



Province of Alberta

The 29th Legislature  
Fourth Session

# Alberta Hansard

Monday afternoon, April 16, 2018

Day 17

The Honourable Robert E. Wanner, Speaker

## Legislative Assembly of Alberta The 29th Legislature

### Fourth Session

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

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

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

### Party standings:

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

### Officers and Officials of the Legislative Assembly

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

### **Executive Council**

Rachel Notley	Premier, President of Executive Council
Sarah Hoffman	Deputy Premier, Minister of Health
Shaye Anderson	Minister of Municipal Affairs
Deron Bilous	Minister of Economic Development and Trade
Oneil Carlier	Minister of Agriculture and Forestry
Joe Ceci	President of Treasury Board and Minister of Finance
David Eggen	Minister of Education
Richard Feehan	Minister of Indigenous Relations
Kathleen T. Ganley	Minister of Justice and Solicitor General
Christina Gray	Minister of Labour, Minister Responsible for Democratic Renewal
Sandra Jansen	Minister of Infrastructure
Danielle Larivee	Minister of Children's Services
Brian Mason	Minister of Transportation
Margaret McCuaig-Boyd	Minister of Energy
Stephanie V. McLean	Minister of Service Alberta, Minister of Status of Women
Ricardo Miranda	Minister of Culture and Tourism
Brandy Payne	Associate Minister of Health
Shannon Phillips	Minister of Environment and Parks, Minister Responsible for the Climate Change Office
Irfan Sabir	Minister of Community and Social Services
Marlin Schmidt	Minister of Advanced Education
Lori Sigurdson	Minister of Seniors and Housing

### **Parliamentary Secretaries**

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

## STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

### **Standing Committee on the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund**

Chair: Mr. Coolahan  
Deputy Chair: Mrs. Schreiner

Clark	Horne
Cyr	McKitrick
Dang	Turner
Ellis	

### **Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future**

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

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

### **Standing Committee on Families and Communities**

Chair: Ms Goehring  
Deputy Chair: Mr. Smith

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

### **Standing Committee on Legislative Offices**

Chair: Mr. Shepherd  
Deputy Chair: Mr. Malkinson

Aheer	Littlewood
Drever	Pitt
Gill	van Dijken
Horne	Woollard
Kleinsteinuber	

### **Special Standing Committee on Members' Services**

Chair: Mr. Wanner  
Deputy Chair: Cortes-Vargas

Cooper	Nixon
Dang	Piquette
Jabbour	Pitt
Luff	Schreiner
McIver	

### **Standing Committee on Private Bills**

Chair: Ms Kazim  
Deputy Chair: Connolly

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

### **Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, Standing Orders and Printing**

Chair: Ms Fitzpatrick  
Deputy Chair: Ms Babcock

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

### **Standing Committee on Public Accounts**

Chair: Mr. Cyr  
Deputy Chair: Mr. Dach

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

### **Standing Committee on Resource Stewardship**

Chair: Loyola  
Deputy Chair: Mr. Drysdale

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

## Legislative Assembly of Alberta

1:30 p.m.

Monday, April 16, 2018

[The Speaker in the chair]

### Prayers

**The Speaker:** Good afternoon.

Hon. members, let us, each in our own way, reflect or pray on our commonalities and not on our differences. Now more than ever it is time for collaborative work for the good of Alberta and of all of our nations. Let us let our deliberations today be guided by the reminder that we as Members of the Alberta Legislative Assembly have a responsibility to ensure that Albertans, our province, and indeed our nation must always succeed.

Hon. members, ladies and gentlemen, we will now be led in the singing of our national anthem by Mr. R.J. Chambers.

**Hon. Members:**

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

**The Speaker:** Thank you. Please be seated.

### Introduction of Guests

**The Speaker:** The hon. Premier.

**Ms Notley:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to rise in order to introduce to you and through you 21 wonderful students who are visiting us today from Garneau school, which is a very old and traditional and long-standing school in the city of Edmonton, in the heart of my riding. They are accompanied by their teachers, Miss Carly Bowman and Mrs. Kristine Peters, and also their chaperone, Mr. Zabaneh. I certainly hope that all members will join me as they rise and receive the warm welcome of the Assembly.

**The Speaker:** The hon. Member for Barrhead-Morinville-Westlock.

**Mr. van Dijken:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to introduce to you and through you to all members of the Assembly 29 students from the Covenant Canadian Reformed School in Neerlandia. The students are accompanied by their teacher, Corlisa Pietersma, along with their chaperones, Karen Schouten, Marcia Van Grootheest, Benita Dejong, Sharlene Hamoen, Francine Schouten, Mel Hooimeyer, and Jelte Jagersma. I ask that they please rise and receive the warm and traditional welcome of this Assembly.

**The Speaker:** Hon. members, are there any other school groups?  
Seeing none, the Minister of Agriculture and Forestry.

**Mr. Carlier:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's very much my pleasure to introduce today three visitors: my brother Ervin Carlier from Val Marie, Saskatchewan, and his daughters, my nieces Jeanelle Carlier from Swift Current, Saskatchewan, and Carina Carlier-Sissons from Pincher Creek, Alberta. I would now like my guests to please rise and receive the traditional warm welcome of the Assembly.

**The Speaker:** Welcome.

The hon. Minister of Health and Deputy Premier.

**Ms Hoffman:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Today I have two introductions. It's my absolute pleasure to introduce to you and through you Dr. Ubaka Ogbogu, who is seated in the members' gallery along with his wife and two lovely daughters. Dr. Ogbogu recently has been appointed to the board of directors of the Health Quality Council of Alberta. He's currently an assistant professor with the faculties of Law and pharmacy, and he's a Katz research fellow in health law and science at the University of Alberta. Due to his passion and experience with health policy, we are excited to have him join the excellent HQCA team. To his daughters and wife: I should let you know that in his interview he spoke so much about how proud he is to be your dad and your husband. Please, colleagues, join me in extending the warm welcome. And to your entire family, please rise and receive our warm welcome.

**The Speaker:** Welcome.

The hon. Member for Calgary-East.

**Ms Luff:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's a privilege to rise and introduce to you and through you to all members of the Assembly members of Nadia El-Dib's family. I am amazed at the strength of this family in the face of incredible tragedy, and I will be speaking more about Nadia today in my member's statement. If Sami El-Dib, Joumana El-Dib, Sali El-Dib, Racha El-Dib, and Jana El-Dib could rise and please receive the traditional warm welcome of the Assembly.

**The Speaker:** Welcome.

Any other guests to introduce, hon. member?

**Ms Hoffman:** Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In that cuteness I failed to conclude my second introduction. I am honoured to introduce guests from the Elves Special Needs Society, located in the constituency of Edmonton-Glenora, that I have the honour of representing. They're in the members' gallery. Elves is a well-established nonprofit offering one-of-a-kind service to individuals with disabilities here in the capital region since 1973, serving over 450 individuals and their families from the ages of two and a half and up. Elves has dedicated staff and supportive volunteers who provide a caring, inclusive environment. I now invite Vivienne Bartee, president; Barbara Tymchak Olafson; Mieczyslaw Pogonowski; Candace Scheuer; and Eva Glover to please rise and receive the warm welcome and the appreciation of our Assembly.

**The Speaker:** Welcome.

### Members' Statements

**The Speaker:** The hon. Member for Calgary-East.

#### Nadia El-Dib

**Ms Luff:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Your kindness has touched more people than you will ever know; you made everyone's day shine; thank you for teaching us the true meaning of strength; you will never know how much I will miss you: these are some of the comments from Nadia El-Dib's Facebook page. A beautiful, bubbly, and kind-hearted girl, Nadia was tragically murdered at just 22 years old on March 25 at the hands of a man whom she knew. This is an unspeakable tragedy, and I can't imagine the loss that her family must feel.

Speaking to her sister over the course of last week, the El-Dib family want Nadia to be remembered as the glue that held her family together, as someone who always had a smile on her face, and as a person who lived her life to the fullest. Nadia was well known for her skill with makeup and her incredible photos on social media. Makeup was something that came naturally to Nadia and something that she had a passion for. She was also just figuring out what she wanted to do with her life. She was in her second semester of a legal assistant diploma at SAIT and had dreams of going on to become a lawyer. One of four daughters, Nadia was close with her family. You can see in family photos and videos just how close the girls were and how much they loved each other.

Nadia's family wants to use her tragic story to bring awareness to the issue of violence against women. They encourage any woman who is in an abusive relationship to reach out for help, but they also want more people to talk about the precursors to violence. They want people to talk about what kind of behaviour isn't acceptable from a boyfriend or a man who is pursuing you. They want friends not to be bystanders but to speak up when they notice things that might be red flags. Nadia's death is a huge loss to her family and to her entire community. Hopefully, this tragedy can lead to the prevention of others like it in the future.

To Nadia's family, on behalf of our government I want to extend our sincerest and deepest condolences for the loss of Nadia, and I want you to know that your government stands with you in your efforts to end violence against women and to ensure that every Albertan can one day live free from the fear, threat, or experience of domestic violence.

Thank you.

#### 1:40 Trans Mountain Pipeline Construction Suspension

**Mr. Panda:** Mr. Speaker, Canada is in a constitutional and economic crisis over the Trans Mountain pipeline expansion. Today's Liberals in Ottawa are not the nation-building Liberals of C.D. Howe's time, when the TransCanada pipeline was built. But make no mistake. When you're in such a crisis, your reference document is the Constitution, not the Leap Manifesto.

It is the job of the Official Opposition to proactively identify solutions and offer the government constructive, practical, common-sense suggestions. The NDP and Trudeau Liberals reject our suggestions. When the B.C. NDP was sworn in, we called for consequences if they tried to obstruct the pipeline. The Alberta NDP ridiculed us, but then it became a possibility in the throne speech six months later. The NDP rejected our call for an emergency debate in February. Then the NDP ended the wine ban too early. From using the declaratory powers of section 92(10)(c) of the Constitution to withholding the billions of dollars in infrastructure funding, the best the Liberals and NDP came up with is: let's take an equity position.

Meet the NDP's world travellers: Tzaporah Berman and Karen Mahon, now illegally protesting the pipeline; and Gerald Butts, the PMO's principal secretary, previously with the World Wildlife Fund, part of the Rockefeller-backed campaign to land lock the oil sands. Nothing like manufacturing a crisis and then appearing to act as if to solve it. Is it a coincidence that this is happening in the lead-up to an election year?

The clock is ticking. There are 46 days left to clear the political hurdles to give certainty for Kinder Morgan. Make it happen, Premier.

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

#### Organ and Tissue Donation

**Dr. Turner:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. All Albertans have been struck by the enormity of the tragedy suffered by the Humboldt Broncos team and the families of those injured and killed. Out of that tragedy have come many stories of selflessness and heroism. One story, that of Logan Boulet and family, has resounded around the world. Logan, born and raised in Lethbridge, had recently turned 21. He told his family that he wanted to be an organ donor and he'd signed his donor card. His parents and family honoured his wishes, and six organs were subsequently transplanted. Because of this act, many people are going to be helped. For instance, two Canadians will be able to get off dialysis and lead normal lives.

I want to pay tribute to the Boulet family for setting such a good example for all of us who may have to make the difficult decision to donate a loved one's organs. It's important to remember that the next of kin need to know and appreciate the intent of those who have signed. Logan and his parents have created a legacy which has prompted a massive increase in the signing of donor cards. Over last five days 13,500 Albertans have registered their intent to be organ donors. That's nearly a 10-fold increase.

I also want to recognize another Albertan family for their heroism. Revée Agyepong, 26, of Edmonton, is the first adult in Canada to be cured of sickle-cell anemia. The donor was her sister. Revée had been dealing with the complications from sickle-cell disease since early childhood. Through the efforts of my Edmonton hematology colleagues, the sickle-cell disease had been controlled with frequent transfusions. Now Revée needs no transfusions. The stem cell transplant was done by the Alberta bone marrow transplant program at the Tom Baker cancer centre in Calgary. This team has achieved a first in Canada and continues to provide Albertans with world-class stem cell transplants. The new Calgary cancer centre will incorporate that team.

Mr. Speaker, these events demonstrate the power of family, the benefits of science, and the value of working together to save lives and make life better.

#### Official Opposition and Government Policies

**Mr. Schneider:** Mr. Speaker, Oscar Wilde said that imitation is the sincerest form of flattery, and if that is indeed accurate, we on this side of the aisle have been the recipient of plenty of flattery as of late. It started off with the leaders of the PC and Wildrose parties talking about how there needs to be a conversation about equalization in this country. We've made no bones about our desire to have a national conversation over this. Now media types and politicians of all stripes are echoing these sentiments.

Over here we've been beating the drum on the rural crime epidemic, holding town halls and having legitimate conversations about this time-sensitive topic. Despite turning us down for the last nine months, including holding an emergency debate, the government appears to have come around somewhat. Although they have yet to engage the public themselves, they are at least starting to engage with us. Lots more work to be done on this topic, Mr. Speaker, but at least they're getting to the starting line.

Now, I guess we should really be flattered over here with the fact that although we've been talking tough about the inaction of the federal Liberals, the constant and flagrant disobedience of the law by the B.C. NDP, and the foot-dragging and backtracking by our own government, it appears that concrete action may be forthcoming. A bill will soon be introduced to provide tough economic penalties with real consequences to the B.C. government, a bill that may turn off the taps to energy products to the west coast, which our leader has been calling for for quite some time. While the name could use

some work as Bill 12, Preserving Canada's Economic Prosperity Act, doesn't exactly roll off the tongue, perhaps we can suggest it be called the Official Opposition Suggested This a Year Ago Act. It may actually sell better here in Alberta if this bill is what it was promised to be.

Thank you.

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

### Henson Trusts for Persons with Disabilities

**Mr. Malkinson:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Today I want to update the House on the efforts of so many to bring Henson trust legislation to Alberta. Prior to the dissolution of the last session I tabled Bill 211 to make life better for Albertans on AISH. Unfortunately, Bill 211 did not become law. While I was crushed by this, I soon discovered that I was not alone. No politician hyperbole here; truly, every single day for the last 16 weeks I have received e-mails, phone calls, and office visits from concerned brothers, loving sisters, frustrated fathers, and worried mothers from across this province. AISH recipients have come into my office and left me voice mails.

As Laura put it: this was a simple bill that would make a big difference; it would provide peace of mind. Calgarians Peter and Rose considered the Henson trust "essential legislation" that would allow adult children to live with the same dignity as other Canadians. Jon Chang, who has a neuromuscular developmental disability, wrote to tell me that at age 37 he's anxious about how he'll be able to live when he is 65. He and so many others wrote because they want to make this good bill a good law.

I shared these messages with the Minister of Community and Social Services and spoke with eternal optimism for so many whom I have a duty to speak for. "Please be my son's voice," implored Jordan's mother in an e-mail. That is why I am truly thankful to the Minister of Community and Social Services for recognizing and responding to these calls by introducing Bill 5, An Act to Strengthen Financial Security for Persons with Disabilities.

To all who have contacted me, hear this: we are getting it done. And to anyone whom I've ever spoken with – please excuse the car racing reference – we need to keep our foot on the gas; we need to keep moving forward. And to Laura and Glen, Judy, Beverley, Tim and Carol, and so many others who are counting on us to cross the finish line, be assured that we will get it passed.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

### Lacombe Generals and Allan Cup 2018 Hockey Championship

**Mr. Orr:** Mr. Speaker, hockey is Canadian, maybe the only thing we can agree upon in this House. Saturday night was the Allan Cup, the triple-A men's national hockey championship final game played in Rosetown, Saskatchewan. Speaking of Saskatchewan, may we never forget the tragedy of Humboldt. The Allan Cup was a game played between generals, the Lacombe Generals versus the Stoney Creek Generals from Ontario. The Lacombe Generals, or the Army, opened the scoring but ended the first period down 3-1. They roared back in the second to tie it up. Thirty-four seconds into the third they went ahead. But the Stoney Creek Generals answered with two more. In the last minute Lacombe pulled their tendy but to no avail. Stoney Creek hit the empty net twice to win 7-4.

Still, you have to celebrate the Lacombe Generals. Established in 1999 by five central Alberta guys, their goal was simply to provide a place for men to play competitively after juniors, but soon sponsors, volunteers, and fans started to rally around them. They play in the

five-team Chinook Hockey League. Winners of the provincial title move on to the larger Canadian national title, the Allan Cup. This team has amazing chemistry. The Lacombe Generals have won the Allan Cup three times, the Generals have been Allan Cup finalists six other times, and since 2008 they have been in the finals every year except two. This year we won the league championships, the Allan Cup west championship, and we won our provincials, states head coach Sean Robertson. In team points they have been first or second in the league every year since 2001. Lacombe is proud of you, our Generals.

Since 1909 the Allan Cup has been awarded to the top amateur team in Canada. Next year the Allan Cup will be hosted in Lacombe. See you there.

1:50

### Oral Question Period

**The Speaker:** The hon. Leader of the Official Opposition.

### Federal-provincial Meeting on Trans Mountain Pipeline Expansion

**Mr. Kenney:** Mr. Speaker, on the weekend there was a meeting in Ottawa that got us no further, no closer to the construction of the Trans Mountain pipeline. Following that meeting, Premier Horgan said that when he asked Alberta's Premier what her intentions were about turning off the taps, she said, quote: their legislative session is very brief, and they were going to bring in enabling legislation, and they didn't necessarily think they were going to act on it. Why did the Premier say that she's going to bring in legislation but has no intention of acting on it? Why did she give away her hand even before playing it?

**The Speaker:** The hon. Premier.

**Ms Notley:** Yes. Well, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Let me just begin by saying that Alberta is leading this fight, and we are very, very proud to be in that position. We are moving on all fronts, on economic fronts, legal fronts, and financial fronts. I would suggest that the member opposite not take his questions from the newspaper's recounting of someone else's recounting of someone else's recounting of what I said because, let me be perfectly clear, we were very clear with both the Prime Minister and with the government of B.C. that we will take whatever action is necessary to get this pipeline built.

**Mr. Kenney:** Mr. Speaker, I'm simply quoting her New Democrat friend Premier John Horgan, who said that this Premier indicated to him on the weekend that she does not necessarily think she's going to act on this legislation. Is Premier Horgan accurate in that remark, or are these comments attributed to him misleading?

**The Speaker:** The hon. Premier.

**Ms Notley:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. What I said to Premier Horgan very clearly when we were in Ottawa was that while there may be some unfortunate consequential impacts on gas prices in the Lower Mainland as we move forward with respect to this bill, the actions of the B.C. government and the failure of this pipeline to get built costs Canada \$40 million a day; therefore, we cannot tolerate this delay any longer. For that reason Alberta is leading the fight, and we will get the pipeline built.

**Mr. Kenney:** For the record the Premier does not deny that she told John Horgan that this legislation is an empty threat. That would be part of a consistent record because back in December 2016, after

our Premier flew to Vancouver, she met with then opposition leader John Horgan ostensibly to discuss the Trans Mountain pipeline, after which Mr. Horgan said that, quote, she had no intention of persuading me. So, Mr. Speaker, is it not true that she talks tough about these things in public but then folds with her friend John Horgan in private?

**Ms Notley:** Oh, Mr. Speaker, things could just not be further from the truth. What I will say is that I'm not grandstanding just for the sake of creating political divisions and gathering votes. What I will say is that it is a critical time for Alberta and that all Albertans have to present a united front. And I will say, speaking of friends, that it was not helpful to have the Leader of the Official Opposition call the federal announcement of support for this pipeline, quote, unquote, disgusting. I would suggest that if the member opposite wants to help, he should talk to his Conservative cousins and get them onside with getting this pipeline built.

