

Legislative Assembly of Alberta

Title: **Wednesday, November 27, 2002**

1:30 p.m.

Date: 02/11/27

[The Speaker in the chair]

head: **Prayers**

THE SPEAKER: Good afternoon.

Let us pray. Our Father, we thank You for Your abundant blessings to our province and ourselves. We ask You to ensure to us Your guidance and the will to follow it. Amen.

Please be seated.

head: **Introduction of Visitors**

THE SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Highlands.

MR. MASON: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to introduce to you and through you a person with a lengthy record of public service to the people of Alberta. He was first elected to the Alberta Legislature in 1982 as the MLA for Edmonton-Norwood and as the New Democrats Leader of the Official Opposition from 1984 to 1993. Mr. Martin served the Alberta New Democratic Party as a member of the executive for over 15 years. His public service record continues today, as he is currently the public school trustee in ward D. He is seated in your gallery, and I ask him to rise and receive the warm welcome of this Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to also introduce to you and through you Ms Lynn Odynski. As a former community health nurse Ms Odynski completed her graduate work on school councils at the University of Alberta. She then served as chair of the Edmonton School Council, an area council of the Alberta Home and School Councils' Association. As chair she promoted the need for parents to be active and legitimate partners in their children's education. She continues to believe strongly in this partnership and is currently a public school trustee in ward C in the city of Edmonton. She is seated in your gallery, and I'd ask her to rise and receive the warm welcome of this Assembly.

head: **Introduction of Guests**

THE SPEAKER: Hon. members, before I call on the first individual to do introductions, I do believe that this is the first time in the history of the Legislative Assembly of the province of Alberta that all of the pages today are women.

The hon. Minister of Justice and Attorney General.

MR. HANCOCK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure today to introduce to you and through you to members of the Assembly 32 grade 6 students and their teachers, Mrs. Natalie Gago-Esteves and Ms Laurie Ewald, from Brander Gardens elementary school in my constituency of Edmonton-Whitemud. They, of course, are here today to observe and learn about the Legislature and about government, and they're seated in the members' gallery. I'd ask that they rise and receive the traditional warm welcome of this Assembly.

THE SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Drayton Valley-Calmar.

REV. ABBOTT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is my pleasure to introduce to you and through you to all the Members of the Legislative Assembly 47 visitors from Calmar school. They are led today by two teachers, Mrs. Sue Biddell and the mother of one of our pages – that's Natalie Wilson's mother – Mrs. Jeanette Wilson.

They also have with them today some parent helpers: Mrs. Buehner, Mrs. Hughes, Mrs. Robinson, Mrs. Snider, and Mrs. Stepanko. They are seated behind me in the public gallery, and I would ask them all to please rise and receive a hearty welcome from this Assembly.

THE SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Leduc.

MR. KLAPSTEIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm delighted to introduce to you and through you to Members of the Legislative Assembly visitors from Covenant Christian school, just south of Leduc in our constituency. They are accompanied by teachers Mrs. Colette Hayes, Mrs. Mary Geiger and parents and helpers Mrs. Ineke Van Beek, Mrs. Melanie Samuelson, Mrs. Linda Cameron, Mrs. Lore-Lee Wagner, Mrs. Monique Tolsma, Mrs. Jenny Ruysch, Mrs. Susan Schuurman, Mrs. Nynke Miedema, Mrs. Debbie Pequin, Mrs. Elly McGowan, Miss Trish Rudiger, Mrs. Karen Gengler, Mrs. Lauren Van Raamsdonk, Mrs. Carol Klooster, and Mrs. Leah Schmidt. I'd ask them to rise and receive the warm welcome of the Assembly.

THE SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Redwater.

MR. BRODA: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's certainly my pleasure to rise today to introduce to you and through you to the members of the Assembly 21 guests. They're from Newbrook school, first time ever in this Assembly since I was elected in '97, and they are accompanied by teachers Wayne Croswell, Mrs. Shirley Frederickson, parent helpers Tony Kwasny, Mrs. Val Ferguson, and bus driver Mr. Nick Kuzyk. They're seated in both the members' and the public galleries, and I'd ask them to please rise and receive this warm welcome of the Assembly.

THE SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Transportation.

MR. STELMACH: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. This afternoon I have the pleasure to introduce to you and through you to members of this Assembly visitors from the constituency of Vegreville-Viking. They are here seated in the members' gallery. They're a number of families of home schoolers that have visited our office this afternoon. They're led by Mr. Barter, and they're from the Chipman and Lamont area, and I would ask them all to rise and receive the traditional warm welcome of this Assembly.

THE SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Calgary-Mountain View.

MR. HLADY: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's a great honour for me to introduce to you and through you to members of the Assembly Mr. Peter MacKay, the MP for Pictou-Antigonish-Guysborough and also the Progressive Conservative Party House leader. Mr. MacKay is out here finding out and learning what Albertans believe is the right way to bring together two federal parties and make things happen and create a very strong opposition to the Liberals in Ottawa. Along with Peter is his assistant, Maureen Murphy-Makin, and I'd ask them to please both stand and receive the warm welcome of this Assembly.

THE SPEAKER: The hon. Member for St. Albert.

MRS. O'NEILL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is my pleasure today to introduce to you and through you to members of this Assembly three guests who are in the public gallery. They are Mrs. Arati Jaiswal and her husband, Colonel (Retired) V.K. Jaiswal, who are visiting from Nagpur, India. They are visiting their daughter

Madhvi Russell, who is the executive manager with the John Humphrey Centre for Peace and Human Rights. They're also accompanied by my husband, Jack. They're seated in the public gallery, and I'd ask them to please rise and receive the warm welcome of this Assembly.

THE SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Castle Downs.

MR. LUKASZUK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. They say that in politics friends come and go, but enemies only accumulate. In the public gallery I have three friends that haven't gone yet, and it's my pleasure to introduce to you and through you Mr. Christopher Sowa, Mrs. Irene Sowa, and Mr. Eugeniusz Gergont. I would like them to rise and accept the warm welcome of this Assembly.

THE SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Strathcona.

DR. PANNU: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to introduce to you and to all my colleagues in the Assembly a very, very energetic young man who's a recent graduate of the University of Calgary with a master's degree in environmental sciences and management. His name is Jan Triska. Jan is the project co-ordinator for ARK, Albertans for Ratifying Kyoto. Mr. Triska splits his time between Edmonton and Calgary and works tirelessly to get the right information out to Albertans on the issue of ratifying Kyoto. He is here to observe the Alberta Legislature in action today and is seated in the public gallery. I'll ask Jan to rise and receive the warm welcome of the Assembly.

THE SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Highlands.

MR. MASON: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to introduce to you and through you to all Members of the Legislative Assembly nine residents of the Beverly Senior Citizens Lodge. I have been honoured to represent the Beverly lodge for many years at two levels of government, and I'm pleased that they have come to see their government in action, including the tabling of a petition on health care that was circulated in the Beverly lodge. It is always a particular pleasure to introduce the people who have helped build Alberta, Edmonton, and the Beverly area. Visiting us today are – and if they'd please rise when I call their names – Bill Boratynek, Rose Taje, Emily Credgeur, Olga Myshyniuk, Peter Myshyniuk, Clarice Stephens, Ann Kuny, Nancy Mozak, and Edith Brown. I'd also like to extend my congratulations to Olga and Peter, who celebrated their 58th wedding anniversary this past Saturday and who have rescheduled their celebration in order to be with us today. So I'd ask them all to rise and receive the traditional warm welcome of the Legislative Assembly.

1:40

head: **Oral Question Period**

Health Care Spending

DR. NICOL: Mr. Speaker, this spring we asked the Minister of Health and Wellness for a cost-benefit analysis on services provided at the Holy Cross hospital. The minister's response: "to date, no analysis has been conducted or sponsored comparing the relative costs and benefits of health services provided in specific facilities in Alberta." In other words, no evidence that contracting out saves money or improves our services. My question to the Minister of Health and Wellness: how can the minister justify expanding private health care delivery in Alberta when he has no evidence that this is more cost-effective or improves service?

MR. MAR: Mr. Speaker, our eyes are clearly on the future and not

on the past. We have undertaken an enormous undertaking with the Mazankowski report. We have asked a number of extremely qualified individuals to provide us with some guidance on the direction to go. Across this country, with the exception of Mr. Romanow, I might add, the idea that there is a role for private-sector providers of publicly delivered and paid-for health services seems to have gained some support in virtually every province and territory of this country. We do see evidence of it in British Columbia, in Ontario, in Quebec, right here in Alberta, where services are being provided. Take, for example, MRIs. But for the involvement of the private sector we would not have the capacity to do the MRIs that we do as we do now. We have invested, of course, in our own MRIs. We invested in a number of MRIs publicly, and we were able to significantly increase our capacity within the public system.

Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that there is an important role for the private sector to play in the delivery of health care services. I would suggest that an individual who is ill will go into a facility, and the only operative questions in their mind will be: does this place have the resources, the people, the skills, and the equipment to diagnose me and treat me so I get better? They do not ask: who owns this place?

THE SPEAKER: The hon. leader.

DR. NICOL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. But as manager of the public purse he should be making sure it's done at a low cost.

Given that the recent report from the Canadian Institute for Health Information provides that health care spending in Alberta is sustainable, why does this minister continue to deny that evidence and claim it is not so?

MR. MAR: Well, Mr. Speaker, I have great respect for the Canadian Institute for Health Information. However, I would suggest that definitions of sustainability may differ from time to time and from place to place. When people talk about sustainability being expressed as a percentage of the gross domestic product and somehow suggest that that means that it's sustainable, well, that is not a particularly meaningful measure. Looking at gross domestic product as the denominator and expressing health care expenditures as a percentage of that denominator is not valuable. Let's say that Kyoto goes ahead and our gross domestic product drops dramatically and our health care expenditures as a percentage of GDP go from 4 and a half percent to 15 percent. Does that make it more sustainable? I don't think so.

DR. NICOL: To the minister: why is the minister so reluctant to table any evidence in this House to support his changes to the health care system? Is there no evidence?

MR. MAR: Well, Mr. Speaker, the facts speak for themselves, and I refer the hon. member to the historical fiscal summary of the province of Alberta where we can clearly demonstrate that the expenditures on health care have clearly risen since 1992-93 expressed as a percentage of the overall spending of the provincial government. We started off in 1993-94 somewhere in the range of roughly something in the magnitude of 24 or 25 percent of every dollar in this province being spent on health care. Now, in our current year, we're in the range of about 36 percent, and it's rising. The reason why it's rising is because of drugs, an aging population, new procedures that we're able to do, and new technology that's available.

So, again, taking a look at what it appears that the hon. Leader of the Opposition and Mr. Romanow both have associated themselves

with is the idea that we should just spend more on the status quo, that we want the status quo system that will be more expensive. Well, we think that there's a better way of doing this, that we need to look instead at what the outcomes are that we want and to drive our direction in the way of getting to the outcome of having an affordable, sustainable, accessible, high-quality, publicly paid for, publicly administered health care system.

DR. NICOL: Mr. Speaker, they still refuse to put standards down so we can judge their performance.

Rural Health Services

DR. NICOL: The new meaning of two-tiered health care in Alberta is better quality urban and a lower quality rural tier. Perhaps this government's plan for rural health care is superboards in urban centres managing 1-800 health lines for rural Alberta. My question again to the Minister of Health and Wellness: how much money does the minister expect to save by creating a handful of superboards and superregions to deliver health in Alberta?

MR. MAR: Well, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition has got more baloney to sell than Oscar Meyer. It does not matter whether you are in rural Alberta or in urban Alberta. People have reasonable expectations with respect to the delivery of health care. Now, that doesn't mean that you will have exactly the same system operating in rural Alberta as urban Alberta, and in fact in urban Alberta there are also concerns with respect to accessing the health care system. Urban people are suggesting that there are enormous issues with respect to unacceptable wait lists in various areas, and there has been a general view that there should be a decentralization of the delivery of services.

On the subject of the number of regional health authorities again this is an issue that for most Albertans is completely invisible. People are not concerned about the number of regional health authorities. People are concerned that there is a system that is there when they need it, and that is the more important issue, Mr. Speaker. Let us not get caught up in this business of who administers this particular facility. Let's only concern ourselves with: is health care delivery of a service there when we need it?

DR. NICOL: To the minister: would the minister table in this Legislature any cost-benefit analysis that you have done creating this handful of superboards or superregions to deliver our health care?

MR. MAR: Mr. Speaker, we are moving forward with our goal that I've stated earlier in this House, and that is with respect to the delivery of health care. The administration of health care is far below in terms of the priorities in the minds of Albertans than is the delivery of health care, and that's our focus.

DR. NICOL: Again to the minister: why has the minister not allowed rural Albertans any say in how their health care services will be delivered? Where was the consultation?

MR. MAR: That's patently untrue, Mr. Speaker. The fact of the matter is that our members, who make up . . .

MS CARLSON: Ask your backbenchers if they agree with you.

MR. MAR: Well, okay. Let's see. How many rural members does the Liberal opposition have? Mr. Speaker, if rural Albertans are concerned about their level of health care, they have certainly taken

opportunity to express it to members of the government that represent rural Alberta.

1:50

Romanow Report

THE SPEAKER: Third Official Opposition main question. The hon. Member for Edmonton-Riverview. I hope, hon. member, that your question will be heard. There seems to be a lot of chattering from your neighbours.

DR. TAFT: I'll do my best, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Health and Wellness has arrogantly rejected the Romanow report before even seeing it as if he had nothing more to learn. [interjections] My questions are to the Minister of Health and Wellness.

THE SPEAKER: Hon. member, I'm going to give you another chance to begin, but I'm going to apply the same rule to the other hon. members in the Assembly.

Please proceed.

DR. TAFT: My questions are to the Minister of Health and Wellness. Why does the minister so irresponsibly dismiss the Romanow recommendations as being "drafted on the back of a cocktail napkin" when he hasn't even seen the report?

MR. MAR: I regret referring to the report as being drafted on the back of a cocktail napkin. I meant a postage stamp, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Romanow has really disclosed virtually all of his report in speeches that he has given to Harvard University, to Memorial University, to people in Washington in the United States. So, Mr. Speaker, it has been much like the dance of a thousand veils: he has revealed all the veils except for the last three. So there isn't anything that we should expect out of Mr. Romanow's report that he hasn't already disclosed.

I think the hon. Member for Edmonton-Riverview has a pretty good idea and would be able to put together the key recommendations of the Romanow report based on what he has seen in the newspaper and accounts of what Mr. Romanow has had to say in the media. I don't think that there will be any surprises coming to him either.

DR. TAFT: Given that the Romanow commission was publicly open and accountable while the Mazankowski commission was chaired by a paid lobbyist, why has the minister rejected the Romanow report before it has even been made public?

MR. MAR: Mr. Speaker, we've said all along that if – if – something came out of the Romanow report that would be constructive and helpful to us moving forward on the goal that I stated about a publicly paid for, administered, accessible, high-quality health care system that's sustainable, then we, of course, would be the first ones to embrace that idea and adopt it and employ it in this province to move forward on the yardsticks towards that goal.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Mazankowski has prepared an outstanding set of recommendations that this government's moving forward on. It is of great interest to Canadians that Mr. Mazankowski's report contains a number of recommendations that are consistent with Senator Kirby, a Liberal Senator, I might add, who has come to similar conclusions, and that suggests to me that both Mr. Mazankowski and Senator Kirby were really thinking about health care delivery and were not locked up in ideology.

DR. TAFT: Well, given that the minister has not only marginalized himself with his comments but marginalized this government, how does he justify throwing away Alberta's voice on this important national dialogue?

MR. MAR: Mr. Speaker, let us examine what has happened across this country. Let's look at the Fyke commission report. Let's look at the Claire report. Let's look at Senator Kirby's report. Let's look at work that has been done by Mr. Mazankowski. All of them have come to the conclusion – whether they come from the background of economists, health care professionals, academics, individuals who work within the system, patients that work with the system – that the status quo is not an option. So we are taking steps forward in moving on this goal of improving what is already a good health care system.

Either the Leader of the Opposition or the Member for Edmonton-Riverview talked about CIHI earlier. Let us look at the data in CIHI. Let us see, for example, the results after having a heart attack. The five best places in all of Canada to have a heart attack are right here in the province of Alberta, where you'll get the best treatment anywhere, Mr. Speaker. We're looking to improve on that.

THE SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Strathcona, followed by the hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury-Three Hills.

Health Care Services

DR. PANNU: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. When the former Premier of Saskatchewan, Mr. Romanow, began his extensive public consultations 18 months ago, he issued a challenge to advocates of private, for-profit health care. Romanow said: show me evidence that for-profit health care saves money or delivers better health outcomes. Well, the privatization advocates have failed to deliver, Mr. Speaker. The emperor has no clothes. My questions are to the Minister of Health and Wellness. What evidence, if any, did the government provide to the Romanow commission that private, for-profit health care saves money or improves health outcomes, and will the minister table that evidence in this Assembly?

MR. MAR: Mr. Speaker, that is really avoiding the question. The question is really about the delivery of health care, not its manner. Whether it's Senator Kirby or Mr. Mazankowski or whether it is the Premier of Newfoundland or the Premier of Ontario or the Premier of British Columbia or the Premier of Alberta, we have all come to the conclusion that we should focus on the delivery of health care and its outcomes, and the issue of whether it is delivered in a not-for-profit or by private provider or by the public system is a secondary issue. People only care that the service is there when they need it.

DR. PANNU: Since the minister of the government has no evidence to present, when will the government take off its blinkers and acknowledge that Albertans would get more services with less money through public health care than they will through privatization, delisting, and user fees, that this minister is proposing to do?

MR. MAR: Mr. Speaker, if having blinkers means that you have an unfailing direction and a vision of where you are going, I am guilty as charged, but that is much better than closing your eyes and shutting your ears to all other possible options.

THE SPEAKER: The hon. member.

DR. PANNU: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If this minister doesn't have

a secret plan to delist services, why is the government's promise made to the Alberta Council on Aging that there won't be cuts in seniors' prescription drug coverage only good until the end of next year? Why did you make that promise?

MR. MAR: Mr. Speaker, we have the most accountable, up-front, transparent business plans and results reporting of any province in this country. We're proud of it. We expect that Albertans should hold this government accountable for the results that we achieve with the money that they give to us through taxes, so the suggestion that there's some secret plan – I mean, we've had press releases about this allegedly secret plan. I fail to understand how the hon. member can characterize our plans to look at the types of services that we should provide in a rational and in a reasonable way . . . [interjections]

THE SPEAKER: The hon. minister will continue. He does have the floor, and I'm going to ask my two hon. colleagues to just button it. The hon. minister.

