



Province of Alberta

The 29th Legislature
Second Session

Alberta Hansard

Thursday afternoon, November 3, 2016

Day 44

The Honourable Robert E. Wanner, Speaker

Legislative Assembly of Alberta The 29th Legislature

Second Session

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

Aheer, Leela Sharon, Chestermere-Rocky View (W)
Anderson, Shaye, Leduc-Beaumont (ND)
Anderson, Wayne, Highwood (W)
Babcock, Erin D., Stony Plain (ND)
Barnes, Drew, Cypress-Medicine Hat (W)
Bilous, Hon. Deron, Edmonton-Beverly-Clareview (ND),
Deputy Government House Leader
Carlier, Hon. Oneil, Whitecourt-Ste. Anne (ND),
Deputy Government House Leader
Carson, Jonathon, Edmonton-Meadowlark (ND)
Ceci, Hon. Joe, Calgary-Fort (ND)
Clark, Greg, Calgary-Elbow (AP)
Connolly, Michael R.D., Calgary-Hawkwood (ND)
Coolahan, Craig, Calgary-Klein (ND)
Cooper, Nathan, Olds-Didsbury-Three Hills (W),
Official Opposition House Leader
Cortes-Vargas, Estefania, Strathcona-Sherwood Park (ND),
Government Whip
Cyr, Scott J., Bonnyville-Cold Lake (W),
Official Opposition Deputy Whip
Dach, Lorne, Edmonton-McClung (ND)
Dang, Thomas, Edmonton-South West (ND)
Drever, Deborah, Calgary-Bow (ND)
Drysdale, Wayne, Grande Prairie-Wapiti (PC),
Progressive Conservative Opposition Whip
Eggen, Hon. David, Edmonton-Calder (ND)
Ellis, Mike, Calgary-West (PC)
Feehan, Hon. Richard, Edmonton-Rutherford (ND)
Fildebrandt, Derek Gerhard, Strathmore-Brooks (W)
Fitzpatrick, Maria M., Lethbridge-East (ND)
Fraser, Rick, Calgary-South East (PC)
Ganley, Hon. Kathleen T., Calgary-Buffalo (ND)
Gill, Prab, Calgary-Greenway (PC)
Goehring, Nicole, Edmonton-Castle Downs (ND)
Gotfried, Richard, Calgary-Fish Creek (PC)
Gray, Hon. Christina, Edmonton-Mill Woods (ND)
Hanson, David B., Lac La Biche-St. Paul-Two Hills (W),
Official Opposition Deputy House Leader
Hinkley, Bruce, Wetaskiwin-Camrose (ND)
Hoffman, Hon. Sarah, Edmonton-Glenora (ND)
Horne, Trevor A.R., Spruce Grove-St. Albert (ND)
Hunter, Grant R., Cardston-Taber-Warner (W)
Jansen, Sandra, Calgary-North West (PC)
Jean, Brian Michael, QC, Fort McMurray-Conklin (W),
Leader of the Official Opposition
Kazim, Anam, Calgary-Glenmore (ND)
Kleinstuber, Jamie, Calgary-Northern Hills (ND)
Larivee, Hon. Danielle, Lesser Slave Lake (ND)
Littlewood, Jessica, Fort Saskatchewan-Vegreville (ND)
Loewen, Todd, Grande Prairie-Smoky (W)
Loyola, Rod, Edmonton-Ellerslie (ND)
Luff, Robyn, Calgary-East (ND)
MacIntyre, Donald, Innisfail-Sylvan Lake (W)
Malkinson, Brian, Calgary-Currie (ND)
Mason, Hon. Brian, Edmonton-Highlands-Norwood (ND),
Government House Leader
McCuaig-Boyd, Hon. Margaret,
Dunvegan-Central Peace-Notley (ND)
McIver, Ric, Calgary-Hays (PC),
Leader of the Progressive Conservative Opposition
McKittrick, Annie, Sherwood Park (ND)
McLean, Hon. Stephanie V., Calgary-Varsity (ND)
McPherson, Karen M., Calgary-Mackay-Nose Hill (ND)
Miller, Barb, Red Deer-South (ND)
Miranda, Hon. Ricardo, Calgary-Cross (ND)
Nielsen, Christian E., Edmonton-Decore (ND)
Nixon, Jason, Rimbey-Rocky Mountain House-Sundre (W),
Official Opposition Whip
Notley, Hon. Rachel, Edmonton-Strathcona (ND),
Premier
Orr, Ronald, Lacombe-Ponoka (W)
Panda, Prasad, Calgary-Foothills (W)
Payne, Hon. Brandy, Calgary-Acadia (ND)
Phillips, Hon. Shannon, Lethbridge-West (ND)
Piquette, Colin, Athabasca-Sturgeon-Redwater (ND)
Pitt, Angela D., Airdrie (W)
Renaud, Marie F., St. Albert (ND)
Rodney, Dave, Calgary-Lougheed (PC),
Progressive Conservative Opposition House Leader
Rosendahl, Eric, West Yellowhead (ND)
Sabir, Hon. Irfan, Calgary-McCall (ND)
Schmidt, Hon. Marlin, Edmonton-Gold Bar (ND)
Schneider, David A., Little Bow (W)
Schreiner, Kim, Red Deer-North (ND)
Shepherd, David, Edmonton-Centre (ND)
Sigurdson, Hon. Lori, Edmonton-Riverview (ND)
Smith, Mark W., Drayton Valley-Devon (W)
Starke, Dr. Richard, Vermilion-Lloydminster (PC)
Stier, Pat, Livingstone-Macleod (W)
Strankman, Rick, Drumheller-Stettler (W)
Sucha, Graham, Calgary-Shaw (ND)
Swann, Dr. David, Calgary-Mountain View (AL)
Taylor, Wes, Battle River-Wainwright (W)
Turner, Dr. A. Robert, Edmonton-Whitemud (ND)
van Dijken, Glenn, Barrhead-Morinville-Westlock (W)
Westhead, Cameron, Banff-Cochrane (ND),
Deputy Government Whip
Woollard, Denise, Edmonton-Mill Creek (ND)
Yao, Tany, Fort McMurray-Wood Buffalo (W)

Party standings:

New Democrat: 54 Wildrose: 22 Progressive Conservative: 9 Alberta Liberal: 1 Alberta Party: 1

