



Province of Alberta

The 30th Legislature
First Session

Alberta Hansard

Thursday morning, May 23, 2019

Day 2

The Honourable Nathan Cooper, Speaker

Legislative Assembly of Alberta
The 30th Legislature

First Session

Cooper, Hon. Nathan, Olds-Didsbury-Three Hills (UCP), Speaker
Pitt, Angela D., Airdrie-East (UCP), Deputy Speaker and Chair of Committees
Milliken, Nicholas, Calgary-Currie (UCP), Deputy Chair of Committees

Aheer, Hon. Leela Sharon, Chestermere-Strathmore (UCP)
Allard, Tracy L., Grande Prairie (UCP)
Amery, Mickey K., Calgary-Cross (UCP)
Armstrong-Homeniuk, Jackie,
Fort Saskatchewan-Vegreville (UCP)
Barnes, Drew, Cypress-Medicine Hat (UCP)
Bilous, Deron, Edmonton-Beverly-Clareview (NDP),
Official Opposition House Leader
Carson, Jonathon, Edmonton-West Henday (NDP)
Ceci, Joe, Calgary-Buffalo (NDP)
Copping, Hon. Jason C., Calgary-Varsity (UCP)
Dach, Lorne, Edmonton-McClung (NDP)
Dang, Thomas, Edmonton-South (NDP)
Deol, Jasvir, Edmonton-Meadows (NDP)
Dreeshen, Hon. Devin, Innisfail-Sylvan Lake (UCP)
Eggen, David, Edmonton-North West (NDP),
Official Opposition Whip
Ellis, Mike, Calgary-West (UCP),
Government Whip
Feehan, Richard, Edmonton-Rutherford (NDP)
Fir, Hon. Tanya, Calgary-Peigan (UCP)
Ganley, Kathleen T., Calgary-Mountain View (NDP)
Getson, Shane C., Lac Ste. Anne-Parkland (UCP)
Glasgo, Michaela L., Brooks-Medicine Hat (UCP)
Glubish, Hon. Nate, Strathcona-Sherwood Park (UCP)
Goehring, Nicole, Edmonton-Castle Downs (NDP)
Goodridge, Laila, Fort McMurray-Lac La Biche (UCP)
Gotfried, Richard, Calgary-Fish Creek (UCP)
Gray, Christina, Edmonton-Mill Woods (NDP)
Guthrie, Peter F., Airdrie-Cochrane (UCP)
Hanson, David B., Bonnyville-Cold Lake-St. Paul (UCP)
Hoffman, Sarah, Edmonton-Glenora (NDP)
Horner, Nate S., Drumheller-Stettler (UCP)
Hunter, Hon. Grant R., Taber-Warner (UCP)
Irwin, Janis, Edmonton-Highlands-Norwood (NDP),
Official Opposition Deputy Whip
Issik, Whitney, Calgary-Glenmore (UCP)
Jones, Matt, Calgary-South East (UCP)
Kenney, Hon. Jason, PC, Calgary-Lougheed (UCP),
Premier
LaGrange, Hon. Adriana, Red Deer-North (UCP)
Loewen, Todd, Central Peace-Notley (UCP)
Long, Martin M., West Yellowhead (UCP)
Lovely, Jacqueline, Camrose (UCP)
Loyola, Rod, Edmonton-Ellerslie (NDP)
Luan, Hon. Jason, Calgary-Foothills (UCP)
Madu, Hon. Kaycee, Edmonton-South West (UCP)
McIver, Hon. Ric, Calgary-Hays (UCP),
Deputy Government House Leader
Nally, Hon. Dale, Morinville-St. Albert (UCP)
Neudorf, Nathan T., Lethbridge-East (UCP)
Nicolaidis, Hon. Demetrios, Calgary-Bow (UCP)
Nielsen, Christian E., Edmonton-Decore (NDP)
Nixon, Hon. Jason, Rimbey-Rocky Mountain House-Sundre
(UCP), Government House Leader
Nixon, Jeremy P., Calgary-Klein (UCP)
Notley, Rachel, Edmonton-Strathcona (NDP),
Leader of the Official Opposition
Orr, Ronald, Lacombe-Ponoka (UCP)
Pancholi, Rakhi, Edmonton-Whitemud (NDP)
Panda, Hon. Prasad, Calgary-Edgemont (UCP)
Phillips, Shannon, Lethbridge-West (NDP)
Pon, Hon. Josephine, Calgary-Beddington (UCP)
Rehn, Pat, Lesser Slave Lake (UCP)
Reid, Roger W., Livingstone-Macleod (UCP)
Renaud, Marie F., St. Albert (NDP)
Rosin, Miranda D., Banff-Kananaskis (UCP)
Rowswell, Garth, Vermilion-Lloydminster-Wainwright (UCP)
Rutherford, Brad, Leduc-Beaumont (UCP)
Sabir, Irfan, Calgary-McCall (NDP)
Savage, Hon. Sonya, Calgary-North West (UCP),
Deputy Government House Leader
Sawhney, Hon. Rajan, Calgary-North East (UCP)
Schmidt, Marlin, Edmonton-Gold Bar (NDP)
Schow, Joseph R., Cardston-Siksika (UCP),
Deputy Government Whip
Schulz, Hon. Rebecca, Calgary-Shaw (UCP)
Schweitzer, Hon. Doug, Calgary-Elbow (UCP),
Deputy Government House Leader
Shandro, Hon. Tyler, Calgary-Acadia (UCP)
Shepherd, David, Edmonton-City Centre (NDP)
Sigurdson, Lori, Edmonton-Riverview (NDP)
Sigurdson, R.J., Highwood (UCP)
Singh, Peter, Calgary-East (UCP)
Smith, Mark W., Drayton Valley-Devon (UCP)
Stephan, Jason, Red Deer-South (UCP)
Sweet, Heather, Edmonton-Manning (NDP),
Official Opposition Deputy House Leader
Toews, Hon. Travis, Grande Prairie-Wapiti (UCP)
Toor, Devinder, Calgary-Falconridge (UCP)
Turton, Searle, Spruce Grove-Stony Plain (UCP)
van Dijken, Glenn, Athabasca-Barrhead-Westlock (UCP)
Walker, Jordan, Sherwood Park (UCP)
Williams, Dan D.A., Peace River (UCP)
Wilson, Hon. Rick D., Maskwacis-Wetaskiwin (UCP)
Yao, Tany, Fort McMurray-Wood Buffalo (UCP)
Yaseen, Muhammad, Calgary-North (UCP)

Party standings:

United Conservative: 63

New Democrat: 24

Officers and Officials of the Legislative Assembly

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

Executive Council

Jason Kenney	Premier, President of Executive Council, Minister of Intergovernmental Relations
Leela Aheer	Minister of Culture, Multiculturalism and Status of Women
Jason Copping	Minister of Labour and Immigration
Devin Dreeshen	Minister of Agriculture and Forestry
Tanya Fir	Minister of Economic Development, Trade and Tourism
Nate Glubish	Minister of Service Alberta
Grant Hunter	Associate Minister of Red Tape Reduction
Adriana LaGrange	Minister of Education
Jason Luan	Associate Minister of Mental Health and Addictions
Kaycee Madu	Minister of Municipal Affairs
Ric McIver	Minister of Transportation
Dale Nally	Associate Minister of Natural Gas
Demetrios Nicolaides	Minister of Advanced Education
Jason Nixon	Minister of Environment and Parks
Prasad Panda	Minister of Infrastructure
Josephine Pon	Minister of Seniors and Housing
Sonya Savage	Minister of Energy
Rajan Sawhney	Minister of Community and Social Services
Rebecca Schulz	Minister of Children's Services
Doug Schweitzer	Minister of Justice and Solicitor General
Tyler Shandro	Minister of Health
Travis Toews	President of Treasury Board and Minister of Finance
Rick Wilson	Minister of Indigenous Relations

Parliamentary Secretary

Muhammad Yaseen	Parliamentary Secretary of Immigration
-----------------	--

Legislative Assembly of Alberta

9 a.m.

Thursday, May 23, 2019

[The Speaker in the chair]

Prayers

The Speaker: Good morning, members. This morning we will open the House in the same way that the Mother of Parliaments has opened their House for the last number of hundreds of years.

Lord, the God of righteousness and truth, grant to our Queen and her government, to Members of the Legislative Assembly, and to all in positions of responsibility the guidance of Your spirit. May they never lead the province wrongly through love of power, desire to please, or unworthy ideals but, laying aside all private interests and prejudices, keep in mind their responsibilities to seek to improve the condition of all so Your kingdom may come and Your name be hallowed. Amen.

Orders of the Day

The Speaker: The hon. Government House Leader.

Mr. Jason Nixon: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to seek unanimous consent to waive Standing Order 39(1) in order to proceed immediately to debate on Government Motion 8.

[Unanimous consent granted]

Government Motions

Federal Bills C-48 and C-69

8. Mr. Jason Nixon moved:
Be it resolved that the Legislative Assembly call upon the Senate of Canada to reject Bill C-48, which unjustly discriminates against Alberta and prevents the export of its energy through the north coast of British Columbia, and to reject Bill C-69 as originally drafted unless it is comprehensively amended to ensure respect for Alberta's exclusive provincial jurisdiction over its nonrenewable natural resources and to ensure greater certainty for investors in major resource development projects.

Mr. Jason Nixon: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I hope that we will receive the support of all members of the Assembly.

Mrs. Savage: Good morning. This is my first opportunity to speak in the Legislative Assembly as the representative of Calgary-North West, and I couldn't be more pleased that this first opportunity to speak is on Bill C-69 and Bill C-48, two federal bills that would severely impact the oil and gas workers in not only Calgary-North West but across the entire province.

One of my first duties as minister was to join our Premier in addressing the Senate Standing Committee on Transport and Communications on Bill C-48. Two days later I had the privilege of joining the Premier again to address the Senate Standing Committee on Energy, the Environment and Natural Resources, which was tasked with reviewing Bill C-69.

The cumulative impact of these two bills is devastating on Alberta. These bills are so problematic that it is difficult to know where to even start. But let's start with Bill C-48. Antagonistic, discriminatory, divisive, illogical, contributing towards civil instability between provinces, threatening the fabric of the Confederation: this is how Bill C-48 has been described. Like Bill

C-69, the proposed legislation threatens our prosperity and, more alarmingly, our national unity.