**The Speaker:** Second main question.

**Mr. Kenney:** For the record the Premier has never denied Premier Horgan's assertion that she had no intention of persuading him to support the pipeline in 2016. She does not deny his claim that she folded already on the public threat to turn off the taps. So, Mr. Speaker, let me ask the Premier this question. In her meeting with the Prime Minister and Premier Horgan on Sunday did she ask the federal government to withhold 5 and a half billion dollars of discretionary federal transfers for infrastructure and job training until the pipeline is built, and if not, why not?

**The Speaker:** The hon. Premier.

**Ms Notley:** Well, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. You know, what we have done is that we have worked with the federal government. It is very clear that the federal government is now joining with Alberta to engage in very meaningful, formal discussions to ensure that investor risk is limited or eliminated, and I am confident that that will happen. Meanwhile, Mr. Speaker, the federal Conservatives, the Official Opposition, are calling that action on the part of the federal government, which has the authority to deal with this issue, disgusting. I say again to the member opposite: is he going to tell his federal Conservative cousins to stop it?

**Mr. Kenney:** Mr. Speaker, I'll have to remind the Premier that it's her friend and ally Justin Trudeau who got us in this mess by cancelling Northern Gateway, killing Energy East, surrendering to Obama on Keystone, and doing nothing in the past two years to ensure the construction of Trans Mountain. Now she seems eager to risk Alberta tax dollars on this project. Wouldn't it make more sense that the British Columbia government should be put in a place of risk by withholding those federal transfers? Why doesn't she join with us in insisting that B.C. have some skin in the game to ensure the protection of our Constitution and our country's economic interests?

**The Speaker:** The hon. Premier.

**Ms Notley:** Well, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Interestingly, what our government is doing is keeping our eye on the ball. There is one government that has the authority to make the decision, which did make the decision, and that is the federal government. We are working with that federal government to make sure that they assert their jurisdiction and get the pipeline built. On that front it does not help to have the federal Official Opposition attacking the federal government for saying that they will support the Kinder

Morgan pipeline no matter what. It is time for this fellow over here to get his friends in Ottawa to join with the rest of Canada and get the job done.

**Mr. Kenney:** Mr. Speaker, I can understand the Premier's desperate effort to spin this complete failure of a meeting yesterday, but the truth is this. Her B.C. New Democrat friends are saying that they are requiring nearly 1,200 provincial permits for Kinder Morgan to go forward, of which only 201 have been approved. What assurance did she receive from Premier Horgan that he will approve the other 1,000 outstanding permits immediately?

**Ms Notley:** Well, again, Mr. Speaker, someone is playing politics, and it's the member opposite because, of course, Kinder Morgan itself has said that they have no concerns about the rate at which the government in B.C. is issuing certificates. The member opposite fully knows that. Now, the fact of the matter is that the federal Conservatives are saying no to federal support for the TMX. The leader of the UCP is joining with Premier Horgan to call for a Supreme Court reference so that we can further delay the project. Meanwhile we've been leading the fight. The federal government is backing our position. The pipeline will be built, and I would suggest that the member opposite simply join with us in that work.

**The Speaker:** Third main question.

#### **Provincial Response to Pipeline Opposition Calgary Board of Education Carbon Levy Costs**

**Mr. Kenney:** Astoundingly, Mr. Speaker, the Premier just said that Kinder Morgan doesn't care about the pace of things. Then why did they suspend the project eight days ago? We have only 45 days left before they might cancel this project outright. The international financial community, Credit Suisse just said that they continue to regard the calculus as fraught and that there is no progress to resolving the legal challenges. What specifically did the Premier get from her counterpart John Horgan to eliminate the uncertainty that the federal government has created about this project?

**The Speaker:** The hon. Premier.

**Ms Notley:** Well, thank you. I think you've got it confused there. Again, to be clear, what we know from Kinder Morgan is that the things that are causing uncertainty are the potential future legal actions that might occur; they are not the rate at which certificates are being issued. As I said before, the member opposite knows that. The federal government has the authority to move this pipeline along in a timely way that will reassure investors. The federal government is working on exactly that, Mr. Speaker. They are doing that because we have shown leadership. The pipeline will get built.

**Mr. Kenney:** Mr. Speaker, on a different matter, we've learned that the Calgary board of education is looking at cutting full-day kindergarten to save a million dollars. It just so happens that the Calgary board of education is now spending a million dollars a year on the carbon tax. Is the Premier proud that her carbon tax is now forcing the school board to cut access to full-day kindergarten?

**Mr. Clark:** Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

**Ms Notley:** Well, Mr. Speaker, none of that adds up, but what I will say is this. First of all, what will not support full-day kindergarten or half-day kindergarten is putting more money into funding private schools. That's the first thing. We won't do it. Those folks over there are suggesting they will.



2:00

Another thing that would cut kindergarten classes, Mr. Speaker, would be freezing education funding at 2015 levels, which is exactly what the member opposite said that he wanted to do. We would never do something so short-sighted. We will continue to stand up for our kids, their classrooms, and their futures.

**Mr. Kenney:** The Premier questions the numbers I just offered, Mr. Speaker. Happy to table these documents.

According to Investing in the Future, the facilities report from the CBE, Calgary board of education, the NDP carbon tax is projected to cost that board a million dollars, and the administration has now proposed cutting a million dollars in spending on kindergarten. Does the Premier not understand that her carbon tax means less access to kindergarten in Calgary, and given that it hasn't gotten us social licence or a pipeline, will she join us in reconsidering the destructive impact of the carbon tax?

**Ms Notley:** Well, Mr. Speaker, that assertion is just ridiculous. The member opposite is reaching beyond all sense of logical debate or consideration here. To be clear, our government has raised education funding to keep up with enrolment funding year after year after year since we've been elected. This is in stark contrast to what their predecessors told Albertans they were going to do leading up to the last election, in stark contrast to what the member opposite just said two weeks ago that he would do if he had been in charge in 2015. Thank goodness, for those kindergarten classes, that we are the ones that are still here and still supporting them.

**The Speaker:** Thank you.

The Member for Calgary-South East.

### Pharmacy Funding Framework

**Mr. Fraser:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The pipeline is crucial to this government and to this province, but at the same time properly investing in health care, equally the same in allied health care, will also do the same for our bottom line. I had a constituent who, being a pharmacist for the past 17 years, wrote to me to express her concern about the changes to pharmacy funding and how that would affect the treatment that she can offer. She mentioned that one patient said that without her help in smoking cessation, he would have just kept smoking and gone on and given up. To the Minister of Health: have you heard from pharmacists who are concerned about your budget cuts and how that will result in fewer smoking cessation sessions and create greater health care costs?

**The Speaker:** The hon. Minister of Health.

**Ms Hoffman:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. We certainly appreciate the role pharmacists have in supporting the health care needs of Albertans throughout our province. Under this new framework Alberta pharmacists continue to be compensated at rates higher than their counterparts in other provinces. Let's be clear. The only ones proposing cuts to health care are the members on the other side of this House. On this side of the House we're standing up with front-line workers, we're standing up with front-line Albertans, and we're making sure that we have sustainable growth so that they get the health care they need. We'll see what you do when we bring forward our budget for approval in a couple of weeks.

**Mr. Fraser:** Mr. Speaker, this minister is the one who just cut pharmacies by \$150 million.

The same pharmacist helped a man who was on antidepressant and anti-anxiety medication to slowly reduce and taper off his use.

The man had started the medication after losing his wife, and he thought he'd have to take them for the rest of his life. After working through the reduction plan with this pharmacist, he asked: why hasn't a doctor shown me this before? To the same minister: have you heard from pharmacists who are concerned that your budget cuts will result in less responsive treatment for patients?

**The Speaker:** The hon. Minister of Health.

**Ms Hoffman:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Again, we sat down with the Alberta Pharmacists' Association, the RxA, and worked with them on a tool that helps us achieve savings year over year. But you know what? We're increasing the pharmacy budget by 4.3 per cent because we know that that's important in this province. Instead of proposing deep ideological cuts – I think some members of the opposition talked about 5 per cent across the board – on this side of the House we're working in a strategic way to keep patients as the focus. A 4.3 per cent increase to pharmacies to keep up with growth and increased needs: that's a responsible thing to do. I suspect that members opposite will hopefully join us in supporting our budget.

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

**Mr. Fraser:** Mr. Speaker, the minister cut front-line staff, pharmacists, by \$150 million.

Pharmacists are planning another rally this week to make their concerns heard about these budget cuts, like community pharmacists who wrote to me and said that they're concerned about the level of care they'll be able to provide their patients and that the patients will suffer because of it. They're also concerned that those cuts were made without their knowledge or consent. If you haven't heard from these concerned pharmacists, will you be at that rally? Will you take the time, listen to them, and work out a plan that's going to help to better patient care?

**Ms Hoffman:** Mr. Speaker, I'm proud of the fact that during difficult economic times we decided on this side of the House to protect health care. We brought forward a 4.3 per cent increase to pharmacy services. It was important to us that that go towards the front lines, ensuring that patients have access to more pharmaceutical coverage, smaller copays, and other opportunities. What is true is that we have a 4.3 per cent increase to that line item. We wanted to be focused on patients, and we wanted to ensure that we get the best outcomes, and I'm proud that the RxA sat down with us at the table and helped us reach this reasonable compromise and position.

**The Speaker:** Hon. members, just for the record I did note a point of order from Calgary-Elbow two questions ago.

Edmonton-Mill Creek.

### Long-term and Continuing Care Beds

**Ms Woollard:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A key election promise of our government in 2015 was to create 2,000 additional long-term care beds across the province. To the Associate Minister of Health: how much progress has the government made in achieving this goal, please?

**The Speaker:** The Associate Minister of Health.

**Ms Payne:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Our government is committed to building 2,000 new long-term care and dementia beds, and we keep our promises. We're well on track to meet our target by 2019. We saw the addition of 800 new spaces last year, and we're investing \$49 million in Budget 2018 directly for continuing care beds.

Albertans have to be able to count on care when and where they need it, and our government will always make these services a priority.

**The Speaker:** First supplemental.

**Ms Woollard:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. What are the continuing challenges to creating these sorely needed long-term beds as soon as possible?

**The Speaker:** The hon. associate minister.

**Ms Payne:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The damage inflicted by Conservative government after Conservative government takes time to heal. We see what happens when they are in charge: firing masses of nurses, blowing up hospitals, and closing thousands of beds. Looking to the days of Ralph Klein is backward thinking, and our government is looking forward. We're investing in infrastructure, we are protecting services, and we will make sure that this economic recovery is built to last.

**The Speaker:** Second supplemental.

**Ms Woollard:** Thank you once again. How will the associate minister and the ministry support public health care as the government moves toward achieving the goal of 2,000 long-term care spaces?

**The Speaker:** The hon. associate minister.

**Ms Payne:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We are the party of medicare, and I am so proud to be able to champion public health care each and every day. We have three major public projects on the way in Fort McMurray, in Edmonton, and in Calgary. We have plans to increase continuing care capacity beyond the 2,000 new beds, and we'll be making those announcements before long. I don't see any plans from the members opposite, just the same old strategy: cut, cut, cut.

### Trans Mountain Pipeline Public Purchase Proposal

**Mr. Fildebrandt:** Less than two weeks ago Kinder Morgan had all of the private-sector investment necessary for the Trans Mountain pipeline. They needed no subsidies, no corporate welfare, nothing from government other than to do its simple duty of providing a stable regulatory framework and enforcing the rule of law. This government and its allies in Ottawa have failed at this, and now their answer is to spend billions of taxpayer dollars and buy the pipeline. Investment dollars are not the issue; government is the issue. Rather than put taxpayers on the hook for this government's failed social licence policy, why doesn't the Premier just tell the federal government to do its job?

**The Speaker:** The hon. Minister of Energy.

**Ms McCuaig-Boyd:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know, I think there isn't a person in this room that doesn't understand how important the TMX pipeline is. It's thousands of jobs; it's billions in investment. On this side of the House we're doing what it takes to get that pipeline built. We didn't start the fight, but we're going to do whatever it takes to get this pipeline built. Failure is not an option on this side of the House.

**Mr. Fildebrandt:** Governments of all stripes have a poor track record at running businesses. This government's failure to read the power purchase agreements cost taxpayers \$2 billion to \$3 billion,

and now they want to buy a multibillion-dollar pipeline. I can see it now: the Minister of Environment sitting on the board of Kinder Morgan, the Minister of Energy participating in the annual shareholders' meeting, and the Minister of Finance pleading with creditors. Does this government really believe that it has the competency necessary to run a pipeline?

**The Speaker:** The hon. Minister of Energy.

**Ms McCuaig-Boyd:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know, every day that this pipeline is delayed, we're talking \$40 million in the Canadian economy that's being lost. We've taken action. We've tried to work with the British Columbia government. We're working with the federal government. We are working every day with industry. I met with industry on Friday to update them on what we're doing. As I said before, on this side of the House we're working every day, and we're going to get this pipeline built.

2:10

**Mr. Fildebrandt:** Ronald Reagan said: "If it moves, tax it. If it keeps moving, regulate it. And if it stops moving, subsidize it." Things were moving, so they brought in a carbon tax. Things kept moving, so they brought in an oil sands cap. Now things appear to be about to stop, so they want to subsidize it. After a carbon tax, excessive regulations, and now a desire to nationalize the pipeline, the advantages of the oil patch will increasingly only be enjoyed by friends of the government, like in Venezuela. Will this government cancel their plans to nationalize the pipeline?

**The Speaker:** The hon. minister.

**Ms McCuaig-Boyd:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know, to be clear, this pipeline approval was achieved because of our climate leadership plan. Had we not had that plan, we wouldn't even be standing here talking about it today. Again, we have worked in every area we can to get this pipeline. We work with the companies. We work with the shippers. We work with the governments. We're working on all sides to get this done because it is too important to not get it done: \$40 million a day being lost, money left on the table because of the differential. We need that pipeline capacity, and we need it now.

**The Speaker:** Hon. members, I would remind each and every one again that after question 5 there is no preamble.

The hon. Member for Chestermere-Rocky View.

### Federal-provincial Meeting on Trans Mountain Pipeline Expansion (continued)

**Mrs. Aheer:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Premier: given this weekend's meeting that failed to get us a pipeline to tidewater, did you point out the shocking hypocrisy of B.C.'s environmental record while Premier Horgan was lecturing Alberta on ours?

**The Speaker:** The hon. Minister of Energy.

**Ms McCuaig-Boyd:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know, we've been clear all along, back to since we revealed our climate leadership plan, that that was going to be the key for development in the energy industry. You know, my energy stakeholders get this. They know that this is a global trend. Countries, businesses are going to price carbon. They're looking at carbon and how to be competitive. Our climate leadership plan got us that approval. It's going to get us that pipeline.

**Mrs. Aheer:** Let me try a question in a different way. Given that British Columbia was responsible for almost 40 per cent of the 120 million cubic metres of untreated sewage and runoff water that entered Canadian waterways in 2016 and given that Alaskans have asked the B.C. government to deal with the Tulsequah Chief Mine in northwest B.C., that is leaking acid waste water into one of the richest salmon runs in the region, did the Premier raise B.C.'s shocking – shocking – hypocrisy on the environmental file when she met with Premier Horgan this weekend?

**The Speaker:** The hon. minister.

**Ms Hoffman:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. To the specifics of the meeting, what I will say is that the Premier was very clear that we need to go forward on this pipeline approval. This approval has been given, and it needs to be worth more than the paper it was written on. She has made it very clear that she won't let other roadblocks be put up in our way. Certainly, I share in concern around raw sewage and Victoria. I know many British Columbians do. The solution, in our mind, is to make sure that we move forward with responsible environmental protections while getting our product to tidewater. We're going to keep moving forward in that direction.

**Mrs. Aheer:** As I understand it, Mr. Speaker, Premier Horgan is still blocking the pipeline. When we talk about the environmental piece, the excess runoff meets the sewer and gets untreated sewage flowing into the ocean waterways. B.C. dumps billions of litres of raw sewage into their waterways, and it's causing massive damage to the ocean. Did the Premier bother mentioning Calgary? The equivalent here is zero, because Calgary made the determination to separate stormwater and sewer water back in the 1960s. What did the Premier do to defend Alberta's environmental record?

**Ms Hoffman:** Every day the Premier defends Alberta's environmental record and works to make sure that we are all in a position where the world is excited to receive our products. Of course, we need to get that pipeline to tidewater to make that happen. That's why we're fighting day in and day out. That's why the Premier was in Toronto earlier in the week, that's why she was back in Ottawa on the weekend, and that's why we'll keep moving forward at all stops to make sure that this pipeline gets built. Nothing is going to count Alberta out. You can mark my words.

**The Speaker:** The hon. Member for Calgary-West.

#### **Police Release of Information on Serious Incidents**

**Mr. Ellis:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Last week in this Chamber the minister of community services expressed condolences to the family of a deceased man who shot and seriously wounded a Calgary police officer. The minister did not mention one word of concern for the officer who was shot or for the officer who risked his life to save his colleague. As Mr. Kaminski, the Police Association president, said, the shooter is not a victim. He attempted to kill two police officers. To the Premier: can you please explain your minister's insensitive response?

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

**Ms Ganley:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and to the member for the important question. Of course, I would like to take this opportunity to express on behalf of the entire government our government's condolences for the officer in that incident. I do know that these are often very serious incidents, and we absolutely do

take them seriously moving forward. I know that our government supports these officers on the front line and the important work that they do every day.

**Mr. Ellis:** Mr. Speaker, given that ASIRT has chosen not to release the deceased shooter's name despite a violent crime spree that would have resulted in serious criminal charges had it not ended in the death of the shooter and given that ASIRT is hiding behind a policy to not cause trauma to the deceased's family without any regard for the traumatized officers and their families, Minister, why are you letting ASIRT keep the name of the deceased shooter a secret?

**The Speaker:** The hon. minister.

**Ms Ganley:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and to the member for the important question. I know that there is a lot of interest in these cases. It is ASIRT's policy and has been ASIRT's policy over a number of years to not release the names of people injured or killed in these incidents. I think that the important thing is that we make these decisions based on principle. There is an agreement between these independent investigative offices throughout the country, and they all have the same policy, but we're always happy to consider it.

**Mr. Ellis:** Well, Mr. Speaker, given that ASIRT appears to have free rein to provide whatever dribs of information it cares to share with the public even in a case where the public has a right to know if a dangerous repeat offender was free on Alberta streets and why, and given that ASIRT's veil of secrecy and the confounding statements made by the minister of community services have shaken the public trust in Alberta's justice system, Minister, will you put an end to this policy of secrecy and release the shooter's name today?

**The Speaker:** The hon. minister.

**Ms Ganley:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. You know, these cases are very serious, and they do take a lot of public interest. That's why it's absolutely critical that ASIRT be able to complete an independent investigation into these matters so that we can maintain the confidence of the public in our law enforcement. That's why ASIRT does a very thorough job of ensuring that they aren't releasing any information that might prejudice a case, particularly when an investigation is ongoing, and I think the entire public has an interest in ensuring that that's the case.

**The Speaker:** Second main question.

**Mr. Ellis:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's interesting that the minister mentioned an investigation. The minister said on the weekend that the Calgary shooter's name must be kept secret because, quote, we need to weigh the transparency against the risk that ultimately prejudices the case. Unquote.