Officers and Officials of the Legislative Assembly

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

Executive Council

Rachel Notley	Premier, President of Executive Council
Sarah Hoffman	Deputy Premier, Minister of Health
Deron Bilous	Minister of Economic Development and Trade
Oneil Carlier	Minister of Agriculture and Forestry
Joe Ceci	President of Treasury Board and Minister of Finance
David Eggen	Minister of Education
Richard Feehan	Minister of Indigenous Relations
Kathleen T. Ganley	Minister of Justice and Solicitor General
Christina Gray	Minister of Labour, Minister Responsible for Democratic Renewal
Danielle Larivee	Minister of Municipal Affairs
Brian Mason	Minister of Infrastructure, Minister of Transportation
Margaret McCuaig-Boyd	Minister of Energy
Stephanie V. McLean	Minister of Service Alberta, Minister of Status of Women
Ricardo Miranda	Minister of Culture and Tourism
Brandy Payne	Associate Minister of Health
Shannon Phillips	Minister of Environment and Parks, Minister Responsible for the Climate Change Office
Irfan Sabir	Minister of Human Services
Marlin Schmidt	Minister of Advanced Education
Lori Sigurdson	Minister of Seniors and Housing

STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Standing Committee on the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund

Chair: Mr. Coolahan
Deputy Chair: Mrs. Schreiner

Cyr	McKitrick
Dang	Taylor
Ellis	Turner
Horne	

Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future

Chair: Mr. Sucha
Deputy Chair: Mr. Schneider

Anderson, S.	Hunter
Carson	Jansen
Connolly	Panda
Coolahan	Piquette
Dach	Schreiner
Fitzpatrick	Taylor
Gotfried	

Standing Committee on Families and Communities

Chair: Ms Goehring
Deputy Chair: Mr. Smith

Drever	Orr
Hinkley	Pitt
Horne	Rodney
Jansen	Shepherd
Luff	Swann
McKitrick	Yao
McPherson	

Standing Committee on Legislative Offices

Chair: Mr. Shepherd
Deputy Chair: Mr. Malkinson

Cooper	Littlewood
Ellis	Nixon
Horne	van Dijken
Jabbour	Woollard
Kleinsteuber	

Special Standing Committee on Members' Services

Chair: Mr. Wanner
Deputy Chair: Cortes-Vargas

Cooper	McIver
Dang	Nixon
Fildebrandt	Piquette
Jabbour	Schreiner
Luff	

Standing Committee on Private Bills

Chair: Ms McPherson
Deputy Chair: Mr. Connolly

Anderson, W.	Kleinsteuber
Babcock	McKitrick
Drever	Rosendahl
Drysdale	Stier
Fraser	Strankman
Hinkley	Sucha
Kazim	

Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, Standing Orders and Printing

Chair: Ms Fitzpatrick
Deputy Chair: Ms Babcock

Carson	Loyola
Coolahan	McPherson
Cooper	Nielsen
Ellis	Schneider
Goehring	Starke
Hanson	van Dijken
Kazim	

Standing Committee on Public Accounts

Chair: Mr. Fildebrandt
Deputy Chair: Mr. S. Anderson

Barnes	Luff
Cyr	Malkinson
Dach	Miller
Fraser	Renaud
Goehring	Turner
Gotfried	Westhead
Hunter	

Standing Committee on Resource Stewardship

Chair: Loyola
Deputy Chair: Mr. Loewen

Aheer	Kleinsteuber
Babcock	MacIntyre
Clark	Malkinson
Dang	Nielsen
Drysdale	Rosendahl
Hanson	Woollard
Kazim	

Legislative Assembly of Alberta

1:30 p.m.

Thursday, November 3, 2016

[The Speaker in the chair]

The Speaker: Good afternoon. Please be seated.

Introduction of Guests

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

Mr. Hanson: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'm very happy to stand today and introduce to you and through you a group of 22 seniors from St. Paul Community Learning Association that are here in the public gallery today visiting, and they also took part in the Remembrance Day ceremonies in the rotunda. It's just proof that you're never too old to learn. I'd like to also point out that two of the members are from the suburbs of the sprawling metropolis of Owlseye, Alberta.

One other point that one of the ladies asked me. They go out all over the province, and this is part of their education process. One lady is trying to convince the organizers that a trip to the casino would be a good math lesson. I wish her luck with that. Anyway, if they would please rise and receive the warm welcome of the House.

The Speaker: Welcome.

The hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury-Three Hills.

Mr. Cooper: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure to rise today and introduce to you and through you a group of students from the outstanding constituency of Olds-Didsbury-Three Hills, from the Three Hills school. In conversations with them earlier, if there's one thing I'm certain of, it's that one of them is going to have my job in probably only two elections. I'd like to welcome them here to the Assembly and invite them to rise and receive the traditional warm welcome of this Assembly.

The Speaker: Welcome.

The hon. Minister of Indigenous Relations.

Mr. Feehan: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm very pleased to rise today to introduce to you and through you to all the members of this Assembly staff and students from D.S. MacKenzie school. D.S. MacKenzie is a school nestled in the northeast corner of my riding, Edmonton-Rutherford, named after the first Premier, therefore first among equals amongst ridings. D.S. MacKenzie takes pride in not just simply teaching students a one-size-fits-all model but in respecting the learning needs of all of their students and has done an excellent job representing students in this province. I'd like to ask them to rise and receive the warm welcome of this Assembly.

The Speaker: Welcome.

Hon. members, are there any other school groups today?

Seeing and hearing none, the Member for Peace River.

Ms Jabbour: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Hon. members, on behalf of yourself, Mr. Speaker, I'm honoured to rise and introduce to you and through you the first-place winner of the 2016 Royal Canadian Legion dominion poem contest, intermediate category, Quirina Thompson. Quirina shared her profound and beautiful poem with us today at the ceremony of remembrance service in the rotunda.

Quirina actually lives in your constituency of Medicine Hat, Mr. Speaker, as you know, and she is accompanied today by her family.

I'd ask that they all rise as I call their names: Dan and Barb Thompson, Quirina's parents; Jack Thompson; Marlene Thompson; Jacqui Cook; MaryAnne Gukert; Valarie Thompson; and, of course, Quirina herself. Please give them the warm welcome of this House.

The Speaker: Welcome. Did she mention it was Medicine Hat?

The Member for Edmonton-Castle Downs.

Ms Goehring: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is my pleasure to rise today to introduce to you and through you someone seated in your gallery who has shown true dedication for the well-being of his fellow soldiers, Regimental Sergeant Major and Chief Stephen "Sticks" Gallard of the Frontiersmen in Canada. He has organized a special evening for healing and remembrance on November 10 at 7 p.m. at the Trinity Lutheran church in Edmonton, where anyone scarred by war or conflict can attend and begin to heal. We would like to thank you for your service and ask that you now rise and receive the traditional warm welcome of this House. [Standing ovation]

The Speaker: Welcome.

The hon. Member for West Yellowhead.