Bill C-48 was first introduced by the federal government in 2017 with the purpose of imposing an indefinite ban on tankers and to fill an ill-conceived election campaign platform of the federal Liberals. It was introduced to impose an immediate ban on tankers from stopping, loading, and unloading off B.C.'s north coast. The bill would ban 14 substances, including crude oil, partially upgraded bitumen, diluted bitumen, marine diesel, bunker fuel, and synthetic crude, among others. At the same time, the bill excludes other products more typically from other provinces, including liquefied natural gas, gasoline, jet fuel, and propane. The Senate standing committee, thankfully, voted last week not to proceed with the bill. This defeat remains great news for Alberta and Canada and, as the Premier said, represented a victory for common sense and economic growth. But our fight does not end here. Our battle has not yet been won. We are asking the Senate to adopt the committee report and not proceed with the bill. Bill C-48 must be killed.

Taken as a whole, Bill C-48 adversely affects Alberta's future. When combined with other proposed federal legislation, including Bill C-69, Bill C-48 would severely impact Canada's global competitiveness. For years the U.S. has been Canada's number one oil customer but has become less dependent on us because it has unlocked massive resources of its own. This means that our biggest customer has also become our biggest competitor. The growth markets today are mostly in Asia, which is where our products would fetch their fair market value, but Bill C-48 shuts the door to Alberta's most viable path to those markets as we need access to ports in northwestern B.C. to reach Asia. There is no question that this bill is specifically aimed at land-locking Alberta resources. This becomes clear when considering that there are no similar bans along any other Canadian coastline with equally if not more sensitive marine ecological systems. In a stunning display of hypocrisy oil tankers on Canada's east coast are welcome through the St. Lawrence, the Laurentian Channel, and the environmentally and culturally sensitive Bay of Fundy. Bill C-48 won't apply to those places.

This bill is not an oil tanker ban; it is a ban on Alberta oil. At our appearance before the Senate committee the Premier and I raised a number of concerns with this bill. Chief among them is how this bill is the result of a foreign-funded campaign led by special-interest groups to land-lock Canadian energy. This campaign has brutalized Alberta's economy and harmed Albertans. We will not tolerate this anymore. We will target those campaigns and the groups that spread lies. We told the Senate committee that the bill must be defeated, and if it is not, the government of Alberta will challenge it as being unconstitutional.

Like Bill C-48, the proposed Bill C-69 threatens our prosperity and, more alarmingly, our national unity. It is so problematic that the Senate committee approved 187 amendments to the bill in an attempt to fix the most fundamental flaws. This bill will now be reported back to the Senate for review of the committee's amendments and for third reading before being sent back to the House of Commons. But there is no certainty that the Senate as a whole will accept those amendments, and there's no certainty whatsoever that the Liberal majority in the House of Commons would either.

In its original form Bill C-69 is an obvious and flagrant violation of our constitutional right to regulate and develop our natural resources. Bill C-69, the no more pipelines bill, will do lasting harm to Canada's reputation as a place to do business. The proposed legislation moves the current system of environmental assessment to impact assessment based on sustainability. This means a broadened scope of review to consider types of impact previously

not considered, including a project's contribution to the federal government's commitments on climate change. Changes in assessment requirements and processes will significantly impact Alberta, both as a proponent of large infrastructure projects and as a regulator of development happening in our province.

9:10

Along with the broadened scope, the proposed new process will have significantly longer timelines for approvals. While timelines will depend on the size and nature of a project, for the biggest types of projects, including interprovincial pipelines, we estimate project review timelines will be longer than five years. This is unacceptable as it puts Canada at a competitive disadvantage and well below the average approval times among competing jurisdictions.

Bill C-69 also expands the breadth of reviews to consider social and health impacts as well as gender-based analysis. It's a political process; it's not a quasi-judicial independent process.

But most egregiously Bill C-69 exceeds federal jurisdiction by granting federal powers to regulate provincial projects, including in situ oil sands developments that are entirely within provincial borders and are already subject to stringent provincial regulation. This overreach is also contrary to the Constitution Act and the 1992 Supreme Court of Canada ruling. Bill C-69 ignores exclusive provincial authority over the development of our natural resources under section 92A of the Constitution, a provision in the Constitution that was hard fought for by Premier Lougheed and was a condition of Alberta's signature on the repatriation of the Constitution in 1982.

The federal government has attempted to tie the exclusion of oil sands facilities to having a cap on emissions. No other type of project on the project list is tied to a climate change requirement or a cap. This is arbitrary, and it's a requirement that is absolutely discriminatory towards Alberta. While Alberta is clearly targeted and treated unfairly in this draft project list, some other jurisdictions are actually getting relief. For example, provinces with large mining sectors will now face fewer federal reviews of their projects as thresholds to capture these projects for federal review are significantly increased. This is completely unacceptable to Albertans.

It's obvious that this bill needs more than a couple of minor amendments to be fixed. It needs a massive overhaul. If not, it needs to be put completely out of its misery. To ensure that this message has been broadcast loud and clear, on May 2 the Premier and I presented to the Senate committee to reiterate the need for major changes to this bill, and our efforts are ongoing. If significant changes addressing Alberta's concerns are not reflected in the final version of Bill C-69, an immediate constitutional challenge will be undertaken.

In conclusion, passing this motion is an important step in telling Ottawa that Bill C-48 and Bill C-69 in its present form are not acceptable. We absolutely have to stand up for Alberta's energy sector, for Alberta's economy, but most of all for its people. That's what we are doing, and that's why we are urging unanimous adoption of this motion.

Thank you.

The Speaker: The hon. Member for Lethbridge-West is rising.

Ms Phillips: That's right. There's a country song that says: the west is the best if you know where to go. So now you'll remember, Mr. Speaker.

Okay. I'm going to leave comments on C-48 to the hon. Member for Edmonton-Strathcona and focus my conversation on the Bill C-69 pieces because that is the file with which I am most intimately familiar.

Now, clearly, there is national jurisdiction over large projects, federal jurisdiction over large projects. As a little bit of a story around environmental assessment – I know that everyone is at the edge of their seats – environmental assessment is a shared jurisdiction in Canadian environmental law. There's clear national jurisdiction over large projects. This actually came out of the Oldman River case in the late 1980s. A bunch of people didn't like the provincial government's approach to damming the Oldman River even though it was a necessary project for the growth of irrigation districts in the region, and there was a lot of back-and-forthing. It ended up at the Supreme Court in the early 1990s, and the court found that large projects were, in fact, subject to environmental assessment by the federal government, including the navigable waters test. That's in part how we got here.

And in part how we got here was that over time, environmental assessment captured more and more different kinds of projects, to the point where projects that found themselves on – the list of federal assessment was very long, hundreds of projects long, at any given time period. That was probably too much.

In 2012 the federal government brought in what has come to be known as CEAA 2012, Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012. They omnibused it in with the budget. In part, this was a good thing. It shortened the list of projects that were subject to environmental assessment, but it contributed to an overall sort of zeitgeist of the time, which was an overpoliticization of regulatory processes because the issues at the time didn't have anywhere else to go. So people, citizens used the regulatory process to jam in what didn't really belong there: questions of climate change, of regional sort of land-based effects, which are just very clearly under provincial jurisdictions, the latter anyway. And because there wasn't an overall federal climate plan and not a provincial climate plan, people went through those routes to have their questions answered.

That was unfortunate because it meant that a country that is built on large projects, that is a resource-based country where the responsibility of governments is to get big projects built, in a place where we understand that the rule of law has to mean something, it then came to be that investors couldn't count on that sort of certainty, and that was hugely problematic. So it came to be that many companies didn't like CEAA 2012 either and they did want to see change in the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act. I do recall being in a meeting with the Conservative caucus of Senators, with the chair of the Canadian Chamber of Commerce at the time, who was also a representative of Suncor, and I remember her saying very clearly to them and to any other Senators who would listen: "No. We don't want this bill scrapped. It cannot pass in its current form – there's no question about that – but CEAA 2012 does require a number of significant improvements that must happen for the good of not just the Alberta oil and gas sector but across the country."

Over the course of time in the Bill C-69 debate it became very, very clear that, yes, while this was of crucial importance to Alberta's economic development, Alberta's ability to have market access to ensure that we are continuing to contribute to Canadian growth over all, which, of course, pipelines and other major projects that get built here are also, Mr. Speaker, involved hydro projects, offshore projects. So it wasn't just about Alberta. Just as the climate change conversation is not just about Alberta or not just about the oil sands, so too was Bill C-69. Certainly, resource-based provinces and even not so resource-based provinces such as the province of Quebec, with hydro projects, began to raise eyebrows about the implications of Bill C-69.

Of course, there needed to be changes to Canadian environmental assessment, but – as always in politics: but, but, but – certainly the

federal government did not get it right. Through a series of consultations and papers and so on – the former Minister of Energy and I expressed concerns about, participated in those processes – they did not get it right. The hon. member opposite the Minister of Energy has clearly laid out the concerns with respect to timelines, infringement on jurisdiction. There are a few others that certainly we took issue with, things like a standing test, those sorts of things. Again, going back to my previous point of how we got here, the words “standing test” raised the hackles of many participants in environmental assessment processes, most certainly among indigenous people but others as well.

9:20

Having said that, you cannot have a situation like we saw with Northern Gateway, with a sort of mob-the-mic approach. There needs to be a reasonable balance there. We weren't sure that C-69 at all achieved that balance, and that was just another one of the pieces that, certainly, we wanted to see an amendment to. We worked with the Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers, CEPA, and others to achieve those amendments.

Now, social and economic impact analysis has always been part of environmental assessment. It is incumbent upon a proponent to prove that their project, because it will have significant environmental effect – there's no question that a dam, a hydroelectric project, a mine, these sorts of things, yes, do involve environmental disturbance. There's no question about that. The question for a regulator is around trade-offs and around national interest. There's always been a need for proponents to prepare a social and economic impact assessment of some kind demonstrating the number of jobs, the number of opportunities for local procurement, training. All of this sort of thing has always been involved, and many proponents will include some kind of gender impact analysis. Really, there's no huge issue with that other than engaging in a little bit of light Facebook wedge politics, red meat for the base.

But the issue of taking into account social and economic impact can allow way too much latitude to the minister for making decisions, in our view. That was one of the other issues that we brought to the Senate committee and to the federal government at the time.

On the issue of the in situ overreach, there's no question that in situ, the development of those resources is firmly within provincial jurisdiction, firmly within the AER's sort of purview of review. The issue with in situ is that it also emits greenhouse gas emissions; we also know that that's shared jurisdiction. Certainly, what we need is a recognition that in situ is governed by an appropriate climate plan in Alberta. This is not only sort of smart investment politics as setting that clear set of rules for companies wanting to responsibly develop our resources is key for them to go out into international markets to make sure that our barrels are competitive in a carbon-constrained future. It's not only smart on that side; it's also smart in terms of it keeps the feds out, which was always a goal of mine when I sat on the other side. It also ensures that the responsible development of it remains within provincial jurisdiction. We need recognition of that.

