



Province of Alberta

The 29th Legislature  
Fourth Session

# Alberta Hansard

Monday afternoon, November 19, 2018

Day 49

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-Hawthood (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)  
Dreesen, Devin, Innisfail-Sylvan Lake (UCP)  
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 (FCP)  
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 (Ind)  
Goehring, Nicole, Edmonton-Castle Downs (NDP)  
Goodridge, Laila, Fort McMurray-Conklin (UCP)  
Gottfried, Richard, Calgary-Fish Creek (UCP)  
Gray, Hon. Christina, Edmonton-Mill Woods (NDP)  
Hanson, David B., Lac La Biche-St. Paul-Two Hills (UCP)  
Hinkley, Bruce, Wetaskiwin-Camrose (NDP)  
Hoffman, Hon. Sarah, Edmonton-Glenora (NDP)  
Horne, Trevor A.R., Spruce Grove-St. Albert (NDP)  
Hunter, Grant R., Cardston-Taber-Warner (UCP),  
Official Opposition Deputy Whip  
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 (Ind)  
Malkinson, Hon. Brian, Calgary-Currie (NDP)  
Mason, Hon. Brian, Edmonton-Highlands-Norwood (NDP),  
Government House Leader  
McCuaig-Boyd, Hon. Margaret,  
Dunvegan-Central Peace-Notley (NDP)  
McIver, Ric, Calgary-Hays (UCP),  
Official Opposition Whip  
McKittrick, Annie, Sherwood Park (NDP)  
McLean, 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, 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)

### Party standings:

New Democratic: 53   United Conservative: 26   Alberta Party: 3   Alberta Liberal: 1   Freedom Conservative: 1   Independent: 2   Progressive Conservative: 1

### Officers and Officials of the Legislative Assembly

Shannon Dean, Law Clerk and Executive  
Director of House Services, and Acting  
Clerk, Procedure  
Stephanie LeBlanc, Senior Parliamentary  
Counsel  
Trafton Koenig, Parliamentary Counsel

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

Brian G. Hodgson, Sergeant-at-Arms  
Chris Caughell, Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms  
Tom Bell, Assistant Sergeant-at-Arms  
Paul Link, Assistant Sergeant-at-Arms

### **Executive Council**

Rachel Notley	Premier, President of Executive Council
Sarah Hoffman	Deputy Premier, Minister of Health
Shaye Anderson	Minister of Municipal Affairs
Deron Bilous	Minister of Economic Development and Trade
Oneil Carlier	Minister of Agriculture and Forestry
Joe Ceci	President of Treasury Board and Minister of Finance
David Eggen	Minister of Education
Richard Feehan	Minister of Indigenous Relations
Kathleen T. Ganley	Minister of Justice and Solicitor General
Christina Gray	Minister of Labour, Minister Responsible for Democratic Renewal
Sandra Jansen	Minister of Infrastructure
Danielle Larivee	Minister of Children's Services and Status of Women
Brian Malkinson	Minister of Service Alberta
Brian Mason	Minister of Transportation
Margaret McCuaig-Boyd	Minister of Energy
Ricardo Miranda	Minister of Culture and Tourism
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

Cyr	Luff
Dang	McPherson
Ellis	Turner
Horne	

### Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future

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

Carson	Littlewood
Connolly	McPherson
Coolahan	Piquette
Dach	Schneider
Fitzpatrick	Starke
Gotfried	Taylor
Horne	

### Standing Committee on Families and Communities

Chair: Ms Goehring  
Deputy Chair: Mr. Smith

Drever	Orr
Ellis	Renaud
Fraser	Shepherd
Hinkley	Swann
Luff	Woollard
McKitrick	Yao
Miller	

### Standing Committee on Legislative Offices

Chair: Mr. Shepherd  
Deputy Chair: Mr. Malkinson

Aheer	McKitrick
Gill	Pitt
Horne	van Dijken
Kleinsteinuber	Woollard
Littlewood	

### Special Standing Committee on Members' Services

Chair: Mr. Wanner  
Deputy Chair: Cortes-Vargas

Babcock	Nixon
Cooper	Piquette
Dang	Pitt
Drever	Westhead
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
Clark	Nielsen
Gotfried	Panda
Hunter	Renaud
Littlewood	Turner
Luff	

### Standing Committee on Resource Stewardship

Chair: Loyola  
Deputy Chair: Mr. Drysdale

Babcock	Loewen
Clark	Malkinson
Dang	Nielsen
Fildebrandt	Panda
Hanson	Rosendahl
Kazim	Schreiner
Kleinsteinuber	

## Legislative Assembly of Alberta

1:30 p.m.

Monday, November 19, 2018

[The Deputy Speaker in the chair]

### Prayers

**The Deputy Speaker:** Good afternoon.

Let us reflect. Today the Assembly hosted a ceremony to commemorate Holodomor, the famine and genocide imposed by Soviet authorities in Ukraine. Let us take a moment to honour and remember all those who have lost their lives during this horrific event.

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

**Hon. Members:**

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

**The Deputy Speaker:** Please be seated.

### Introduction of Visitors

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

**Ms Notley:** Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I'm honoured to rise today and make two introductions to you. First of all, I'm honoured to introduce through you to all members of the Assembly Mr. Derek Fox. Derek was elected to the Legislative Assembly of Alberta in 1986 to represent the good people of Vegreville for seven years. Like our current members, he shared the understanding of the importance that our rural communities, farming, and agriculture have in our province. During his time in office he fought for hard-working people in rural Alberta as the Official Opposition critic for agriculture and rural development. Today he carries on the entrepreneurial spirit of Alberta as a business owner in Vegreville, and he plays an active role in his community as secretary treasurer of Warwick Hall and is a sponsor of the Vegreville Agricultural Society. I would ask that Mr. Fox please rise and receive the warm welcome of this Assembly.

Madam Speaker, I'm also honoured to present to you and through you to all Members of the Legislative Assembly Mr. Tom Sigurdson. Tom has been described as tireless and formidable in his long career advocating for immigrants, impoverished and, of course, working people throughout Canada and Alberta. He was elected to the Legislative Assembly of Alberta in 1986 to represent the good people of Edmonton-Belmont. Serving until 1993, he fought for hard-working Albertans as the Official Opposition critic for manpower, tourism, Education, and Labour. He also had the good fortune to have one of the bossiest summer students ever, subsequently becoming the Premier of the province. All I can say is that if you thought I was bossy then, you should try working with me now. Currently the executive director of the B.C. building trades council he tirelessly fights for 35,000 highly skilled trades workers

from 17 different unions making up the council. I ask that you please rise and receive the warm welcome of this Assembly.

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

**Cortes-Vargas:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. It's a privilege to rise today and introduce to you and through you to all members of this Assembly enthusiastic members of the Strathcona County Pickleball Association. Later today I'll be speaking a little bit more about the growing sport. Here today are Rita Fournier, Loui Fournier, Zane Nykiforuk, Roger Kemp, Jamilah Mumo, Sharon Loughheed, and Rob Loughheed. As you know, Rob Loughheed served as a member of this Legislature for three terms, representing the constituencies of Clover Bar-Fort Saskatchewan and Strathcona. I ask my guests to rise and to receive the traditional warm welcome of this Assembly.

### Introduction of Guests

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

**Mr. Schmidt:** Well, thank you, Madam Speaker. With your indulgence I have two introductions. First of all, I'd like to introduce 37 members of the grade 6 class of Waverley school, who are here for a week at the Legislature. I see them eagerly waving at me. They're accompanied by their teachers, Mr. Douglas and Ms Walls, and their chaperone, Ms McLennan. I had the pleasure of visiting Waverley school at the end of October, where we debated and eventually decided to extend voting rights to 11-year-olds here in the province of Alberta. I'd ask that they please rise and receive the traditional warm welcome of this Assembly.

For my second set of introductions, Madam Speaker, I rise today to introduce a group of student leaders in our postsecondary system. The Alberta Students' Executive Council represents students in every corner of our province and are here at the Legislature for their inaugural Fall Advocacy Week. I've been proud to work with them as we crafted Bill 19, and I'm happy to have them in the building as debate continues. With us today – and I ask that they rise as I say their names – are Garrett Koehler, Nicholas Newnes, Ramon Ramirez III, Karen Velasco, Dacil Aguilar, Chaise Combs, Lindsey Comeau, and Alex Bedard. Forgive me if I've missed anybody. I'd ask that they all please rise and receive the traditional warm welcome.

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

**Ms McCuaig-Boyd:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. It's indeed my pleasure to rise today and introduce to you and through you to all members of this Assembly 18 staff from the Ministry of Energy. The staff here today are from all parts of departments and provide invaluable support in our province's largest industry. Some are involved with mapping oil and gas resources, others help develop policy, and yet others help to ensure collection of Alberta's royalties. Not all the staff are new to the ministry, but for the most part this is their first time in this Legislature. I want to thank each and every one of them for the important work they do every day on behalf of Albertans. I'd ask that they rise and receive the traditional warm welcome of the Assembly.

**The Deputy Speaker:** The hon. Member for Edmonton-South West.

**Mr. Dang:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. It is really my pleasure today to rise and introduce to you and through you to all members

of the Assembly some of the greatest students in the entire province because they come from the greatest constituency. There are 25 in the public gallery today from George P. Nicholson school. They're accompanied today by their teacher, Jamie Wilson. I'd ask them to please rise and receive the traditional warm welcome of the Assembly.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Are there any other school groups?  
The hon. Member for Sherwood Park.

**Ms McKittrick:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. Last month eight exceptional Albertans received the highest honour our province can bestow, the Alberta Order of Excellence: Wayne Chiu, k.d. lang, David Manz, Solomon Rolinger, Allan Wachowich, Ralph Young, Rosella Bjornson from Strathcona-Sherwood Park, and Sherwood Park's very own Reg Basken.

Today I introduce to you and through you to all members of this Assembly Mr. Reg Basken. Reg has dedicated his life to taking care of people and communities. Through his work with the precursors to Unifor, the Alberta Labour Relations Board, and the International Chemical Energy Federation, he has worked towards workplace safety, environmental sustainability, and ensuring that workers have a voice in the collective bargaining process. He has been actively involved in the United Way. He received the Queen Elizabeth II silver, golden, and diamond jubilee medals and was very instrumental in establishing medicare. Reg is here with his sister and brother-in-law, Dorothy and Bob McRae, that I'm happy live in my riding; his niece Carene Schroeder; and grandnieces Eden and Jorden. I'd like to ask Reg and his family to please rise and receive the traditional warm welcome of this Assembly.

1:40

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

**Dr. Swann:** Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. A real honour for me today to stand and introduce to you and through you to the House six very dedicated citizens representing a number of different organizations in the province calling on the government to commit to the safer use of chemical pesticides, especially in urban areas. I'll ask them to stand as I mention their names: Dr. Elisabeth Beaubien, a plant ecologist at the University of Alberta; Dr. Raquel Feroe, member of the Canadian Association of Physicians for the Environment; Rod Olstad, member of the Edmonton chapter, Council of Canadians; Hayley De Rose, practical nurse and mother; Robin McLeod, project co-ordinator with Alberta Low Impact Development Partnership and Healthy Calgary; and Sheryl McCumsey, co-ordinator for pesticide-free Calgary. Let's give them the warm welcome of the Assembly.

**The Deputy Speaker:** The hon. Member for Edmonton-McClung.

**Mr. Dach:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. It's my pleasure to introduce to you and through you to all members of the Assembly a wonderful group of constituents who have taken the time to share their stories with me and advocate for changes that take care of the most vulnerable Albertans: Francine Bérubé, a member of my staff, who I'm so lucky to have working in my constituency office; her sister, Evelyn Bérubé; Wendy McDonald from Inclusion Alberta – she has spoken with me numerous times regarding AISH and PDD benefits and making sure Alberta is more inclusive – and Angela Rouel, a constituent who is an outspoken advocate for an increase to AISH, who has shared her concerns with not just me but Premier Notley as well. I'll be speaking more about AISH and Bill

26 later today. Now I ask my guests to rise and receive the warm welcome of the Assembly.

**The Deputy Speaker:** The hon. Minister of Culture and Tourism.

**Miranda:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. It's a privilege to rise and introduce to you and through you to all members of the Assembly Justin Zalewski, Jordan Conway, and Jonathan Berube from the Alberta LGBTQ chamber of commerce. Since its inception in October 2017 the chamber has been tirelessly working to advocate for and support the LGBTQ businesses in Alberta. I would like them to now please rise and receive the traditional warm welcome of the Assembly.

**The Deputy Speaker:** The hon. Member for Cypress-Medicine Hat.

**Mr. Barnes:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. It's my pleasure to rise today and introduce to you and through you a friend of mine, a lady that I share quite a bit in common with. We're both from a small-business background, we both believe in strong Alberta families, we both like knocking on doors to hear what's important to Albertans, and we both received our nomination about the same time this year, she for Fort Saskatchewan-Vegreville and me for Cypress-Medicine Hat. Could I please ask Jackie Armstrong Homeniuk to rise and accept the traditional warm welcome of the House.

**The Deputy Speaker:** The hon. Member for Cardston-Taber-Warner.

**Mr. Hunter:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. It's my pleasure to rise and introduce to you and through you to all members of the Assembly four individuals that came to my office and had a great chat this afternoon. I'd like them to stand as I call their names and recognize them: Ramiro Mora, CWell Consulting; James Allen, director of government affairs for Savers Value Village; Jeff Smail, VP Canadian operations; and Khazeena Ashroff, recycling sales manager. These individuals work with Value Village, which my wife appreciates greatly. Please rise. Give them the traditional warm welcome.

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

**Mr. Cooper:** Why, thank you, Madam Speaker. It's my pleasure today to rise in the Assembly to introduce one of the most important people in my life. This particular individual had the unfortunate pleasure of carrying me for an extended period of time. She, along with my dad, has invested literally hundreds and hundreds of thousands of hours into their five children. Of course, I'm her favourite, fourth-born, that is, as she would say. We all know that we can't do this job without those who support us, and certainly my parents have been that for me for so long, always encouraging me to strive to be my best, to help others, and I've been pleased to follow their example of serving the community, which they have done for all of the years of their lives.

She may not be a giant in stature, but she's certainly a giant in my life. She once in a while reminds me that she may be little but she could still whup me, and nothing could be further from the truth. It's my pleasure to introduce to you my mom, Mary Cooper.

## Members' Statements

**The Deputy Speaker:** The hon. Member for Edmonton-McClung.

### Bill 26 and AISH Client Benefits

**Mr. Dach:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. Conservative opposition members often accuse the NDP of building government policy on a framework of New Democratic Party ideology. To this I proudly say: guilty as charged. There is perhaps no better example of this shameless adherence to our party's core values than Bill 26, now before the House. I've heard from constituents on AISH about their struggles to pay the rent, to put food on the table. I've heard worries from vulnerable members of my constituency that benefits were not enough to cover the rising cost of living. I want to thank those who took the time to bring forward their concerns to me and MLAs across the province. Your concerns have been heard.

If passed, An Act to Combat Poverty and Fight for Albertans with Disabilities will index social benefits to inflation and recognize the higher cost of living by providing an immediate increase to AISH and income supports. These changes treat recipients with greater dignity and respect. An MLA's predominant role, Madam Speaker, is to fight for people who need help the most. Albertans shouldn't have to choose between putting food on the table or paying the rent.

For me, the last three years have been about fighting for what matters to regular people, fighting to make sure our economic recovery reaches everyone, especially the most vulnerable Albertans. If Bill 26 is passed, Madam Speaker, 250,000 Albertans – 250,000 – including people with disabilities, low-income families, and seniors, would see increased financial supports. We've heard the concerns of people on benefits, and our NDP caucus will never stop fighting to ensure that everyone can succeed and live with dignity. This fight requires some framework, some policy, and, yes, some ideology, an ideology that is concerned about everyday Albertans. Let the opposition tell the 250,000 people benefiting from Bill 26 that we are wrong. Albertans know who really has their backs.

### Unemployment and Government Fiscal Policies

**Mr. Barnes:** Ignore it, and it will go away: that seems to be the strategy employed by Alberta's Finance minister. There are plenty of warning signs that the NDP's managed decline of Alberta's economy and layers and layers of burden are causing considerable hardship, and it is Alberta families that suffer the consequences. More than 180,000 Albertans are unemployed. That's 7.3 per cent, the highest unemployment rate outside of Atlantic Canada. In Calgary the story is even worse. Unemployment in the Stampede city is 8.2 per cent. Only St. John's is higher. To make matters worse for Alberta families, more than half of jobless Albertans are no longer eligible for employment insurance.

Clearly, something isn't working. And it's not going away; it's getting worse. Too bad the Finance minister is so focused on NDP ideology. Under this Finance minister Alberta is on track to amass nearly a hundred billion in debt. The cost to service that debt: \$4 billion ever single year. Four billion dollars: that makes the ministry of debt the fourth largest in government.

1:50

But according to the Finance minister this is normal. According to the Finance minister the deficit will sort itself out in a few years once we start receiving revenues from the Trans Mountain and the Keystone XL pipelines. However, the Finance minister doesn't mention that Trans Mountain is hopelessly bogged down in red tape, and their initial position against Keystone resulted in yet another halt. The government's failure to build pipelines to tidewater has driven the differential price to \$54. According to the

Alberta government's own estimates we're on track to lose \$4 billion this year due to that differential price.

So where does that leave Alberta families? Out in the cold. This government's carbon tax has also made it more expensive for Alberta families to heat our homes, keep our lights on, feed and clothe our kids. Madam Speaker, 180,000 families have at least one wage earner without a job and more than half without employment insurance. But, hey, the Finance minister says that we worry too much.

### Statement by the Speaker

#### Use of Electronic Devices in the Chamber

**The Deputy Speaker:** Hon. members, before we commence our afternoon's business, it has come to my attention that there may be a need to remind all members that the use of any recording device or camera, either as a stand-alone device or active on a member's phone, tablet, or computer, is not permitted in the Chamber at any time. I would ask all members to observe this rule out of respect for their colleagues and the institution as a whole.

### Oral Question Period

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

#### Provincial Budget Revenue Forecasts

**Mr. Nixon:** Well, thank you, Madam Speaker. On April 10, 2018, the Finance minister said: we built pipeline revenues into our path to balance projections; we're confident all the pipelines will be built, so we're just going to keep going down this road. Let me be clear: the projections included TMX and Keystone XL being built. We now know that these projects, at best, are going to be delayed. How does this impact the debt that Albertans are now facing, Madam Premier?

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

**Ms Notley:** Well, thank you very much, Madam Speaker. There is no question that, as we have clarified a number of times, our path to balance incorporates the successful completion of 2 of 3 pipelines or one if it's Keystone, and of course we know that both TMX and Keystone are delayed. Nonetheless, we feel relatively confident that as we move closer to our path to balance, we will be able to meet the targets that we have set and at the same time support those important services and economic growth that are so important to Albertans.

**Mr. Nixon:** Madam Speaker, analysts say that the decision on Keystone could be delayed for upwards of a year, and we now know that the federal Natural Resources minister says: we will not put a stop clock on consultation for Trans Mountain. This can go on a very long time; it's a reality. I know the Premier has promised Albertans that these pipelines will be built within the timeline of her budget, but the fact is that that's not going to happen. She has failed on that issue. Again, will she table a fiscal update to show how these changes will change her budget?

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

**Ms Notley:** Well, thank you very much, Madam Speaker. In fact, the Finance minister will be tabling a quarterly update soon, and we know that we are on track to meet all of our targets this year. Then we will take a look at where we're going going forward. But what

we do know is that as we deal with these struggles, the answer is not to cut taxes by \$700 million or a billion or whatever more for the top 1 per cent of the population or to make Albertans pay for the difficulties that we are facing after successive federal governments' inability to get a pipeline built.

**Mr. Nixon:** Madam Speaker, the Premier continues to audition to be the Leader of the Opposition. Let me be clear: the UCP has been clear that they will not be doing those cuts the Premier continues to just make up in imaginary land. But again, this question is important. This Premier promised this province that these two pipelines would be built, she used them as her projections in her budget, and she continues to delay in this House giving answers to the members of this House. Again, how will this impact your budget, the fact that you've now lost two pipelines that you promised Albertans would be built?

**Ms Notley:** Well, Madam Speaker, I'm not in the business of cheering for failure. I know that the members opposite think that that is their path to some form of electoral success, but that is not the way that we are going to go. We are going to keep fighting for TMX, we are going to support TCPL with respect to the Keystone project, and we're going to do everything that we can to stand up for Albertans. We are not going to cheer for their failure. We are not going to plan massive tax cuts, and to be clear, they have not clarified that they are not going to move forward with that. Moreover, we are going to support Albertans in their schools, in their hospitals, and where they need strong public supports.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Second opposition main question. Chestermere-Rocky View.

#### Services for Persons with Disabilities

**Mrs. Aheer:** Thank you. Albertans who are challenged with cognitive and physical disabilities have so much to give to our province. This is something that has been recognized by the private sector, many MLAs, the Alberta Legislature, and the cities of Edmonton, Lloydminster, and Grande Prairie, who have led in employing people with disabilities. To the minister: why does the government of Alberta fail to follow, let alone lead, in employing these amazing, able Albertans? And, no, an internship program that offers temporary employment at best does not count.

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

**Mr. Sabir:** Thank you, Madam Speaker, and thank you, Member, for the question. What we have done is that we have increased supports for persons with disabilities by \$150 million. Those supports also include employment supports. In fact, we have created an internship program within our ministry as well, so we are taking all steps that help them live in dignity. We are providing them with the resources they need to live.

**The Deputy Speaker:** First supplemental.

**Mrs. Aheer:** Thank you. As I said, Madam Speaker, that internship program does not count.

Madam Speaker, employment opportunities for disabled Albertans are crucially important. There are still a great deal of questions from stakeholders and Alberta families about the roles and responsibilities for the Advocate for Persons with Disabilities, which was finally announced after almost a year of waiting. To the minister: can you clarify the role of the advocate, if employment

opportunities for our disabled population will fall under this new office, and if not, why not?

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

**Mr. Sabir:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. Let me tell you, Member, that for those who are in those positions, you can ask them. For them, that internship does count.

The role of the advocate was very clear in the legislation, that he will advocate on behalf of Albertans with disabilities, bring forward their interests and their voices to the table, and also help them navigate the supports that exist. Employment support exists under PDD, and that will remain the same.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Second supplemental.

**Mrs. Aheer:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. Maybe the minister has forgotten, but the advocate actually falls under his ministry, so I'm actually asking him that question.

The government has regularly proven themselves to be unreliable when it comes to consulting with Albertans on the importance of persons with developmental disabilities. The provincial advisory committee that was created to bring ongoing advisory capacity has been disbanded. The minister providing input on the PDD issues: this committee was disbanded by the government with no warning to the stakeholders receiving PDD supports. Now their families, service providers no longer have a seat at the table. To the minister: will you commit to reinstating this council?

**The Deputy Speaker:** The hon. Minister of Community and Social Services.

**Mr. Sabir:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would say that I will put our record, my record on this file against theirs any day. They are the ones who were imposing decisions on PDD. We worked with them, and we repealed the safety standard that they imposed on PDD. They imposed a supports intensity scale on PDD; we repealed it. We are currently working with them on all issues that matter to them. I would urge and encourage you to be part of that and to attend any one session to see what they have to say.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Second Official Opposition main question. Calgary-Foothills.

