans Mountain pipeline, what I think the opposition is forgetting is the fact that the only reason we’re here debating next steps as to when to get shovels in the ground is that we passed the first hurdle, which was getting federal approval. We would not have got that approval without having the best climate leadership plan in the country.

We would not be at this stage in the process if the opposition had its way. It’s that simple. In the opposition’s world view, which is void of a climate leadership plan, which drives innovation and efficiency in both traditional oil and gas and in the renewables sector, we’re not standing here talking about shovels in the ground. No, Madam Speaker. We would still be trying to convince the federal government of the need for a pipeline, and we’d have no answers to questions like “What are you doing to reduce emissions?” or “What are your targets for renewables on the grid?”

It really is because of this government’s foresight, because of this government’s working with the energy sector on policy, climate leadership, royalties, renewables that we have approval for the pipeline that we are debating here today. What’s more, Madam

Speaker, British Columbia should take notice of the fact that we do have a robust climate leadership plan, and it should be a factor in their decision to stop delaying construction. Now, the opposition can jeer at the idea of social licence, but – make no mistake – the climate leadership plan is a necessary component of getting this pipeline built, and this government knew this from the start.

You know what else this government understood, Madam Speaker? This government knew that action against man-made climate change is simply the right thing to do. It’s the right thing to do for our children and our grandchildren’s future, and it’s the right thing for the longevity of the energy sector, driving efficiencies and research and development into other areas like renewables.

With that said, Madam Speaker, with this government setting the stage with strong economic and environmental arguments, with this government’s use of diplomacy with both the federal and provincial governments, with Premier Notley using the B.C. wine ban to demonstrate . . .

An Hon. Member: Name.

Mr. Coolahan: Pardon me.

. . . to the B.C. government that she is focused and determined to get this pipeline built, and with the Premier’s continued focus on this file, I am optimistic. I am optimistic that the Trans Mountain pipeline will be built.

And when it is, the opposition must understand that it never stood a chance under its watch. Modern pipeline construction is complicated. People are demanding responsible energy development and responsible pipeline construction. Purchasers of energy are demanding the same. This is what this government and my colleagues on this side of the Assembly understand, and this is something that the opposition is missing. It comes down to the fact that we believe that we can have a thriving energy sector and a robust climate leadership plan. In fact, we believe it is necessary.

Madam Speaker, I don’t believe that getting the Trans Mountain pipeline should be a partisan issue because it benefits the entire country. We all benefit from this pipeline. With that said, you know, the opposition continually bets against Alberta on getting the Trans Mountain pipeline built. They see victory in pipeline construction being delayed. They put ideology and misinformation ahead of success for the province.

Nowhere is this more evident than in the fact that the opposition continually suggests that members of the government caucus are anti-energy. Nothing is further from the truth. The opposition mistakes a call for sustainable, responsible energy development as anti-energy. But this is what the world wants, and the world has taken notice. In fact, with that being said, it’s the opposition that is anti-energy. It’s the opposition that doesn’t understand the modern energy industry. As such, it does nothing for success in getting this pipeline built when the opposition falsely accuses this caucus of being anti-energy. It does nothing for the success of getting the pipeline built.

Madam Speaker, knowing what’s available at this stage of the process to get shovels in the ground is extremely important. I’m grateful that we have a Premier that people view as tough, tough but not scary, at least not scary in the sense that she’s not trying to drag the energy industry back 30 years, not scary in the sense that people fear that economic and social progress will cease to continue to move forward under her watch. We’ve seen the Premier’s resolve on the pipeline file. We’ve seen the caucus’s resolve on the pipeline file. Getting the Trans Mountain pipeline built is necessary, and it requires a delicate balance of environmental action and progress and a steely resolve. Alberta has the right Premier to get the job done.

You know, when the city of Burnaby tried to block the Kinder Morgan pipeline in court, we intervened. When the B.C. government tried to overstep its authority and regulate something it had no right to regulate, we stood up. We shut down talks about electricity sales to B.C. that could have been up to \$500 million per year for them, and we banned B.C. wine from Alberta shelves and brought together a task force to provide us with the best advice.

I've had many conversations with my constituents in Calgary-Klein over the past few months, Madam Speaker, and they know that we're focused on their priorities, like fighting to get this long-overdue pipeline to the coast built. We refuse to let anyone turn their backs on hard-working people in our energy sector. On this side of the House we're fighting for pipelines and hard-working Albertans, and we're not going to cheer for Alberta to fail because of narrow political interests. We're focused on creating good jobs in a diversified energy economy. Unlike members opposite, we are not going to settle for the same old boom-and-bust policies that hurt working families.

In closing, Madam Speaker, I would just like to say that I am in full support of this pipeline and in full support of the Premier's approach to getting this pipeline built. I have the utmost confidence that every decision the Premier has made to date and every decision she makes going forward is in the best interest of Alberta's energy industry and will lead to getting this pipeline built. The Premier and Alberta's energy industry have my full support, as does section b(i) of this amendment.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

3:40

The Deputy Speaker: Under Standing Order 29(2)(a), no questions or comments?

Then I will recognize the hon. Member for Strathmore-Brooks.

Mr. Fildebrandt: Thank you, Madam Speaker, and thank you, members, for your comments to date on the motion before us. I want to thank the government for bringing forward a motion that should be able, I hope, to garner the unanimous consent of all members in this House. It is important that we send a strong, unified message to the rest of the country and to pipeline opponents in particular that Albertans, regardless of partisan stripe or the ideological bickering that can take place in this place, can put those differences aside and stand together for the common good of all Albertans. I want to thank members of the opposition who have been putting forward pretty much just this idea for some time now. But thank you to the government for bringing it forward as the first item of business that we have here.

Just a few days ago – or perhaps it was a week ago – there was a rally of Canadians, primarily British Columbians but, I think, some Albertans, too, in Vancouver standing up for the Kinder Morgan pipeline and the development of our resources. I know that the Member for Calgary-Foothills was there. The vast majority of Canadians support responsible resource development, including the vast majority of Canadians along the proposed pipeline route.

But the enemies of this pipeline are intractable. Some of the key activists against it, including Elizabeth May, the federal Green Party leader, have said that they're willing to go to prison to stop this by illegal means. That is disturbing. Regardless of what party is in power federally or provincially in any of the provinces, I've always had a sneaking suspicion that it might take armed security along the route of this pipeline to get it built because we're not having a debate simply about the legality, the pros and cons of pipelines anymore. There is no social licence to buy. There is no

level of responsible resource development or pipeline safety measures that will bring most of these opponents onside. They are stiffening their resistance; they are not softening it.

I'm going to stay away from the conversation about how successful or not I think the carbon tax and its related plan have been in earning social licence – it's a debate for perhaps another day – because I want us to be able to put the province first here, put party and ideology aside, and try to come to a consensus all 87 members of this House support.

I'm speaking in favour of the opposition's series of amendments to the government's motion, and I think that if the government will accept them, I would certainly be in favour of the motion. The first amendment, part one, I think, is the most important. All members of this House, I trust, support the Kinder Morgan pipeline and fighting to get our resources to market, but we don't all necessarily agree on the means, on how that's been done. I would find very little, until very recently at least, in the government's approach to fighting for pipelines that I would agree with, that I think is the best way forward. I don't doubt that the government is sincere in how it has fought, at least in its own mind, to get this pipeline built. I believe they are sincere in their intentions. I just think: woefully wrong.

But it would be incorrect to ask all members of this House in goodwill to unanimously support a motion saying that we support this government's approach to this fight. We all have different approaches. There is a variety of parties in this House, and to varying degrees we might agree or disagree with the government's approach. But I think we all agree, every member of this House, on the ends which we are trying to achieve, getting our products to tidewater to get fair prices for Albertans' own natural resources. We agree with the ends, but we don't agree with the means. That is why I think this motion should focus on the ends, on what we are trying to achieve, what we are trying to do, not how we're trying to do it because even within different parties I'm sure there is some dissension. I'm sure there is some dissension in the NDP, some differences of opinion about how hard the government should be fighting for this or not. I'm sure there are differences of opinion within the UCP about how aggressive the government should be or not. There are going to be differences of opinion about how we achieve this, and those are all fair debates to have. I'll have my own position, and you will all have yours.

I think that the first part of this amendment is about making sure we are focusing on the ends, getting access to tidewater for our products, and not the means of it. If the government would accept that part of the amendment, this motion would earn my own support. I very much hope that I will be able to support it. The government has already said it will agree to section 2, which is a relatively minor amendment.

Section 3 is about strengthening the wording of the motion regarding invoking section 92(10)(c) of the Constitution Act, 1867. I'll listen to members here about how necessary or not or redundant or not that particular declaratory power is in this debate, but I'm of the opinion that we should be throwing the kitchen sink at getting a pipeline to tidewater. It is hopefully not a necessary power, but it may become a necessary power, especially when we are dealing with many actors in this debate who are willing to take extralegal means to block pipelines, be that chaining themselves to fences or trees or whatever other measures they might want to take. But it is important that the federal government use every tool at its disposal, and if the federal government needs to throw the kitchen sink at it, we should support them in that. I'll be happy to listen to other members as they quote constitutional scholars about the necessity of that particular section or not.

For me the most important part of this amendment is part 1, to make this a nonpartisan, nonideological issue, not to make this about trying to obtain post facto the support and endorsement of MLAs in other parties to approve of the government's own handling of this fight. I think it would be a bit of a stretch to say that this side of the House is broadly in support of how the government has handled it so far, but if they are willing to deal in a spirit of goodwill and make this about how we go forward, not the particular ideological or partisan approach of the government in power or the party in opposition, if we make this just about the ends we are trying to achieve, I think it would say a lot about this government, that they are growing into the role and that they're willing to reach across the aisle to work with members of all stripes on one of those rare occasions where we can come together unanimously to support something for the good of all Albertans.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The Deputy Speaker: Under Standing Order 29(2)(a), any questions or comments?