But we also need a climate plan to go along with that to ensure that producers have that answer to the question from investment banks, from funds and so on, institutional investors, who want to be able to answer those questions when they go back to New York or wherever. They need to be able to say: no; Alberta has got this covered. In a world that is taking action on climate change, where you're seeing financial disclosure, where you're seeing climate risk being taken into account by the central banks around the world, this is not a question that's going away, so we need an environmental assessment act that actually responds adequately to those questions.

And, yeah, what it does in the complicated world of environmental decision-making and shared jurisdiction is that it keeps the federal government out.

Now, off we went to make Alberta's case... [An electronic device sounded] What is that? All right. We're good.

The Speaker: Hon. members, if I can just remind everyone to silence or not bring your phones into the Chamber. I sure would appreciate that. I know the hon. member is apologetic.

Ms Phillips: It's the first day, but at the same time – all right.

We made the case, we worked with industry, we worked with a number of folks to make sure that our amendments were thoughtful, that they were substantive, that they answered the basic questions that investors, that producers had here in Alberta. We made sure that they were reasonable and that they reflected the desires of not just Albertans but, more broadly, large industry across Canada.

I should say that there was an entire consensus among industry on Bill C-69, mostly. But the Canadian Mining Association sort of hedged a little bit, and they did want changes, more than, I think, other organizations, to Bill C-69. So we had to engage with them, too, and they engaged through the Canadian chamber as well. Certainly, the Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers was very proactive and helpful in helping us synthesize all of these various amendments because I'm sure, as everyone in this House can appreciate as I saw many eyes glazing over, talking about Canadian environmental assessment, it's not that exciting and it is extremely complicated. We needed to make sure that all of the amendments jibed with one another because they were coming from various different industry groups. So we did that.

When we went and spoke to the Independent Senators Group, something really interesting happened, which was that as soon as we brought up the question of jurisdiction and exclusive jurisdiction over natural resource development, because there is some language that certainly does walk that line within the original draft of C-69, which was what raised all of our red flags, the Quebec Senator stepped right up, which keys us into – you know, there's much more as Canadians that often brings us together than divides us. They were keenly interested in that.

Certainly, when the indigenous Senators had a number of questions, we were able to answer them. When Alberta takes substantive steps towards reconciliation, towards investment in indigenous communities via reinvestment of the climate leadership funds, via reducing our greenhouse gas emissions, via ensuring that we've got co-management of parks, just all of these basic things that are sometimes felt like baby steps in the steps to reconciliation, they actually did matter in terms of the answers given to the Independent Senators Group.

When we did that and when we went through sort of methodically which amendments we wanted to see, something quite extraordinary happened, which is that across sort of various party lines and reasons for being there – you know, in the Senate you've got everything from these, like, washed up old Conservative bagmen to other various political appointees who are just living out their political days, because these are not elected people, right? Some of them aren't really interested in public policy, and that's just the way it is. The Senate is not exactly a place where we've seen the most upstanding examples of service to the public at all. We've seen, in fact, many scandals. But even despite that, you've got some really good people and some people that have been in the news. They all agreed, and they agreed with Alberta's position because we took the position that we needed to do something on this bill. I don't make any apologies for talking about people who expense the taxpayer for all manner of stuff.

Anyway, that meeting went well, and what it allowed the thoughtful Senators who really wanted to dig into files to do was that it allowed them to make a country-building argument. It actually allowed them to exercise what the Senate should be and, I think, really allowed, in Canadian politics anyway, us to turn the page on some of that more unsavoury chapter of Senate history, because they actually did what they were supposed to do, which is to look through a bill, discuss it with the stakeholders, make reasonable amendments, actually, you know, read stuff and not just file expense claims. They did what they needed to do. They were the sober second thought in this case, and I think that's a real bright spot for democracy. I don't know if having independence mattered.

The Speaker: Members, questions and comments under 29(2)(a)? Seeing none, the hon. Member for Central Peace-Notley.

Mr. Loewen: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Yes, I would like to stand today and speak in favour of Government Motion 8, which seeks to

call upon the Senate of Canada to reject Bill C-48, which unjustly discriminates against Alberta and prevents the export of its energy through the north coast of British Columbia . . .

And it also seeks to ask the Senate

. . . to reject Bill C-69 as originally drafted unless it is comprehensively amended to ensure respect for Alberta's exclusive provincial jurisdiction over its nonrenewable natural resources and to ensure greater certainty for investors in major resource [developments].

Mr. Speaker, I think that's something we need to remember. We need to have certainty in our markets here in Alberta if we expect to have the investment that we need to create jobs.

9:30

Now, recently the Senate committee voted to defeat Bill C-48, what we call the tanker ban, but, of course, this vote still has to go to the Senate. It's too bad that we weren't able to stop this in the House of Commons before it got to the Senate, but here we are at this point right now. This is despite the fact that we've had decades of safe shipping of oil in the B.C. waters.

What's also interesting is that they have exempted certain products to be shipped, like LNG tankers to be operating on that same coast, so this is definitely a discriminatory piece of legislation that discriminates against Alberta's oil. Of course, we know the importance of Alberta oil not only to Alberta and to jobs in Alberta but of course all of Canada. This is all about stopping the oil from Alberta, and it's about land-locking our oil. Of course, this land-locking operation is something that's supported by anti-oil activists. These activists are not our friends. They're not people that are here to support Albertans, to support Alberta, or to support Canada. They have an ideology that precludes them from wanting to see us have success in our own province here.

Even within Canada we seem to see a bit of a double standard here, where we have oil moving into Canada on our east coast, and there seems to be no problem with that. This oil is coming from other countries with nowhere near the environmental and safety regulations that we have here in Alberta, so it's unfortunate that we have this situation where we have a government of Canada wanting to restrict the flow of our oil out in an export market to other jurisdictions so that we can benefit here in Canada and here in Alberta, but we seem to be welcoming oil coming from other parts of the world to our east coast.

Now, of course, we also know that Alaska still ships oil along the west coast, still moving oil up and down the coast, but of course there's no problem with that. Nobody's protesting that. Nobody's trying to stop that. But here we have our own government here in

Canada wanting to restrict that flow of oil from leaving our country and benefiting us right here.

We know that there's a world oil demand. We know that that isn't going away soon, and the best thing that we can do is have our socially responsible oil that's produced right here in Alberta be taken around the world. We have the highest safety standards, the highest environmental standards, the highest human rights records here in Alberta and in Canada, so the best thing we can do for oil and for the world on all these issues is to produce as much oil as we can right here in Alberta and get it to those world markets and displace that oil that's produced in jurisdictions that are nowhere near as safe, environmentally friendly, or have the human rights records that we have.

Again, this isn't about protecting our environment. If it was about protecting our environment, we would be trying to get these projects done, but, of course, we have a government that seems to think that its job is to obstruct rather than facilitate this process, and that's where we have a huge problem. We seem to have a government that seems to want to cater to special-interest groups. Those interest groups don't have our interests in mind. They have their own ideology, their own plans, and whatever that is. Apparently, they want to land-lock our resources, and that's not in our best interests. It's not in the best interests of Albertans. We need to stand up and fight against these things like this – Bill C-48, Bill C-69 – that are here to obstruct our opportunities here in Alberta and of course all of Canada because when Alberta succeeds, so does all of Canada.

Now, we talk about Bill C-69 here. Some people say that it was maybe well intentioned, but if it was so well intentioned, I just don't know why there were so many mistakes with it. We're sitting here now. I think the Senate has about 70 amendments they want to put forward on this bill. Obviously, it's deeply flawed, and it needs a lot of work. Again, we're sitting at this point here, you know, where it seems like we're working from behind on this issue. But we've got to work with the Senate, and we need to be able to either get this massive number of amendments done or get this bill pulled. It's either one or the other because it's unacceptable the way it is.

Now, of course, it seeks to overhaul the National Energy Board and the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency and change how major projects are reviewed and approved in Canada. According to the Canadian Energy Pipeline Association they said that, quote, it is difficult to imagine that a new major pipeline could be built in Canada under the impact assessment act. This is what's being proposed here. Obviously, an organization like that, they have opinions on these things because this is what they do for a living. This is their industry, and they know what they need to do to operate, and, of course, this bill here was going to restrict those opportunities. I know we identified this, and the UCP identified this as a massive problem the day it came out, which was February 8, 2018. By contrast the NDP Alberta government at the time didn't speak out until after C-69 passed the House of Commons. That's why we're in this situation here where we're trying to get things stopped in the Senate, where we hopefully could've had something done while it was in the House of Commons. That's why we need to be fighting. We should've been united in Alberta fighting this right from the start, right from February 2018.

Now what this does, what Bill C-69 does, is that it makes a complicated system even more complicated. We've seen what happened with the Trans Mountain pipeline. Over five years of work, over a billion dollars, and now we had the federal government buy it out for – what? – four and a half billion dollars? And we're sitting here a year later, and we still have not one bit of progress on that pipeline. It's absolutely astounding to think that with the system we have now and the problems that we've had in trying to

get a pipeline built, now we want to have Bill C-69 come along and make that system even more complicated. It's obviously unacceptable. We can't have situations go on like this.

Obviously, if we want to attract investment to Alberta, if we want to attract investment to Canada, if we want to have projects like this continue – and let's be clear, these projects, these aren't government projects, these are private industries that want to come and spend their money to help create jobs here in Alberta and help develop our resources. This isn't government money, this isn't taxpayer money; these are private investors who want to come here, and they want to help us out. Of course, they want to make a return on their investment, and that's why we can't have them sitting for years and years and years with billions of dollars tied up with no chance and no sight on the horizon as far as an opportunity to get some sort of return on their investment.

Now, again I'll mention that the Senate has come up with about 70 amendments. Obviously, this bill is deeply flawed. I guess it would be humorous if it wasn't so serious, the situation, an acronym called a BANANA law, and that stands for build absolutely nothing anywhere near anything. That's the situation we have here, where we have a bill that wants to slow down and stop any kind of production here in Alberta and Canada. It definitely violates our Constitution. This is provincial jurisdiction. We have the right to regulate and develop our resources. There's some discussion back and forth on the size of projects and that sort of thing, but obviously this is something we need to stand up and we need to fight for. We need to stop these two bills. We need to put up a fight because it's important. It's not only important for Alberta and for Albertans and for jobs for Albertans, but it's also important for the Canadian economy.