#### Provincial Special Envoys to the Energy Industry

**Mr. Panda:** Madam Speaker, after taking victory laps, the Premier appointed another task force today, which includes her former chief of staff, the antipipeline Brian Topp, to go around and talk to energy companies about solutions to the oil price differential. Due to the actions and inactions of this NDP government and their Trudeau Liberal allies, western Canadian select was selling at \$14.68 per barrel this morning. This is just over 9 cents per litre. A can of Coca-Cola costs more than that. What does the Premier expect to accomplish by having more appointees and having more talks?

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

**Ms McCuaig-Boyd:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. Certainly, we were happy to announce that panel this morning. They bring a lot of expertise in a number of areas. This is a serious matter. The differential is absurd, and we have to do something about it. We have an opposition, however, whose leader was in Ottawa for 20 years, 10 in cabinet, and did not build one single pipeline to tidewater. We know that market access is important, and that's what



Albertans want to do: they want to see action to get that pipeline built.

2:00

**Mr. Panda:** Madam Speaker, with respect to the price differential between WTI and WCS the Premier was quoted in the *Calgary Herald* saying, “we can’t have it racing out of the ground at \$10 a barrel for a really long period of time.” To the Premier: Brian Topp compared Alberta’s energy industry to selling land mines. Isn’t this appointment just like bringing back Tzaporah Berman again?

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

**Ms McCuaig-Boyd:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. You know, Mr. Topp, for example, he’s one of three in the group, and he has a long history of negotiations and is respected from all sides of the political spectrum. We also have two other members who bring a wealth of experience, because we know that we can’t sit and wait as has been done in the past. We know we can’t sit there and yell at people and expect action to come because we know that doesn’t work either. We’ve seen that for 20 years. We are on the side of Albertans. We know that market access matters to Albertans and it matters to our industry, and that’s what we’re doing.

**Mr. Panda:** Madam Speaker, Brian Topp opposed the Keystone XL pipeline, and he’s the architect of the carbon tax for pipeline strategy and wants to ban cars from the cities of Edmonton and Calgary. Is this really the best person Alberta could find to act as a special envoy for all our energy workers? They don’t have any confidence in this gentleman and in this government. Because of their actions thousands of Albertans are out of work. Why did they choose him, same as Tzaporah Berman?

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

**Ms McCuaig-Boyd:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. Our government from day one has fought for what matters to Albertans, and that’s jobs in energy, that’s market access, and that’s prosperity to Alberta, and we’re doing that. We’ve been fighting for long overdue access, which was not fought for by the Leader of the Opposition when he had a chance to stand up for Alberta; 10 years in cabinet, 20 years in Ottawa, he did nothing. There were no pipelines built to tidewater, and that’s why we’re in the situation we are today. We are fighting very hard, something they have not done, and they continue to have no plan, just to criticize.

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

### Oil Price Differentials

**Mr. Clark:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. The massive price discount on Alberta’s oil is costing our province and our country billions of dollars. It is without doubt a national crisis, but instead of decisive action, the NDP have decided to strike yet another committee. Now, industry has been clear. Until pipelines are finally built, we need to temporarily curtail oil production to increase prices, keep producers viable, and, most importantly, keep Albertans working. To the Premier: why have you kicked the can down the road when it is clear that urgent action is required right now?

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

**Ms McCuaig-Boyd:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I think the Premier made it fairly clear this morning that this is a team that will start right away, that will be reporting very soon because we know

that action matters, because we know market access matters. We know that jobs in our energy sector matter. That’s what matters to Albertans, and that’s what we’re doing. We’re taking action to provide those jobs and provide a path to get those pipelines built because we know that market access matters, as does our whole energy industry.

**The Deputy Speaker:** First supplemental.

**Mr. Clark:** Madam Speaker, thank you, but let’s be absolutely clear. What the minister is actually saying is that she really doesn’t have faith in the officials in her own ministry to quickly do that work. That means that either the minister is happy with the status quo or, in this case, making no decision is itself a decision. Again to the Premier: I understand why you’ve asked the Deputy Minister of Energy to be part of the panel, but beyond his credentials as a good New Democrat, what message does it send to industry to have Brian Topp part of this panel?

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

**Ms McCuaig-Boyd:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. We’re very proud of the panel that’s been created. As with all good teams, it’s a team that brings a variety of skills. We expect that action will happen because of that. As the hon. member and anyone who lives in this province knows, there’s a disparity of agreement as to what next action should be, so that’s what this committee is going to look at. We’ve been working with industry constantly, looking at all options. No doors have been closed, and we’re going to continue to engage with industry.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Go ahead, hon. member.

**Mr. Clark:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. What I can tell you is that Alberta energy producers and Albertans don’t like Ontario New Democrats coming and telling them their business. Albertans want to be involved in those answers. But I will say that the challenge facing our province is absolutely extraordinary. But desperate times call for desperate measures. In the short term curtailing oil production would be a dramatic step, but having personally talked with many industry experts over the last week, I believe it’s the right thing to do to maximize the value of the resource that all Albertans own. Again to the minister: will you agree to temporarily curtail production to increase the take for Alberta’s key producers?

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

**Ms McCuaig-Boyd:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I want to remind my colleagues here that this isn’t just an Alberta issue. This is a Canadian issue, and it matters not where people come from to address this issue. It is about Canada as well as Alberta. We’re losing over \$80 million a day because of this differential, and we need action; we need it quickly. As my hon. colleague knows, there’s a variety of opinions on this. That’s why we’ve engaged some experts to come and work with industry to get those opinions and look at all options. As I said, no doors are closed at this time.

**The Deputy Speaker:** The hon. Member for Edmonton-Mill Creek.

### Mental Health Services in Edmonton

**Ms Woollard:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. The Valuing Mental Health report highlighted that our mental health system is complex and hard to navigate. With multiple access points into community-based addiction and mental health services in Edmonton and

without 24/7 support other than crisis teams or the ER, families are left without the care they need. To the Minister of Health: what is being done to fix this and follow through with the recommendations out of the Valuing Mental Health report?

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

**Ms Hoffman:** Thank you very much, Madam Speaker and to the member for the important question. It's incredibly important to know that our government is committed to removing barriers that Albertans face when they're accessing mental health services, including difficulties navigating the system, and that's why we created the Valuing Mental Health: Next Steps, which has over 150 initiatives that are currently under way to improve and expand co-ordination of mental health services. One specific one the member mentioned, 24/7 access: we announced recently a 24/7 mental health clinic at the Royal Alexandra hospital here in Edmonton, and we're very excited for it to open its doors.

**The Deputy Speaker:** First supplemental.

**Ms Woollard:** Thank you again, Madam Speaker. How will this initiative provide better care for patients, please?

**Ms Hoffman:** The 24-hour clinic at the Royal Alex will expand counselling, treatment, and crisis support, ensuring that it's there even evenings and weekends, when people often feel the most isolated. It will be staffed by more than 100 additional mental health employees, including mental health therapists, nurses, social workers, and addictions counsellors, all important investments in health care, Madam Speaker. Instead of talking about pulling thousands of dollars, millions of dollars, billions of dollars, out of front-line services, this government is investing in the services that matter to Albertans and increasing access through things like the 24/7 clinic at the Royal Alex.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Second supplemental.

**Ms Woollard:** Thank you, Madam Speaker, and thank you for the response there. Who was involved in the creation of this program, and when will families be able to use this new program, please?

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

**Ms Hoffman:** Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. AHS consulted with over 400 individuals from a range of organizations as well as patients and family members who have lived experience on how best to improve access to substance use and mental health services, specifically in the Edmonton area, and our government is providing a million dollars to renovate the space. The Royal Alexandra Hospitals Foundation and the Mental Health Foundation are raising an additional \$350,000 towards that new clinic. Construction is already under way, and we expect it to open later this winter. It can't come a day too soon; that's for sure. We're really excited for this project.

### Rural Crime Strategy

**The Deputy Speaker:** The hon. Member for Vermilion-Lloydminster.

**Dr. Starke:** Well thank you, Madam Speaker. I continue to receive many calls from rural constituents who have been victims of criminal activity. Now, there has been a small drop in crime statistics, and that's prompted the Justice minister to loudly proclaim that the government's rural crime initiative is working. But those statistics are small comfort for people who continue to be

victimized, for some for the fifth or sixth or seventh time. To the Justice minister. Frustration continues to grow for these rural residents. What do you have to say to them?

**The Deputy Speaker:** The hon. Minister of Justice.

**Ms Ganley:** Thank you very much, Madam Speaker and to the member for the important question. Well, as the member has correctly pointed out, we have seen an 11 per cent drop in property crime across rural areas in the province. I've been clear in every instance in which I have spoken about this, that that has not extended to every area in the province. That's one of the reasons why our crime reduction units are so important. They can follow where the crime goes to make sure that they are proactively targeting those individuals who are doing a disproportionate amount of damage to our communities.

2:10

**Dr. Starke:** Well, Madam Speaker, given that the RCMP has started telling my constituents that when it comes to stolen property, they don't have the time to spare nor the manpower to recover it and the RCMP are now telling people to simply file an insurance claim for stolen property and that some of our residents are finding it very hard to either obtain insurance or that the prices have skyrocketed, to the minister: what concrete actions are you taking to ensure that rural residents continue to be able to access property insurance at a reasonable cost?

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

**Ms Ganley:** Thank you very much, Madam Speaker and to the member for the question. Again, as we're moving forward, we're making sure that all Albertans across the province feel the impacts of our rural crime strategy in decreasing our property crime. I cannot be clear enough about this. The RCMP have been clear about this as well. It is important that all people across Alberta report crime where it's occurring. That goes into our intelligence databases, and it allows us to target the crime more effectively. We've had a fantastic relationship with Rural Crime Watch and Citizens on Patrol, and they are helping us to move forward.

**Dr. Starke:** Madam Speaker, given that our local RCMP are so overwhelmed by cases that they can't respond to or investigate crimes that have occurred and that when the much-vaunted rural crime reduction unit visited my constituency, the Vermilion River county councillors were told that our county is simply too big to provide adequate police protection, to the Justice minister. Your government is finally admitting that your economic recovery isn't reaching all Albertans. When will you also admit that your crime reduction initiative is failing to serve and protect all rural Albertans?

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

**Ms Ganley:** Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. As I've indicated previously, the strategy is working. It's having an impact in terms of decreasing crime in many areas of the province. It is clear that it hasn't rolled out equally to all areas of the province, as is normally the case. We are working with those areas to make sure that we're moving forward on that. The answer here is more investment in police, not less. That's why our rural crime strategy is taking the steps to invest in police, invest in prosecutors, and I would wonder why the member opposite voted against it.

**Dr. Starke:** Point of order.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Point of order noted.

**Provincial Budget Revenue Forecasts**  
(continued)

**Mr. Barnes:** Madam Speaker, a year ago the differential, the difference in price between west Texas intermediate and western Canadian select that Alberta produces, was just \$18. Last week the differential hit a punishing \$54, a 200 per cent increase. To the Finance minister: what impact does a \$54 differential have on your government's debt, revenues, spending, and interest expense?

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

**Mr. Ceci:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. You know, first, let me address the debt-servicing cost question that was brought up in the member's statement. I just looked at Budget '18, and it's half of what he has said is the debt-servicing cost, so I'm not sure where he got his numbers. But I do want to say that our path to balance is intact. The opposition, we know, has no plan to balance. They have no plan for anything other than giving the super wealthy a \$700 million tax cut, and we will have hard-working Albertans pay for that tax cut. I don't think that they're on the side of Albertans. They're on the side of their superwealthy friends.

**Mr. Barnes:** Madam Speaker, my member's statement was about the \$4 billion he wants to put us under interest expense not the \$2 billion we're currently under. But again to the minister: is the government concerned that this substantial loss of royalty revenue as a result of the differential will result in your seventh credit downgrade as it becomes obvious that this government's path to balance is nothing more than a path to debt, interest, and hardship for Alberta families?

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

**Mr. Ceci:** Thanks again, Madam Speaker. You know, we're not going to take advice from that side of the House. For instance, the opposition leader, when he was in Ottawa – and we heard it from our Minister of Energy earlier – had six straight deficits in the governments he was in, a \$56 billion deficit in just one year alone, and he added \$145 billion to the national debt and racked up over \$309 billion in interest payments. On this side of the House we cut the deficit by \$3 billion already without firing 4,000 nurses and 4,000 teachers, which they would do.

**Mr. Barnes:** Madam Speaker, \$50 billion in debt in just three years.

Given that this government's 2018-19 budget pegged the cost of the differential at \$28 and was counting on it to actually decrease next year, not the north of \$50 that it currently is, and given that this government already prematurely calculated the revenue from a pipeline that isn't even built or started and was planning to increase the carbon tax on Alberta families, to the minister: when will you and your government get realistic about the cost of interest that reduces all of our priorities?

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

**Mr. Ceci:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'll just talk about the principles that Budget 2018 was built on. A strong and diversified economy: we see that across our economy. There are challenges, but we're addressing those. Stable spending and cost containment: something that side could never do. Reducing our reliance on resource revenues: that is taking place through PDP 1 and other things. We laid out a plan that would not bring in the reckless cuts

that that side is calling for, cuts that the member from Lac La Biche has said would hurt Albertans. Well, that's right. It will hurt Albertans.

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

**Mr. McIver:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. The Finance minister sees things that don't exist.

When Alberta's NDP government released its so-called path to balance, it banked on higher resource revenues from the Trans Mountain pipeline. At the time the Dominion Bond Rating Service called the NDP's revenue forecast, quote, highly uncertain. Now, with the pipeline delayed indefinitely, we know that that revenue forecast is highly impossible. To the Minister of Finance: since Alberta has seen six credit downgrades since your government took over the books and you have not learned a thing, how will you explain the next one, and what are you doing to avoid credit downgrade number 7 on your watch?

**Mr. Ceci:** It's like a bad movie over there, Madam Speaker.

You know, we're putting jobs and economic diversification first in this province, and our plan is working. I can tell you, Madam Speaker, that businesses are coming to Alberta. Flair Air moved their headquarters from Kelowna to Edmonton. CN Rail is investing another \$320 million in Alberta for upgrades. Nexen is investing \$400 million to expand their Long Lake oil sands. On and on and on. It's not as dire as that person says.

**Mr. McIver:** Madam Speaker, given that Albertans consider this minister's policies to be a horror movie, given that the minister's response is not surprising because he tends to remain in denial right up until our credit rating falls again and then he simply shrugs his shoulders, and given that our lack of pipeline capacity has created an alarmingly high discount on every drop of oil we sell, resulting in a very low price, to the minister: have you had any discussions with DBRS, Moody's, or Standard & Poor's about Alberta's escalating revenue crisis and the potential on the credit rating that you are responsible for?

**An Hon. Member:** Hopefully not.

**Mr. Nixon:** Point of order.

**Mr. Ceci:** Madam Speaker, you know, Q2 is coming at the end of this month. We'll have an opportunity to update all Albertans with regard to the fiscal situation of our budget, and I can tell you that there's going to be some good news in that Q2 update. As a result of our work, we have cut the deficit already, \$3 billion, something that side refuses to recognize and understand. When they were in government, the operating expense of their government went sky high. They spent like drunken sailors. We're restrained on this side.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Point of order noted.

Second supplemental.

**Mr. McIver:** Thank you. Given that the minister is restrained by the truth because he won't tell it as often as he should and given that in a continuing effort to deflect attention from his government's mishandling of the growing crisis, the minister for economic development unveiled a real-time lost revenue counter and given that the counter highlights national revenues of \$84 million a day – it's good to highlight that – but fails to tell Albertans how much they are losing per day, to the Finance minister: do you even know the daily amount of Alberta's real-time revenue counter, and what are you actually doing to make it better other than spending more

money than you're bringing in and building up a bigger pile of debt and deficit for them to deal with later?

**The Deputy Speaker:** The hon. minister of economic development.

**Mr. Bilous:** Thank you, Madam Speaker.

**Mr. Nixon:** Point of order.

**Mr. Bilous:** What we do know is that no one has been a stronger advocate for market access than our Premier, unlike the opposition over there, whose leader spent 20 years in Ottawa, 10 years in cabinet, and failed to get any pipelines to tidewater, Madam Speaker.

It's a little rich for us to be taking advice from these folks. It's also ironic that when they talk about debt and deficit, they look at the leader and how much he racked up: six straight deficit budgets – do you discuss that at your caucus meetings? – \$56 billion in one year alone. We are moving forward. We've rolled out a strategy to ensure that these pipelines move forward.

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

## 2:20 Educational Curriculum Redesign

**Mr. Smith:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. The Minister of Education's new curriculum appears to be taking a one-size-fits-all approach, applying the same template to every educational discipline. As a former social studies teacher I can assure you that forcing math into a social studies template will not result in good math instruction. Each discipline requires its own appropriate approach. To the Minister of Education: why are you trying to stretch or chop every subject to fit the same narrow template?

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

**Mr. Eggen:** Well, thank you, Madam Speaker. Certainly, I'm very proud of the curriculum work that we're doing here in the province of Alberta in all subject areas at all grade levels. This is a way by which we can track and make sure that we quantify skills as they move from grade to grade and make sure that we do have those interactions between subject areas. For example, financial literacy exists and will live in mathematics, but it will also live in social studies, and it will also live in health and so forth. This is a way by which kids can internalize and learn these lessons and carry them with them for the rest of their lives.

**The Deputy Speaker:** First supplemental.

**Mr. Smith:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. Given that many cognitive theorists maintain that children do not develop critical thinking skills until around the age of 12 and given that the new curriculum asks even the youngest students to think critically and given concerns that the curriculum does not teach the basic knowledge they'll need to think critically when they're ready, how will the minister address concerns that this inattention to basic knowledge will leave students unprepared to think critically?

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

**Mr. Eggen:** Well, thank you, Madam Speaker. You know, I find it a bit curious that we would be debating something around basic skills. We are building basic skills into the curriculum. The draft curriculum for K to 4 is up on the website now for people to look at, and we'll start field testing in the new year. Certainly, it's

important to match basic skills with more advanced cognition in later grades, so we're working on grades 5 to 9 right now. Critical thinking is a very important part of being a member of a modern society. I know that the members opposite don't like critical thinking because once people learn it, then they will be less likely to vote for the UCP.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Second supplemental.

**Mr. Smith:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I think somebody had better work on their critical thinking skills.

Given that Alberta's diverse communities have varying educational needs and given that, for example, farm safety education is vital in a rural setting but may not be needed by urban students and given that the new curriculum appears to treat every student and every discipline according to the same template, when will the minister release the instructional resources so that Albertans can be confident that the curriculum can be tailored to meet local needs?

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

**Mr. Eggen:** Well, thank you, Madam Speaker. Actually, that's a very good question. What we're doing is that we are doubling down on the professionalism of teachers and of local boards and so forth to build content that does work in their own particular local areas. I will make no excuses about urban students learning about agriculture, for example, because it's our second-biggest industry and it's a very important part of the structure of who we are as Albertans. You know, what you don't do, though, is take 4,000 teachers out of the system, make major cuts . . .

**Mr. Nixon:** Point of order.

**Mr. Eggen:** . . . from the budget for the sake of simply trying to make ideological choices, which is what the members opposite are doing.

## Energy Industry Diversification Programs

**Cortes-Vargas:** Madam Speaker, the construction of the Inter Pipeline facility has done a lot to stimulate the economy in the Industrial Heartland. This investment would not have been possible without the first round of the government's petrochemical diversification program, and understandably a lot of my constituents have been asking me how we can keep this momentum going. Last spring we passed legislation to enable the second round of PDP as well as programs for partial upgrading and petrochemical feedstock infrastructure. To the Minister of Energy: what is the status of these programs, and when can we expect announcements of the next steps?

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

**Ms McCuaig-Boyd:** Thank you, Madam Speaker, and thank you for the question. I'm very proud about the work our government has done on diversification. You know, I'm old enough to remember when Peter Lougheed started that work, and then for whatever reason it was dropped until our government. We know, as I've said many times in this House, that the first round was very well subscribed, and we're very proud of the results. The second had just as much interest. Right now they are being evaluated at arm's length from our minister's office and by an independent fairness monitor, and we're going to have more to say early in the new year.

**Cortes-Vargas:** Given that workers, industries, and municipalities all submitted feedback about PDP and other programs in the economic diversification panel, how is the minister ensuring she is addressing their feedback as we move to the next round of applicants?

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

**Ms McCuaig-Boyd:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. As I said, I'm very proud of what we've done so far. The benefits of the Inter Pipeline investment have been well beyond the heartland itself. I've had the pleasure of touring a factory in Grande Prairie where they're providing vessels to the project. There are companies in Balzac and Red Deer that are also enjoying the benefits. In the new one we've placed some additional weight on jobs provided, apprenticeship opportunities, and benefit to indigenous groups.

**Cortes-Vargas:** Given that workers in the building trades are anxiously awaiting more projects and given that the Industrial Heartland plays a critical role in Alberta's GDP, to the minister: are there criteria to ensure that there are viable projects that are ready to move ahead if there are successful applicants?

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

**Ms McCuaig-Boyd:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. The simple answer is yes. We have two sets of criteria for evaluating the projects. One, as was mentioned, was benefit to Albertans. The other criteria speak to the economic viability of the programs, including having a solid business plan, evaluating the technology used, the company's environmental performance, which speaks to the overall capabilities, and the timing of the project completion. I'm excited about the opportunities that are before us and excited for the next steps to come.

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

#### **Tow Truck Driver Safety**

**Mr. Drysdale:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. Last fall a private member's bill would have allowed tow trucks to use blue and white warning lights along with the currently permitted amber. The industry asked for this change because their work on Alberta's roadsides creates hazards for tow truck operators as well as members of the motoring public. Although this bill died on the Order Paper, the minister had indicated interest in it. To the Transportation minister: does the minister have any plans to implement this bill's proposal?

**The Deputy Speaker:** The hon. Minister of Transportation.

**Mr. Mason:** Thank you very much for that very good question, Madam Speaker, from the hon. member. I just want to start out by reminding people that the law requires them to slow down when they pass a tow truck with flashing lights to a minimum of 60 kilometres an hour, and we urge drivers to be cautious at all times. With respect to the question about the lights, that's something that is under consideration. I'm happy to give more information in subsequent answers.

**The Deputy Speaker:** The hon. member.

**Mr. Drysdale:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. Given that tow truck operators are asking if there's anything they can do to help advance the proposals in the bill and given that I'm also receiving interest

from industry representatives from other provinces but I'm not sure how to respond to them, to the same minister: what actions would you recommend tow truck operators take to obtain this extra level of safety for all Albertans?

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

**Mr. Mason:** Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I wish to correct a previous answer. You must slow down at least to 60. That's not a minimum; that's a maximum. I just wanted to clarify that for everyone.

We know that Saskatchewan has implemented a system of two-colour lights for tow trucks, including blue and, I believe, amber. We're in touch with Saskatchewan. We're looking at their experience. We want to deal with that. In the meantime I urge all drivers to respect the fact that tow truck operators are out there, that they're exposed, and we need to be careful.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Second supplemental.