MR. MAR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We are looking at how we can sustain our health care system, and we are again focused on results. We want to make sure that our health care system provides the kinds of services that help people get better, and if it means that we have to take a look at all of our services and ask what criteria should be applied to them to ensure that people get what they need when they need it, we're not afraid to do that.

Mr. Speaker, with respect to drugs, drugs are an area of great concern. It is estimated that there can be a prescription error rate of something in the magnitude of 20 to 30 percent. Now, that is anecdotal. I do not have something that I could table before this hon. member, but suffice it to say that when it comes to drugs, we want to make sure that we don't stand in the way of somebody who has a condition that can be alleviated by a prescription drug. On the other hand, we must also be cautious that we don't prescribe things that don't help people or, in fact, even worse, can harm people.

THE SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury-Three Hills, followed by the hon. Member for Edmonton-Gold Bar.

2:00

Provision of Abortion Services

MR. MARZ: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Many of my constituents are very disappointed to hear that recently the Expert Advisory Panel to Review Publicly Funded Health Services has advised the minister of health that they have singled out one medical procedure and will exclude it from their final recommendations. That one procedure is abortion. My question to the Minister of Health is: what justification can the minister offer that one medical service can be determined by a single doctor as medically necessary and paid for and all other medical services require the review and advice of an expert panel?

MR. MAR: Mr. Speaker, this is a very, very difficult question to answer, but medically necessary abortion services will continue to be paid for by the Alberta public system. As is the case with any insured service, the government must rely upon professional judgment of physicians to determine which procedures are medically necessary. Now, the expert panel indicated that there would be some difficulty with respect to jurisdiction and legal issues if they were to deal with this particular service. I agree that that is true. Nonetheless, I will say that medically necessary abortions will continue to be paid for by our system.

THE SPEAKER: The hon. member.

MR. MARZ: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, given that the College of Physicians and Surgeons has not defined medically necessary in their guidelines and the expert panel refused to do so, how is the minister going to deal with this issue of medically necessary?

MR. MAR: Well, Mr. Speaker, I can tell you that it would not be incumbent upon the judgment of the Minister of Health and Wellness to determine what is medically necessary. We do rely on the College of Physicians and Surgeons to establish clinical practice guidelines that help physicians guide their decisions about what is medically necessary. These physicians do follow these guidelines when making decisions about abortions for their patients. If a physician deems an abortion to be medically necessary, our system will provide it as required under the Canada Health Act.

MR. MARZ: Well, given that in a recent survey 72 percent of Albertans stated that they do not wish to fund non medically necessary abortions, will the minister, then, appoint a committee that's responsible and willing to take on this task of defining medically necessary, consult with Albertans, and resolve this issue once and for all?

MR. MAR: Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware of this statistic nor the methodology that was used to derive it, so I won't comment on the particular numbers, but I will say that this is a very, very emotional issue for many Albertans. There are two very distinctive views on what the resolution should be, and there appears to me to be no common ground that will satisfy both at the same time. We have to try and distance ourselves from the emotion of the issue and deal only with the facts which are before us.

First of all, the Canada Health Act requires us to provide medically necessary services through the public health system. Physicians determine medical necessity using clinical practice guidelines. A review by any committee, whether the expert panel led by Dr. Westbury or others, would not change the facts on which we base our decision to fund abortions. Finally, if a physician deems an abortion to be medically necessary, Alberta's publicly funded health care system will provide the procedure as required under the Canada Health Act.

THE SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Gold Bar, followed by the hon. Member for Calgary-West.

Drivers' Licences

MR. MacDONALD: Thank you. Canada's new antiterrorism legislation could force all Albertans to retake their driver's test and prove citizenship in order to receive a new driver's licence in light of the insecurity of the current system. The holes in Alberta's privatized registry system were proven yet again by two break-ins at the same Edmonton registry office last week. It is very distressing to consider that with a fake Alberta driver's licence a terrorist could obtain any number of false documents including a passport and birth certificate. My first question is to the Minister of Government Services. How can this government guarantee the authenticity of any proof of citizenship when issuing new drivers' licences given that the security of drivers' licences has been compromised?

MR. COUTTS: Mr. Speaker, that's a very good question. We have a protocol in place for registry agents' offices to follow when it comes to citizenship papers, the primary citizenship papers and

secondary citizenship papers to be presented in front of a registry agent. As well, we also have the documentation of drivers' licences in our database, and that particular process is part of our policy that the registry agents use in identifying legitimate people coming up and looking for not only a proper identification but a proper driver's licence in the province of Alberta.

THE SPEAKER: The hon. member.

MR. MacDONALD: Thank you. Again to the same minister: are the recent thefts of driver's licence making equipment as good an excuse as any for this government to revive its plan to make all Albertans carry smart cards?

MR. COUTTS: Mr. Speaker, what we're looking at is an improvement to our driver's licence manufacturing facility by going to a central manufacturing facility that is safe and secure. It is not our intention at this time to look at any other cards. This is strictly a driver's licence proposal that has been put forward.

THE SPEAKER: The hon. member.

MR. MacDONALD: Thank you. Again to the same minister: if all Albertans were to retake their driver's exam and get new drivers' licences, how on earth does this government propose to avert the utter chaos that would occur from that?

MR. COUTTS: Well, Mr. Speaker, that is strictly speculation, and as much as I respect the individual who brought that forward and made that public yesterday and as much as I respect the question that has come from the hon. member opposite, we've taken the initiative within our department this morning to take a look at the federal security bill and the regulations and the legislation around that. We'll be doing a thorough analysis to see if it's actually true that every Albertan would have to take a new test and get a new driver's licence. We'll do our thorough investigation of that and confirm that with Albertans as time goes on.

THE SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Calgary-West, followed by the hon. Member for Edmonton-Centre.

Long-term Care Facilities

MS KRYCZKA: Thank you. Mr. Speaker, the impact of an aging population is already being realized in Alberta, especially so with residents in our long-term care centres. Many have complex health needs that require a much higher level of care. The Calgary health region, for example, while working to balance its budget, has been decreasing staff and, thus, the hours of care the residents receive in their long-term care facilities, and many upset residents and families have written me and my colleagues over these changes. My question is to the Minister of Health and Wellness. What assurances can the minister offer to senior and disabled residents of their long-term care facilities that they will not suffer as a result of the reduction in care hours?

MR. MAR: Mr. Speaker, I have looked into this particular matter on behalf of the hon. member, and I can assure her that for the Calgary health region and other health regions throughout the province the well-being and comfort of their patients is an issue that they take seriously.

The change that's being referred to by the hon. member in Calgary is a minimal one. It will amount to a reduction of five and a half

minutes of care per patient per day, which in a 24-hour day is not a particularly large change, but it will save the region \$2.5 million. Now, I am being assured, Mr. Speaker, by the regional health authority that that \$2.5 million will be reinvested in improving their facilities and in the care of their residents. This is in addition to the Calgary health region adding \$4.6 million to long-term care funding, including the addition of 47 beds this year and an additional 50 long-term care beds each year – each year – over the next five years.

MS KRYCZKA: Mr. Speaker, my next question is also to the same minister. Many residents of long-term care facilities were already concerned about living conditions prior to these latest changes. What is the minister doing to improve the living conditions in Alberta's long-term care facilities?

2:10

MR. MAR: Well, first of all, Mr. Speaker, over the last five years we have provided \$280 million in capital for funding and upgrading of long-term care beds, but the recent findings of a long-term care review told us that many facilities are out of date with the contemporary needs of residents that are there, and we need to listen to these recommendations. We are implementing nine different strategies to improve continuing care in Alberta. One of those strategies is the regeneration of our long-term care centres. We want to create better environments for residents and improve care for clients with complex needs. Three- and four-bed wards will be phased out by the year 2006, and we are enhancing the skills and increasing the supply of workers that can provide assistance in this particular area.

Seniors' Benefits

MS BLAKEMAN: Mr. Speaker, for several months seniors across this province heard that the government would be cutting them off from Alberta Blue Cross coverage. An information bulletin was sent from the department of health to Tory MLAs saying that coverage was not in danger of being cut, but no one would or could deny that a committee had been struck to examine age-related benefits. My first question is to the minister of health. Are there any other plans to have Alberta seniors pay more for services that they used to get for free?

MR. MAR: No plans at this time, Mr. Speaker.

THE SPEAKER: The hon. member.

MS BLAKEMAN: Thank you. My next question is to the Minister of Seniors. Can the minister tell us: what are the criteria and time line for the age-related benefits committee?

MR. WOLOSHYN: That, Mr. Speaker, is not my committee, so I can't give her an answer.

THE SPEAKER: The hon. member.

MS BLAKEMAN: Thank you. Then as the Minister of Seniors could I ask you to please find out about this committee and get some information through to me?

MR. WOLOSHYN: For my own edification I'll be pleased to do so, and I'll share the information with the hon. member.

THE SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Beverly-Clareview, followed by the hon. Member for Edmonton-Mill Woods.

Automobile Equipment Infractions

MR. YANKOWSKY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. When I drive down the streets, I'm seeing all kinds of automobile equipment infractions. I'm seeing blue and green headlights, red and blue turn lights in the front of vehicles, blue turn lights on the rear of vehicles, and other various modifications. On a ride-along with police they point out these infractions but don't do anything about them because they say that the Alberta statutes are either unenforceable or the fines are so small that ticketing is not worth the effort. Also, for \$200 curbers can get any patched-up, written-off car back on the streets, and percentages of mechanically unsafe cars on our streets are much too high. My questions are all to the Minister of Transportation. Could the Minister of Transportation tell this Assembly why digression from established regulations regarding automobile equipment is given such low priority in Alberta and enforcement is very rare?

THE SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. STELMACH: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. All Canadian jurisdictions, including the province of Alberta, place top priority on equipment legislation. There are certain penalties and regulations under the Traffic Safety Act that, of course, monitor and help enforce some of these various modifications to equipment that the hon. member has mentioned. We are currently reviewing fines in some of the areas that the hon. member has brought forward, and these will come in force, of course, once discussions have been completed with Alberta Justice, and then we go through a process through standing policy. We're looking forward to implementation sometime in mid-May of this year.

THE SPEAKER: The hon. member.

MR. YANKOWSKY: Thank you. Since any digression from established regulations for colours of lights and vehicle design pose a safety hazard, why are you not doing something immediately to curb these modifications?

MR. STELMACH: Under our current legislation any modifications, as mentioned by the member, are against the law, and police do enforce these violations. However, as the hon. member had brought forward in the past, some of the fines for these modifications, so to speak, are less than the cost of repair, et cetera. As a result, we are reviewing that whole policy, coming forward with changes. I know that I will be getting support for this legislation.

MR. YANKOWSKY: Will the minister consider bringing in some form of enforceable auto inspection program to get mechanically unsafe vehicles off our roads and streets?

MR. STELMACH: Mr. Speaker, we're not going to make mandatory inspections. At least, we're not entertaining that at the moment. However, we are working very diligently with the Minister of Environment in terms of working out a plan to ensure that any modifications to muffler systems are such that do not increase not only the noise level but also the amount of emissions. With the co-operation of the Minister of Environment we will be bringing the policy forward in this House soon.

Thank you.

THE SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Mill Woods, followed by the hon. Member for Edmonton-Highlands.

Day Care Review

DR. MASSEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Serious staffing problems confront Alberta day cares. In April 2001 the Minister of Children's Services told the House that the Clelland day care report was not yet ready to be tabled. Seven months later, in November, we were again told that the report was not ready, and 11 months after that, in March of this year, we were told that the report was still not ready for the House. My questions are to the Minister of Children's Services. After 19 months is the Clelland report ready to be tabled?

MS EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I think it's fair to say that the Clelland report was part of a number of reports that have been done not only on the basis of day care worker thoughts and observations and recommendations but on work that we have done further to the Clelland report to look at a system of providing early child development within centres in Alberta that will make meaningful and effective differences in the lives of the people who subscribe to day cares.

Let's come back to the basic tenet of providing day care service in Alberta. It is to provide supports to families who are the number one providers of services to children. Our system of providing subsidies to families who have low incomes so that they can make proper choices in day care has been the premise of being able to provide quality day care and quality assurance in day cares in Alberta.

One of our findings at the outset through our work on the Clelland report pointed out something that's been a very difficult hurdle in overcoming how we would do anything different in providing supports for families taking their children to day care. That was the fact, Mr. Speaker, regrettable as it may seem, that some day cares charge the province more – in other words, through the subsidies of the family – than they would charge families who did not require subsidies. It was that discovery through the implementation of a process of learning about day cares and through the Clelland report that created a great difficulty.

Mr. Speaker, if we were to examine the books of every day care to follow through to make sure that this wasn't a common practice – and I don't believe it's a common practice – we would have some difficulty in equalizing the supports. What we will come out with before Christmas of this year is a report that has been approved that I think will satisfy many of the issues of day care parents or parents subscribing to services in day care and will be met favourably by day cares and workers throughout this province.

DR. MASSEY: My question is to the same minister. Why won't the minister share this publicly paid for Clelland report with Albertans?

MS EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I think that would be sharing only part of the information. At the time we release our report and discuss the recommendations with Albertans, we will provide some background information relative not only to the findings in the Clelland report but the findings of other studies that we have done on this subject.

DR. MASSEY: To the same minister: when can we expect to see the Clelland report?

2:20

MS EVANS: Mr. Speaker, you can expect – and I said it in my answer to the first question – that before Christmas we will provide assurances to Albertans that they have been listened to, reports relative to all our findings on the day care issue, that we would bring them forward at that time.

THE SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Highlands, followed by the hon. Member for Calgary-Fort.

Balancing Pool Shortfall

MR. MASON: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. In the government's desperation to keep a lid on electricity bills just before the last provincial election, so many rebates were paid out of the Balancing Pool that it was left with a \$345 million deficit. Three guesses as to who is going to make up that deficit. The Balancing Pool's annual report says: "It is expected that a charge to consumers will be levied in the future to collect the anticipated short-fall." My question is to the Minister of Energy. Will the minister level with this Assembly and with all Albertans and tell us by how much electricity prices will have to rise when the \$345 million Balancing Pool shortfall is added to customer bills?

MR. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, the Balancing Pool has announced that there will be no charge or credit to consumers in 2003. I think that's the first important fact.

Secondly, the deferral account changes each year, Mr. Speaker, based on the results of the Balancing Pool operations and on electricity prices from now to 2020. In a marketplace that is in excess of \$5 billion between now and 20 years from now there will be fluctuations, positive and negative, and the Balancing Pool, which is an appropriately skilled group, will advise the government and will advise consumers appropriately on how much credit and how much deficit sits in the Balancing Pool. The original decision to dispose of the assets that were held in the Balancing Pool was one that got consumers their very own money back as quickly as possible. It was paid out in a 12-month period. It was a prudent decision.

THE SPEAKER: The hon. member.

MR. MASON: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Well, given that the assurance has been made that this will not be added to bills in 2003 and, further, given the minister's assumption that bills would be coming down in 2003 and 2004, can he tell us approximately how big the deficit is expected to be in 2004 and how much that will translate into in terms of an increase in people's power bills in the year 2004?

THE SPEAKER: Well, that's a lot of detail, hon. member.

MR. SMITH: That's correct, Mr. Speaker; it is a lot of detail.

THE SPEAKER: Well, there is a provision for detailed information. It's called Written Questions.

The hon. member.

MR. MASON: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the minister please tell us: given that the black hole in the Balancing Pool deferral account is not going to get considerably bigger as a result of this year's sales of the Clover Bar, Sheerness, and Genesee power contracts, what effect will that have on bills?

MR. SMITH: Well, again, Mr. Speaker, that is substantial detail. We would be more than pleased to entertain a written question or a return.

I can say that the Balancing Pool has announced successful sales of certain tranches of 100-megawatt levels from the Balancing Pool into the private sector, and that will be added to the balance sheet, the income statement of the Balancing Pool, and on a regular basis and under generally accepted accounting principles the Balancing Pool comes forward and tells the government and all Albertans exactly what the status of their account is.

THE SPEAKER: The hon. minister wants to supplement?

MR. NORRIS: Yes, I would, Mr. Speaker. The member opposite has continued after the Energy minister for several days now, talking about energy deregulation and its negative effects. I'd like to actually offer some information to him that I think he'll find very interesting.

Since 2000, when deregulation started, the number of total immigrants into the province is up over 35,000, the number of international skilled workers . . .

THE SPEAKER: Hon. minister, please. [interjection] No, no, no, no. Sit down.

The hon. Member for Calgary-Fort, followed by the hon. Member for Edmonton-Ellerslie.

Infrastructure Funding

MR. CAO: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Given that our Alberta government emphasizes partnerships – I call it the G3 partnership – among three levels of government in developing community infrastructure and given that the infrastructure plays a vital role in the development of the economy and the life of Alberta and also given that a few projects in my constituency are applying for such funding, my question today is to the hon. Minister of Transportation. In the G3 partnership what were the past year's ICAP funding and achievements?

MR. STELMACH: Mr. Speaker, Alberta has a very strong relationship, of course, with its municipalities, and in co-operation and consultation with those municipalities it was agreed that the primary priority of ICAP, the infrastructure Canada/Alberta program, is water and wastewater, followed by efficiency upgrades to municipal buildings. These are energy-efficiency upgrades. Then a second priority would be roads and bridges. I'm proud to say that all those applications that have come forward were centered around upgrades to water and wastewater.

Now, the whole ICAP is broken down into three areas. The first area is, of course, the entitlement that comes to every municipality based primarily on a per capita funding. Second, of course, is rural municipal green. Third is projects that are nominated by both the federal and provincial governments. On the provincial side most of the nominated projects are again related to water and wastewater. As a result, we have greatly caught up with the badly needed projects in the province of Alberta with respect to the green side, water and wastewater. To date the total program is about \$169 million or so. One point some million is administration; the rest all went into the projects.

THE SPEAKER: The hon. member.

MR. CAO: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To me the ICAP program is quite a successful partnership, so what I'd like to ask the same minister is: what about the P3 approach, that is the private/public partnership, in your areas of responsibility?

MR. STELMACH: There are, of course, further discussions with Transportation, Infrastructure, and Finance with respect to moving P3 projects for road construction and possibly vertical infrastructure, buildings. To date we have had good success with private/public partnerships. A new bridge was opened just recently, 50 percent of the cost borne by the private sector. It's a bridge over the Brazeau River. Of course, relationships with the Department of Transporta-

tion in terms of private/public: we've outsourced to the private sector all of the engineering project design and maintenance. That has saved anywhere from 28 to 35 percent in all of those categories.

THE SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Ellerslie.