Mr. Rosendahl: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure to introduce to you and through you to all members of this Legislature Lisa Mueller, president and executive director of Epoch Energy, and His Worship Rob Mackin, the mayor of Hinton. Epoch Energy, with the support of the town of Hinton, has proposed the development of a geothermal project in the Hinton area. We would like to thank both of these individuals for their contribution in diversifying our energy sector. I would like to ask both of them to rise and receive the traditional warm welcome of this House.

The Speaker: Welcome.

The hon. Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark.

Mr. Carson: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It is my privilege to introduce to you and through you to all members of the Assembly Mr. Michael Reinhart. Mike is presently the assistant business manager for the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers. He joined the IBEW in 1979. This month the IBEW is celebrating their 125th year, after being founded in 1891. I want to acknowledge Mike and the IBEW and thank them for their contributions to jobs, training, and diversification in the province of Alberta and our economy. I'd ask him to please rise and receive the traditional warm welcome of the Assembly.

The Speaker: Welcome.

The hon. Member for Airdrie.

Mrs. Pitt: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my honour and my pleasure to introduce to you and through you to all members of this Assembly a wonderful friend of mine and her family: Samreen Junaid, Ali Junaid, with Dua, Raheel, and Raiyan. Would you please rise and receive the traditional warm welcome of this Assembly.

The Speaker: Welcome.

The hon. Member for Strathcona-Sherwood Park.

Cortes-Vargas: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure to stand today to introduce to you and through you two constituents from Strathcona-Sherwood Park, Mike and Lynn Roppelt. Mike and Lynn own and operate GSS Integrated Energy, a company whose operations I will be speaking about in more detail later on this afternoon. I'm proud of the contribution that GSS has made to our

community and our province. I would ask that Mike and Lynn Roppelt rise and receive the traditional warm welcome of this Assembly.

The Speaker: Welcome.

The hon. Member for Sherwood Park.

Ms McKittrick: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is my privilege to introduce to you and through you to the Assembly Jacquie Surgenor, Krystal Gibson, Amy Churchill, and Heather Wieler. They are part of a dedicated group of parents who raised about \$300,000 in two years to build a fully accessible playground at Westboro school in Sherwood Park. The parents wrote grants and obtained over \$100,000 from the province, \$91,000 in cash and donated labour from Strathcona county, and over \$100,000 from corporate sponsors and individual donations. I would like to ask them to rise and receive the traditional warm welcome of the Assembly.

The Speaker: Welcome.

1:40

Members' Statements

The Speaker: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Castle Downs.

Remembrance Day

Ms Goehring: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my privilege to rise today, as the Member for Edmonton-Castle Downs and as the provincial liaison for the Canadian Forces, to honour Remembrance Day as we take the time to show our gratitude and respect to those who have fought to maintain the freedom, peace, and security that we are so fortunate to have in this country.

It was at the 11th hour of the 11th day of the 11th month in 1918 when the guns fell silent to end the First World War. It was intended to bring peacetime for our soldiers, yet here we are, a century later, still striving to bring stability to a fractured world amid one of the largest refugee crises in living memory.

In war, armed conflicts, and peacekeeping missions around the globe Albertans and their fellow Canadians have served with valour and without hesitation. The price has been and continues to be high. It has been and continues to be paid with the lives of our military or with their mental and physical health and their years of service, and it has been and continues to be paid by the families who soldiered on while their loved ones were away on tour or forever.

These are debts we can repay only by living honourably and in our own ways upholding the freedoms that they defended. We wear the poppy on our left lapel, closest to our hearts, to show the world that we remember, that we honour the sacrifices made for us, and that we who never saw a battlefield will continue to carry the torch and protect our society and its values. With that commitment, those who lie in Flanders fields and elsewhere can rest, and those who survived and who defend us still will know that we stand with them.

Thank you.

The Speaker: Thank you, hon. members. We must never forget.

The hon. Member for Drayton Valley-Devon.

Clean Energy Technology Centre

Mr. Smith: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to bring to the attention of this Legislature some good-news stories out of Drayton Valley and the opportunities they present for the government. A few years ago the town of Drayton Valley lobbied the government to create a unique organization called the Clean Energy Technology Centre,

that would become a business incubator. Two of its initiatives are starting to grow fruit and reinvigorate the Alberta economy.

The first is between the CETC and Dan Madlung, owner of BioComposites Group. The CETC and the town of Drayton Valley have worked with Dan to set up the only manufacturing facility in North America that will create a one hundred per cent biodegradable matting out of natural fibres like wood and hemp. This business has just recently signed the first contract with an auto company to make the inside door panels out of hemp and flax. This new industry based on hemp has the potential to be a \$400 million industry in Alberta in the next four years.

Hemp takes five times the amount of carbon out of the air in one year that a North American forest will take out of the air in 20 years, and Alberta is the best place in the world to grow hemp. The stock that BioComposites is using is now a waste product of the hemp industry.

Interest in this manufacturing facility is growing so quickly that Mr. Madlung has now decided that the industry must go provincial, and he's arranging the financing to build more facilities. To do this, he will need to work with the CETC and with the various levels of government, including the Ministry of Economic Development and Trade.

The second company is a company called Gas Recapture Systems, that is working with the CETC to assemble the equipment that will be necessary to recapture all of the fugitive gases from flare wells and turn them into a saleable energy product. GRS is turning a waste stream into a profitable venture and dealing with carbon issues at the same time.

Both of these ventures are using their expertise and working with various levels of government and organizations like the CETC to help Alberta diversify economically.

The Speaker: The hon. Member for West Yellowhead.

Geothermal Project in Hinton

Mr. Rosendahl: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As part of Alberta's climate leadership plan Environment and Parks Minister Shannon Phillips and Eric Denhoff, deputy minister responsible for climate change, are working in partnership with the oil and gas industry to find innovative ways to combat climate change.

The Speaker: Hon. member, I would just remind you that we don't normally use ministers' names.

Mr. Rosendahl: Sorry. I apologize.

The Speaker: Please continue.

Mr. Rosendahl: Geothermal energy projects, which harvest energy from deep within the Earth, have been identified as an innovative way to deal with some of the abandoned, suspended, and inactive oil well sites found throughout the province. While oil companies complete environmental restoration work, we are looking for new ideas to redevelop some of these locations as industrial opportunities.

Epoch Energy in conjunction with the town of Hinton has proposed the development of a geothermal project to take advantage of the near perfect conditions for this type of initiative in the Hinton area. Lisa Mueller, president and executive director of Epoch Energy, is uniquely positioned to bring this groundbreaking vision to reality. Research supported by GeoDiscover Alberta, a provincial public information service, has identified Hinton as an ideal location to test the development of this groundbreaking industry. Supported by both Mayor Rob Mackin and my office, this

project is expected to replace much of the carbon-based fuel currently used to heat government buildings and other facilities located in the community. Additionally, it may be possible also to produce electrical energy because of the high heat value, and another project is the possibility of greenhouses in the area to produce local food.