**Mr. Mason:** Point of order.

**Mr. Ellis:** Minister, what case are you referring to, the case against the deceased shooter or the case against the police officer who was shot?

**Ms Ganley:** Mr. Speaker, again, in that interview what I was referring to was the need that we make decisions in the legal system on consistent rules and consistent principles and that those rules apply equally to everyone and to every case. ASIRT investigates very serious matters. As a result of that, there are instances in which

they don't release these names — those are most instances — and that is consistent with the policy across the jurisdictions. We're always willing to review our policies, but we do like to make decisions based on principle.

**Mr. Ellis:** Well, given that three years ago Constable Wynn was shot and killed at the St. Albert casino and that when it was learned that his killer Shawn Rehn was a repeat violent offender who was out on bail, it prompted a full review of the bail hearing system, the one that you challenged in court, and given that if ASIRT had been following the new naming process then, we would never have known about Shawn Rehn, Minister, do you now see why naming the deceased shooter is so important for the sake of public trust?

**The Speaker:** The hon. minister.

**Ms Ganley:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Of course, the reforms made to the system following the tragic death of Constable Wynn were absolutely sort of critical steps moving forward. The government did not challenge the decision in court. We were advised to go to the court and seek a ruling, and that's exactly what we did, and we have followed and abided by that ruling to ensure that we're making the necessary improvements to the system. Again, these cases garner a lot of attention. They are extremely important for the public, and that's why we need to make decisions based on principle in each case.

2:20

**Mr. Ellis:** Mr. Speaker, given that Albertans need assurance that there has not been another major failure in the bail hearing system and given that since ASIRT is keeping the shooter's name under wraps and that the public must now rely on the minister for assurance that the bail hearing process is capable of keeping dangerous offenders off the streets, Minister, it's now on you. For the maintenance of the public trust will you guarantee Albertans here today that the Calgary police shooter was not a violent repeat offender who was out on bail?

**Ms Ganley:** Mr. Speaker, ASIRT performs an incredibly important function. That function is necessary to maintain the public trust. They are an independent agency that investigates these matters. They work very closely with police services, and this system works incredibly well. I would say that it's the best in the country. I'm not going to interfere with their role. I think it's very important that they be permitted to be an independent investigator because, at the end of the day, it supports the legal system to have that public faith.

**The Speaker:** The hon. Member for West Yellowhead.

### Commodity Rail Transportation Backlog

**Mr. Rosendahl:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Market access for our products is one of the top priorities of this government. This is as true for agricultural products as it is for our nonrenewable resources. There were recent disruptions to the transportation system to get Alberta's wheat, canola, pulses, and other products to market via railways. To the Minister of Agriculture and Forestry: how is the minister ensuring that producers' concerns are heard?

**The Speaker:** The hon. Minister of Agriculture and Forestry.

**Mr. Carlier:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker and to the member for the question. The member is correct in saying that grain movement by rail has been a challenge this year. My office has heard from concerned producers throughout Alberta on this issue, and we take it seriously. I spoke with CN and CP Rail as well as reached out to

my federal colleagues to discuss this concerning issue. There were some natural barriers that slowed things down earlier in the spring such as poor weather but also delay in Bill C-49 in the Senate, a bill that would benefit Canadian farmers.

**The Speaker:** The first supplemental.

**Mr. Rosendahl:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. What will this government do to ensure that this situation is avoided in the future?

**The Speaker:** The hon. minister.

**Mr. Carlier:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Fortunately, our discussions with CN and CP have been productive. With the additional resources that have been applied to accelerate things along with improved weather conditions, the railways are returning to a more normal level of service in terms of crews and locomotives. We will continue to monitor the train transportation situation, advocate for the progress of Bill C-49, and communicate with CN and CP, the grain industry, and producer organizations going forward.

**The Speaker:** The second supplemental.

**Mr. Rosendahl:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again to the minister: what are you hearing from your forestry stakeholders about their transportation issues; i.e., pulp and lumber?

**Mr. Carlier:** The grain transportation issue appears to be abating, Mr. Speaker, but I've heard from forestry stakeholders that the mills are having difficulties getting their products to customers. They're having to take extraordinary measures to avoid unplanned shutdowns. I've spoken to forestry companies and with the railroads. All have committed to working together to find solutions. This is something that I will continue to keep an eye on and continue to engage with the federal government.

### Government Revenue Forecasts

**Mr. Barnes:** No one in Alberta wants the Trans Mountain pipeline to fail, but yesterday's meeting in Ottawa failed to secure anything. Environmental extremists continue to ignore the rule of law, NDP ally Justin Trudeau is on his way to Paris, and B.C.'s NDP Premier remains as resolute as ever. This pipeline has already seen its completion date pushed back a year, and the project could be soon abandoned, yet this government bet the farm in its budget that not only will the pipeline be built but that it will be completed by 2021. To the minister: how much debt will Albertans have if the pipeline is delayed and your budget is wrong?

**The Speaker:** The hon. Minister of Energy.

**Ms McCuaig-Boyd:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know, the Trans Mountain expansion, as I've said, is an historic achievement. It's going to add tens of billions of dollars in investments and thousands of jobs not just here in Alberta but across Canada, and it's for that reason that we've been working so hard to get this expansion done. When we talk about our climate leadership plan, that's why we got the approval that we did, and we're working hard every day. At the end of the day, the only outcome that's good for Alberta is to get that pipeline done.

**Mr. Barnes:** Mr. Speaker, given that the Premier and her government promised that none of the revenue from the carbon tax would be allocated to general revenue and given that on page 84 of the 2018 fiscal plan it states that "revenue . . . from the federally-imposed carbon [tax] . . . will be used" to cover Alberta's general

expenditures, we now know the government wasn't truthful. To the minister: if your government has given Trudeau notice that without a pipeline, there will be no further carbon tax increases, why have you accounted for the carbon tax revenue in last month's budget?

**The Speaker:** The hon. Minister of Finance and President of Treasury Board.

**Mr. Ceci:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. We're not going to apologize on this side for making sure that funding is provided to protect the necessary supports and programs like hospitals and schools and services that Albertans require. In 2021, when the carbon levy changes as a result of the federal government, we will use those monies to close the deficit and to invest in the necessary services that Albertans require.

**Mr. Barnes:** Mr. Speaker, given that Alberta has the second-highest per capita spending in the country and that under the NDP we are on track to accumulate \$96 billion in debt and given that even a short delay in completing the Trans Mountain will cause this government to miss its path by billions – billions – more and given that higher debt means more money going to Bay Street and not main street, to the minister: how high does Alberta's debt have to go before you begin to tackle your spending problem?

**The Speaker:** The hon. Minister of Finance.

**Mr. Ceci:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. The only spending problem that exists is because that side left too many things undone. There's Conservative waste that we are cleaning up. We have cut salaries and eliminated bonuses for the highest paid executives, that that side put in place, saving \$33 million over three years. We've extended a salary freeze to management and non-unions. We have closed the deficit by reducing it by \$1.4 billion at the end of November. We're on track.

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

#### School Board Finances

**Mr. Smith:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Calgary board of education has announced that in order to make up a \$35.6 million shortfall for the 2018-2019 school year, they're considering cutting their full-day kindergarten program by one-third. The CBE has stated, quote: the carbon tax, increasing utility costs, and the costs of operating our new schools have not been funded. Minister, this is happening on your watch. Does cutting full-day kindergarten by 33 per cent in Calgary represent your commitment to funding education?

**The Speaker:** The hon. Minister of Advanced Education.

**Mr. Schmidt:** Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Of course, our government believes that every child in Calgary and across Alberta deserves an education that prepares them for success in a fast-changing world, and that's why we've invested in more teachers, new schools, smaller class sizes, and additional learning supports for the students of Calgary. I just want to be clear. By fully funding for enrolment growth, we put tens of millions of dollars more into the CBE than would have been the case under the Conservative government. As well, the Minister of Education has been quite clear that the Calgary board of education should balance its budget without any impact on front-line staffing levels or classroom . . .

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

**Mr. Smith:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Given that the minister has stated again today that the provincial funding is appropriate for enrolment increases and given that the CBE has stated that expenses are rising faster than funding and they are looking in every nook and every cranny for savings and given that the CBE has also been quite open about the financial burden the carbon tax has placed on their finances, there seems to be a disconnect between the minister and our largest school board. Again to the minister: who's telling the truth? You or the CBE?

**Mr. Schmidt:** Well, Mr. Speaker, let's talk about disconnect for a little bit. The member opposite is concerned about funding for education, but he's going around campaigning on a platform of tax cuts for millionaires and budget cuts in Education. That's a big disconnect that won't result in any more students getting education under their plan. Our government has invested millions of dollars in the Calgary board of education. The Calgary board of education has a pattern of predicting deficits and running budget surpluses at the end of the year. We'll be working closely with the Calgary board of education to make sure that they meet their budget commitments and don't impact front-line services.

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

**Mr. Smith:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, given that school boards have been pushing the minister for a carbon tax exemption for two years but to no avail and given that the CBE pays over \$1 million in the carbon tax per year, money that would be better spent in the classroom, again to the minister: will you work to protect programs like full-day kindergarten without increasing your budget by exempting school boards from the carbon tax?

2:30

**Mr. Schmidt:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the members opposite will promise to exempt the school boards of this province from the negative impacts of the cuts that they want to make to pay for millionaires' tax breaks. I don't think they are.

Our government is investing millions of dollars to fund for enrolment growth. We've hired thousands of teachers across the province. We've built hundreds of schools, the largest school build in the history of this province. No government has invested in education more than this government today, and we are very proud of our record of supporting students in this province.

**The Speaker:** The hon. Member for Bonnyville-Cold Lake.

#### Anti Energy Industry Advocacy in Alberta

**Mr. Cyr:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Albertans expect their public universities to serve for the betterment of our province. Our universities have played a crucial role in the environmentally responsible development of our oil and gas resources for the benefit of all Albertans. Given this, it was surprising to find out that one of our most prestigious institutions plans on awarding an honorary degree to one of the most extreme voices against the economic interests of our province. Will the minister agree that David Suzuki should not be praised by taxpayer-funded universities?

**Mr. Schmidt:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the member for the question and the opportunity to explain to this entire House that the government has absolutely no control over what universities offer honorary degrees and who they offer them to. I personally don't necessarily agree with everything that David Suzuki says in public, but I do respect his right to say it. Of course, the members

opposite continue a campaign of smearing any opponents that they don't seem to agree with, a plan that resulted in zero pipelines to . . .

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

**Mr. Cyr:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Given that this alarming inclusion of extreme voices has not been limited to our post-secondary institutions and given that Calgary parents were shocked to find out that David Suzuki was paid to lecture Calgary public teachers and given that Mr. Suzuki has a history of making extremely offensive comments, even likening the oil and gas industry to slavery, telling Evan Solomon that it's the same thing, will the Minister of Education agree that it is irresponsible to spread these unbalanced anti Alberta oil views amongst our teachers and students within Alberta?

**The Speaker:** Thank you, hon. member.

**Mr. Schmidt:** Mr. Speaker, I remember a time in the distant past when the Conservatives were a party of defending free speech. In fact, they didn't have to agree with anything that anybody was saying, but they would at least defend the right of people to say it. It's very troubling to me that the Conservatives seem to be intent on continuing on their 10-year-long campaign of bullying anybody that they don't agree with, a plan that resulted in zero pipelines to tidewater being built and has only served to further divide the people of this country.

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

Hon. member, I wish to remind you that you've got to adjust the question to the government's policy rather than the perspective of some other party. So, please, focus that way.

**Mr. Cyr:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Given that there is nothing free about a \$50,000 honorarium and given that we want to provide young Albertans with a balanced perspective on critical issues facing our province and encourage independent thinking, will the minister agree that the extreme views of activists like David Suzuki should not be endorsed by our taxpayer-funded institutions, and will he commit to providing opportunities for administrators and educators to be presented with information on the immense benefits that our environmentally responsible energy industry brings to Alberta?

**The Speaker:** Thank you, hon. member.

**Mr. Schmidt:** Well, Mr. Speaker, there's a lot to unpack there. However, I do want to say that it's quite ironic that advocates, so-called champions, of independent thought all parade out of the Legislature when Bill 9 comes to the floor, apparently under the orders of their leader. They're not free to speak their minds at all. It's interesting to me that they demand that our students be taught independent critical thought yet fail to exercise their rights to independent critical thought when given the opportunity when Bill 9 is presented in the Legislature. Perhaps that will change in the future.

**The Speaker:** The hon. Member for Grande Prairie-Wapiti.

#### **Beaverlodge Health Facility Capital Plan**

**Mr. Drysdale:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. For 10 years I've been advocating for my Beaverlodge and west county constituents who desperately need a new health facility. We would all like to see this project move along. The project was in the budget for previous

years, and now it's not. It's not even on the unfunded list. To the Minister of Health: where is it today in your priorities?

**The Speaker:** The hon. Minister of Health.

**Ms Hoffman:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I've had the opportunity to visit Beaverlodge and meet with many of the wonderful staff and community members who are part of the community, including Mrs. Doris McFarland, who was a registered nurse at the hospital for many years. I appreciate her ongoing, unwavering support to her community and to public health care. I have to say that it's pretty rich to have this question coming from the former minister responsible for Infrastructure because we know that it didn't get built when he was Minister of Infrastructure. We're continuing to work with the community and wanting to move this forward for all parts of this province. We know that there is infrastructure need in all communities, and we're happy to work with Beaverlodge to move this forward.

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

**Mr. Drysdale:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Given that in the last few years there was money in the budget for the design of rural health facilities and that included Beaverlodge and given that now those funds are no longer in your estimates at all, to the Minister of Infrastructure: how much money was spent, and is there anything to show for it?

**The Speaker:** The hon. minister.

**Ms Hoffman:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. We're continuing to work with the mayor and community leaders to make sure we have the right plan for community health care for Beaverlodge families. We know that there were many decades with Conservatives in power where health care cuts continued to be the message of the day, but that doesn't reflect our values. That's why we're working for stable, predictable health care for all Albertans through a public model and why we've been able to take some of the outcomes from that early investment in rural health facility design to help streamline processes moving forward.

**The Speaker:** Second supplemental.

**Mr. Drysdale:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Given that the Beaverlodge project turns up in the Health budget one year and then in Infrastructure the next and then disappears altogether and given that seeing ministers punt it back and forth like a football has made it impossible for the community to determine if there's any progress being made, can one of you please tell the people in my constituency, particularly those in the west county, about the future of the Beaverlodge health facility?

**The Speaker:** The hon. minister.

**Ms Hoffman:** Thanks, Mr. Speaker. Just to reiterate. I believe it was the hon. member who just spoke who said in estimates last year: "I get it. That's been going on for years, and I'll take responsibility for that, too." We know that there are many needs in the community of Beaverlodge. I was really proud to meet with a number of the folks, including with the Minister of Infrastructure. We had a very productive meeting, made it very clear. Their number one concern, I have to say – and it's because of rumours that they heard under a former government – was that their hospital was going to close. I was proud to say that that is not the case, that we have renovations at the existing facility, including renovations to

address flood damage and replace the roof, a nurse on-call system, fire alarms, et cetera, and that we believe it's important for Beaverlodge to have a hospital.

**The Speaker:** Thank you, hon. member.

### Postsecondary Educational Finance

**Loyola:** Mr. Speaker, I'm proud of the work that the government has done to rein in spending at agencies, boards, and commissions while at the same time ensuring that compensation is fair and appropriate. I was pleased to see the Minister of Advanced Education's announcement last week of a plan to bring executive compensation at our universities and colleges in line with other jurisdictions in Canada. To the Minister of Advanced Education: how will this affect postsecondary institutions?

**The Speaker:** The hon. minister.

**Mr. Schmidt:** Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just want to take the opportunity to remind the member that it was the Minister of Finance and Treasury Board and me who made that announcement jointly. Our university and college presidents do critical work, but for too long their compensation packages were out of touch with the expectations of Albertans. Postsecondary compensation in Alberta was the highest in the country, and these changes will finally bring these salaries into line with those in the rest of Canada. This savings will mean more money in our classrooms and for our students.

**Loyola:** Mr. Speaker, before my role in the House I represented staff at the U of A, and I remember all too well the impacts of cuts made by the previous government. Given that students and staff of the university have been standing together to protest across-the-board cuts and major fee hikes proposed by the U of A budget, to the same minister: can you update the House on what action you have taken to address this?

**The Speaker:** The hon. minister.

**Mr. Schmidt:** Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's no secret that universities and colleges across the province are still trying to recover from brutal cuts that the Conservative government imposed on them a few years ago. Unlike the Conservatives, of course, our government believes that all Albertans deserve an affordable higher education. That's why we've increased funding to all institutions by 2 per cent as well as provided backfill funding in compensation for the tuition freeze. We expect that institutions will allocate these funds responsibly and prioritize the education of their students and support for staff and faculty. We will continue to work with the university to make sure that that happens.

2:40

**Loyola:** Mr. Speaker, students need predictability when they are planning for the cost of their degrees. To the same minister: what actions are you planning to address tuition, especially international student tuition?

**The Speaker:** The hon. minister.

**Mr. Schmidt:** Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. The member hits the nail on the head when he talks about predictability, and I'm very pleased to say that under our government that's exactly what students have been receiving. As part of Budget 2018 we're again providing another year of frozen tuition. That's four years of affordable higher education under our government. Finances should never be a barrier for anyone who wants to get an education, and

that's true no matter where you're from. We're not going to balance the budget on the backs of students. We're going to ensure that all students get the affordable, accessible higher education that they deserve, and that includes international students as well.

### Introduction of Bills

**The Speaker:** The hon. Minister of Energy.

#### Bill 12

#### Preserving Canada's Economic Prosperity Act

**Ms McCuaig-Boyd:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I request leave to introduce Bill 12, Preserving Canada's Economic Prosperity Act.

Our government is standing up for Alberta and for a healthy Canadian energy sector. The legislation I'm introducing today represents the next step in Alberta's fight to gain better market access and to gain better value for the resources that Albertans own. Mr. Speaker, the Canadian economy is losing out on millions of dollars because of the price differential from what we currently earn for our resources and what we ought to be earning, a gap that the Trans Mountain pipeline would help to address. That's money that should be supporting jobs, families, social programs, and funding our transition to a greener economy. Through Bill 12 we are ensuring that natural gas, crude oil, and refined fuels will only be exported from Alberta if that action is in the public interest of our province and of its citizens. This legislation will provide Alberta with flexibility and leverage to ensure that Albertans are getting the full return on the natural resources produced in our province. Bill 12 would also help to guarantee that there are adequate supplies and reserves of these products for Albertans now and into the future.

More specifically, the Preserving Canada's Economic Prosperity Act will permit the Minister of Energy to require that a licence is obtained for the export of natural gas, crude oil, and refined fuels from Alberta at the minister's discretion. The minister would have the ability to set the terms and conditions of these licences, including but not limited to the point at which the licensee may export natural gas, crude oil, or refined fuels from Alberta; the method by which these products can be exported; limits on the exported quantities of these products; and the conditions under which the export of these products may be diverted, reduced, or interrupted.

The Preserving Canada's Economic Prosperity Act is a crucial element in our plan to defend Alberta's workers, our economy, and our progress on climate action. With that, Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of Bill 12.