Seeing none, the hon. Member for Calgary-Fish Creek on the amendment.

Mr. Gotfried: Thank you, Madam Speaker. You know, it's clear that today much has already been said by my colleagues and other members of the House, really, on behalf of hard-working Albertans. But I do find it interesting that we actually are having to have to debate this motion and what I think is a reasonable and well-reasoned amendment which supports a project which is essential to our future, probably the most essential thing that we've come across in our short but rich history, namely the Kinder Morgan pipeline expansion. Is there any question that we as accountable Members of this Legislative Assembly need to act swiftly and without hesitation arguably with the strongest mandate from an overwhelming majority of hard-working Albertans? There is no debate on that self-evident truth.

We've been saying this for months, but we have sadly been greeted by tone-deaf ears on many occasions when it comes to acting without hesitation, equivocation, or delay on behalf of Albertans who we represent. I am glad we are moving towards this today and over the coming days as we debate this amendment and the motion itself. But let's be clear. Our leader, the hon. Member for Calgary-Lougheed, proposed – no; he pleaded – with the Premier in early February that we take the threat from this government's B.C. comrades seriously, reconvene the Legislature, and debate a motion with a similar intent to this one. Madam Speaker, that was more than a month ago.

3:50

Since then we have been stuck at a green-and-orange roadblock, thinking we have a social licence while being told by enviro-radical gatekeepers that our licence is being regarded as little better than a learner's permit. At that time, the Premier's chief spokesperson stated, "On the face of this, there doesn't seem to be a lot of value in recalling the Legislature to debate an issue we all appear to agree on." She followed that up with the following tweet, which again I'm quoting verbatim: "We don't need to have a debate to work together. This isn't a partisan issue, we all agree on this."

Madam Speaker, it's encouraging that the government has changed their tune and decided to have this debate after all. I think it's important to all members to come together and show the intransigent B.C. NDP that our province and our people are united in our desire to get this pipeline built for the benefit of all Canadians. This arguably is one of the few issues in this Assembly where we have broad agreement, but it is still important to have the

conversations on the record lest we forget and veer from our steadfast position that access to tidewater is indeed our constitutional right.

Overall I think the motion at hand was a positive step, albeit over a month late, and a good starting point, but I believe – no; I know – there is room for improvement, hence the amendments brought forward by my colleague the hon. Member for Rimbey-Rocky Mountain House-Sundre to strengthen this amendment and ensure there is absolutely no mistake in its attempt and the clarity around the desired outcome. I do not believe that asking the federal government to take all legal steps in support of the pipeline construction goes far enough. We need to make a very specific request of the federal government and the Prime Minister to do what Albertans expect them to do, not just on our behalf but in defence of a strong, vibrant, and prosperous Confederation, the country we all know and love.

The federal government is clearly not doing everything within their power at the current moment to make sure this pipeline gets built. It's pretty clear to all of us here. Their resolve appears vague, conciliatory with those already stating their intent to defy the law and lacking in balance with respect to our proven track record of world-leading environmental stewardship and responsible resource development.

As we see foreign-funded eco radicals, if you will, inside and outside the B.C. Legislature and local governments continue to plot the demise of not only the Kinder Morgan pipeline but any future pipeline projects, the Prime Minister and his cabinet continue to dither with respect to their constitutional authority. Indeed, I would suggest that the Prime Minister – sorry – that Trudeau Sr. would be appalled at the lack of clarity and resolve in his own offspring given his own fierce defence of clear delineation of constitutional authority and jurisdiction. We are getting none of that clarity nor any sense of urgency from this government's ally and compatriot in Ottawa in spite of what would appear to be common belief in the power of social licence.

This Assembly here now, today, needs to make an explicit and direct request of the federal government in order to ensure that they respond and respond with a sense of urgency and clarity, with meaningful and concrete action. The government needs to follow up with dogged determination in what is, guess what, the Year of the Dog – maybe the stubborn earth dog, of which I happen to be one – with the Prime Minister and his government to continue to push them to step up and do their job on behalf of Canadians from coast to coast, who stand to benefit from well-reasoned and responsible resource development.

I know this may be hard for this government, having been hesitant to criticize Justin Trudeau and his cabinet and playing along at every step with his regional favoritism, hypocrisy, and all-pain, no-gain environmental policies, but the self-evident truth known all too well by generations of Albertans is that the Trudeau Liberals have failed Alberta again and again when it comes to the energy sector and pipelines. For two generations, in fact. We need to demand the transparency of due process and constitutional accountability now, today, with solidarity from Albertans of all political stripes and from all walks of life.

Madam Speaker, the Trudeau Liberals failed on Northern Gateway, blocking approval for a pipeline, which has now led numerous aboriginal communities in northern British Columbia to consider court action against the federal government for rejecting that project. The federal government failed Alberta and all of Canada on Energy East by having the NEB rescope the review to include downstream emissions in spite of ignoring similar or even more blatant downstream emitters in the heart of central Canada. The federal government will again fail Alberta if they do not step

up without hesitation or delay and use their declarative authority under this country's Constitution.

Asking the federal government to continue to take all necessary legal steps in support of the pipeline construction does not go far enough, hence our amendments. It does not go far enough because I do not believe that the federal government is currently taking all the necessary legal steps to support pipeline construction. Far from it. You can't continue to do something if you aren't doing it well or diligently in the first place – that's pretty clear – and we need to ensure that clarity in this motion.

The second and more important reason, which I've previously touched on, is that when we are talking about the Trudeau Liberals, words are not enough. In fact, I apply a deep discount to them virtually every day. Talk is cheap, as they say. The PM can play the game and give good stump speeches while he is in Alberta, but that simply isn't good enough. Alberta needs actions, not words.

Our leader has been very clear on this issue, and I would suggest that we have not heard the last of his impassioned plea, indeed his battle cry, in defence of our province and the people we fiercely represent as patriotic Canadians and proud Albertans. On August 12, 2017, he stated, and I quote: "So we need to send a very clear message to Premier Horgan and the British Columbia NDP that Alberta will not take this lying down. We will stand up and defend our legal rights, our economic interests. This is about more than merely some pipeline. This is about whether or not Canada is a country governed by the rule of law and whether or not we are an economic union."

Again on September 28, 2017, he stated, and I quote: "If the government, the NDP B.C. government, violates the rule of law and the economic union of Canada through dilatory measures that stop the construction of the approved Kinder Morgan Trans Mountain pipeline, there must be repercussions. There must be consequences, and there's a whole range of possible consequences, one of which, I think perhaps the strongest consequence, would be to say that we would stop signing permits for the shipment of oil and gas through the current Trans Mountain pipeline, which fuels much of the economy of the lower mainland."

He followed up these comments once again on November 10, 2017, with the following, and I quote: "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 the national energy policy. You know, perhaps we should consider doing the same thing with respect to the current shipment of oil through the current Kinder Morgan pipeline, that's 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."

Yet, Madam Speaker, the Premier stated on December 3, 2017, and I quote again: "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 wouldn'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. pays for it, and then the next day he'll come out and wonder why it is that we can't get the pipeline built."

Well, Madam Speaker, the Premier seemed very dismissive of escalating action, of using decisive measures against the government in British Columbia just a few short months ago, yet in the Speech from the Throne, delivered so eloquently by Her Honour the Lieutenant Governor, Lois Mitchell, the government stated, "In the past when workers in our energy industry were attacked and when the resources we own were threatened, Premier Peter

Lougheed took bold action. Your government has been clear: every option is on the table." Apparently, if you list turning off the taps as a retaliatory option in December as a Conservative, you're promoting Trump-ish protectionism, but if you promote the same idea in March as a New Democrat, you are standing up for Alberta's interests. A curious, self-serving juxtaposition indeed. However, at the end of the day, we have a broad consensus from all parties in this House around the intent of this motion. I would suggest to the members opposite that our friendly amendment does indeed strengthen the motion and deserves not only due consideration but your vote of support. Albertans are counting on it, and anything less will reflect on your judgment or perhaps resolve to address this challenge to the livelihood of all Albertans without equivocation.

4:00

As I've already stated, the Prime Minister and his government have, at best, tepidly supported Alberta's energy sector, jobs, and the proven engine of our national economy. We need to make a clear request, we need to be specific, and we need to ask for – no; we need to demand – concrete and deliverable action. Doing so will provide the federal government with ample opportunity to back up their words to prove to all Canadians that it is not just empty rhetoric and to ensure this pipeline gets built.

Madam Speaker, in closing, I would encourage all members of this Assembly to support the amendment to the motion put forward by my hon. colleague. Thank you.

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

Seeing none, any other speakers to the amendment? The hon. Member for Bonnyville-Cold Lake.

Mr. Cyr: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I appreciate this opportunity to speak about pipelines as they actually are very true to my heart. Pipelines mean jobs for me, plain and simple. People are out of work in my constituency right now, and it comes down to the fact that we can't get the oil out. Literally, it is that simple.

What I have to say is that we have to look at the track record here. I have to say that the NDP government has been repeatedly saying that our federal Conservatives have not put out pipelines. I see that they've stopped that, but to be sure to put this on the record because this is important, the Kinder Morgan anchor loop was completed in 2008, the Enbridge Clipper was completed in 2010, the TransCanada Keystone was completed in 2010, and the Enbridge line 9B reversal was completed in 2015. Together these projects provide 1.25 million barrels per day of additional capacity for western Canada. It's very impressive.

Let's look at the track record of the federal Liberals, and let's look at the track record of our provincial NDP here. I'm going to paraphrase; I don't have the Blues in front of me. We've got the Member for Calgary-Klein: a pipeline would never have had the chance to be built under the opposition. I adamantly disagree with that. I believe that we would be right now fighting for four pipelines, not one. Four pipelines. We have Energy East, that the Trudeau government shut down. We have Northern Gateway. I credit our Premier, the Premier of the province of Alberta, for shutting that one down, Northern Gateway. Keystone XL was another one that the Premier, in my opinion, was planning on shutting down. But you know what? It is actually the one that is moving forward the quickest. Ironical that we have a pro-pipeline government down in the United States right now trying to make sure energy gets to markets. It's good for everybody.