Unemployment Rates

MS CARLSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. An unemployment rate of 5.8 percent is not good news for all Albertans. My questions are to the Minister of Economic Development. What is this minister's department doing to increase the employability and decrease the deplorable rate of unemployment for aboriginals in Alberta, since 17 percent of aboriginals, on average, and a whopping 27 percent of those on reserves are unemployed?

THE SPEAKER: Now, hon. minister.

MR. NORRIS: If I may, Mr. Speaker?

THE SPEAKER: Please.

MR. NORRIS: Thank you. The basic premise that 5.8 percent unemployment is troubling is not correct. In actual fact, most economists will tell you that a 5 percent unemployment rate is relatively low by anybody's standards. In fact, there's a skilled labour shortage in Alberta, upwards of 30,000 people, due to a white hot economy, so if people don't have jobs, it's not for lack of trying.

There were a number of questions in the member's comments. Referring specifically to aboriginal people, I have worked very closely with the minister of aboriginal affairs, and she may want to supplement. We have a number of programs ongoing with companies such as Syncrude and Suncor to look at ways of getting aboriginals to not drop out of school and to get into apprentice training courses. I'd be happy to provide the hon. member with the information on those courses in due course.

THE SPEAKER: The hon. member.

2:30

MS CARLSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. When the minister says that if people don't have jobs, it's not for lack of trying, how does he relate that to the average duration of unemployment for Albertan workers 45 years or older, which is 24 weeks long, compared to 13 weeks for the labour force as a whole? Those people are trying to get jobs.

MR. NORRIS: Well, clearly, Mr. Speaker, I would never indicate that anybody who is trying to get a job isn't trying in sincerity. Not being in my mid-40s, I can't relate to the hon. member's question as well as she might be able to, but I have no way of knowing what happens on those job interviews or what they do in the course of their employment search, so how can I comment on that? I just can't.

MS CARLSON: Well, perhaps the smart-aleck minister can relate to this one: what measures are being taken to narrow the gap between the youth unemployment rate of a staggering 11.2 percent when the provincial average is 5.8?

MR. NORRIS: Well, Mr. Speaker, you know, last year it was rookie and softball and weakest link. Now at least there's "smart" in the title, so I feel like I'm improving a bit.

I have every belief in the Alberta economy. In fact, I know full well that in the Minister of Learning's department there are programs which accelerate people who don't want to necessarily go to university to get into trades. We're doing as much as we can through SAIT and NAIT, Mount Royal, and Grant MacEwan, which are some of the best institutions in all of Canada, and we will continue to provide opportunities. But, in actual fact, the best way to provide job opportunities is to provide a low tax base, continue to provide solid government, which we do, and have the best economy in all of Canada, which we do. So jobs are plentiful.

THE SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development to supplement.

MS CALAHASEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think it's really important to be able to address the concern that the hon. member has brought forward. She is right in terms of looking at the unemployment rate of aboriginal people, but in this province we're doing a number of things which are really important when talking about skill development and education. As a few examples, we've got the Calgary Urban Aboriginal Initiative Committee, which is collaborating with the Metis Nation of Alberta and Treaty 7 in development and implementation of a skills training program. That's one example. HR and E and petroleum land administrator training, Stoney tribal administration, Suncor, Olympia Energy, and UtiliCorp. HR and E, Treaty 7, and Metis Nation of Alberta zone 3 labour market development units project involving SAIT and Bow Valley College. First Nations resource training project involving four nations with industry, federal government, HR and E, and Petroleum Industry Training Service. Gift Lake employment training project working with PITS and Edge Petroleum. Petroleum Project 2000, Northern Lakes College, are training aboriginal workers in the High Level area for employment in the oil and gas industry. In fact, Alberta Learning has been involved with the Metis Nation of Alberta. We've granted 44 native education projects for school jurisdictions.

Mr. Speaker, I can go on with some of the really great projects that have been going on, but I think it's really important to address that issue.

THE SPEAKER: Well, hon. minister, thank you very much for that supplementary answer. There is a provision in the Routine, of course, for ministerial statements, that the hon. minister might want to take advantage of.

Hon. members, before we proceed, might we revert briefly to Introduction of Guests?

[Unanimous consent granted]

head: **Introduction of Guests**

(reversion)

THE SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark.

MR. MASKELL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is my pleasure to rise today and introduce to you and through you to the members of this Assembly 54 talented students from Afton school. Afton is an arts alternative elementary school, and I'm certainly looking forward to attending their Christmas production in a couple of weeks. Unfortunately, they've just left the Assembly. Accompanying the students today are their teachers, Miss Erin Wilkes, Miss Brianne McBride, Mrs. Sherri Larson-Ashworth, and teacher aide Ms Lisa-Marie Szyron. I'm also pleased to introduce parents Mrs. Sarah Schwartz,

Ms Teri Urquhart, Ms Elaine Daly, Ms Monica Velt, and Mr. Brian Noorman.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

THE SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Mill Woods.

DR. MASSEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure to introduce to you and to members of the Assembly Anand Sharma. Anand is the chair of the Council of Alberta University Students and is in the public gallery. With your permission I would ask Anand to stand and receive the traditional warm welcome of the Assembly.

THE SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Glenora.

MR. HUTTON: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It's a pleasure for me to rise today and introduce to you and through you to members of this Assembly a fine exchange student from Germany. Felix Wilke is a 17 year old from Minden, Germany, and he is staying with a wonderful family in my constituency, the Gordons, which includes one of our pages, Maya Gordon. It is a pleasure for me to introduce him, and if he would please stand and receive the warm welcome from this Assembly.

head: **Recognitions**

THE SPEAKER: The hon. Member for St. Albert.

St. Albert Children's Theatre

MRS. O'NEILL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise today in this Assembly to acknowledge the incredibly spirited creativity and demonstrated artistic talents displayed by the adults and children in St. Albert Children's Theatre. Boasting 20-plus years in growth, St. Albert Children's Theatre is a program that is unique in concept. It teaches a wide spectrum of artistic facets including dramatics, vocals, and dance. This program is educational and beneficial to youth, giving them the opportunity to acquire a variety of skills that will last them a lifetime.

Opening on the 29th of November is their current production called *Footloose*, which is the story of a free-spirited kid who reminds a local minister that it's no sin to be young.

So I would like to acknowledge all those who are involved in St. Albert Children's Theatre.

THE SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Calder.

Cerebral Palsy Association Bikeathon

MR. RATHGEBER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is a pleasure to stand and recognize and congratulate members of the Alberta Cerebral Palsy Association who very recently conducted a very successful stationary bikeathon. Specifically, in the members' gallery today are Ronda Blasco, Carolyn Brown, and Ralph Leibo from the Alberta Cerebral Palsy Association.

Several members of this Assembly had the opportunity to participate in the stationary bikeathon. I was one of the participants in this fun-filled event, and Ralph, who suffers from cerebral palsy, was also a willing participant. The team that I was on was the celebrity team, and I might add that the Member for Edmonton-Castle Downs and also the Member for Edmonton-Strathcona participated. The entire event raised in excess of \$3,000 dollars for the Cerebral Palsy Association, and a good time was had by all.

I'd ask all members of this Assembly to recognize the Alberta

Cerebral Palsy Association for their fine dedication to finding a cure for this disease.

Thank you.

St. Mary & St. Mark Coptic Orthodox Church

MS CARLSON: Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate St. Mary & St. Mark Coptic Orthodox Church, located in Edmonton-Ellerslie, and their congregation on celebrating two milestones in their history in Edmonton. This year marks the 25th anniversary of the church and the launching of their Canadian Coptic community centre project.

The mission of the centre is to serve the community by promoting the spiritual, physical, and emotional well-being of all through love, caring, and compassion. The CCCC is committed to building a healthy and safe community by promoting, supporting, and strengthening family values and spirit. As a multifaceted wellness centre the aims are to provide advice, counseling, and programs on a variety of issues to satisfy spiritual, social, health, educational, and recreational needs. The centre will provide a community focal point and gathering place in a safe and supervised barrier-free environment. They will facilitate events and activities through partnerships and co-operation with other nonprofit organizations.

We wish them every success in the years to come.

THE SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Redwater.

Redwater Area Forest Fire

MR. BRODA: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In May of this year we had a large forest fire near Redwater which threatened homes and possible life. Today they're still putting out peat moss hot spots.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to recognize the great service our volunteer firefighters provided to our community. They not only came from Redwater but from the whole of Sturgeon county and surrounding municipalities. I'd like to recognize the excellent leadership provided by Sturgeon county fire chief, Bart Clark, and Redwater's chief, Andy Makowsky, the numerous community groups and individuals for their assistance in preparing meals and providing security. Also, special thanks to the Edmonton garrison military personnel for providing relief for those volunteer firefighters who worked 10 to 12 hours, many of them high school students.

Please join me in saluting all firefighters in this province for a job well done.

THE SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Lac La Biche-St. Paul.

2:40 Northeast Alberta PDD Regional Conference

MR. DANYLUK: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. The fourth annual northeast Alberta PDD regional conference was recently held in St. Paul and attended by people from all over Alberta. This year's theme, Building Community Capacity for Individuals with Developmental Disabilities: Opening Our Hearts, Our Minds, and Our Doors, clearly reinforced and recognized the importance of community support, co-operation, and innovative ideas.

The conference also provided a unique opportunity and experience for our students from the regional high school to translate the board's business plan into a multimedia art project inspired by Inuit story quilts. Congratulations to organizers Donna Desjardins, Don Schultz, Glen Christensen, the regional high school art students, and all of the other community partners for a job well done and another phenomenal success.

Thank you.

THE SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Dunvegan.

Edward and Stella Pimm

MR. GOUDREAU: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise today to recognize the 2002 Alberta 4-H Hall of Fame inductees, Edward and Stella Pimm of Berwyn. Induction into the Alberta 4-H Hall of Fame is the highest honour that 4-H leaders can receive. Edward and Stella Pimm joined the ranks of 55 volunteers inducted into the 4-H Hall of Fame since it began in 1971. The 4-H Hall of Fame recognizes men and women who have made significant contributions to the 4-H program, agriculture, and rural life. Their leadership exemplifies the 4-H motto of learn to do by doing. They live out the 4-H pledge of service through their commitment to their club, community, and country through all activities and levels of the organization.

Mr. Speaker, Edward and Stella Pimm have made volunteering in the 4-H program a way of life for themselves and their family. In addition to their significant work with 4-H, they were honoured individually as Berwyn's citizen of the year. In 1989 the Pimm family's contributions to agriculture and rural community life earned them the Alberta farm family of the year award.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

THE SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Strathcona.

Dr. Chuck Chamberlin

DR. PANNU: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to rise and recognize Dr. Chuck Chamberlin, an exceptional educator and environmentalist and a person of extraordinary commitment and passion for community service and common good. The hon. Member for Edmonton-Mill Woods and I had the privilege of working with Chuck for many years at the University of Alberta.

Chuck Chamberlin came to this province in 1969 from the University of Minnesota and joined the Faculty of Education, where he retired as a professor of education in 1995. During his tenure at the U of A he published an impressive number of articles in scholarly and professional journals for teachers. After retirement from teaching, Chuck immersed himself in a cause most near and dear to his heart, the protection of the environment. He has served the Sierra Club for many years as a member and leader and served over the years as issue leader for Sierra Club's urban sprawl campaign and encouraged municipalities to embrace the concept of smart growth.

As well, Chuck Chamberlin has worked as a volunteer for many years both with my constituency office and my office at the Legislature. His contribution has been a godsend. He has continued this extraordinary commitment until a few months ago, in spite of the fact that he has been battling cancer for many years.

As I pay tribute to Chuck, I invite my colleagues in the Assembly to join with me in honouring this dedicated educator, passionate environmentalist, and model citizen.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

head: Statement by the Speaker

Calendar of Special Events

THE SPEAKER: Hon. members, as we're closing the month of November and as we do have the process of Recognitions in the House, the chair would just like to advise that November, this week and other weeks, will also be covered. What invariably happens is that when recognition is given to some types of weeks and recognition is not given to others, my office does receive inquiries why such is the case.

November is also Crohn's and Colitis Awareness Month, Diabetes Awareness Month, Family Violence Prevention Month, National Community Safety and Crime Prevention Month, Osteoporosis Month, Pancreatic Cancer Awareness Month. September to December is part of the United Way fund-raising campaign. October/November is our time for the March of Dimes campaign. October to December is the Christmas Seal campaign. The time frame October 21 to December 15 is the missing children calendar campaign. November 1 to December 15 are Girl Guides mint cookie weeks. November 24 to 30 is National Home Fire Safety Week. November 24 to December 1 is National AIDS Awareness Week. November 25 to December 6 is White Ribbon Week. Hanukkah will begin on November 29 and go through December 7. November 28 to December 4 will be the time frame for the Toys for Tots campaign, and November 28 to December 24 will be the Christmas kettles appeal. November 30 will be St. Andrew's Day.

head: **Presenting Petitions**

THE SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Cardston-Taber-Warner.

MR. JACOBS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. With your permission I would like to present two petitions today, one on behalf of the Member for Livingstone-Macleod, who has received a petition from 73 Albertans living in his constituency petitioning the Legislative Assembly of Alberta to urge the government of Alberta to deinsure abortion.

My other petition is on behalf of 20 Albertans from the constituency of Cardston-Taber-Warner, again petitioning the Legislative Assembly of Alberta to urge the government of Alberta to deinsure abortion.

Thank you.

THE SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Clover Bar-Fort Saskatchewan.

MR. LOUGHEED: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to present a petition signed by several members of the Clover Bar-Fort Saskatchewan constituency. These constituents request that abortion be removed from the list of insured services as provided by Alberta Health.

THE SPEAKER: The hon. Member for St. Albert.

MRS. O'NEILL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to present the petition signed by 20 residents of St. Albert and area urging the Legislative Assembly to "remove abortion from the list of insured services that will be paid for through Alberta Health."

THE SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Highlands.

MR. MASON: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'm presenting today a petition signed by 83 Edmontonians, primarily residents of the Beverly Senior Citizens Lodge, petitioning the Legislative Assembly to urge the government to "not delist services, raise health care premiums, introduce user fees or further privatize health care."

head: **Introduction of Bills**

THE SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

Bill 38

Miscellaneous Statutes Amendment Act, 2002 (No. 2)

MRS. NELSON: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. On behalf of

the Minister of Justice I'd like to beg leave to introduce Bill 38, the Miscellaneous Statutes Amendment Act, 2002 (No. 2).

Mr. Speaker, the elements of this bill have been reviewed by the members opposite, and we request that it proceed in the normal fashion.

[Motion carried; Bill 38 read a first time]

head: **Tabling Returns and Reports**

MR. JONSON: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table five copies of the communique released by Canada's provincial and territorial ministers of energy and environment at their joint ministers' meeting in Halifax on October 28, 2002. The communique lists the 12 principles agreed to by the provinces and territories as being the necessary basis of a national plan to address climate change.

THE SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Innovation and Science.

MR. DOERKSEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have three tablings this afternoon. I'd like to table copies of the 2001-2002 ICORE annual report. ICORE, of course, stands for informatics circle of research excellence.

The second tabling would be a copy of the 2001-2002 Alberta ingenuity fund annual report.

The third tabling is copies of the Alberta Heritage Foundation for Medical Research triennial report for 1999-2002 in the form of a 2003 calendar as well as the financial statements for 2001-2002 in this session of the Legislative Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, copies of all these reports have been previously sent to MLA offices, and I encourage them to read them because these highlight some of the very successful things the province has done in the areas of research and medicine, science, and information communications technology.

2:50

THE SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Human Resources and Employment.

MR. DUNFORD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have six tablings today. First, the College of Chiropractors of Alberta annual report for the year ended June 30, 2002; the Alberta Veterinary Medical Association radiation protection program 2001 annual report; the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Alberta radiation health administrative organizational annual report for the period of April 1, 2001, to March 31, 2002; University of Alberta authorized radiation health administrative organization annual report, 2001-2002; University of Calgary authorized radiation health administration organization annual report for the period April 1, 2001, to March 31, 2002; Alberta Dental Association and College 2001 radiation health and safety program annual report, January 1, 2001, to December 31, 2001.

THE SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Calgary-Currie.

MR. LORD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to rise today in the Assembly to table the requisite number of copies of the review of school construction and operating cost committee's interim report and preliminary findings which highlights innovative ways in which significant savings might be realized when building new schools in our province.

THE SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury-Three Hills.

MR. MARZ: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise today to table five copies of the policy of the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Alberta on the termination of pregnancy.

THE SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Centre.

MS BLAKEMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have three tablings today. The first is a carefully handwritten letter from constituent Mike Wolfer in which he notes that at the present stage his AISH payment is \$855 a month while his rent has just gone up to \$475, and he can't afford to pay for other things like fresh fruit.

My second tabling is also on AISH from Richard Gagne, and he is noting that "with the cost of living constantly going up and the AISH amount is not, people just can't afford to get the [most] basic needs met."

Finally, a letter from the office manager of the Spina Bifida and Hydrocephalus Association of Northern Alberta noting that on behalf of adult members of their association that are receiving AISH she would ask that we "appeal to our provincial government to see the need for an increase in benefits."

Thank you.

THE SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Strathcona.

DR. PANNU: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have one tabling today. It's appropriate copies of a letter dated November 8. It's from Ms Patricia Brownlee of Calgary and is addressed to the Minister of Environment, copied to me. She expresses in this letter deep concern about the Alberta government's opposition to the ratification of the Kyoto protocol and its general failure to protect the environment of this province.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

THE SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Highlands.

MR. MASON: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I have a number of tablings today. First I am tabling five copies of a speech delivered by Senator Douglas Roche, formerly a distinguished Member of Parliament for the Progressive Conservative Party, entitled *Demanding Conservative Government Action for the Homeless*, addressing the Edmonton housing and homelessness conference. Senator Roche pointed out that "the poor and homeless in Canada have been forgotten" by governments more interested in "appeasing big business than social justice" and that "persistence of poverty in Alberta . . . is outrageous." He believes that it's time that political leaders responded to the voices of marginalized people, calling for social reinvestment and a building of a more inclusive society.

I have some other tablings, Mr. Speaker. The first one is copies of an electricity bill from some individuals who own a recreational property at Square Lake, and they have only been there since Labour Day three times, but the charge for one month for their bill even though they're using almost no power is \$160.

Secondly, I have another electricity bill sent to me by a seniors couple in Edmonton. They are paying \$63 for a small condominium and live on a fixed income. They write, "We could not have made it last year without the rebates and wonder how we will survive this year."

My fourth tabling is also an electricity bill for a three-bedroom house in Wetaskiwin. The charge there, including all of the administration fees, is 8.18 cents per kilowatt-hour. They have sent me several bills that show their electricity has gone up from \$105 in July of 1999 to \$500 in the year 2002.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I have an electricity bill from a farm near

Westlock. The bill was \$535 three years ago when there were two families and a significant amount of livestock on the farm, including 80 cows and 60 horses. It is now \$600 to \$900 per month, even though most of the livestock has now been sold.