We are all very proud of our efforts to work in partnership with the oil and gas sector and local governments to find innovative strategies to promote the development of green energy options.

The Speaker: Thank you, hon. member.

The hon. Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark.

International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers 125th Anniversary

Mr. Carson: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise today to acknowledge that this month the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers will be marking their 125th year as an organization representing members employed in some of the most important trades in our province. After being founded in 1891 in St. Louis, Missouri, as the National Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, their Canadian arm set roots down in Ottawa in 1899. At that time they represented 286 electrical industry workers, with the goal of advocating for improved safety and training standards.

Today, representing 65,000 members from a diverse range of industries across the country, the IBEW plays a significant role in the lives of workers. Of the three locals in Alberta local 1007 represents EPCOR, local 254 represents Enmax, and local 424 represents 8,400 construction workers across the province. I recently had the opportunity to tour the IBEW local 424's facility. Their Electrical Industry Training Centre teaches a variety of courses, including photovoltaic systems and electric vehicle charging stations.

I'm continually impressed by the commitment of IBEW to ensure that their members have the best opportunities possible to upgrade their skills and to work in safe, equitable conditions. As an apprentice electrician and IBEW member I appreciate the efforts that go into ensuring workers have the best opportunities for training and employment.

IBEW 424 is doing great work to support the goals of diversification in our province by offering quality programs that are evolving to meet the demands of a changing industry. I want to thank assistant business manager Michael Reinhart and his colleagues for their great work and to congratulate IBEW on 125 years of great service.

Thank you very much.

The Speaker: The hon. Member for Sherwood Park.

Inclusive, Accessible Facilities in Sherwood Park

Ms McKittrick: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The United Nations proclaimed December 3 to be the International Day of Persons with Disabilities. As this date approaches, I am mindful of the ways we build cities, design buildings, and are inclusive in our communities and workplaces. I am fortunate to live in a municipality creating inclusive, accessible facilities where everyone can participate and feel a sense of belonging.

It was my pleasure to open the new Emerald Hills Leisure Centre, which is equipped with specialized change rooms, aquatic lifts and wheelchairs, and zero-entry pools thanks in part to provincial funding. The Glen Allan fitness centre recently reopened and now includes a wheelchair-accessible curling rink. I was able to see first-hand how the design allows wheelchair curlers to deliver a rock.

1:50

Community groups in the area are also committed to creating inclusive environments. Earlier I introduced representatives from the Westboro elementary school parent council. Recently this group celebrated the grand opening of a playground designed so that everyone can play. Ramps are wide and plentiful. There's lots of space around the pieces of equipment for wheelchairs. Kids of all ages and abilities can now enjoy the playground. The wider ramps are also handy for parents pushing strollers, grandparents using a walker, or even someone using crutches while their leg heals. The design is spectacular, as anyone who drives down Broadmoor Boulevard can attest to.

At the opening I noted that it takes a village to raise a playground. In this case it took a committed parent council, a supportive municipality, provincial funding through the Ministry of Culture and Tourism, and donations from local businesses such as the Alberta manufacturers' recycling association. Thank you to the Westboro community and to all those involved in creating this playground. It is innovative projects such as this that encourage inclusion that I as an MLA want to support and inspire.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Oral Question Period

The Speaker: The hon. Member for Chestermere-Rocky View.

Energy Policies

Mrs. Aheer: Mr. Speaker, Alberta used to be a proud leader in oil and gas production across Canada in all categories, but things have changed under this NDP government. The Petroleum Services Association of Canada announced yesterday that for the first time Saskatchewan will pass Alberta in oil and gas wells drilled in 2017. It's just the latest example of bad NDP policies, and it's making things worse for the working men and women across this province. When will the Premier stop driving jobs out of our province with their risky economic policies?

The Speaker: The hon. Premier.

Ms Notley: Well, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and thank you to the member for the question. Let me begin by first of all noting that this projection, of course, relates to both oil and gas and ultimately is a projection that is driven by the geological differences in the new plays in natural gas. That being said, I think it's important for the member opposite to take some note of the recent report out of the U of C which actually states that under our government the oil and gas royalty framework is now the most competitive in western Canada.

Mrs. Aheer: Since the NDP came to power 18 months ago, they've raised every tax they can think of. They've raised taxes on business, incomes, gas, beer, even on trains, and now Albertans are preparing for a damaging new carbon tax to come into effect in two months, a policy even the Premier admits will mean thousands more jobs lost. These policies are doing more to help Saskatchewan's oil and gas sector than Alberta's. What is the Premier going to do about it?

Ms Notley: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think on the matter, for instance, of the climate change leadership plan, you know, let me begin by quoting the CEO of Cenovus. In answer to the question of whether this was a radical plan, he said: I'm not sure I would use the word "radical" to describe being a leader; I would describe it as being bold, and I would describe it as something that is very significant, something that all Albertans should now be able to take pride in.

The Speaker: Second supplemental.

Mrs. Aheer: Thank you. Well, the Premier has no one else to blame, then, for her own NDP government's record.

One of the reasons cited for Saskatchewan beating Alberta in drilling is, quote, a more attractive investment environment for producers. That's just a nice way of saying that bad NDP policies are driving jobs and investment out of Alberta. The fact is that when you rip up contracts with Alberta-owned companies, raise everyone's taxes, it hurts the very people we are sent here to help. I wonder if the Premier can tell Albertans why Saskatchewan is becoming a more attractive investment environment for producers?

Ms Notley: Well, one thing I will say, Mr. Speaker, is that when it comes to comparing this province with Saskatchewan, even after the carbon levy is fully implemented, there will be a \$7.5 billion tax advantage for investors here in Alberta.

Carbon Levy

Mrs. Aheer: A Fraser Institute survey conducted last December found that among 126 world-wide energy jurisdictions, Alberta's perception among oil and gas investors had fallen from 16th to 38th. The reason? Bad policies scaring away investment. And now the CEO of Surmont Energy, Mark Smith, is warning that the new cap will squeeze them out of the province. So will the Premier at the very least stop her plans for a carbon tax in 2017?

Ms Notley: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think over 80 per cent of Albertans understand that a key mechanism for improving the opportunity for jobs and investment in Alberta is getting a pipeline to tidewater. So let me just quote from the head of Kinder Morgan, the next pipeline that is up for consideration. He says, quote: I think the Alberta climate change plan and the alignment with some very specific environmental organizations was a huge step forward. Then he goes on and says: as a matter of dark clouds parting, it was a huge benefit to me and us, and we've seen that on the ground.