The Kinder Morgan pipeline: for sure it's clear that this is our last hope of seeing something move out of here from this NDP government. So I understand that they actually want to see this. I

don't believe that every one of the members across the aisle wants to see pipelines fail, but I will say – and, again, I brought this up earlier – that when you look at NDP governments across Canada, I am certain that you're probably going to find that most or all of them except for Alberta are actually advocating against us, which is why we're getting some strange messaging, which was why I think that the Trudeau Liberals don't seem to really care about the direction we're going in.

Now, I have to say that my colleague from Calgary-Hays on June 1, 2017, asked the question: "Do you now regret opposing Northern Gateway, and do you have any real plan to get Kinder Morgan's shovels in the ground?" This is a question that he asked last year, last summer.

The response from the Premier was:

Well, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. What I don't plan to do is to talk down the chances for Alberta's growth, talk down the fact that Alberta is actually a great place to invest, try to discourage people from coming here by telling them the sky is falling when it's really not, all the kinds of politically motivated things that we see from those guys over there and those guys over there. They are so interested in their own political success that all they want to do is to see economic failure for Albertans.

That wasn't even the question. That's the problem. The fearmongering isn't coming from our side. What we actually are seeing is a reasonable question from Calgary-Hays, saying: what are you doing to get shovels in the ground? And we're hearing: it's because of the opposition. That's the strangest answer I've ever heard.

Let's go on. Fort McMurray-Conklin on November 4, 2015, so going back a little further: "Energy East will only be viable if this Premier can convince the NDP Premier in Manitoba to stop trying to shut it down." What we've got here is the question: "When is she going to stop fighting against Alberta jobs and start fighting for pipelines?" That's from the Member for Fort McMurray-Conklin.

Now, the answer here was:

I took an approach of working collaboratively and respectfully with our colleagues across the country. In so doing, we got them to agree to the Canadian energy strategy. Temper tantrums were not a way to get our colleagues across the country to agree to the Canadian energy strategy. A collaborative effort was required, and that's what we did.

You know what? We saw the results. That pipeline was cancelled. That's clear. So social licence was very successful in that example.

Now, what I've got here is another example from one of my other colleagues. The question is – oh; sorry. I will put the date on it for *Hansard*. I don't have the date. I'll get the date to *Hansard*. "Your public confidence is admirable, but can you confidently say today that the Trans Mountain pipeline is any closer to being built than the Northern Gateway ever was?"

The Energy minister said:

You know, we continue to do the work we've done, and so does Kinder Morgan with Trans Mountain. As we speak, they are in B.C. talking. We continue with our relationships, as we've done. These relationships and this adult way of dealing with pipelines has gotten us not just one but two approvals. It's also been our climate leadership plan that got us those approvals as well, and we're going to continue that good work.

It doesn't seem that everybody else has got the message. What it does seem is that the only thing the NDP have been good at is demonizing the opposition, and that is all the opposition on the other side. Instead of working with us like they should have been, they continue to rail at us, saying that we're fearmongering. You know what? We've seen pipelines continually put down, and now we have a government that's worried about getting re-elected, so

they're suddenly starting to ramp things up to see if they can get back into government.

Now, let's go to May 25, 2017. This was back in the summer again. This was an answer that was put forward by our Energy minister. The Member for Calgary-Foothills put this question forward. "Why is the NDP government working with the anti-Alberta organizations like Tides and radical activists like Karen Mahon and Tzeporah Berman, who are clearly on the take from people who would ruin Alberta?"

The response from the Energy minister was: "You know, this side of the House has taken a different approach because, we know, for far too long the other side wanted to go full John Wayne and pull everybody against each other."

4:10

I don't say that this answer is wholesome because, in the end, challenging the government and saying, "Why were we paying people to oppose our own pipelines?" – it seems to be an insane option for this province.

Now, let's go on to Calgary-Foothills:

By now you probably might have heard that the Petroleum Services Association of Canada, PSAC, lambasted our Premier and our Prime Minister for not standing up for the oil and gas industry.

The PSAC president said, quote, it's totally irresponsible that Canada is not getting its oil and gas to tidewater, to other parts of the world. Mr. Speaker, this is just common sense. Karen Mahon in her petroleum-made kayaks should have been out protesting the city of Victoria, not Kinder Morgan, for dumping untreated sewage into [our] ocean.

This was on November 1, 2017.

You know, I can go on and on with these examples, but we have limited time. I will say that what we needed has been a clear message from both opposition and government. This entire three years that you've been in government you have failed us. Now it's time to start to back up something. This motion is a good thing. We should accept this motion.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The Deputy Speaker: Under Standing Order 29(2)(a), the hon. Minister of Transportation.

Mr. Mason: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Now, I heard the hon. member say that he lays the responsibility for the cancellation of the Northern Gateway pipeline directly at our Premier's feet. I don't know if he was with us yesterday when this was debated, but I want to know from the hon. member, given that the Northern Gateway pipeline was cancelled by the Federal Court of Appeal, who in their ruling overturned the project after finding that Ottawa, that is to say the previous federal government, of which his leader was a leading member, failed to properly consult with First Nations affected by the pipeline. It said in the ruling that

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.

Given that the Northern Gateway pipeline was cancelled by the Federal Court of Appeal because of inadequacies and failures on the part of the previous federal government, of which his leader was a key member, will the member stand and apologize for blaming the cancellation of that pipeline on our Premier?

Mr. Cyr: With the Kinder Morgan we went and got intervenor status. Now, I'm not wholly familiar with that case, but I will say, though, that if we had gone through the same process with the Northern Gateway that we're going through with the Kinder Morgan right now, would that have changed? I'm going to say that we didn't start ramping this up until you realized that you were going to get no pipelines through. Let's just say that the federal Liberals changed the game plan or the rules halfway through that pipeline, like most pipelines, and it's shameful to see that we have co-operation from our Premier, the Premier of Alberta, who is an NDP leader, actually working with the federal Liberals to shut down that pipeline. I've got no apology for that.

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

Seeing none, any other members wishing to speak to the amendment? The hon. Member for Battle River-Wainwright.

Mr. Taylor: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm really pleased to be able to be here to speak on behalf of this amendment not only for Canadians, because I believe there are jobs that are going to be brought across this country because of this, but for Albertans and for the people in my riding. Hardisty has got this nexus of pipelines that are sitting that deliver oil across this country right from there.

I find it encouraging that we are here to debate a government motion that asks the Legislative Assembly to support Alberta's fight on behalf of Albertans' interest to ensure that a lawfully approved Trans Mountain pipeline expansion is built, to also call for the federal government to continue to take all necessary legal steps in support of pipeline construction, and to reaffirm our support as a Legislature for the Trans Mountain pipeline expansion. I think the government would agree with all those points because that came right out of the initial motion.

I as well as my colleagues have been supportive of this expansion of the Trans Mountain pipeline since day one, and we have been clear about our support for that expansion. While I certainly support any efforts by the government to accomplish this by standing up for this much-needed project, I really believe that this motion can be better, and this amendment helps make this motion better. Why do we need to make this better? It's simple. As Albertans we are leaving billions – that's billions – of dollars on the table that could go directly into our economy. But let me be clear here, too. We are not just leaving dollars on the table for Albertans alone; our resources could create prosperity again across all of the country, not just Alberta. We could have done so much more if we didn't have so much opposition from both the federal Liberal government and the B.C. NDP Party.

I want to go on. I want to agree with my colleague from Calgary-Foothills when he says that we need to do everything that we can to be able to put everything that we can, all that ammunition, to the government to be able to get this thing processed. Simply, the federal Liberal government can do more, and they aren't doing everything within their power. The federal Liberal government can end this debate right now by using the declarative authority under the Constitution. This project is in the national interest. As I said before, there are monies that can be obtained or, you know, seen, realized throughout this whole nation because of manufacturing and services across the country. If the federal government used section 92(10)(c) of the Constitution and declared that this is in the national interest, then we would have it done. We'd have a pipeline.

Why hasn't the carbon tax social licence worked as promised? Yesterday the Premier stated during a question from the Leader of the Opposition:

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... No pipeline, no diversification. They had their chance, and they blew it. That won't happen again. We will get that pipeline built.

Well, I hate to break it to you – I know another member had to break that news to you – that during our leader's tenure in Ottawa four pipelines were actually built. Four of them. The Kinder Morgan anchor loop was completed in 2008, the Enbridge Clipper was completed in 2010, the TransCanada Keystone was completed in 2010, and the Enbridge line 9B reversal was completed in 2015, all built under the Conservative government.

So it seems that what we are left with is a statement from B.C. and a carbon tax that, frankly, has hurt businesses throughout my riding of Battle River-Wainwright. I've recently talked to an owner – this was just about 10 days ago – who has a gravel- and grain-hauling business. He told me that this tax has increased costs to him by about \$100,000 per month. That's \$100,000 per month, the carbon tax. That's about \$1.2 million a year. That's outrageous. This is money that could be going back into the economy, the local economy in this small community, but it's not. It's going to the carbon tax, and it's going directly to different green agendas that this NDP government is wanting to put up. Tire shops, too, are at a standstill compared to a couple of years ago because of slow activity in the oil field. And the list goes on.

4:20

The thing about oil is that we all get what the market will bear. We don't get any more than what the market will bear. Unfortunately, right now we have to take the western Canadian select price, not the WTI, or the west Texas intermediate. More carbon tax just makes it harder for companies to compete. Their bottom line is being shrunk. Companies are, frankly, moving south of the border, where there are fewer costs, less regulation. They can see that there's less profit here in Alberta each day. Therefore, it is more imperative than ever to get this product to tidewater – that's what we're trying to do here – so that we can realize a higher price for this product, not the western Canadian select price.