**Mr. Drysdale:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. Given that allowing tow trucks to use more visible blue and white warning lights enhances safety for all motorists and given that Saskatchewan and four other provinces have successfully made this change and that the minister can easily make the required changes to the highway traffic act simply through regulation, to the minister: will the minister work with all parties to implement this common-sense proposal as soon as possible?

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

**Mr. Mason:** Thank you very much, Madam Speaker and to the hon. member for the question. Well, as I indicated, we're looking at the experience of Saskatchewan and other provinces with respect to this. When we've analyzed it and are convinced that it's actually going to make a difference to improve safety, we're seriously prepared to take a look at what changes we can make to make sure that tow truck drivers, like everyone on our highways, are safe.

**The Deputy Speaker:** The hon. Member for Cardston-Taber-Warner.

2:30

#### **Business Regulations**

**Mr. Hunter:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. This past week our neighbouring province to the west hosted the B.C. Business Summit 2018. One of the slide decks showed that Canada ranked 34th of 35 Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development countries when it comes to time to obtain a permit for a new general construction project. This was just one slide in many that showed how poorly Canada is doing on red tape. To the government: how is Alberta doing on red tape reduction?

**The Deputy Speaker:** The hon. Minister of Economic Development and Trade.

**Mr. Bilous:** Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I think we're doing quite well, actually. Thank you for the question. There are a number of things that our government has undertaken, including that every time that we are reviewing a regulation that comes back up – many, many government regulations are on a five-year timer – we look at the regulation to ensure that it's still serving its purpose. If it's a safety issue, if it's an environmental issue, or if the regulation is stale-dated and needs to be either amended or discarded, this is an ongoing process. We don't need a campaign in

order to have a focus on regulations. We are constantly looking at how we can make it easier to do business in the province of Alberta.

**Mr. Hunter:** Madam Speaker, given that Amber Ruddy, the director of CFIB, said, "Alberta is the only provincial government in Canada that refuses to be publicly accountable for the regulatory burden," would the NDP say that they are bringing down Canada's grade amongst OECD countries or raising it?

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

**Mr. Bilous:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. What I'll point out to the member if they want to count regulations simply or only: look to the province of British Columbia, where up until recently there were regulations for bar and restaurant owners as far as the height they could have televisions inside their restaurant or bar. That seems absurd to me. Alberta doesn't have those types of regulations. Starting off with a certain number, other provinces have an abundance of regulations. What I will say and what we've introduced not long ago is that Alberta is moving forward on a common business number because we want to make it easier for businesses to do business in Canada and work with the federal government, and we are waiting on them.

**Mr. Hunter:** Madam Speaker, given that this government has received an F from CFIB every year and given that they have added over 100 pages of legislation to just the OH and S act alone, how can they stand in this House and defend their record on red tape reduction? Struggling Albertans deserve an answer.

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

**Mr. Bilous:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. You know what? I was very proud to be Alberta's trade minister and to partake in the negotiation of the Canadian free trade agreement or the renewed AIT, where actually the national Canadian Federation of Independent Business awarded all trade ministers the golden scissors because we are moving forward with trying to make it easier to do business across the country. Now, I recognize there are a number of other initiatives that we are working on with other provinces, trying to make it easier to do business in all jurisdictions. We recognize this, and we will continue to work toward making it easier . . .

**The Deputy Speaker:** The hon. Member for Fort McMurray-Conklin.

#### **Hillview Park Condominiums in Fort McMurray Condominium Regulations**

**Ms Goodridge:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. Over 2,500 homes were destroyed almost two and a half years ago in the Fort McMurray fire. Only 30 per cent, 823, have been fully rebuilt, leaving 70 per cent still not home. One of the many horror stories comes from the Hillview condo complex, which has 214 separate units and has faced a series of serious challenges, and they're still a long way from being home. The government has recently committed \$2 million to help these individuals. Could the minister please tell the House what the conditions are for the money?

**The Deputy Speaker:** The hon. Minister of Service Alberta.

**Mr. Malkinson:** Well, thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I'm pleased to report that in partnership with the regional municipality of Wood Buffalo and the Red Cross there's an additional \$6 million being made available to support those who were affected from the

Hillview condos. The Red Cross, of course, has an office set up in Fort McMurray and has already provided individual assistance to upwards of half the Hillview owners. I'd of course want to point out to any Hillview condo owner to definitely contact the Red Cross to see the help that is available to them.

**The Deputy Speaker:** First supplemental.

**Ms Goodridge:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. Given that this NDP government created a licensing system for builders to be able to build post fire in Fort McMurray to prevent the very failures that we are seeing today in the Hillview complex, will the government admit that there was a failure in the licensing process, and as a result, are you looking to review this very flawed framework?

**The Deputy Speaker:** The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs.

**Mr. S. Anderson:** Sorry. I'm a little slow, Madam Speaker. Hurt my back. Actually, the member is incorrect. The builder licensing legislation came in after the fire in Fort Mac. What was in place in Fort Mac was kind of a precursor, a pilot, to put some things in place to try to help where we could. The legislation, in fact, that is in place, that Municipal Affairs put in, that I'm quite proud of, that we did great consultation on, and that builders and developers alike were happy with, has proven to work quite well since then because it's doing the job that we want it to do.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Second supplemental.

**Ms Goodridge:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. Given that many of the 70 per cent that aren't currently home are in multifamily dwellings, specifically condominiums, and given that any community in Alberta is simply a flood or a fire away from a similar fate and given that the people in Fort McMurray have already gone through enough, when will you finally release the condo regulations that you've been working on for the last three and a half years, and will these regulations actually protect against another Hillview tragedy?

**The Deputy Speaker:** The Minister of Service Alberta.

**Mr. Malkinson:** Well, thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Of course, you know, condo owners throughout the province deserve to have a condo board that functions appropriately. That is why we went out and consulted with Albertans. We did two rounds of consultation, working with many different industry groups. And the condo regulations that came out of that consultation: I think the hon. member can expect to see those shortly.

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

#### **Lethbridge Drug Use and Crime Rates**

**Mr. Ellis:** Well, thank you, Madam Speaker. Of nine Alberta communities on *Maclean's* magazine's list of the top 20 most dangerous places in Canada Lethbridge sits in third place due to a spike in illicit drugs and associated addictions problems. In a recent *Lethbridge Herald* article police confirmed that addicts are fuelling their drug habits by committing break-ins and other property-related crimes, and the UCP is hearing from citizens concerned for the safety of their families. To the Justice minister: do you concur with the police that drugs have prompted this sharp increase in crime in Lethbridge?

**The Deputy Speaker:** The hon. Minister of Justice.

**Ms Ganley:** Thank you very much, Madam Speaker and to the member for the important question. Certainly, we have been having conversations with our police partners around substance abuse issues throughout the province. It's certainly one of the things that is seen as a driver of crime. That's why we think it's important to address crime from a multifaceted perspective, ensuring that we're addressing not only the criminal end point but the upstream things like addictions and mental health. I'm sure we'll have more to say about that in subsequent questions.

**The Deputy Speaker:** First supplemental.

**Mr. Ellis:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. Given that residents are saying that a drug consumption site is attracting an influx of addicts to their neighbourhood and given that schools, parks, residences, and businesses are all located within walking distance of this site and given that I understand that the purpose of this consumption site is to save lives and reduce harm but that that does not mean the government should dismiss residents' valid concerns about harm to their neighbourhood, to the Justice minister: will you order an immediate review of the crime rates in this particular neighbourhood?

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

**Ms Hoffman:** Thank you very much. Since this is certainly a public health situation, I'm going to take the lead on this, but rest assured that I work regularly with the Justice minister as well as both local MLAs from Lethbridge. They've done an excellent job of raising the concerns and helping us make sure that folks who live in Lethbridge get the supports and services they need. That's why we've invested an additional \$80,000 for needle collection, that we've doubled now to \$160,000. These funds are supporting additional cleanup. We're also making sure that we are working with service providers. The fact is that substance use in Lethbridge is at a significant rate, and we can't turn our back on the people who are dying in the community, unlike the Leader of the Official Opposition recommended when . . .

**The Deputy Speaker:** Second supplemental.

**Mr. Ellis:** Thanks, Madam Speaker. Given that the location of this consumption site is posing hazards to residents, with many people especially concerned about children, and given that no one is asking this government to ignore people in the throes of addiction but that at the same time it must not ignore residents and businesses experiencing negative effects from the unintended consequences of this initiative, Minister, will you commit today to deal with this situation for the health and welfare of the entire community?

2:40

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

**Ms Hoffman:** Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. That's exactly what we're doing, and that's exactly why we've worked with the local MLAs to increase supports for community initiatives around the community. The truth is that the supervised consumption site in Lethbridge has the highest rate of use anywhere in our province's supervised consumption sites. It's saving lives every day. ARCHES responded to over 800 emergencies since opening in February, so this is certainly a state of emergency. The members opposite encouraged us to address it as an emergency. We're doing so. We're also working with local businesses, local law enforcement, the police, the mayor, and the local MLAs because this isn't something that we can police our way out of.

**Mr. Sucha:** Well, Madam Speaker, I'd like to open by congratulating the Calgary Stampeders on their win last night.

### Urban Wildlife Management

**Mr. Sucha:** With the growth of the city of Calgary, interaction between wildlife and residents becomes a way of life. My riding's proximity is very close to Fish Creek park, so we see wildlife like deer, coyotes, bobcats, and on the rare occasion even moose and bears enter my community. To the Minister of Environment and Parks: what is your ministry doing to track wildlife in these areas?

**The Deputy Speaker:** The hon. minister of environment.

**Ms Phillips:** Well, thank you, Madam Speaker. Alberta towns and cities have developed rapidly in urban areas. Certainly, we have an urban park in Fish Creek, and we often hear about wildlife-human interactions. That's one of the reasons why we have struck a committee to manage it, being chaired by the hon. Member for Banff-Cochrane, who's doing excellent work around human-wildlife interactions. We also have a number of other initiatives. We've invested in parks infrastructure, we've invested in wildlife corridors and underpass infrastructure, we've invested in parks staff and enforcement officers: all things that would not have happened had the folks across the way had their way.

**The Deputy Speaker:** First supplemental.

**Mr. Sucha:** Well, thank you, Madam Speaker. Given that I have heard significant concerns with interactions between bobcats and residents in my area, what is the government's policy to remove wildlife that may be dangerous to encounter for residents?

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

**Ms Phillips:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. If a wild animal is posing a danger to Albertans, there are a number of different things that they can do, but if they're in one of our parks or on public land, they should call their local fish and wildlife management office. Depending on the species of animal, what the behaviour is, where the encounter occurred, fish and wildlife officers may take one of several actions, including relocation, medical care, or euthanization.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Second supplemental.

**Mr. Sucha:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. Given that we have heard some concerns that the work on the southwest ring road and the growth of south Calgary are disrupting migratory patterns of wildlife, causing them to enter areas that they haven't entered before, what is the ministry doing to prevent these negative impacts on wildlife during these projects?

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

**Ms Phillips:** Well, thank you, Madam Speaker. In the case of the ring road what we try to do is mitigate the impact on wildlife, including clearing vegetation outside the breeding-bird window, identifying locations to improve wildlife passage through clear-span bridges, building fences at specific locations. We also made sure that the 2013 wetland policy applies to that project. We've therefore been able to avoid some wetland loss at Weaselhead that would have otherwise happened. We're trying to make sure that we carefully balance the environment and the economy. With the ring road and with the coming green line, people need to get to where they're going, whether it's work or school, and we are committed as a government to making sure that happens.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Hon. members, the Minister of Justice has asked to be able to supplement a response given during an earlier question.

The hon. Minister of Justice.

### **Rural Crime Strategy**

*(continued)*

**Ms Ganley:** Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. In response to the Member for Vermilion-Lloydminster I had indicated that he had voted against the rural crime strategy. That was incorrect. It was our colleagues from the UCP who voted against it, but the MLA for Vermilion-Lloydminster had in fact voted in favour.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Hon. Member for Vermilion-Lloydminster, did you wish to respond?

**Dr. Starke:** That covers it very well, Madam Speaker.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Just before we continue on, I've had a request to revert to introduction of guests briefly.

[Unanimous consent granted]

### **Introduction of Guests**

*(continued)*

**The Deputy Speaker:** The hon. Member for Red Deer-North.

**Mrs. Schreiner:** Well, thank you, Madam Speaker. I am pleased to introduce to you and through you guests from the Alberta Federation of Rural Electrification Associations who are here today in support of my motion to promote long-term viability and sustainability of REAs and other co-operatively organized utility associations. The AFREA represents member-owned co-operatives that distribute electricity throughout rural Alberta. These co-ops have distributed electricity for over 75 years. Here today are President Dan Astner, Vice-president Charles Newell, and Vice-president Robert Peyton. The board has been instrumental in bringing the important topic of REA sustainability to my attention. Also joining us today is CEO Al Nagel, who has worked in the electricity industry for over 50 years. I'd ask all of my guests from the AFREA to now rise and receive the traditional warm welcome of this Assembly.

### **Members' Statements**

*(continued)*

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

### **Holodomor Memorial Day**

**Mrs. Littlewood:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. Today we mark 85 years since the Ukrainian genocide known as Holodomor, a word made up of two brutal realities: "holod," meaning hunger, and "moryty," meaning a slow, cruel death. In just two years millions of Ukrainians died of starvation.

Last year I travelled with the MLA for Edmonton-Beverly-Clareview to Kiev to pay my respects at the Holodomor memorial in the country of our ancestors. We carried a bowl of wheat as we walked by the Angels of Sorrow, statues that guard the souls of the starved. We passed 24 millstones that remind us of the 24,000 human lives ground to death every day during the famine. We laid our eyes on a statue of a girl, with tears on her face, captured in time along with her frail frame.

Stalin's plan was deliberate, and beginning in 1932, brigades of men came to steal any and all food. Many came specially equipped with long metal rods topped by hooks, used to prod any surface in search of grain to feed Stalin's armies. Natalia Talanchuk remembers her mother forbidding her to look outside the windows in the mornings because out in the streets were bodies of the people who had died of starvation overnight. Outside of Ukraine little was known, and inside to even speak of this event was a crime subject to imprisonment, exile, or execution.

Remembering the Holodomor isn't just for those of us with Ukrainian blood; it is for all of us. As Albertans we do more than remember. We act to ensure that their tragedy is never repeated. In the memorial book there I left a note: "We are each born with rights to live as who we are, no matter race, religion, age, gender, gender expression, or social economic situation, without fear. I commit to working to protect these rights, every moment, every day."

Madam Speaker, today I recommit myself to these things. May the memory of those who died live forever. [Remarks in Ukrainian] Memory eternal.

### **Hunting Season**

**Mrs. Pitt:** Madam Speaker, the leaves have changed colour, and the weather has cooled down. For many Albertans their thoughts have turned to red flannel and blaze orange toques. Hunting season is here. Hundreds of thousands of people take part in this time-honoured tradition. Whether a rifle or bow hunter, we are extremely fortunate here in Alberta to have about 5 million acres of public land under agricultural lease that hunters may access.

Regardless of whether you want to hunt on public or private land, there are rules that need to be followed before you enter the property. If you wish to access public land such as grazing leases, you must contact the leaseholder and provide information about your visit. Although leaseholders must allow reasonable access to the land for recreation, there are some circumstances where the leaseholder may deny or apply conditions. Similarly, if you want to hunt on private land, you must first contact the landowner or the landowner's designate for permission. They can allow you to hunt or not – it's entirely up to them – and you must respect their discretion or face the consequences.

Last year investigations were conducted by fish and wildlife, resulting in charges or warnings being laid. This is unacceptable given technology today – the use of GPS devices, hunting apps – and even the good old-fashioned county maps with ownership and quarter sections clearly marked. There really isn't much reason for not abiding by the rules.

Madam Speaker, there are youth programs, seniors' programs, and programs to help those with disabilities enjoy this outdoor pursuit. There are even programs that allow for the donation of your harvest to the less fortunate. We should be proud that our hunting community plays such a vital role in wildlife management in this province. The money spent on licences and tags helps to keep these programs viable. Please join me in wishing everyone a safe, successful, and law-abiding hunting season.

Thank you.

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

### **2:50 Strathcona County Pickleball Association**

**Cortes-Vargas:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. It's my honour to stand today and recognize the active volunteers in an association that has been thriving in Strathcona county, and we all share the



goal of ensuring our community has the spaces they need to meet their fitness goals.

Pickleball is one of the fastest growing sports in Canada, and it encourages players from the ages of seven to 70. Pickleball is alive and well in Strathcona-Sherwood Park, and rarely is there ever an event or meeting I can get through without someone bringing up the subject of pickleball. I enjoyed my brief experience with the pickleball association when I had the pleasure of opening one of the new Strathcona county courts last year. The newest location is in my constituency, and it includes three outdoor courts at the Ardrossan junior and senior high school. There are now nine Strathcona county venues where residents can come together to play.

Pickleball is not simply dropping a ball into an old pickle jar, as it's been explained to me in jest. It's a combination of ping-pong, tennis, and badminton. Using paddles, players take turns to volley the ball across the net. It's an inclusive sport, and the rules have been adapted so pickleball is accessible to those in wheelchairs.

In July the Strathcona County Pickleball Association, with the help of 100 volunteers, held the first-ever Sherwood Park Open, which brought together 200 players. The Strathcona County Pickleball Association is a warm and friendly group, and, boy, are they active. People can drop in almost at any time and be welcomed by seasoned players who will explain the rules and get you started.

Madam Speaker, it has been a difficult two weeks for Strathcona county, but Strathcona county is resilient and has an amazing community spirit and co-operation that, to me, is exemplified by our many hard-working community groups. It is exactly this spirit of kindness and inclusion that keeps our community strong and a great place to call home.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

#### Bighorn Area Land Use

**Mr. Schneider:** It is with interest that over the last little while on this side of the House we have had numerous stakeholders come to us expressing concerns with the NDP plans for the Bighorn area. We have seen the internal e-mail talking about turning the Bighorn into a wildland area, and we have also seen and heard about the resolution/proposal at the Alberta NDP's most recent AGM proposing the same. Contrast this to last week's statement by the minister that, quote: we're looking at proposing a mix of land designations that will conserve and protect natural landscapes while accommodating a wide range of economic, recreation, and tourism opportunities in the Bighorn. Unquote. Contrasting statements, it seems.

Now, the minister's own website states, "Wildland provincial parks are large, undeveloped natural landscapes that retain their primeval character." So this begs the question: how does that align with what the minister stated? Do we go with the policy e-mail, the minister's statement, or the party resolution? Remember that the minister had previously stated that the government wanted more Alberta parks. So what's the direction here? If the minister says that they are planning a park in the Bighorn, can the government ensure that no forestry sector jobs will be lost? Will existing forestry leases be respected? If the Bighorn is designated as a wildland park, can it be done in such a way that no jobs are at risk? So many questions and so many conflicting statements.

What will the government do if a pine beetle outbreak occurs in a newly designated Bighorn provincial wildland park? Will they act too late, similar to what happened in Jasper? What would a new designation in the Bighorn mean for the area's communities? Would they be consulted before any new park is designated,

knowing that the loss of energy, forestry, and tourism dollars could be a reality? Will we have more communities face economic oblivion, similar to what this government has done to our coal communities? I, for one, hope not, but past actions by this government make me and stakeholders very skeptical.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

#### Notices of Motions

**The Deputy Speaker:** The hon. Member for Strathmore-Brooks.

**Mr. Fildebrandt:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. Pursuant to Standing Order 42 at the appropriate time I will rise on a motion later today. The motion I will be putting forward states:

Be it resolved that the Legislative Assembly urge the government to reject co-operation with the federal government in the imposition of the Paris agreement on climate change.

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

**Mr. Ellis:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. At the appropriate time I intend to move the following motion pursuant to Standing Order 42:

Be it resolved that the Legislative Assembly urge the government to immediately release an updated fiscal projection given that Budget 2018 did not account for the delay in the Trans Mountain pipeline expansion and the Keystone XL pipeline or the significant differential in oil prices that is impacting Alberta jobs and the economy.

Thank you.

#### Tabling Returns and Reports

**The Deputy Speaker:** The hon. Member for Edmonton-Centre.

**Mr. Shepherd:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. As chair of the Standing Committee on Legislative Offices and in accordance with section 4(7) of the Election Act and section 4(2) of the Election Finances and Contributions Disclosure Act I would like to table five copies of the 2017-18 annual report of the Chief Electoral Officer. A copy of this report will be provided to all members.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Hon. members, I have two tablings today. First, I would like to table five copies of the fifth annual report of the Alberta Public Interest Commissioner.

Second, I'd like to table five copies of the 51st annual report of the Alberta Ombudsman.

#### Tablings to the Clerk

**The Acting Clerk:** I wish to advise the Assembly that the following documents were deposited with the office of the Clerk. On behalf of the hon. Mr. Schmidt, Minister of Advanced Education, pursuant to the Apprenticeship and Industry Training Act the Alberta Apprenticeship and Industry Training Board 2017-2018 annual report.

On behalf of the hon. Ms Gray, Minister of Labour, pursuant to the Government Organization Act annual reports for the following authorized radiation health administrative organizations: the Alberta Association for Safety Partnerships, January 1, 2017, to December 31, 2017, with attached financial statements; the Alberta College and Association of Chiropractors, July 1, 2017, to June 30, 2018, with attached financial statements; the Alberta Dental Association and College, January 1, 2017, to December 31, 2017, with attached financial statements; the Alberta Veterinary Medical

Association, November 1, 2016, to October 31, 2017; the College of Physicians & Surgeons of Alberta, January 1, 2017, to December 31, 2017; the University of Alberta, April 1, 2017, to March 31, 2018; the University of Calgary, April 1, 2017, to March 31, 2018; and pursuant to the Chartered Professional Accountants Act the Chartered Professional Accountants of Alberta annual report 2017-2018.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Hon. members, we have some points of order that were raised. The hon. Member for Rimbey-Rocky Mountain House-Sundre.

### Point of Order

#### Addressing Questions through the Chair

**Mr. Nixon:** Well, thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise on my first point of order. I will actually quote my friend the hon. Government House Leader because when he raised the exact same point of order last time that we were here, he did a very good job of it. I agreed with him at the time, so I think that that will speed things up. He said on October 29, 2018:

Thanks very much, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker was in the chair at the time.

Well, during question period today the hon. Member for Fort McMurray-Wood Buffalo was asking a series of questions to the Minister of Health and during that group of questions, in a fairly aggressive way, pointing at the minister he referred to [her] as “you.” I want to just make a couple of points. In *Beauchesne’s Parliamentary Rules & Forms*, sixth edition, on page 142, “It is the custom in the House that no Member should refer to another by name. Members should be referred to in the third person as ‘the Honourable Member for .....’” or the “Minister is normally designated by the portfolio held.” That is the hon. Minister of Health in this case.

Mr. Speaker, in *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, third edition, 2017, on page 510 under the section dealing with principles and guidelines for oral questions it also says very clearly, “Finally, all questions and answers must be directed through the Chair.”