Speaker's Ruling Tabling Documents

THE SPEAKER: Hon. members, before recognizing the next member under this part of the Routine, the chair wishes to advise the Assembly that the sheer volume of the tabling by the Member for Edmonton-Beverly-Clareview, roughly some 6,700 postcards, requires a slight relaxation of the rules concerning tablings. To meet the requirements of Standing Order 37(3) would mean that there would have to be a minimum of 10,000 pages to provide an additional four copies, which would consume significant resources.

Members may recall that the chair relaxed the rule on December 8, 1997, with respect to a great number of cards presented during the national unity debate. In keeping with the 1997 ruling, the original postcards will be kept in the Clerk's office for the historical records of the Legislative Assembly of the province of Alberta, but for this occasion, the library and the opposition will receive a copy of the first page with a notation that the original can be viewed at the Clerk's office.

head: Tabling Returns and Reports (continued)

THE SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Beverly-Clareview.

MR. YANKOWSKY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to table 6,126 postcards which I have received on behalf of the Minister of Seniors at the National Housing Day of Action vigil on November 22, 2002. These cards, signed by concerned individuals in a concerted campaign, urge the provincial government to provide funding to construct necessary, affordable housing as quickly as possible and continue to fund emergency and supportive housing needs. Our thanks to all those who co-ordinated the campaign and to those who signed the cards.

head: Orders of the Day

head: Government Motions

Climate Change Action Plan

33. Mr. Jonson moved:

Be it resolved that the Legislative Assembly of Alberta, consistent with its commitment to protecting Alberta's environment, hereby endorses and accepts the following principles agreed to by all provinces and territories on October 28, 2002, to provide the basis for the development of a national climate change action plan.

- (1) All Canadians must have an opportunity for full and informed input into the development of the plan.
- (2) The plan must ensure that no region or jurisdiction shall be asked to bear an unreasonable share of the burden and no industry, sector, or region shall be treated unfairly. The costs and impacts on individuals, businesses, and industries must be clear, reasonable, achievable, and economically sustainable. The plan must incorporate appropriate federally funded mitigation of the adverse impacts of climate change initiatives.
- (3) The plan must respect provincial and territorial jurisdiction.

tion.

- (4) The plan must include recognition of real emission reductions that have been achieved since 1990 or will be achieved thereafter.
- (5) The plan must provide for bilateral or multilateral agreements between provinces and territories and with the federal government.
- (6) The plan must ensure that no province or territory bears the financial risk of federal climate change commitments.
- (7) The plan must recognize that benefits from assets such as forest and agricultural sinks must accrue to the province and territory which owns the assets.
- (8) The plan must support innovation and new technology.
- (9) The plan must maintain the economic competitiveness of Canadian business and industry.
- (10) Canada must continue to demand recognition of clean energy exports.
- (11) The plan must include incentives for all citizens, communities, businesses, and jurisdictions to make the shift to an economy based on renewable and other clean energy, lower emissions, and sustainable practices across sectors.
- (12) The implementation of any climate change plan must include an incentive and allocation system that supports lower carbon emission sources of energy such as hydro-electricity, wind power generation, ethanol, and renewable and other clean sources of energy.

And be it further resolved that this Assembly, in the absence of agreement on a national plan by provinces and territories, denounces any unilateral ratification by the federal government of the Kyoto protocol in violation of the principles of constitutional law, convention, federalism, and long-established practice whereby the federal government must adequately consult with and seek the consent of provinces prior to ratification of international treaties or agreements that affect matters of exclusive provincial jurisdiction or that require provincial actions or legislation to achieve implementation where implementation will result in significant harm to the economy of Alberta and of Canada.

MR. JONSON: Mr. Speaker, the resolution that is before the Assembly this afternoon represents a strong statement from Alberta in support of the 12 principles that all provinces and territories agreed must be respected in any national plan on climate change. These principles were developed at a joint meeting of environment and energy ministers in Halifax on October 28, 2002, and they signify that all provinces and territories stand behind a made-in-Canada approach to climate change.

The 12 principles, Mr. Speaker, are not vague or ambiguous. They are clear statements that will protect Canadians' interests. They ensure greenhouse gas emissions are reduced across the country without sacrificing the economic prosperity of Canada. The fact that all provinces and territories, without exception, agreed to the principles speaks to the tremendous will across this country to tackle the issue of climate change in a way that makes sense for Canada and accommodates the unique needs of each province. Rarely is there such unanimous agreement among all provinces and territories.

But despite the provincial unity and agreement on this issue, the federal government still intends to ratify Kyoto by the end of the year and released its own Kyoto implementation plan on November 21, 2002. Mr. Speaker, this plan was not shown to the provinces prior to being released and provinces were not consulted about its content.

Even more troublesome, Mr. Speaker, the plan does not adequately address the 12 principles agreed to by the provinces. In particular, it totally disregards three of the principles that are of great importance to the provinces, those being principles 2, 6, and 7. These three principles ensure no region or jurisdiction bears an unreasonable share of the climate change burden. They emphasize that the federal government has an obligation to financially back its climate change objectives and not simply leave these costs to the provinces. They also recognize that benefit from assets such as agricultural and forestry sinks must go to the provinces. However, the federal government plan also fails to answer the question of how the Kyoto targets will be met and at what cost, questions that provinces and Canadians have been saying must be clearly answered before a decision regarding Kyoto ratification is made.

Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that the federal government has opted to act unilaterally on this matter, but it is certainly not uncharacteristic, particularly on the issue of Kyoto. The federal government has ignored the concerns of the provinces from day one. Ottawa has not undertaken any meaningful consultation with the provinces about Kyoto, the issue of whether or not to ratify it, on the nature of ratification, and how it will be implemented. Provinces called for a first ministers' meeting on climate change, but Ottawa refused. Then in September the Prime Minister took the astonishing step of announcing his intention to have Kyoto ratified before the end of the year despite the fact that meaningful consultations with provinces had not occurred.

3:00

Mr. Speaker, some say that it is not possible for governments to co-operate on this issue because the federal position is so different from the position of most provinces. However, I believe a co-operative relationship on change is possible. There are certain examples where the federal government and provinces have worked well together. The development of a health care dispute mechanism was done successfully, and we've worked co-operatively on the softwood lumber dispute. The G-8 conference held in Kananaskis, in southern Alberta, was a success. I can attest personally to the fact that federal officials and ourselves and the two governments generally worked together to make that an overall success. All governments can work together on a made-in-Canada climate change plan that makes sense for Canada and the provinces. We can provide a framework represented by these 12 principles for that co-operation to begin.

Alberta is certainly willing to tackle the issue of climate change. In fact, we are the only government in Canada to put our words into action. Not only have we released a detailed plan on how we will reduce greenhouse gas emissions in Alberta, but we have backed that plan up with legislation which is currently before this Assembly. Mr. Speaker, Alberta's approach will bring substantial but more gradual reductions in emissions. It involves actions aimed at reducing emissions, investing in research and technology, providing leadership, and adapting to change. It is based on partnership and working with industry, consumers, and all Albertans to address climate change. The plan is designed to be cost-effective while achieving meaningful long-term emission reductions, unlike Kyoto, which will simply move the creation of emissions to other parts of the world.

Mr. Speaker, the fact that Alberta is the first government in Canada to release such a detailed plan is not surprising. Alberta has shown leadership on climate change for many years. We led the way by establishing Climate Change Central, a unique public/private sector organization that has been working since 1999 to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in Alberta through research, education, and conservation measures.

We have also taken major steps to improve the energy efficiency of Alberta government facilities. In other words, Mr. Speaker, Alberta has moved beyond the rhetoric and beyond the good intentions to meaningful action. We have said time and time again that we are willing to work with other provinces and the federal government on a broader Canadian plan to address climate change. However, the federal government's response has been: it is Kyoto or nothing. The Prime Minister and his Environment minister have been clear that they plan to ratify Kyoto before the end of the year despite the fact that many reports show that implementing Kyoto will result in significant harm to the economy of Alberta and Canada.

At this point we are hopeful that the Prime Minister will reconsider his position, but if he does not reconsider, Alberta has other avenues to explore within the legal and constitutional realm. The province's legal position will depend on how the federal government intends to implement Kyoto, and we do not yet have a clear enough implementation plan from them, even though two federal plans have been released. Mr. Speaker, under the Constitution the federal government cannot legislate within areas of exclusive provincial jurisdiction. The development, management, and conservation of nonrenewable resources is exclusive provincial jurisdiction. Therefore, Alberta can challenge the federal government if its implementation plan intrudes into Alberta's jurisdiction.

There are also constitutional questions surrounding the ratification of Kyoto. Mr. Speaker, there is clear precedent in Canada that the federal government must undertake meaningful consultation with provinces and obtain their consent before ratifying a treaty that impacts the areas of exclusive provincial jurisdiction or where implementation requires provincial action. The federal government has done this in the case of many international trade agreements and many human rights conventions, but it has not happened with Kyoto. Alberta's Kyoto External Advisory Committee, chaired by former Premier Peter Lougheed, is looking at these legal and constitutional areas and will be providing advice to the Alberta government on how best to proceed. In the meantime, this resolution is one more step that Alberta can take to call on the federal government to stop its unilateral approach and work with the provinces and territories towards resolution of this particular matter.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that there are somewhere in the neighbourhood of nine major conferences that have been held on this particular topic since the initial concept of the Kyoto accord was developed about, I believe, eight or nine years ago. The activity in Canada, of course, I think is indicative of our priority that we put on the environment, but we certainly have to develop a plan which will work and which will fulfill the needs of Alberta and protect its economy. It has to provide for the needs of the whole nation and protect our economy as well.

One cannot help but wonder why at this particular point in time our neighbour to the south, that has certainly been examining the accord over the years, has chosen to not stop protecting the environment but, in fact, is moving forward with their own particular plan adjusted to their particular needs. Likewise, our Commonwealth sister country of Australia has been involved for a great time and has with due consideration decided not to become part of the accord, although again, as I understand it, they are developing many environmental measures that will be designed to protect their climate overall.

It raises the question, Mr. Speaker, as to the viability of the Kyoto accord, and it emphasizes, I think, and underlines the importance of us as Albertans being part of a Canadian program which is going to be sure to provide the reductions in emissions that are sought but, at the same time, not damage our economy and allows the country of Canada to continue to grow and prosper and to be able to serve its

people as well as the many countries that we are associated with.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

THE SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Ellerslie.

MS CARLSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm happy to have an opportunity to speak to Motion 33, which is the government's own 12-step program, as they see it, on climate change. As with any of these programs they are very, very good in theory, and the principles as outlined here sound excellent and, certainly, very motherhood and apple pie, but as with any of those programs the problems really come with the application and the interpretation. Unfortunately, I have absolutely no hope that this government will interpret these principles as I see them. However, I still don't have much hope that they will interpret them in a manner that most Albertans would find to be . . .

3:10

DR. MASSEY: Preferable.

MS CARLSON: Yes, to them and acceptable to their families. So we go forward with this motion cautiously and take a look at what's been said so far and what we hope will be said in the remainder of the afternoon.

The minister didn't do very much to eliminate my concerns in terms of explaining the principles one by one and going into some detail on them. The way these principles are styled in the motion makes it very difficult to object to most of them in principle, and in practice it will be quite easy to manipulate them into the interpretations we've seen and in the way the government perceives things. For instance, when the government talks about protecting the environment, what they really mean is mitigating damage by industrial activity. I see protecting the environment as ensuring that we have a sustainable environment for generations to come. Same sentence, quite different interpretations, and that is the basic problem with these principles as they are laid out.

If we take a look at the background on this particular document, we see that at the joint meeting of energy and environment ministers in Halifax on October 28, 2002, a document entitled Provincial and Territorial Statement on Climate Change Policy was released at that time. The purpose was to establish principles agreed to by all of the provinces and territories that would guide the development of a national climate change plan. These are the same ones as we see before us now, but not all of the 12 principles in the motion have received federal approval. There are reservations about three of them. As the province has said, acceptance of or willingness to negotiate on the principles as a prerequisite to co-operation with the federal government – there's been little co-operation between this province and the federal government or other provinces at this point in time. So it becomes, then, very difficult to negotiate when you won't sit down at the table or when, as we saw the Minister of Environment do, you rudely get up and leave.

If we take a look at the 12 principles and we take a look at the end of the motion where it talks about "in the absence of agreement on a national plan," which is primarily denouncing any unilateral ratification, and then goes on to talk about how that plays out, what it's really calling for is for the federal government to consult with the provinces. But there's an inherent contradiction in this, Mr. Speaker, in that this province is demanding consultation from the federal government when they refuse to go to the table themselves. So how do they see this being resolved in a timely fashion? They don't. In fact, what they want is a fight. They are hoping that the advice they're going to get – and I must say that I did see that huge

troop of senior lawyers from the Justice department coming into the Assembly yesterday after 5:30. I know that this province will go well armed to that particular discussion and hope that they will get a constitutional challenge ability, but that isn't the right answer for Canada, and it isn't the right answer for us as participants in a global community. So I really raise some cautions and some concerns about that and hope that this provincial government truly has a good-faith intent to negotiate, because so far it doesn't look like that's happening.

I'd like to take the principles as laid out here one by one and talk about them a little bit. The first one talks about: "All Canadians must have an opportunity for full and informed input into the development of the plan." Well, that's an excellent principle, and we ask for that kind of principle to be applied to all of the major decisions this provincial government makes. But how do we see them actually interpret that? Time after time we see who they consult as being, for the most part, special-interest groups or consultation done through a process that is not open, that is not transparent, and that is not verifiable. So we would hope that when they take a look at this principle in this regard, they don't hold the federal government up to a standard quite different from the one they apply to themselves.

I'd like to see the bar raised for everybody. Let's know what the consultation process is. Let's know that it's open to whomever wishes to participate. Let's know that it's going to be open in a manner that is accessible to all people, that it is completely transparent, and that the information they get is verifiable. So nothing less in this particular case than something equivalent to forensic audits would be satisfactory, in my opinion. Then let them use that framework as a model for all future consultations in this province on key issues.

The second principle talks about the plan ensuring that "no region or jurisdiction shall be asked to bear an unreasonable share of the burden and no industry, sector, or region shall be treated unfairly," and so on. Also sounds very good when you first take a look at it, but we don't have any definitions. What do the terms "unreasonable" and "unfairly" mean? I know for sure, having listened to this government for 10 years, that their interpretation of those terms is quite different than mine, and how they apply to sectors and individuals and consumers and the environment is also quite different than mine. So I'm hoping this afternoon that we'll get someone who will stand up and define them, but it's how these get applied that really matters the most.

This government, the Alberta government, has said before that the determination of undue burden can only be made by the jurisdiction accepting the burden. Well, this just sets up everybody for a huge fall. The principle likely applies to the terms "unreasonable" and "unfairly" as well. If this is the case, then it's likely that each region will claim that it has been assigned an unreasonable burden and that each has been dealt with unfairly. So, then, if each region, sector, and industry has exclusive rights to determine the reasonability and fairness of its treatment and no other authority, who can claim otherwise? So what happens then is that you get a huge deterioration into a situation where no meaningful plan could ever be implemented.

What we need is some sort of ability to, first of all, define those and then someone who can interpret whether or not that, in fact, has happened. If everybody just takes their toys and goes to their corner and says, "It doesn't work for me because it's unfair," we never get any agreement. So definitely we need some definition here, and there needs to be someone who can do the arbitration when people and industries and sectors and governments don't agree. I don't see any provision for that here, and that would've shown some leadership on behalf of this government if they'd have done that. You

know, if they'd just give us a cursory definition of those two terms and then propose some sort of an arbitration method, I would be prepared to support this principle.

The third one talks about: "The plan must respect provincial and territorial jurisdiction." This is going to be one, I imagine, that is going to be quite controversial as time goes on because it hasn't been determined yet, Mr. Speaker, whether or not the federal government tackling environmental issues in our province does or does not exceed their jurisdiction or interfere with Alberta's. There have been ongoing disputes, there have been all kinds of discussions about this in the past, but we don't have, I don't think, any clear answer on this. Environmental issues are not exclusively the jurisdiction of the federal government and, I would say, are also not the exclusive jurisdiction of the province, so let's get some definition there too.

We take a look at the fourth principle. It talks about including the "recognition of real emission reductions that have been achieved since 1990 or will be achieved thereafter." Well, this is one that I really like. I think that this is excellent to have in there. I would be very dismayed if it wasn't in the federal plan when they roll it out. Certainly those organizations, companies, industries, governments who have taken action since that date, 1990, should have acknowledgment for the work that they have done, and there should be some way to measure that work and to give them credit for it. This to me should have been the first principle. It's really a fundamental building block of any kind of plan being able to go forward and be achievable. So this one is good, and let's hope we see it at the federal level and that we don't need to take too much time discussing it.

3:20

The fifth one talks about "bilateral and multilateral agreements between provinces and territories and with the federal government." Well, of course, to do that, you've got to go to the table. So if they're not prepared to go to the table at this stage, what exactly does this particular principle mean? I think it means they just get together and discuss it, but it could also mean: do you want subsidiary agreements between the provinces? So we would need to know then: what would those agreements look like? What would be in them? How would they expect to roll those agreements out? What would be any of the triggers for breaking the agreements? Those kinds of things we need to know, just more information. It just isn't here, and we need to see that.

The sixth principle talks about ensuring "that no province or territory bears the financial risk of federal climate change commitments." Well, this is an interesting principle. Does this also mean that no province or territory will bear the financial gain of federal climate change commitments, because, Mr. Speaker, there will also be some gains. We don't see any talk about that. So I would suggest that you can't have it both ways. If you won't take the risk, then you can't have the gain. So some of that discussion should be had. [interjection] Exactly. That's exactly right.

So do they really mean here that no one province should bear the entire or majority of financial risk or that none of the provinces or territories bear any financial risk? Not laid out here and left wide enough open that it could be interpreted any way the provincial government wants to. Certainly, we think that not one province should bear all the risk, but there is some burden to be shared here. As consumers we will bear some of the cost and some of the risk and we will also benefit from those gains.

As we see technological changes and innovations, we as consumers benefit from that. If we are sloppy consumers and overuse resources, then we will pay the price for that. That's just normal market conditions. I'm not sure why a free market government

would be so concerned about looking at this kind of protectionism for their own risks, because they for sure are the first at the trough when there's money to be had. So I have some concerns about that one.