Again, this creates uncertainty for industry. If we talk about wanting to refine our resources here and everything, and any time we have a company or people from outside the country that want to come in here and invest, if they wanted to do a big project here and they see what's happening here in this situation with something like Bill C-69 and what happened with Trans Mountain, they are so less likely to want to invest in Alberta because of these things. I think what we need to do – it's really simple. Government should be here to facilitate these things and not obstruct these things.

So with that, I just want to say I support this Government Motion 8. We need to pass this, and we need to keep the pressure on the federal government and on the Senate to do what's right with these two bills. Thank you.

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

Seeing none, the Member for Edmonton-Strathcona and the Leader of Her Majesty's Official Opposition.

9:40

Ms Notley: Well, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and let me begin, of course, by taking this opportunity, where this is my first opportunity to speak on the record, to congratulate you on your new position.

I rise today, of course, to speak to this motion regarding the federal bills C-69 and C-48. Like previous speakers, I want to begin by of course suggesting that I am in favour of passing that motion because, quite clearly, when it comes to these two federal bills, the people of this province have been very loud and clear, and they have been loud and clear for some time. Bill C-48, the so-called tanker ban, is a vague and discriminatory piece of legislation that, quite frankly, just needs to be done away with completely. It is beyond fixing, Mr. Speaker. Bill C-69, the so-called no more pipelines law: well, that too needs a very significant rewrite, and it is as simple as that.

Of course, I want to begin by saying that I'm pleased that the hon. Premier has moved from his position of simply suggesting we need to eliminate Bill C-69 to accepting the suite of amendments that we put in to the Senate when we were in government and essentially endorsing that path forward. I'll talk a little bit more about that in a moment.

These bills are significantly difficult bills. They're troubling to the people of Alberta, and they represent a significant risk to Alberta jobs and to the Alberta economy overall. More than that, they represent a significant risk to jobs across this country, and they represent a significant risk to the Canadian economy, so that was why when we were in government we did a tremendous amount of work to try to have these bills either rejected or significantly amended. My colleague, the Member for Lethbridge-West, from whom you just heard, in her time when she served as the minister of environment, and also the former Minister of Energy, our former MLA for the riding of Central Peace-Notley – I guess I can say her name now, Marg McCuaig-Boyd – did a tremendous amount of work over some time advocating to the federal government and then subsequently to the Senate about the problems with respect to these pieces of legislation, as did many people in our public service – I also want to offer my thanks to them for their support and their advocacy with respect to this issue – as of course did many, many other leaders in Alberta's civil society fight very hard against these bills and continue to, whether it be industry leaders, whether it be municipal leaders, whether it be leaders from indigenous communities. They all came together to outline the significant concerns with respect to these bills.

We assembled numerous position papers, Mr. Speaker. We made assertions for clarity, and we presented, as I said, a suite of comprehensive amendments to the Senate. In short, what we all did was that we came together to speak often and always in favour of the future of Alberta's energy industry, to protect it, in essence, from the consequences of these two horribly misguided and broken bills. I was pleased myself to be able to go to Ottawa to speak to the Senate on Bill C-69, and I was also pleased because initially, you may recall, when the Senate was going to consider Bill C-48, the original plan was that they were not going to come to Alberta. I don't know if many of you remember that. The plan was that they were going to pop by B.C., interestingly, but they didn't think it would make that much sense to pop by Alberta. We quickly raised the alarm on that and outlined the fairly obvious reasons for why maybe they might want to pop by Alberta and talk to the people who were directly affected and impacted by the rather discriminatory nature of Bill C-48. So they did, and I think that that actually helped quite a bit.

[The Deputy Speaker in the chair]

I have heard from Senators who would not necessarily have considered the consequences of C-48 had they not heard not only from people in Alberta's energy industry but other community leaders from Alberta who talked about why the people of Alberta were so offended by what C-48 represented. I was very pleased that that was able to happen, and as well, of course, like many in this Assembly, I was pleased when we saw that some of our advocacy has had at least an interim success as it relates to the results of the two committees that were considering those bills and their recommendations to the rest of the Senate.

We saw, of course, as you know, the Senate committee that was considering C-48 do an outright recommendation that it not go any further, essentially demonstrating what I would suggest is the soberest second thought we have seen out of the Senate for some time. As well, we saw the transportation committee review and

adopt a series of very comprehensive amendments to C-69, and they will be sending that back to the Senate.

I want to say that this is because we all came together with a very simple message, and it's basically this: if Alberta is going to continue to do what it does for the rest of Canada, if Alberta is going to continue to drive economic growth throughout this country, if we are going to continue to contribute to the schools and the hospitals and the roads, which actually you see throughout the country of Canada, if we are going to be able to continue to do that and to keep Canadians across this country employed in many ways, then we are going to have to have a federal government that works with us and that understands the import of the Alberta economy and we need a federal government that works for Alberta.

That has been, of course, the position that we have taken in this caucus, whether we were in government or in the role that we serve now, and it will continue to be that we basically need the federal government to work with us on pipelines, that we need the federal government to work with us on energy policy, and that we need the federal government to work with us on the environment because as Canadians, as I've said, we all share in the prosperity that these resources bring.

When I went and presented on Bill C-48, I actually had an opportunity to bring people with us to actually enhance that case, so I invited two workers, Angela and Roger, who came with me when I spoke to the Senate in Calgary. They talked a little bit about their history as people who worked within the energy industry. While they were both from Calgary, they both actually had come from other parts of the country, and they'd lived, in fact, all over the country, working in the energy sector, so they provided a tremendous picture to members of the Senate of what Canadians from coast to coast to coast who depend on our energy sector look like and what they think and what that bill meant to them.

I was pleased that we were able to make some of those points, and we were able to make as well the point that if we as Albertans are faced with a series of legislative actions, whether it be in other provinces or whether it be federal, that we will not just take it lying down, that we will come together in order to not only protect our interests as Albertans but to protect our interests as Canadians. So that's what we did.

We didn't approach it by ranting and raving, Madam Speaker. What we did instead was we rolled up our sleeves, and we went in, did our homework, we talked to industry, we talked to all these folks, we talked about what the most pragmatic and meaningful and evidence-based amendments would look like and what kind of work had to be done. We developed consensus, and we worked collaboratively because that's what you do when you work as a province which is part of a nation like ours. We looked for Alberta solutions, and that is what we presented because it's also our view that we cannot simply have Bill C-69 disappear and have it replaced with the broken system that we had in the past.

It is important, as we have seen with the wrangling over the last four years, that we have public trust from indigenous communities, from communities that are also rightly – rightly – concerned about environmental issues. We cannot, Madam Speaker, fall back 10 years to a time where we demonized people for the very act of raising legitimate concerns about the safety of our air and our land and our water.

9:50

What we have to do is understand that we are faced with two competing challenges. One challenge is to position our energy industry such that we can expand our markets, expand the demand for our product, be smarter about how we market our product, get it there faster and cheaper. That's one challenge. On the other hand,

we must also face the challenge which is presented to us by climate change, which is impacting people across the world as a result, and also the challenge that we face here in Alberta as a result of climate change and the consequences of climate change, and also other environmental issues that arise from the work that we do in our energy sector.

These are things that governments are elected to do. Governments aren't elected to do the easy thing. It's not black and white being in government. It's not like, "Oh, hey, we're going to turn this dial and make everyone rich" or "We're going to walk away and make everyone poor." Those are not the decisions that we make, Madam Speaker. We are elected to find a balance and to forge through difficult challenges. That's what the new members over there are going to have to work on. That's what we were working on, and that is the message that we've been taking to all Canadians for the last four years.

It's fundamentally important, then, that all of this be taken into consideration. Bill C-69 is the flawed product of an attempt to go too far the other way, but we cannot fall back into this search for easy solutions where we then flip back the other way. What we need to do is fix C-69, and that's why I'm pleased that so many of the amendments that were the product of much consultation, much research, much scientific study were the amendments that actually found their way to being approved by the Senate committee. Hopefully, we will see that move forward.

Let me just talk a little bit about what we were looking for with respect to Bill C-69. I won't go through all of them because it was rather lengthy, and I was trying to find a way to reduce my submissions to something that could be talked about in a relatively short time. In essence, we said that, first of all, what we need are clear exemptions for in situ, for interprovincial pipelines, for all generating units using natural gas, renewables, and petrochemicals. We said to the Senate and we have said to the federal government that we already have a system for oversight of these projects within our borders. We probably have the most developed system of oversight for these kinds of projects within our borders here in Alberta in relation to anywhere else in the rest of the country as well as very possibly anywhere else on the continent, so we don't need other people getting involved in that. We don't need a back-seat regulator, is what we said.

We also said, as many other people have already commented, that we have to get rid of all the vague language. We need certainty. That's very clear. We told Ottawa: listen, we've already spent over a decade in court over multiple efforts to build energy and major, major national infrastructure projects. We don't want to – you know, the only people that are going to make money off of C-69 the way it's currently written are lawyers because we could easily generate another 20 years of court cases trying to figure out what the heck half of the language that exists in the first version of C-69 means. We said: don't do that. I mean, I'm a fan of lawyers. As you know, I am one. But at the end of the day, I really think that we can find other ways to make our own living, and in the meantime we need to provide clarity and certainty to investors and definition for what their rights are, and that is what needed to be changed in C-69 so that we didn't enhance and exacerbate the problem that already existed.

The third thing that was pretty critical that we talked about was strict timelines. We needed to fix the issue of timelines so that there weren't a whole bunch of loopholes that could trigger and retrigger the process around project reviews. With the way C-69 works in its current form, there were way too many opportunities for game playing with respect to timeline loopholes.

Finally, we also said that the federal government and the Senate needed to recognize the work that we had done under Alberta's

climate leadership plan and that the work done under Alberta's climate leadership plan should be seen as sufficient for the federal government to keep its nose out of our environmental business because, in fact, we were already leading the country with respect to comprehensive work to address climate change issues as they are related to the work within our energy industry.

[The Speaker in the chair]

Contrary to what many members over there may believe, there was much more to our climate leadership plan than a price on carbon. We had a plan to phase out coal-fired production. We had a robust strategy for reducing methane, which, of course, is a far more problematic substance to the matter of climate change than even carbon. And we had, as you know, put on the 100-megatonne cap on oil sands emissions, therefore delinking the matter of climate change from the conversation around energy infrastructure, construction, and investment. So those also were the points that we made.