Today, in response to a question, the Finance minister leaned over to the Member for Calgary-Hays, pointed his finger directly at the member, and aggressively started saying “you,” not speaking through the chair.

I agree with the Government House Leader, as I did then. That’s the process for our House, and I would ask either that he withdraw and apologize on behalf of this member or that you rule accordingly.

Thanks, Madam Speaker.

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

3:00

**Mr. Mason:** Well, thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Interestingly, I also agree with the Government House Leader on this matter. I did not observe the occasion, but I did observe during question period today, as on most days, that there were occasional lapses on both sides where people referred to the person they’re asking or answering as “you.” It’s a good reminder that all members should remember to go through the chair on these matters. If this is as the Official Opposition House Leader says it is, then he’s quite right, and I will ask our members and members of our government to try and keep this in mind.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Moving on to the next point of order, the hon. Member for Rimbey-Rocky Mountain House-Sundre.

### Point of Order

#### Reflections on Nonmembers

**Mr. Nixon:** Well, thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise on 23(h), (i), and (j) in regard to some comments made by the Minister of Education in a response to a question by the hon. Member for Drayton Valley-Devon. During the minister’s response to the question – I was quite shocked to watch him do it – he indicated that he was making drastic changes to the education system in order to be able to deal with, essentially, conservative voters, who he said were not capable of critically thinking. Then that way, in the future they would not vote for Conservative parties and would vote for the NDP.

Now, there were 772,000 Albertans who voted for the Conservative side of the question in the last election. There are hundreds of thousands of Albertans who identify as conservatives, and I can tell you that they would be greatly insulted to be informed by the Education minister that they cannot critically think. Let’s be clear. This is a government who continually calls Albertans names, a Premier who referred to some Albertans as Chicken Little because of their concerns with the carbon tax, and, most famously, a Deputy Premier who called Albertans sewer rats. In this case, again to say that they are not capable of critically thinking is appalling, and that minister should stand up and apologize and withdraw his ridiculous remarks about the people of Alberta.

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

**Mr. Mason:** Well, thank you very much, Madam Speaker. You know, some people in the House seem to be able to twist the truth like a pretzel, and this is a perfect example. For example, if you take what the Minister of Education said – and I thought it was a fairly lighthearted political jibe across the aisle – it was not that people who voted Conservative were incapable of critical thought but that, in his opinion, the more people were able to reason critically, the less likely they were to vote for the UCP. I don’t disagree with that point of view, but we respect and the Minister of Education certainly respects the right of every Albertan to make up their own mind with respect to how they vote and what their political leanings are. There are very many intelligent people on both sides or on all sides of the political system. It’s important that we encourage critical thought as a whole, not with a political objective in mind but just to help everyone make informed decisions about things that affect their everyday lives. That doesn’t mean they’re going to arrive at the same conclusion, and I don’t think the Minister of Education meant that.

Another example of how the hon. member is twisting words here was his reference to the Health minister’s talk about sewer rats, which was not directed to all Albertans by any means, not by a large degree.

**An Hon. Member:** Then why did she apologize?

**Mr. Mason:** She did apologize for that, but it was very focused, I think, on Rebel Media, which is, of course, very supportive of the UCP. The UCP leadership and members of their caucus have been repeatedly interviewed by Rebel Media notwithstanding the fact that it provided live coverage of the Nazi rally in Charlottesville and had adopted a very openly racist point of view and tone in its coverage, Madam Speaker. For the Official Opposition House Leader to then point the finger at the Minister of Health for being critical in a sharp way, admittedly, of that so-called media outlet is a bit rich because I think, quite frankly, that the UCP has a lot to answer for with respect to their associations with extremist groups, including Rebel Media. So I don’t think any apology is warranted

in this case. It's part of the normal debate in this place, and I think that the opposition doth protest too much.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Hon. members, with regard to this point of order I don't have the benefit of the Blues. I did hear the comment, but in my viewpoint it was again part of that lighthearted banter back and forth. It's something, arguably, it perhaps would be nice to have a little more of in this Assembly and in this Chamber. That said, it's nice to have a reminder that we do need to always be conscious of our words and our decorum and the statements that we're taking in, how people are understanding these.

Was there another point of order? You've withdrawn one?

Did you still have another point of order, hon. member?

**Mr. Nixon:** I'm just checking.

**The Deputy Speaker:** The hon. Member for Vermilion-Lloydminster has withdrawn his point of order.

### Point of Clarification

**Mr. Nixon:** I rise, Madam Speaker, on 13(2) and ask you to explain your ruling and, in particular, why you think that insulting almost a million Albertans is light banter.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Hon. member, I've made my ruling, and I don't think any explanation of that is necessary.

### Motions under Standing Order 42

**The Deputy Speaker:** The hon. Member for Strathmore-Brooks on Standing Order 42.

#### Paris Agreement on Climate Change

Mr. Fildebrandt:

Be it resolved that the Legislative Assembly urge the government to reject co-operation with the federal government in the imposition of the Paris agreement on climate change.

**Mr. Fildebrandt:** Thank you, Madam Speaker, for the opportunity. Now, I think this is a matter of relative urgency for this House to debate. The federal government and many provincial Legislatures across the country have had the opportunity to debate and discuss the Paris climate accord. This Legislature has not. The Paris climate accord, while those agreements are international, has massive direct effects on Alberta, its finances, and our economy. Just as this House has in times gone by debated other accords like Kyoto and Copenhagen, the Paris climate accord is of direct consequence to Alberta, and this House has not had the opportunity to debate it yet. So I would request that the Legislature of Alberta be afforded the opportunity to debate this important and imposing federal policy, and I ask all members of the House to agree to allow this debate.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Unanimous consent is required to proceed with debate.

[Unanimous consent granted]

**The Deputy Speaker:** You can begin debate on your motion, hon. member.

**Mr. Fildebrandt:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. Well, I want to thank members for agreeing to allowing this debate to move forward. The Paris agreement on climate change is of critical importance to all of Canada and to Alberta in particular. The agreement, signed by Prime Minister Trudeau along with support

from the federal Green and ND parties, commits Canada to meeting climate change and emission objectives that are outrageously unrealistic. They are objectives that no country on the planet is currently headed towards actually meeting.

3:10

The Paris agreement on climate change follows in the footsteps of the Kyoto accord and the Copenhagen agreement. It follows in a long story of these international accords where politicians, big business, and other international interest groups come together, have a bunch of photo ops, and agree to save the world on a piece of paper. Unsurprisingly, these agreements always require that advanced industrialized economies like Canada do far more than our share. Now, the only good thing about these agreements is that our governments have consistently never met the objectives because meeting those objectives would strangle our economy.

You can still see some old, worn-out bumper stickers. I remember seeing bumper stickers on trucks around rural Alberta that said: no gun registry, no Kyoto accord, and no liberals. You can still see some of these because the Kyoto accord is – I'm sure the Member for Calgary-Mountain View doesn't like part of the bumper sticker. He probably doesn't like any of the bumper sticker, I would imagine. I'm sure they weren't referring to him.

Now, any government that realistically attempted to meet the objectives of Kyoto or Copenhagen or Paris is – no government has attempted to actually meet those objectives. They are merely aspirational. Any attempt to impose them in full would be debilitating to our economy. Of course, we need to do work to ensure that our industries are operating safely and cleanly, that we have an emphasis on environmental policy, on clean air, water, and land.

But I'm going to say something that shouldn't be news to this House. Carbon dioxide is not pollution. It is a naturally occurring phenomenon. Too much of it can be damaging, but it is not pollution. It is not a tax on pollution because carbon dioxide is not pollution. It's what plants breathe. So we need to be careful in the language we're using here when the government talks about taxes on pollution.

The Paris climate accord was signed by the Trudeau government with the support of the Green Party, the NDP, and the federal Tories. The very first act of federal Conservative Party leader Andrew Scheer after becoming leader was to whip his caucus into voting to support the Paris climate accord, and that was a early warning sign for me that perhaps that would not be a party that I could necessarily trust anymore. The Paris climate accord is supported by every single establishment federal political party. I would assume it's supported by our government, but I'll let them speak for themselves.

This is an agreement that our federal government has signed that they are now imposing or attempting to impose in legislation on provinces that do not comply. Ontario has recently liberated itself from the Kathleen Wynne Liberals, and they have pulled out of the backdoor carbon tax of that government, a cap and trade plan. They have pulled out, and now the federal government intends to impose a direct carbon tax on its own. Now, this case is going before the Supreme Court. It is to be determined yet if the federal government has the constitutional authority to impose a tax on one province and not another. To date that has generally not been the case. The federal government does not have that authority, but they believe they have it, and I suppose the courts will make that determination. The federal government is at this time imposing a carbon tax on provinces that do not comply.

Now, I might not agree with everyone on this side of the House, but I have a pretty strong feeling that a year from today there will

not be a carbon tax in Alberta. It will be gone, one way or another. It is important for us to take a stand against any attempts by the federal government to impose policies that it has signed off on without provincial consultation or, in fact, without consultation with Canadians. In the last federal election, except for the people who voted Green, no Canadian voted for a carbon tax. Only about 5 per cent of Canadians voted for a federal carbon tax, yet it's being imposed at a national level.

So what is behind it? The Paris climate accord is an agreement between wealthy and connected elites and governments and big business for wealth redistribution. It is a plan that does not have the best interests of economic growth at heart, and it doesn't have the best interests of Canada and especially Alberta at heart. We should take a stand in this House and vote very clearly to reject the Paris climate accord in its entirety. We should send a message to the federal government that we will not be a part of their plan to impose the Paris climate accord here in any part whatsoever. We have an opportunity to speak loudly and with a unified voice as Albertans in this Legislature to send a message to the federal government that they can keep their carbon tax and they can keep their accord. We want nothing to do with it.

Albertans were not consulted on a carbon tax. Albertans were not consulted on the Paris climate accord. The Paris climate accord is one of these kinds of international agreements that violates our sovereignty as a country. It puts the UN above Canada. It puts the UN above Alberta. It puts international bureaucrats and international celebrities above the interests of real, everyday working people. This is an opportunity for this House to send a message loud and clear to Ottawa, to Prime Minister Trudeau, and to the international community that are behind the Paris climate accord that we want none of it. They can keep their carbon tax, and they can keep their climate accord. Alberta is going to stand on its own, strong and free.

Thank you.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Before I recognize the next speaker, I just want to verify that although we haven't hit Orders of the Day, as per our previous precedent you will be allowed to bring your drinks into the Chamber.

I'll recognize the hon. minister of environment.

**Ms Phillips:** Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I'm very pleased to rise on this matter of the pressing issue of climate change. Of course, it is probably the most important and pressing issue of our time. Certainly, humanity has never seen a challenge such as climate change before. That is why, for example, the international panel on climate change released its first post-Paris scientific assessment very recently, showing that higher global warming temperatures will affect Canada's biodiversity in a number of ways. Impacts associated with risks such as forest fires, the spread of invasive species are lower at 1.5 degrees than they are at two degrees of warming. Climate change will intensify the risk of forest fires. The spread of invasive species will over time change the complexion of our forests. It also makes extreme weather events such as floods much more likely and much more severe. "Severe weather due to climate change is already costing Canadians billions of dollars annually." That is not from an environmental organization; that's from Don Forgeron, who's the president and CEO of Insurance Bureau of Canada.

Around the world the cost of disasters has increased fivefold. In Canada federal disaster relief spending rose from an average of \$40 million a year to an average of \$100 million now. Then in 2013 spending hit a record \$1.4 billion, largely due to flooding disasters in Ontario and in Alberta. This is why, Madam Speaker, Canada's

property insurance industry is calling on governments across the country to come together and implement expansive climate policies that will better prepare Canadians and their communities for when disasters strike.

Similarly, Lloyd's of London has indicated that the frequency and cost of natural disasters continues to rise, with their CEO noting that direct losses over the past decade estimated at \$1.4 trillion annually. The Prairie Climate Centre, closer to home, for example, their models have shown that 2018's record-breaking summer heat will become the new normal by 2050. At the same time the prairies, from Manitoba to Alberta, are likely to be drying out. Co-director Dr. Danny Blair had no hesitation recently in linking the larger, hotter forest fires of the last few summers at least in part to climate change.

In the south drought stress is making it tough on boreal staples such as aspen trees. In an article in March of this year Dave Gambrill from *Canadian Underwriter* magazine wrote Alberta: Canada's Poster Child for Climate Risk, showing that 8 out of 11, the most expensive natural catastrophes to hit Canada since 1983, swept through some portion of Alberta. Those eight catastrophes accounted for \$9 billion in damage claims.

3:20

Sean Russell, managing director of a reinsurance broker, told a panel discussion that "of the approximately \$9 billion that the property and casualty insurance industry paid out . . . 63% of those losses have happened in Alberta," prompting questions as to whether Alberta is rapidly becoming uninsurable, Madam Speaker.

Another source of rising costs from climate change is public infrastructure and whether our bridges, our roads, our dams, our levees, our sewers, our drainage systems are ready for these kinds of frequent and severe weather events. The overwhelming consensus is no; we are not ready. The Conference Board of Canada showed the replacement value for existing assets deemed to be in poor or very poor condition at \$141 billion. There are costs, Madam Speaker, because climate change is real.

This is despite the fact that we have members both of this House and of the party opposite who have said that climate change is a hoax. The candidate for Calgary-Beddington, for example, said that, and he still won the nomination. He was allowed to run. We have an MLA for Calgary-Foothills here who claims that "we need some carbon dioxide here to grow the trees and plants and forests and whatnot," Madam Speaker. The MLA for Fort McMurray-Wood Buffalo said: I'm pretty much in the middle of the road on this, whether climate change is a hoax. The MLA for Cypress-Medicine Hat has on numerous occasions aligned himself with this hoax conversation, which, of course, we see coming from President Trump stating global warming is a complete hoax in reaction to a tweet by NASA, because apparently the MLA for Cypress-Medicine Hat knows better than NASA. Even the Leader of the Official Opposition has asserted that there's, quote, a legitimate range of perspectives about exactly to what degree humans are responsible for climate change.

Now, in that I could take a scientific rebuttal to that, Madam Speaker. I could just lean on John Oliver, the comedian, who said that we don't need a politician's opinion on a fact. As John Oliver said, you might as well have a poll asking: "Which number is bigger, five or 15?" or "Do owls exist?" or "Are there hats?" You don't need an opinion from a politician who has spent his life denying the science of climate change on whether climate change is real. There is unanimity that climate change is real and it poses significant risk now and into the future. I know that for my little boys, when I have to look them in the eye at the end of the day,

seven and nine years old, as they become adults they're going to ask me: why didn't you do more? I know they will.

Now, as Dr. Katharine Hayhoe, an acclaimed Canadian atmospheric physicist said: "The climate does not care about ideology. Instead, the true threat is the delusion that our opinion of science somehow alters its reality. This is deluded thinking." Steve Williams, CEO of Suncor, one of Canada's largest oil producers, says this: climate change is happening; we think a broad-based carbon price is the answer. The World Bank Carbon Pricing Leadership Coalition, a voluntary partnership of 160 businesses, says: "Climate change is one of the greatest global challenges of our time. It threatens to roll back decades of development progress and puts lives, livelihoods, and economic growth at risk." That is why, Madam Speaker, recent Nobel prize winning economists William Nordhaus and Paul Romer have said that carbon taxes are the solution to climate change.

We know we are moving into a carbon-constrained world. Nobody cares about random UC opinions. The climate doesn't care. We are moving into a carbon-constrained world. We are moving into a world where the voluntary targets laid out in the Paris agreement – the world is looking for the opportunities in meeting those targets. Within it there are a number of market-based mechanisms that are pointed to within the Paris agreement, including article 6, which a number of folks in our business community here in Alberta and in Canada are watching very closely because there's a tremendous amount of opportunity here.

Now, what do Nobel prize winning economists have to say about pricing carbon? Here's a quote:

The policy is very simple. If you just commit to a tax on the usage of fuels that directly or indirectly release greenhouse gases, and then you make that tax increase steadily . . . people will see that there's a big profit to be made from figuring out ways to supply energy where they can do it without incurring the tax.

These are market-based, free-market economists, Madam Speaker. They say that this crisis can easily be averted through economic policy. The way to do that is to ensure that we price carbon pollution, helping Canadian companies create jobs and compete successfully in the global shift. Now, the opportunity in competing in that global shift is estimated to be worth \$23 trillion globally between now and 2030.

Madam Speaker, there are a number of conservatives who believe in climate change or they understand the science of climate change. They believe that we actually must take action. There's a difference there. Over here we have a misunderstanding of the science, but we also have a fundamental belief that we ought to do nothing. Here are some Conservatives who believe that we ought to do something. Here's one: Stephen Harper. In an interview with CBC in 2014 he told Peter Mansbridge that climate change remains "a significant threat" to humanity, up there with economic challenges. He said that Canada was phasing out the use of coal-fired electricity, which he described as the single biggest source of greenhouse gas emissions in the world, and also said, "If others would just follow our lead, we'd have this problem solved." He also made a speech in Berlin around that time, where he endorsed carbon pricing as well.

Here's another granddaddy of the Conservative movement in this province and in this country, Madam Speaker, Preston Manning:

For any economic activity, especially the production of energy, we should identify its negative environmental impacts, devise measures to avoid, mitigate or adapt to those impacts,

which we are also doing through our climate leadership plan, as an aside,

and include the costs of those measures in the price of the product.

Going back to Mr. Manning:

It's the idea behind using carbon pricing to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

Now, Madam Speaker, that is why we worked with our oil and gas producers, worked with clean tech companies, worked with renewables companies, worked with energy efficiency companies, worked with the forestry sector, with the fertilizer sector, with the agricultural sectors, with refining and upgrading sectors all across this province to design our approach to climate change, because all of those folks, who employ Albertans, want to see their business model resilient to a carbon-constrained future. They actually think ahead. They also listen to scientists, and they know that climate change poses a significant risk if we do nothing.

That's why we put in place the policies that we did, Madam Speaker. They are market-friendly policies. They are policies that ensure that we remain competitive. They are policies that have a number of trigger points where we can review them over time to ensure that they are working for our economy. That is why the same year that we brought in carbon pricing, we led the country in economic growth, and then the next year that we had carbon pricing in place on an economy-wide scale, we also led the country in economic growth. Next year we'll have carbon pricing in place, and we're projected also to lead the country in economic growth.

Last year alone we saw the reduction of 11 megatonnes of greenhouse gas emissions, which is roughly the annual emissions of Newfoundland, Madam Speaker. So when the opposition claims falsely that carbon pricing does not reduce greenhouse gas emissions, again, that is wrong. That is wrong. Taken together, our climate leadership plan is paving the way for emissions reductions of 43 megatonnes by 2020. That's double the annual emissions amount of the entire province of Manitoba.

Alberta's energy producers are strong partners in these efforts, benefiting from \$1.4 billion worth of investments and innovation, which is seeing some huge payoffs in our energy sector. This year Emissions Reduction Alberta celebrated nine successful oil sands innovation challenge projects. Those include partial upgrading technology, water treatment processes and materials, and enhanced bitumen recovering technology. Those projects will reduce about 4 million tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions and create more than 250 well-paying jobs, Madam Speaker. There are so many success stories with respect to our reinvestment of the price on carbon into what industry asked us for, which is clean tech, which is innovation, which is phasing out coal, which is our lowest cost emissions reduction, Madam Speaker, and ensuring that we have a good market for our cheap and plentiful natural gas in this province as well as our amazing renewables opportunities.

We have some of the best renewables opportunities on the continent. The solar resource in Calgary is roughly the same as the solar resource in Rio de Janeiro. It is not true that we don't have relative advantage when it comes to solar and wind but also natural gas. That's kind of why we've seen such a growth in solar industries. We've seen a 500 per cent growth in our solar installations since 2015, Madam Speaker. We have seen so many companies grow as a result of our investments.

3:30

But let's talk a little bit back to oil and gas. At CNRL's Horizon mine, north of Fort McMurray, they built a multilevel mobile platform that separates bitumen from sand, leaving behind dry tailings. This technology also shaved \$2 off the cost to produce a barrel of oil, Madam Speaker, and that's because carbon is also an input cost. We're seeing this across the oil and gas sector, that as we reduce our greenhouse gas emissions, we're also reducing our

water use, our steam-to-oil ratio, and a whole bunch of other inputs, which reduces costs.

Similarly, the Aspen project by Imperial Oil just got final investment decision approval the week before last, again a solvent-assisted technology that reduces their costs as well as reduces their greenhouse gas emissions. Suncor just opened up Fort Hills. The Fort Hills mine will produce a barrel of oil at the North American average, Madam Speaker. So it is not true that we cannot compete in a carbon-constrained world because we are doing it now. It is not a theoretical future. It is the present that Alberta is living in now.

But there are also other forces at work. It's not just a national carbon pricing framework and our government's desire to keep the federal government out of our jurisdictional space, where they don't belong. There are also other changes afoot globally. For example, there are new marine fuel standards with respect to sulphur content in marine fuel coming in. But in Fort Saskatchewan Enlighten Innovations is pioneering their CleanSeas project, which uses new technology to remove the sulphur from feedstock and produce that cleaner fuel that the world is looking for. I had the opportunity to tour it with the Member for Fort Saskatchewan-Vegreville, Madam Speaker, and those investments were funded through our price on carbon. They're putting people to work east of Edmonton here to solve a global problem.

We are an energy province, and it has baffled me my entire adult life, before I sat on this side of the House, why Alberta couldn't be that source of export of clean tech technology, why we couldn't be the ones putting people to work solving the world's problems with respect to what we know is coming, which is a carbon-constrained future.

Those are the kinds of things happening right now here in Alberta. That's to say nothing, Madam Speaker, of converting biomass into electricity. We're doing it . . . [interjection]

**The Deputy Speaker:** Hon. member, please take your seat.

Go ahead.

**Ms Phillips:** Oh. Thank you.

. . . where we're converting biomass into electricity. Dapp Power in Westlock is accomplishing this. Lethbridge Biogas in southern Alberta is accomplishing this. Those investments are also funded by our price on carbon.

Madam Speaker, closer to home, too, our cities, our towns are being assisted with making those changes to make them resilient to commodity prices in the future. If there's one thing we know, it's that we cannot control the price of commodities. We certainly know that very, very well on this side of the House. So ensuring that our communities have as much resilience as they can to grow and to invest in services for kids, for seniors, for families by displacing some of their electricity and natural gas costs is exactly what we're focusing on.

For example, we have lowered our utility costs in places like an aquatic centre in Barrhead, a fire hall in Northern Sunrise county, an affordable housing complex in Valleyview. Ty Assaf, a councillor for the town of Barrhead, said: "Investing in renewable energy diversifies our local economy and improves our community. Barrhead's 149-kilowatt system on the Aquatics Centre will save about \$17,000 on electricity bills each year." Madam Speaker, that's a lot of money for a small town's recreation centre. That is a lot of money that can go towards low-income seniors' programs or low-income children's programs.