Principle 7: "The plan must recognize that benefits from assets such as forest and agricultural sinks must accrue to the province and territory which owns the assets." Also, this is one that I heartily agree with and wish it had been closer to the top of the list. It's very reasonable, and for me it goes without saying that this is the way that this should happen and just makes good sense. It's reasonable. It provides an incentive for provinces to maintain or develop the carbon sinks that will come under their jurisdiction and to sustain their own industries in the manner that they have in the past, so I think this is excellent.

Principle 8 says that "the plan must support innovation and new technology." In some ways this is a good principle. I like it too, and in some ways the province is moving forward on this. But, you know, we don't have a definition of "support" here. Once again, is this province asking the federal government to do something that they are not prepared to do? While we see money going into research and development and while we see the province looking at doing retrofits for their own buildings, we heard yesterday in debate a number of people in this Assembly who did not support dollars or funding or grants or loans for consumer retrofits.

So, on the one hand, the feds are expected to support innovation and new technology. Does that just mean that they're going to support it on the business side too? What about the consumer side? This province is clearly on the record as not wishing to do that. I hope they change their mind. I hope that what we see is a full definition of innovation and new technology which includes financial support at both the federal and the provincial levels as we move through this transition time and that it truly reflects a real need being faced on the front lines by consumers today; that is, some sort of access to funding for retrofits. Retrofits are not cheap; they are expensive. If we expect all of us to move forward carrying our share of the need for technology upgrades, there's got to be some sort of provision in there. So let's see what they do on this.

Principle 9: "The plan must maintain the economic competitiveness of Canadian business and industry." What does this mean? The way I interpret it, it looks completely unrealistic, because I don't see in here any differentiation between rewarding businesses who are best in class and rewarding businesses who do nothing. Could we see some definitions in here? As it stands, I don't like it all.

Principle 10: "Canada must continue to demand recognition of clean energy exports." Once again, what do they mean? What does "recognition" mean? Does it mean global recognition? Does it mean money? Does it mean credits? There are no definitions in here. So let's get some information so that we can know what it is that we're supposed to be debating in this particular principle.

The 11th principle:

The plan must include incentives for all citizens, communities, businesses, and jurisdictions to make the shift to an economy based on renewable and other clean energy, lower emissions, and sustainable practices across sectors.

It's ironic that the government plan, as we've seen it, doesn't include any of these provisions, Mr. Speaker, but they certainly expect the feds to ante up.

Let's talk about who should provide that kind of support. We all know that the most effective support comes when it's closest to the source. Do you want the federal government, who are very removed from the people, to develop these kinds of plans, or should that support come at the most direct level? What I would like to see are municipal funding grants to look at consumer incentives because

that's the level of government that's closest to the people. It can provide often the most effective and efficient kind of service. So this government could show some leadership by taking a look at that. At the very least, they should look at doing it themselves. Hopefully, they'll do this.

It's my belief that on a global level what we see is that plans or laws that desire to meet non status quo targets have incorporated into them incentives. This government is quite happy to talk about that, particularly the Minister of Environment, who is on record as saying that. They see incentives for businesses and jurisdictions in the form of penalties, like fines and imprisonment and so on. So what does this government mean with this application when they talk about incentives? Do they want negative ones? Do they want positive ones? Are they willing to participate? Are they willing to look at delivering incentives to the most direct level of availability and adaptability, which I believe is municipal government? It doesn't talk about that here.

The 12th principle talks about: "The implementation of any climate change plan must include an incentive and allocation system that supports lower carbon emission." This one looks like it's alluding to an emission credit trading system. I hope they read the Leader of the Official Opposition's speech yesterday, because he talked extensively about how this could be put in place and be operable and move us forward on this. So, of course, this is a principle we support because it is very consistent with the Official Opposition's proposals. If they need more information or detail on that, I know for a fact that the Leader of the Official Opposition would be willing to participate in that discussion.

Thank you.

THE SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Calgary-Bow.

MS DeLONG: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak to this resolution this afternoon. I wanted to speak to this resolution because it touches on the best way to protect Alberta's economy and environment, but it also shows a deep understanding of how federalism should work in this country.

3:30

I emphasize the word "should" because the resolution stands in stark contrast to the debate going on right now in Ottawa. Well, we can't really call it a debate; can we? What's going on there is a Prime Minister unilaterally steamrolling any opposition. It's one individual on an extended retirement tour who has disregarded the concerns of the provincial governments that would be forced to implement the Kyoto protocol at the ground level.

But in the resolution before us today we see a difference. We see governments of all political stripes from all regions of the country and on different sides of the Kyoto debate who are able to agree on 12 common principles centred around one common theme: that the essence of federalism should be fairness so that no jurisdiction suffers for the benefit of the other and that no laws are passed without a healthy, honest discussion between all governments concerned. All provinces have agreed to the principles enshrined in this resolution. That should count for something. In my mind, it shows that the provinces have at least said: let's ground this discussion in reality. Given reality, Mr. Speaker, it will be clear why I don't want to see a Kyoto plan; I want to see a Canadian plan tailored to Canadian realities.

Today I want to highlight those Canadian realities so that we can all get a sense of what it is we're really talking about. Canadian reality number one: Canada produces only 2 percent of the world's man-made greenhouse gases. Two percent; that's it.

AN HON. MEMBER: What percent?

MS DeLONG: Two percent, and by the way, it's only 1/10,000 of a percent of the total worldwide Kyoto gases that they want to reduce in Kyoto. As it should be, Kyoto cheerleaders say: what does it matter? Well, it matters quite a bit when the United States, which produces about a quarter of the world's man-made greenhouse gases, isn't even a party to Kyoto. It matters when China and India, two of the world's largest producers, have no reduction targets under Kyoto. It matters a whole lot when we consider that roughly half of the world's countries – half of them – who have less stringent pollution laws than Canada, are not party to Kyoto.

[Mr. Shariff in the chair]

There is no incentive for nonsignatory nations to reduce their output of greenhouse gases. Given that many of them won't sign on to Kyoto because they have no intention of reducing their output, what is the point of forcing industry to comply with an impossible time line meaning losses to their bottom line and our economy when not so much as a dent will be made in the overall amount of global greenhouse gas emissions?

Canadian reality number two: we're the only North American country with targets to meet under Kyoto. The President and Senate of the United States had the wisdom not to ratify this accord, and because of this, while one of our major exports is clean energy to the United States, we would get no credit for those exports under Kyoto. It's as though the protocol envisions a world in which the only countries that exist are those that have signed on. Further, southern Ontario is flooded with smog from the northeast United States, so while we force automakers to either shut down or reduce manufacturing levels, all in the name of ostensibly reducing pollution, more than enough pollution will come sailing over the border.

This leads me to wonder: just how does Canada benefit by crippling our manufacturing industry if we'll see no real improvements in the air quality? What do we say to the plant technician who will lose his job because a narrow-minded federal government failed to work with the provinces or industry to get a deal done that works in the best interests of all involved? It's time for the federal government to stop and take a breath and not ratify this flawed protocol.

Canadian reality number three: we have no European bubble. It's been speculated that countries in the European Union will not have to make any reductions whatsoever to meet the targets set by the Kyoto protocol. This is because they have signed on as a bloc of countries rather than individually. So what we've got there is a mixture of robust economies like Germany, stagnant former eastern European economies, traditionally low polluters like Norway and other Scandinavian nations, and other countries which do not have a heavy reliance on manufacturing or resource development. This mixture allows the European nations to assess their strengths and weaknesses and make deals which at minimal cost result in minimal actual change in their emission levels.

Essentially, these countries trade off with one another in order to strengthen the overall economy of the European Union. For them Kyoto is about economics, not the environment. It makes them money while it breaks our back. All of this has drastic implications for the Canadian economy. While the other signatories to Kyoto are either European countries that have something to gain by signing the protocol or developing countries that have no targets, Canada is the only country that will pay a heavy price, and of all the provinces it is ours that will bear the lion's share of that price.

Let's talk about our province, and let's talk about some Alberta

realities. In doing so, let's refute the critics on the front steps of the Legislature who say that we've done nothing to protect our environment. Alberta reality number one: in 1990 we started provincial cleanup air strategy consultations so that all provinces could become involved in Canada's effort to reduce greenhouse gases. Like the resolution before us today, that's federalism at its finest. I'd argue that the federal Liberals could learn a thing or two.

Reality number two: since 1999 the amount of electricity generated from wind energy in Alberta has doubled. We've worked with industry to develop new, cleaner ways of producing petroleum and natural gas. Flaring has been reduced dramatically. We're working on new technology for clean-burning coal.

Alberta reality number three: the Alberta plan, which has recently been developed by the Minister of Environment, provides a comprehensive framework for reasonable, well-thought-out actions to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. We're protecting the environment, and we're ensuring that our economy does not take a hit that it cannot withstand. We want to ensure that our economy can not only withstand environmental action but can actually thrive underneath new legislation. We need to work with the people who are most affected by it.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, Alberta reality number four: Kyoto will mean economic ruin in this province. Some Albertans believe that Kyoto will only hurt the energy sector. Nothing could be further from the truth. Kyoto will affect all parts of the Alberta advantage, right down to the family-owned corner store. If we allow Kyoto to drive business from Alberta, it means fewer jobs. It means less money in the pockets of Albertans.

There is a better way, Mr. Speaker. Let's work with the environmental groups and industry. As today's resolution suggests, let's keep getting together with other provinces to design a Canadian plan to accommodate Canadian realities. Let's work with our researchers in our universities who are on the cutting edge of designing clean technologies for Alberta's industry sector. Let's have an open discussion with industry and work to set time lines and tough emission standards that, unlike Kyoto, they're actually capable of meeting.

These are the initiatives we are focusing on. This is what other provinces are talking about. We're talking about a plan that achieves real results, one that actually improves the environment, one that does not unfairly penalize the average Albertan for working hard in a successful province. This can be done, Mr. Speaker, and this is what this resolution is all about.

I therefore support this resolution and call upon all the members of this House to do so as well. Thank you.

THE ACTING SPEAKER: Under Standing Order 29(2) we have five minutes allocated for questions to the hon. member. The hon. Member for Edmonton-Ellerslie.

MS CARLSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the member please tell us whether or not she would support a provincially supported retrofit consumer program, like Manitoba has had for many years or like the territories has had for many years, where there would be a fund available, either through a loan or granting program, for consumers to do retrofits on their homes?

3:40

MS DeLONG: That's something that the private sector could handle very well. Thank you.

THE ACTING SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Highlands.

MR. MASON: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to ask the hon. member if she can tell us how much actual CO₂ has been reduced in the province since 1990 as a result of the steps that she claims the government took at that time.

MS DeLONG: I'm not sure how much greenhouse gases have been reduced, but I am very aware of the pollution that has been reduced in Alberta since 1990. Our flaring program has been extremely successful working with industry, and we have by far exceeded our targets when it comes to pollution.

MR. SMITH: I'd like to ask the member a question, Mr. Speaker: if she would compare or care to comment on the efficacy or the efficiency of having Albertans reduce their electrical consumption during the peak time from 4 to 8 and using market price signals. Would that be a more effective way of doing it than offering direct cash incentives to the marketplace, thereby distorting the marketplace?

THE ACTING SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Calgary-Bow.

MS DeLONG: Thank you very much. I think that's an excellent idea. That's something that we would be able to institute without paying to either consumers or industry, and it would result in less pollution.

THE ACTING SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Ellerslie.

MS CARLSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's clear that the member didn't understand the question that I asked earlier. The point is not whether or not the private sector can provide services. The point is: can consumers afford to retrofit their homes? The answer is in large part no. Does she support a program, a loan or a grant, where consumers would have access to money for retrofits?

MS DeLONG: I personally am replacing my two-pane windows with three-pane windows, and, yes, the payout is going to be over several years. It is something that you can actually save money on in terms of retrofitting your home. Some of the easier things that save a tremendous amount of energy and reduce pollution have to do with just going around and finding the places in your home where air is escaping or where the cold air is coming in. There's a tremendous amount that you can do to reduce your bills and reduce pollution that way.

THE ACTING SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Highlands.

MR. MASON: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Is the hon. member aware of the comments made by the Minister of Environment, who clearly says that CO₂ is not a pollutant, that global warming and air pollution are two different things, and is she also aware that while flaring has been reduced in Alberta, the venting of natural gas – and that means a lot of methane, which is a more aggressive greenhouse gas than CO₂ – has actually increased dramatically? Is she further aware that since 1990 the amount of CO₂ that has been emitted in Alberta has increased by over 30 percent?

MS DeLONG: Yes, I am very aware of the difference between pollution and greenhouse gases. Greenhouse gases are what we are breathing out right now, CO₂. It's nontoxic. It's naturally occurring.

In fact, plants cannot exist without CO₂. It's something that is required in our environment, and it's totally different from pollution. It's pollution that we need to concentrate on much more than so-called greenhouse gases.

THE ACTING SPEAKER: Hon. member, are you rising to speak?

MS CARLSON: No. A question. Has the time expired?

THE ACTING SPEAKER: I believe the time has now left us.

Before I recognize the next speaker, may we briefly revert to Introduction of Guests?

[Unanimous consent granted]

head: **Introduction of Guests**
(*reversion*)

THE ACTING SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development.

MS CALAHASEN: Well, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Today I have the great pleasure of introducing two wonderful ladies who are seated in our members' gallery. One is from my constituency originally, who has now moved to Edmonton. Her name is Kim Thibeault Caudron, and she hails from Jossard, Alberta, where the fair usually is held. With her is a good friend of hers, Yasmine Shaheem, who is from South Australia, visiting Kim in Canada, so she's been touring Alberta the last month to see what it's like. I think we should give them a warm welcome from the Legislative Assembly.

head: **Government Motions**
(*continued*)

THE ACTING SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Centre.

MS BLAKEMAN: Thanks very much, Mr. Speaker. I would like to make just a couple of comments on the information that's been put forward in this motion. First, I would like to note that my constituents in Edmonton-Centre support the ratification of Kyoto.

AN HON. MEMBER: Not all of them.

MS BLAKEMAN: Well, the ones that live there and vote, as compared to the many MLAs that I'm delighted to have actually live in the constituency who maybe vote somewhere else, are very supportive of Kyoto. I want to put that on the record because they've made it very clear to me that they expect me to do that.

Further to that, Motion 33 is not to be seen as an either/or situation. If it is in conjunction with the ratification of Kyoto, then we're all for it. If it's an either/or situation, there is not the support in the constituency of Edmonton-Centre for that.

The next thing I would like to say is: I'm not a federal Liberal. I don't think there's been a cheque that's been cashed in my name to join that party. I want to make that clear, because I know that members of this House are very fond of constantly pitching back on us and attempting to have the provincial Liberals accept responsibility for what's happening on the federal level. I don't think my colleagues here on the Conservative side are any happier with the poor performance of their federal cousins than I am with my federal cousins. So let's just get that on the record.

It also seems to me that to a certain extent part of this debate is about the battle of the scientists, and I will also put it very clearly on

the record that I believe in the science of Kyoto. I believe in the work that's been done by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. I believe that that's a fair system. The scientists do gather and review published material, and thus far the scientists that have been brought forward by the other side in this House have either not published anything that I can find or, in fact, their work has not been reviewed by the IPCC. So I will take the IPCC science anytime.

Now, when I look at the 12 points here – and I think my colleague for Edmonton-Ellerslie has been quite clear that many of these are pretty self-evident points and hard to disagree with at face value. The trick here is always in the implementation of it and in the interpretation of it. I've now been elected long enough to go through the debates on electrical deregulation and on the privatization of health care, otherwise known as Bill 11 in this House, and know how important it is to get that all written down, because, boy, does the land ever shift underneath your feet once the bill is passed and the government decides to put a different interpretation on things. So nailing down exactly what the interpretation is and what the implementation is is very important, and I'm not hearing that kind of detail coming forward, so I would like to hear it. I hope that in this debate we would have that kind of very detailed information brought forward.

Now, the first point is about consultation. I'm a big proponent of consultation, but I also have to say: just a minute here. This particular issue of climate change has been on the world agenda for a significant period of time. I believe that the first time the scientists met on this was in 1973. Now, that may have not hit the world newspapers at that time, but certainly we can start counting from 1988. Most definitely we can count from 1992, which was the Rio summit, which resulted in the beginning of what we know as the Kyoto protocol.

3:50

So, you know, frankly, unless you've been living somewhere without access to any kind of mass communication, I see no reason why people would not have had an ample opportunity to read and consider or to watch and consider or to listen and consider what's being brought forward in this debate. I don't know how much more consultation is being anticipated by this point 1, and perhaps the minister can fill in the gap there. There have been, as I pointed out, at least 10 years of world discussion on this. How many more years does he want to see happen? All Kyoto does is agree on a target. We can keep talking for some time about how we wish to implement it, but let's be realistic. That's what Kyoto does: it agrees on a target. We can continue to talk, if you like, on the implementation of it.

The second point is asking about the mitigation. Just let me get the exact wording here.

The plan must ensure that no region or jurisdiction shall be asked to bear an unreasonable share of the burden and no industry, sector, or region should be treated unfairly. The costs and impacts . . . must be clear, reasonable, achievable, and economically sustainable. The plan must incorporate appropriate federally funded mitigation of the adverse impacts of climate change initiatives.

This is where I start to sense the differences that are applied between how this government wants to be treated and how this government treats others. Certainly, I don't know how realistic it is to be insisting that there be federally funded mitigation and, at the same time, to be insisting that all these natural resources are ours. That strikes me as a schism in thought here and a gap in logic. It seems to me that we're more than happy to take the wealth of the bonanza that's left under our feet, but there is no wish to be responsible for the by-products of that wealth. This doesn't stop us from making money from oil, but I think we have to recognize the responsibility

for what that product of oil does and to accept that. If we want to own and benefit from this, then we're going to have to shoulder some of the responsibilities for the damages of it.

Section 3 is talking about respecting provincial and territorial jurisdiction. Well, supposedly, or on the surface of it, an obvious point. But, again, I have no reason to trust, and based on two extensive debates in this Assembly on electrical deregulation and the privatization of health care, I have triple no reason to trust this government on blank statements like that on blank cheques. So I would like to know exactly what they are anticipating by that.

When we look at principle 4, the plan includes "recognition of real emission reductions that have been achieved." Of course, an obvious point. If people have done the work, they should get credit for it.

Principle 5: providing for "bilateral or multilateral agreements between provinces and territories and with the federal government." Fine.