How to make life better? Scrap the carbon tax for one thing. We have not changed a single pipeline opponent's opinion because of the carbon tax. No jurisdiction is saying, "Yes, let's do business right away" because it's been legislated. Why are Albertans strapped with this tax that only, frankly, drives business away and is, frankly, counterproductive?

Madam Speaker, we needed to make this motion stronger. It's clear that the federal government isn't doing everything within their power. We can make it known to the rest of Canada that Alberta elected officials stand united in their desire to get this pipeline built. After all, it was our leader who wrote the Premier asking for this debate to happen last month, and we were rebuffed. There is simply no logical reason for the government not to get onboard and support our motion. If they agree that the feds have the authority to declare this project essential to Canada's interests, then why not lend their voice to this motion? Where's the downside?

We are blessed to be here in the province of Alberta, that has the third-largest oil reserve in the world, but if we can't get our product to market, we can't realize our potential. My colleague from Rimbey-Rocky Mountain House-Sundre's motion may help do just that. I encourage all the members of this House to support this motion in a united purpose and go forward.

Thank you.

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

Seeing none, are there any further speakers to the amendment? The hon. Member for Lacombe-Ponoka.

Mr. Orr: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I appreciate the opportunity to rise and speak to the government motion to really express a united voice on the part of Albertans to get the pipeline done. We need to do that. I speak clearly in support of the motion and also in support of the amendment. I think it's quite obvious that we are going to support on this side of the House the efforts to stand up for the Trans Mountain project, and it's something that we absolutely need to do. Albertans know exactly where we stand on this issue. Our leader, Jason Kenney, has been very clear on it, stated it over and over again, as have we, and we will continue to support the motion towards getting the pipeline built. I do think we can make it slightly better, and that's why we've introduced the amendment. I think the important thing is that we make this motion as effective as possible and get it done as quickly as we possibly can.

Albertans, particularly the Albertans in my riding, Lacombe-Ponoka, have been waiting far too long for the opportunity for us to get our energy to market and to be able to have the jobs and the economic benefits that will come with that. Quite frankly, it benefits all Canadians. It benefits all of Canada. Alberta oil and gas is the most innovative, the cleanest there is in the world. Right in Lacombe-Ponoka we have one of the largest secondary oil and gas industries, at NOVA Chemicals, manufacturing ethane and polyethylene. They also create green energy at that plant through cogeneration, capturing lost heat and turning it into electricity. The energy that comes out of Alberta and the energy products that come out of Alberta are actually extremely clean, much cleaner than in most other places in the world. We need to be careful that we don't basically shut down Alberta oil and gas and then have the rest of Canada using, really, energy that comes from other places that are not environmentally conscious, that are not socially conscious, that in fact are very dark in many different kinds of ways.

Also, I think people need to know that the east side of my riding, actually, is the area where carbon sequestration is going to be happening, coming out of the Alberta Industrial Heartland area, pumping carbon back down into the ground as one of the by-products of the production of oil and gas products. That happens right in the gas field on the east side of my riding because the geology is extremely beneficial for it. The pipeline will take carbon from some of the manufacturing process and pump it right straight back into the ground, where it came from, and will in fact reduce the carbon emissions from that particular part of it to zero. We need to be conscious of the fact that Alberta oil is not all about creating greenhouse gases. It's also about finding ways to mitigate greenhouse gases and finding ways to produce oil and gas and oil and gas products in ways that are beneficial to the rest of Canadians.

I should say that, really, it is Alberta oil that provides the quality of life that many Canadians enjoy. In fact, protesters themselves use the very oil that they protest. I find that extremely disconcerting. I've always said to people, you know, that it's extremely easy to shut down the oil and gas industry permanently if we really want to. Any group of people that would actually take this seriously could put an end to this industry very quickly, and that would be to just stop using it. But everybody wants to be able to fly. Everybody wants to drive. Everybody wants to heat their houses. Everybody wants to use the plastics, their clothing, their houses, their cars. You know, protesters need to show us how to stop using it if they think it's that bad. I just struggle with the cognitive dissonance of protesting the delivery of oil but accepting the uses of that same oil every single, solitary day, even on the days of protest.

I call on the citizens of British Columbia to challenge the false logic and the false messaging of extremist environmentalists

against Alberta oil and gas. All of Canada benefits not just from the products but also from the wealth that's generated through this in the form of – what's the word? I can't even say it – transfer payments to the rest of Canada, to all of those areas that don't have this wealth. They get some of the cash benefit of this. We need to somehow get the messaging right on this. We don't have to destroy our country in order to receive the benefits of a modern economy. We don't need to punish our nonprofits, our agricultural industries.

Last week I spoke at a gas co-op in my riding. I was really disconcerted to hear that that gas co-op in the last 10 months, January to October, not even including the cold winter weather that we've had, had to collect from the people of my riding, the hard-working, ordinary people of just the eastern side of my riding, \$750,000 in carbon tax. That came out of their pockets, out of their lifestyle, and that's just the natural gas to heat their homes. It doesn't count the increased cost of driving in rural areas, of agricultural uses, the increased costs of products, and all the rest of it. I think we need to find ways to do things in a more positive and forthright manner that are actually beneficial and not punitive to our people and to our country.

I would like to see us accept the amendment that has been put forward. We need to call on the federal government. I realize that there's some difference of opinion and debate with regard to section 92(10)(c) of the Constitution. You know what? Whatever it takes, let's just get it done. If Parliament has the jurisdiction already, well, then, act on it. And that's the challenge. I mean, the Prime Minister has stated that they believe the pipeline to be in the national interest of Canada. Well, then, do something to effect that belief. Take some action to actually cause it to happen. We need to challenge the federal government to act upon what they say, to take action. We need to make this motion as strong as we possibly can so that they get that message.

I truly believe that the Liberals could end this debate now rather than stand by silently. So I call on the Liberal government of Canada to actually resolve this in the Canadian national interest, for the benefit of all Canadians both in terms of product and in terms of the money that it produces for all of Canada. I implore all of us. Let's do the very best we can. Let's get this thing done. Let's do what needs to be done and move on with it.

Thank you very much.

4:30

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

Seeing none, any other speakers to the amendment? The hon. Member for Calgary-Greenway.

Mr. Gill: Thank you, Madam Speaker. It's my honour to rise to support the amendments as proposed by the Opposition House Leader to Government Motion 2. Like everyone in the UCP caucus, I'm pleased to speak to the government's motion calling upon the Legislative Assembly to fully support the Trans Mountain pipeline expansion. Of course, we support the government's fight because (a) it is in the best interest of Alberta and Canada and, second, taking up the fight was the idea of our leader. Until the Member for Calgary-Lougheed started pushing our NDP government to fight with all its effort for this pipeline, you would hardly have known the pipeline was in any peril, despite B.C.'s clear plan to obstruct it. Now the government has come onboard to battle, and we are happy to do so to support government.

After all, this discussion itself is something our leader urged a month ago. At that time, the Premier dismissed it as unnecessary, and although she has come full circle to seeing its benefits today, we're not placing any barriers in its way because we offer full support. As our leader said last August, quote: we need to send a

very clear message to Premier Horgan and the British Columbia NDP that Alberta will not take this lying down; we will stand up to defend our legal right, our economic interest. Unquote. This is an opportunity to send that message to the British Columbia NDP and the federal government. The message is important for B.C., who is playing games, that those games must end. The message is important to all Canadians, because it is important to the prosperity of our whole nation and it is important to the prosperity of future generations of this country.

It has taken quite a while to get this NDP government to this point. Two months ago the Premier said, quote: they want us to act like tough guys, threatening a trade war with B.C.; it would be amusing if it wasn't so bad. Unquote. Six weeks later she imposed a boycott on B.C. wine, which our leader supported, and now we're here today supporting this motion but asking that it first be strengthened. Since the Premier has taken our leader's advice, since she decided to acknowledge that Alberta had to play hardball with a province that wasn't respecting the rule of law in Canada, we are hoping she will take his advice on ways to strengthen this motion as well.

A key way to make this motion particularly relevant is to add the clause "including . . . a declaration that the pipeline is in the national interest" by the use of section 92(10)(c) of the Constitution. This clause is aimed at the Prime Minister, who confirms that the Trans Mountain pipeline is in the nation's interest but refuses to invoke the clause that puts an end to B.C.'s manoeuvring to delay the project with the hope that Kinder Morgan walks away from it. This is a smokescreen for not wanting to act as the leader of a country should when its country's economic future is placed at risk.

Our NDP government has been shy about criticizing Justin Trudeau and his Liberal government. We're confident they'll get over it when they see that Albertans do not want them to pander to Ottawa. Alberta has a fine heritage of standing up to the federal government when it wasn't looking out for all provinces fairly. The example that always comes top of mind is Peter Lougheed standing up to Pierre Trudeau and his national energy program, and we have discussed that many times in this House.

Our leader said in September, quote: I think we need our Premier to stand up to these attacks on our economic union and free trade and the rule of law the same way that Peter Lougheed stood up to Pierre Trudeau back in the 1980s. Unquote. Almost 40 years later we need that kind of leadership again. That's why our leader suggested a debate like this a month ago, and that's why we're supporting this motion today. But we're asking the NDP government to add this critical clause. Think about how powerful it would be if every member of this Legislative Assembly urged our Prime Minister to use this clause in order to support this pipeline expansion. It would put an end to B.C.'s delaying manoeuvres on this project. Investors who have been waiting to see if Alberta can get a pipeline to tidewater will obtain the confidence that they need to announce projects, building upon our resource industry, which has been damaged so badly in the last few years.

Fifteen thousand pipeline construction jobs will become a reality. The 37,000 direct and indirect jobs created by the project will be a go. Alberta will reset itself as a leader in Canada, a position we have lost in recent years. There is absolutely no reason to reject this amendment and, I think, every reason to support this amendment. We hope we're not disappointed after discussing Government Motion 2 for two days under the spotlight that Albertans have turned on our House as we deal with a question so important to the future of our province and the future of our country. This is the time for the Legislative Assembly of Alberta to display that we can set aside partisanship and political theatre for the common good of our

province. After all, we are asking the same of our country, so we're compelled to do so. That's why we're adding this amendment. We will not give up, for at every stage of this discussion the NDP has mocked us and rejected us at every turn, only to suddenly change course.