Now, although we know that the members opposite are very keen to get rid of the plan to price carbon, I certainly hope that they do not also remove these other elements of our plan – the methane reduction, the emissions cap, and the plan to roll back and phase out coal-fired pollution – because these are the kinds of things that, quite frankly, give comfort to Canadians from coast to coast to coast that, in fact, Alberta is a jurisdiction that they can count on to do what is necessary to find that fine balance, that relationship between a robust, sustainable energy industry and, on the other hand, the need to think beyond the six-month or the 12-month or even the four-year election cycle and instead think about the future of our climate and our air and our land and our water. So I would suggest that these are the ways that we were able to focus on Bill C-69 and make the kinds of changes that were necessary.

Now, with respect to Bill C-48 I've already heard some of the comments that folks opposite have made, and I think they've really touched on the critical elements of C-48 that were problematic. It is in effect a ban on Alberta energy products – no question about it – and it was irritating as heck to see something like that be put forward by the federal government with so little consideration for the consequences and implications for Canada's energy industry. It was a ban that overreached – far overreached – and there was not a scientific, research-, evidence-based linkage between the ban and the issues that the legislation was theoretically designed to address.

It was also and continues to be a bill that is, I would suggest, both hypocritical and inconsistent. You know, we can't have double-, triple-hull tankers that contain partially upgraded bitumen, but we can have LNG tankers, and we can also have whatever the U.S. decides to put in a boat in Alaska and ship right down through the same shipping corridor. That makes no sense.

What was even more offensive to me, quite honestly, which I have heard mentioned by other members here, was the east-coast versus west-coast dynamic. Here we are in Alberta unable to get our products to Ontario, to Quebec, to Atlantic Canada, and we see Quebec and Atlantic Canada importing petrochemical products from other jurisdictions, putting the very kinds of products into tankers that would potentially be banned on the west coast, but it's okely-dokely for them to sail up the east coast and down the St. Lawrence because they happen to need those energy products.

It is utterly hypocritical, and more than that, separate and apart from how frustrated that makes Albertans – it's not a small amount of frustration, we all know – it's just bad nation building. It's bad governance. You know, as much as we think of ourselves as being sort of the centre of the world sometimes, the reality is that Canada is a very small country in a very big world. As a nation we need to

act strategically when it comes to selling our products and exploiting the potential of our resources, and we are acting the opposite of strategically right now. We are buying products from other jurisdictions and saying no to our products and limiting our ability to expand to other markets. When you pull it all together, it really is – and this was a phrase that I used when I was speaking to the Senate committee – a stampede of stupid. It truly is, and it needs to not go forward.

10:00

I will say that we should therefore make sure that we do not move forward with Bill C-48, that we have to essentially keep our options open. You know, we have three pipelines right now that are in various stages of approval and, well, hopefully, someday construction. Two of them we have no agency over; we just have to rely on the good graces of the United States. The third one: we all know the story with that one. The idea that we would then close off any other opportunities, to me, is very short-sighted.

As well, the final thing I would say about C-48 is that I do believe it was profoundly disrespectful to Canada's indigenous people and that it simply didn't reflect the level of consultation that those indigenous communities who have an interest in our oil and gas resources deserve to have had before their ability to take advantage of that was shut off. That is what C-48 proposes to do, and that's why we also believe that that was another reason for it to be rejected.

In closing, let me just say that while we are cautiously optimistic about the progress with C-69 and the progress with C-48 and while we hope that C-69 will be amended in alignment with the proposals that we put forward and while we hope that C-48 is completely iced – those are all good things – let me say that for the members on this side of the House, we believe that Canadians are going to expect that we must also take seriously our responsibility to the environment. We will also have to take seriously our responsibility as it relates to doing actual things to fight climate change. I was quite distressed a couple of days ago to hear the new environment minister suggest that climate change is not really a crisis, it's not an emergency, and that we're just going to talk about it for a while. I would suggest that that's what we were doing 20 years ago. Now is not the time to go back to that.

I would also suggest that we are, in fact, part of a bigger country and that we need to be conscious of what people are thinking about these issues outside of our borders. If we are going to nation build as opposed to nation divide for the sake of politics, then what we must do is we have to hear Canadians on these issues as well. Those Canadians that we have to hear would include the thousands of young people that were marching just a couple of weeks ago, even in Alberta, to talk about how concerned they are about the matters of climate change.

Once again, I would urge the members opposite, even as we will be talking about their Bill 1 – if you want to go ahead and stop carbon pricing, well, have at 'er. I mean, there are numerous conservatives not only in Canada but around the world who actually believe that carbon pricing is the most effective way to combat climate change. Yeah, do your thing. But to stop all work on combating climate change is profoundly irresponsible, and it will be a legacy about which none of your grandchildren will be very proud. We, frankly, have an obligation to all Canadians to keep working on this world-wide problem. I would suggest that if we are going to have Canadians come with us on the matters of C-69 and C-48, which I think they should, then we must also hear them on these other issues. We must also hear our kids on these other issues, and we absolutely must not demonize or attack any Albertan or any Canadian who wants to raise their concerns on these other issues.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to end my comments and again offer my support for this motion. Thank you.

The Speaker: Hon. members, questions and comments under Standing Order 29(2)(a) are available.

Seeing none, the Member for Calgary-West.

Mr. Ellis: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Let me again be one of the ones to congratulate you on your election as well as your two colleagues. It certainly was a remarkable day yesterday and certainly has been a remarkable past month, of course, with the election and the people of Alberta speaking very loud and clear as to what they would like going into the future. I'd also like to take a moment here to thank the new Minister of Energy for her words in speaking in regard to this motion that is being brought forward against Bill C-48 and Bill C-69. Certainly, her expertise in that particular role, I think, in my opinion, is second to none and something that will be valued in this Legislature and outside of this Chamber.

The motion, which talks about, of course, rejecting Bill C-48 and Bill C-69, I think is something that is very important not only to the people in this Chamber. It's nice to see the opposition supporting this motion, at least based upon many of the comments that I've heard. I think that is a good sign, we'll say, going forward.

I also want to touch a little bit on what the Minister of Energy talked about when she mentioned C-48 and talked about antagonistic, discriminatory, and, in fact, a bill that is considered illogical. I'm not going to talk from the perspective of somebody who's going to pretend to be an expert on the oil and gas industry. I'm not. I'm a citizen like everybody else in this room, a police officer by trade. Others in here are butchers and farmers and social workers. But I think we need to talk from a perspective of the people, the people whom we represent.

I think everybody here, at least everybody here on the government side, can talk about recent door-knocking, talking to people in the community, talking to constituents of mine in Calgary-West, talking to constituents outside of Calgary-West when I assisted others in door-knocking. The disappointments and – I think I'm very kind by saying that – I would almost argue the anger of people in Calgary against Bill C-48, against Bill C-69 is something that really can almost not be measured. This is really something that is about – and I know our Premier has talked about this before – national unity. We're a generous people, as the Premier has stated, but, you know, we're not going to continue to be kicked around like a football, and we're going to be in a position where we are going to let Ottawa know that these bills are unacceptable for our oil and gas industry.

Now, the Leader of the Opposition talked about ranting and raving. I haven't seen ranting and raving. What I have seen is people that want somebody to defend them, somebody they want to stand up and say that they're going to defend their oil and gas industry, and they're going to defend their jobs. That's not ranting and raving. That's just letting the people in Ottawa know that they're not going to be taken advantage of anymore, because that's what it sort of feels like.

10:10

We Albertans, you know, we're generous people. We supply the federal government with these transfer payments, and all we've ever asked for is fairness. Fairness. That's not too much to ask from Ottawa or anybody else in Canada. So when we feel like we're not being treated fairly, it's not about ranting and raving; it's about defending, defending our province, defending the people who we represent, and that – that – is not something that is unreasonable.

When we talk about those who are opposed to our oil and gas industry here in Alberta, my experience is that sometimes you just can't negotiate with people who refuse to negotiate. That's a challenge. That's a challenge that many people that are in forms of negotiation face.

Now, I come from a very unique position where myself, along with our Minister of Transportation and, in fact, our new minister, our Associate Minister of Mental Health and Addictions, was also part of a previous government. I remember being in caucus when the Premier at the time, God rest his soul, Premier Jim Prentice walked in, and he said, "Ladies and gentlemen, we're in trouble." Eyes light up. "What do you mean, sir?" "We have now become the largest supplier of oil and gas to the United States, and people are mad. People are very mad." Saudi Arabians were mad. Other oil suppliers were mad. We had just done what we always do in Alberta. We put our heads down. We work hard. We don't ask for handouts. All we do is go to work, and that work created an industry that, in my opinion and I think the opinion of everybody else for sure on the government side, was second to none. Technologies used everywhere around the world, experience, personnel: again, second to none.

So when the Premier at the time said that we were in trouble, that is what really got my attention as just a normal Albertan as to the concerted effort amongst those who oppose our oil and gas industry, on how they collaborated to really drive down the price of oil. Remember, we don't have control. We in Canada don't have control over OPEC. I mean, this is a group of individuals who really decide, you know, what the price of oil is going to be, and that's not something that we in Alberta have any control of. And we saw that. We saw the oil price purposely coming down. Why was that? Well, it's because for us in Alberta, it probably – I'm no expert on this, but I'm going to hazard a guess that it's probably in the realm of \$30, give or take, to extract a barrel of oil out of the ground. For other countries, not so much. For other countries, I've heard \$8, \$9 a barrel to extract the oil out of the ground. Well, that's a big difference.

How can we hurt the industry here in Alberta? Well, if we drive down the price of oil, it makes it challenging for these companies to operate. Then we saw what happened. We saw what happened. We saw our oil industry be devastated over the last four years, and then there was a doubling down of issues, a doubling down of regulations, bills such as these, C-48, C-69, coined as the antipipeline bill. It's not coined as the pro-industry bill. It's coined as the antipipeline bill. That should be telling everybody something right now as we sit here in this Chamber.