Now, principle 6. "The plan must ensure that no province or territory bears the financial risk of federal climate change commitments." This is a very interesting one. I think that when we in Alberta have had the advantage of being able to emit and take up much more of the atmospheric ability to recover from greenhouse gas emissions, we have to take that proportionate share of the costs for it. I am interested in knowing if that is what is anticipated and is what is accepted by the government on this particular point. I think that if the government is saying, "Well, we want all the advantage of being able to continue to do whatever we're doing without shouldering the appropriate economic and whatever else is involved proportionate to what we are emitting," I think there's a problem here. I'm perfectly willing to say: it all has to be fair and equitable. Indeed it does have to be fair and equitable. I think the risk is greater of not doing anything and of being left behind. In this struggle against ratifying Kyoto, my concern as an Albertan is that this government resists so strongly, digs their heels in so strongly, that, in fact, we could be left behind, and I think that's a greater economic disadvantage than what's being considered here.

Principle 7. The government plan recognizes "benefits from assets such as forest and agricultural sinks." This one, I think, is a very good one, because while we in Alberta have the accidental bonanza of oil and gas under our feet, those provinces that have taken steps to preserve or expand their carbon sinks through their forestry management or their agricultural management policies should definitely be given credit for doing that. Conversely, in Alberta if there's been any evidence that we have put forward policies that took away from or reduced our forest or agricultural sinks, then we have to pay the appropriate price that goes with that.

Points 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12 are, you know, evident: yes, sure, fine, wonderful, delightful, excellent. But when we get to the section "Be it further resolved," where it's talking about denouncing "any unilateral ratification by the federal government of the Kyoto protocol in violation of the principles of constitutional law," et cetera, this is where I and my constituents come to a full stop in being able to support the government. As I said when I started, this is not an either/or debate for us. We very clearly stand for ratification of Kyoto, and let me be clear here. I have not had one letter, e-mail, phone call, or in-person encounter with a constituent who was not in favour of ratifying Kyoto. I have had e-mails, letters, phone calls, and in-person encounters with constituents who very clearly have asked me to support Kyoto. So I want to be very clear that that's where my constituents are coming from.

What I see involved in this "Be it further resolved" paragraph that is at the end is a form of provincial NIMBYism, and I question whether the province has any intention of moving forward on this

seeing as we have a government that is still disputing the science of this, that is still saying: no, we'll bring our own scientists forward. Again I say that we have 2,000 of the world's best scientists that have put their heads together. They've done reviews, and they've come to a consensus on the statements they put forward on the science of this, and we still have the government going: well, we don't believe them. I'm sorry, but I'll bet those 2,000 scientists against the 74 members of the Conservative caucus any day. If we're going to talk about the science of this, that's where I'm going to go, with the IPCC.

Let me give you an analogy. If we had a neighbour in our community who was growing noxious weeds or sorting manure or something particularly unpleasant in their backyard, as a society we look to the local authority to come in and say: clean that up, or we're going to do it for you. If they don't clean it up, then, in fact, the local authority does clean it up and bills them for it, and we are partly in that situation or could move into that situation with Alberta. So I would hope that Alberta would move forward and would work with the federal government in this ratification.

I think that in this instance I'm glad I live in a federation. I'm glad that there is another authority that can speak for me and that can speak for my constituents. We do end up with instances and different issues in this federation that have arisen from time to time where a province may take a point of view that in fact does not fit with the rest of the country, and I see that happening here on this issue of climate change and the ratification of Kyoto. I'm with the ratification of it.

So I just wanted to give that input into this debate, and I appreciate the opportunity for having been able to speak to it. Thank you.

THE ACTING SPEAKER: Under Standing Order 29(2) we have five minutes for questions to the hon. member. The hon. Member for Edmonton-Ellerslie.

4:00

MS CARLSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I welcome this opportunity to ask the Member for Edmonton-Centre a question. Of those constituents to whom you have talked to about this issue, could you share with us what their thoughts are on how the Alberta government has handled their communication plan in regard to both the content and the cost?

MS BLAKEMAN: If I have to synthesize what I heard, putting it all together, then it would be people's concern that they were being given a massive propaganda rollout. Again, they were looking for the science of it. What people have talked to me about is going to town halls that have been sponsored on Kyoto, reading up on as much as they could get, phoning in to radio stations, and participating in debates that way. Their level of understanding of the issue was much higher than I had expected, frankly, and in a number of cases they had a better grasp than I did at the time. So they were . . .

THE ACTING SPEAKER: Hon. member, this opportunity is to exchange very brief questions and answers. It's five minutes to be allocated with different members.

MS BLAKEMAN: Okay. I'm still just trying to answer the question.

MS CARLSON: Point of order, Mr. Speaker, under Standing Order 13(2).

THE ACTING SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Ellerslie on a point of order.

Point of Order

Explanation of Speaker's Ruling

MS CARLSON: Could you explain that ruling in a little more detail? We have had a series of questions asked in this Assembly where both the question and the answer were of greater duration than the one we just heard.

THE ACTING SPEAKER: Hon. member, are you rising on a point of order or a point of clarification?

MS CARLSON: Well, it's a point of order under Standing Order 13(2), which asks the Speaker to further clarify his comments.

THE ACTING SPEAKER: Anybody else on the point of order?

Standing Order 29(2) allows five minutes for questions and answers, back and forth. This is an opportunity for at least three or four or five members to ask questions, and if it's going to be a four- or five-member inclusion, it has to be succinct. Therefore, more people can ask questions and receive answers. That has been the tradition of the five minutes that has been allocated until now, and I believe that we would like to continue in that light.

The hon. Member for Grande Prairie-Smoky.

Debate Continued

MR. KNIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask a question of the member opposite with respect to the resolution before us or, at least, the motion that speaks to the resolution. I don't see anything in that resolution that says federal. What it says is "a national plan." A national plan indicates a plan that would be a partnership. It's a national plan; it's not a federal-against-provincial resolution. So my question is: given that this is a national plan, would we expect that the risks and rewards should be shared?

MS BLAKEMAN: In responding to the first part of the question on why I had referenced "federal" rather than "national," I'm reacting to the words that are used in the document. Section 5: "The plan must provide for bilateral or multilateral agreements between provinces and territories and with the federal government." Principle 6: "The plan must ensure that no province or territory bears the financial risk of federal climate change commitments." Under "Be it further resolved," about four lines in: "denounces any unilateral ratification," et cetera, et cetera, "constitutional law, convention, federalism." So I was referring to the federal government and federalism because it is referenced, as you can see, a number of times in the document.

Thank you.

THE ACTING SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Ellerslie.

MS CARLSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Could the Member for Edmonton-Centre tell us if her constituents want the government to spend any more money on an information campaign other than the \$3 million plus they've already spent?

MS BLAKEMAN: No, they don't. As I mentioned, they're very concerned with what they see as very one-sided propaganda and again referencing other attempts by this government in the recent past with Bill 11 and the electricity deregulation, both of which had massive government propaganda rollouts. The figure, my constituents are saying, is \$5 million, not \$3 million, including the costs of

agency fees for development of television ads and the payment of those ads and the radio ads.

Thank you.

THE ACTING SPEAKER: Hon. Member for Grande Prairie-Smoky, did you want to rise on a question?

MR. KNIGHT: No. Thank you.

THE ACTING SPEAKER: Hon. Member for Red Deer-North, are you rising on a question?

MRS. JABLONSKI: Yes. I just wonder if the Member for Edmonton-Centre knows what percentage of her constituents are oil field workers?

MS BLAKEMAN: Most of my constituents, a lot of them, work in the service industry and retail sector. There are not many oil field workers; it's a fairly small percentage. Most of my constituents are retail and service workers and then in a professional strata – dentists, lawyers, doctors, accountants – plus 13 percent are retired people. For oil field workers I don't have a definitive number for you, but I don't think it's a high number.

THE ACTING SPEAKER: Before I recognize the next speaker, may we briefly revert to Introduction of Guests?

[Unanimous consent granted]

head: **Introduction of Guests**

(*reversion*)

THE ACTING SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Human Resources and Employment.

MR. DUNFORD: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. In the members' gallery this afternoon are a couple of people I have the honour to introduce to you and through you to the members of the Legislature. Nychcole Penny is a young woman from Lethbridge that happens to work in the Lethbridge-West constituency office. She's accompanied today by Ace Northcott and also accompanied by my executive assistant, Shelby MacLeod. Please provide them a warm welcome.

head: **Government Motions**

(*continued*)

THE ACTING SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Red Deer-North.

MRS. JABLONSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. What is Canada? Canada is a country made up of ordinary people living ordinary lives. Canada is a country made up of ordinary people who stick to their guns or, more politically correct, who stick to their principles. Principles are fundamental truths. They are primary elements. Without principles we are like driftwood floating on the sea: going somewhere but going nowhere at the same time.

Before us today we have a resolution introduced by the Minister of International and Intergovernmental Relations that upholds 12 principles. Like the 12 days of Christmas these principles bring us a gift of reason that will protect all Canadians from those who are without reason. Mr. Speaker, everyone here today will agree that the environment is a priority and we must take action to protect it, but taking action that does more harm to this country than good is incomprehensible. I find these principles to be straightforward and

sensible, principles that every Canadian can easily understand. There is nothing hidden or secret, as my opposition colleagues have alluded to.

The first principle: "All Canadians must have an opportunity for full and informed input into the development of the plan." Are there any Canadians who would oppose this? The first principle of the national climate change action plan is not up for debate. Canadians want to be informed, and they want input.

The second principle:

The plan must ensure that no region or jurisdiction shall be asked to bear an unreasonable share of the burden and no industry, sector, or region shall be treated unfairly. The costs and impacts on individuals, businesses, and industries must be clear, reasonable, achievable, and economically sustainable. The plan must incorporate appropriate federally funded mitigation of the adverse impacts of climate change initiatives.

No region shall "bear an unreasonable share of the burden." Since all regions are required to share through federal transfer payments by giving or receiving, this burden, too, should be shared for no region of Canada is more equal than another.

4:10

"No industry, sector, or region shall be treated unfairly." Do Canadians believe in the universal golden rule, "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you"? You bet they do. This country is made up of a majority of people who use this as their guiding principle. We are just asking to extend that principle to industries, sectors, and regions.

"The costs and impacts on individuals, businesses, and industries must be clear, reasonable, achievable, and economically sustainable." Tell me how much it costs. Can I afford it? Will I be able to make the payments? Every Canadian asks these questions. These are principles we use every day in our lives. These principles need to speak to Albertans and to all Canadians, for even the scientific elite have not yet reached a consensus.

In the final clause of the second principle it asks that the plan "incorporate appropriate federally funded mitigation of the adverse impacts of climate change initiatives." This principle is one that has not been accepted by the federal government, but it shouldn't be too difficult, because I heard the federal Minister of the Environment say that they ran the numbers over and over and over and all they could determine is that the costs will increase by 3 cents a barrel. If the federal Minister of the Environment truly believes his own words, then he should have no problem accepting this principle.

The third principle asks that the plan "respect provincial and territorial jurisdiction." No Canadian would expect this line to be crossed. We pay our taxes through an honour system, and that system works. That's because Canadians live by their principles, and principle 3 is one principle of one truth that holds this regionalized federation together. This principle is ignored at the peril of our Canadian federation.

The fourth principle states that "the plan must include recognition of real emission reductions that have been achieved since 1990 or will be achieved thereafter." All the work and effort that has been developed since 1990 or thereafter cannot be ignored. This is a simple principle. We have taken positive action to protect our environment up to now, and this should be recognized. Do you think that those who live in the mountains, by the rivers and forests love and appreciate their environment less than those who live in the brown air of Burlington or the smog of Toronto? We know how beautiful and precious our environment is. We congregate every weekend to pay homage to the beauty of the rivers, the lakes, and the wilderness. We see the belching smokestacks of Sarnia, Ontario, in CBC presentations on Kyoto. We know we don't want that for our

environment, and we have worked hard to prevent that from becoming part of our landscape. Recognizing the emissions reductions that we have painstakingly achieved since 1990 is the right thing to do.

The fifth principle states that “the plan must provide for bilateral or multilateral agreements between provinces and territories and with the federal government.” Is there anything new here? Is this not how Confederation has succeeded for the last 135 years? Mr. Speaker, this principle is what makes Canada great. It’s what keeps Canada together.

The sixth principle states that “the plan must ensure that no province or territory bears the financial risk of federal climate change commitments.” The Prime Minister and the federal Minister of the Environment have told us that the effects of the Kyoto protocol implementation plan will be minimal. They should have no problem accepting principle 6.

The seventh principle states that “the plan must recognize that benefits from assets such as forest and agricultural sinks must accrue to the province and territory which owns the assets.” Mr. Speaker, when I invest in RRSPs and I earn interest, I keep the benefits of my assets minus the income tax, of course. This principle, like others, is simply common sense. This one has not been agreed to yet, which I don’t understand. Why argue over this principle if the impact of the Kyoto protocol will be barely noticeable, as stated by federal officials?

The eighth principle states that “the plan must support innovation and new technology.”

MR. DOERKSEN: Right on.

MRS. JABLONSKI: Now, I know that my colleague from Red Deer-South, the Minister of Innovation and Science, is pleased with this principle. So are all Canadians. Innovation and new technology are the lifelines to the future. This, Mr. Speaker, is as fundamental as the other principles.

The ninth principle states that “the plan must maintain the economic competitiveness of Canadian business and industry.” Mr. Speaker, I heard the Prime Minister say himself that he would not tear down what he has helped to build. Would the federal government destroy its provinces? Would the federal government execute a power play that will end up in penalties that will throw Alberta and other provinces out of the game?

Principle 10: “Canada must continue to demand recognition of clean energy exports.” Our clean energy exports must be recognized by the international climate cops. An agreement that does not recognize these clean energy exports is one-sided, unequal, and punitive.

Principle 11: Provide “incentives for all citizens, communities, businesses, and jurisdictions to make the shift to an economy based on renewable and other clean energy, lower emissions, and sustainable practices across sectors.” Provide incentives. What a brilliant idea. The entire capitalist system is based on incentives, and besides we pay enough taxes now to provide incentives for good clean energy. If we would only shift payment from unnecessary projects and questionable printing jobs to clean energy incentives.

Principle 12: In implementing a climate change plan we must include an incentive and allocation system that supports lower carbon emission sources of energy such as hydroelectricity, wind power generation, ethanol, and renewable and other clean sources of energy.

We encourage development and design. Once again this 12th principle is fundamental to change.

Mr. Speaker, this land is your land. This land is my land. It is

ours to work with, to play with, and to keep safe. The federal government knows that without the power to unilaterally implement Kyoto, their treaty promises will only be effective to the extent that the provinces agree to implement the plan. We know that the Canadian Constitution gives the federal government the authority to ratify an international treaty such as the Kyoto protocol, but implementation depends on the agreement and co-operation of the provinces.

Mr. Speaker, it is in the best interests of Canada that the federal government accept these 12 principles agreed to by all provinces and territories on October 28 of this year to provide the basis for the development of a national climate change action plan.

The Prime Minister of Canada needs to accept these principles. The Prime Minister does not want a black legacy. The Prime Minister does not want to push westerners to the breaking point. Even the supporters of the Kyoto protocol do not believe that the protocol would in itself reduce the planet’s temperatures. Is this dispute all about power?

Mr. Speaker, for the good of Canada, for the good of the people of Canada – the farmers, the mechanics, the auto workers, the steel workers, the labourers, and all Canadians – I respectfully demand that the government of Canada accept these 12 principles for the development of a national climate change action plan. For what is Canada if not a democracy of the people who stick to their principles?

THE ACTING SPEAKER: Under Standing Order 29(2) five minutes for questions. The hon. Member for Edmonton-Highlands.

MR. MASON: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. At one point the hon. member referred to something which I heard her to say was “questionable printing jobs.” Now, did she have in mind the questionnaire on the future of the heritage trust fund that the Minister of Revenue has distributed?

MRS. JABLONSKI: Thank you for the question. Mr. Speaker, I was more referring to the printing jobs that were paid for by the federal government that didn’t get done, that didn’t get completed, that were more than one, and that were given to people that I’m not sure deserved to have the job appointed to them.

THE ACTING SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Ellerslie.

MS CARLSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am quite happy to ask a question with a very short preamble. This government supports royalty holidays and royalty reductions and tax incentives and tax reductions and all kinds of things of that nature on the business side, so it’s a surprise to me that they are not prepared to support a retrofit program for consumers. Does this member support some sort of a loan program or a grant program for consumers to do retrofits on their homes? Something that provides an incentive for us to move forward on this issue.

4:20

THE ACTING SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Red Deer-North.

MRS. JABLONSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I certainly support doing retrofits to our homes. For example, we can all do simple things like replacing the light bulbs with the energy-efficient light bulbs. We can make sure that we don’t have those drafts going through our homes. I think that because this is an initiative of the federal government and it’s the federal government that’s insisting

that we go through with this at their rate of timing, then the federal government should step up to the plate and have some of these grants issued to all people in Canada.

DR. PANNU: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. member. I heard her supporting these 12 principles. It seems to me that these 12 principles really would provide a very good framework for implementing Kyoto, not ratifying Kyoto. Is my understanding, therefore, right, that the hon. member's support for all these principles is, in fact, a support for ratifying Kyoto and the moving on to implementation?

THE ACTING SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Red Deer-North.

MRS. JABLONSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I do not support the ratification of the Kyoto protocol. I think it's the wrong thing to do; however, I've also been informed time after time that the federal government is going to ratify. So instead of pouting or sitting back and saying, "I'm not going to play with you anymore," then I think that we're doing the right thing by saying, "If we have to go through with this, if you're going to do this, then at least recognize what all of your provinces and all of your territories" – and, you know, every single Canadian lives in a province or territory – "have said and what they've agreed to, and at least let us have that much input to something we don't agree with."

MR. HUTTON: I'd like to ask the hon. Member for Red Deer-North if her constituents have been contacting her with regard to the Kyoto protocol and if they are supportive of it at all?

THE ACTING SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Red Deer-North.

MRS. JABLONSKI: Thank you. I have been contacted by a number of my constituents, and the majority of my constituents are not in favour of the Kyoto protocol. As you know, the MP from the Red Deer area is Bob Mills – is he still standing? – and he is breaking records in the House of Commons to let the people of Canada know what the people in Red Deer and central Alberta think of the Kyoto agreement.

THE ACTING SPEAKER: Hon. Member for Calgary-Currie, are you rising with a question?

MR. LORD: No.

THE ACTING SPEAKER: There being no further questions, the hon. Member for Edmonton-Highlands has been . . .

MR. MASON: I have a question if there's still time, Mr. Speaker.

THE ACTING SPEAKER: Yes.

MR. MASON: To the hon. Member for Red Deer-North: does that mean that the hon. member supports filibusters by the opposition when they feel that something is seriously wrong with what the government is proposing?

MRS. JABLONSKI: Mr. Speaker, when it becomes necessary to repeat over and over and over again to people who have a hearing problem, I would agree with a filibuster.

THE ACTING SPEAKER: The chair now recognizes the hon. Member for Edmonton-Highlands.