Mrs. Aheer: The NDP is telling Albertans that we need a carbon tax to grow our markets – okay – but down south two major presidential candidates are promising zero carbon taxes. It means that Alberta's businesses and our energy sector are put at a significant disadvantage with other energy producing jurisdictions across North America when we can least afford it. Why does the Premier believe that Albertans should pay a carbon tax when our number one competitor, the United States, won't?

Ms Notley: Well, you know, Mr. Speaker, I have to say that I am quite perplexed that that particular party, which claims to stand up for Alberta, wants to take a made-in-Alberta carbon plan and hand it over to Ottawa. It makes no sense to me because that, my friends, is the choice that is in play right now, and they are completely living in never-never land if they fail to accept that. [interjections]

The Speaker: Calm down, folks.
Second supplemental.

Mrs. Aheer: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Okay. Well, Australia has repealed its carbon tax, and its economy is continuing to grow. The French Socialist government looks prepared to nix its carbon tax plan due to concerns about higher power prices and a sluggish economy. So maybe the Premier could give the socialists in France a call for some economic advice. The fact is that the government is more worried about raising everyone's taxes instead of getting people back to work. Why is it that at a time when major western

economies are dropping the carbon tax, this government is bringing the largest tax increase in Alberta's history?

Ms Notley: You know, it truly is the case that the members opposite are reaching, reaching – the Fraser Institute; really? – in order to be able to tell a negative story. Even though leaders from around the world and within our province describe our government as taking a leadership role in moving forward on a long-ignored issue, what they want to do is vote against Alberta, against Albertans, against diversification, against Alberta innovators because they don't seem to think that we can do it. But you know what, Mr. Speaker? I know we can.

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

Ethics and Privacy Investigations

Mr. Nixon: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Last week Alberta's Information and Privacy Commissioner asked for the Minister of Justice to be investigated, the second time in less than two months, for a quasi-criminal offence. There are currently three different investigations into what looks like a cover-up in the awarding of a tobacco litigation contract, and now the RCMP have told us in writing that they are doing an assessment of whether to investigate breach-of-trust charges. It is beyond me why the NDP government would want to cover up and obscure files. Has the Department of Justice turned over all the pertinent documents to this investigation?

The Speaker: The hon. Premier.

Ms Notley: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Let me begin that with this matter our government has done everything we can to responsibly move forward with as transparent a review as we can. That's why we first invited in a former Supreme Court of Canada justice, Frank Iacobucci, to review the whole matter. He made recommendations, including that the matter be referred over to the B.C. Ethics Commissioner for additional review. That has been done. We are doing everything we can to follow the directions of all the various and sundry legal advisors to ensure that the process has integrity, that transparency is promoted at every possible corner because that is a value we believe in.

2:00

The Speaker: Thank you.

Hon. members, again I've had to on a couple of occasions in this last week reference the sub judice principle. I hope that's not where we're going on this one. I would say that to both sides of the House.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, this is serious. Here are the facts. We know the Justice department had crucial files from Alberta's former Ethics Commissioner and that we now have the B.C. Ethics Commissioner reinvestigating the matter. We know that Alberta's Information Commissioner has had to appoint an independent investigator and an outside prosecutor to look into whether the Justice department criminally tampered with the related FOIP. Let's be clear. This miscarriage of justice is happening under this government, and they can't keep blaming this mismanagement on someone else. Can the minister tell us why under her leadership Justice is covering up what happened with the awarding of the tobacco litigation contract?

The Speaker: Hon. Premier, perhaps yourself or one of the ministers might provide information on any particular legal action

here or not, but if you're not concerned, please proceed. Not sub judice on this one? Please proceed.

Ms Notley: Mr. Speaker, I simply need to say that I reject the premise of pretty much all of that question. It is simply not accurate. I will say again: transparency and openness are exactly what our government is endeavouring to do while protecting the rights of all Albertans who would benefit from a successful tobacco litigation and at the same time ensuring that where there was any wrongdoing, it is openly and objectively assessed. So we are taking steps as appropriate to make sure that happens.

The Speaker: Thank you, hon. Premier.

Mr. Nixon: Alberta Justice is accused of manipulating FOIP applications and imposing arbitrary deadlines on request. Until we're shown otherwise, it's a cover-up, plain and simple. The independent adjudicator has still not received all the government documents requested despite more than two years of investigation. There is no evidence that Justice is co-operating with any of the three ongoing investigations, leading Canadian privacy experts to describe our Justice department as a rogue organization. Albertans are curious, Minister. How are you planning to clean up the mess in your department and re-establish trust for Albertans in their institutions?

The Speaker: The hon. Premier.

Ms Notley: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will simply say this, that we understand that there were additional recommendations made by an official from the OIPC, office of the Privacy Commissioner, and we are reviewing those recommendations. There will be additional information provided by the Minister of Justice in the days to come.

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

Electricity Power Purchase Agreement Lawsuit

Mr. Gill: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. For the last two days the Member for Calgary-West asked the Deputy Premier about Mr. Joseph Arvay, the B.C. lawyer with close ties to the NDP that the government hired to litigate its PPA court case. The Deputy Premier refused to say what the sole-source contract given to Mr. Arvay was worth, so we looked it up for her: \$500,000. And that's just a retainer. To the Premier: given that there are surely a great many lawyers right here in Alberta who are more than qualified to handle this case and given that this money is coming directly from the pockets of hard-working Albertans, don't you think you should have at least spent the money in Alberta?

The Speaker: The hon. Premier.

Ms Notley: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Absolutely all of the rules were followed in the decision to secure the advice and work of this particular lawyer. I'm very pleased for the members opposite that they were successful in finding the blue book and looking up the amount. Congratulations to you all. That being said, the point here is that Albertans deserve to have the best representation that they can get, and I am firmly convinced that in selecting this particular counsel, that was the objective that we were achieving.

The Speaker: First supplemental.

Mr. Gill: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know, \$500,000 is a lot of money, especially to the thousands of Albertans who are out of work right now. When you add this half a million dollars to the

\$100,000 you spent to influence both public opinion and potentially the courts through advertising, it totals as much as your government provided to Alberta community organizations to prevent child abuse earlier this month. That is shameful. Given that you're wasting borrowed money on this court case, money that Alberta taxpayers are on the hook for, will you cut our losses and drop this ridiculous lawsuit?

The Speaker: The hon. Premier.