We're also making sure that we're involving indigenous communities in these developments as well, Madam Speaker. Germaine Anderson, who's the chief of the Beaver Lake Cree Nation, says: "We recognize the importance of becoming energy-

efficient and how moving to the green economy will . . . position us economically down the road." That is why we have done things like invest in training, in business development, in energy plans as well as energy retrofits for both band infrastructure and for people's homes and renewables. We'll have more to say later on this week about that as well.

But the fact of the matter is that indigenous communities are often the most at risk in terms of the fact that they don't have the infrastructure to deal with more frequent and severe weather events. They are looking for diversification opportunities so that the new economy, which we know is happening out there with new clean tech and new opportunities, doesn't bypass them as for so long economic opportunities have bypassed them. We need to make sure that we continue those investments, Madam Speaker, and be open to all of those new opportunities, again, because we're an energy province.

We have a number of other opportunities that are happening here in Alberta. We have industrial energy efficiency, long ignored by the previous government, for near-term, low-cost energy solutions that also save companies money. We have commercial energy efficiency, deeper retrofits, those kinds of initiatives, being funded by the Energy Efficiency Alberta agency.

And, like I said, we have a number of new renewables investments, Madam Speaker. About 7,000 jobs will be created by our renewable energy program as we go through our phasing out of coal. To be clear, 12 of those 18 plants were slated for phase-out. As we know, Stephen Harper actually felt quite strongly about that under the Leader of the Official Opposition's watch, but what they didn't have was a plan to transition those communities, and that's also what we are investing carbon levy funds in, in addition to things like transit.

That's where I want to finish off here, around transit and around infrastructure. The green line in Calgary and the valley line LRT and the expansions in Edmonton will get people going quicker to their jobs, to their homes, to their schools, Madam Speaker, in a way that is more sustainable.

Similarly, too, we will protect Calgary through climate adaptation investments with investments in the Springbank dry dam facility, to which we are deeply committed. There seems to be a little bit of confusion on the other side on this matter.

Madam Speaker, there is more to be done. Thank you.

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

**Dr. Swann:** Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Well, I must say that it's an interesting time in the Legislature when we are still debating climate change and the reality of climate change. I think we have had 20 years of debating and denying and deferring and committing and not fulfilling commitments to reducing our carbon footprint on the planet. For some in Alberta it's a surprise to know that we are among the highest per capita emitters of carbon emissions on the planet. We're a small population, but we have a tremendous carbon footprint as a result of our cold temperatures, our significant transportation challenges, and our heavy oil industry, among other industries that emit carbon, obviously.

I think it's important to reinforce the fact that this is the closest thing to an emergency that we as legislators face. If we care about the future, if we care about the evidence that's mounting on almost a monthly basis, the efforts to try to reduce our collective impact, industrial impact, our domestic impact, our transportation impact, our heating impacts, all of these combined, are critical. I would call it an emergency. Clearly, the clock is ticking. The damage is already being done.

The minister has already spoken about the unprecedented insurance claims that have resulted from extreme weather events. We know about new infectious diseases like the West Nile virus that have moved north as a result of the temperature changes. We know that food production is going to change. Obviously, it might improve in some parts of Alberta, and that's part of the dilemma Alberta faces. There could be some very significant benefits to warming in Alberta, so we drag our feet in Alberta because, of course, we have these financial interests in the oil industry and we don't mind warming in a climate that's often very cold. Of course, if we can improve productivity in some of the constituencies in northern Alberta – what surprises me is that this member comes from the Palliser Triangle in which there is a significant threat of drought, significant threat of loss of food production, and water shortages.

3:40

Whether the Paris accord is the ideal approach to this, it's clear that nothing else has emerged. We have basically four choices for reducing greenhouse gases. We can legislate by targets, force a province to meet a certain limit on their emissions and pay fines if they don't. We can legislate by taxes to incent the behaviour change in citizens, in consumers, and in producers of greenhouse gases. We can go, as Mr. Harper tried to do, sector by sector, calling for efficiency standards in certain industries: the transportation industry, the heating industry, the oil and gas industry, the manufacturing industry. We can set some sector-by-sector targets. We can do a cap and trade where one jurisdiction has a cap on the amount of the total emissions that they can produce. If they exceed that, they pay a fine or, I guess, a trade into the pot that goes to those who are actually reducing the carbon in that particular jurisdiction. At some point that is supposed to balance out and actually move us to lower emissions.

What I can say is that this is now at the eleventh hour in this challenge. Anybody who is thinking seriously about future generations and about the impacts this is having, especially in the poorer and lesser developed countries, the flooding that is already occurring in some of the South Asian countries and some of the island states that have in fact been relocated as a result of climate change impacts, has to recognize that we are beyond the point of debating climate change.

We should be beyond the point of debating what 196 countries two years ago decided was a very good step. Not the be-all and end-all, and scientists across the world have said that that will not get us where we really need to go, but it's a start. It's at least something that we can agree on voluntarily to try to achieve, to minimize the increased temperature below two degrees Celsius, which is considered to be a very critical level at which there will be significantly more damage to people, to property, to our planet, and to our ability to grow food, which is the most fundamental issue that many countries are already facing and are now fighting over.

As indicated, it's not a treaty; it's a voluntary agreement. Some of the criticism around this has been that it's a voluntary agreement, and Mr. Trump has said that he's pulling out. Within 12 months he will be pulling out of this agreement. That's 1 out of 196 countries that says that they want to pull out of this. This is absurd, and it's so harmful to think about the possibility that we once again start to undermine an international agreement that has made such efforts to try to pull us around the same table and reach some at least minimal targets as countries and the commitments around the world.

Yes, we can't legally bind countries to these targets, but in good faith these countries have recognized that they owe it to their children, they owe it to their future, and they owe it to their country to make every possible effort to, number one, reduce the emissions;

number two, start adapting already to some of the fierce changes that are going on in their country; and number three, to think about what strategies can best begin to make these important changes.

While I welcome the chance to talk about climate change and reinforce the urgency that this Legislature come to grips with this and embrace the tremendous urgency around action and commitment and collective putting aside of ideology to honour the science, to honour the long-term commitment that we should have to this planet and to our children and grandchildren, I am somewhat disappointed that we are still wrestling with even these very most basic targets and discussions when, as I say, over 85 per cent of the world has said: "We recognize the problem. We want to work together. We know this is not perfect, but we are going to do everything possible to mitigate carbon, to adapt to it, and to put in place some kind of a carbon market that will help us send the right message to people and businesses to do the right thing."

There are other elements to this that include supports for the least developed countries, including financing and technological support. Clearly, if we in this part of the world can't share some of our technology and resources with the least developed countries, we can't expect them to take the kind of leadership that we must take.

To honour the current commitments of this provincial government around moving to clean, renewable energy, efforts at conservation in homes and businesses and transportation, I applaud what the government has done so far against some pretty significant challenges. I think we are making progress. It is obviously not enough but huge, huge initiatives, compared to the previous government on this whole file, that are welcomed by those in Alberta that really pay attention and care about the long-term well-being of this province, both economically and environmentally and socially, because as in every other country, when resources and fighting over resources and shortages of resources, including food and clean water and clean air – when those become an issue, you have social disruption. You have all kinds of I would call it violence. I don't think it's too extreme to say that we are going to see many more refugees coming to our gates as a result of climate change and the conflict that results from shortages and inadequate resources.

So let us be clear. This is not a perfect agreement, but it is the one we have. It is the one we're moving towards. Inadequate as it is, according to the scientists, it is progress. What I would like to see is a debate on how we can redouble our efforts around carbon reduction in this province, around transportation such as the new project out of the University of Calgary, where something like eight or 10 transport trucks are going to be moving to hydrogen fuel for the next two years and the measurement of how efficiently we're managing that. In this fossil fuel province we maybe can't compete with the electricity generation that, say, Quebec or B.C. can use out of clean water energy, hydro energy. However, using hydrogen and our fossil fuel industry, we can move towards a hydrogen economy that would both use our skills and technology in hydrocarbon development and provide clean energy through the hydrogen fuel cell, which produces only water and oxygen. So a tremendous opportunity to show more leadership than we have in the past.

There's no question in my mind that the Paris accord stands. We have to stand firm despite the U.S.'s, or one man's, decision to pull out. Who knows how long he's going to be in place, anyway? I expect and I hope that he won't be in power too much longer and that we will actually have a responsible and competent and informed President there who will bring the U.S. back to its senses around climate change and the leadership that's needed there.

Again, the U.S. is a big emitter. Along with China they're the biggest emitters totally, but, you know, Canada on a per capita basis

is a huge emitter. We have a responsibility as individual citizens and as responsible legislators to see our key responsibility as educated, resourced, technologically savvy, recognizing the long-term well-being of this place and the planet, to listen to the United Nations, the climate convention, listen to the scientists, and look at our own backyard and see what the impacts of floods and fires have been here along with new infectious diseases.

There's no question in my mind that this is one of if not the most important issues that we deal with and that we set aside the politics of this and look at what's the best alternative given what we have in terms of the global agreement and move forward with it, exceed it. Let's exceed the targets that Paris has established with Canada, and let's pull together with other provinces and the federal government and make sure that we leave a legacy for our children that says: we took this seriously; we came to understand the science, and we're doing everything possible as legislators to create policies that provide the right incentives to conserve, to develop new technologies and clean energy, and to mitigate the worst impacts expected from this climate chaos, which is more what it should be called, rather than climate warming. It's climate chaos.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Before I recognize the next speaker, we've had a request to revert to Introduction of Guests. Is anyone opposed to the request?

[Unanimous consent granted]

**The Deputy Speaker:** The hon. Member for Strathmore-Brooks.

### 3:50 Introduction of Guests (continued)

**Mr. Fildebrandt:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. Just following on the comments from the Liberal member on his plan to make Alberta great again, I wanted to take this opportunity to introduce to the House Valerie Keefe. She is here to meet with me today, but much to my surprise I actually got a motion passed to do something in here, which is rather rare for an opposition member, so we're debating this. Valerie is an advocate for trans people. She is a former member of the NDP but has seen the light of conservatism and libertarianism and is here to discuss potentially getting involved with the Freedom Conservative Party of Alberta. She isn't moving from one side of the spectrum slowly along it. She just jumps the whole way along, apparently. I wanted to take this opportunity to introduce a former member of the NDP, as I understand it, who, I guess, has been surprised to be able to indulge in today's debate. I'd ask all members to give her the traditional warm welcome of the House.

## Motions under Standing Order 42

### Paris Agreement on Climate Change (continued)

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

**Mr. Nixon:** Well, thank you, Madam Speaker. It's a pleasure to see you today in the chair and to be able to rise to speak to this motion. I'd like to start off just briefly quoting the hon. Leader of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition on June 11 of this year. In a scrum he said in regard to this issue that "the preponderance of carbon tax for them to come close to achieving the Paris climate GHG emission targets would require a price in the range of \$300 a tonne, not the current \$30 a tonne. This is not environmental policy. It's political

theatre. It's the NDP government addicted to the idea of expanding its control over people's lives and bringing in more tax revenue. As Doug Ford said, it's just another tax. It's not about environmental policy. We, the UCP, in our platform will present a comprehensive plan that will include concrete measures to reduce greenhouse gas emissions."

Madam Speaker, that's important for a couple of reasons. The first is at the end of that statement where it makes clear that greenhouse gas emissions is something that needs to be addressed and that a future United Conservative government will address it. We'll bring forward ideas in the next election as is our responsibility when we're in an election.

[Ms Sweet in the chair]

The second part of that that's important is the staggering number that it would take, the staggering amount of carbon tax that would need to be charged to be able to meet the agreement of the Paris accord. The reality is that it's significantly more than is already being charged to Albertans right now by this NDP government and their close, personal friend Justin Trudeau, the Prime Minister of this country. Significantly more. To use a carbon tax to be able to meet those emissions would require us to go even further than this government already has, to go further with the consequences to the people of Alberta and to our country as a result of that decision.

The reality is two things here, Madam Speaker. One is that at the amount that the NDP government has brought forward, they cannot meet the targets, and they will not have a significant impact on the environment. Their own numbers say that. So they've brought forward a tax, a punishing tax for many Albertans, in order to, they say, try to meet targets, but the reality is that they know and their own documents have shown that in order for them to meet those targets, they would have to go significantly further. At the time of that quote, it was \$30. I believe it's \$50 right now. They would have to go to about \$300 or more.

The problem with that is that in exchange for what the NDP said would be social licence, which we'll talk about briefly in a minute, the government has chosen to put a punishing tax that they did not campaign on, that they hid from Albertans and then brought forward when they received a mandate to govern in Alberta. They put that tax on, knowing that they could not meet emissions targets. They know that. Either they intend to raise it at some point to be able to meet those targets or it really had nothing to do with the accord and was just a tax, as the hon. Member for Calgary-Lougheed said in his comment, a tax on Albertans, a money grab by this NDP government. It has to be one or the other.

The problem is that people continue to hurt because of the decision of this government to bring forward this carbon tax. They made the decision. They said that they would get social licence, that they would be able to get the pipelines built to be able to tackle some of the most serious issues facing our energy industry if we as a province accepted this carbon tax, which the province never did. We took the pain that is associated with that.

Now, we know that they didn't get that social licence. In fact, social licence at this point, I think this House has to declare, is a failure. This government has stood in this Chamber repeatedly and put up their hands and said: two pipelines; we got two pipelines approved. They had celebrations and told Albertans it was a done deal.

**Mr. Cooper:** Mission accomplished.

**Mr. Nixon:** Mission accomplished. It turns out that it was not. We now know that. Social licence did not work for that.

Now, what happened to the people of Alberta during that time? We've seen widows losing their carbon tax rebates when their



spouses passed away. I sat with school boards who are struggling now with the increased costs of transportation to get our children to school and the increased costs of operating their facilities.

A seniors' centre in my constituency is a great example, the West Country seniors' centre. We've talked about it in this Chamber many times. It is one of the most appalling things that I've ever seen this government do. You know what they did, Madam Speaker? When that was brought to their attention and there was a lot of political pressure associated with that issue, they told everybody: hey, we'll work with that seniors' centre, and we'll get it fixed. Now, do you know what working with that seniors' centre was? The Premier's office called those seniors' centre officials and said: have a fundraiser to pay for the carbon tax or raise the rates on your fixed-income seniors, the fixed-income seniors to whom this government continues to charge a tax that we now know can't even come close to meeting their objectives and has not given us the pipelines.

Now, we brought that up, and there was more political pressure. So the government then called up and said: "Sorry. We went too far. We'll work with you. We want to do an assessment of your building." They, the government, spent thousands of taxpayer dollars – I don't remember the exact amount; I believe it was north of \$10,000 – doing an assessment on this facility, enough to pay, from what I recall, close to a decade of the facility's carbon tax. That was their assessment. How about they just give them their money and stop taking it? But they did that.

Now, you know what the report said? I have the report. It's bizarre. It comes back with only one real suggestion. Madam Speaker, get this. It suggests that they unplug their coffee makers when they're not having coffee to lower emissions.

I talked, of course, to the president of that centre, a long-time friend of mine, Mr. Ed Wicks, a great guy from the great town of Sundre, who's been advocating for seniors in that community for a long time. He said, "The problem, Jason, is that we've got our coffee makers on timers. We don't need to unplug them."

**Mr. Fildebrandt:** Names are not allowed.

**Mr. Nixon:** The hon. Member for Strathmore-Brooks points out that I used my own name, and I do apologize for that. He is correct. Ed Wicks said to the hon. Member for Rimbey-Rocky Mountain House-Sundre: the problem is, Jason, we use timers. Oops, I did it again. That's twice in a row, Madam Speaker.

The point is this. This government continues to punish the people of Alberta with a carbon tax that can't even meet their own goals. [interjections] They laugh right now. They laugh about those fixed-income seniors. They laugh about our education system that is struggling because of the carbon tax. They laugh about our municipalities. They laugh about that. They laugh about our nonprofits, who are struggling to be able to pay the bills. They laugh. It's not funny, Madam Speaker. This is not a funny thing. It is not funny. What is happening to the people of this province because of your decisions is not funny, so you should not laugh at it. They've had to pay significant consequences as a result of that decision.

[The Deputy Speaker in the chair]

Now, I think that there was no way that we should have gone the carbon tax route. That's no secret. We spoke about it in this Chamber, the members on this side of the House, but the reality is also this. This government chose to go the carbon tax way even though they knew that they could not meet the emissions targets at the price that they brought forward. Clearly, it was not about emissions; it was about a tax grab. But then they said: don't worry; we'll get social licence, and we'll get pipelines built. That's what

they said. So at the very least, if they forced that tax upon the people of Alberta, they should have come through on their ability to get those pipelines built.

4:00

We now know they did not. They did not come through. One of the biggest crises that this province has ever faced is happening right now despite the fact that many people have warned this government about this for years. They continue to prematurely celebrate getting pipelines built. So social licence didn't work.

What did they do, though, when it came to standing up to the federal government? In fact, often we hear members of the NDP say: "This is not our fault. I'm sorry we said that it was built. I guess we shouldn't have said that. But don't worry; we're working with Justin Trudeau. It's going to be okay." Working with Justin Trudeau? What has Justin Trudeau done on this issue? I've told members across the way from me over and over that paper approval from Justin Trudeau is worth nothing, and that has been proven.

This government stood in this House and supported repeatedly Justin Trudeau on so many issues with our energy industry, waited 229 days to even speak up against Bill C-69, the no-more-pipelines bill brought forward by Justin Trudeau, stood on their hands and, in fact, supported Justin Trudeau on his decision to cancel and block the Northern Gateway pipeline. It would sure be nice if that was on its way, a pipeline that got done by Stephen Harper, by the way.

They stood on their hands while Energy East was cancelled, said nothing, took no action against the Prime Minister and the federal government, did not stand up for Alberta and, instead, sided again and again and again with their ally in Ottawa. That's what they do over and over.

On Trans Mountain we could not even get this government to take a serious stand against B.C. or the feds for months, over a year, maybe longer, and then all of a sudden, once the political pressure finally ramped up, they said: okay; hon. Leader of the Opposition, we'll try this shutting-off-the-tap legislation. But, Madam Speaker, you and I both know they never intended to do it. They never intended to take action. Yet again they sat on their hands and did what Justin Trudeau did. They filibustered their own bill inside this Legislature, had the nerve to go back and tell Albertans: "Don't worry; we're going to do this. We're going to defend you. We're going to defend you. We are going to pass this legislation. We're going to shut off the taps." Then they sat in this House and filibustered the bill so they would not have to do that. It was shameful. Over and over this government chooses to side with Justin Trudeau, even now.

Actually, one other example. The Leader of the Opposition, long before it was talked about in the Senate – and when it was talked about in the Senate, it was important – said that we should be using the Constitution to declare this in the national interest. He brought forward motions in this Assembly which he tried to negotiate with the other side in good faith, but they were too worried about protecting Justin Trudeau to even talk to him, and they voted against calling on the House of Commons and the Prime Minister to make Trans Mountain in the national interest. They voted against it, voted with the Prime Minister again, over and over. The actions, or the lack of action, are very, very clear.

Now, Trans Mountain gets stopped yet again. They've not been able to force the Prime Minister to enforce the rule of law. Now they're in a situation in court where they can't get the Prime Minister to get this in the national interest. He won't move. There's a bill inside the Senate. They haven't spoken in favour of that at all. They didn't get their ministers down to Ottawa to say: this has to be passed; this project is in the national interest. Instead, they sat on

their hands again and kept coming back to this place and telling Albertans that they were going to get this pipeline built.

I think it's fair for Albertans to start to ask: what the heck is our government doing? Our government continues to punish people, Albertans, that they are elected to protect, the most vulnerable, people on fixed incomes. The carbon tax, Madam Speaker, is a regressive tax, particularly now that they've pulled back all the rebates. It's a regressive tax. It hurts the poor more than the rich. That's what the carbon tax does. [interjections] I know it makes them mad, but that's what they did. They brought forward a carbon tax that hurts the most vulnerable people in our communities. The rebates have been clawed back. [interjections] The members are heckling away.

I'll give you another example.

**An Hon. Member:** The rebates are still there.

**Mr. Nixon:** But not for the increase to the carbon tax. That's not true, hon. member. You should maybe talk to your minister if you're concerned about that. But that's not true.

In fact, here's one other one, fixed-income seniors, who are disproportionately impacted by this, without a doubt, because they're on fixed incomes, somewhere we're all going to be one day. This government allowed their carbon tax rebates to be clawed back by 30 per cent without even a word from the minister, without even a word to defend the very people this government claims to help. Hockey moms and hockey dads at the pumps are not going to be how we fix this problem. We've been telling the government that for a very, very long time.

You know, sometimes you've just got to accept that you were wrong. You should just accept that you're wrong, because people are being hurt by it. This is not a game, that we get to come here and play and wear our fancy clothes and stand inside this Chamber and give speeches all day. This has real-world consequences. Decisions that are made in this place have real-world consequences. The government policy has been a failure, in particular in their inability to take action against the federal government and, before that, B.C. Their unwillingness to take action, not even having the ability to call on the Prime Minister to appeal the decision on Trans Mountain – they couldn't even be bothered to do that.

They should be hanging their heads in shame on this. They've stood in this Chamber, Madam Speaker – you saw them do it – and said: "We got two pipelines built. It's done." They stood outside the Legislature in the summer and had a big party, screaming and hollering about how great this moment was. I wish it was true. It's not true. It's not true. But instead of coming back to this place and saying, "Okay; you know what; we got it wrong," which is the stage that they should be at – we clearly can't buy social licence by punishing the people of Alberta; that has not worked – we should pull back the carbon tax, something that this side of the House has moved many motions on to ask this place to do that have always been voted against by the NDP.

At the same time, all across this country in jurisdictions – you know, Ontario had a big election. There goes the carbon tax. In Manitoba, I believe, in New Brunswick – the state of Washington, the most green state of all the states, could not even get a referendum passed on the carbon tax in the state of Washington in the last midterm election.

**An Hon. Member:** What about California?

**Mr. Nixon:** They want to use California. I'm not even going there today.

They want to continue to hang onto this idea, and it's okay. If it was just them who were going to pay the consequences for it, in the

polls or wherever Albertans choose to give them those consequences, that would be one thing, but as they make those decisions, they are continuing to hurt people. Now we don't have the pipelines that we need, and it's going to have consequences for many years to come.

**Drever:** Well, there was a climate change denier.

**Mr. Nixon:** The hon. Member for Calgary-Bow just heckled at me that I'm a climate change denier. I am not a climate change denier. She should not heckle that at me. In fact, I opened this speech with a comment about how emissions are an issue that need to be dealt with and that we will bring forward policies to do that.

What I reject, Madam Speaker, is that the Member for Calgary-Bow believes that she can solve that problem on the backs of Albertans that are just trying to make a living, that she can solve those problems on the backs of fixed-income seniors, that I represent inside this place with pleasure. She thinks that she can solve this problem by making it harder for schools to transport kids to school. That is shameful. That's where we are at. It's more shameful, as I said at the beginning of this speech, because they knew the entire time that they could not meet the goals. Either they meant that they're going to increase it on the people of Alberta at some point to be able to meet the goal, or they never had the intention of ever meeting the goal and just wanted to bring in a tax.