MR. MASON: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to speak to this particular resolution. I must indicate that I really had hoped to ask that question of a minister, because the great glee with which members opposite are following the filibuster in the House of Commons fills me with hope that we may, in fact, at some point be able to match the performance of the hon. member. [interjections] One can always try; can't one? That certainly gives us something to shoot towards, and we'll see how the government likes it.

Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by talking a little bit about the path not chosen by Alberta about 12 years ago. There's a report that has been circulated and tabled in the House called *A Discussion Paper on the Potential For Reducing CO₂ Emissions In Alberta, 1988-2005*. It was produced by the energy efficiency branch of the Alberta Department of Energy in September of 1990. That energy efficiency branch was one of the first victims of the cuts by the Klein government in the early and middle 1990s.

AN HON. MEMBER: Whose government, Brian?

MR. MASON: That was the Klein government.

MS HALEY: You referred to people by their names here instead of their ridings.

MR. MASON: Then I apologize, Mr. Speaker. The current regime.

There are a couple of points, Mr. Speaker, that are interesting. The summary of results from this report indicated that retrofit energy conservation measures in 1998 could achieve a savings of 250 PJ of fossil fuels and 21,639 gigawatts of electrical energy. The capital cost of doing so would be \$6.7 billion and would result in a first-year saving of \$2.2 billion per year. The average payback of the investment would be 3.1 years.

It goes on to say that adding future energy savings potential, the province's 2005 total fossil fuel use would grow by 11 percent of the 1988 level, down from an estimated growth of 38 percent with no energy conservation measures. I might add, Mr. Speaker, that that was a fairly accurate prediction because, in fact, there were no serious energy conservation measures adopted when this report was produced. Electrical use would decrease by 48 percent of 1988 levels by 2005. The overall result would be a net decrease in Alberta's energy use.

So we see, Mr. Speaker, that, in fact, the government's own report 12 years ago showed that Kyoto targets could easily have been met with a substantial saving to the Alberta government. It leaves us wondering why the government is trying to create the impression among Albertans that implementing Kyoto now would have a devastating effect on Alberta's economy. This is the road that the government chose not to take and thereby, by following the other fork in the road, have landed us in the position that we now find ourselves.

The second point I want to make, Mr. Speaker, is that the federal government also chose the easy road at the time. Even though the federal government participated in a series of discussions internationally and ultimately in negotiation of the Kyoto accord, they have failed since that time to take any significant efforts either. With these efforts that Alberta could have taken, the results would have been magnified tenfold by the federal government had they also taken action at that time.

The federal government has also failed to engage the entire country, including the provinces, in a serious negotiation and discussion about the future of the country under climate change. The federal government bears, in our view, a very significant responsibility for the current serious situation that has arisen around Kyoto. Only at the last minute did they start doing any advertising

or communication about the accord. Now, Mr. Speaker, it's not good enough on an issue of this much seriousness to wait until the Grey Cup to start talking to Canadians about the effect of climate change. So we certainly think that the federal government is as culpable in this situation as this provincial government.

Now, I certainly think that we should be working co-operatively, in a co-operative federal manner, and I will say one thing in the federal government's defence, and that is that the provincial government of Alberta has waged guerrilla warfare against the Kyoto accord. They claim to want a made-in-Canada solution, but what they really want, Mr. Speaker, is just to kill the Kyoto accord. That's always what they've wanted, and they don't want to hear how it could be implemented in a way that would not damage the economy of this province. They simply want to kill it. So you have to ask yourself who they're acting on behalf of, whether or not they're actually acting for the people of Alberta or whether they are acting on behalf of oil companies based in Texas.

4:30

The government strategy of guerilla warfare has involved resigning from federal bodies that are charged with assessing economic impacts of Kyoto long before the federal government indicated that it was prepared to unilaterally ratify the treaty. It has involved things as crude as portraying chance meetings in hotel lobbies with federal ministers as international snubs designed to destroy relationships with the province of Alberta.

Now, I want to deal with Bill 32 for just a minute, Mr. Speaker. I find that it's very curious that this bill, which would have had to pass through committee stage and would have allowed extended opportunities such as those that have been grasped by the federal member for Red Deer – it has been now indicated that they're going to let this supposedly flagship piece of legislation die on the Order Paper. Why is that? They introduced this bill as if it was the centrepiece of Alberta strategy to fight the implementation of Kyoto, and now they're just going to quietly let it die after second reading, and instead they brought forward this particular resolution.

Well, I think the first thing is that there would have been an opportunity for the opposition to present amendments and to debate it at some length, and the government doesn't want that to happen. But I also think that it is such a flimsy piece of legislation that it would have been laughed out of the courts. For example, the whereas clause:

Whereas carbon dioxide and methane are natural resources, are not toxic under atmospheric conditions and are inextricably linked with the management of other renewable and non-renewable natural resources, including sinks,

and then corresponding clauses in the legislation claim that as these are so-called natural resources, the government of Alberta therefore owns them. That this is going to provide the basis of a constitutional challenge is, quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, a complete joke. If you want to use carbon dioxide in an industrial process, you might be able to make the case, but of course 99 percent of CO₂ is going to continue to be released into the atmosphere as a nontoxic waste product, and no court, not even one in Alberta appointed by this government, would accept such a ludicrous proposition. So I think the government saw that the bill that they had indicated was their key and paramount piece of legislation in their strategy for dealing with Kyoto was laughable, and as a result they're going to let it die.

But suppose I'm wrong, Mr. Speaker. Suppose it is, in fact, a really important piece of Alberta strategy. Then why would the government let this particular piece of legislation die if it's so critical to the future of this province at this very, very critical juncture for Alberta and for the country?

[The Speaker in the chair]

I want to indicate, Mr. Speaker, that the resolution before us is a substitute for the first failed attempt of the government to launch a pro-Kyoto strategy. It served, I suppose, rather well as a forum for the Premier to stand in this Assembly and make attacks on the opposition and on the federal government and to encourage Albertans to be dissatisfied with the federal government. I think that the government's actions in this regard have been irresponsible and have stirred up a lot of anti-Canadian sentiment in this province completely unnecessarily.

Now, there are 12 principles contained in the resolution, and it may surprise some members opposite to know that we've gone through them in our caucus, and we are of the view that we can support these 12 principles. There are some that are harder to swallow than others, and there are some that are quite excellent as a statement, as we see it, of all of the Premiers and all of the governments of this country. They talk about how the provinces need to be taken into account, in our view, in a plan to implement the Kyoto accord. So if we just took these 12 principles alone, it would indicate, in our view, support for a rational and fair approach to ratifying Kyoto. But the government, of course, doesn't want that, Mr. Speaker, so they have added a 13th principle.

That 13th principle is contained in the "be it resolved" clause where it says: unilateral ratification of Kyoto "in violation of the principles of constitutional law" and so on and so on "that affect matters of exclusive provincial jurisdiction," which they now are calling CO₂ or that require actions by provinces that could be harmful to the economy of Alberta and so on. So they've added a principle. This is not one that the other provinces have agreed to. This is something that they've added as a "be it resolved" clause.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce an amendment to this resolution on behalf of my colleague the hon. Member for Edmonton-Strathcona. I have copies here. It's to amend Government Motion 33. The motion is amended by striking out the final paragraph, beginning "and be it further resolved that this Assembly . . ." I will provide the requisite copies of this particular amendment, which can be distributed now.

Mr. Speaker, would you like to wait while this is being distributed and resume my time at that point?

THE SPEAKER: Well, hon. member, as I understand it, the amendment the member will be circulating essentially says to delete the paragraph contained in Motion 33.

MR. MASON: That is correct.

THE SPEAKER: Well, then, on that basis, you continue with the understanding that nothing can come to a conclusion until all hon. members have a chance to see and study it. Continue.

MR. MASON: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Well, I believe that this 13th principle that the government has slipped into the 12 principles that they actually got agreement from the other Premiers on needs to be deleted, and then we can have a straight-up vote on the 12 principles that the government has suggested we're doing. I believe that my amendment ought to be supported by all hon. members so that we can have a clean and fair vote on whether or not we support the 12 principles that have been provided to us that have been agreed to by the other provinces. Certainly, what the implication of the "be it resolved" clause is is that the provincial government of Alberta would have a veto on any federal treaties and the implementation based on spurious principles that CO₂ is somehow

a natural resource and therefore is subject to Alberta's rights under the Constitution.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think the government has been quite underhanded in how they've drafted this resolution. First, they introduce this big bill, which is used only as a bully pulpit by the Premier to attack people that don't agree with him. Then they let it slide off the Order Paper after second reading, not even to be dealt with in this sitting, and this is supposed to be their flagship piece of legislation. Then they introduce this one supporting the 12 principles, but they add their own language that essentially would give the province a veto.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all hon. members to support this amendment. Thank you.

THE SPEAKER: The hon. Government House Leader on the amendment.

MR. HANCOCK: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I will be very brief on the amendment. What the hon. member is doing by proposing this amendment is suggesting that we can support the 12 principles that all provinces and territories in this country have agreed to unanimously, have stressed must be part of a national plan, but that if the federal government doesn't agree and goes ahead to endorse Kyoto and ignores the 12 principles, we should do nothing about it. It goes without saying that we endorse the principles, and we call on the federal government to incorporate those principles into any ratification process or any national plan with respect to dealing with greenhouse gases and climate change.

By not dealing with those principles, Mr. Speaker, it again goes without saying, because it's one of the constitutional principles that's time honoured in this country, that when you enter into an international agreement that deals with issues that fall within provincial jurisdiction, you consult with the provinces. Obviously if they do not agree with those principles, we cannot agree with any plan that they put forward.

4:40

So it makes sense to ask. It's not underhanded at all, but rather it's logical to add the second "be it resolved," that if they do not seek the consent of the provinces, if they do not consult with the provinces, and if they do not accept the 12 principles that have been unanimously agreed to by the provinces and territories of this country, of course we would denounce the unilateral action of the federal government, and I would urge all members to soundly defeat the amendment.

THE SPEAKER: Under our provisions we have debate now on the amendment, and Standing Order 29(2) still applies, so there can be questions to the hon. Minister of Justice and Attorney General.

Is this under the question side?

MR. MASON: Certainly, Mr. Speaker. Yes. It certainly is.

THE SPEAKER: Proceed.

MR. MASON: Can the minister point out to us anywhere in the 12 principles that provides for an individual province on its own to essentially veto a federal treaty?

MR. HANCOCK: Well, Mr. Speaker, it has nothing to do with an individual province vetoing a federal treaty. It's a number of provinces, in fact all of the provinces and the territories, who have agreed that all of these principles ought to be included in any

national plan. The federal government has not accepted to date that all 12 principles ought to be included. Therefore, it's a unilateral plan that they have, and they ought to be denounced as they are being denounced, as I understand it, on an ongoing basis by the Member for Red Deer, who's still on his feet debating this issue in the federal Parliament of Canada and bringing to the attention of the federal Parliament of Canada that they ought to take into account these 12 principles.

THE SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Highlands.

MR. MASON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Can the Justice minister and Government House Leader interpret for us the resolves that are being proposed to be deleted and whether or not it would give the province of Alberta the authority on its own to veto federal treaties, a power that Alberta does not even have for constitutional changes?

MR. HANCOCK: Well, Mr. Speaker, that's not the interpretation of the clause at all. The clause says: "in the absence of agreement on a national plan by provinces and territories" – the straight, clear wording of the clause – "denounces any unilateral ratification by the federal government of the Kyoto protocol in violation of the principles of constitutional law." It couldn't be clearer on the face of it that we're not talking about a veto power. What we're talking about is the federal government, before it ratifies any international treaty dealing with greenhouse gases and climate change, agreeing with the provinces and adhering to the 12 principles that are there and, if they don't agree with those 12 principles, at least consulting with the provinces, which is their constitutional duty.

THE SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Highlands.

MR. MASON: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister, then, define for the Assembly what an agreement on a national plan is? How many provinces need to have bought into it before it's an agreement?

MR. HANCOCK: Well, Mr. Speaker, this one is easy. All of the provinces and territories have agreed to the 12 principles that need to be included in a national plan. So the only one that needs to come to the table now is the federal government, and they ought to come to the table very quickly because all the rest of the provinces and territories are in agreement with what needs to be in the plan.

THE SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Highlands.

MR. MASON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. With respect, the minister didn't answer the question. It says, "In the absence of agreement on a national plan." Is he saying that if the federal government agrees to these 12 points, then we have a national agreement?

MR. HANCOCK: That would be obvious, Mr. Speaker. All of the provinces and territories have agreed to these 12 principles being the basis of a national plan. If the federal government agreed, I guess we'd have a national plan.

MR. MASON: Okay. That's simple.

THE SPEAKER: Continuing, then, on the debate on the amendment. The hon. Member for Edmonton-Strathcona.

DR. PANNU: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to speak to the amendment. The motion before us is clearly a two-part motion. The

justification for the amendment and speaking in support of the amendment requires me to talk about both parts because they are related. Certainly they are part of the motion before us.

The first part of the motion, of course, asked the Legislative Assembly to endorse the 12 principles agreed to by the provinces and territories on October 28 “to provide the basis for the development of a national climate change action plan.” Since October 28, whenever I have been asked, I have said that I support these 12 principles as a basis for a national climate change plan. In fact, many of the 12 principles mirror the positions taken by the New Democrat opposition in the Kyoto position paper that we released this last September.

For example, principle 1 says that “Canadians must have an opportunity for full and informed input into the development” of a climate change plan. We agree. We state that in our position paper. In fact, in my speech on Bill 32 yesterday afternoon I tore a strip off the federal government. It’s been five years since the federal government signed on to the Kyoto protocol, which is the global community response to the threat posed by human-induced climate change. Yet it is only in the past few weeks that the federal government began communicating with Canadians on the importance of taking meaningful action to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, which are contributing to global warming. To be blunt, the federal Liberals have blown it when it comes to exercising responsible leadership on the climate change issue, Mr. Speaker.

The New Democrats strongly support principle 2, which requires that “no region or jurisdiction shall be asked to bear an unreasonable burden,” and they should be treated fairly. We agree, and we have been saying this from day 1. Instead of mindless opposition and scare mongering, we have urged the provincial Tories to defend Alberta’s interests when it comes to the implementation of the Kyoto protocol.

Principle 3, Mr. Speaker, says that “the plan must respect provincial and territorial jurisdiction.” Again, we agree absolutely. At the same time, we have been critical of the Tories’ attempt through Bill 32 to claim provincial ownership of environmental pollutants.

Principle 4 says that any plan must recognize “real emission reductions” achieved by forward-looking companies since 1990. We agree. We believe that companies like Suncor and BP should not be penalized for being proactive in reducing emissions compared to companies like Talisman and Imperial Oil, that have been dragging their heels.

Principles 5, 6 and 7 deal with federal and provincial matters when it comes to intergovernmental agreements, bearing financial risks, and benefits of agricultural and forest carbon sinks. One positive win for Canada in the negotiations of the Kyoto protocol and mechanisms was the recognition that our agricultural and forest lands capture carbon and, therefore, contribute to fighting climate change. In fact, the recognition of carbon sinks will take us 10 percent or more on the path to meeting our Kyoto targets.

Principles 8 and 9 say that any climate change plan must support innovation, new technology, and improving economic competitiveness. Couldn’t agree more, Mr. Speaker, with this principle. The Alberta-based Pembina Institute has published an excellent study detailing how meeting greenhouse reduction targets will spur innovation, development of new technology, and thereby improve the underlying competitiveness of the Canadian and Alberta economies. The Pembina Institute study also points out that when previous environmental agreements were being negotiated – such as the ban on leaded gasoline, the ban on CFCs to protect the ozone layer, and the UN/Canada acid rain treaty – powerful vested interests predicted economic doom. What actually happened is that the costs of meeting those targets set out in the above treaties were way lower

than the critics said they would be. More importantly, these treaties not only reduced pollution; they spurred innovation and improved our economic competitiveness.

We do not oppose principle 10, which urges the federal government to “demand [the] recognition of clean energy exports.” However, I must point out that it would be much easier for Canada to achieve the recognition if the Bush administration reversed its position and ratified Kyoto. That’s because most of our clean energy exports go to the U.S.

Finally, principles 11 and 12 advocate using sort of incentives to achieve greenhouse gas reductions, not penalties. We also agree that it’s much better to use a carrot than a stick.

The New Democrats support the first “be it resolved” that endorses the 12 principles, but unfortunately this Tory government couldn’t leave these things well alone. They had to go further. The upshot of the second “be it further resolved” is to prevent the federal government from ratifying the Kyoto protocol unless all of the provinces consent. Even this might be acceptable if the Alberta government were willing, Mr. Speaker, at the end of a successful conclusion of this process to support going forward with Kyoto ratification. But we all know that this is not the case.

4:50

The Tory government’s agenda is not to develop an acceptable Kyoto implementation. The Tory government’s agenda is to kill Kyoto, not to enter into negotiations to seek its ratification on terms that would be acceptable to Alberta. That is why this second “be it further resolved” is a cynical ploy. I should remind members that had such a provision been in place during the free trade debate, that particular agreement would never have been signed. More than one province was opposed to the free trade agreement, yet the Mulroney government moved forward with it. The same thing applies to the UN convention on the rights of the child, which the Alberta government opposed prior to its federal ratification. We can’t support the second “be it further resolved”. It’s that simple, Mr. Speaker.

That is why I speak in support of the amendment that was moved on my behalf by the hon. Member for Edmonton-Highlands, and I urge all members to support it.

Thank you.

THE SPEAKER: The provisions of Standing Order 29(2) now kick in, and we will recognize the hon. Member for Edmonton-Highlands in the question portion.

MR. MASON: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Does the leader of the third party and the Member for Edmonton-Strathcona – I believe that the 12 principles are a framework for a discussion of the ratification of the Kyoto accord. Could the Kyoto accord be approved consistent with these 12 principles, in your view?

DR. PANNU: Mr. Speaker, there are 10 provinces and two territories which are partners to this draft of 12 principles. I’m assuming that the government of Quebec and the government of Manitoba, which support ratification of the Kyoto agreement, have signed on to these 12 principles on the assumption that these 12 principles will ultimately provide a reasonable framework not only for ratification but moving beyond that to implementation.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

THE SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Highlands again.

MR. MASON: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I would like to

thank the hon. leader of the third party for that most illuminating and outstanding answer to my question. You don't often get an answer like that in this place.

Now, my second question to the hon. member has to do with whether or not he believes that the Alberta government has ever been serious about the Kyoto accord or climate change, for that matter.

THE SPEAKER: I will recognize the hon. Member for Edmonton-Strathcona to respond, but if that would have been a question in question period, in all likelihood it would have been ruled out because the hon. Member for Edmonton-Highlands is seeking an opinion.