Ms Notley: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First of all, it needs to be understood that the money that is reported in the blue book has not actually been spent. That was just the retainer, so in fact a fraction of that amount of money has been spent on the matter thus far. So less, not more. [interjections]

The Speaker: Hon. members, I can't hear the Premier's answer. Please.

Hon. Premier, please continue.

Ms Notley: That being said, Mr. Speaker, we will continue to take whatever actions we can to protect Alberta consumers, residential and industrial. I know the folks over there want to protect the right of certain companies to pass on their losses to consumers and to Albertans, but we are going to challenge that as long as we can.

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

Mr. Gill: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I find it curious that you insist that Mr. Arvay is the best person for the job when he has a long history of working with the B.C. NDP, close and personal ties to one of your government's most expensive patronage appointments, and given that the optics of paying one of your comrades half a million taxpayer dollars to take Alberta companies owned by Alberta taxpayers to court because you are too arrogant to admit you made a mistake are simply irresponsible, will you please save yourself from any further embarrassment and drop the case?

Ms Notley: Mr. Speaker, we will continue our efforts to stand up for regular Albertans, for citizens, for consumers, for homeowners, for families, for business owners, and for industry because that's what we were elected to do. [interjections]

The Speaker: I can see that all of us can hardly wait till Monday.
The hon. Member for Calgary-Mountain View.

Remand Centre Drug Overdoses

Dr. Swann: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. My questions are for the Justice minister today. In the first nine months in Alberta there have been 23 near-fatal overdoses and three fatal overdoses in the Edmonton Remand Centre. In all of the year of 2014-15 in our federal correction services there were only six reported fatal overdose deaths, six in the entire federal prison system. This indicates a serious problem in the Edmonton Remand if not in the provincial remand system generally. Will the minister tell the House how many overdoses and overdose deaths have occurred in the other remand centres?

The Speaker: Thank you, hon. member.
The hon. Minister of Justice.

Ms Ganley: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and to the member for the important question. Of course, the safety of our inmates and of our correctional facility staff is absolutely of top priority at all

times. Unfortunately, it has been a long-standing challenge with correctional centres that sometimes drugs do get into them, and because of the recent wave of fentanyl coming into the province, that has had a really tragic impact on our correctional centres. We continue to work with our correctional staff to make sure that they are trained. They use drugs, they use searches, they use a number of methods to do their absolute level best to prevent those drugs from coming in.

Dr. Swann: My question was: will you table the number of overdoses and deaths in Alberta remand?

The Speaker: The hon. minister.

An Hon. Member: Hello?

Ms Ganley: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Sorry. That was rather shorter than usual.

I don't have those numbers in front of me right now. We can certainly look into how those numbers are kept. Given that the hon. member has the numbers, I'm not really sure why he's interested in my tabling them, but I will absolutely loop back with my officials.

2:10

Dr. Swann: Well, Mr. Speaker, my final question is: will the minister call a fatality review and find out what opportunities for prevention, where we're falling down in protecting our children, our mothers, our fathers, our relatives who are charged but not yet convicted and staying in remand? I think we owe them a fatality review.

The Speaker: The hon. minister.

Ms Ganley: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and to the member for the question. As I've said, the safety of our inmates and of our correctional facility staff is absolutely top priority for us. Whenever there is a fatality within a correctional centre, there's an automatic process that puts that before the Fatality Review Board, and ultimately that independent review board and not people at the political level makes the decisions on what ought to go to a fatality review. That being said, we do internal reviews of all overdoses and all deaths within corrections to make sure that we're always taking steps to get a little bit better.

The Speaker: The hon. Member for Lethbridge-East.

Bovine Tuberculosis

Ms Fitzpatrick: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This year has already been very challenging for Alberta ranchers and farmers with the wet and snowy conditions delaying harvest in many parts of the province, and now in southeastern Alberta some ranchers are facing a stressful situation after a case of bovine TB was confirmed in a cow that originated from that area. To the minister responsible: would you please update the Assembly on this situation?

The Speaker: The Minister of Municipal Affairs.

Ms Larivee: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to start by saying that our government supports farming families and is incredibly proud of the beef industry in this province and the iconic product that we export to the world. Our government remains very engaged on this issue and continues to work with industry and federal partners as the investigation continues. The CFIA has initiated an investigation into the case, and Alberta Agriculture and

Forestry continues to work closely with them to provide any assistance they may require.

The Speaker: First supplemental.

Ms Fitzpatrick: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The beef producers affected by this situation are very concerned by the quarantines preventing them from marketing their cattle, and these producers have been dealing with this situation for a number of weeks. To the same minister: what is the government doing to help ensure an expedient solution for these farmers and ranchers?

The Speaker: The hon. minister.

Ms Larivee: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. These farmers and ranchers need our government to help the CFIA expedite the investigation and reduce quarantine times, and doing that is our priority. A team of staff has been set up to co-ordinate activities, identify areas of co-operation, and help expedite the investigation. The team is also co-ordinating communications from Ag and Forestry and CFIA to industry and reviewing CFIA situation reports to identify areas where Alberta can help. We know the industry in Alberta is strong and resilient, and we continue to work with our partners to support them through this.

The Speaker: Second supplemental.

Ms Fitzpatrick: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Given that the Canadian Food Inspection Agency, CFIA, is the lead on this investigation, again to the same minister: what is your department doing to aid our beef producers?

The Speaker: The hon. minister.

Ms Larivee: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We've been in close contact with beef producers about this issue, and we know it is causing some producers a great amount of stress. A recovery team has been assigned to assess potential avenues for providing financial assistance to impacted producers. The Department of Agriculture and Forestry continues to work very closely with CFIA and beef producers to share information on financial options with affected producers. We will continue to listen to beef producers and affected parties to look for ways to support our hard-working farm families.

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

High-risk Offender Monitoring

Mr. Cyr: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Recently an Edmonton justice found a national sex offender registry to be unconstitutional. I know that there are always exceptions to a rule, but this registry is about keeping our community safe from repeat sex offenders. The Crown is still able to oppose and find alternative solutions, and I sincerely hope that they will. To the Minister of Justice: what is her government's position on the sex offender registry?

The Speaker: The hon. Minister of Justice.

Ms Ganley: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and to the member for the question. Well, obviously, it would be inappropriate for me to comment directly on the decisions of a justice who feels that they are enforcing the rights of average Albertans.

With respect to the Crown prosecution service we have a number of registries that work within police at a provincial level and a federal level to ensure that long-term offenders, that high-risk

offenders, that a variety of different offenders are tracked to ensure, Mr. Speaker, that we're keeping the population of Alberta safe. [interjections]

The Speaker: You guys done?

Mr. Nixon: Yes, we're ready, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: I'm glad.
First supplemental.