I will close with this. We are in a situation as a province – we are actually past that situation as a province – where we need to take action, concrete, strong action to defend our constitutional rights for our resources, to be able to get our resources to tidewater, and to stand up for Alberta. It has been three and a half years or longer of an NDP government sitting on their hands, voting over and over with their close ally Justin Trudeau against the people of Alberta, against the people that they represent. Over and over they voted with Justin Trudeau, and then we didn't get pipelines. They didn't succeed in it.

**4:10**

We brought forward significant ways that we could do that: shutting off the taps for B.C., a referendum on equalization, making the project in the national interest. Do something, but stop punishing the people of Alberta. Stop punishing the people of Alberta. It is time to start saying to Ottawa that there will be consequences if you will not work with our province on this issue. There will be consequences. It is time to say to the other provinces that we want fairness. It is not wrong to want fairness.

With this, I will close for real. To the NDP across from me: stop punishing the people of Alberta with your ideological agenda. Madam Speaker, through you to them, stop punishing the people of Alberta, start standing up for the people that you represent, stop this ridiculous path, and let's get to work on how we can get our product to tidewater.

**The Deputy Speaker:** The hon. Member for St. Albert.

**Ms Renaud:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. Let me think about it: should we go with comments the Official Opposition leader made in a scrum about a nonexistent platform or with a Nobel prize winner who, after decades of studying solutions to address climate change, came up with something that won a Nobel prize? An economist dealing with science, dealing with fact: imagine that.

It was actually only a few weeks ago that the United Nations released a really unique report, and it's not something that you hear about very often. Ninety-one of the best minds from 40 countries have concluded that the world is on a fast track to irreversible damage. But the opposition wants us to stop. They'd like to play

games and put bumper stickers on their trucks that say, “Axe the Tax” instead of stopping and dealing with the most progressive idea, that won a Nobel prize, by the way, a free-market idea that deals with reducing emissions. A child born today will suffer the effects, the impacts of climate change when she turns 23. This is our future.

The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, that issued this report, told us again and again and again – and we’ve been warned by scientists – that the seas will rise faster, that droughts will last longer, that extreme weather changes will be our reality. Diminishing Arctic ice: I think we’re already seeing that. The impact on humans and species and plant life will be incredible, yet you have the opposition that is taking a position only to play political games like to slap on a little bumper sticker that says, “Axe the Tax.” You don’t have the political courage to stand up and do something extraordinary, to start bending this curve. We don’t have a lot of time left. The risks of ignoring climate change are very, very real.

I want to go back to the Nobel prize winner, Yale professor William Nordhaus. For this path-breaking idea, putting a price on carbon, he won this award after four decades of research. His research shows that raising prices through a carbon tax is a far more effective and efficient way to lower carbon emissions than direct government controls on the quantity of emissions through regulations on cars, power plants, et cetera. He won a Nobel prize. I haven’t heard that coming from over there. I haven’t heard that at all.

You know, I was talking with my son yesterday. My son is a scientist, and actually his girlfriend teaches introductory climate change at the University of Alberta. It’s too bad they don’t open it up for auditing so that some members can sit in on her class. One of the things they said to me, you know, is that it’s a little baffling that there’s so much opposition to addressing climate change. People certainly had a fit when things around recycling were introduced like deposits on bottles, an extra cost for dealing with your trash or your compostables, things like that. But people got over it, and people saw the value.

The opposition is stuck on hanging their hats on getting rid of something that is working. Fact: it’s working. It can work; it will work. If we do nothing, the reality is that for us and our families, for our children and their children, the price they will pay is unbelievable. Then you’ll hear them talk about: well, you know, Canada is not the biggest problem. We might not be the biggest problem, but as the hon. member said, per capita we’re a huge problem. We need to step up. We need to do something about this.

Think about the alarms that were raised around ozone depletion and the use of CFCs. Eighty-five per cent of ozone depletion was man-made. The rest occurred naturally. As you know, this layer protects life on Earth from the sun’s damaging UV rays. We were warned by scientists, and we listened, and we took some bold steps. Many countries agreed to reduce or prohibit the production of materials made of or by the use of CFCs. We raised awareness, and we took steps. We’re seeing the benefit, and we will see the benefit going forward. At a certain point it would have been too late, but we listened to the scientists, we looked at the science, and we took steps. We took bold steps to reverse this trend.

You know, it’s interesting. I thank the member for allowing us this opportunity to debate this emergency motion about the Paris accord, but it’s sort of interesting to hear members opposite talk about the need for Canada to withdraw. I don’t know if you know this, but Syria has actually become a signatory on the Paris climate agreement, leaving the U.S. as the only country in the world not to support the framework deal to combat greenhouse gas emissions. Now, I think back to some of the news coverage over the weekend,

where you had the President of the United States standing in California, where a fire has wiped out an entire city – Paradise, not Pleasure – and people are missing. Hundreds of people are missing. They’re finding the remains of residents every single day. I’m not saying that climate change started that fire, but we know that the results were far worse because of the implications of climate change, man-made climate change speeding up the effects of climate change.

[Ms Sweet in the chair]

There is a huge difference. Some of the really interesting arguments that I hear from opposition members and some of their supporters, you know, that climate change is a hoax: look at the temperature; it’s gotten so much colder here. Well, again, I just want to remind people that there’s a huge difference between climate and weather. You know, I think it’s really important to look – I’m talking about some global issues, but if you look at Alberta in the last few years, if you think about some of the horrible natural disasters that we’ve lived through, some of them were events that are said to occur approximately on average every hundred years, and they just keep coming. We just keep having these floods that are devastating, that wipe out communities and families and businesses. We have fires. We’ve always had fires, but certainly they’re worse. All of these events continue to happen, so implementing a tax on pollution – and that’s what it is – is a strategy to start to move us in another direction.

When I think about the future, I’m always hopeful when I look at the young people in my family, within my circles of friends, and in my community. I’m always extremely hopeful because it’s a generation of people that are really well informed, and our children are well informed. They understand that the effects of climate change are the biggest – the biggest – problems that are in front of us. They will impact every facet of our lives from mass migration to negative impacts on our ability to produce food, water, so many things. They know that we need to do something, and I believe they see that this government, after a very long time of ignoring hard science, has the political courage to stand up and do something.

The opposition likes to play their games and – I don’t know – talk about the Prime Minister. Whatever. What we’ve done is focus on Alberta and focus on an Alberta-made solution that will focus on what’s happening right here. We need to do our part. We absolutely need to do our part, and I don’t think any of the opposition members get a free pass on this. You don’t get to stand up and walk out of this Chamber, like you’ve done when we asked you to protect women. You have to address this. This is a reality for every single one of us. You need to have the courage to, say, maybe disagree with your leader. Maybe your dear leader is wrong. Maybe he’s wrong. This is a bold step forward in addressing a problem that is huge, that scientists agree – and let me tell you that scientists don’t often agree – that this is real. They’ve been telling us this for decades, and we’ve been ignoring them. It’s time to wake up.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

4:20

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

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

**Ms McPherson:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I just wanted to take a couple of minutes to speak to this motion urging “the government to reject co-operation with the federal government in the imposition of the Paris agreement on climate change.” I find the wording very interesting. I don’t think that this is a situation of imposition so much as an agreement. The Paris accord was actually ratified by

Canada on October 5, 2016, so I'm a little confused as to why this would be an emergency right now. We've had a couple of years to talk about it.

But in doing some research on this this afternoon, trying to understand more about the Paris accord so I could speak rather cogently this afternoon, when you take a look at the [canada.ca](http://canada.ca) website, there's actually really great information. They talk about long-term goals and what we need to do to mitigate climate change. It is a foregone conclusion that we are seeing the effects of climate change and they will continue to accelerate.

Long-term goals, including adaptation: what can we do to adapt to our changing climate and the weather that it produces? We've seen the forest fires in California, and I'm sure that was really reminiscent of what we experienced in Fort McMurray here in Alberta. I'm sure that it was really difficult for a lot of people to see that. If we can do anything to prevent that from happening somewhere else, that doesn't include rakes or vacuum cleaners in the forests, I think that it's incumbent upon us to do that.

Some of the other things that are highlighted on the website are a co-operative approach, and I think collaboration and integrated approaches to problem solving are always the most effective way to address an issue. If we try and solve something in a silo on our own or by denying that it exists, we're not going to solve any problems. We're just going to kick the can down the road for somebody else to deal with, and that'll be our kids, and I don't think that that's a very fair burden to put on them.

Some other highlights from the website talk about the finances. It costs money to address this problem. The model that we have right now is certainly good at generating wealth in many areas, but we need to change that so that the way we run our economy allows people to build wealth but also mitigates the effects of climate change. That's incredibly important.

Transparency and stock-taking. We can't solve a problem if we're not really clear and honest about where we are now and where we want to be in the future. None of those things happen if we don't have good communication, if we don't have good relationships between different levels of government and between governments across the world.

So for all of these reasons and the fact that this isn't really an emergency for us to debate right now, I will not support this motion.

**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. I am pleased to rise and speak to the emergency motion that has been brought forward toward the House this afternoon. I won't take a whole lot of time, but I will advise the House that I really believe that the Official Opposition's position with respect to this motion and climate change in general really is an abdication of responsibility. We in this House as elected politicians, as government and as opposition, need to recognize our primary responsibility to lead, and by that I mean leading in terms of recognizing threats and planning a strategy to protect Albertans from those risks that we might identify.

This abdication is one that I think is fundamental to the strategy of the Official Opposition, to hide behind what they try to tell us is not happening, and that is their view, that climate change is not real. The economic geniuses on the other side of the House will lose out on all the potential opportunity that actually tackling climate change and recognizing the threats that we face as a result of it and ensuring that we make the right investments on behalf of Albertans to transition to a low-carbon economy and financing that transition with strategic investments into green energy development and

energy efficiency using the very same energy levy, climate change levy, that they deride all the time. I really can't fathom why they think that Albertans will believe that their way is the way to go, because Albertans are clear thinkers. They do recognize what's going on around the world.

We see our northern ocean, our Arctic Ocean, no longer freezing over. We have had drastic fires and weather situations. The bottom line is that the global mean average temperature is rising, and we have enough scientific evidence that is so clearly telling us that we have a problem. It's a man-made problem caused by man-made addition of carbon into the atmosphere, whether you like to call it pollution or not. I would invite the hon. members who claim that CO<sub>2</sub> is not pollution to try switching CO<sub>2</sub> for oxygen and seeing which one is easier to breathe. CO<sub>2</sub> is definitely pollution. It's causing our climate change to accelerate and the global mean average temperature to accelerate to a point where it's causing devastating effects on our planetary ocean levels as well as our weather.

That responsibility to mitigate those risks lies with us as legislators who are bound to recognize and take action against those risks to protect our Albertan citizens that we represent and to also, really, take advantage of the opportunity. This new low-carbon economy that we are entering into, to lose the opportunity to transfer those dollars that we can obtain while there still is a demand for our responsibly produced energy products, not to take advantage of those dollars and invest them into a new transitioning low-carbon economy is a foolhardy, missed opportunity.

I really think that Albertans are very knowledgeable and will definitely vote with their minds and with their wallets when it comes to determining who should lead Alberta into this new energy economy, a government led by individuals who see and respect the science that is before us and who also take advantage of the opportunities that mitigating those risks present to us and our economy while a short window of us being able to sell our responsibly produced energy into global markets exists and allows us to use that economic rent to finance this transition into the low-carbon economy which is upon us. Those who deny climate change will, I think, be fundamentally left behind to wonder why they ever denied it in the first place.

I won't go further. I'm really very passionate about this. I think we have nothing but bright blue skies ahead of us as an Alberta economy. We do have some hurdles to get over, but the long-term situation where we have a very large supply of fossil fuel which will be fed into a global demand that is still quite vibrant for the next two to three decades at the very least is something we should use as an economic advantage and a lever to finance the transition into a low-carbon economy and take advantage of the artificial intelligence operations that are starting to come into our oil patch. We're looking at automated vehicles. We're looking at all kinds of technological advances that we can use to advance the transition to a lower carbon economy and make our workforce more amenable to the economics of the future.

If indeed we don't take advantage of the opportunities as the opposition would have us do, we would deserve to lose the election, but I don't think we will because I think Albertans are listening to what's happening around the world and realize that we're taking steps to protect them against the risks of climate change that's real, and we'll be recognized for that.

Thank you.

4:30

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

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

**Mr. Shepherd:** Well, thank you, Madam Speaker. I appreciate the opportunity to rise today and take part in this debate. As the Member for Calgary-Mackay-Nose Hill noted, perhaps it's not an emergency in the sense that's often considered in this House, but we've taken the opportunity for this debate, so I appreciate the opportunity to participate in it.

I'd like to begin by addressing some of the initial comments from the Member for Strathmore-Brooks in regard to how we should be describing CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. Certainly, this is a point of some pedantry amongst many on the conservative right in talking about the issue of climate change and choosing to nitpick on particular words or definitions as opposed to actually addressing the real issue at hand, but, fair enough, we'll address that.

If one looks at the definition of pollution in the Oxford dictionary: "The presence in or introduction into the environment of a substance which has harmful or poisonous effects." Certainly, Madam Speaker, an excess of CO<sub>2</sub> qualifies as something that, when introduced into the environment, indeed has harmful or poisonous effects.

*Encyclopaedia Britannica:*

Pollution, also called environmental pollution, the addition of any substance (solid, liquid, or gas) or any form of energy (such as heat, sound, or radioactivity) to the environment at a rate faster than it can be dispersed, diluted, decomposed, recycled, or stored in some harmless form.

That being the case, I think we can set aside minor quibbling about definitions and recognize that what we are talking about today is in fact a very real and genuine problem.

When we have an excess of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions – and to be clear, Madam Speaker, when we speak about climate change and we talk about emissions and we talk about pollution, we are not talking solely about CO<sub>2</sub>. CO<sub>2</sub> is the predominant greenhouse gas, but we're also talking about methane, sulphur dioxide, other gases which are also released and which also contribute to the issue. CO<sub>2</sub>, of course, is the primary pollutant in excess which is causing the issue due to man-made choices, man-made decisions, our approach to industry, the actions and choices that we each individually and on an industrial level make every day which are contributing to the very real issue of climate change.

As others have addressed today, we're seeing the impacts of that in the world today. Just a few weeks ago I had the opportunity to join the community from St. Vincent and the Grenadines here for their cultural celebration and their independence day celebration, and I talked with them about the very real experience of some of their country's brethren and sisters who have endured the effects of some severe hurricanes. Indeed, officials in that country noted that that was directly related to issues that are spinning off from the ongoing issue of climate change.

We recognize that this is a real and genuine issue that impacts people around the world and, indeed, Madam Speaker, that the decisions that we make and have made, that have contributed to our prosperity and have placed us in an incredibly advantageous position with an impressive quality of life that is the envy of many around the world, are predicated and built upon the fact that we have been contributing to this issue over the years, significantly. We set a standard that other countries wanted to adopt, and they have therefore increased their impact. So we can try to dismiss the fact and say that we don't produce as much as China or India or some of these other countries, but the fact is that those countries are following our example.

We have set that standard, and it's time for us to set another standard, too. Madam Speaker, dealing with climate change is something called a collective action problem. Now, a collective action problem is defined as a situation in which all individuals will

be better off co-operating but fail to do so because of conflicting interests between individuals that discourage joint action. This is a very real problem that we face because the reality is that we are not going to deal with this situation in any way unless we find a way to enact some collective action.

As has been often observed by members opposite and indeed others on the conservative right – you know what? – no one jurisdiction can do this alone. I agree with them there, Madam Speaker, but where I begin to disagree is when they say: therefore, there is no need to take action, or therefore we cannot take any action until somebody else goes first, or we can only go as far as someone else is willing to go. That is not leadership. That is not what Canada is known for, that is not what Alberta is known for, and that is not going to move us forward in addressing a very real problem.

Now, as I said, Madam Speaker, part of the issue here is that some on this issue are choosing to get caught up in pedantry, are choosing to get caught up in small politicking, very short-term thinking, because they believe that's going to be to their own political gain. We see that south of the border. We see that amongst our own opposition here in Alberta. We see that amongst Conservative opposition in Canada.

Now, I appreciate that members opposite have come around to agreeing that this is a problem. That's a good step forward. Indeed, recently data was released that shows that the majority of Canadians – and that includes a majority of Conservative voters – recognize that this is a real and genuine problem. So when we come back around to the question of this debate, as put forward by the Member for Strathmore-Brooks, that we as Alberta should step back and say, "We will not support the federal government in their decision, having signed on to the Paris accord," that being the global agreement to set those targets, I cannot agree with that motion.

Now, let's be clear, Madam Speaker. Members opposite have talked about, you know, the astronomical figures that would be required to address this issue. To be clear, there is no addressing this issue without cost. That is simply an impossibility. So what our discussion comes down to, then, is: how are those costs to be best addressed? How do we implement them into our system?

They have to be implemented somewhere, whether that's going to be through regulation, which seemed to have been the favourite option of our former Prime Minister, Mr. Harper, and his Conservative government at the time, who said many great things about all the steps they were going to take and how they were going to rein in industry and how they were going to bring in regulation and all the steps they were going to take to begin to achieve Canada's carbon emission reduction goals but ultimately did nothing, ultimately did very little, again, because of that lack of political will, that unwillingness to be leaders on this issue, the unwillingness to address the fact that this is a challenge that we're going to have to face and there will be costs involved.

Now, members opposite have chosen so far not to put forward any actual policy on this issue or any indication of how they would actually choose to address it, again choosing to play that short-term political game. Frankly, Madam Speaker, I'm proud to stand with a government that is taking real action on this issue.

What we are seeing around the world, Madam Speaker, that I think is relevant to this conversation and particularly in the way the question has been framed by the Member for Strathmore-Brooks, is also concerns with the rise of nationalism, that being a very clear degradation of the principles of co-operation and collaboration on the global scale. Now, again, this is a word on which we often see folks on the right exercising some pedantry and trying to parse it in different ways to say things that it doesn't actually say, so I will be clear in my definition. When I talk about nationalism, I'm talking

about, as the Oxford dictionary says, “Identification with one’s own nation and support for its interests, especially to the exclusion or detriment of the interests of other nations,” or another definition, “Loyalty and devotion to a nation especially: a sense of national consciousness exalting one nation above all others and placing primary emphasis on promotion of its culture and interests as opposed to those of other nations.”

Now, I recognize that the Member for Strathmore-Brooks leans a little bit in this direction. I mean that in terms of favouring a much higher, I guess, elevation of Alberta values, Alberta culture, Alberta’s interests over its place currently in the national scene. I’m not quite sure that you could call that provincialism. That would perhaps be a misunderstanding and a misrepresentation. But I recognize that, and I appreciate that the member stands by those values. Personally, I’m concerned by the growth of this sort of point of view and this sort of populism around the world.

4:40

There is indeed, Madam Speaker, a time to be patriotic, and indeed I consider myself a patriot. I am proud of my country. I am proud of my province. I am proud of my city. I don’t consider any of those necessarily to be superior to other parts of the world. There are many things to admire in many nations and many places, but that’s to one side of the point.

Ultimately what it comes down to, Madam Speaker, is that I find it very problematic that we are moving to a world where, increasingly, people are choosing to elect governments in nations that say me first, everyone else after. There are times to stand up for our national interests: indeed, when we are negotiating a free trade agreement; indeed, when we are working to negotiate pipelines for Alberta; indeed, when the city of Edmonton is advocating for its fair share of the resources that come from the province for its municipal infrastructure. Indeed, those are appropriate things to do.

But there are times and there are things where we need to come together to address action. This increasing move towards nationalistic approaches, policies, this increasing move towards populist thinking, as being demonstrated right now in the United Kingdom with the Brexit issue, is ultimately destructive. It ultimately harms those whom it tries to draw in. The people that they bring in under a populist philosophy and tell that it’s going to benefit them are ultimately harmed, because we do more and are able to accomplish more when we work together than when we choose to be entirely selfish in our interests.

So to bring this around, obviously I cannot support this motion from the member. I believe that these goals that have been set in the Paris accord: indeed, they are lofty. Indeed, they are challenging to meet, but they are also in one sense, Madam Speaker, I think, aspirational. We recognize, of course, that these are the realities of what we have to do if we want to truly circumvent the catastrophic effects of long-term climate change. But that does not mean that anybody is suggesting that these will be accomplished overnight or in the next year. We need to take these initial first steps. We need to begin that journey. If we just simply sit back and say, “This is too big an issue to possibly handle,” then we will never make any progress. Indeed, when we talk about the legacies that we are going to leave to our children and grandchildren, this is far, far worse than any of the doom-and-gloom scenarios that members opposite like to sometimes put forward in regard to the economy.

Now, the reality is, Madam Speaker, that we have taken real action as a province to begin to address this issue. Indeed, the introduction of a price on carbon is the first step, and it is one of many steps. Now, when members opposite choose to speak about the \$300 price on carbon being what has to be in place to achieve the Paris climate goals, indeed that is if that is the only step that is

put in place. Nobody has suggested that that is the only tool in the tool box, and certainly it is not the only tool in the climate leadership plan that our government brought forward. There is the ending of coal-fired electricity by 2030. There are steps to create technological innovation, which is reducing emissions in the barrel. Increasing renewable energy and the use of renewable energy, providing supports to people to help them reduce their energy usage, moving up energy efficiency in the province of Alberta: all of these things cumulatively begin to move us towards that goal.

So we can choose, Madam Speaker, again, to fearmonger, like members opposite like to do, misrepresenting particular parts of the climate leadership plan while offering no solutions in return. Indeed, if we are not going to put a price on carbon which applies to all sectors of the economy, then that means that burden will be left solely to industry. I would love to hear from members opposite what the burden would be on industry to meet the Paris accord goals if it’s left to them alone and no other steps are taken.

We are, of course, working with industry, Madam Speaker. We’re helping them, and all the funds that come in from the price on carbon go right back into other things to help reduce that. There are the rebates that go to individuals to help them offset the cost to them personally. Then there are the amounts that go into renewable energy, the amounts that are going into helping communities that have been dependent on the coal power industry to transition, amounts that are going into developing better technology, amounts that are going into energy efficiency, amounts that are going into green transportation and sustainable transportation across the province.

All of these things together, Madam Speaker, are us showing initiative, showing leadership because Alberta took these steps first. We didn’t follow Ottawa on this one; we led. Frankly, I’m happy to see that Ottawa has come along behind us and that they’re working to make sure that these types of positive steps are being brought forward across Canada with the national price on carbon, which then allows the choice for each individual jurisdiction to determine how they will reinvest that income, allows each individual the choice to determine how they can best address their own carbon usage, allows industry the choice to determine which technologies, which approaches they would prefer to implement, as opposed to the only other option that’s left to members opposite: imposing some form of regulation on industry telling them what they have to do.

I’m proud of the work of our government. I will proudly stand behind it. I will proudly campaign on it, as I do every week when I go out and I talk to my constituents at the doors. This is policy we can be proud of and that has put Alberta on the map internationally as a responsible energy-producing jurisdiction.

For all those reasons, Madam Speaker, I’ll be voting against this motion. Thank you.

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

I’ll now recognize the hon. Member for Cardston-Taber-Warner.