We have all known the record of this NDP government and that some of the caucus members of the government haven't been in favour of development of resources in this province. It's in public display. I am going to give a couple of examples. This is our hon. Education minister from November 1, 2008. Quote: balance of mind and balance of body starts by doing the right thing, and I say that doing the right thing means that we have no new approvals for tar sand projects. This is what our hon. Education minister said on November 1, 2008.

We have also seen the pictures of the hon. Member for Calgary-East holding the no more dirty oil sign. We have also seen the pictures of the Premier attending the antipipeline, anti oil and gas rallies. I mean, this is the stigma. This is the reputation of this NDP government pertaining to resource development. I think that by supporting this amendment, the government can actually truly prove that they do believe in resource development, that they do believe in the development of our oil and gas industry.

Madam Speaker, I ask that, hopefully, by supporting this amendment, this government and this Premier and the caucus members on the government side will restore the position they claim, that they do believe in resource development and fighting for our province and our country's resource development.

Thank you very much. I hope all the members of this House support this amendment.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

4:40

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

Seeing none, are there any further speakers to the amendment? The hon. Member for Cypress-Medicine Hat.

Mr. Barnes: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I am pleased and honoured to rise today and speak in favour of the amendment to strengthen and improve the government's motion. The issue is not whether I or anyone else in the UCP caucus supports the government's efforts to stand up for the Trans Mountain pipeline project. We not only support the government; we want them to be doing even more. I'm very, very appreciative of my colleagues who for the last hour or two have expressed many of the strong, strong reasons that we need our government to do even more, that we need to ensure that British Columbia and the rest of Canada gets a clear, unequivocal message of how important this pipeline is not only to just Alberta but, of course, to British Columbia and to all of Canada.

You know, I want to take just a couple of minutes and go back to who we are supporting. Madam Speaker, I had an oil and gas guy in my office about three or four days ago whose company is still going, barely going, and he told me that because of the drop in work, because of the decline in activity, he has not taken a wage from his company for three or four years. Can you imagine?

I was watching my youngest son play basketball in Brooks the other day, and a group of young men came in. They were in a good mood. They were positive. They were joking. They were friendly. They were a nice fellowship to witness. They kind of sat down in front of me, and I could hear them talking about how they had just got back to work, so I leaned in, Madam Speaker, and I said: "That's great. Good to hear that you guys are working. Whereabouts around Brooks are you working?" Unfortunately, the answer came back Saskatchewan. They had to travel great distances to find some work.

I think of many of my friends that are in the oil and gas business who tell me that although they've gone a year longer without work, they're grateful now to be working for 60 per cent of what they used to make or the ones that have lost their houses or had to move on.

You know, that's where I want to turn to next. Who are we doing this for? Why do we need B.C.? Why do we need Trudeau? Why do we need the government of Canada to ensure that this happens? My colleagues spoke at great length about how Alberta in Canada is the best producer in the whole world environmentally and socially.

I just saw on the Internet – it was by an Alberta economist – that only 55 per cent of young men in Alberta, 15 to 24 years old, are even working. Can you imagine the price they're paying for this radical environmental – this competitive battle that we've lost to get our good oil and gas to tidewater? That is something like 100,000 young men in Alberta who want to work and can't find work. Women with a higher degree are, unfortunately, unemployed as well, but this article stated that it wasn't as bad for young women. Of course, Madam Speaker, I'm concerned about all Albertans that want to find work and cannot find the type of work they want when they want it and at the highest amount of pay they can get. So to the Prime Minister of Canada, the ceremonial Prime Minister of Canada: this is what we're fighting for. To the Premier of British Columbia: young men, young women, young people everywhere are unable to find the work that they're looking for.

You know, the *Medicine Hat News* had a headline a week ago that still shocks me, that 18 properties over four years hadn't paid their property taxes. I remember talking to a city councillor three or four years ago who assured me that the number then was zero. So, my goodness, if that many properties haven't paid their property taxes in four years, how many haven't in one, two, or three? How many haven't been making their mortgage payments? How much of this kind of thing, Madam Speaker, is affecting the quality of Albertans' lives, their mental health, their ability to provide for their families, their ability to take care of their communities and their neighbours?

Madam Speaker, this is what we're fighting for, and it's back to what so many of my hon. colleagues have said: Alberta, bar none, is the best producer, the best producer environmentally and socially, in a world that's going to be demanding more and more barrels of oil every day. As we get cleaner, as we get more efficient, the demand for the product increases. It is our opportunity and our obligation to provide this to the rest of the world.

Look at how far offside our politicians have gotten it everywhere in Canada. We've heard about big cities in Canada dumping raw sewage into the precious waters with little regard. We know that Ontario and Quebec buy something like 800,000 barrels of oil a day from Saudi Arabia or Venezuela. Of course, our hon. leader has talked about those two regimes; many others have talked about those two regimes. We have turned this world upside down. We have done what is not the best. We have done what is not right for the environment, for young workers, and for the Canadian economy.

Now I want to talk a little bit about where we're at. I had breakfast with 30 Cypress-Medicine Hatters last Saturday, and I would say to the government, my colleagues across the floor, that they have a credibility problem. Many, many Albertans do not believe that their heart is in this fight, do not believe that they are really here to advocate for Albertans, to advocate for our oil and gas industry and get the pipelines we need.

I'm amazed that our Premier backed down on the wine embargo so quickly. I'm amazed that she backed down with a little bit of a promise although I believe that Premier Horgan has done nothing. Well, actually, Madam Speaker, that is not true. Premier Horgan

went a step further; he taxed Albertans that own property in recreation areas that might be vacant. So our Premier fired a shot, then she retracted it, and the Premier of B.C. is now taxing Albertans even further. When I had breakfast with 30 Cypress-Medicine Hatters, it's no wonder that they don't believe that this government has their backs, that this government really believes in pipelines. Premier Notley's weak attempt at the wine embargo absolutely supports that.

Madam Speaker, you know what was so refreshing about these 30 people, too? We all took a minute or so, talking about what we'd like to see happen in this dispute with British Columbia to get the pipeline. They were all very, very concerned about their family members, their community members, other Albertans that couldn't find work at the maximum wage or the best opportunity they could. But, you know, Albertans being the wonderful people that they are, they were also concerned about anybody in British Columbia that might get affected inadvertently as well by what needs to be done. The genuine concern that Albertans have for all Canadians and the people of B.C. was so refreshing.

But, Madam Speaker, don't get me wrong. The people of Alberta, the people of Cypress-Medicine Hat want the Trans Mountain pipeline. They want our ceremonial Prime Minister to get to work. They want our government to get to work and make this happen. They want to do what needs to be done to make sure that Albertans can work, that Albertans can work to their full productivity, and that we can enjoy access to markets. Make no mistake that that was their overriding concern.

4:50

Madam Speaker, I said it earlier: I was disappointed to see the Premier and her NDP government fold at the first sign of pressure, you know, from the B.C. NDP and their Green Party allies. We know that their goal is to delay this, delay this, delay this until Kinder Morgan finally takes – jeez, I don't even know what it is – their \$3 billion or \$4 billion or \$5 billion and invests it elsewhere along with those many good jobs that go with it. They're saying that the B.C. NDP agreed to take their plan to regulate and restrict the flow of diluted bitumen to the courts, but besides that, nothing has changed. The NDP B.C. Premier said that he would be using every single tool available for him to fight the Trans Mountain pipeline. Every single tool. That's kind of a coincidence because that was the phrase that the hon. minister of environment used when she wrote her foreword in *An Action a Day Keeps Global Capitalism Away*. I digress.

I just want to take a moment to point out that the B.C. government hasn't actually referred anything to the courts yet. They are still formulating the exact question to ask the court. A court delay is going to take three, four, or five, maybe 10 years, Madam Speaker. It's no wonder that Cypress-Medicine Hatters know how disingenuous this government is and know how important this fight is.

But back to my point. The B.C. NDP have not moved an inch from opposing the pipeline. They oppose the pipeline. In fact, not a single person or group that opposes the pipeline has moved to become a pipeline proponent, as our hon. leader pointed out the other day, in spite of us paying \$2 billion a year in carbon tax.

It doesn't sound like this government was successful in convincing the B.C. Premier to accept that his actions are illegal or unconstitutional, nor does it sound like he's agreed to stop the obvious delay tactics specifically designed to disrupt the Trans Mountain pipeline. Madam Speaker, this government needs to show Albertans that they truly are in this fight, that they truly will do everything possible to get this pipeline so that men and women in Alberta can get back to work. That's why I'm supporting it.

Madam Speaker, thank you very much.

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

Seeing none, any further speakers to the amendment?

Seeing none, are you ready for the question?

Mr. Mason: Madam Speaker, if I may.

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. Government House Leader.

Mr. Mason: I would like to move that we shorten the bells to one minute for amendments to the government motion only.

[Unanimous consent granted]

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

[Several members rose calling for a division. The division bell was rung at 4:54 p.m.]

[One minute having elapsed, the Assembly divided]

[The Deputy Speaker in the chair]

For the motion:

| | | |
|----------|----------|------------|
| Aheer | Gotfried | Pitt |
| Barnes | Hunter | Schneider |
| Clark | Kenney | Smith |
| Cooper | Loewen | Starke |
| Cyr | McIver | Strankman |
| Drysdale | Nixon | Taylor |
| Ellis | Orr | van Dijken |
| Fraser | Panda | Yao |
| Gill | | |

Against the motion:

| | | |
|---------------|-----------|-----------|
| Anderson, S. | Ganley | Miranda |
| Babcock | Goehring | Nielsen |
| Bilous | Gray | Payne |
| Carlier | Hinkley | Piquette |
| Carson | Hoffman | Renaud |
| Ceci | Horne | Rosendahl |
| Connolly | Jansen | Sabir |
| Coolahan | Kazim | Schreiner |
| Cortes-Vargas | Larivee | Sigurdson |
| Dach | Loyola | Sucha |
| Dang | Luff | Sweet |
| Drever | Malkinson | Turner |
| Eggen | Mason | Westhead |
| Feehan | McKitrick | Woollard |
| Fitzpatrick | Miller | |

Totals: For – 25 Against – 44

[Motion on amendment A1 (a) lost]

The Deputy Speaker: We'll proceed to the vote on amendment A1 (b)(i).