DR. PANNU: Mr. Speaker, before I answer the question, I want to thank the Member for Edmonton-Highlands for the compliments that he was so generous to offer in response to my first answer.

I think the question that my hon. colleague has asked is a very important one. I think Albertans need to know what the Alberta government's position has been on this issue, starting in Rio. This government sent its contingent of ministers there to oppose any steps being taken by the international community in Rio, then it packed up two members to Kyoto to again do the same: to oppose the conclusion by the international community of an agreement, of an accord which we now know as the Kyoto protocol.

This government had never any intention – quite the contrary, it had every intention to oppose and defeat any action taken globally by the international community to deal with global warming, which indeed, Mr. Speaker, is a global problem. I regret to mention this: the behaviour of this government on this issue has been anything but honest and honourable.

Thank you.

MS DeLONG: I would like to ask the hon. member whether he thinks it's more important to pay lip service to the environment or to clean up the environment. The Alberta government has been exemplary in cleaning up our air and cleaning up our water, and we have actually done it as opposed to what's happening with Kyoto, where it's all a bunch of hot air and CO₂.

THE SPEAKER: The question is to the hon. Member for Edmonton-Strathcona. We still have 38 seconds.

DR. PANNU: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member's question is rhetorical. I think we are talking about greenhouse gas emissions. The issue of greenhouse gas emissions is one on which there is powerful scientific evidence and advice, and that is that greenhouse gas emissions stand in and by themselves as a serious threat to economic well-being, to our environmental well-being, and the scientific warrant for making that statement is so powerful, so overwhelming that there's no room for any questions on this. So I say to the member that the GEs are a serious issue, and the government of Alberta is afraid to do anything about it.

Thank you.

THE SPEAKER: We're back to the debate on the amendment to the motion. Well, the question is being called. Then we'll now proceed to the debate with respect to this. We are now on an amendment to Motion 33, an amendment moved by the hon. Member for Edmonton-Highlands on behalf of the hon. Member for Edmonton-Strathcona.

[Motion on amendment lost]

THE SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Calgary-Currie.

MR. LORD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my great pleasure to rise today to speak to one of the many and perhaps more controversial issues of our time: the worldwide climate change debate surrounding the Kyoto protocol and how it relates to the 12 climate change principles that are before us today.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard a lot of discussion and debate on this issue. The facts of this or any other matter are that no one – no one – ever has a monopoly on the truth: not us, not them. But unfortunately, as is often the case, sometimes some think they do, and this makes it much more difficult for us as a society to find the best way to proceed in a focused and united manner. In cases like this I am mindful of a quote attributed to Vaclav Havel which states, "Follow those who seek the truth but flee from those who have found it."

Having heard much of this debate and, beyond that, having had quite a bit of background history dealing with these issues personally, Mr. Speaker, I have reached the conclusion that it would be far better for the federal government to not ratify the Kyoto protocol at this time or, at the very least, until such time as Canadians coast to coast have had a chance to start developing some sort of informed national consensus on how it is to be handled and until such time as the investor and consumer uncertainties which have been created by this argument have been alleviated and confidence in our economy and in our abilities to meet this challenge restored. Federal government acceptance of the 12 principles before us today would go a long way towards doing exactly that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I know there are many who are disappointed with our government's position and worry that Canada might even end up getting blamed by the entire world for cratering Kyoto, since apparently our vote is a very critical one. Not surprisingly, we have seen a lot of emotional, angry opposition to our position; however, I have observed that this opposition mostly tends to start with an assumption that we Alberta politicians on this side of the House are neither intelligent nor competent, that we haven't done our homework on this issue, and that somehow we need to be educated on the facts. Well, nothing could be further from the truth. Any person who attempts to influence a government starting with an assumption that we lack intelligence because we do not share their point of view is making a serious error in judgment, in my opinion. I believe that there's not one single person in this entire Assembly – and I'll graciously include all members of the opposition parties in that – who is not blessed with exceptional intelligence. They simply would never have been elected otherwise. Besides, starting with a position of respect for everyone is always more effective than not, in my view.

5:00

We as a government have reached our conclusions about Kyoto not out of a base of ignorance but rather out of a base of experience, of knowledge, and of a caring viewpoint that encompasses a wide rather than a narrow range of stakeholder concerns. Of course, having said that, I realize that federal government politicians may well want to give us the same advice about them but perhaps I should add: there are always exceptions to every rule.

Mr. Speaker, I decided that it might be helpful in my comments today to put forward a few of the best points on both sides of this argument to demonstrate that we have reached our conclusions in a thoughtful and balanced manner. After all, I agree that anyone who cannot argue both sides of an issue equally well probably does not fully understand the issue and may have lost some perspective, and that is a dangerous thing. In fact, the first test of anyone you suspect of being a zealot is to first ask them if they can argue the other side of the issue, to see if they can do that. Almost always they cannot.

That's to prove that this government has in fact carefully looked at both sides of the argument and to let zealots know that we really don't need any new lectures from them.

Here are some of the main Kyoto arguments for and against that I think are pertinent. To start with, it has been put forward by Kyoto advocates that over 100 Nobel laureates and, beyond them, a huge body of literally thousands of scientists worldwide warn us that climate change is real and the earth is warming, and there's no doubt that many perceive, whether it be true or not, that the weather is being a little weird. It, in fact, is reported here in Alberta that the measurable water flow of the Peace River is apparently down 35 percent from its long-term average, the South Saskatchewan down 53 percent, and the North Saskatchewan down 62 percent. It's reported that weird weather has already cost us about \$16 billion across Canada in the last 10 years. Of course we're concerned about these sorts of reports, and of course we realize that, you know, there are a number of other observations by serious scientists with serious credentials who make a strong case that the earth is warming and it could have significant impacts on all life.

All that may well be true, but there are a number of other possible explanations for that other than just greenhouse gases. For example – and I'll just give one of the many examples – there's a new geothermal theory that has just been put forward by experts on the subject postulating that at the centre of the earth, rather than just molten silica, iron, and nickel, there may be, in fact, a 5-mile-wide ball of uranium drawn there by its heavier weight, which in its density may now be fissioning in a nuclear manner similar to what the sun does, only slower. Clearly, such a process would generate tremendous heat and greatly vary in temperature; thus, eventually the surface of the planet would vary greatly as well.

This theory also explains a number of other mysteries that have remained unsolved by the greenhouse gas theory. While this theory may not be generally accepted yet nor even heard of by most and, frankly, may not be correct, it does prove that there are plausible alternative explanations for global warming. It may well be the case that mankind is expending enormous time, money, and energy fighting the wrong battle entirely, which may in itself have disastrous consequences.

Furthermore, it doesn't take a lot of research into past history to find cases of where large bodies of credible scientists turned out to be very wrong, almost so much so, in fact, that some consider it the norm. For contrarians, which I admit to being, the moment we sense that there's a bit of a bandwagon going on, a bit of herd thinking acting up, well, I can't help but suspect that the truth may well lie in the opposite direction. History and the stock market provide lots of evidence of cases where this was true. So this is not a sufficient reason to blindly support Kyoto, the fact that there are large numbers of scientists that think it explains the mysteries of global warming, if it exists.

Next, it has been argued by Kyoto proponents that the Kyoto protocol does not contain any penalties, that we can unilaterally withdraw without penalty, et cetera. In other words: what are we afraid of? Well, it may be true that the Kyoto protocol isn't really much more than international puffery from a legal standpoint, and this is even understandable given the near impossibility of trying to get hundreds of sovereign nations to reach consensus on anything. But we must also remember that Canada's reputation and credibility are at stake here, and signing on with absolutely no intention of doing anything just because we couldn't be forced to legally is basically dishonest. It risks earning us worldwide scorn and further loss of credibility, maybe even more than what not signing might likely earn us. Thus, we should not ratify if our only expectation is to just withdraw at a later date. We may get European boycotts in

that case. We may get them either way. It's just not a sufficient reason to ratify Kyoto.

Thirdly, our government has been criticized for fear mongering, for saying that the Kyoto protocol is driven by a desire to see massive transfers of wealth to Third World countries, for example. Well, it doesn't actually rule that out, and it is true, we will admit, that the emission-trading idea was basically forwarded not as a penalty but rather as an incentive to inspire nations to try and exceed their Kyoto targets. In fact, it's also true that many Third World countries actually vigorously opposed the emission trading credit idea on the basis that they thought rich countries would just use the program to easily buy their way out of their commitments and not actually have to do anything. While it even may be true that there have been a number of voices calling for heavy penalties, calling for massive international wealth transfers, calling for international enforcement and Kyoto cops, et cetera, well, those voices did not carry the day of the initial agreement and are in the minority and likely will not convince the majority at any time in the future.

I can understand why some might say: well, you're fear mongering. The reality is: how else do we as Canadians fight this? Can we actually afford to sit back, do nothing, and gamble? Or more importantly, will consumers and investors gamble on how the federal government may interpret and implement this document within Canada? Will investors invest not knowing what an outgoing Prime Minister might do in terms of international wealth transfers, putting future Canadians' good names on the line for commitments that he will not actually have to be around to honour? Even if despite his dismal past track record in environmental issues to the point of reportedly even punishing backbenchers who promoted green issues in the past and even if we believed his intentions are honourable, we must still remember that investment capital is the world's greatest coward. It trusts almost no one. It always runs at the first sign of trouble, and trouble and lack of trust within Canada is what the federal government has wrought here and failed to address or even recognize even after five years.

Fourthly – and I could actually go on for hours with this debate, but we're only allowed 15 minutes – we have been accused of doing little or nothing, of not knowing of the benefits that would accrue from Kyoto. Actually, Alberta leads the nation on a number of energy conservation fronts, and those projects were started before Kyoto ever came along. Soon we'll also lead the nation in alternative energy generation in windmills. We have lots to celebrate here, even brag about, not apologize for, and not surprisingly either, considering that Albertans have been turning obstacles into opportunities better than almost anybody for almost a century now. Entrepreneurs in Alberta are among the best of the best if not the best anywhere, but they don't need any extra burdens. They are heavily burdened already.

As to comments about our government being influenced only by big oil or big coal, well, anyone can quickly see that our made-in-Canada proposal contains strong penalties, strong enforcement, strong regulations, none of which the Kyoto plan does. In fact, by bringing this subject up in such a vigorous manner, one could well observe that it actually has not helped big oil or big coal companies' share prices at all. So if this is big oil's plan, I could hardly say that it has been successful for them. In fact, quite the opposite, and they may well have preferred the federal government's mystery plan to what the strong regulations we are proposing would have in store for them instead. Clearly, that argument doesn't stand up to much scrutiny either. Besides, the world's two largest oil companies are already exceeding the Kyoto commitments, so why would they care or be trying to influence us?

To conclude, Mr. Speaker, we do know this argument well, and we have made our conclusions accordingly. The fate of this issue

now rests in the hands of one individual. Let us pray he makes the correct decision for all.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

THE SPEAKER: Hon. members, Standing Order 29(2) now kicks in. 5:10

MR. OUELLETTE: Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure for me to rise today and speak to this present motion. The Kyoto protocol and the implications of its ratification are certainly issues that concern the majority of Albertans and a great many Canadians, and I am very glad to be able to offer my thoughts on the debate.

It is important to note at the outset of this debate that no one in the provincial government is questioning the merits of taking action on reducing greenhouse gas emissions. For the past 10 years the government of Alberta has proven itself to be a leader on this issue. No one in this nation can deny the leadership role that this province has taken in addressing this issue with more than just words and promises. In fact, I am very proud to be a part of Climate Change Central, a key government initiative that has been in operation since 1999 and that continues to bring together environmentalists, researchers, academics, industry and government representatives to address the problems of climate change. All of us are focused on reducing greenhouse gas emissions in Alberta through public education and outreach, policy advice, and demonstration products.

Alberta continues to prove itself as a leader on the issue of climate change. The present debate on the merits of the Kyoto protocol is in large part driven by Alberta's belief that the Kyoto protocol is wrong: wrong for this province, wrong for this nation, and wrong for the environment. But rather than listen to the concerns of Alberta and work with the government on a constructive solution, the federal government has simply closed its ears and mind to any contrary thought on this issue and has gone on to ignore the concrete actions that this government has undertaken to establish its roles and responsibilities in addressing greenhouse gas emissions. This is the fundamental problem that this motion works to address, 12 principles that call on the federal government to sincerely engage the provinces on the legitimate concerns they have on the Kyoto protocol.

Mr. Speaker, one can clearly differentiate between the reaction from other provincial governments and that of the federal government in this matter. From our fellow provincial governments the Alberta government has received support and encouragement, even from those governments who support the eventual ratification of the Kyoto protocol. That support and respect for the right to hold our position can be seen in the 12 principles that we are debating here today. These principles speak to the basic tenets of Confederation and our Constitution, principles that clearly state that no region should bear an unreasonable share of the burden of a federal government policy, that Ottawa must respect provincial and territorial jurisdiction, that agreements between the provinces and territories must be recognized by Ottawa. These principles agreed to by all provinces and territories are the result of negotiation and a healthy dose of respect for the different positions and unique considerations that each province must deal with. I must stress again that these principles were unanimously agreed to by all provinces and territories regardless of policy position on Kyoto.

What is the federal government's reaction to our position on Kyoto and the 12 principles we are debating today here in this motion? Mr. Speaker, at best it is an all-consuming arrogance that seems to pervade the entire federal cabinet. At worst it is a dangerous attitude of indifference which threatens the ties of Confederation. It is unacceptable for the federal government to blatantly

ignore the real and meaningful objections that many Canadians hold regarding this treaty. It is unacceptable for the federal government to promise a meaningful national dialogue and turn around and disdainfully order Parliament to support ratification. It is totally unacceptable for the federal government, which holds the fundamental responsibility to act on behalf of all Canadians, to ignore and vilify a particular province out of sheer political considerations.

Well, Mr. Speaker, Alberta's concerns with respect to the Kyoto protocol are legitimate, and we will not back down in protecting this province. The 12 principles that we are debating here today work toward addressing the legitimate concerns that we hold. For instance, for some nations the average emissions reduction requirement of 5.2 percent under Kyoto has already been accomplished. Russia's greenhouse gases, or then known as the Soviet Union, peaked in 1990. As a result of the collapse of the Soviet Union and its economy, greenhouse gas emissions have steadily fallen since that time, and Russia will not have to actually cut emissions to achieve its Kyoto targets.

Under Kyoto Russia and other such nations will be able to benefit significantly from the sale of hot air allowances; in essence, selling credits to other industrialized nations like Canada that are significantly above their Kyoto requirements. Also, because the European nations signed on to the Kyoto accord as a bloc of nations, it is expected that Canada's European industrialized competitors, such as the United Kingdom, France, and Germany, will benefit from the inclusion of eastern European nations with excess hot air allowances, such as Poland, the Czech Republic, and Hungary. These nations will not have to restructure their economies to the point that Canada and Alberta would be required to do under Kyoto. Mr. Speaker, is the federal government answering these concerns?

As well, Albertans know that not all nations are constrained by the Kyoto protocol. In fact, the countries constrained by Kyoto represent only about 30 percent of the world's greenhouse gas emissions. Since none of the highest emissions growth countries, including China and India, would be subject to Kyoto constraints, before long that 30 percent could fall as low as 25 percent or less. As Gwynn Morgan, one of Alberta's pre-eminent business leaders, has pointed out, the countries making commitments under Kyoto are economies with the lowest population growths and are already relatively efficient producers or users of energy. By signing Kyoto, these nations like Canada take on cost burdens which hinder growth and competitiveness while new growth investments are transferred to countries not constrained by Kyoto. Once again, Mr. Speaker, how is the federal government answering these concerns?

The benefits that Canada and the world might achieve under Kyoto are also being questioned by the scientific community. A model by Tom Wigley, one of the main authors of the report of the United Nations climate change panel, shows how an expected temperature increase of 2.1 degrees Celsius in the year 2100 would be diminished by the Kyoto protocol to an increase of 1.9 degrees Celsius instead. Or put another way, the global temperature increase that the planet would have experienced in 2094 would be postponed to 2100 – six years, Mr. Speaker, at the cost of billions of dollars that could be directed at other environmental initiatives. Yet on this and so many other problems one has to wonder: where is the federal government in answering these concerns? Unfortunately, these issues are ignored and relegated to being concerns of a provincial government only worried with the bottom line.

That is why these 12 principles are so important. They simply try to force the federal government into doing its job: working towards a better Canada and respecting the concerns of all regions and all provinces. As Canadians we should expect no less from our national government. It is a sad commentary on the state of the nation that

it takes a motion such as this, that endorses 12 basic principles, to try and force the federal government to listen to its own people. But, Mr. Speaker, if a motion is needed, then so be it.

I would encourage all members of this Assembly to vote in support of this motion and send a signal to the federal government that it is time for it to listen to the concerns of Canadians. Thank you.

5:20

THE SPEAKER: Hon. Member for Edmonton-Glenora, I take it you're now participating under Standing Order 29(2)?

MR. HUTTON: I am, Mr. Speaker.

THE SPEAKER: Please proceed.

MR. HUTTON: Thank you. Obviously, the Member for Innisfail-Sylvan Lake has spoken eloquently opposing Kyoto, and I'm wondering if he has heard from a number of his constituents with regard to this protocol.

MR. OUELLETTE: You know, I've heard from a number of my constituents. I have a number of constituents that work in the oil patch, and they're saying things like: "We've had \$25 to \$30 a barrel of oil all year, we've spiked at \$6 in gas, and we have less than 25 percent of our rigs working. What's going on?" We've already affected our economy like this. Let's get on with the show here.

MR. HUTTON: And have you heard from any of your constituents that are supporting the protocol, hon. member, through the Speaker?

MR. OUELLETTE: Everyone is supporting us not ratifying.

THE SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice and Attorney General.

MR. HANCOCK: Yes. Mr. Speaker, I'm wondering if I might ask the hon. member, given that he's had such a rousing speech and aroused our enthusiasm, whether he might consider moving adjournment of debate.

MR. OUELLETTE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to adjourn debate.

THE SPEAKER: Well, I'm afraid, hon. member, that that is just physically impossible under our rules. Under Standing Order 29(2) the hon. member had the debate, and we're now participating under the question-and-answer segment. We'll deal with that, and then we'll recognize another member who can then deal with the adjournment.

Additional questions under 29(2)?

MS HALEY: Mr. Speaker, if there are no more questions under 29(2), I would move that we adjourn debate.

[Motion to adjourn debate carried]

THE SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice and Attorney General.

MR. HANCOCK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would move that we adjourn until 8 this evening.

[Motion carried; the Assembly adjourned at 5:24 p.m.]