I, of course, support this motion, support the motion to reject C-48, to reject C-69. Let those in Ottawa, let those in that government know that we are not going to take this anymore. It's not about ranting and raving, but it is about defending the people whom we represent, and I cannot stress that enough. It was made perfectly clear during the last election that they, meaning the people of Alberta, wanted a government to represent them and defend them in Ottawa, not agree with everything that the Prime Minister says. Certainly, we will try to reason, we will try to do our best to talk, but it's very clear, when you see bills like this, C-48 and C-69, this is not something that requires some sort of amendment, as was previously tried by others. As our Premier has stated, this is something that requires if not the complete, absolute rejection of the bills then, at minimum, absolute reconstructive surgery of these bills. I cannot stress the importance of the national unity component, of making sure that we are together on this motion, that we let everyone in Ottawa know that we are unified in rejecting Bill C-48, rejecting Bill C-69.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to add one more thing if I do have any time left. I want to talk about the responsible oil that was developed here in Alberta to the highest standards – highest standards – in the world, technology that, I would say, is second to none. We have human rights standards which, I believe, are second to none. When you have companies like some of the major companies that have left Alberta to go to places like Qatar, Venezuela, other countries that have less human rights standards, less standards for employees, less standards when it comes to environmental records – we were not the embarrassing cousin. We were the leaders. We were the leaders in this industry, and we were a threat, and that is why there was a co-ordinated effort to go after Alberta. I'm proud to say that I am part of a group of individuals that are going to stand up on behalf of the people of Alberta, on behalf of the constituents that have asked to elect me for a third time in this Legislature to say no to Bill C-48, to say no to Bill C-69, to say no to anything that is going to hinder our oil and gas industry from, really, becoming once again the leaders in the world.

Mr. Speaker, I'm just going to close by saying thank you. Thank you for the opportunity to speak on this issue. Thank you to my colleagues for all being here today, for letting people in Canada know, for letting the world know that Bill C-48, Bill C-69 need to be rejected by those who are in positions of authority at the moment, which is in front of the Senate. We need to let Ottawa know, under the current government, that we are not going to take this anymore. We are not going to accept these types of bills in the future.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for this time.

10:20

The Speaker: Hon. members, Standing Order 29(2)(a) is available for questions and comments.

Seeing none, the Member for Calgary-McCall.

Mr. Sabir: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and congratulations on your election.

It's my pleasure to rise today to speak to this motion regarding federal bills C-48 and C-69. The content of these bills is critical to the livelihoods of hundreds of thousands of Albertans and, in fact, Canadians across this country. It is particularly important for those in Calgary, who were hit the hardest when commodity prices fell in 2015.

[The Deputy Speaker in the chair]

There is no question where Calgarians or Albertans stand on these bills. We have a vested interest in having a strong economy that includes everyone, that offers opportunities for everyone, an economy where prosperity is shared fairly and more equitably, an economy that can support a cutting-edge school system for our youth, an economy that can support publicly funded and publicly delivered universal health care, and an economy that creates conditions for the full inclusion of those who are differently abled.

We also have a vested interest in protecting the environment for ourselves, for our children, and for our future generations. That is why, Madam Speaker, our leader has been very clear from day one that environment and economy can and must go hand in hand. She has been very clear that the respect for indigenous rights and the economy can and must go hand in hand.

We know that we have taken steps to address climate issues, we have taken steps to address indigenous rights issues, and we know that Albertans will not stand by while Ottawa tries to kneecap Alberta's energy industry. Albertans won't stand for it, and neither will we. In fact, when we were in government, we fought hard against this, against these bills. The Senate committee's rejection of Bill C-48, the tanker ban, is a direct result of the hard work of our

leader, the former Premier. This was an important step in the right direction, but we are not out of the woods yet. We still need the full Senate and the House of Commons to reject Bill C-48 and make substantial improvements to Bill C-69 as laid out by our leader and our former environment minister, the MLA for Lethbridge-West. When she was Premier, the hon. Leader of the Opposition fought diligently against the federal government's punishing tanker ban, a ban we all know is targeted at Alberta's resources.

On that note, I would also like to thank our newly elected government for joining us in the fight to get our resources to market and to stop the federal government's attempt to ban Alberta's oil. I think it's safe to say that we agree that the so-called tanker ban is not about marine traffic. It's not even about tankers. If it were, B.C. LNG tankers wouldn't be allowed to travel freely off the west coast. It's as clear as a prairie sky that this is about banning Alberta oil from reaching new markets. We have known for a long time now that we can no longer count on simply selling our resources to one market, the American market. They were our biggest customers; now they are our biggest competitors. But for some reason successive federal Conservative governments have failed to build a pipeline to move Alberta's resources. Our new Premier was a federal cabinet minister and failed, when he was in Ottawa, to get a pipeline to tidewater. In fact, in this House he said – and I paraphrase – that he was not responsible for the pipelines.

Our current federal government promised to fix their broken system and, instead, put forward these two bills designed to increase the land lock on Alberta resources. Now more than ever we need to access new markets to support good-paying jobs and investments in Alberta. That is why our government and our leader made the critical decision to get our oil moving by rail, 120,000 barrels' worth a day. Our rail deal would have helped keep folks working until Ottawa gets the pipeline mess sorted out, but it was never and should not be considered a long-term solution. There is only one solution, pipelines, but pipelines won't make a difference if we can't move them past the coast.

Albertans elected this government in the hopes that they would be able to finally get a pipeline and, with it, jobs. It is in everyone's interest that they succeed in this pursuit, and I truly hope they do. I hope that by repealing our climate leadership plan, they don't put the pipeline in jeopardy. I hope that by turning back the clock on environmental protections, on the emission cap, on the emission reductions, they don't lose the support of Canadians, that our government fought so hard to earn. Above all, this fight, the one we are all joined in here, is for the people of Alberta. There aren't many Albertans who were not affected by the historic economic downturn. The drop in the global price of oil took a big toll on working people and had ripple effects throughout our province and our country.

Here in Alberta we are blessed with an extremely valuable natural resource, a resource in demand across the world right now and for years to come, a resource that helped build this country and has improved the well-being of every Albertan and every Canadian. That resource is pulled from the ground by women and men who make good, family-supporting wages. Those wages support strong communities where working people can build good, secure lives, where all Albertans flourish. That resource funds strong public services like public health care, education, and services for vulnerable Albertans. These are things that connect us and give us hope for the future.

Over the last four years, that resource was pulled from the ground in conjunction with North America's most ambitious and comprehensive climate plan, a plan that made Alberta a world leader and one of the world's most responsible energy producers, a plan that secured the approval of the Trans Mountain pipeline

expansion project and put Alberta in a strong position to protect our constitutional rights to regulate our own resources against attacks like Bill C-48 and Bill C-69, a plan that won over the hearts and minds of Canadians and increased national support for a new pipeline to tidewater, a plan that generated strong enough national support for a new pipeline that we were able to compel Ottawa to buy Trans Mountain when investors pulled out, a plan that gave our industry the competitive edge that it needed to sell our product in an increasingly lower carbon global economy. Our government proved that you can protect the environment, take leading action on climate change, and grow our economy at the same time.

We cannot afford to go backwards. There is too much at stake and too much to lose. We need to defend the things that make Alberta one of the best places on Earth to live, work, and raise a family and to fight for an Alberta and Canada that works for everyone.

With that, I will be supporting this motion. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

10:30

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 29(2)(a), are there any comments or questions?

Seeing none, the hon. Premier.

Mr. Kenney: Thank you so much, Madam Deputy Speaker. Let me begin by congratulating you on your election to the chair.

Let me also begin, as these are my first words in the 30th Legislature, with an expression of deep gratitude for my Calgary-Lougheed constituents for having given me the honour of representing them in this place for the second time. Let me congratulate all members from both sides of the House on their election, and let me reinforce my hope that we can work together, wherever possible finding common ground. I not only acknowledge but applaud the opposition for having to discharge its constitutional obligation to hold the government to account and to oppose, I hope more often constructively. But on this it is, I think, felicitous that we are beginning the history of this, the 30th Assembly, on a point of common accord, of shared defence of Alberta's vital economic interests.

As Her Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor said in the Speech from the Throne yesterday, our province has gone through a time of adversity, and it is essential for us to work together to reignite Alberta's economy and to defend our vital interests. That is why we have proposed this motion to begin this session of the Legislature.

Be it resolved that the Legislative Assembly call upon the Senate of Canada to reject Bill C-48, which unjustly discriminates against Alberta and prevents the export of its energy through the north coast of British Columbia, and to reject Bill C-69 as originally drafted unless it is comprehensively amended to ensure respect for Alberta's exclusive provincial jurisdiction over its nonrenewable natural resources and to ensure greater certainty for investors in major resource development projects.

I understand that the Official Opposition intends to support this motion, for which I would like to thank them. More specifically, I would like to thank the hon. Leader of the Opposition and former Premier for having cosigned a letter from the leaders of Alberta's four main political parties on May 17, last week, which was sent to every member of the Canadian Senate. This was also cosigned by the leader of the Alberta Party and the Alberta Liberal Party, so four parties which collectively won the votes of some 98 per cent of Albertans in an election where there were more voters than any in our history. So, Madam Speaker, this is a powerful expression of consensus. We may have – I don't know – perhaps some small, nuanced differences on aspects of these bills, but fundamentally we

are united speaking for Albertans as Team Alberta, sending a clear message to Ottawa: stop these attacks on this province, on its economic future, on our vital economic interests, on jobs, on our way of life; stop undermining national unity; stop damaging the province that has done so much to create wealth and opportunity for people from coast to coast.

Madam Speaker, we Albertans should be enormously proud of what we have achieved. As Her Honour said in the throne speech, there are very few societies on the face of the Earth that have seen greater economic and social progress than has Alberta in the past century, and much of that progress was thanks to our ability to develop responsibly the endowment nature of our natural resources. We as Albertans are blessed beyond compare to have inherited the third-largest recoverable oil reserves on Earth, the fourth-largest recoverable natural gas reserves on Earth. We are the fourth-largest exporter of crude oil in the world. And if we were unleashed, if we could knock down the constraints and the barriers that have been erected around us, we could be perhaps the second-largest exporter of energy on the face of the Earth.

Madam Speaker, those resources represent an incalculable value. In fact, if one were to commodify our oil resources alone at current global prices, they would have a value of greater than \$16 trillion. Now, it's hard to conceptualize the meaning of \$16 trillion, but let me put it in these terms. If we could develop even a reasonable fraction of those resources at a time in world history where there is a growing global demand for oil and gas – according to the International Energy Agency there will be at least a 10 per cent increase in demand and consumption of oil and gas in the next 20 years, from now through 2040. If we were to commodify the value of that resource in that period, it means that we as Albertans and as Canadians would be able to manage the over \$1 trillion in combined public debts and liabilities that encumber Canadian governments. According to fiscal studies, if one adds up all of the tax-supported provincial and federal debt, other forms of liabilities, and the unfunded liabilities of public pension plans, we have a total public indebtedness in this country of over \$1 trillion.