[The voice vote indicated that the motion on amendment A1 (b)(i) carried]

[Several members rose calling for a division. The division bell was rung at 4:59 p.m.]

[One minute having elapsed, the Assembly divided]

[The Deputy Speaker in the chair]

For the motion:

| | | |
|--------------|----------|-------|
| Aheer | Gill | Orr |
| Anderson, S. | Goehring | Panda |

| | | |
|---------------|-----------|------------|
| Babcock | Gotfried | Payne |
| Barnes | Gray | Piquette |
| Bilous | Hinkley | Pitt |
| Carlier | Hoffman | Renaud |
| Carson | Horne | Rosendahl |
| Ceci | Hunter | Sabir |
| Clark | Jansen | Schneider |
| Connolly | Kazim | Schreiner |
| Coolahan | Kenney | Sigurdson |
| Cooper | Larivee | Smith |
| Cortes-Vargas | Loewen | Starke |
| Cyr | Loyola | Stier |
| Dach | Luff | Strankman |
| Dang | Malkinson | Sucha |
| Drever | Mason | Sweet |
| Drysdale | McIver | Taylor |
| Eggen | McKitrick | Turner |
| Ellis | Miller | van Dijken |
| Feehan | Miranda | Westhead |
| Fitzpatrick | Nielsen | Woollard |
| Fraser | Nixon | Yao |
| Ganley | | |

Totals: For – 70 Against – 0

[Motion on amendment A1 (b)(i) carried unanimously]

The Deputy Speaker: The final vote, on amendment A1 (b)(ii).

[The voice vote indicated that the motion on amendment A1 (b)(ii) lost]

[Several members rose calling for a division. The division bell was rung at 5:05 p.m.]

[One minute having elapsed, the Assembly divided]

[The Deputy Speaker in the chair]

For the motion:

| | | |
|----------|--------|------------|
| Aheer | Hunter | Schneider |
| Barnes | Kenney | Smith |
| Cooper | Loewen | Stier |
| Cyr | McIver | Strankman |
| Drysdale | Nixon | Taylor |
| Ellis | Orr | van Dijken |
| Gill | Panda | Yao |
| Gotfried | Pitt | |

Against the motion:

| | | |
|---------------|-----------|-----------|
| Anderson, S. | Fraser | Miranda |
| Babcock | Ganley | Nielsen |
| Bilous | Goehring | Payne |
| Carlier | Gray | Piquette |
| Carson | Hinkley | Renaud |
| Ceci | Hoffman | Rosendahl |
| Clark | Horne | Sabir |
| Connolly | Jansen | Schreiner |
| Coolahan | Kazim | Sigurdson |
| Cortes-Vargas | Larivee | Starke |
| Dach | Loyola | Sucha |
| Dang | Luff | Sweet |
| Drever | Malkinson | Turner |
| Eggen | Mason | Westhead |
| Feehan | McKitrick | Woollard |
| Fitzpatrick | Miller | |

Totals: For – 23 Against – 47

[Motion on amendment A1 (b)(ii) lost]

The Deputy Speaker: We are now back on the main motion. Any speakers to this? The hon. Member for Calgary-East.

5:10

Ms Luff: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I have stood in opposition to new pipelines in the past. Maybe you've seen the picture. It's not a great one. I'm wearing a hat, and while I enjoy a good hat from time to time, I'm not really a hat person. It was downtown in 2011. I stood in front of the Harry Hays Building in downtown Calgary to protest the expansion of Keystone XL.

I was there for several reasons, reasons that a picture does not adequately explain. I felt that the government at the time was not doing enough to diversify the economy and that they were relying too heavily on the oil and gas industry and that this was doing irreparable damage to our economy long term. At the time, the government in 2011 was also not actively endeavouring to reduce Alberta's carbon emissions. They were not adequately protecting Alberta's greatest resources: our land, our water, and our air. I felt that shipping more raw bitumen to the United States so that it could be refined there and sold back to us was not in the best interests of Albertans.

I wasn't confident that the government at the time was spending the money from our oil boom wisely. How could we have such a successful, profitable oil and gas industry but still have such a fragile economy, susceptible to booms and busts, busts that saw and still see Albertans from all over the province hurting? With oil above \$100 a barrel and talk of expanding pipelines, why were teachers being told that they might not have jobs next year? Why were we not building schools? Why were we not contributing to our heritage savings fund? Other jurisdictions have been famously documented as navigating these same waters with much greater success. When Alberta was booming, why weren't profits being directed towards innovation and diversification across multiple industries?

I do not regret protesting a pipeline expansion in 2011. A pipeline in 2011 would not have created the jobs and the path that we need now. A pipeline in 2011 would have contributed more to the past government's inability to harness the power and economic force that a pipeline has the potential to be. A pipeline in 2011 would only have amplified the past government's propensity to spend money by providing tax cuts to their friends so that the rich could get richer. So I do not regret my actions in 2011. I stand by my actions at that time and in those circumstances.

But circumstances have changed. It's not 2011 anymore. Alberta voted to get rid of that government, and I can tell you that this government will utilize this pipeline to benefit all Albertans, not just those at the top; that this government will work towards a more creative, innovative, and diversified economy; that this government has a climate leadership plan that addresses carbon emissions and air pollution.

The opposition quickly points fingers and blames our government for the recession we've just been through, but our government has had to face down the economic reality of what former governments left us and create a plan that ensures that Alberta does become a leader in innovation, diversification, and that we do it with creativity and Alberta grit. There are people who ask me: "Why more oil? Why are you pushing this pipeline so hard? This isn't what I was expecting from an NDP government." They say, "Haven't you protested pipelines?" They say that I've flip-flopped, that I'm being political.

But I'm a science teacher, and I've always prided myself on basing my decisions on the best facts that I have before me. I'm here today, and I can tell you that I've toured refineries, in situ sites, and university labs. I've read countless studies and heard economic

reports, and I can tell you without reservation that the Alberta oil industry is working continuously to take carbon out of the barrel.

I also know that the oil industry has been integral to the foundation of Alberta, and denying this would be ill informed and unenlightened. Here today, in 2018, we are in a position to work with the oil and gas industry, with universities, and with entrepreneurs to bring about the changes that we all seek, to create an economy that will provide the future that we want. I know now that protesting pipelines is not an effective way to reduce carbon emissions. Fewer gas-powered cars would reduce emissions. Better technology reduces emissions. More public transit; more green energy – solar, wind, wave, thermal – more energy efficient homes, offices, and businesses; more local food production; more local production of goods, period; less deforestation: these are things that will lead to a lower carbon economy.

In 2018 I stand having educated myself, and I know that pipelines are not the enemy. In Alberta this pipeline is needed so that we can continue building the diverse, innovative, multifaceted economy that we require for the prosperity of future generations. If anything can be seen as an enemy, it has been past governments' inability to adjust to new challenges, challenges that we can face and overcome together.

We can't remain fixed. We can't have one path. We have to be flexible, and we have to develop. I'm not fixed. Every day I challenge myself to learn more, to be more open, to try to more fully understand our difficulties. I am proud that our NDP government has not remained fixed in our strategies, that we strive to improve and rise up to meet the challenges that Alberta faces. I got involved in politics because I wanted a government that based its decisions on facts and the situation currently in front of them, one that took all factors into consideration, and I am confident that this NDP government is doing exactly that.

As a legislator I often ask myself if the policies that I am voting on will hold up for my children. We cannot deny that Alberta needs to diversify, to innovate. The energy industry is the backbone of our economy, but that doesn't mean that we shouldn't be making every effort to expand and lift Alberta into a future of all possibilities, a future with better public transit, more renewable energy, and more energy products being made in Alberta. To do this, we need the ability to sell our oil now. We need to be able to sell it without a steep discount and to support our industry in its ongoing quest to lower emissions. There's no question that this pipeline will help us get there.

For me, this issue boils down to three questions. First, will this pipeline mean that we as Albertans and as Canadians are better off in 20 years? Second, do the benefits outweigh the risks? And, most important, is it what the majority of my constituents want? The answer to all three of these questions is a resounding yes, so I am happy to support this motion.

Thank you very much.

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

Seeing none, I will recognize the hon. Member for Calgary-Mountain View.

Dr. Swann: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I'll make a few preliminary comments, and then I have an amendment to put forward to the Legislature. It's a very important issue, that we're all appropriately spending a lot of time and energy on.

I want to be clear that I think our oil sands have provided unparalleled opportunity and economic returns to Albertans, jobs for citizens across this country. It's been the engine of our economy, and technological advances with environmental demands have

reduced the emissions per barrel of oil as we move from 2.5 million barrels a day to almost 4 million barrels per day in the coming years. It's clear that the Kinder Morgan pipeline passes all the tests of our current federal energy panel and our own Alberta Energy Regulator, and the federal government clearly has constitutional power to act across provincial lines in the national public interest.

But it's also clear to Albertans that in relation to the oil sands resource this government has a constitutional requirement to act in the long-term public interest, not just short-term economic interests. We must develop the resource but not at any cost. On behalf of Albertans and Canadians let us (a) be more transparent about the benefits and the risks to taxpayers, (b) ensure that these largely foreign-owned corporations pay fully for pollution and reclamation costs, and (c) report regularly on our commitments to climate change, holding ourselves accountable as the largest emitter of greenhouse gases in the country.