[Motion carried; Bill 12 read a first time]

### Tabling Returns and Reports

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

**Mr. Hanson:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to present five copies of letters from the Student Transportation Association of Alberta to the Minister of Transportation, where they've been trying to request meetings with him since May of 2016.

**The Speaker:** The Member for Rimbey-Rocky Mountain House-Sundre.

**Mr. Nixon:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to table two sets of reports on behalf of the Leader of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition.

The first is a document from the Calgary board of education, that he referred to in question period, that clearly shows the astronomical costs of the carbon tax and the consequences to kindergarten education inside Calgary.

The second is another document that he referred to, which shows credit analysis showing that despite even federal government intervention, Trans Mountain expansion will be difficult to go forward.

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

**Ms Ganley:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I rise to table a document referenced in my answers to questions in question period earlier today. It is a joint statement from Canadian civilian oversight agencies on the release of names.

**Mr. Panda:** Mr. Speaker, I rise to table five copies of the federal waste-water systems effluent regulations, registry of transitional authorizations, that shows that west Vancouver, Victoria, Tofino, Richmond, Nanaimo, Ladysmith, among others, are not meeting effluent quality standards but are trying to.

My other tabling, Mr. Speaker, is five copies of a map of the province of Quebec that shows that a hundred communities continue to dump raw sewage into the waterways of the province. Given that Quebec is now helping B.C. in its opposition to the Trans Mountain pipeline expansion, I found out that in 2015 more than 82.3 billion litres of raw sewage came from B.C., with the city of Victoria continuing to dump directly into the Juan de Fuca Strait because of NIMBY to a sewage treatment plant.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

### Tablings to the Clerk

**The Clerk:** I wish to advise the Assembly that the following document was deposited with the office of the Clerk: on behalf of the hon. Ms Gray, Minister of Labour and minister responsible for democratic renewal, pursuant to the Veterinary Profession Act the Alberta Veterinary Medical Association 2017 annual report.

**The Speaker:** I believe we have two points of order.

The hon. Member for Calgary-Elbow.

### Point of Order

#### Supplementary Questions

**Mr. Clark:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'll be brief. Referring to the order of questions in which the Leader of the Official Opposition asked his question, I'll start with a brief citation from *Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules & Forms*, sixth edition, page 122, section 414. In speaking about supplementary questions, it says that "the extent to which supplementary questions may be asked is in the discretion of the Speaker."

You yourself, Mr. Speaker, made a ruling on the 7th of December 2016, *Alberta Hansard*, pages 2401 and 2402, referencing a ruling of Speaker Kowalski from May 12, 2004, page 1390 of *Hansard* of the day. Speaker Kowalski said, "Now, there's also a tradition we follow here that if an hon. member is recognized, they raise a first question and then they're allowed two supplementals. It has always been understood that supplementals must have something to do with the first question."

On March 30, '98, Speaker Kowalski ruled, on page 1200 of *Hansard*, that "there is a consistent rule that there should be some flow with the questions and they should be in a similar type of subject."

As you'll recall, the Leader of the Official Opposition – although I don't have the benefit of the Blues, I believe his third main question had something to do with pipelines, and his first supplemental even said something to the effect of, "now changing topic," about the Calgary board of education and something to do with kindergarten. Mr. Speaker, I imagine this perhaps could be from his experience in other Legislative Assemblies or Parliament, but that is not how we do things here in Alberta.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**The Speaker:** The Government House Leader.

**Mr. Mason:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Well, I won't repeat what the hon. member has said. I concur with his point of order. I would just draw your attention to the statement that says that the supplementaries ought not to have a preamble and the question should flow from the answer that was given to the first question. Obviously, if you're completely changing the subject in your second preamble, you're not adhering to that admonition. I'm referring to *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*. I know that apparently I have an outdated edition, so my precise page citation will not be correct, but that's generally what it says, Mr. Speaker.

2:50

**The Speaker:** I noted that one time before, hon. member, but I'm glad to see you've got up.

The hon. member.

**Mr. Nixon:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would point out two things. First, in *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, third edition – I think that is the most current.

**Mr. Mason:** Second.

**Mr. Nixon:** Yeah. The Government House Leader is stuck on the second edition, but that's okay. He's probably still got the first edition back there, too.

Anyways, in chapter 11 on page 513 it says, under supplementary questions:

By definition, a supplementary question is meant to arise from the information given to the House by a Minister or Parliamentary Secretary in his or her response to the initial question. It is thus posed immediately following the response to an initial question. The same guidelines that apply to initial questions also apply to supplementary questions.

Speakers historically had used their discretion to insist that a supplementary question be on the same subject and as a general rule be asked of the same Minister. However, at the beginning of the Thirty-Sixth Parliament in 1997, Speaker Parent allowed the practice to be modified by not insisting that an additional question be, strictly speaking, supplementary to the main question. He indicated that he would find it acceptable for a party to split a round of questioning between two Members, with each one asking a different question to a different Minister. The practice remains in effect today.

Mr. Speaker, that's one thing that I would like to point out to you. But in addition to that, the argument from the third-party House leader and the Government House Leader is that the hon. Leader of the Opposition's questions were not relevant to the other questions that he asked in his order today. I would submit to you that the government is trying to have it both ways with that argument. [interjections] I know the Government House Leader really wants to chime in again, and maybe he can when I'm done, but for now I have the floor.



They, throughout all of their questions today, have referred to the climate action plan or the carbon tax as the reason that the pipeline is being built as a very relevant topic associated with pipelines, and the majority of the questions that were asked by the Leader of the Opposition today were in regard to pipelines, were in regard to consequences as a result of pipelines and the lack of action by this government on pipelines. I would submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that pointing out the lack of consequences to B.C. while at the same time the consequences to Alberta's schoolchildren, in this case, as a result of this government's failed carbon tax is very relevant.

**The Speaker:** Thank you, hon. member.

In this particular instance I agree that there is a point of order. Just to substantiate that, the first supplementary, I believe it was, started out with, "Mr. Speaker, on a different matter," and it seems to reinforce. I would also point out that the Parent ruling did use the phrase "strictly speaking." I know that in this House I do recall that the hon. Member for Calgary-Elbow may have been exactly the victim of that last time, but I did rule on this matter in December 2016, and therefore I would respectfully ask that in the future we keep the supplementary questions related to the main question that any member may be asking.

I believe we have a second point of order. The Government House Leader.

**Mr. Mason:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Well, I've reviewed my point of order and concluded that I do not in fact have a point of order, so I would like to withdraw it.

**The Speaker:** That is always nice to hear from you, hon. member.

### Orders of the Day Public Bills and Orders Other than Government Bills and Orders Second Reading

[Ms Sweet in the chair]

**The Acting Speaker:** The hon. Leader of the Official Opposition.

#### Bill 202 Alberta Taxpayer Protection (Carbon Tax Referendum) Amendment Act, 2018

**Mr. Kenney:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise today to move second reading of Bill 202, the Alberta Taxpayer Protection (Carbon Tax Referendum) Amendment Act, 2018.

Madam Speaker, as a young chap I used to work a lot in this building as head of the Canadian Taxpayers Federation 25 years ago. In fact, I helped to get the Alberta taxpayers association started, if memory serves me correctly, in 1991. At that time Alberta was facing a fiscal crisis not dissimilar to the one in which we are now engulfed. There were some people in this Legislature and outside of it who were suggesting that the way to deal with the then enormous deficit was through the imposition of a sales tax, and, of course, those voices continue to be heard today.

As head of the Canadian Taxpayers Federation at the time, on behalf of our members and, I think, the vast majority of Albertans, I launched a campaign to ask the that Legislature adopt a bill to be called the Taxpayer Protection Act to require that Albertans would get the final say on any prospective future sales tax. I got a very welcoming ear from the then Premier, the late Ralph Klein, and indeed his government accepted our idea in total and in 1995 adopted a statute that has ever since been on the books, the Alberta

Taxpayer Protection Act, which requires, Madam Speaker, that a referendum must be held before a broad-based consumption tax, a sales tax, can be introduced. It's a good thing, because I suspect we'd have a sales tax from this NDP government were it not for this requirement to go through Albertans first.

Let us be clear, Madam Speaker. Albertans have been consistently opposed to sales taxes. The most recent public opinion poll conducted by Mainstreet in January of 2015 indicated 73 per cent disapproval of a provincial sales tax in Alberta versus merely 9 per cent in favour. That's pretty consistent with public opinion polling on this over the recent decades. As any member who has ever observed this will recognize, PST has come to stand for political suicide tax in this province because Albertans pride themselves on having had this Alberta advantage, on having had lower taxes than other provinces, and having been PST free.

But, Madam Speaker, the NDP recognized this when they came to office in 2015, so they brought in what is in many respects a de facto sales tax by another name. They call it the carbon levy, but it is a tax on the consumption of energy. There is nothing that we consume, Madam Speaker, no service or no good that is not somehow produced or delivered with the use of energy. Whether it's going to the grocery store to buy our groceries: they've been shipped in. Those trucks have had to purchase diesel, which is subject to the carbon tax. Heating our homes: whether it is coal fired or gas fired, that energy, which produces about 90 per cent of the power on our grid on an average day, is subject to very high rates under the NDP carbon tax. If we go and buy a restaurant meal, the cost of heating the restaurant, of delivering the food to the restaurant and many other associated input costs are increased by the NDP carbon tax. And on and on and on.

I just mentioned in question period, Madam Speaker, the \$1 million cost increase imposed on the Calgary board of education as a result of the carbon tax, the consequence of which is that they are now looking at reducing their expenditures on full-day kindergarten by one-third.

The impact of this carbon tax has been real and widely felt. I recently visited with my hon. friend, the Official Opposition House Leader. The seniors' centre in his constituency, which is run completely by volunteers, has a modest budget of just \$18,000 per year, and they remarkably deliver fantastic programs to keep seniors active in this community notwithstanding their modest budget. But they're now spending 8 per cent of their annual budget on the NDP carbon tax, causing the volunteer directors of that organization to wonder whether they can keep the doors open and the lights on. When they called the Premier's office to raise concerns about this, they were told to do a fundraiser or to raise their membership fees from low-income seniors on fixed incomes. That's just one microcosm of the real-world impact of this carbon tax, Madam Speaker.

Given that impact and given the 23-year-long precedent of the Alberta Taxpayer Protection Act I have tabled this bill, which seeks to broaden the effect of the Alberta Taxpayer Protection Act to require a referendum before a carbon tax can be introduced in the future or before the rate of the current carbon tax can be increased.

3:00

Now, Madam Speaker, you might reasonably ask: well, since there is a carbon tax, why would we be talking about a referendum for the prospective introduction of one since it's currently a fait accompli? The answer, very simply, is that one of the key issues that Albertans will vote on at the next election is whether or not to eliminate the NDP carbon tax. The Official Opposition, the United Conservative Party, will in our platform be committed to the immediate repeal of the NDP carbon tax in its entirety. Unlike the

third and fourth parties in this place, we don't intend to replace the NDP carbon tax with a different carbon tax.

I must give the NDP credit, though. They do officially oppose the sales tax, unlike the third party, which supports both a carbon tax and a sales tax. So Albertans who want very high taxes will have a choice. They can choose between the NDP or the third party. I don't know where the Liberal Party will end up on this, but they tend to like high taxes. Voters will have a clear choice, Madam Speaker, and if they elect a majority of United Conservative MLAs, I hope and predict that in June 2019 in this Legislature we'll be adopting the carbon tax repeal act.

Now, heaven forbid, Madam Speaker, but at some point in the future beyond that, should a government try to pull an NDP hidden agenda on us again and impose a future carbon tax, they would then be barred from doing so without the consent of Albertans through a referendum should Bill 202 become law. That is why we are proposing this bill.

Also, it is to protect us from future increases because the government has been very clear about this. They introduced their carbon tax without the consent of Albertans, without having mentioned it in their platform. Incidentally, I keep in my desk their platform, Madam Speaker, and on page 24, in the appendix entitled, ironically, *Balancing the Books*, they projected in this current fiscal year a \$25 million surplus, when, in fact, we have an \$8 billion projected deficit. In this platform, on which the government members were elected, there are eight tax changes itemized in the appendix, none of which relate to a carbon tax or carbon levy or whatever euphemism you choose to apply to it. Yet five months later the government introduced the largest tax increase in Alberta history. Whoops. It just kind of somehow appeared out of the ether. They just somehow forgot to mention by far the largest tax increase in our history in this document. That was short-circuiting democracy, and we won't let that happen again. That's why I brought forward this bill.

Now, when they introduced that job-killing carbon tax, they did so at a price level of \$20 per metric tonne, that applies differently to different sources of fuel and energy, but the general rate is \$20 per metric tonne. Then on January 1 of this year, just 10 weeks ago, the government raised that by 50 per cent to \$30 per tonne. But they're not done yet because they've committed to raise it by another 67 per cent. Why? Because Justin Trudeau told them to, which is just about the worst reason I could imagine to do anything, Madam Speaker, let alone raise a tax. But they've committed to raise it by another 67 per cent. Not only have they committed to this in some rhetorical way; they've actually baked it into the budget. The budget projections, including the specious projection of a surplus in the year 2023, are conditional upon that 67 per cent increase in the NDP carbon tax with the associated increase in revenues.

They're not done even there, Madam Speaker, when they jack it up to 50 per cent, because as the Premier said on November 30, 2016: we have never outlined that \$30 was where it was going to stop; people who talk about effective carbon pricing acknowledge that as time progresses, it needs to go up. Quote, unquote. It needs to go up.

So, Madam Speaker, we know that's their intention. As I've said before, it's the frog-in-the-pot syndrome. They started with \$20. They get people used to the idea, without a referendum, without an electoral mandate, without mentioning it in the platform, then a 50 per cent increase, and then a 67 per cent increase. But it doesn't stop there. It's only beginning because their own hand-picked expert who helped to write the carbon tax plan, Professor Leach, has said that a carbon tax would have to be at least \$200 a tonne, in addition to other regulations and policies, in order to achieve a reduction of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions commensurate with the Paris climate conference

targets by 2030. And Environment Canada, the federal environment department, issued a memo in March 2017 saying that a carbon tax would need to be at least \$300 a tonne to achieve the Paris climate emissions targets by the year 2050.

I've made this point before, Madam Speaker, about the disingenuousness of the government's carbon tax policy. If they really believed that they were somehow saving the planet with this carbon tax, if they thought that this was really existential to the future of the planet and the global environment, then they would have the courage of their convictions. They'd just be honest with Albertans and say: "You know what? Everybody, one hundred per cent of the experts, agrees that a \$30 or a \$50 carbon tax does not make an appreciable difference in emissions." If it did, then emissions in British Columbia today would be lower than they were when the Liberal Party there imposed their carbon tax.

If a carbon tax in this range was effective, then it would have resulted in a reduction of emissions in Australia, but it didn't. In fact, they saw emissions increase but the economy and jobs hurt. As a result, the Liberal government in Australia repealed it.

Washington state voters, in the greenest U.S. state, had a chance to review all of these arguments, and they overwhelmingly vetoed a carbon tax when it was put to a referendum last November.

Madam Speaker, this bill merely seeks to give to Albertans the same right that Washington state voters had to determine whether or not to impose such a tax on themselves, and I suspect they would come to the same conclusion.

The French Socialists, Madam Speaker, philosophical fellow travellers of the NDP and, with the NDP, a member party of Socialist International: they, too, intended to introduce a carbon tax until they looked at the data and realized that it was all economic pain and no environmental gain. So the NDP's brothers and sisters in the French Socialist Party did a one-eighty on their intended carbon tax. Unfortunately, apparently the NDP here doesn't really believe in solidarity with their French Socialist brothers and sisters.

So, Madam Speaker, we have this carbon tax, this hidden agenda. It is a de facto consumption tax. Worse than that, it's actually a tax on tax because their friend and close ally Justin Trudeau imposes his GST on the NDP carbon tax. Maybe that's why he wants them to raise it by 67 per cent because he gets more GST revenue out of the higher, future NDP carbon tax.

Madam Speaker, I've asked the government repeatedly: how high will they go? You know, when do they intend to go to Professor Leach's \$200 carbon tax? When do they intend to deliver the Environment Canada preferred \$300 carbon tax? Of course they won't tell us, for the same reason they wouldn't tell Albertans about the \$30 carbon tax in the last election, because they know as well as I do that Albertans would say no. So I say: what are they afraid of? Why don't they support Bill 202 to allow Albertans to have the final say? The only possible grounds for opposition to this bill are fear of the judgment of the Alberta people. The only grounds on which you could oppose this bill are if you oppose the principle of democracy.

3:10

Now, this government had a chance to get a mandate from Albertans on the carbon tax in the last election, but they were afraid. They were afraid of being forthright and honest. That is the same reason why 24 years ago I lobbied the Klein government for a taxpayer protection act requiring a referendum prior to the introduction of a prospective sales tax, because I knew then what every member of this place knows now, in every party, that the government that introduces a sales tax would not be a government that runs on that promise. It would be a hidden agenda in the same way that the carbon tax was.

Madam Speaker, let me just add something. There was a new study that was just produced by a PhD student at the University of Calgary on the impact of carbon taxes on employment, in particular the impact of the British Columbia revenue-neutral carbon tax. Now, to be clear, that was introduced originally about a decade ago as a revenue-neutral carbon tax; there were commensurate offsetting reductions in B.C. income taxes. But the Alberta NDP carbon tax made no such pretense. It was not supposedly revenue neutral.

In any event, this study, which has been done in British Columbia, concludes the following, that the B.C. carbon tax “[increased] the unemployment rates of medium- and low-educated males by 1.4 and 2.4 percentage points respectively. The policy is implemented mainly at the expense of the low-educated.” Mainly at the expense of the low educated. This is a study by Chi Man Yip, published in the *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management*, On the Labor Market Consequences of Environmental Taxes.

Madam Speaker, the NDP, I think, call themselves a progressive party. I’d like to ask them: what’s progressive about adopting a policy has a particularly pernicious effect on employment for people with modest levels of education, for people at the bottom and the margins of the labour market? The NDP loves to talk about soaking the rich in tax policy. That’s not what the carbon tax is doing. It is a regressive tax that imposes proportionately the largest cost on the lowest income people. That’s why notionally they have a rebate, but that rebate is not helping the 2.4 per cent of young Alberta men with the lowest levels of education, because they lost their jobs and a little rebate cheque isn’t going to make up for no job. It’s not helping the Sundre seniors’ centre, and it’s not helping the Calgary kids who are going to lose their kindergarten because of the Calgary board of education. They don’t get a rebate.

I submit, Madam Speaker, that it is time for this Legislature to embrace the principle of democratic decision-making, as we have done with respect to sales taxes, that we ought to apply the same principle to carbon taxes by supporting this bill. If members vote against it, they will be sending a clear message to Albertans that they do not trust the common sense of ordinary Albertans when it comes to such a critical issue, but I am proud to say that the United Conservative Party will always trust Albertans to make such critical decisions.

I call on all members to support this bill. Thank you.

**The Acting Speaker:** Thank you, hon. member.

Are there any other members wishing to speak? The hon. Minister of Indigenous Relations.

**Mr. Feehan:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. It’s my pleasure to stand for a few moments to speak to Bill 202. I can tell you that I am very proud of everything our government has done over the last number of years in order to support two things at the same time, and those are to support both the environment and to support business in this community.

Our job is to stand up for Albertans and our industry by getting real results, and that includes a pipeline approval to tidewater, something that did not happen while the Leader of the Opposition was in a place to do exactly that thing, in Ottawa, for something like 10 years. Why didn’t he get that approval? They were afraid to do the work necessary in order to get things done. That’s one of the things that we are not afraid to do.