Now, handling that debt, in the context of an aging population with a shrinking birth rate, is an enormous demographic challenge. If you want to understand how deep that challenge is, we need look no further than the countries of southern Europe – for example, Greece and Spain – that are 15 or 20 years ahead of the demographic curve of aging, governments that have been skirting insolvency in recent years. That is the fiscal implication of the demographic trends which we are beginning to experience here, with a shrinking tax base and an expanding population of people who require social support. And if we want to be able to provide that high-quality social support, that health care, those pensions, and a bright future for the next generation through high-quality public education and the infrastructure to support an increasingly diversified economy, if we want those things – and we do – then we must have a way of paying for them.

These resources constitute that way not just for Albertans, Madam Speaker, but for all Canadians. We have played a massive, oversized role as the key engine of Canadian economic prosperity and of generosity in the federation. In fact, according to research by University of Calgary professor emeritus Dr. Robert Mansell, Albertans have contributed a net \$611 billion to the rest of the federation since 1957. That's an average per person contribution of \$14,000 per year. That is to say that roads in Cape Breton and hospitals in Newfoundland and Labrador and public services in Quebec and all across the country are indirectly funded in part by the wealth generated by the enormous resources of this province.

So when we propose this bill, this does not constitute special pleading for the province of Alberta although clearly we are

defending our interests. This represents the national interest, and this is the message – we will have hon. members of the Senate joining us, I believe, in the gallery later this morning to observe the vote on this motion. I will be joining them. They have accepted my invitation to meet over lunch later today, as has the hon. Leader of the Opposition. I want them to carry back to Ottawa this message, that what we Albertans are conveying in our opposition to policies incorporated in bills C-48 and C-69, what we are doing is seeking to strengthen the federation, to strengthen and defend the Canadian national interest, not some parochial provincial interest.

Now, Madam Speaker, we Albertans have been enormously generous in contributing those resources, and, by the way, it's not just the net fiscal transfers. Think about how this province has been an elevator for social progress in this country. Think about how since the late 1980s our population has doubled, in large measure thanks to migration from other parts of Canada as well as growing levels of immigration from abroad. Those folks, who joined us from Newfoundland to British Columbia to become Albertans, arrived here to pursue opportunity, and so many of them left behind the despondency created by dependency, by unemployment, and sometimes by even poverty. People left behind their inability to care for their families themselves and their communities.

10:40

The great east coast folk artist Stan Rogers had a great song about this called *The Idiot*, about a working man from Newfoundland who said: maybe I'm an idiot, but I'm going to go out to the oil refineries in Alberta and work hard in a dirty job to take care of myself and my family. This has become part of who we are as Canadians. Alberta has been an accelerator of national unity because of this role that we have played in relieving economic anxiety amongst our fellow Canadians. In so many ways we have made this huge contribution, and we are proud to have done so.

I grant that there's always been a tiny minority of Albertans who resent any net contribution that we make to the rest of the federation. I say that they are wrong. I say that we are proud, through equalization and other transfers, through this role we have played in our economy, to have contributed to the rest of Canada, and we do not begrudge that, Madam Speaker.

In fact, tomorrow I will be in Toronto. I'll be delivering this message on Bay Street to the C.D. Howe Institute, to Canadian business leaders, and in a meeting with the mayor of Canada's largest city, who I know supports this province and the critical role that we play in the federation. My message to those people on Bay Street tomorrow and in Quebec in two weeks, when I'll be meeting with Premier Legault and speaking in Montreal, is the same message I carried to Ottawa with the hon. Minister of Energy two weeks ago, when we appeared before the Senate energy committee on Bill C-69, and here in Edmonton before the Senate transport committee on Bill C-48.

Here is the message. We as Albertans want to continue to be the source of that great generosity and wealth in the federation. We want to help to guarantee our fiscal future and that of our public services from coast to coast. But, Madam Speaker, we need the ability to develop those resources and to get a fair global price for them, and what we can no longer as Albertans tolerate are governments or interests in other parts of the federation seeking to benefit from our resources and the hard work and innovation of Albertans while seeking to block in and lock down this province. No longer will we tolerate that. We as Albertans are now together, united, standing up and demanding fairness in the Canadian federation, and that is why we begin this Legislature with this motion.

As I say, its basic sentiments were expressed in our May 17 letter from all four major party leaders, from which I will quote. This was to every member of the federal Senate.

As you know, the Senate Standing Committee on Transportation and Communications voted on Wednesday, May 15, to recommend against proceeding with Bill C-48, the so-called Tanker Ban Bill. Albertans are deeply concerned about this legislation, which we see as a direct and discriminatory attack on one of Alberta's principal natural resources, the bitumen produced in Alberta's oilsands. The . . . Tanker Ban Bill would not prevent tankers from transiting British Columbia's coastal [waters] (and in fact could not under international [marine] law). Nor does it prevent tankers from loading other products, such as liquefied natural gas, from B.C. ports. It would only prevent a narrow category of products, almost exclusively produced in Alberta, from being loaded into tankers to be able to reach international markets. We urge you, and the entire Senate of Canada, to respect the decision of the Standing Committee on Transportation and Communications and not proceed with Bill C-48 and let this unjust and discriminatory legislation die on the Order Paper.

The letter continues:

Similarly, we understand that the Senate Standing Committee on Energy, the Environment and Natural Resources, meeting at clause-by-clause stage, has adopted substantial amendments to Bill C-69, the Impact Assessment Act, which are aligned with the recommended amendments of the Government of Alberta and significant stakeholder groups such as the Canadian Energy Pipelines Association and the Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers. While we remain concerned about the overall spirit of Bill C-69, we believe that with the inclusion of all of these amendments, that the bill would be acceptable to the interests of Albertans. Therefore we call upon the entire Senate to likewise respect the deliberations of the Standing Committee on Energy, the Environment and Natural Resources and vote in favour of the entirety of this amendment package. Otherwise, we would urge all Senators to reject this bill, which in its unamended form would seriously threaten Alberta's exclusive provincial jurisdiction over the regulation of the production of non-renewable natural resources and present insurmountable roadblocks for the proponents of major resource development projects, further jeopardizing jobs and investor confidence.

Madam Deputy Speaker, my colleague the Government House Leader will table this letter later today.

Let me, then, move to some of the details in these two bills that together constitute a full-frontal attack on both the economic prosperity and constitutional jurisdiction of Alberta. First of all, Bill C-48 can only be described as a ridiculous political sham. There is no scientific or economic or legal rationale for this bill, which, I believe, is a view that was expressed by the hon. Senators who voted to effectively delete the bill at the Senate transport committee last week. The rationale for this bill is only political, a partisan political ploy.

As my colleague the Minister of Energy can confirm, a member of the Trudeau cabinet a decade ago brought forward in the House of Commons a private member's bill to impose a so-called tanker moratorium but, effectively, a ban on exporting Alberta's largest export product. Why? Simply to respond to irrational political pressure of some voter groups for her political party in Vancouver. As others have pointed out, if this made any sense, then why would the federal government continue to allow Alaskan crude oil tankers to pass through Canadian waters, including the Salish Sea, en route to refineries in the state of Washington? Why would we allow tankers to export British Columbia based liquefied natural gas from the northern B.C. coast? Why would we allow oil tankers to enter

the Bay of Fundy, an ecologically sensitive UNESCO site on the east coast of Canada? Why would we allow oil tankers to enter and often bring OPEC dictator oil into the Gulf of St. Lawrence, a heavily populated area, which is also ecologically sensitive? Why would we allow those things?

This bill does nothing but prejudicially identify and seek to ban the export of one product that is produced effectively in one province, this province. I therefore submit, Madam Deputy Speaker, a *prima facie* violation of the Constitution in the economic union section in seeking prejudicially to ban one province from exporting a product that it alone produces. That is why, should the full Senate restore the original Bill C-48, prior to committee amendments, and should it then ultimately be proclaimed into law, I have advised the Senate and Prime Minister Trudeau that the government of Alberta would launch an immediate constitutional challenge of Bill C-48, seeking a court order to suspend the application of that bill.

Now, Madam Speaker, let me then address Bill C-69, what I have long called the no more pipelines act. This, the so-called new Impact Assessment Act, is a devastating blow to investor confidence. I don't need to review here the sad history of our seeming inability as a country to build pipelines to coastal markets. It's true that there has been progress in building pipelines within North America, including four pipelines in the past decade that were commissioned, doubling our take-away capacity by increasing it by 1.72 million barrels per day. But it's also true that we have suffered from a highly co-ordinated, foreign-funded campaign to defame our energy production and to land-lock Alberta oil.

10:50

By now I hope Albertans are familiar with this Tar Sands Campaign, which began in a very co-ordinated fashion at the Rockefeller Brothers Fund office in New York City in 2008 at a meeting of a consortium of special-interest groups, which have collectively received tens, if not hundreds, of millions of dollars from primarily U.S. but, we think, other foreign sources to land-lock specifically Alberta crude oil. We must confess that these groups have been successful beyond probably their wildest expectations in so doing. Madam Deputy Speaker, one of their allies, Tom Steyer, a hedge fund billionaire in San Francisco whose fortune was generated in part by trading natural gas and coal – talk about hypocrisy. He spent over \$200 million U.S. on a political campaign to persuade President Obama to veto the Keystone XL pipeline.

It is not a coincidence, Madam Speaker, that 48 hours after our current Prime Minister took office, he received a call from Barack Obama, who'd been ragging the puck on this for six years, finally announcing a presidential veto. President Obama dared not do that, I submit, under the administration of Prime Minister Harper. He knew there would have been a diplomatic fight with Canada. But he also knew that the government of Canada and, at the time, the government of Alberta would effectively surrender in the face of the veto of Keystone XL. So we lost that. We lost several years on that project.

Then the same Prime Minister immediately announced an arbitrary veto of the Northern Gateway pipeline, that had been approved by the National Energy Board with conditions and by the federal cabinet after years of review. It's true that the court had ordered supplementary aboriginal consultations almost identical to the ones we've undertaken currently on Trans Mountain, but that was another political veto of another pipeline that had been opposed by both the Trudeau government and the previous Alberta government and had been the target of the foreign-funded campaign.

Then Energy East was killed when TransCanada PipeLines Limited – sadly, they dropped “Canada” from their name because

of the loss of investor confidence and the ability of this country to respect the rule of law. They gave up a \$1 billion investment and six years of work on that critical pipeline that represented the hope of energy independence for Canada. It represented the thousands of jobs and the opportunity to displace foreign dictator oil imports to eastern Canada. It was killed – and they said this explicitly – because of the uncertainty created by new federal mandates expressed by the National Energy Board, which created regulatory uncertainty, mandates which are now reflected in Bill C-69, and Bill C-48 is the legislative enshrinement of the cancellation of Northern Gateway. Both of those pipeline disasters, political and legal disasters: we now have the federal government seeking to enshrine those policies in these two bills. Madam Speaker, the energy industry and the financial industry have been clear that if Bill C-69 is passed in anything remotely like the form in which it was introduced in the Senate, it will represent a massive chill on investor confidence in this country.