Let's talk first, then, about the benefits. The focus of this discussion has been entirely one sided, focused only on the benefits without the acknowledgement that we are taking risks whenever we develop heavy oil and transport it. We therefore have a duty to all citizens to provide a balanced, triple-bottom-line business case.

Recently the Parkland Institute reported that the claim of \$18.5 billion in economic benefits should be seen in the context of a 20-year period, translating to \$925 million annually for this pipeline, split between Alberta, Ottawa, and B.C. So let's be clear about the full accounting of the benefits. As the institute also pointed out, the revenue, fiscal benefits, and job numbers are premised on production levels that appear to go far beyond what will be allowed under our provincial emissions cap for oil sands production.

5:20

I think the Alberta public and the Canadian public will add their support to Alberta's call if we are much more transparent about both the benefits and the risks. Kinder Morgan as recently as August 2017 said that the total number of construction jobs for the project would be 2,500 per year for two years, not the 15,000 that were claimed in the media. Our credibility, as we deserve as the most responsible energy producer, also depends fundamentally on providing accurate information on both benefits and risks.

To address some of the risks – the principle is well supported across the political spectrum; I think there's no one in the House that doesn't believe that the polluter should pay. We now see growing interest among corporations in releasing their responsibilities as a result of the Redwater decision, and this government along with the federal government has loaned significant funds to oil and gas companies to particularly clean up orphan wells.

This is a concern, I think, that is doubly there for the oil sands, where a \$21 billion cleanup is estimated to be required in the context of 4 per cent of that amount being set aside for cleanup today. It's also important to recognize and for Albertans to realize that only 1 per cent of the oil sands has been reclaimed so far. So I think we have to acknowledge the potential for a real hand-off to the public purse, and we have to start reporting on that in a more robust way to Albertans. The 2015 Auditor General report identified in relation to the mine tailings issues, quote: inflated asset measures, unrecognized development costs, and overestimation of the mine life. End quote. Albertans deserve to know full, detailed liability disclosure, and they need to know, as I asked yesterday in this House, what the government is going to do to ensure full financial security if they really plan to honour their commitment to the polluter-pays principle.

In this context we need to remember what's happened elsewhere in Canada. The tar ponds in Sydney, the Yellowknife Giant mine:

both of those left to the public purse. I'm not saying that this will happen, but I'm saying that a prudent government acting in the public interest has to be more serious about reporting every year to Albertans both the benefits and the risks.

Our First Nations interests are, thankfully, being much more addressed by this government, and I applaud them for their making a priority around First Nations treaty rights and including them in a lot of the consultations that have failed in the past to be appropriately done. They have health interests and concerns which we haven't fully characterized in the research yet. First Nations have reported higher incidence of a number of illnesses that still need to be researched in relation to ongoing oil sands development.

In relation to greenhouse gas monitoring and climate change, the fundamental question in relation to the government's clear commitment to climate change, I applaud them again as the government that has done more on climate change than any government since I entered the Legislature. I want to go on record as saying that I support the carbon levy. It's the price of using our atmosphere to dump carbon.

Let's get real about the seriousness of climate change across this planet. We are not suffering from climate change. Too many Albertans welcome warming here. That's part of the reason Alberta has been able to get away with much slower progress on reducing our carbon emissions. Our commitment in the Paris accord is to reduce by 2 per cent per year. The best information I can get – and I was asking the minister yesterday why we're not getting more timely information on greenhouse gas emissions – is that we're increasing 2 per cent per year in our carbon emissions. It's not 4 per cent, which was the previous decade, so we've reduced the percentage of increase. But let's face it. A 2 per cent increase every year is not going to get us to reductions in 2030.

How do we, in fact, reduce greenhouse gases by expanding the oil sands? We have other fossil fuel options that we need to consider as Albertans, thinking about not just this next election cycle or this next four-year period but long into the future. This government has yet to consult Albertans meaningfully, with full-cost accounting, on how Albertans want to see this critical resource developed over the coming years based on a balance of economic, social, and environmental values. As in the past, it appears that the political needs and industry pressure are still determining the pace and scale of our development of the oil sands. To quote Peter Lougheed: treat Albertans as the owners of our resource. End quote. To respect this is to provide Albertans with all the dimensions of the benefits and risks of our resource.

In relation to the recent Parkland report, they indicate that the big five oil sands producers have only one way, really, to reduce their total emissions. Because they have not been able to absolutely reduce emissions, they have reduced emissions relatively per barrel of oil.

Mark Jaccard of Simon Fraser University, a widely respected consultant on climate change, consultant to national and provincial governments over the last 15 years, asserts that, quote, if you freeze emissions today on the oil sands, it will still be extremely difficult to hit the Paris target.

It's puzzling that Albertans do not hear annual updates on our net GHG emissions, as we do on other key indicators for the oil sands, given the climate's significance to our health, our economy, and our environment. We have abundant local experiences of extreme weather and disasters. Our Paris commitment, again, is to reduce by 2 per cent per year, especially since Alberta contributes almost 50 per cent to the national greenhouse gas inventory.

In short, I'm asking this Legislature on behalf of present and future generations to be more conscientious about reporting the true benefits, costs, and long-term liabilities that current and future

generations will bear as we grow the oil sands. I'm asking for full-cost accounting that relates to annual GHG emissions, annual industry reclamation liabilities, and public consultations on the future of the oil sands.

In this spirit I move the following amendment:

And be it further resolved that the Legislative Assembly seek to address public concerns about increasing bitumen production and pipeline transport by urging the government of Alberta to report each year, in the government annual report, on Alberta's oil sands region through a transparent, full-cost accounting framework that includes reclamation liabilities and estimated greenhouse gas emissions from the region.

I'll circulate that, Madam Speaker.

The Deputy Speaker: This will be known as amendment A2.
Go ahead, hon. member.

Dr. Swann: I think it speaks for itself, Madam Speaker. We are an energy-producing province. Both the population in other provinces and, I think, citizens of Alberta have expected that they're getting the full information needed to make good decisions about our environment and our social impacts from oil sands development.

5:30

Yes, it's been overplayed to the extreme on both sides, with some people reviling the pipelines and the oil sands and other people saying: there's no problem with the oil sands, and there's no problem with pipelines. There's some balance there in the middle that I think we could get to, both in terms of our own credibility with our population and with other provinces, not even to mention the international community with respect to our commitment to climate change.

I dare say that it's been difficult in this province to get as serious about climate change as it requires. If we can't show leadership on climate change, with all the technology and all the wealth and all the good science here, where on the planet can we start to really show the importance of this triple bottom line that we talk about but that somehow escapes us with each successive administration as we desperately need the money and we desperately need the credibility now on the environment?

Finding that middle ground: I think this government is closer than any government I've been with to finding that balance. But this amendment would help to build that credibility, that we are not closing our minds, closing our eyes to the facts around some of the benefits and the risks in, particularly, two areas, climate and oil sands liability, that is very substantial, looking at the Auditor General's report.

I'll take my seat and look forward to the debate. Thanks, Madam Speaker.

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. Minister of Transportation.

Mr. Mason: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker, and I want to thank the hon. member for his amendment. This goes a little far afield, in my view, from the focus and intention of the main motion. Although I'm a little surprised, it has been approved by Parliamentary Counsel.

The hon. member raises a couple of important things that should be benchmarked. The first is reclamation liabilities and greenhouse gas emissions for the region. Now, the hon. member provided the amendment to me yesterday, which I appreciate, and I did send it over to the Minister of Environment and Parks for her review. She informed me that these issues are already captured and provided in the climate leadership progress report and in the tailings management framework. Since they are already recorded and

reported, Madam Speaker, I don't believe that the amendment is necessary and would be advising members not to support it.

The Deputy Speaker: Any other members wishing to speak to amendment A2?

Seeing none, are you ready for the question?

Hon. Members: Question.

[Motion on amendment A2 lost]

The Deputy Speaker: We're back on the main motion.

Dr. Swann: I'd like to have a standing vote, Madam Speaker.
[interjections]

The Deputy Speaker: The rules say three.

The hon. Member for Vermilion-Lloydminster.

Dr. Starke: Thank you, Madam Speaker. It's my pleasure to bring forward comments on this motion, which I broadly support. I think that it is very clear, within the confines of this Assembly, that the members here support and understand the need for market access, pipeline capacity to be increased such that our products can get to market.

There was one phrase that the Premier gave in her introductory comments that really sort of struck me, and that is that we should speak and debate not as partisans but as citizens. I actually really like that. I think that's something we have to do more often in this Chamber. So for now, notwithstanding some of the comments I've heard from both sides, I'm going to set aside some of the things that we regularly hear from that side, which, quite frankly – and we heard it during the course of this debate as well, you know, things like, “Well, we cut the small-business tax.” But only after we dragged you kicking and screaming to cut the small-business tax, after all four parties on this side said that you should and the Finance minister insisted that it couldn't be done, then you cut the small-business tax.

I won't go into the constant refrain from over there about the failure to diversify Alberta's economy because, in point of fact, Alberta has the most diversified economy in the nation. That was correctly pointed out by the Member for Calgary-Elbow. What we don't have – actually, the Member for Calgary-Elbow has been correct in this, and the Government House Leader has pointed this out – is adequate diversification of revenue to the government. That is true, and we see that very clearly with the quarterly updates that show that not only is nonrenewable resource revenue down, but, associated with that, corporate income tax revenue, personal income tax revenue are also down because so much economic activity in Alberta is driven by oil and gas.

You know, we'll even set aside – and it was interesting to hear the Member for Calgary-East speak – past opposition to pipelines because it is well known that members on the other side have been opposed to pipelines in the past. It is also well known that they've claimed that pipelines do nothing but export jobs to other jurisdictions. We'll set those things aside because it sounds like the other side, if they haven't had a conversion on the road to Damascus, has had a pipeline epiphany.

Madam Speaker, the government is discovering the challenge of governing. It means making difficult decisions, and it means sometimes making decisions that alienate people who once were your base. They're discovering that challenge. It's taken a while, but they're discovering that.