Sometimes the opposition reminds me a little bit of the people who can’t keep their eye on the goal line in order to achieve the outcome that they desire because it’s going to take a little bit too much effort. I’m very concerned that they want us to right now run away and give up when things get a little tough in the economy in

this province. You know, the fact that they want to throw out all of the work that’s been done to clean up the environment for the next generation because of their frustration about how hard it is to get things done in this province and sometimes in this country is amazing to me.

We’re very proud of the work that we’ve done to promote pipelines to tidewater, something that the Conservative government in this province failed to do over 44 years. Right now line 3 is under construction, Keystone XL has achieved commercial support to proceed, and we’re closer than ever to breaking our land lock with the Trans Mountain pipeline. We’re very happy to have introduced a bill into the House today that’s going to help us to ensure that we, unlike the opposition, can get the job done even though the job is hard. The Leader of the Opposition and his plan to cancel our climate leadership plan puts all of this at risk, including the great pipeline jobs that are out there and the public transit jobs that are being created all across this province using the carbon levy money.

As Minister of Indigenous Relations I really wanted to take a moment to talk about what it is that the opposition is suggesting doing. The opposition is suggesting taking money out of the hands and therefore out of the mouths of indigenous people all across this province. They have suggested that they are going to come in and that the very first thing they’re going to do is that they’re going to raid and attack the indigenous people in this province who have been using that carbon levy money to create new opportunities and to ensure that two things happen simultaneously. I know that that can be hard for the opposition, but you can achieve two outcomes at the same time if you’re willing to put in the effort and if you don’t give up at the first sign of trouble.

In the indigenous community they talk about that as a pair of moccasins, in which one moccasin is the environment, that we need to take care of and we need to be able to pass on to our children in a way that allows them to live sustainable lives, and the second moccasin is the employment that will provide for the economy today so that they can feed their children. One moccasin on one foot is ridiculous. You need to wear both moccasins at the same time if you’re going to take a journey and you’re going to achieve an outcome. That’s what it is that we have done by coupling together the indigenous climate leadership program, that comes from our carbon levy, and the support for the pipeline.

I can tell you that people in the indigenous community have said many times that they support what we are doing with regard to the carbon levy because they say that they have a respect for the Earth and a desire to pass on a clean environment, to tackle the pollution that’s put out there by carbon, to tackle the pollution that’s put out there by the coal plants, because they care about their children.

For example, Gerald Cunningham, the president of the Metis Settlements General Council, said:

Respect for the land is a fundamental value instilled in the Metis people from the day we are born. Our relationship to our land is unique and deeply spiritual – one that casts us as stewards of a great blessing bestowed by the creator. Our land is the beginning of everything. It feeds us, shelters us, clothes us, and in return, we honour it, we protect it, and we endeavor to leave it better than we found it for the next generation.

Madam Speaker, what Gerald Cunningham is telling us is that we cannot support jobs if we fail to protect the Earth, which is the basis of all that we do.

Yet the opposition is planning right now to take this money away from Gerald Cunningham, away from the Métis settlements, away from the Métis Nation of Alberta, away from the 48 First Nations in this province, who have all used this money to create a better world. In fact, just this last year over 124 projects went forward in indigenous communities, all of which will be stolen from them, just

like the land has been for many years in this country. They are going to steal that away from them again, repeating the degradation of our history with indigenous people. I can't believe that they're standing in the House to make those kinds of statements.

3:20

In fact, there are over 35 communities in this province that are putting up solar panels in this year alone. All of that – the workers that are learning to do the trade, the savings in the economy, the preservation of the Earth, and the reduction of pollution – is going to be stolen by this opposition from the very people who are the primary protectors of the land. I can't imagine: why would they make a decision to do that? Because they only have one thought in mind. The reason why they want to do that is because they have a group of friends, and those friends want to be able to reduce their taxes. It will save the 1 per cent at the very top of our economy \$700 million if they follow through with their plan. That's why they want to do it.

They get up and they talk about the effects of carbon levies on low-income people, yet they oppose raising the actual minimum wage for those low-income people. They talk about how we are going to affect the economy in this province, yet they are going to destroy and undercut the school system, the medical system, and the social system in this province, that support all of those low-income people and allow them to live dignified lives.

None of that matters. Only one thing matters. They only wear one moccasin. They cannot keep two things together. What we have now is a very ridiculous proposition that we are going to give up at the first sign of trouble and that we're going to run away from our commitment, that we're going to say: "Oh, the environment is not so important. We just really want to pursue the income that will be allotted to a very wealthy group of people, and that's what we're going to preserve."

I can tell you that on this side of the House we are not going to do that. We are going to build a strong economy. In fact, indeed we have built a strong economy. Last year we had the highest growth in the economy in the country. Last year we built 90,000 new jobs. What we are doing is successful, and they hate it. They hate it because it proves that the decisions that we made were the right decisions.

At the same time, we are also taking care of the people. We are providing the communities in which there is coal reduction the ability to work on developing new industries in their communities. We are allowing First Nations people, who have consistently struggled within our economy, the chance to develop new job skills, to save money on energy, to retrofit their homes, and, of course, ultimately to participate in the energy market in this province.

For the very first time we have a REP system coming forward requiring that First Nations have equity participation in electricity development in this province, the first time that that's happened. They never did that in the Conservative opposition. That totally depends on us having a carbon levy that allows equity participation and encourages indigenous participation.

I ask again: what does the opposition have against success in the indigenous community? I don't understand why they constantly want to undermine and thwart the success that has been built up by the indigenous people. When the Métis people and the First Nations people come to me, they say: Richard, do two things. I can tell you, it's very exciting.

**An Hon. Member:** Names.

**Mr. Feehan:** You're right. I apologize.

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

Are there any other members wishing to speak? The hon. Member for Drayton Valley-Devon.

**Mr. Smith:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm honoured to rise today to speak to Bill 202, the Alberta Taxpayer Protection (Carbon Tax Referendum) Amendment Act, 2018, that's being put forward by my hon. colleague from Calgary-Lougheed.

Madam Speaker, "democracy" is made up of two Greek words: "dēmos," the people, and "kratia," to rule. The idea in a democracy is that the laws and the rules that bind us together as a community, those laws and those rules that we are expected to obey, the laws that we pass and that we make for this province, should be a reflection of the will of the people of Alberta.

Now, normally in this great province of Alberta we do not practise a direct form of democracy. We have chosen to instead have a representative form of democracy, where the MLAs are elected by their constituents and where those constituents expect that we will go into this Legislature, into this House, and that we will choose to support the vision and the ideas of the people that have elected us, that we will vote on legislation that is consistent with the views of those who have elected us.

We have general elections where political parties put forward platforms and where those platforms are expected to outline the party vision, the vision of where that party wants to go and be directed and where they would take us as a province should they become the government. In a representative form of democracy, Madam Speaker, sometimes the wheels can fall off the vehicle, or the government, so to speak. Sometimes representative democracies can actually be fairly undemocratic when a party makes a clear promise to the constituents and to the people in a general election and then they choose to break it or when they pass legislation that they did not campaign on or where the pieces of legislation that they bring before the House clearly do not represent the support and have the support of the people of the province.

Sometimes, Madam Speaker, the people of this province and the people of a democracy need protection from a government that has forgotten or chosen not to support the wishes of the people. This government has done some pretty unbelievable things in the province over the last three years, and it's damaged our province in the last few years. Their economic policies have led to unprecedented numbers in unemployment. They, through their policies, have created an economy and an economic milieu where investment has often chosen to flee the province, and they have consistently failed to consult with stakeholders, that have a right to have an impact on the legislation that is brought before this House. It's been clear time and time again, as they have brought legislation before this House, that they have failed to consult with stakeholders in any meaningful way.

Madam Speaker, we've seen over the last number of years a doubling of the percentage of the unemployed in Alberta. In 2015 it was at 7.8 per cent, or about 11,600 individuals, and today we're looking at somewhere around 15.6 per cent, or 30,300 individuals, that have been out of work for at least a year or more.

The NDP have failed to consult with Albertans. They failed to consult with Albertans during the election of 2015, when they made no mention of their disastrous carbon tax in their election campaign. Instead, I guess they thought they could save that announcement, that surprise, until they were safely in office. One can only come to the conclusion, Madam Speaker, that they did this because they knew that if they had brought this forward in the last election, they would not have stood a chance of being elected. If they had flaunted that fact, that upon entering office they were going to enter into a

carbon tax, the largest tax hike in Alberta history, this would have resulted in a clearly different result in the election of 2015.

Madam Speaker, the NDP's carbon tax: if it didn't break the law, it clearly violated the spirit of the Taxpayer Protection Act. Even though there is no mention of a carbon tax in the Alberta Taxpayer Protection Act, I think that we could say that in the spirit of that act, this has abrogated that act, clearly.

3:30

Madam Speaker, my colleague who has presented this private member's bill, Bill 202, would suggest that we officially add the carbon tax to Mr. Klein's original legislation to protect Albertans from a government that seeks to punish them with this hidden tax without first giving them the right to have their say. Sometimes the only way to restore the concept of the people ruling is to ensure that the government, through legislation, has to go back to the people in a referendum. Referendums allow the people to have the final say through a direct vote. It allows the people and the government, for that matter, to see if they actually have the support of the people on a particular policy. It allows the people to have the final decision as to whether they will support or whether they will reject a piece of legislation. In this case we would suggest that supporting Bill 202 will allow the members of the great society that we have here in Alberta the opportunity to have the final say, and in a democracy that is never a bad thing.

Madam Speaker, I believe that when Albertans are given the facts, they make wise choices. When given the opportunity to consider how a piece of legislation will impact them and whether it takes Alberta into a position that they can support, they do indeed vote in favour of those pieces of legislation. But I would suggest that history is clear that Albertans were not given the information, were unaware of the desires of this government and, therefore, should have the ability to have a say. Bill 202, which requires a referendum before any future carbon tax is hiked or will proceed, is a good thing for the people of Alberta to have a say on.

The NDP has already raised the carbon tax by 50 per cent. We know that they promise a further 67 per cent and that they're doing this, really, just to curry favour with our current Prime Minister. We know that this carbon tax is a tax on almost everything that we consume. It's linked to the carbon that is being produced, and it means that this carbon tax is, in fact, Madam Speaker, a consumption tax or, as some have called it, a backdoor provincial sales tax.

As we have seen over the last three years, Madam Speaker, no one is safe from this tax. This government has given no leeway. It's given no leeway for us to protect the vulnerable in our population or the nonprofits that serve those folks. Even as I stood up today in the House and asked if this government was prepared to provide an exemption for schools on the carbon tax, the answer was clear: no.

**The Acting Speaker:** Thank you, hon. member.

Are there any other members wishing to speak? The hon. Member for Calgary-Mountain View.

**Dr. Swann:** Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I'm pleased to stand to speak to Bill 202, Alberta Taxpayer Protection (Carbon Tax Referendum) Amendment Act, 2018. Bill 202 proposes to amend the Alberta Taxpayer Protection Act to require that a referendum be held and the result announced by the Chief Electoral Officer before a bill can be introduced which proposes to increase a carbon tax rate or impose a new or expanded carbon tax. It was Mr. Klein back in 1995 that brought in the Alberta Taxpayer Protection Act, that currently requires the province to hold a referendum and have the Chief Electoral Officer announce the

results before a bill can be introduced which seeks to impose a general provincial sales tax.

Given that there is controversy over the carbon tax across the province, it's quite understandable – in fact, perhaps close to 50 per cent of Albertans haven't supported the carbon tax – that for political purposes the UCP might jump on this as an opportunity, a political opportunity to divide and provoke a tax revolt. I find it disingenuous and difficult to embrace when we say that we believe in climate change and we are going to do things about climate change – and this government has done something about climate change, including a modest but graduating carbon tax that everyone, every business can prepare for and that indeed the federal government has said is essential to us moving in the right direction.

This is about changing behaviour, all of our behaviour since we are all responsible for the climate crisis that we are now in. One of the most significant shortcomings of the carbon tax is that it's hard to see how its purpose for changing behaviour is in fact going to do so when 60 per cent of Albertans get a rebate. One could question whether it's significant enough to incite behaviour change and reduce energy demand and reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Indeed, we know from looking at our greenhouse gas numbers, at least up until the last two years, that they've been increasing by 1 to 2 per cent per year steadily, and it's hard to see any impact so far. But that's not a reason to stopping doing it; that's a reason to graduate it and increase it.

While we have supported the carbon tax, we've had real concerns in the Liberal caucus about where the money is going. That was the struggle that I had in supporting the carbon levy when it was brought in. Now I see that my concerns were realized with this fund now being used for all manner of things, including paying the Balancing Pool, when it was supposed to be used for green energy, energy efficiency, education in reducing our energy use.

Apart from that, though, the Alberta Liberals recognize that the Constitution grants the provinces broad taxation authority. That is what we elect governments for, and they were on pretty firm legal footing when it came to introducing the carbon levy in 2017. The same goes for future adjustments to the levy. In fact, under the new federal carbon pricing system, all provinces in Canada will be required to start introducing a price on carbon. Let's provide what the UCP says they want, some certainty for industry. Let's be clear. Let's not be jumping back and forth from one day, one year, one party to the next, saying that we will provide some certainty or that we won't. There is a degree of certainty now not only in Alberta but across the country that we're going to seriously take on, all of us, in terms of our behaviour around carbon fuels.

Albertans, Canadians in general want to see more serious commitment to climate change than they've seen in the past. Certainly, under the past Conservative government here in Alberta, the charge, I think, an intensity target of \$15 a tonne amounted to about \$2.50 per tonne of emissions in this province. No wonder it had no credibility and no impact.

To be clear, we do believe in putting a price on carbon. It's absolutely the right thing for Alberta and for Canada to show some leadership in the world. Of course, we don't produce the major emissions in the world, but we have a responsibility for leadership. The NDP approach to reducing emissions, quite frankly, is not entirely the program that we would favour, but it is a step. It's an important step. We need to be consistent about this carbon levy going into the future. Business wants certainty, and there is at least some clarity coming from both levels of government. I'm not eager to see the impacts of passing a bill like this, creating more uncertainty and certainly sending the wrong message to Canadians as well as the international community about our commitment to climate change.

3:40

From our perspective, the most credible case for having the carbon levy would be (a) to change behaviour, reduce energy consumption; and (b) to finance a truly revenue-neutral change in the tax mix that would enable the province to reduce personal and corporate taxes, to pay for some things that taxpayers care about and that, in terms of lowering taxes on businesses, would encourage economic diversification to happen much more organically instead of the current NDP interventionist approach, which is creating an unfair playing field and some degree of uncertainty in business subsidies, who gets it and who doesn't.

For all the UCP's lofty talk about the importance of direct democracy, Bill 202 is largely about inciting a tax revolt for partisan political gain. It's a kind of political gain for progressives in the same way that the UCP claims that the abortion bubble zone bill is a trap for Conservatives. Bill 202 is also about trying to bind the hands of the Alberta government and restrict its policy options, which I don't think is ever advisable and no government would accept, especially the UCP. It reduces the Legislature's flexibility in terms of dealing with the changing and evolving realities of our province. The government needs options to allow for timely and effective responses.

I'd remind the House that we've seen Alberta Conservatives previously claim that they were acting in defence of taxpayers by legislating balanced budgets only to have to embarrassingly repeal their own legislation when it became too restrictive and they, too, needed flexibility. So the legislation worked for them, at least politically, until one day it didn't work anymore.

In a way Bill 202 is also about trying to enshrine in legislation with some degree of permanence a key Conservative political principle, that being that low or limited taxation is an end in itself. There's an arrogance in assuming that Alberta is still best served by a single, narrow political approach from bygone days. The simple truth is that many Albertans are concerned about climate change and have become increasingly pragmatic in their approach due to the lack of progress, facts that appear to be lost on the UCP leader, presumably, from all his years in Ottawa.

The UCP has offered no real plan of its own to reduce greenhouse gas emissions other than to float the idea of bringing back the PC-era specified gas emitters regulation, SGER, a half measure, at best, that allowed absolute emissions to continue to increase, as a move that would only see others, large emitters really, pay a levy of sorts. The measure would no doubt find favour in at least some circles, but this, I suspect, would be partly true of those who don't acknowledge the threat of climate change or see themselves as a real part of the solution.

Again, this is consistent with what Environics has told us in their polling, and the UCP knows this, that people tend to support tax scenarios that see other people pay. What this ultimately comes down to is a choice. The UCP can either choose to do what's right for our planet, our children, our children's children or, like successive Conservative governments in this province that frittered away hundreds of billions of dollars in nonrenewable resource revenue, it can choose to do what's in its own narrow, short-term political interest. Sadly, this bill signals that the UCP has chosen the latter.

It has also pledged to repeal the carbon tax if elected. This threatens to set Alberta on yet another Conservative-manufactured collision course with the federal government, one that most legal experts say would be in vain. If the UCP leader believes that climate change is real or deserving of meaningful response, he has a funny way of showing it. Albertans are tired of the arrogance and the antics. They want to see real, broad-based action on climate.

The last point I'd make is that referendums are not without their problems and their costs, not the least of which is that not everyone takes the time to properly, objectively weigh the question at hand. This can sometimes lead to problematic outcomes, unintended consequences. But in terms of cost we know from the recent debate around eliminating daylight savings time that a referendum paired with a provincial election would cost somewhere between \$2 million and \$6 million dollars while holding a referendum on its own would cost nearly \$22 million. I think we need to be asking whether this is a good use of public funds, Madam Chair.

**The Acting Speaker:** Thank you, hon. member.

Are there any other members wishing to speak? The hon. Member for Rimbey-Rocky Mountain House-Sundre.

**Mr. Nixon:** Well, thank you, Madam Speaker. It's a pleasure to rise in support of this private member's bill from the hon. Member for Calgary-Lougheed. I thank him for bringing it forward. I'd like to, with my brief time, focus most of my comments on some of the comments that I heard from the hon. Minister of Indigenous Relations, the MLA for Edmonton-Rutherford, earlier today. You know, I have to say that in watching that presentation, which was the government's official response, I guess, to the hon. Member for Calgary-Lougheed's bill, I was quite alarmed. I mean, it was extraordinarily, I would say, hysterical, had very little to actually do with the legislation that is in front of us. Madam Speaker, this is the problem that we see continually with this government and with members in the NDP, not wanting to look at a serious piece of legislation like this that will help Albertans.

You know, the other day the Premier of Saskatchewan tweeted out that a carbon tax does the following: increases the cost of everything for families, including gas, groceries, power, and heat; exports jobs and investment out of Canada to other countries. He says: a carbon tax does not reduce carbon emissions and remain revenue neutral.

The minister who gave that hysterical presentation just a few minutes ago in this Assembly . . .

**Mr. Feehan:** Point of order.

**The Acting Speaker:** A point of order called. The hon. Minister of Indigenous Relations.

#### Point of Order Insulting Language

**Mr. Feehan:** Thank you, Madam Speaker, for the opportunity to address this. My point of order is with regard to 23(h), (i), and (j); that is, a comment that

- (h) makes allegations against another Member;
- (i) imputes false or unavowed motives to another Member; [or]
- (j) uses abusive or insulting language of a nature likely to create disorder.