In addition to that, Madam Speaker – and this is a point where I'm not sure the opposition agrees with us – Bill C-69 represents a gross *prima facie* violation of the exclusive constitutional jurisdiction of the people and province of Alberta. This is the point which I emphasized most strongly in my appearance before the Senate committee recently. Madam Speaker, the bill purports to give the national government the regulatory authority to assess and potentially veto projects related to the upstream production of oil and gas within this province, but that is in clear violation of section 92(a) of the Canadian Constitution, which was a critical historic victory by one of Alberta's great Premiers, the late Hon. Peter Lougheed. During the disaster of the first Trudeau government's national energy policy in the early 1980s we had the concurrent effort to patriate the Canadian Constitution. As we know, that led to two years of extensive negotiations. We can recall that the government of Quebec under René Lévesque's leadership refused to sign its consent to the patriation of the Charter and to this day remains, in that sense, outside of the Constitution Act.

Madam Speaker, Peter Lougheed made it patently clear that he would not sign that patriation on behalf of the people of Alberta unless it included a constitutional guarantee of this Assembly's exclusive authority – exclusive is the word in the Constitution – to govern and regulate the production of natural resources, and it includes explicitly oil and gas. This is not a section of the Constitution with any ambiguity in it. There is no court that could find that there is a shared jurisdiction over the regulation of upstream oil and gas. We find it peculiar that the previous government refused to object to C-69 on these grounds or indeed to the National Energy Board's presumption that it could force a consideration of carbon emissions related to upstream oil and gas production, which was effectively presaging the powers proposed in this bill.

So let me be absolutely clear to this Assembly, Madam Speaker, as I was to the Senate energy committee two weeks ago and to Prime Minister Trudeau. If Bill C-69 reverts to its original form, if it includes any purported authority of the federal government to regulate the production of upstream oil and gas, and if that is proclaimed into law, this government will launch an immediate constitutional challenge of the no more pipelines law. We will not let it stand. The message I conveyed to hon. Senators was this. After the enormous role that Alberta has played as an agent of national unity, as an accelerator of shared prosperity in this country, after all of that, we have seen the current government in Ottawa and certain provincial governments aligned effectively with the foreign-funded Tar Sands Campaign through decision after decision: through the vetoing of Keystone XL, the vetoing of Northern Gateway, the killing of Energy East, the campaign of obstruction that has led to

endless delays on the Trans Mountain expansion. Through these and other decisions they have attacked the vital economic interests of this province and have helped to deepen and prolong years of economic stagnation and decline in this province, and we will not tolerate this any longer. These two bills seek to enshrine that attack on this province as a great champion of unity and prosperity, and that is why these two bills must not stand.

[Mr. Speaker in the chair]

A recent poll by the Angus Reid group estimated that 50 per cent of Albertans could foresee this province seceding from the federation. Madam Speaker, I am and will be every day of my life a proud and unqualified federalist and a champion of a united Canada. But these bills represent a threat to national unity, so I call on all members of the Canadian Senate to respect their moral obligation to be champions and defenders of national unity. Through this Assembly we ask them to support the recommendations of the Senators who spent thousands of hours studying these bills, to listen to the voices of the four political parties representing 98 per cent of Albertans, and to do the right thing and ensure that we kill bills C-48 and C-69 in the Senate of Canada before this federal election.

11:00

The Speaker: Hon. members, Standing Order 29(2)(a) is available for questions and comments.

Seeing none, are there any others who wish to speak? The hon. Member for Edmonton-Castle Downs.

Ms Goehring: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and congratulations on being elected as our Speaker.

It's my absolute pleasure to rise today for the first time as part of the 30th Legislature to speak to this very important motion. I am pleased to see this come forward as this is clearly a matter of urgent and acute importance for all Albertans and, in fact, all Canadians. This is a topic that Albertans at dinner tables in Edmonton-Castle Downs and across this province are talking about because it concerns our livelihoods, the livelihoods of our families, friends, and communities, and the heart of our province's industry.

It is a topic that our leader, the hon. Member for Edmonton-Strathcona, focused on with great determination as Premier. For many years she has been a strong and uncompromising advocate for our province, workers, economic interests, and industries. She has been a champion who has travelled the country to fight for our province, lobbied federal leaders, and changed hearts and minds with her determination. She has been a fierce negotiator, one who never backs down from a fight. So before I continue, I want to start by recognizing her because without her work I don't think we would be having this conversation today.

Both bills C-48 and C-69 have attracted national attention, debate, and concern as these bills move through the House of Commons and now Senate, and for good reason. In the case of C-48, as our leader suggested earlier this year when she addressed the Senate, this is a bill that never should have seen the light of day. This bill attacks the core interests of Alberta and our right to get our resources to market. The bill's tanker ban sets a double standard, one in which big tankers full of LNG are fine but product from Alberta is not. This is a bill that mirrors no other restrictions in Canada, and if it is passed, there will be grave impacts for our community and our country, especially during a time of economic downturn and recession.

Right now many families are hurting, and it is the job of political leaders and governments to ensure that we can get these hard-working families back to work. Unfortunately, this bill will have

the opposite effect. It kills jobs and kills opportunities for our province. This bill is so entirely backwards that there are few fixes that can be made, and there is no way to improve something so broken. It is for that reason that we are pleased to see the Senate committee on transportation and communications vote this bill down and recommend this bill be scrapped in its entirety. As a government we stood against this bill without reservations, and we continue to stand against it today.

But we also must know that we are not yet out of the woods. This bill must return to the House of Commons, and when this does return to the House, we call on Members of Parliament to do the right thing for our economy, for our country, and for all Canadians. We call on all members to act in the interests of families across our country and put an end to the internal fighting.

We need to heed the long-standing advice of the hon. Member for Edmonton-Strathcona and retire this bill for good. When she visited the Senate earlier this year, she was steadfast and strong in her message: Bill C-48 does not work for Alberta, and it won't work for Canada. We are pleased to see the members opposite in this House join with us in our message in opposition to this outrageous bill. We must be united in our belief that this bill is an attack on Alberta, on our livelihoods, and on our communities.

I am pleased that we stand together in our concerns about Bill C-69 as well. This bill cannot move forward in its current form. While the federal government has argued that this bill allows for greater certainty in the assessment process, in fact it does quite the opposite. It creates uncertainty and allows projects to flounder in the face of an unclear, difficult, and clunky assessment process. It is only through the 200-plus amendments through the Senate standing committee on energy that we have seen common-sense, practical improvements to this legislation.

One of the amendments, advocated for strongly by the Member for Edmonton-Strathcona, is: set timelines to ensure project approvals do not bleed out over the course of many years, leaving projects vulnerable. We are pleased to see amendments limiting political interference in project approvals and ensuring that there are processes and standards in place before projects are subjected to federal reviews. We also welcome amendments to clarify processes around court challenges, the scope of the assessment, and public participation.

Through the steely determination and hard work of the hon. Member for Edmonton-Strathcona the federal government purchased the pipeline, provided certainty, and moved the project forward. We must make sure that this pipeline is built and that the processes we've made cannot be undone. We will continue advocating for the working people and families of this province, and I hope the members opposite support us in this commitment.

With that, I would like to conclude my comments on bills C-48 and C-69. Thank you.

The Speaker: Hon. members, Standing Order 29(2)(a) is available. Are there any other members wishing to speak to the motion?

Mr. Jason Nixon: Mr. Speaker, if you would, I would like to move – and I suspect we may have unanimous consent on it given that benches are full – to one-minute bells. I'll leave it up to the House. But if you could seek that motion, I would appreciate it.

[Unanimous consent denied]

The Speaker: Are there any other speakers who wish to speak to Motion 8?

The hon. Government House Leader to close debate.

Mr. Jason Nixon: I'm good.

[The voice vote indicated that Government Motion 8 carried]

[Several members rose calling for a division. The division bell was rung at 11:07 a.m.]

[Fifteen minutes having elapsed, the Assembly divided]

[The Speaker in the chair]

The Speaker: Members, before the division is called, I just wanted to highlight for you. Returning members will certainly have noticed a significant change in the decibel level with the bells inside the Chamber, as in I'm not sure you heard them, but the system is currently being upgraded, and hopefully by next week we will have the bells at a reasonable level here in the Chamber for us to all hear so we can prepare for our division votes.

For the motion:

Aheer	Horner	Reid
Allard	Hunter	Renaud
Amery	Irwin	Rosin
Armstrong-Homeniuk	Issik	Rowswell
Barnes	Jones	Rutherford
Bilous	Kenney	Sabir
Carson	LaGrange	Savage
Ceci	Loewen	Schow
Copping	Long	Schulz
Dach	Lovely	Schweitzer
Dang	Loyola	Shandro
Deol	Luan	Shepherd
Dreeshen	Madu	Sigurdson, L.
Eggen	McIver	Sigurdson, R.J.
Ellis	Milliken	Singh

Feehan	Nally	Smith
Fir	Neudorf	Stephan
Ganley	Nicolaides	Sweet
Getson	Nielsen	Toews
Glasgo	Nixon, Jason	Toor
Glubish	Nixon, Jeremy	Turton
Goehring	Orr	van Dijken
Goodridge	Pancholi	Walker
Gotfried	Panda	Wilson
Gray	Phillips	Yao
Hanson	Pitt	Yaseen
Hoffman	Pon	

Totals: For – 80 Against – 0

[Government Motion 8 carried unanimously]

The Speaker: Members, I wish to draw your attention to the Speaker's gallery. I noticed a couple of Senators have joined us for this morning's debate. I see Senator Scott Tannas and Senator Doug Black. On behalf of the Chamber thank you so much for your service to our province and to our nation. You are doing an incredible job representing the people of Alberta.

The hon. Government House Leader.

Mr. Jason Nixon: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. That was a great morning. I think we had lots of progress and a very conciliatory tone in the House today, a united front standing up for Albertans, which is great. As such, I suggest that we see the clock as 12 and will move to adjourn until 1:30 today.

[Motion carried; the Assembly adjourned at 11:27 a.m.]

Table of Contents

Prayers	9
Orders of the Day	9
Government Motions	
Federal Bills C-48 and C-69	9
Division	22

Alberta Hansard is available online at www.assembly.ab.ca

For inquiries contact:

Managing Editor

Alberta Hansard

3rd Floor, 9820 – 107 St

EDMONTON, AB T5K 1E7

Telephone: 780.427.1875