Mr. Cyr: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Given that recently at a Wildrose AGM our members overwhelmingly passed a policy that says that Alberta should "improve monitoring of and strengthen restrictions on those who have been released from jail [and] still . . . pose a threat to the community" and given that the sentiment is echoed across our province from concerned parents to community members, what specific measures will the NDP be implementing to support this policy and keep our communities safe?

The Speaker: The hon. minister.

Ms Ganley: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and to the member, for what's really a very important question. Our Crown prosecution service has a number of ways in which they track high-risk offenders and long-term offenders, and they do make those applications whenever appropriate. In addition, we've made a number of reviews of different elements of the justice system, as has the federal government, to ensure that we're using the justice system more efficiently, to ensure that we're not using it in cases where people are suffering from mental health and addictions but to ensure that it is able to focus its resources on those who present a danger to society.

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

Mr. Cyr: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Given that according to the Justice website there are 40 high-risk offenders in Edmonton, 20 in Calgary, and 17 in other areas of the province and given that there are not enough resources for all these people to be monitored by the police forces, threatening the safety of our communities, what additional actions will the government take to stop these individuals from reoffending in our communities?

The Speaker: The hon. minister.

Ms Ganley: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and to the member, for the question. Well, certainly, it's the case that those offenders are monitored, both by Justice and by police, where appropriate. It has been my experience that our police partners do their absolute level best and that they actually do a fine job of ensuring that that's the case.

But we at Justice are always looking to move the ball forward, Mr. Speaker, and that's why we've instigated a number of system reviews to ensure that we are focusing critical resources like police, like jails, like the court systems on matters that actually pose a risk to the public as opposed to those . . .

The Speaker: Thank you, hon. minister.
The Member for Calgary-North West.

School Fees

Ms Jansen: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In its 2015 election campaign the NDP government promised Alberta parents that it would cut

school fees in half. For the record, the pledge is on the NDP's 2015 campaign website and page 8 of its campaign booklet, which I will table. Allow me to quote from the website. "We will invest \$45 million to reduce school fees by half, with a particular focus on banning lunch supervision fees." To the Education minister. You've been in office now for a year and a half. When will you fulfill this promise for Alberta parents?

The Speaker: The hon. Minister of Education.

Mr. Eggen: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you for the question as well. Certainly, we have been working hard to identify where school fees are being charged and how much. We were in a circumstance with Budget 2016 where we had to make some difficult choices. However, we've seen over time that with our process of looking at where school fees are, many school boards have reduced their school fees, and certainly in the long term we will endeavour to do so on a province-wide basis.

Ms Jansen: "Difficult choices." Alberta parents will remember that.

Given that the Member for Edmonton-Strathcona criticized the previous government for school fees which she claimed were the result of poor management and given that the Member for Edmonton-Beverly-Clareview accused the former government of downloading public services onto hard-working Albertans through the use of busing and supervision fees, again to the Education minister: reducing school fees got huge traction in the last election, but now that the voting is over, is your interest over, too?

2:20

The Speaker: The Minister of Education.

Mr. Eggen: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know, there are difficult choices to be made budgetwise. We chose to invest in enrolment so that we could hire 1,100 teachers, more than 800 support staff, and to make sure we kept the lights on. School boards appreciate it. Parents appreciate it. The kids appreciate it in the classroom. Otherwise, we would have fallen off an education cliff if the previous government had happened to have won again.

The Speaker: Second supplemental.

Ms Jansen: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Given this government clearly has no plans to reduce school fees and it's now downloading more costs onto parents with a carbon tax that school boards cannot afford to pay and cash-strapped boards have to increase school fees, particularly for busing, to help pay for this new tax, to the same minister: since you will not cut school fees, can you at least tell parents that you're not going to hike those fees up?

Mr. Eggen: Well, once again, Mr. Speaker, I'll make it very clear that we are working to reduce school fees across the province. We weren't able to do it this year because of a difficult financial circumstance, which probably most people understand in the province – maybe this member doesn't – and certainly we're working very hard to make sure that we don't just keep the lights on in schools but that we have the best school system here in Canada based on the financing that we put into place, funding for enrolment and building new things like a school nutrition pilot and building a plan to reduce school fees in the out-years.

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

Home-schooling Providers

Mr. Smith: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We've heard from parents that only 60 of 100 home-schooled students, out of the 3,500, as of yesterday have found an appropriate replacement for Wisdom Home Schooling. One of those parents, after being turned down many times by school authorities, has had to place their child, who has a special-learning need, in a public school authority in a classroom without an aide. Will this minister apologize to the parents of 3,500 students who have had their educational program of choice ripped out from under them and are now having to enrol in programs that may not meet the needs of their children?

The Speaker: The Minister of Education.

Mr. Eggen: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you for the question. It's important to make sure that we're looking after each of the home-schoolers that need registration in an affiliate to move forward in education. It is home-schooling, so people can move forward because they are schooling at home.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I would encourage the member opposite to carefully read the report that started this in the first place and think twice about hitching his wagon onto allowing this financial situation to continue in that school.

The Speaker: First supplemental.

Mr. Smith: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Not much of an apology.

We all want to ensure that taxpayer dollars are being protected while our students are getting a world-class education, but given that the minister's sudden decision to close Trinity has left 3,500 students and parents in a lurch two months into the school year with no authentic choices that meet their educational needs, Minister, what's to stop you from unilaterally closing any other school, leaving more Albertans suffering the consequences of your bad decisions?

Mr. Eggen: Mr. Speaker, I won't apologize for making sure that we spend public money appropriately, following the law. Once again, if this member wants to hitch his wagon to a circumstance like that, well, he does it at his own peril, quite frankly. We are making sure that we will have places for these students. If he has individuals who are having trouble registering, please come visit me in my office, and we will look after them. [interjections]

The Speaker: The two front rows, please.
Second supplemental.

Mr. Smith: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Given that this minister has created an outrageous problem for 3,500 students and their families by closing Trinity Christian School without warning and given that he decided not to approve ReThink charter school in Calgary and given that the NDP tabled an amendment to Motion 504 that negated parental choice, why should parents anywhere in the province believe that he and his government support parental choice in education?

Mr. Eggen: Well, you know, Mr. Speaker, it might be a convenient point to exercise and indulge in hyperbole, but let's look at the facts. We have maintained stable funding for all forms of education, including home-schooling, private schools, and chartered schools across the province. This is an unfortunate circumstance. Certainly, we are working hard to mitigate the situation. I looked at it. It's home-schooling, so schooling does carry on. We will work hard with all parents and students to come to an amicable solution.