So let's speak as citizens, not as partisans. You know, two great citizens of this province were privileged to be Premiers of this

province. It's been interesting to hear the name of one of them invoked so frequently during the course of this debate, and that's Premier Peter Lougheed. As was said in a recent article in the *Journal*, as the last Progressive Conservative in captivity I'm rather proud that Mr. Lougheed's memory and his vision are being invoked so many times. In fact, recently one of his sons said, "That the left, right & centre in Alberta still find aspects of his vision, values & leadership appealing would make him quite happy, for that was his objective, [to] build an open, inclusive, pragmatic & moderate party that appeals to a broad base of Albertans across the political spectrum."

An Hon. Member: Here we are.

Dr. Starke: No, you're not even close. Don't even try.

Madam Speaker, the truth of the matter is that regardless of who wins the next election – we've had so many people invoking and we've had all parties invoking Peter Lougheed – it seems that Peter Lougheed's vision will live on, and that gives me great heart.

Mr. Lougheed's vision was important because – and the Member for Calgary-Mountain View just mentioned one of his six basic tenets, that I think have stood the test of time. It's important that we keep those tenets in mind: the first, behave like an owner; second, collect your fair share; the third, save for a rainy day; the fourth, add value; the fifth, go slow; the sixth, practise statecraft. Those basic fundamentals were the fundamentals of Peter Lougheed. Now, we can have a discussion, we can have an argument that at times there has been a departure from those basic tenets, but the truth of the matter is, Madam Speaker, that those tenets have served Alberta well in the past. I think we would do well to look at them on a regular basis in the future as opposed to treating some of the things that Mr. Lougheed did as a buffet and just picking and choosing the items that you happen to like and that fit your ideology.

Now, I have to say that the talk that's been brought up of turning off the taps I have found a little bit amusing. Things have changed since Premier Lougheed's time, and it has been well documented that while it may be politically expedient to stand up and say, "We're just going to do what Premier Lougheed did," the truth of the matter is – and it's been made very clear by a number of academics – that it's not simply that easy to do. There is a complex allocation system for how pipeline space is allocated. It's not simply a matter of shutting off the taps. The province of Alberta does not own the pipeline. The province of Alberta does not control all of the resources flowing through that pipeline. We have to make sure that we understand what effects that would have on our reputation as a secure supplier of energy to our customers.

5:40

That reputation has already taken a severe hit under this administration because of their inconsistencies with regard to how they deal with the energy industry. While they can trumpet the support they've received from large oil companies, I can tell you that overall, especially among small and medium-sized producers, by which the oil industry in this province was largely built, those producers are certainly not in favour of much of what this government has done.

You know, my concern is: are we leveraging alternatives? Are we developing any sort of a plan B in doing this? I see no evidence of that. I haven't seen that the advisory force, the task force of 19 experts that was appointed, has come up with any alternatives. I haven't seen the government look at: well, what happens if the pipeline doesn't get built? They've put absolutely all their faith that, either through the actions of the Prime Minister – and I have very

little faith that he will act on our behalf because it's not politically expedient for him to do so. I think that if we hold our breath and wait for this Prime Minister to act on behalf of Albertans, we might get anoxic in a real big hurry.

Madam Speaker, I think it's critically important that we look at alternatives, including other proposals like the pipeline that is being proposed that largely has ownership and equity and the approval of First Nations and indigenous peoples along its entire route. There is a proposal there, yet this government hasn't even given those folks the time of day.

There's another proposal to build a rail line from northern Alberta to Alaska, the port of Valdez. You, Madam Speaker, attended a conference with me on that, and you know, as a northern Albertan, that that causes considerable excitement in northern Alberta because of what it would do for market access for products from northern Alberta, not just bitumen, which would be shipped in heated railcars not requiring diluent. Get this: they would be powered by electrical batteries that would be charged by wind turbines along the route. You want to talk innovation? You want to talk forward thinking? You should take a look at that project. But, no, that hasn't been given any attention by this government. Instead, the only project that we're pinning all our hopes on is the Kinder Morgan expansion, and we know that that expansion is encountering significant opposition.

Madam Speaker, I do support this motion. I support the efforts that the government has been making, but I also want to remind the government that many of their actions have not been consistent as far as support of our industry. While I am glad that they have come around and while I am glad that they are learning what it takes to govern and the complexities of governing, I think that it's important that we as an Assembly stand together, that we unanimously pass this motion, and I would urge all members in the Assembly to vote in favour of said motion.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Seeing none, any further speakers to the motion? The hon. Member for Sherwood Park.

Ms McKittrick: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I am not going to talk about Peter Lougheed, but I'm going to be speaking about my constituency and the Industrial Heartland, that I share with the MLAs for Strathcona-Sherwood Park, Fort Saskatchewan-Vegreville, Athabasca-Sturgeon-Redwater, and Edmonton-Manning. This area is not only the area for the Industrial Heartland, but it's also where the Strathcona industrial area is located.

Pipelines and the oil and gas industry are a large, if not the major contribution to the economy of these constituencies. These constituencies are home to workers who work in all aspects of the oil and gas sector, from building the pipelines to maintaining them, to monitoring the flow of oil, to the numerous trades that build the plants that upgrade the oil and gas, to the trades that work in the plants, and to many who work in extracting in the oil and gas fields, commuting back to their homes in many communities in Alberta. For those of you who use Baseline to commute to points east, you will know the importance of this sector in this region. Many pipelines begin or start there. The safety and environmental standards of the industries in the region are exemplary, and the leadership of the industries work hard to mitigate environmental damage and carbon emissions.

The Trans Mountain pipeline will start in this area and move east just past my constituency office. This pipeline is important to the people I talk to every day. This pipeline is crucial for everyone in

Alberta. As we all know, we need more pipelines to ship our oil for good value to tidewater. Even if there are currently projects to reduce the need for diluent to transport bitumen and partially upgrade the bitumen in Alberta, as was recently announced, we still need more capacity in existing pipelines.

Madam Speaker, the motion is clear in asking the federal government to continue to take all necessary legal steps in support of the pipeline's construction. It is also clear that the Premier has been working with the federal government to ensure that there is clarity on the importance of the pipeline to Alberta and the economy of Canada.

Just as a reminder, we are here in the provincial Legislative Assembly, and we are not in the House of Commons, as sometimes I think I hear. We are here to support Alberta industries and workers. We are here to affirm our commitment to the Trans Mountain pipeline and to the process that gave permission for its construction. We are here to affirm the work of Alberta companies, what they're doing, and their strong environmental record. We are here to boast about the innovative technology of Alberta companies that make pipelines safer.

Madam Speaker, my constituents and those of many of us in this House are ready to work on the pipeline. The industries here are ready to provide the materials and tools to build the pipelines. Les résidents de ma circonscription sont prêts à travailler sur le pipeline. Je suis prête à appuyer la première ministre et à voter pour.

I would urge all members of the Assembly to vote for the motion and support the Premier in ensuring the Trans Mountain pipeline is built. Merci.

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

Seeing none, any further speakers to the motion?

Are you ready for the question?

[The voice vote indicated that Government Motion 2 as amended carried]

[Several members rose calling for a division. The division bell was rung at 5:48 p.m.]

[Fifteen minutes having elapsed, the Assembly divided]

[The Deputy Speaker in the chair]

For the motion:

| | | |
|---------------|------------|------------|
| Aheer | Gill | Orr |
| Anderson, W. | Goehring | Panda |
| Babcock | Gotfried | Payne |
| Barnes | Hinkley | Piquette |
| Bilous | Hoffman | Pitt |
| Carlier | Horne | Renaud |
| Carson | Hunter | Rosendahl |
| Ceci | Jansen | Sabir |
| Clark | Kazim | Schneider |
| Connolly | Kenney | Schreiner |
| Coolahan | Larivee | Smith |
| Cooper | Loewen | Starke |
| Cortes-Vargas | Loyola | Stier |
| Cyr | Luff | Strankman |
| Dach | Malkinson | Sucha |
| Dang | Mason | Swann |
| Drever | McIver | Sweet |
| Drysdale | McKittrick | Taylor |
| Eggen | Miller | Turner |
| Ellis | Miranda | van Dijken |
| Feehan | Nielsen | Westhead |
| Fitzpatrick | Nixon | Woollard |
| Fraser | Notley | Yao |
| Ganley | | |

Totals: For – 70 Against – 0

[Government Motion 2 as amended carried unanimously]

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 4(2) the House stands adjourned until 9 a.m. tomorrow.

[The Assembly adjourned at 6:05 p.m.]

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|--------|
| Introduction of Guests | 55 |
| Members' Statements | |
| Agricultural Safety Week | 56 |
| Troy Black..... | 56 |
| Sexual Assault Services in Lethbridge | 56 |
| Immigrants to Alberta..... | 57 |
| Friends of Confederation Creek..... | 66 |
| Carbon Levy | 66 |
| Oral Question Period | |
| Carbon Levy Increase | 57 |
| Pipeline Approval and Construction..... | 58 |
| Energy Policies and Social Licence..... | 58 |
| Coal Strategy | 59 |
| Supervised Drug Consumption Sites | 59 |
| Rural Crime Prevention | 60, 61 |
| Electricity Power Purchase Arrangement Lawsuit Settlement..... | 61 |
| Privacy Commissioner Investigation | 62 |
| Seniors' Facility Resident and Family Councils..... | 62 |
| Carbon Levy and Rural Education Costs..... | 63 |
| Carbon Levy and Northern Albertans..... | 63 |
| Economic Indicators | 64 |
| Carbon Levy and Postsecondary Education Costs..... | 64 |
| Educational Curriculum Review..... | 65 |
| Tabling Returns and Reports | 66 |
| Orders of the Day | 66 |
| Government Motions | |
| Trans Mountain Pipeline | 66 |
| Division | 80 |
| Division | 80 |
| Division | 80 |
| Division | 85 |

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