I think it's fairly clear that the member's attempts to use an old-fashioned Freudian term to refer to my commentary is clearly outside the bounds of respectful discourse and betrays, you know, a desire to bring the repute of this House to a lower level. I think that he should be chastised for engaging in that kind of behaviour and asked to refrain from it in future.

Thank you.

**The Acting Speaker:** Hon. member, do you wish to respond?

**Mr. Nixon:** There's a lot to say but lots to do today with those comments. First of all, the hon. minister clearly doesn't want to be called out on the ridiculous things that he said in this Assembly. I

think that what he said was hysterical. That's the word that I would use to describe that. I would submit to you, Madam Speaker, that this is a matter of debate. If the minister wants to talk about decorum in this place, I suggest that he take some time later on this afternoon to read *Hansard* and re-examine his behaviour in his presentation and things he says about other members of this House.

With that said, Madam Speaker, I'd like to move on with my speech. If the minister could stop interrupting me, I would appreciate it.

**The Acting Speaker:** Thank you, hon. member.

At this point there is no point of order, but I'd just remind the members of the House: if we can be cautious around what sort of language we use.

Please proceed.

### Debate Continued

**Mr. Nixon:** Thank you. As I was saying, Madam Speaker, in response – this is what I think is important – this minister then said to the Premier of Saskatchewan, democratically elected by the people of Saskatchewan: man, oh, man; Trumpism is alive and well in Saskatchewan; when the Premier can't understand science, he prints demonstrably false statements and hopes to create public mistrust now. Sad.

**Mr. Kenney:** Who said that?

**Mr. Nixon:** That's the minister of indigenous affairs, the Member for Edmonton-Rutherford.

That is what I'm talking about, hysterical, to react that way when we're trying to have a discussion, whether with the Premier of Saskatchewan or with members of the House. The way that he acted during his speech, I would say, is hysterical, but I will move on past that because it's troubling the member.

The point is that all that minister wants to do and all that that side of the House wants to do on this important issue is to talk about issues that have nothing to do with the actual legislation we're talking about here, Bill 202. The minister talked about stealing land from indigenous people, projects that may happen in indigenous communities, that may or may not be happening. I don't know if they are. If they are, I'm sure that's great for those indigenous communities. But the point is, Madam Speaker, that if that has all taken place the way this minister submits, he should be happy to submit that to a referendum by the people of Alberta. He should be happy to pass this legislation to give the people of Alberta, including indigenous people, the right to choose whether or not they want this carbon tax.

I represent three reserves. I'm proud to represent three indigenous communities. I can tell you that when I communicate with those indigenous communities, they're not happy with this legislation or the fact that they have to pay a carbon tax. They're certainly not happy with the fact that this is a tax on everything.

But the biggest thing they're not happy with is that this government, when they campaigned, did not tell them that they were going to bring forward this carbon tax. They kept it hidden. As the Leader of the Opposition submitted in his presentation, the reason that they likely kept that hidden – and I agree with the Member for Calgary-Lougheed on this assertion – is because they knew that it was really just a backdoor PST and that if they went to the people of Alberta with that, the people of Alberta would categorically reject it, because that's simply what more than two-thirds of Albertans are already saying when they hear about the carbon tax.

3:50

I'll tell you what the indigenous communities and all my communities that I represent say when they talk about the carbon tax. First, they get very upset about their heating bills. They're upset about their gas bills. They're furious that this government then brought in a \$30 carbon tax, that they did not tell Albertans about. Then because Justin Trudeau, the close personal ally of this NDP government, asked them to, they raised it to \$50 without consulting Albertans, and then, hidden in this budget, they raise it another 67 per cent. If all the great things with the carbon tax are actually happening and Albertans truly want the carbon tax, this government should be happy to submit it to the people and show the opposition that this is actually what Albertans want. Prove us wrong. The only reason, Madam Speaker, that you would not want to go to the people of Alberta is because the government side of the House knows the opposition is right and that Albertans have categorically rejected this approach. They've categorically rejected it.

When the minister stands and talks about the projects the carbon tax may be buying for certain communities, he does not answer the questions and the points brought forward by the Official Opposition leader with this legislation on the damage that this carbon tax is doing to the social safety net of many places in this province. He ignores the fact, as the Member for Calgary-Lougheed presented, that the Sundre West Country Centre, which is still in danger of closing directly as a result of this NDP's tax – in fact, the social agencies within my communities have said repeatedly, over and over and over, that they are in danger of not being able to provide services to our communities, one hundred and ten per cent because of the carbon tax that this government brought in.

Now, maybe there are more – maybe there are more – Albertans that actually do want the carbon tax, but that's the point. Let's bring forward some legislation that will then let them have a choice. This is important, because while I believe that we will form the next government – and I want to be a hundred per cent clear that it is our intention in bill 1 to remove the job-killing carbon tax and to be able to provide relief to Albertans – the fact is that as we've already seen inside this House, the other parties, including the Liberal Party and the Alberta Party, want to bring in more than just a carbon tax. They want to bring in a provincial sales tax. We have a government here that hides the tax and wants to continue to increase the tax on Albertans.

So it's important that we make sure that the spirit of law that Premier Klein brought in as a result of the lobbying by the Member for Calgary-Lougheed or the good work that he did with the Taxpayers Federation is honoured because that is not what's happening. Now, certainly, 10 years ago or whenever we first brought in that legislation, we weren't talking about taxing air or carbon. That was just not part of the political equation at the time, so it makes sense to update that legislation to make sure that Albertans can have a say in the future. That's all that this legislation does.

If the minister of indigenous affairs actually feels that this carbon tax has accomplished so many great things for his community and for the people of Alberta, he would stand in this House and he would say: "I support this legislation. Let my constituents have a right to be able to decide if they want to be taxed this way." That's all this legislation does. Let the people of Alberta decide if they want this carbon tax. This government and that minister in particular, in my experience, forget who they work for. He doesn't work for the Premier. He doesn't work for the NDP. He works for the people of Edmonton-Rutherford and for the people of Alberta, and the people of Alberta want a say in whether they are taxed this way.

The people of Alberta are sick of paying this carbon tax on every product that they purchase in their daily lives. The kids inside the Calgary school board that are going to see their kindergarten classes be reduced directly as a result of this government's carbon tax want the carbon tax to go away and want to be able to go to kindergarten to the same level as the kids that were before. The swimming pools in our communities: that's actually one of the interesting nonprofits that have been hit the most inside of rural communities because they're all run by volunteers and people that raise money so that kids can go to those swimming pools. Their heating costs went up astronomically, and they're in danger of shutting. They want a referendum. They want to be able to tell this government that this is not acceptable.

This government rejecting and the NDP and its members standing up in this House and saying that there's something wrong with this legislation and indicating that they're going to vote against it – and if they do vote against it, let's be very clear what that means. They are voting against Albertans' – their boss and my boss – right to make a decision on whether or not they should pay a tax. That's it. That is the decision that is before this House, nothing else. If the government truly believes that this is the right way for Albertans to go, they should stand up, support it, and have Albertans show the United Conservative Party that we're actually wrong and that they want a carbon tax. The problem is that that's not what Albertans will say. The members across the way know that's not what they say.

I predict, through you, Madam Speaker, that they will continue through the afternoon to rise and say hysterical, irrelevant things because they have no argument as to why they've been putting this job-killing carbon tax on the people of Alberta. They have no argument for the attack that they've done on our social agencies inside our communities. They have no answers for the senior citizens who are being forced to pay this carbon tax on a fixed income. They have no answers for the seniors in my community that are calling me and telling me that they've had to turn down the heat as a result of their gas bills. They have no answers for the agriculture community on the direct increase in costs in getting their product to a market. They have no answer at all. That is why they continue to force this tax on Albertans, and that is why they're not supporting the Member for Calgary-Lougheed's legislation.

**The Acting Speaker:** Thank you, hon. member.

Are there any other members wishing to speak? The hon. Member for Edmonton-McClung.

**Mr. Dach:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. It gives me pleasure today to rise to speak to Bill 202, brought forward by the Leader of the Official Opposition. You know, like many members of this Legislature, I go door to door canvassing regularly in my riding of Edmonton-McClung, and I did so this week as well, yesterday, as a matter of fact, for three hours. I was in a fairly affluent area of the constituency. The constituency has a very mixed economic spectrum, from people who are well below the poverty line to those who are among the most affluent in the province. The neighbourhood that I happened to be door-knocking in yesterday afternoon was one that had homes in the \$500,000 to \$750,000 range, not individuals who would generally be eligible to receive the carbon levy rebate. I knocked on probably 40 or 50 doors and had good conversations with a number of people.

Madam Speaker, I'm not sure if you can guess how many people in that evening of door-knocking asked me for a referendum, but I'll let you know. It was exactly zero who asked me to go back to the Legislature and demand that a referendum be called to determine whether or not we should increase the carbon levy. I can't

imagine a more divisive instrument in our political world than a referendum.

I lived through, as many people in this House have done, referendums on existential matters at a federal level, where we were looking at the division of our country, the loss of Quebec from our country. I happened to be in Quebec for the 1980 referendum debate, the first one, in an immersion program for a month when the debate was taking place, and I can tell you that I had a more difficult experience politically in those formative years, looking at how divisive the debate was up in the community of Jonquière, Saguenay Lac-Saint-Jean, where the leader of the Liberal Party, Bourassa, where Premier Lévesque came. Indeed, Prime Minister Trudeau came to rally the troops in their own defence, in defence of their own arguments. The community was split very decisively. In that particular area the forces for the oui won by 75 per cent, and it was a very, very thunderous and deafening debate between family members across the streets and even within families, where you had divisions that were raised that really, to this day, live on.

So I'm not a big fan of referendums per se. I know that they may have their place in that type of a debate, where it's an existential question, but when we're talking about simply raising a carbon levy, something that's already in place, I really question whether or not that – well, I don't believe, in all honesty, that we should be looking at a question of a referendum to ask Albertans whether they approve of this or not because, as the Leader of the Official Opposition has already indicated in his remarks, Albertans, of course, always have the final say, and they will have the final say, and it will be in a kind of referendum. It will be in a general election. That's where the final say will happen.

I really look forward to that general election upcoming, when they will announce themselves, because I believe that the result that we'll find is one of support for the government policy and a carbon levy. You know, the question that Albertans have asked themselves repeatedly – and I think they've come to a very knowledgeable and expressed conclusion – is the question that I think, maybe, the opposition should perhaps ask themselves to implement as a referendum question. That question, Madam Speaker, is to ask Albertans: do you think climate change is primarily caused by human carbon footprint? Do you think climate change is real? The answer to that question, that you'll get throughout this province, is yes.

**4:00**

I think that the Official Opposition probably misses the mark on a lot of things right now. You know, God love them. If they want to continue on in that vein, far be it from me to get in the way of having them drive their little blue truck back in time with their transmission firmly placed in reverse. They should be careful. That driving with the rearview mirror is going to land you in a ditch. Going back in time, which is something that the Official Opposition seems to really want to do – as expressed by the Leader of the Official Opposition in an opinion piece that was asked of him in the *Edmonton Sun* sometime ago, his favourite superpower would be to choose to go back in time. Well, he's leading us back in time with these requests for referendums.

I'm not sure how far back in time the Leader of the Official Opposition would have us go. You know, back to the '90s, when shoot, shovel, and shut up was the order of the day or we were blowing up hospitals? Or perhaps back to the 1950s, when indeed we were going full speed ahead, not really caring about the environment, whether it happened to be in our energy consumption or in our agriculture. I can remember back as far as 1968, when I was shovelling coal in my grandfather's basement into a coal furnace. It wasn't too many years after that – it was about that time



– when they transitioned that house, that they built in 1947, to natural gas. Even back in that time, in my childhood, Madam Speaker, we recognized the benefits of transitioning to cleaner burning fossil fuels. I think that the Official Opposition is, as I said, really missing the boat when they try to explain to Albertans that the climate change program that we've implemented is going in the wrong direction.

There is a real reason that we've implemented a price on carbon, and that's because it works. But don't take my word for it. Take the word of Mr. Preston Manning, who indicates in this quote that for any economic activity, especially [with] the production of energy, we should identify its negative environmental impacts, devise measures to avoid, mitigate or adapt to those impacts, and include the costs of those measures in the price of the product. It's the idea behind using carbon pricing to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

From, of all people, Preston Manning.

Now, I'm not sure if the Official Opposition leader is going to contest those comments made by Mr. Manning, but I'd be interested to hear how he responds to that defence of carbon pricing from one who would be described I think quite favourably as a leading light of the conservative right. From that perspective, I think that they should really think deeply about where they're going with their movement towards expecting that Albertans are going to back them on a referendum and expecting that Albertans will decide that pricing carbon is something that they shouldn't be doing.

I think that at the doors and the meetings that I have with constituents, almost nobody is questioning the reason for what we're doing. They realize that carbon levies, as has been expressed by other members of the Legislature opposite, are put in place to change behaviours, and that is a measure that is taken by governments the world over and, not only that, but by businesses. Businesses employ the same type of measures. They will increase or lower prices to change behaviours of their customers. Governments, when they do impose or remove taxes, are doing the same thing. I'm not sure why when a business will do this, it's somehow an effective tool, but when a government does impose a tax or reduce a tax, it's somehow a means of imposing their will on a free economy, which they believe should just be left alone to do as it sees fit.

For those reasons, I really believe that the blunt instrument of a referendum should be used only for really, seriously existential questions and that this divisive instrument is totally unnecessary. The referendum that I really look forward to, Madam Speaker, is the one that's going to take place during the next general election. I for one and, I'm sure, all other members on this side of the House join me in eager anticipation because I sure as heck can't wait for it.

Thank you.

**The Acting Speaker:** Thank you, hon. member.

Are there any other members wishing to speak? The hon. Member for Calgary-Greenway.

**Mr. Gill:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. It's a great honour for me to rise to speak to second reading of Bill 202, the Alberta Taxpayer Protection (Carbon Tax Referendum) Amendment Act, 2018, proposed by the Member for Calgary-Lougheed. Since the carbon tax was introduced, Albertans have rejected it from day one and not just because it was sprung on Albertan taxpayers without forewarning and not just because foisting an unnecessary financial burden on Albertans, who are already struggling, is wrong and not even because of the provincial government's capitulation to every ridiculous proposal of their best friend in Ottawa. In fact, there is so much wrong with this tax on every level imaginable that I could

go on for hours. Actually, I think all the members in opposition would love to go on on this bill for hours because this is rejected by Albertans on every single level.

Even after exploring all of these contradictory, disingenuous, and unfair aspects of the carbon tax, I still felt a deep-rooted despair that struck at my very core. I'm pleased to tell you that I've figured it out. The sponsor of Bill 202, the hon. Member for Calgary-Lougheed, underscored it in his brilliant maiden address to this Assembly last Thursday. Now, I'll mention the date for anyone who has yet to view his inspirational speech. It was April 5, and I believe he started at 3:10 p.m. and ran until the end of session at 4:30. At approximately 3:40 in his address the Leader of the Official Opposition quoted a phrase that has been dear to my heart from the first time I walked into this Chamber. That phrase is right above your chair, Madam Speaker, and is in our coat of arms: *Fortis et Liber*, strong and free. You have heard me talking about the coat of arms in this Chamber a lot of times. That is Alberta's motto.

You know, the forefathers of this province gave us that motto as a definition of this province and perhaps even as a challenge. Through the first 11 decades since our founding in 1905 legislators have kept Alberta strong and free, Madam Speaker, but I'm afraid that in the last three years, it hasn't been as strong and free. When this government imposes a tax without even consulting Albertans – close to 70 per cent of Albertans rejected this tax – how can they be free and strong?

If you want to point out the most glaring example of a government that's marching to drumbeats that only it can hear – and, of course, the drummer is their best friend Justin Trudeau – it is a carbon tax born in Ottawa and heavily welcomed by our socialist NDP government. Actually, I think, Madam Speaker, that the word “welcomed” is a very soft word for no sooner did Justin Trudeau say that a national carbon tax was on the horizon than did Alberta rush to put its own carbon tax in place. This was despite our economy sliding into a terrible recession. The government did not care about what the state of the economy was; they just wanted to, you know, move forward with their ideology.

In fact, you can likely say that the NDP's best friends in Ottawa provided them with an excuse and false credibility to introduce a tax plan, carefully hidden during their 2015 election campaign, because if this government had introduced this in their election campaign, the chances are that they probably would not have been here.

**An Hon. Member:** They wouldn't be here.

4:10

**Mr. Gill:** They wouldn't be here. Yes.

But they're wrong, Madam Speaker, for neither they nor their carbon tax have any credibility with the people who matter, Albertans, the people whom we all come here to serve. What we know is that this is a tax that Albertans rejected and that Albertans saw through from the beginning.

Now, let me address the importance of Bill 202, Madam Speaker, the carbon tax referendum act, and explain why I support it so strongly and, as a matter of fact, why all the members on this side would support it so strongly. First of all, I think I must thank the Member for Calgary-Lougheed for showing strong leadership in not only opposing the carbon tax but also in his fairness to doing so through this bill and actually setting an example by giving the authority and power to the people to make a decision, not us making a decision on their behalf when they rejected this carbon tax. This proposed legislation will give this NDP government an opportunity to hold a province-wide vote on the carbon tax.

Why would they accept this opportunity? Well, there are good reasons for doing so. They keep on telling us: "This is not a job-killing carbon tax. This is not an economy-damaging tax. It's not a big deal. Albertans can easily absorb it by making simple changes in their daily lives. Don't eat meat. Take a bus. These are simple changes they can make." That's what the government is saying. If the government is so proud of their mandate, let Albertans decide. I don't think it should be up for debate. The government should be championing this bill.

We, on the other hand, happen to believe that it is a job-killing carbon tax, that it is an economy-damaging and ideological tax. Albertans should not have to freeze in the dark to fulfill this NDP's and Justin Trudeau's ideological tax. That is accomplishing nothing except causing hardship for our citizens. You can see that we're on very different sides of this equation. Bill 202, however, gives the NDP a fair chance to prove that we are wrong. They can send this bill to a referendum. Maybe we are wrong. Let Albertans decide that.

Right now a referendum on the carbon tax, as you know, Madam Speaker, will take place in 2019. Otherwise, there's a general election, where our leader and all the members from the UCP have said that, clearly, we will repeal this carbon tax should Albertans give the UCP a mandate to serve them. But the NDP can pass Bill 202, invite the LG to call a referendum, and let Albertans vote on this carbon tax now. Then when it's defeated through a referendum – because, Madam Speaker, it will be; trust me – they can repeal it themselves and have an election that does not hinge on this hidden tax.

The Member for Calgary-Lougheed has been very clear about his plan for Alberta's carbon tax. It will vanish, and in quick order, after the next election. We all know that he has said that in public on many occasions.

Madam Speaker, this bill is actually doing a favour for this socialist NDP government, and of course it's doing a favour for the very people we are all here to serve, Albertans.

Actually, I would like to cover one more issue regarding this tax, and that is the NDP government's next step to take away the veil that the carbon tax is about carbon reduction. The minister of indigenous affairs was talking about how we don't care about the clean environment and how we're climate deniers.

[The Speaker in the chair]

We have asked in this House to give us the details on how much of a reduction of greenhouse gas emissions there has been after the implementation of this tax, and we have yet to see the numbers. There's no data about it. The people, the scientists, economists, professional people, have said on this very topic that in order to make any difference, the carbon tax has to be close to – what? – \$200, \$300 per tonne.