**Mr. Hunter:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. First of all, I just wanted to say that there were a couple of comments that were made by some members from the opposite side there, St. Albert and Edmonton-McClung specifically. I don’t have the Blues in front of me, so I can’t quote them specifically, but the comments that were made identified us on this side of the House as being the problem with their carbon tax and that we are continually going against their carbon tax. But let me be absolutely clear. The reality is that two-thirds in almost every poll that we have seen of Albertans say that they are against carbon tax, so when they get up in this House and

they start pontificating and waxing poetic about how right they are, the reality is that Albertans are not buying it.

In fact, Albertans are saying: "We are going to reject this. Give us an opportunity in an election, and we will show you how upset we are about the fact that you have crammed this carbon tax down our throats." This is the sort of thing that in this House they can stand up and sound fantastic, that they're so high and mighty and that they're so right, but the truth is that every election Albertans get the choice, and they get to choose who is right.

I'm not exactly sure why the members opposite are not actually taking a look at the polls and actually saying: "You know what? Albertans aren't buying it. We need to be able to maybe back off from this thing." But they aren't looking at it. They aren't actually addressing Albertans' concerns. I thought that we were a House that represents Albertans here, but in reality what they're talking about is a party that represents a small minority in Alberta. The truth is that the large majority of Albertans are saying: we reject this premise that the carbon tax is the way to go, that it can build us pipelines, that it can actually build us social licence. Because of that, on this side of the House we have maintained over and over again that the carbon tax is not the right approach to being able to address this issue.

4:50

Now, I think that it's important to let people know about a situation down in my riding. We have a lot of heat units down there. We grow lots of stuff down there. In the Taber area we have Rogers Sugar, or Lantic Sugar as it's called, that is a fantastic employer in my riding, and the cost of the carbon tax – because sugar, the sugar beets that they grow down there, is an international market, the sugar producers are price takers. They're not price makers. They have to sell this sugar into the market. The problem is that they have this carbon tax that the people right across the border in the States do not have to pay. This huge employer in my riding is in this situation where they are just hoping that the NDP don't get in a second term, Madam Speaker, because if they do, they might just leave. If they were to leave, the number of jobs that my riding in the Taber area would lose would be devastating to that community.

This is the sort of thing, Madam Speaker, that I think that this NDP government, which has been coined the government of unintended consequences, needs to really start thinking about. They ideologically push forward with their agenda, and in reality, rather than actually taking a look and saying, "Well, what is the economic impact? What are the consequences of what we're doing?", rather than doing that, they ideologically move forward in and push their agenda down Albertans' throats. As poll after poll shows, Albertans are not buying it. They're not excited about it. In fact, they're going to show them how unexcited they are in the next election.

Madam Speaker, this concept, the concept of carbon tax being this silver bullet that is going to buy this social licence, that is going to provide all of these jobs because we're going to build pipelines to the coast: we've not been able to see any fruition of that. We haven't been able to see any kind of growth in that. Now, they spike the ball on a regular basis saying: "You know what? See, we did it." In reality it's always premature because then something else happens. The court says: "No. You didn't have proper duty to consult, so you can't move forward."

The problem is that rather than actually stepping back and saying, "Until we actually get this social licence, we're going to get rid of this carbon tax we have. We're going to give Albertans the opportunity to be able to vote on this in the next election" – if Albertans say in the next election, "You know what? You've now been honest with us and you've told us that we're going to have a carbon tax and this is the cost of that carbon tax. Yes, we accept it.

We're going to vote you in," then that's democracy, Madam Speaker. That's the system we live in of democracy. If that was the case, then we have to accept it. But the truth of the matter is that rather than actually saying that they are willing to let the voters decide, let the Albertans, the people who struggle with this, the people who struggle . . .

**The Acting Speaker:** Sorry. I hesitate to interrupt, Member.

Members, can we all please sit down in our seats. We're not in Committee of the Whole. Thank you.

Please go ahead.

**Mr. Hunter:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. If they had the ability to take a look at what Albertans want and give them that opportunity, I'm sure – not just sure; poll after poll indicates that Albertans would reject this agenda of the Alberta NDP. Yet we have heard time and again – again I go back to what the members for St. Albert and Edmonton-McClung said, that it's us that are causing the problems, that we're the ones who are against the carbon tax. Albertans are against the carbon tax. They're the ones who are giving us the clear indication that, no, that is not the correct approach, this is punitive, and there's no benefit to it.

If the benefit was that we were going to get a pipeline to tidewater, maybe the polls would change. I don't know. But I can tell you right now that the single mom with three young children, the person who's struggling, the fixed-income homeowner or the fixed-income person that's just trying to be able to make a go, they are not happy about this. I hear from them on a regular basis. These are the people who say they need a cease and desist. They need a stop with this destruction of the Alberta economy. Stop with destroying individuals' lives with this carbon tax that is punitive in nature.

Now, there was another comment that was made by the Member for Edmonton-Centre, and one of the things that he said in there – the argument is constant from the opposite side – is that if Albertans want to have a good environment, they'll want to have the carbon tax and that they want to be able to do their part. Well, you know what? If they were so sure of that, they could do a plebiscite or they could do an election. They could call an early election. You know what? I think Albertans would be very happy to have an early election. They would love to be able to have an opportunity to be able to make this the ballot decision. I can tell you that if they go to the ballots with this decision, if this is the ballot decision, I can tell you what Albertans are going to say. I talk to Albertans all the time. Albertans are not happy with this. This is not going to be able to provide that silver bullet that they seem to think that it is.

So, Madam Speaker, the issue at hand here is this government's complete lack of listening to Albertans, complete lack of this government's desire to know what Albertans want and then moving forward with something that's going to help Albertans. This is the reason why they're sitting so low in the polls. This is the reason why Albertans are rejecting their message and what they're doing.

Madam Speaker, I hope that all members of this House think about the consequences of the work that they're doing here, that this is not a laughing matter, as we've seen when my colleague was speaking earlier about how members of the opposite side were laughing as he was talking about senior citizens and fixed-income earners. For them to laugh at the plight of Albertans is deplorable, something that is not acceptable, is definitely not parliamentary.

Madam Speaker, I hope that the government will rethink this approach that they've had to the carbon tax, to how it's punitive in nature, that they would recognize that this is not helping Albertans – it's just punishing them – and that the members opposite who say that it's us that are causing the problems would take a look at this

and realize that it's not just us. This is the majority of Albertans that are saying: no; we never voted you in for this, and we're not going to accept it.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Are there any other members wishing to speak to the motion? The hon. Member for Calgary-Northern Hills.

**Mr. Kleinsteuber:** Thanks, Madam Speaker. It's a pleasure to rise this afternoon to speak to Standing Order 42. I'm in agreement with the environment minister as well as the Member for Calgary-Mountain View and many of our colleagues here that climate change is real and that these might be the most substantial debates of a generation and perhaps for the future of humanity. The opposition has proven time and time again that they refuse to accept the science of climate change, and again we're hearing that here in this House today. The Conservatives plan to go backwards on climate change, which would remove billions of dollars of investment in renewables, eliminate energy efficiency programs that save money for families, businesses, and industry.

You know, Madam Speaker, each year April 22 is Earth Day. This is now a global event each year, and there are an estimated more than 1 billion people in 192 countries that now take part in the largest civic-focused day of action in the world. In this place, this Legislature, we hear day after day questions coming from the United Conservative Party opposition, questioning the value of Alberta's climate leadership plan, raising doubts that the value of the carbon levy and whether or not one province could have any effect on the overall global emissions at all.

You know, we've heard here today some quotes from former Prime Minister Stephen Harper and Preston Manning, but it reminds me of another notable Conservative politician that received some credit years ago. It was at an Earth Week gala dinner that was held back on April 18, 2006, and it was at this gala dinner where former Prime Minister Brian Mulroney was the distinguished greenest Prime Minister in Canadian history. It all happened at the Château Laurier in Ottawa before a sold-out crowd of environmentalists and corporate leaders.

5:00

Let's reflect for a moment on the significant accomplishments that would have led to this distinguished award. Myself, along with many others in this Chamber, was born and raised in Ontario, and many of us have memories of the acid rain debates and were aware of the damage that concentrations of sulphur dioxide emissions did to our natural ecosystems such as lakes and rivers, much of which was caused by coal-fired plants in the American Midwest and nickel smelting in Sudbury. I think the member moving this motion might recall some of those debates, too. Recognizing that something needed to be done about this environmental issue, government took action, and in 1991 Prime Minister Brian Mulroney and American President George Bush signed the acid rain accord. This would lead to a cut of more than 50 per cent in sulphur dioxide emissions in eastern Canada. During that time there were also significant measures introduced that reduced ozone depletion and helped clean up the St. Lawrence Seaway.

[The Deputy Speaker in the chair]

I'd like to offer that these changes have paid massive returns decades later. It shows that government programs and initiatives can have a positive effect on the environment. I wonder, Madam Speaker: what happened to those Progressive Conservatives that

used to look decades ahead, attend climate change conferences, and represent Canada proudly? Every once in a while you hear an anxious point of order from the UCP, trying to perhaps distance themselves from their climate change doubting colleagues, but that gives us hope that a few of them might actually believe that human activities might have an impact on a changing global climate. I hope that all my Legislature colleagues on the other side of the House can learn the historical lessons from the former federal PC governments and understand that we actually do have an impact on our environment and that our government policy can have an impact on emissions and reduce the effects of climate change.

In the words of Brian Mulroney: climate change is the most serious environmental challenge, and time is running out; let's acknowledge the urgency of global warming. Then let's work together, bringing the world to a consensus on this topic. Madam Speaker, this is not the time to pull out of the Paris agreement on climate change.

We know that it's possible to take leading action on climate change and grow the economy at the same time because we've done it year over year. Alberta stands at a crossroads. We can ignore the signs of climate change and be dragged along, or we can take and make our own choices.

For those of us that lived in Calgary last summer, we know the air quality was poor due to forest fires elsewhere in B.C. The poor air quality lasted weeks and weeks on end, at least six weeks as I recall, and it was the same story the summer before. This year was different, though. I noticed that events were being cancelled, outdoor community recreation events specifically. It had a clear effect on people's lives.

Madam Speaker, our government has a solution. It's about investing in Calgary's green line LRT, that will create more than 12,000 jobs. Our energy efficiency programs mean that Albertans are saving \$70 for every tonne of carbon emissions reduced, Albertans are saving \$10 for every \$1 they invest in the residential energy-efficiency products, and our energy efficiency programs have saved \$414 million in energy costs. That's enough energy for 850,000 homes for one year. Businesses in Alberta have saved \$36 million in energy costs, and that's the same as taking 78,000 cars off the road. We're helping lower and middle-income families offset their costs through carbon levy rebates, with approximately two-thirds of households receiving a full rebate.

Madam Speaker, these are real solutions designed to tackle climate change. We can make a difference, we need to start now, and this is why I cannot support this motion.

Thank you.

**Ms Fitzpatrick:** Mine is really quick. I just have, actually, a question for the Member for Cardston-Taber-Warner. He had indicated that the Lantic Sugar factory was in his riding and that they were very worried. Now, I wonder how worried they are when they've put in \$20 million worth of renovations to continue with the business after we provided some support.

Thank you.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Any other members to speak to the motion? Calgary-West.

**Mr. Ellis:** Thank you. I want to thank everyone for their discussion on this certainly important topic. I'd also like to thank the Member for Calgary-Northern Hills for speaking. Certainly, he's been very passionate about this. I certainly believe that with his passion he might even reconsider running again in 2019. I certainly would encourage that, to run in Calgary supporting, you know, the carbon tax in that particular riding that he represents.



Now, I have to talk about a couple of things that I think are important, Madam Speaker. I know it's been said here before that two-thirds of Albertans consistently support getting rid of the carbon tax, but you have to recognize, whether you like it or not, that there is what is called a pattern. It doesn't matter if it's a biased poll. It doesn't matter if it's an independent poll. It doesn't matter if it's one that's commissioned by whomever. There is one constant theme, and that theme is that two-thirds of Albertans do not want this regressive carbon tax. That has been very, very clear, and that's been made very clear to me in Calgary-West.

I think it's important that we talk about listening, listening to our constituents, listening to the people of Alberta. You know, I sat in this Chamber – I was kind of thinking about this the other day – with some folks that may be perceived to be arrogant. We sat in a caucus of 76 people, Madam Speaker. I thought: my goodness, if 2019 comes around and I am so fortunate to be humbled by the people of Calgary-West, to be re-elected. I look at all the people that are running for the United Conservative Party and, of course, my friend here from Calgary-Hays – as I look at the picture of the Chamber from the previous Legislature, in the end it is just the Member for Calgary-Hays and myself who are the only two left standing from a previous government. My point is that you need to listen to the people you represent.

Now, I know that it's been said that, you know, we have other caucus members who were part of the previous PC Party, but they're not running again. The only two people that are running that are part of the Conservative caucus are the Member for Calgary-Hays and myself, so fair warning. When you don't listen to the people of Alberta – you can take away their jobs. You can take away their homes, but – I'll tell you what – you're never going to take away their right to vote, and they will send a clear message to the people in this Chamber in 2019.

Madam Speaker, I need to talk to you a little bit as well regarding what has been brought forward in the House in regard to people on fixed incomes. You know, I know that it's been said here that somehow all my friends are wealthy, but let me tell you something. I'm a simple, simple man. I came from a very simple home. My mother and my grandmother both currently live on fixed incomes, and they struggle. They struggle because of a carbon tax. You don't realize what sort of effect you are having on the daily lives of these people. They need to make choices on whether they can have bread or milk or heat their homes. Every time I go to Safeway – every time my grandmother goes to Safeway, less and less groceries can she afford. You guys can deny it all you want, but you are having a negative impact on people on fixed incomes. That will stop, and it's going to stop in 2019.

5:10

One of the members brought up Brian Mulroney. I was pretty young back then, but I'll tell you my recollection of Brian Mulroney. He led his party to one of the worst defeats in Canadian history, so I certainly wouldn't be taking any advice from him. Now, you can try and link him to the Conservatives all you want, but he's not a party that I ever belonged to.

Madam Speaker, there are people in this province who are hurting. You know, I spent the weekend as a hockey dad, getting up at 6 o'clock in the morning, taking my son to the rink, and listening to the people at that rink talk to me about how they don't want a carbon tax, talk to me about how the policies from this government are hurting them. This is not about Suncor. This is not about any major, large corporation. Quite frankly, I don't care about them. But I care about my family, I care about my friends, I care about my neighbours, and those people are hurting right now. There are

people that are hanging on by a thread with their jobs, making mortgage payments, all because of this regressive carbon tax.

So I am proud to stand here and say: I do not support a carbon tax, and I do not support what this government is doing when it comes to the energy industry right now.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Other members wishing to speak to the motion? The hon. Member for Calgary-Hays.

**Mr. McIver:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I appreciate the opportunity to rise and speak on this motion that's before us. You know what? I've been listening to the debate, and there are a few things that have caught my attention. I heard, for example, the members from the government side talking about: let's do this together. All right. That sounds nice. Let me say this: I agree with that.

But the point, Madam Speaker, is that the government is not doing it together. If they were doing it together and they were grouping themselves together with larger, world-wide economies that could actually make a significant difference to the environment, then of course that might make a difference. If they were doing it together and they were doing it with larger numbers of people that could make a difference to the environment, then they might have something. The problem is that if you shut down completely Canada's economy, you would lower the world emissions by, from what I understand, about 1.6 per cent according to the scientists that the folks on the other side are fond of quoting. Nothing wrong with quoting scientists; we depend on them for a lot of our knowledge about the world.

But the fact is that sacrificing yourself to not help the environment doesn't make sense. The fact is that if we could actually work together with the rest of our country and bring along large economies like the United States, like India, like China in meaningful changes together, then we could actually make a difference on the emissions that go out into the world whereas doing this without them is self-sacrifice without actually doing anything for the environment, and that is actually silly. That is actually silly.

Here's the other thing. Because of that, the problem, without bringing together a large enough block of the world when you're making changes like this, is the fact that this particular carbon tax of this particular government is actually having a net negative effect on the environment. The carbon tax is actually not only not doing good for the environment; it's negative.

Again, someone that people on both sides of this House often quote is Andrew Leach. The government is aware of this: he's talked about carbon leakage. The fact is that every time you make our Canadian industry less competitive so that somebody buys a barrel of oil from Venezuela, from Saudi Arabia, from Russia instead of from Canada and, more specifically, Alberta, that barrel of oil is arriving at a higher burden on the environment, with higher emissions, lower human rights standards. That's what this government has wrought. That's what they're bringing forward. They're bragging about that. The fact is that I know they intend to do the right thing, but the evidence doesn't indicate that they are successful. In fact, the evidence indicates that what they're doing now has a net negative effect because they are not bringing along the larger economies with them while they do this.

All Albertans and, I believe, all Albertans in this Legislature want to ensure that we protect the environment. I think that's a core value. I don't think that that really has a political bent to it. I think everybody wants the world to be a clean and healthy place, not only for ourselves but for those we love, for our children, for our grandchildren, and for future generations. That's not a Conservative

value. It's not an NDP value. It's a human value. That's not a party value. I would not accuse members of this House of wanting to leave the planet a mess. That's not what anybody intends here.

The question is about how to do it in a way that makes sense. If we could convince, again, our neighbours in the United States, China, and India to come together and make – I don't know – a different half of what this government thinks they're making but have everybody else doing it at the same time we did, it would be a way bigger positive effect than what's even being contemplated here, a way bigger positive effect than if we shut everything in Canada down, if we had countries like China, India, the United States making a smaller contribution to the environment.

Madam Speaker, the fact is that doing it by ourselves is much, much less effective, and when we provide prohibitive costs to our industry, to our people, we take away jobs, hurt the lowest income people, the most vulnerable people in Alberta. So for bragging rights? If you're actually not making the environment better, all you're getting is bragging rights. Why don't we actually think about doing it and bringing other people along so we can actually make a positive difference to the environment instead of just for the bragging rights? It doesn't make sense without bringing the rest of the world along.

So, in that spirit, I have an amendment to move, Madam Speaker, and I would like to move it if that's okay with you. I could keep speaking, but my guess is that you're going to want me to wait until you've seen it before I continue. Yes? I will wait for your signal.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Hon. Member for Calgary-Hays, go ahead.

5:20

**Mr. McIver:** Thank you. For those watching at home, I move that the motion brought forward by the Member for Strathmore-Brooks be amended by adding the following after "climate change":

"; but recognize the need to reduce greenhouse gas emissions without imposing disproportionate costs on the Alberta economy not being imposed by our economic competitors."

This, Madam Speaker, is what I have been talking about. I believe everybody in this Legislature wants to make the environment better. I would hate to think anybody in this Legislature wants to virtue signal or create the illusion of making the environment better while not actually making it better and, in so doing, take away the jobs of tens of thousands of Albertans or hundreds of thousands of Albertans, making life more expensive and less enjoyable for the most vulnerable and the lowest income Albertans and the people that need the support of this government and this Legislature the most. I would hope that members of this House want to improve the environment without disproportionately damaging Alberta's economy, without disproportionately damaging those people in Alberta that are the weakest amongst us, those that most need our support, those that might have the lowest income, those that actually are the ones that we most need to protect.

We have a responsibility to all Albertans, of course, but we have, I believe, a greater responsibility to those that need us the most. That's what this says. Why would we disproportionately hurt the Alberta economy, taking away jobs, opportunity, making consumer goods more expensive, making housing more expensive, making food more expensive? When we do that, we actually hurt the people that are of the lowest income, the poorest Albertans, the most. Those are the people that we all should be thinking about. Those are the people that, I would say, around here we all claim to say that we're thinking about. These are the people that we all ought to be thinking about every single day that we're in here, every time we stand up to speak, every time we vote, every time we act on behalf of our constituents. We ought to be making sure that we do not hurt

them disproportionately or hurt Alberta disproportionately. It only makes sense.

Now, we've already seen the evidence of not doing that. This carbon tax has disproportionately hurt Alberta while actually probably doing net damage to the environment. What have we seen as a result? Economic activities have been leaving Alberta in droves, well over \$40 billion in investment gone along with the jobs, the opportunity, the future opportunities for our children and grandchildren, chased out of Alberta by, amongst other ways, the carbon tax introduced by this government.

**Mr. Piquette:** Not at all. You know that.

**Mr. McIver:** Yes, I know you did better than the carbon tax. I see the member from Athabasca there arguing. I'll give him credit. He also chased out the investment with the corporate taxes, with the personal taxes, with the excess regulations, but the carbon tax was part of it. You're right. I should have given you credit for all the other bad policies, but we are talking about this one right now.

The fact is that this is what happens when you have bad policies. You chase out jobs, opportunity, things that can make life better for Albertans. Again, Professor Andrew Leach calls it carbon leakage, and he's right. Every time a barrel of oil comes from somewhere else, we've actually supported a country with lower human rights standards than Canada, lower environmental standards than Canada. If you're actually giving the business to somebody with lower environmental standards, you're actually not doing anything for the environment, and it's probably a net negative out of the carbon tax in its current form. Again, if we could come together along the way with the United States, with China, with India and say, "Together let's reduce the world's emissions," we could actually make a dent. Someone might actually notice. For those that, you know, claim they care about the environment, then that is the way, I believe, we all ought to be looking at it.

In fact, there's lots of other evidence. I mean, you look and see oil and gas booming in places like Texas and North Dakota but slumping in Alberta. They don't have the NDP policies tripping them up, making their product more expensive, causing everything for their citizens, whether they're in the industry or not, to be more expensive than it needs to be, including basics like food, basics like heat for people that – frankly, again, it's not wealthy people who have to choose between groceries and heat. It's poor people. It's people of low income. Those are the ones that we need to actually be turning our thoughts and our minds to, not thinking about our fancy friends from France and how happy they're going to be with us.

I know that we sent the minister over there to meet up with her fancy friends, and what we have is a carbon tax as a result. What we have is damaging Alberta's economy. What we have is hurting the people that we're supposed to help. Yes, we should work to lower our emissions, primarily with technology, and we should not impose the costs upon ourselves that our closest competitors are not paying.

You know what? The fact is that people didn't really switch from horses to cars because they ran out of horses. They switched from horses to cars because they went faster, eventually, not right away. Eventually, they were more reliable, could go farther without stopping. It's certainly more comfortable in the winter when you're heated when you're driving. The technology evolved to have people naturally shift, which is the attitude that we should have here.

If we want to lower emissions, we need to work together with other countries, have technology where we can heat our homes more efficiently, technology where we can move goods and services around more efficiently, technology where we can do

everything that we do with energy: cool things, heat things, make sure that the refrigeration in the grocery store is more efficient through better technology. These are the ways in which we can actually make a difference to the environment without hurting our citizens, in particular without hurting our citizens with the lowest income, the most vulnerable of our citizens, the ones that we should care the very most about.

Madam Speaker, I hope that members of the House will support this amendment. Economic activity and jobs are at stake. Yes, the environment will be affected. I think that we need to do both of those things. I think we need to have a positive effect on the environment and the economy and not choose one or the other.

**Mr. Coolahan:** Well, what's your plan?

**Mr. McIver:** I just heard chirping from the other side. Well, I'll tell you what. We will have a plan, as our House leader has said, before the next election comes, but I'll tell you that what makes the environment better is killing the carbon tax. The government's carbon tax is bad for the environment because it's driving out oil and gas production into countries with lower environmental standards than Canada's. Sorry, but the government's policy is making it worse.

To talk about what the plan is, our plan is, first, to stop the damage that's being done by the government's current policy – and there is damage being done – and, secondly, to put a common-sense solution in place that protects both the environment and the economy. The government's current plan does neither.

On that, I will stop speaking. I hope that members of the House can see their way clear to supporting what I believe is an important amendment, and I will listen to the debate.

Thank you.

**The Deputy Speaker:** On the amendment, Strathmore-Brooks.

**Mr. Fildebrandt:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm sorry to preempt the Government House Leader, who seems very eager to join in this evening's festivities. I want to thank the Member for Calgary-Hays for his participation in this debate, putting forward the amendment to the motion before us now, essentially adding I think we'll call it a disclaimer clause, adding that we're against Paris but not too against Paris.

I think it is a reasonable amendment. No one on this side, that I'm aware of at least, is arguing that we shouldn't do anything about greenhouse gas emissions, that there should be nothing whatsoever. Now, what it is that we're going to do in the place of a carbon tax or in the place of complying with the Paris accord: that's to be seen. I mean, cap and trade is simply a backdoor carbon tax that is perhaps even more harmful to the economy than a direct carbon tax. And then the traditional command and control regulatory approach is also highly disruptive to the economy, picking winners and losers, and has a lot of costs, but people don't see these costs.

5:30

I'm going to have to give a rare bit of perhaps backhanded praise to the NDP here. A carbon tax is braver than the other forms of backdoor carbon taxes: command and control regulation or cap and trade. It's braver in the sense that people can see it. You can actually see it. That tends to make it less politically popular. And we have to know that we shouldn't only do what is popular; we have to do what is right. In this case I think the NDP are not doing both what's right or popular. But in their own minds they think this is the right thing to do, and they're entitled to think that until they no longer have the ability to pass that legislation.

The amendment put forward by the Member for Calgary-Hays here is perhaps making the motion now rather wordy in its completeness, but I find it to be reasonable. You know, far be it from me – the Siberian corner here now is more the gulag archipelago; it's getting so busy over here. But in this corner of the Legislature we learn some lessons on co-operation and working across party lines and the ability to get things done. If someone else, regardless of party, brings forward an amendment to anything I'm putting forward, if I think it's reasonable – and I don't necessarily think it improves it, but I think it's reasonable – and if that helps members to feel more comfortable in supporting a motion from this Legislature to reject the Paris climate accord, then I think it's well worth including.

I would encourage members to accept the amendment and from there move forward to the final vote in this House rejecting all co-operation with the federal government in its attempts to impose the objectives of the Paris climate accord.

Thank you.

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

**Mr. Mason:** Well, thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I'm pleased to rise to speak to the amendment to the motion put forward by the hon. Member for Strathmore-Brooks. It's an interesting amendment.

The original motion made by Strathmore-Brooks asks that we "urge the government to reject co-operation with the federal government in the imposition of the Paris agreement on climate change." That at least, Madam Speaker, is clear. The hon. Member for Strathmore-Brooks doesn't support the international agreement that was arrived at in Paris, and he doesn't like the consequences of that because he's also very much opposed to the climate leadership plan that this government has brought forward. That is at least clear. We do not agree with that approach. Nevertheless, we thought it was very much worthy of debate this afternoon because I think it's really important that we clear the air with respect to the policies of not only our government and our party but of the other parties as well.

The problem comes now with the amendment that's been put forward by the UCP. I have to admit to a certain curiosity as to how they were going to respond to the motion from Strathmore-Brooks, and now we can see what the manoeuvre actually is, Madam Speaker. The manoeuvre is to say: well, what would it mean if it was adopted? They're amending the motion. They're not changing what's in the motion. The motion asks that we "reject co-operation with the federal government in the imposition of the Paris agreement on climate change." They're not changing that in their amendment. They're clearly still prepared to support that position, but they want to hedge their bets. I'm a little disappointed that Strathmore-Brooks didn't see through their strategy here.

They want to recognize the need to reduce greenhouse gases, so they want to be able to tell Albertans that they actually agree with reducing greenhouse gas emissions. They want to tell Albertans that. But it can't impose "disproportionate costs on the Alberta economy not being imposed by our economic competitors." That sounds reasonable in a way. But there are all kinds of other buts, Madam Speaker. You know, they don't want any kind of price on carbon notwithstanding the fact that that is the most market-friendly approach to dealing with reducing greenhouse gases. They don't want a cap and trade. They don't want really anything that would actually do something. This is the problem with their position.

Some of them claim to believe in human-caused climate change. You know, I think that there are a couple of them that actually think that. But we also know – and we heard this in the speech from the

Minister of Environment and Parks today – the list of statements from members opposite that oppose the idea, in one degree or another, that climate change is actually caused by human activity. Sunspots or – I don't know what else – some cosmic kind of activity are what they tend to credit for that.

The fact of the matter is that there is a clear consensus among scientists and world leaders, with the exception of one just to the south of us now, who believe that climate change is an urgent priority, that it is already well advanced. Indeed, Madam Speaker, we can see the impacts of climate change around us. I'm old enough. I'm older than probably most of the members over there, not all. There are a couple of seniors in their back row, shaking their fingers at me, you know, waving their canes in the air, that remember what winters used to be like in this province. You normally wouldn't be able to walk outside with just a light jacket in November in the province of Alberta. It was cold, and it was cold right across the prairies. It was cold right across most of Canada with the exception of the little area along our west coast. The winters were long, and they were hard, and Canadians took some considerable pride in being able to live through the kind of winters that we had. That's not the case anymore.

You know, Madam Speaker, when I was a kid – I was probably eight or nine – our family drove up the Icefields Parkway between Lake Louise and Jasper. We stopped at the Columbia Glacier, about halfway up the road, and there was a huge glacier there that came right down almost to the road. There was a little bit of a lake there, and it was very, very impressive.

Well, we went back, you know, a few years ago, and they had developed markers from where that glacier had been at certain years. Back at the end of the 19th century the glacier had actually been on the other side of the highway. I saw where it was when I went and saw it – that would have been in the mid-60s, I guess – and then I looked to where the glacier was now. This is just within my lifespan. There was a huge, huge distance – I would say the better part of a kilometre – that that glacier had retreated since I was a boy. Members opposite wonder about climate change, whether or not it's real or whether it's really a problem, and I think that there's a clear measurement right here in Alberta, that anyone can go and see, for what has actually changed.

5:40

But what else has changed? Well, the Minister of Environment and Parks talked about it earlier in her speech. What about the forest fires that we've had to deal with in this province? They are extraordinary events. What's happening today in California is not the normal cycle of fires. You know, fires occur everywhere. Forest fires are a natural thing. And, yes, they have been made worse because of poor long-term forest management practices around the world. But they are occurring more severely: much larger events, more damage. Whole cities are burning. We saw Paradise. Well, it's not a city but a town. There are over 1,000 people missing right now just in California. A couple of years ago in Australia: the same sort of situation. We had, of course, our huge fire, a couple of them, one at Slave Lake and then, again, in 2015 the devastating Fort McMurray fire. So that's one thing.

Then flooding is the other consequence. We've seen an increase in disastrous flooding. Again, flooding is a natural event. You can't just sort of say that there were no floods before climate change, but you can say that floods are more serious, more severe, and may happen more frequently.

That's why the insurance industry in this country and around the world is strongly supportive of action to fight climate change, to mitigate it, to reduce it, to slow it down, eventually to reverse it, because it's very bad for their business. They are paying out billions

of dollars in claims that they didn't have to pay before. It changes everything in terms of how they calculate their actuarial tables and the rates that they're going to have to charge to pay for all of this. We're all going to pay for it, billions of dollars of costs, even right here in Alberta, and that's borne by everyone in this province.

To say that climate change isn't an urgent and serious problem that requires a response is irresponsible. But you can't have it both ways like the UCP wants. They want to say: "Oh, yes. Climate change could be human caused or partly human caused. Yes, it's a problem, but let's not do anything." That's their position, essentially: let's not do anything. Every time you put forward an idea to deal with it, of course, it's not free, and they're not willing to pay any price, that I can see, to deal with this problem. But Albertans are paying a price. They're paying higher insurance premiums. They're having to deal with all kinds of things. Taxes are affected by the need to deal with climate change and to protect our cities and our farms from the ravages of ongoing climate change.

The opposition, the UCP opposition in particular, I think, is extremely irresponsible in their approach. They think that they can get away with it: "Yes, we don't like climate change. But, no, we don't want to do anything about it." It's high time that the leader of the UCP stood up here or some other place in front of Albertans and said exactly what the UCP is prepared to do about climate change because he has not done that. He's really hoping to finesse his way into power in the next election by talking about all the problems and offering no solutions. Well, I don't think it's going to work, Madam Speaker. I don't think it's going to work at all.

The Member for Calgary-Hays stood up, and he said that other countries aren't doing anything. Well, you know, I have to remind the hon. member that almost every country in the world originally signed on to the Paris accord. Yes, some countries are treated somewhat differently than others because they have economies that are developing at different stages than the rest of the world or than other countries. So, yes, there are some differences in the approach to the solutions. But everybody signed on.

We have one problem, which is giving them hope, I suggest, and that is that the United States has elected a President who's decided to pull out of the Paris accord. I really hope, Madam Speaker, for our sake, the sake of the world, that that is a temporary situation and that it will be resolved in a couple of years. I very much hope that that is the case because the United States has become an outlier in terms of the international consensus. It's unfortunate to see our friends in the UCP falling into the same trap. They want us to be an outlier, too. I think that that's something that I don't think will sit very well with people.

Now, the hon. Member for Calgary-West gave a very angry speech about all of the terrible economic hardship that this government is inflicting on poor and elderly Albertans, and I just want to deal with that because those people, first of all, have a struggle far beyond the climate leadership plan and the carbon levy that is part of that. They have a struggle dealing with taxes. They have a struggle dealing with the cost of living, in some cases rent, food, all of those things. I just want to remind the hon. member that the difficult financial situation that we find ourselves in now and the rough patch in the economy, the downturn in the economy that we have seen as a result of dramatically falling oil prices is really what has hurt people more than anything else.

Why are we in that position? Well, quite frankly, we're in that position because the previous Conservative government, of which he was a member, failed to diversify our economy and failed to diversify the sources of revenue that this government depends on. When we took office – and this was not new – 30 per cent roughly of program expenditures were paid for by volatile nonrenewable

royalty revenue, and that is a situation that they had years, nay, decades, to fix and did not fix. They handed that to the new government. That was something we inherited at a time of plunging oil prices and depressed natural gas prices.

So what do you do? Well, you know, there are lots of things you can do. One thing that we don't do – I can tell you that this government doesn't – is cut services to those same people, and that's what this opposition would have us do. Again, they don't want to connect the consequences of their actions. "We're going to reduce spending by 20 per cent," says their leader, "but there won't be any consequences to the people of Alberta; we have severely depressed royalty revenues coming in; we're going to cut the expenditures of the government by 20 per cent with no negative consequences for the people of Alberta," instead of saying, "Well, here's what we're going to do." I can respect a position that says that we have to reduce our expenditures by that much. You know, that's not a position I agree with, but it's at least a legitimate conservative position to take. But the question is: what do you do to get there, and who pays and who benefits? Questions they refuse to answer.

5:50

Now, it seems to me that if you want to reduce spending by that amount, you have an obligation to tell people how you're going to do it. Again, it's the same strategy that's being followed. They're going to try and finesse their way through the election by promising to make reductions and pretending that there are no consequences and offering no clues as to how they're actually going to do what they want to do. It's an intellectually dishonest approach, and I sincerely hope the people of Alberta are going to recognize it.

It's clear – just to get back to this point because I don't want to let Calgary-West off the hook just yet. In his anger about the impact of the carbon tax, is he also angry at a government that failed to diversify the economy that left the people of Alberta once again to face dramatic cuts to government programs and other expenditures when the price of oil goes down? When we were in opposition back in the day when I was leading our caucus, we said over and over again that we should not be laying off teachers and nurses just because the price of oil goes down, and we have to find a way to not do that. We know – and everyone in Alberta knows – that the price of oil, the price of natural gas goes up and it comes down all the time. That is a regular thing. You can count on it.

Why would we have a budgeting system that makes investments and funds new programs when the price of oil is high, only to turn around and cut them when the price of oil goes down? That makes no sense, but that is the past to which they want to return. I have to say that we need to do everything possible to stop them from doing that because that is the past that has hurt Albertans over and over again, and it's time we learned the lesson.

You know, Isaac Newton – no. He was replaced by Einstein. It was Einstein that said that the definition of madness is to continue to repeat the same actions and expecting a different result. That, I'm afraid, defines the operating philosophy of that government.

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

**Mr. Nixon:** Well, Madam Speaker, there's limited time obviously before the supper break, but it's interesting. I think actually I'll pick up right where the Government House Leader left off, and that is that the definition of madness is to continue to do something over and over even though it's not working, which is exactly what this government has done during their entire time in this mandate.

They brought forward a carbon tax, punished the people of Alberta, said that they would have social licence, caused significant social damage across this province. It hurt people, something that they want to forget that they did, but Alberta hasn't forgotten, and then they continue to do it because – well, first of all, they said that it was because they would get social licence to build pipelines, but even though we know that's now not true, they continue to do it over and over and over, punishing the people of Alberta.

You know, the Government House Leader brought up a lot of interesting points. Time is short. I want to focus on one particular area. He attacked or called out, I guess, the Member for Calgary-West for speaking passionately defending fixed-income seniors and showing his frustration with what this government has done to his constituents. I am just as frustrated, and so are those fixed-income seniors across the province. This Government House Leader and his caucus, his fellow caucus mates, his Premier, the cabinet that he belongs to have gone out of their way to punish the people of Alberta. They have hurt the people of Alberta.

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

**The Deputy Speaker:** The hon. Government House Leader on a point of order.

#### Point of Order Imputing Motives

**Mr. Mason:** Standing Order 23(h), (i), and (j), including imputing motives. The hon. member, the House leader for the UCP has just stood here and suggested that we've gone out of our way to hurt people. Now, that may be his opinion, but that is unacceptable in this House, and I believe that it violates the standing orders.

It's one thing to say that what you have done may have hurt people. I don't believe that's true, not at all. I can see that it could be a legitimate and parliamentary argument that could be made, but to suggest that I, personally, as a member of this House and other members of this House, have gone out of their way to deliberately hurt people is completely unacceptable, Madam Speaker, and we shouldn't be having that kind of tone in the debate here. Talk about policies. Say that the policies are good. Say that the policies are bad. Say that the policies help people. Say that the policies hurt people, but quite frankly to say that you've deliberately set out to hurt people is in fact, in my opinion, unparliamentary, and it's in violation of those standing orders.

I would ask that the hon. member withdraw that remark and apologize to me and other members of this House.

**Mr. Nixon:** Madam Speaker, in your words earlier today, it sounds like lighthearted banter maybe, but what I will say is this: I never said him specifically. I spoke about the policy of the government that he belongs to. Now, he might be ashamed of what his government has done. He, quite frankly, should be, but I will not apologize for standing up and defending fixed-income seniors from this government's behaviour. This government's policy has been devastating and has hurt people, and this member should stand up and apologize to Albertans. It's a matter of debate.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Hon. members, it's getting late in the day, and I have to say that I don't think there is a point of order on this, but again it's a good reminder for all of us to really be careful that we are not making personal implications with our remarks against another member or group of members.

Please continue, hon. member.

### Debate Continued

**Mr. Nixon:** Well, thank you, Madam Speaker. I do know that the Government House Leader appears to not want to hear what I have to say today. I wouldn't want to hear it either if I was him based on his government's policy and actions and the significant impact that they have had on the people of Alberta. I would be ashamed of that, too.

But here is the point. The Government House Leader in his tirade that he just gave to this House did not answer any of the important questions, and the most important question is this. The government's own reports show that for them to meet the Paris accord with the carbon tax, they would have to charge \$300 a tonne instead of the \$50 or so that they're charging at this moment. That means one of two things. Either this government knowingly is bringing forward a tax to hurt people in this province, that hurts people in this province, or they intend to raise it. It's one or the other. They don't answer that question. That's part of their secret agenda, I guess, Madam Speaker. I know that the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs, the hon. Member for Leduc-Beaumont, is laughing about that, but the people in his constituency are not laughing about it.

That's what's important about this. The decisions by this government have real consequences, and the Government House Leader standing up here and calling out the Member for Calgary-West for defending seniors is totally inappropriate, and he should actually, I think, be ashamed of that. A member of his standing who's been in this Chamber for so long should stand up in this Chamber and fight for the seniors in his constituency. It's disappointing to see him and all of his fellow colleagues continue to stand by idly as their constituents have to go through the pain that comes with their bad policies. Very disappointing. It is extremely disappointing to see what has taken place.

Now, why won't the government stand up and answer that? Instead they want to attack the opposition who brings forward a pretty reasonable amendment saying that we need to tackle greenhouse emissions without making Albertans pay undue consequences for it. They don't believe that. That's the difference between these two parties. They think that their ideological agenda can be dealt with on the backs of everyday Albertans. We think not. We will stand in this House and defend fixed-income seniors. We will defend the most vulnerable. We will defend our municipalities. We will defend our hospitals. We will defend our families over and over and over, and if this government wants to continue to stand up and defend their actions against the people of Alberta, their actions that have cost them significant amounts of money all the while without getting pipelines built, I know that they're disappointed.

They get upset when we point it out because I know without a doubt that when they go home to their constituencies, they're getting flack for it, and they should get flack for it. They should get flack for the way that they've treated Albertans. They should get flack for it. They should stand up and they should answer the question: do they intend to bring it to \$300? Is that their plan? Or did they just realize – the Government House Leader is shaking his head no. Their own documents show they can't meet their emission targets. They just agreed that this is just a tax on the people of Alberta, and it has nothing to do with the environment. The Government House Leader just admitted that, nodding his head, saying: we don't intend to do it.

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

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

### Point of Order Imputing Motives

**Mr. Mason:** Again, 23(h), (i), and (j). He's imputing motives again. I never admitted any such thing, and I really do wish the opposition – because this is a general problem. Specifically this House leader, who's just done it again, is standing up and attempting to suggest that I or others in this House have said things that we simply did not. I think we should be very careful in this House, quite frankly, to prevent that sort of debate because it's really important that we get our ideas out and talk about what we're going to do about the problems and how we see those problems. I think those are really valuable things to be talking about. It's unfortunate that the Opposition House Leader just wants to twist people's words to suit his own political purposes, Madam Speaker.

6:00

**Mr. Nixon:** Madam Speaker, if I misrecognized the hon. member's head nod or head shake to not bring it to \$300, I apologize. I guess that means he intends to bring it to \$300. I'm confused which one he was trying to contribute.

**Mr. Mason:** Same thing again, Madam Speaker.

**The Deputy Speaker:** You can't call a point of order on a point of order.

**Mr. Nixon:** With that said, I'd be happy to withdraw pointing out the member shaking his head.

### Debate Continued

**The Deputy Speaker:** The time allotted for that order of business has now elapsed.

I need to call the vote on the amendment brought forward by the Member for Calgary-Hays.

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

[Several members rose calling for a division. The division bell was rung at 6:01 p.m.]

[Fifteen minutes having elapsed, the Assembly divided]

[The Deputy Speaker in the chair]

For the motion:

Ellis	McIver	van Dijken
Fildebrandt	Nixon	Yao
Hunter		

Against the motion:

Anderson, S.	Gray	Nielsen
Babcock	Hinkley	Payne
Carlier	Horne	Phillips
Ceci	Kazim	Piquette
Connolly	Kleinstauber	Renaud
Coolahan	Larivee	Rosendahl
Cortes-Vargas	Littlewood	Schmidt
Dach	Loyola	Schreiner
Dang	Malkinson	Shepherd
Drever	Mason	Sucha
Eggen	McCuaig-Boyd	Turner
Feehan	McKitrick	Westhead
Fitzpatrick	Miranda	

Totals:	For – 7	Against – 38
---------	---------	--------------

[Motion on amendment lost]

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

**Mr. Mason:** Well, thank you very much, Madam Speaker. In light of the fact that the RMA is holding a number of events and social activities this afternoon and that members, at least on this side, would like to be there to interact with the municipal councillors from rural Alberta, I would request unanimous consent of the House to shorten the bells to one minute.

[Unanimous consent granted]

**The Deputy Speaker:** On the motion itself by the hon. Member for Strathmore-Brooks.

[The voice vote indicated that the motion lost]

[Several members rose calling for a division. The division bell was rung at 6:19 p.m.]

[One minute having elapsed, the Assembly divided]

[The Deputy Speaker in the chair]

For the motion:

Cyr	Hunter	Schneider
Ellis	McIver	van Dijken
Fildebrandt	Nixon	Yao

Against the motion:

Anderson, S.	Gray	Nielsen
Babcock	Hinkley	Payne
Carlier	Horne	Phillips
Ceci	Kazim	Piquette
Connolly	Kleinsteuber	Renaud
Coolahan	Larivee	Rosendahl
Cortes-Vargas	Littlewood	Schmidt
Dach	Loyola	Schreiner
Dang	Malkinson	Shepherd
Drever	Mason	Sucha
Eggen	McCuaig-Boyd	Turner
Feehan	McKitrick	Westhead
Fitzpatrick	Miranda	

Totals:	For – 9	Against – 38
---------	---------	--------------

[Motion lost]

**The Deputy Speaker:** The House stands adjourned until 10 tomorrow morning.

[The Assembly adjourned at 6:23 p.m.]









## Table of Contents

Prayers .....	1933
Introduction of Visitors .....	1933
Introduction of Guests .....	1933, 1944, 1952
Members' Statements	
Bill 26 and AISH Client Benefits .....	1935
Unemployment and Government Fiscal Policies .....	1935
Holodomor Memorial Day .....	1944
Hunting Season .....	1944
Strathcona County Pickleball Association .....	1944
Bighorn Area Land Use .....	1945
Statement by the Speaker	
Use of Electronic Devices in the Chamber .....	1935
Oral Question Period	
Provincial Budget Revenue Forecasts .....	1935, 1939
Services for Persons with Disabilities .....	1936
Provincial Special Envoys to the Energy Industry .....	1936
Oil Price Differentials .....	1937
Mental Health Services in Edmonton .....	1937
Rural Crime Strategy .....	1938, 1944
Educational Curriculum Redesign .....	1940
Energy Industry Diversification Programs .....	1940
Tow Truck Driver Safety .....	1941
Business Regulations .....	1941
Hillview Park Condominiums in Fort McMurray Condominium Regulations .....	1942
Lethbridge Drug Use and Crime Rates .....	1942
Urban Wildlife Management .....	1943
Notices of Motions .....	1945
Tabling Returns and Reports .....	1945
Tablings to the Clerk .....	1945
Motions under Standing Order 42	
Paris Agreement on Climate Change .....	1947, 1952
Division .....	1966
Division .....	1967

*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