**Mr. Mason:** Is that what you want?

**Mr. Gill:** That's what you want, it seems like. Albertans don't even want this, Minister. You know that.

To answer your question, sir, why don't we put this to a referendum and let Albertans decide what they want? It's not about what we want. We don't want any tax.

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

**Mr. Hanson:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Again I'd just like to thank you for coming up to Lac La Biche on Friday. I hope you had a great time up there. It's a beautiful community. Thanks again.

It's an honour to rise and speak in support of Bill 202, the Alberta Taxpayer Protection (Carbon Tax Referendum) Amendment Act, 2018, brought forward by my hon. colleague from Calgary-Lougheed. You know, back in the 1990s the concept of taxing carbon, air, and everything else would have been laughable here in Alberta – and I think a lot of Albertans still think it's laughable – so much so that at that time Ralph Klein, in consideration of taxpayers, passed the Alberta Taxpayer Protection Act. He would ensure that Alberta does not impose a provincial sales tax on Albertans before a referendum is held and everyone's voice has a chance to be heard. As a matter of fact, a younger version of the Leader of the Opposition was president of the Canadian Taxpayers Federation at the time, and he helped this essential law get passed.

Of course, in the '90s no one was talking about a specific carbon tax, sort of like the NDP during the 2015 election campaign. Go figure. Since almost everything else we consume can be linked to carbon, it seems to me that it is, in fact, a tax on everything, or, in other words, a consumption tax. Not only is it in essence a consumption tax but also an ever-growing consumption tax, the largest tax hike in Alberta's history, in fact. By not mentioning it in their 2015 election platform, they managed to circumvent any consultation with Albertans and inflict this tax on families that are already struggling in the grips of what even the members opposite agree is the worst recession to hit us in a generation.

You know, last week I asked a very interesting question, that was pertinent to folks out in my constituency, regarding the carbon tax on school bus drivers. I pointed out that school bus drivers are hauling our very precious cargo every day, and the Minister of Education's answer to whether we could get an exemption for school bus drivers was: well, we're reinsulating schools, we're changing windows on schools, and we're going to save school boards all kinds of money. Never once in the three questions I asked – and I will be asking him again in the days coming forward to clarify – did he actually address the cost of the carbon tax on the school bus drivers. It's ever-increasing. Their insurance is increasing.

I did a very interesting video, that I'm going to have to send to the Transportation minister, on a five-mile bus ride that happened the day I was talking to those school bus drivers about their carbon tax. They were complaining about this one specific road, so I said: well, let's go for a ride. They had a 60-seat bus, and I went and sat in the back seat of that thing. I'll tell you what. I'm a pretty big guy, and I can't imagine being a 40- or 50-pound kid sitting in the back of that bus, because he'd have been bouncing off the roof. Man, it was quite scary, you know, the racket and the vibration on the bus. These are privately owned buses, Mr. Speaker, that these folks not only have to repair on their own but that they have to fuel and oil change and change springs on and all this kind of stuff. What I'm saying is that the carbon tax is just another added expense to them.

Just a couple of points here. The Canadian Taxpayers Federation said in the *Calgary Sun* on January 12 that 55 per cent of Albertans received no rebate cheque or that it was less than they paid in carbon taxes. The Canadian Taxpayers Federation in the *Calgary Sun* on January 12 also said that while the NDP claims a family of four will receive \$540 in rebates this year, government estimates show the carbon tax will cost the same family up to \$613 this year. It's still a negative impact. You have to be a low-income earner to qualify for this rebate, so even that \$100 could be a major hit to them.

By the same token here, in the *Globe and Mail* on January 21 the Laurier centre for economic research said that a significant hike to the carbon price is necessary to achieve emissions targets. A 10 per cent reduction in emissions over seven years would require a \$175-per-tonne levy. So the \$30 tax that we're hitting Albertans with is

absolutely doing nothing, and I think that's been reiterated by many other groups as well.

4:20

The NDP's carbon tax is in clear violation of the spirit in which the Taxpayer Protection Act was passed. Again I will mention that they did not include it in their campaign platform. There should be no pride in their managing to get a consumption tax passed without first going through the proper channels and without even asking Alberta families how it would affect them. We've often asked about the economic impact analysis that they've done, but they've never come forth with that because apparently there really isn't one or they don't like the information that it might share with us.

Bill 202, the Alberta taxpayer protection amendment act, will specifically add the carbon tax to the existing act to alleviate any chance that the NDP government or any future government can continue using a grey area as a loophole. Unlike the NDP, we've been very clear from the start: bill 1 of a United Conservative government will be focused on repealing the carbon tax. We see the real effects it is having on families, that are essentially being told to turn down the heat in this apparently never-ending winter. It seems to be snowing out there again today, so we're in the middle of April, and we're far from being out of it.

The NDP is desperately trying to avoid discussing their carbon tax, but voters will finally have their say in the spring of 2019. Although we're confident that Albertans will have their say at the polls this time around, we need to ensure their peace of mind for the future. Years from now we need to make sure that no government will force through a carbon tax without directly asking the voters first. We can't have a repeat of what has happened this time around with a surprise tax and then continuous tax increase after tax increase. A referendum will be mandatory before a provincial government can impose a carbon tax. This is why I'm so pleased to be speaking about Bill 202 today. We want to assure Albertans that they will not be seeing a surprise tax without having any input on the matter beforehand. We've already seen the NDP raise their carbon tax by 50 per cent. Where was the consultation on that? I don't recall any.

**Mr. Strankman:** Or the benefits.

**Mr. Hanson:** Or the benefits. Yes, exactly.

Now they promise to further increase the carbon tax by 67 per cent just because their friend Justin Trudeau has asked them to. We know that Justin Trudeau is planning on even further hiking the tax. These taxes are relentless in hitting families where it hurts, over and over, with each increase.

But, Mr. Speaker, this doesn't just affect families. The reason that we like to call it a tax and that the government likes to call it a levy is because if it was a tax, they wouldn't be able to pass that tax on to municipalities. I hear from school boards, municipal governments all over the province, seniors, native friendship centres. The Minister of Indigenous Relations talked about the effects of this bill somehow on solar panels on reserves. But, you know, you forget that there is also a cost to native friendship centres. I usually fill up at my local co-op store and gas bar in St. Paul, and a lot of times I'm standing in line with natives from either Saddle Lake or Kehewin or from the Métis settlements. They're standing there paying for the gas, just like I am. They're paying the tax, just like I am. There's no exemption there for them. They're not seeing the benefit of that.

You know, saying that this doesn't affect them or that they're going to have this wonderful windfall from solar panels – the minister and I have spoken numerous times in estimates and other

places regarding the road conditions. Is it going to be a comfort to the parents and council in Goodfish Lake or Saddle Lake this spring when the kids are missing school or they can't get water hauled to some of the residences because of the road conditions but they'll maybe have these nice, shiny solar panels on the council chamber building? It'll be small comfort to them, when you and I both agree that the very most important thing is education for those kids. [interjection] Yes. You're nodding. I'm happy to see that.

Not only that, but it affects food banks – you know, we've talked about trying to get exemptions for some of these folks – women's shelters, volunteer community organizations. Somebody talked earlier about swimming pools. Hockey rinks: everybody knows the importance of hockey to our small communities, as we found out with that horrific accident in Saskatchewan and how it affects those communities. A lot of our communities are centred around the rinks.

Actually, I was at a celebration on Saturday night for the CAP Arena in St. Paul, where they celebrated 35 years. That was a community initiative to get a second piece of ice for kids to practise on. You know, 10-year-old kids were having to show up at 5:30 in the morning for hockey practice before school, so the parents all got together and lobbied the government, lobbied the town and the county, and raised money . . . [Mr. Hanson's speaking time expired] That was a quick 20 minutes.

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

**Dr. Turner:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I know it's sort of traditional to say that it's my pleasure to stand up and talk about Bill 202, but in fact I'm really disappointed in the new Leader of Her Majesty's Official Opposition. Basically, this was a great opportunity. This was the first bill that he was bringing forward before this Legislature. I'm sorry to have to use this terminology, but it's really a waste of time. There are so many other things that we could have been talking about during this private members' business, and this is our time. The backbenchers and the opposition get the chance to actually talk about topics of importance to Albertans, particularly to the Albertans in their constituencies. We have had some brilliant private members' bills arising from the opposition, and several of those have actually been a boon to this province and have received the support of all members.

I think the first one that I can remember came from the Member for Calgary-West, the private member's bill dealing with getting some control on pill presses. All of us recognize that the addictions crisis, particularly the fentanyl crisis, is something that basically affects all Albertans. We need to do whatever we can, and this side recognized that that was a good idea coming from the MLA for Calgary-West.

His colleague the MLA for Chestermere-Rocky View also had a very good idea and spent a lot of time researching and consulting on and developing a bill that was really important. This was the adoption information bill; I don't have that name completely correct. I had several constituents who came to my office and said to me – and I won't use my name – “Make sure that this goes ahead because this is vitally important to us. We've been trying to get involved in adoption, and it is very important that we get this bill going ahead.” I am proud that I can say that I stood up and participated in the debate and participated in support of the Member for Chestermere-Rocky View, and I am very happy that that bill has been passed.

[Ms Sweet in the chair]

The third bill that we all agreed to, that came from the opposition, to my recollection, was the bill from the MLA for Bonnyville-Cold

Lake, again a very important bill and, actually, a bill that has some resonance with what we're talking about today. It was the image-sharing bill. In case the opposition doesn't realize what was going on, this bill was looking at a situation where social media could be manipulated for ill ends by reprobates, that we needed to put a stop to. The Member for Bonnyville-Cold Lake was particularly concerned about the sharing of intimate images. I mean, this goes back to how, say, referendums could be manipulated by people, reprobates that want to use social media in a very inappropriate way to influence an election.

4:30

I can tell you, for instance, just to give an example of how that might affect a referendum, to look at the Brexit situation. Look at what happened with Brexit. The leader of the Conservative Party in the House of Parliament of Great Britain thought that she – sorry, it was not a she; at the time it was a he – could call a referendum and sort of get a false approval for this Brexit. It turns out that nefarious conspirators in the social media world, maybe coming from a foreign source like Russia or actually more likely from an American source, from the same types of people that supported the election of the most recent President of the United States – but there are ways that Facebook and other social media can be manipulated, and in fact even the electoral process itself can be manipulated in a referendum.

I bring all this up because, again, it's a waste of time to discuss this. We have been elected in May 2015 to make laws. I can tell you that many of my constituents have told me that they're very happy that this government was elected in May 2015 and that in November 2015 presented our climate leadership plan because they are concerned about the climate, and they are convinced of the evidence that man is creating problems with the climate. This goes back 200 years. It's related to industrialization. It's a process that is scientifically proven despite the suggestions from some of the members of the opposition that the science isn't clear on this. There is absolutely no doubt that the industrialization and the burning of fossil fuels and other activities have led to excessive greenhouse gas emissions, and we as a world need to do something about this. So the Paris agreement was agreed to more than 20 years ago, and Canada is a signatory to that. We need to be doing our part here in Alberta to deal with that.

It is, in my estimation, a complete waste of time to be discussing this today. I would have hoped that the Leader of the Opposition could have come up with something that actually will help Albertans, will help them deal with the effects of climate change.

Madam Speaker, I've been here in this province for 42 years, and pretty well every year and sometimes more than once a year I go up into the national parks of this province and go to the glaciers at Lake Louise, and I drive the highway. I want to just spend a bit of time talking about Lake Louise – or the Columbia icefields are probably an even better example. Go to the Columbia icefields and go to the sort of headquarters there – it's on the other side of the road from the glacier – and you can actually see the signposts that have been put in along the distance, and it's now close to three kilometres, I believe, from the headquarters to the toe of the glacier. This, to me, is incontrovertible evidence that our climate is warming.

Just this past year, 2017, the Arctic Ocean has been open at Christmastime. Unheard of. It's happening. The last 10 years have seen, I think, seven of the hottest years on record, and it's going up. It's going up because of mankind producing too many greenhouse gases. Our carbon footprint is too large. We need to be doing something about this.

So the bill proposes to require a referendum if the carbon levy is to be increased, you know, or if we're going to respond to the federal government increasing the carbon levy, presumably it would

have to be approved by that. You know what? The opposition talks about our best friends in the federal government. In fact, the federal government is going to help us get the Kinder Morgan expansion done. They are stepping up.

**The Acting Speaker:** Thank you, hon. member.

I will now call on the hon. Member for Calgary-Elbow, followed by the hon. Member for Calgary-Fish Creek.

**Mr. Clark:** Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I want to be very clear that the Alberta Party supports action on climate change. We believe that climate change is human caused. We believe it's a problem that needs to be addressed, but we do have great concern with the way that this particular government's carbon tax has been structured. We are supportive in the Alberta Party of a carbon tax in principle. I think that, done properly, it can work well, but this particular government's version of the carbon tax has not been done very well. As a result, they have taken what can be a very effective policy tool and, unfortunately, have caused many Albertans to find themselves opposed to this. Many Albertans that I talk with in my own constituency and elsewhere see nothing but downsides, see nothing but money going out of their pockets, and they don't see a tangible benefit from Alberta's carbon tax. That is what needs to be fixed. Having said that, Madam Speaker, I don't think that a referendum is the best way to go about fixing that.

What I find interesting is that the Leader of the Official Opposition has proposed a bill here which really backs Alberta into a corner. On the one hand, he's arguing that the federal government should use their legislative authority, constitutional authority to make sure that the Kinder Morgan pipeline goes ahead. I agree. We should ensure that the federal government does everything within its power, right up to the very edge of that power, to ensure that a project that has been federally approved and reviewed and is very clearly in the national interest moves ahead. I'm very much supportive of that. But, on the other hand, he proposes a bill that would allow an Alberta referendum to override, in essence, the federal taxation authority as it relates to the increases to the carbon tax going forward, and that to me seems not to add up.

I want to speak a little bit, though, about the concerns that we do have with the way that this carbon tax is structured. My concern is that it is really not an environmental policy. Any pretense of this being an environmental policy went out the window with this last budget, where money is clearly in the future going directly to general revenues without even the pretense of the – I think that "revenue recycling" is the code word they've used in current budgets. By definition, income and corporate taxes are revenue neutral because they all get, quote, unquote, recycled in Alberta. That is not the definition of revenue neutrality by any authority that I know of. I would suggest that this current carbon tax does contribute directly into general revenues, and what's absolutely certain is whatever, I would say, is a mythical path to balance relies heavily on future carbon tax revenues going into general revenues.

If we want to take action on climate change – sorry; just let me make one more point on that. The reason for the need for this government to put the carbon tax revenue into general revenues is because they've been unable to restrain themselves on the spending side in any meaningful way, and they've also been unable to grow the pie, to allow Alberta entrepreneurs to create an attractive investment climate to invest, to create jobs, to generate economic activity and increase tax revenue to allow us to pay for the things that matter in this province. That would be true of energy investments but is true also of broader investments as well. So if we want to take action on climate change, we'd better be ensuring that we're doing something that's effective.

4:40

Interestingly enough, this government finds itself in the position of being the single-largest carbon emitter in the province because now they own all the PPAs from the coal-fired plants that still exist. I'm fairly sure that when they were elected, they didn't anticipate that an NDP government would be Alberta's largest carbon emitter, but there you have it.

The Alberta Party is very much a believer, as I said last week in my member's statement, in that great word, "and." We believe we can have a strong energy sector, traditional hydrocarbon oil and gas sector, and we can have innovation and investment in environmental technologies. I think we should look at climate change and the challenge of overcoming climate change, the challenge of overcoming carbon emissions, as not something to be afraid of, not something to ignore, as the Official Opposition I think would do, but as something that is the single-greatest market opportunity in Albertans' lifetimes.

We have the entrepreneurs. We have the innovators, the technology folks, the scientists, the engineers, the welders, the tradespeople. We have the finance people to put the deals together. We have all of the ingredients to allow Alberta to thrive in a carbon-constrained world by creating the technologies of the future that Alberta entrepreneurs will sell to the rest of the world. A carbon tax can be an important part of that because it takes money and allows that investment in those green technologies. It can be Alberta entrepreneurs who drive this if we do it right.

I would argue that we can't do that without a carbon tax, but it has to be done properly. It shouldn't be scrapped; it should be fixed. How would we fix it? We would make it revenue neutral by cutting personal and corporate tax to offset the amount of money that comes in from the carbon tax. We would exempt not-for-profits. We would exempt schools and school boards. We would ensure that home heating is exempted as well. We would fix the rebate system to ensure that people who genuinely are disadvantaged by paying the carbon tax, people who really, truly have to make that choice between putting food on the table and paying their carbon tax would get a rebate. I would argue that is not two-thirds of Albertans, so I would suggest that fixing the rebate system is going to be a huge part of it. They need to make sure that the people who genuinely need help do actually get that help. We'd also ensure that investments are made in green technologies, in making sure that Alberta has an attractive investment climate.

I know that Albertans do want to take action on climate change because I hear from them all the time. The number one issue I hear from my constituents is about the carbon tax, but it's not that they necessarily want to scrap it entirely. They want to fix it. Albertans that I talk with understand the need to take action on climate change. They understand the importance of a carbon tax and doing that, but they want the carbon tax to be effective, not just simply another revenue-generating tool.

I would be very clear, Madam Speaker, that the Alberta Party will not be voting in favour of this bill because we feel that it doesn't address the core issue of fixing the carbon tax instead of simply repealing it. Thank you.

**The Acting Speaker:** Thank you, hon. Member.

The hon. Member for Calgary-Fish Creek.

**Mr. Gottfried:** Thank you, Madam Speaker, and thank you for the opportunity to rise today in support of Bill 202, Alberta taxpayer protection amendment act, as thoughtfully brought forward by the hon. Member for Calgary-Lougheed.

Madam Speaker, it's very clear that the NDP never campaigned on the carbon tax, the largest single tax hike in Alberta's history.

They never even mentioned it, in fact, not once in print or in campaigning during the 2015 election. Since pretty much everything we consume is linked in some way to the carbon tax – we've heard it from other members with respect to transportation, delivery of goods, a tax on virtually everything – it's clearly just a consumption tax and in not a very good disguise, quite frankly.

Madam Speaker, it was Ralph Klein who passed the Alberta Taxpayer Protection Act, which requires a referendum before any move to impose a provincial sales tax of any sort. In fact, it was a young Jason Kenney, as president of the Canadian Taxpayers Federation, that helped the Klein government draft and pass this important law. The NDP's carbon tax clearly violated the spirit of the Taxpayer Protection Act, if not the law itself, but nobody was talking specifically about taxing carbon back in the mid-1990s, and as such the words "carbon tax" aren't currently listed in the law. I would argue it should be to protect the rights and best interests of Albertans.

It is indeed time to change that bill, Bill 202, to specifically add "carbon tax" to the Taxpayer Protection Act, again, to protect the rights and the taxation against Albertans.

We've been clear that bill 1 of the United Conservative government will be the carbon tax repeal act, possibly the summer of repeal, as has been mentioned. The commitment and resolve remain while the NDP continues to not want to have to disclose their fondness for the carbon tax back in the 2015 election. Their fondness obviously predated the passing of this carbon tax. In fact, still they didn't want to disclose that to the electors, to the voters of Alberta, and they desperately tried to avoid discussing that omission today. Voters will finally have their say in the spring of 2019, a de facto referendum, if you will.

The Albertans that I speak with do not share the NDP's fondness for such an insidiously disguised sales tax, but we also need to ensure that no future government of any stripe, even five, 10, or 15 years from now, can force a carbon tax, a sales tax in disguise, as it were, without first consulting Albertans directly. A referendum will be required before a provincial government can impose such a tax if we indeed support this bill.

Bill 202 also requires a referendum before any future carbon tax hike. The NDP has already raised its carbon tax by 50 per cent, Madam Speaker, and promises a further 67 per cent increase because Justin Trudeau asked them for it. And we know Justin Trudeau is planning even further carbon tax hikes beyond that. In fact, it is clear that when this government's political ally Justin Trudeau says, "Jump," the Alberta NDP rapidly respond with, "How high?" without ever thinking to consult hard-working Albertans, that it will most affect.

If the NDP is confident in public support for their carbon tax, the central policy of the climate leadership plan, they should have no problem putting the question directly to voters, Madam Speaker. Given their adamant claims of widespread support we see no reason why this government would not just acquiesce to it but would be keen to prove such bold and principle-laden claims to all Albertans.

Madam Speaker, this government has made the carbon tax and their quest for social licence the crowning jewel of their government despite the fact that they did not mention it once in their 2015 election platform. Did I mention that they did not mention it once during the 2015 election? They have made it key to their social licence strategy to secure approval for pipelines and the development, growth, and viability of our energy sector. How's that working for us today? We have not changed the mind of one opponent of the pipelines through this misguided social licence strategy, very clearly so, and it continues. We hear it in the news already today from the opponents, including Karen Mahon and Tzeporah Berman, who have not changed their mind one iota.

Given that the NDP have touted this legislation as a clear win for Alberta and something that all Albertans benefit from and should support, this misguided carbon tax, it stands to reason that they should be more than comfortable allowing Albertans to vote in a referendum for such taxes in the future. As I said already – and I'll say it again – the carbon tax is the largest tax hike in the history of Alberta, and it has had a devastating impact on everyday Albertans, many just trying to get by day to day, paycheque to paycheque.

So let's talk about the carbon tax and families. At \$30 a tonne the carbon tax will cost the typical Albertan household about \$667 per year, as reflected in University of Calgary energy economist Jennifer Winter's release, as quoted in the *Financial Post* on January 3, 2018. At \$50 per tonne the carbon tax will cost the typical Alberta household \$1,111 per year, also from economist Winter. These are big numbers; these are real numbers. This is the cost to them of after-tax costs, after all the other taxes that they pay, the cost to that household. Madam Speaker, I can tell you that that kind of money will keep a child in a sport. It will help to pay for clothing that they need. It will help to pay for additional school supplies or other activities that they may wish to do.

4:50

Madam Speaker, the Canadian Taxpayers Federation noticed that 55 per cent of Albertans received no rebate cheque or that it was less than they paid in carbon taxes. Revenue neutral, indeed. The Canadian Taxpayers Federation also reflects that while the NDP claims that a family of four will receive \$540 in rebates this year, government estimates show that the carbon tax will cost that same family up to \$613 per year. Who's paying for the cap?

The Laurier centre for economic research shared that significant hikes to carbon prices will be necessary to achieve emissions targets. We've heard that from the Member for Calgary-Lougheed many times. A 10 per cent reduction in emissions over seven years requires a \$175-per-tonne levy. Where is that going to come from, Madam Speaker?

The carbon tax has also unfairly attacked the organizations that support our province's most vulnerable. The Official Opposition of the day humbly put forward amendments that would have exempted not-for-profit organizations, but this government callously voted against those amendments. At a time when many Albertans are struggling, this government has unnecessarily taken dollars away from nonprofit organizations – I hear this every day – and from their front-line service providers. Those same funds could be going to feed, clothe, and support the vulnerable or those going through difficult times in many cases due to this government's disastrous, job-killing economic policies.

Let's talk about the carbon tax and the nonprofits. Ray Sharp from Sundre West Country said: the centre is emotionally, mentally, and physically the most wonderful thing for our seniors, but as a nonprofit organization we don't get any rebates; it's financially eating us up.

Leona Bennett, Sundre & District Aquaplex: we're really getting hit hard; it's not just us that are impacted; it's the community as a whole; our little organizations are what keep Sundre going, and without these facilities in the community we won't have a community; because of the carbon tax we had to increase our rates, but we couldn't increase them enough.

**The Acting Speaker:** Thank you, hon. member.

Under Standing Order 8(7)(a)(i), which provides up to five minutes for the sponsor of a private member's public bill to close debate, I'd like to invite the hon. Leader of the Official Opposition to close debate on Bill 202.

**Mr. Kenney:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I thank all members who participated in the debate for having done so. It is my hope that members will demonstrate their respect for Albertans by voting in favour of this bill.

This bill, Madam Speaker, is not actually about the carbon tax, nor is it about sales taxes. The bill is not about the current NDP government's policy per se. The bill is about democracy. The bill is about whether or not members of this Legislature have the confidence to trust their constituents to make a decision on a matter of this nature. A bill like this perhaps would not be necessary if it weren't for the tendency of politicians to avoid difficult debates at election time. The NDP avoided such a difficult debate in the last provincial election by bringing forward a platform that was silent on the question of carbon taxes, only to introduce the largest tax increase in Alberta's history.

I've heard members opposite in the course of this debate celebrate the putative merits of their carbon tax. Funnily enough, they won't even call it a tax. That's how lacking they truly are in confidence. They come up with these absurd euphemisms that nobody accepts such as "a levy." One very peculiar speech opposite, Madam Speaker, somehow tried to tie this suggestion that Albertans should have a say on whether the tax should be increased to colonialism and aboriginal issues. That was special, but what Albertans want to know is why that particular minister is opposed to letting all Albertans, including aboriginal Albertans, have a say on whether or not to increase this tax. That was the issue, not desperate efforts to deter and deflect and deny.

I also heard suggestions from some members that the carbon tax is all about environmental policy and that it's essential to help us save the planet. Again, that really is disingenuous because the very same members know, if they're at all serious and honest about this, that all expert opinion, including that of the federal government, Professor Leach, all of the environmental organizations, indicates that the only way for a carbon tax to come anywhere close to achieving, for example, the Paris greenhouse gas emission targets would require a price that is in the range of 1,000 per cent higher than the current tax. This is not an opinion, Madam Speaker; this is an established consensus. I don't know why these members are denying the climate change consensus. Why are they deniers?

If they want to be truthful and honest with themselves and Albertans, they will accept the scientific consensus. I have. In this party we accept the scientific consensus on climate change, which says that the only way a tax or, if you want, euphemistically, a levy can achieve the desired reduction in greenhouse gas targets to actually make a demonstrable effect in global climate would be in the range of a 1,000 per cent increase. Why are they denying that, Madam Speaker? Why do they think that a 30 per cent or a \$30-a-tonne or a \$50-a-tonne tax is efficient? They know it's not, but they know that that is at the outer limits of the public's tolerance. In fact, it's beyond the public's tolerance, as demonstrated by every poll.

The hon. leader of the Liberal Party, for whom I have considerable respect, said that he thought that about half of Albertans accepted this tax. With respect, Madam Speaker, every single public opinion survey done on this question indicates that at least two-thirds of Albertans are opposed to the carbon tax even after the NDP has spent millions of tax dollars telling Albertans why it's good to punish them. And I'll tell you why Albertans don't buy it. It's because they know that punishing consumers is not an environmental strategy. They understand that forcing seniors to turn the heat down at home when it's 30 below outside, when it's snowing like it is right now, in late April, is not an environmental policy.

Madam Speaker, maybe I'm wrong about this. Maybe, actually, the government is right, and the majority of Albertans do support

their policy. Then let them decide. Let them have the say. That's the question. We can have a debate ad infinitum on the putative merits of a carbon tax, but the question is: who decides in that debate? I submit that that ought not be 87 members of this Chamber, let alone a few dozen members of the government benches. It ought to be millions of adult Albertans in whom – you know, I heard these arguments about how divisive referenda are. It's called democracy. A referendum is no more divisive than an election.

I call on members to support this bill.

**The Acting Speaker:** Thank you, hon. member.

[The voice vote indicated that the motion for second reading lost]

[Several members rose calling for a division. The division bell was rung at 4:58 p.m.]

[Fifteen minutes having elapsed, the Assembly divided]

[Ms Sweet in the chair]

For the motion:

Aheer	Hanson	Panda
Anderson, W.	Hunter	Pitt
Cooper	Kenney	Schneider
Cyr	Loewen	Smith
Drysdale	McIver	Strankman
Gill	Nixon	Taylor
Gotfried	Orr	Yao

Against the motion:

Anderson, S.	Goehring	McLean
Babcock	Gray	Payne
Carlier	Hinkley	Renaud
Ceci	Hoffman	Rosendahl
Clark	Horne	Schmidt
Connolly	Jansen	Schreiner
Cortes-Vargas	Kazim	Shepherd
Dach	Littlewood	Sigurdson
Dang	Luff	Sucha
Feehan	Malkinson	Swann
Fitzpatrick	Mason	Turner
Fraser	McCuaig-Boyd	Westhead
Ganley	McKittrick	Woollard

Totals: For – 21 Against – 39

[Motion for second reading of Bill 202 lost]

## Motions Other than Government Motions

### Amendments to Standing Orders

501. Mr. W. Anderson moved:

Be it resolved that the Standing Orders of the Legislative Assembly of Alberta be amended by renumbering Standing Order 52.04 as Standing Order 52.04(1) and by adding the following after suborder (1):

(2) Suborder (1) does not prevent a Legislative Policy Committee from undertaking a hearing or inquiry during the same period of time that a matter stands referred to the Committee by the Assembly if the hearing or inquiry does not interfere with the work of the Committee on the matter referred to it.

Ms Fitzpatrick moved that the motion be amended by adding the following after "Be it resolved":

that the following proposed amendment to the Standing Orders of the Legislative Assembly of Alberta be referred to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections,

Standing Orders and Printing for review and that the committee submit its report to the Assembly on or before June 19, 2018:

[Debate adjourned on the amendment March 19: Mr. Malkinson speaking]

**The Acting Speaker:** The hon. Member for Rimbey-Rocky Mountain House-Sundre.

**Mr. Nixon:** Well, thanks, Madam Speaker. I suspect that if you seek it, you will find unanimous consent to move to one-minute bells.

[Unanimous consent granted]

**The Acting Speaker:** Are there any members wishing to speak to the motion? The hon. Member for Grande Prairie-Wapiti.

**Mr. Drysdale:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise to speak in support of Motion 501, which recommends allowing a legislative policy committee to perform other work when the Legislative Assembly has provided it with a specific task. I do not support the amendment to send it to committee.

Madam Speaker, I want to thank the Member for Highwood for introducing this motion. Since the NDP took governance, our UCP experience in attempting to meet with stakeholders has been frustrating, to say the least. More importantly, it has been dismissive of stakeholders. For example, it's been almost three years now that the Standing Committee on Resource Stewardship has been sitting on requests to present from the AAMD and C, now RMA; the Independent Power Producers Society of Alberta; the Alberta Used Oil Management Association; the Alberta Beverage Container Management Board; and the Alberta Recycling Management Authority.

Last fall, after our committee wrapped up its priority task, in October '17, the chair, who is the Member for Edmonton-Ellerslie, noted that the committee had now completed the tasks assigned to it by the Legislative Assembly. He then mentioned that a number of groups, namely the ones I listed above, had asked to make presentations to the committee. The Member for Calgary-Currie took time to run through the list and informed us that by now each group either would have had their concerns dealt with or they might have an issue that – and I quote from *Hansard* – "has been fixed or changed or is something that they don't need to bring through to this committee."

Madam Speaker, I was greatly surprised by these presumptions by a still novice member. In his defence, he and his ND colleagues may not understand the value that committees offer as a conduit to the Alberta Legislature because they have from the beginning blocked all attempts by opposition committee members to meet with the above stakeholders.

Madam Speaker, in October '17 the committee had just finished the task handed to it by the Assembly. The NDP members immediately tried to shut down any further work. Let me make this clear. The committee had a clear slate. All opposition members of the Resource Stewardship Committee then sought to return to the other important business we can do: consult with stakeholders about issues that affect resources in Alberta. The NDP would have none of it.

Besides meeting with stakeholders who reach out to us, Resource Stewardship should also be initiating our own consultations on many issues that affect Alberta's resource sector. Let's just look at a few of them. Our oil and gas sector has experienced many serious challenges in recent years; the caribou plan needs to meld with the

sustainable goals of our forestry industry; and agriculture always has specific issues to explore: getting grain to market, for instance.

I could go on and on, Madam Speaker, but I think now I'll give the floor to my colleague from Highwood to close debate. Thank you.

**The Acting Speaker:** Thank you, hon. member.

There is time remaining on the clock. Are there any other members wishing to speak before I call on the member to close?

Seeing none, I will now call on the hon. Member for Highwood to close debate.

**Mr. W. Anderson:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. Much appreciated. If everybody recalls, this motion was introduced because current rules, the standing orders of the Legislative Assembly of Alberta, did not allow for any activities to be undertaken by a legislative policy committee other than the specific tasks assigned to it even if there is ample time between meetings dealing with assigned tasks. Now, really, this whole committee – all we wanted to do with this motion was to improve consultation with stakeholders, let Albertans have their voice. I mean, it's all about streamlining process. There have been several groups that have been waiting years to meet with this committee. That's not consultation with Albertans. That's not doing our job. I mean, just to give you some background here, stakeholder groups have been trying to get invited to a committee to present, and in some cases the wait has been over two years.

5:20

This has been an ongoing issue, one that took head in December of 2017, when the government blocked a motion to do meaningful work in the standing committee. The MLA for Grande Prairie-Smoky introduced a motion, but it was voted down. It was voted down on the grounds that the committee could not undertake any activities other than the tasks that had been assigned even if those activities would have helped accomplish the task. Streamlining process, cutting red tape: what a concept.

On November 29, 2017, the Resource Stewardship Committee met, and the MLA for Grande Prairie-Wapiti expressed his disappointment that previously the UCP had brought forward a motion directing the committee to meet with stakeholders that had been waiting, waiting, waiting. He expressed that they had not met from October 10 to November 28, a full month and a half, yet, due to the current standing orders, were not able to meet with any of these stakeholders. The MLA for Grande Prairie-Smoky spoke up and said: due to the current business the committee could possibly be tied up for one whole year. They motioned that the "committee set up a working group that can meet with these organizations." But guess what? It was defeated.

On January 25, 2018, government caucus committee members once again voted down the MLA for Lac La Biche-St. Paul-Two Hills on a common-sense motion to allow the committee to meet with stakeholders to hear their concerns directly. His direct concern was the "lack of [availability] of the Resource . . . Committee to address any other issues." He thought that Resource Stewardship, a very, very important committee, had been tied up for two years between the Lobbyists Act review and the Conflicts of Interest Act review. His frustration – and he was frustrated – was that the committee would be tied up until November 29, and many groups and individuals who wanted to present to the committee would be forbidden to do so under the Conflicts of Interest Act review.

The stakeholder groups had been trying to get invited to the committee to present, but like I said before, for two years they'd been waiting. Now, we brought forward several amendments or

several proposals for several motions, but every time they got voted down. Committees sometimes don't sit for over three months at a time, but they're unable to call these groups due to the standing orders, that are outdated.

Now, we have to give Albertans their opportunity to speak, but I'm hoping that we'll vote against sending this back to committee. Isn't it a little ironic, sending this motion back to committee about the committees that are holding back meetings in the committees? I mean, it just seems ironic. You're just delaying the process once again. You have to give Albertans a chance. You have to listen to Albertans. This committee has to be functional and accountable to all Albertans. I'm asking you: vote against this amendment.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

**The Acting Speaker:** Thank you, hon. member.

Now, we have an amendment on the floor, so I will be asking the question on the amendment.

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

[Several members rose calling for a division. The division bell was rung at 5:23 p.m.]

[One minute having elapsed, the Assembly divided]

[Ms Sweet in the chair]

For the motion:

Anderson, S.	Hinkley	Payne
Babcock	Hoffman	Renaud
Carlier	Horne	Rosendahl
Connolly	Jansen	Schmidt
Cortes-Vargas	Kazim	Schreiner
Dach	Littlewood	Shepherd
Dang	Luff	Sigurdson
Feehan	Malkinson	Sucha
Fitzpatrick	Mason	Turner
Ganley	McCuaig-Boyd	Westhead
Goehring	McKittrick	Woollard
Gray	McLean	

Against the motion:

Aheer	Gotfried	Panda
Anderson, W.	Hanson	Pitt
Clark	Hunter	Schneider
Cooper	Kenney	Smith
Cyr	Loewen	Strankman
Drysdale	McIver	Swann
Fraser	Nixon	Yao
Gill		

Totals:	For – 35	Against – 22
---------	----------	--------------

[Motion on amendment to Motion Other than Government Motion 501 carried]

**The Acting Speaker:** Hon. members, pursuant to Standing Order 8(5) only one motion other than a government motion may be considered each Monday. Therefore, I will call upon the hon. Government House Leader to adjourn the Assembly.

**Mr. Mason:** Well, I can't do it, Madam Speaker, but I can propose it, and the Assembly can do it. I will propose that we adjourn until 1:30 tomorrow afternoon.

**The Acting Speaker:** Legislative policy committees will convene this evening and tomorrow morning for consideration of main



estimates. This evening Families and Communities will consider the estimates for Community and Social Services in the Rocky Mountain Room, and Alberta's Economic Future will consider the estimates for Infrastructure in the Parkland Room. Tomorrow

morning Alberta's Economic Future will consider the estimates for Agriculture and Forestry in the Rocky Mountain Room.

[Motion carried; the Assembly adjourned at 5:29 p.m.]



## Table of Contents

Prayers.....	537
Introduction of Guests .....	537
Members' Statements	
Nadia El-Dib.....	537
Trans Mountain Pipeline Construction Suspension .....	538
Organ and Tissue Donation .....	538
Official Opposition and Government Policies.....	538
Henson Trusts for Persons with Disabilities.....	539
Lacombe Generals and Allan Cup 2018 Hockey Championship.....	539
Oral Question Period	
Federal-provincial Meeting on Trans Mountain Pipeline Expansion.....	539, 542
Provincial Response to Pipeline Opposition Calgary Board of Education Carbon Levy Costs .....	540
Pharmacy Funding Framework.....	541
Long-term and Continuing Care Beds .....	541
Trans Mountain Pipeline Public Purchase Proposal .....	542
Police Release of Information on Serious Incidents .....	543
Commodity Rail Transportation Backlog.....	544
Government Revenue Forecasts .....	544
School Board Finances .....	545
Anti Energy Industry Advocacy in Alberta .....	545
Beaverlodge Health Facility Capital Plan.....	546
Postsecondary Educational Finance.....	547
Introduction of Bills	
Bill 12 Preserving Canada's Economic Prosperity Act.....	547
Tabling Returns and Reports .....	547
Tablings to the Clerk .....	548
Orders of the Day .....	549
Public Bills and Orders Other than Government Bills and Orders	
Second Reading	
Bill 202 Alberta Taxpayer Protection (Carbon Tax Referendum) Amendment Act, 2018.....	549
Division .....	563
Motions Other than Government Motions	
Amendments to Standing Orders.....	563
Division .....	564

*Alberta Hansard* is available online at [www.assembly.ab.ca](http://www.assembly.ab.ca)

For inquiries contact:

Managing Editor

*Alberta Hansard*

3rd Floor, 9820 – 107 St

EDMONTON, AB T5K 1E7

Telephone: 780.427.1875