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

Economic Development

Mr. Hunter: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Albertans have been pleading with this government for stability and a sustainable economy. History has shown time and time again that this sustainability and job creation are the by-product of low taxes, entrepreneurship, and investment. What has the Minister of Economic Development and Trade done to create an atmosphere where investors' confidence can materialize into jobs that don't rely solely on government subsidies and spending?

The Speaker: The Minister of Economic Development and Trade.

Mr. Bilous: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and I'll thank the member for the question. There's a number of initiatives that our government has embarked on over the past year since this ministry was created, including increasing lending limits of ATB by \$1.5 billion. We've also reintroduced the STEP program. We've reduced the small-business tax by 33 per cent starting January 1. Alberta will continue to have the second-lowest small-business tax in the country. I look forward to telling the member about all of the other initiatives our government is undertaking.

Mr. Hunter: Mr. Speaker, given this government has gone after companies like Enmax and EPCOR, it could be argued that this minister is in fact doing the opposite to inspire confidence in people to invest and given that it's already hard enough to start a business and to be successful at it without making them even less competitive by adding a carbon tax and a 50 per cent increase to minimum wage, does this minister believe that he is creating an environment to nurture diversification or hinder it?

The Speaker: The hon. minister.

Mr. Bilous: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm happy to respond to this and to point out the fact that even with the carbon levy coming in on January 1, 2017, Alberta will continue to have the lowest taxes in the country, lower than Saskatchewan by \$7.5 billion. I'll tell you how else we're helping to grow local economies. By raising the minimum wage, we are putting dollars in the hands of hard-working men and women of the province who are going to be spending that money within their local economies. I can tell you as well that we will be introducing legislation on two new tax credits.

The Speaker: Thank you, hon. minister.

Mr. Hunter: Minister, a person will not invest unless they're confident that they will be able to earn a profit.

Given that your risky economic policies have severely damaged investors' confidence in this province and as a result jobs are being lost and families in Alberta are suffering, Minister, will you tell this House how many net new jobs Alberta has created under the NDP and provide evidence that shows that your policies are actually working to help Albertans get back to work?

The Speaker: The hon. minister.

Mr. Bilous: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd love to respond to this question. Increases to our Infrastructure investments sustain about 10,000 jobs a year for the next three years, and 2,700 students had summer jobs because we reintroduced the STEP program. The Alberta Enterprise Corporation investments: 1,100 direct and 1,400 indirect jobs. The modernized Alberta royalty framework has led to more than 80 new well approvals, supporting 135 jobs each. We

provided \$10 million to make Alberta's agrivalve processing incubator the biggest in the world, and that has created more than 400 jobs. The list goes on.

Ethics and Accountability Committee

Dr. Starke: Mr. Speaker, last June, amidst great fanfare, the NDP government appointed the Select Special Ethics and Accountability Committee. Now, after a slow start, the committee worked diligently throughout the summer and completed work on one of the four acts that we were asked to review. The work on a second act is also largely complete, and a great deal of information has been collected from hundreds of submissions on the other two acts. The all-party committee unanimously asked to be reconstituted to complete its important work, but now we hear that won't happen. To the minister: why not?

The Speaker: The hon. Minister of Labour, proceed.

2:30

Ms Gray: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. The committee that was proposed by this government was because we wanted to take a collaborative approach, working with all parties to review conflict-of-interest legislation, election financing, whistle-blowers, following on Bill 1, the act that banned corporate and union donations, getting big money out of politics. The committee worked well together to make some recommendations and made recommendations around whistle-blower protection. But when it came to stopping the old ways of doing things in elections financing, they did everything they could to stop it on the opposition side. They fought against getting big money out of politics.

The Speaker: Thank you, hon. minister.

Dr. Starke: Well, Mr. Speaker, given that I was on that committee and given that when the minister was the chair, we met only four times during the first seven months of existence for a total of less than eight hours of meetings and given that the submissions of hundreds of Albertans on the elections act and the Conflicts of Interest Act have been collected and diligently reviewed by the committee and given that the mandate of the committee could easily be extended to allow for this important work to be completed, to the minister: what do you intend to tell the hundreds of Albertans who, because of your decision, will now be ignored by your NDP government?

The Speaker: The Minister of Labour and democratic renewal.

Ms Gray: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Albertans have told us that they want to take big money out of politics, and we have responded. Moving forward, the committee will not be reconstituted, but we will be looking at the submissions from Albertans, the discussion that happened at that committee, and bringing forward some recommendations for our financial system to get big money out of politics. Today \$105,000 can be donated by one person across four years. That is big money still in politics. Although the opposition was opposed to changing it . . .

An Hon. Member: Not true.

Ms Gray: . . . we will be bringing forward reform.

The Speaker: Allow me to remind the House again about language and statements being made like "Not true." Please contain it. [interjections] I'm reminding the House, please.

Dr. Starke: Well, Mr. Speaker, given that the committee's work was continuously hampered by interference from the Premier's office and given that dozens of votes by the committee ended in a tie which was always broken by the committee chair in favour of the government members' position and given that virtually all of the contentious issues were decided in the government's favour even when there was overwhelming evidence of widespread public opposition, why doesn't the minister simply admit that this committee was merely a sham designed by the NDP government to tilt the electoral playing field in its favour?

The Speaker: The hon. minister.

Ms Gray: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Modernizing elections financing should have been a nonpartisan issue. Unfortunately, the opposition parties did everything they could to stop changes from being implemented. We are currently looking at the unfinished work of the committee so that we can move forward, making sure that our electoral laws match the principles that exist in virtually every other jurisdiction in Canada. We will be working to get big money out of politics. We will be working with Albertans to do this in a smart, modern way.

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

Fort McMurray Wildfire Recovery

Mr. Piquette: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It has now been six months since the Wood Buffalo wildfire forced tens of thousands of people from their homes. Many Wood Buffalo residents have voiced concerns about just how long they've been kept from their communities. To the Minister of Municipal Affairs: can you provide an update on the progress of recovery in this region?

The Speaker: The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs.

Ms Larivee: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm proud of the significant progress that has been made in the recovery of the Wood Buffalo region. Demolition and cleanup are close to complete, and rebuilding is under way. We continue to support residents as they work through the insurance process and to ensure the community has the mental health supports that they need. As someone who lived through a devastating wildfire in my own hometown, I know this will be a long journey, but we have been standing with the people of Wood Buffalo since the start of this disaster, and we will continue to do that in the weeks, months, and years ahead.

The Speaker: First supplemental.

Mr. Piquette: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you, Minister, for the answer. Albertans have shown just how resilient this province is and dug deep to contribute to those displaced by the wildfire. To the same minister: what assurance do these thousands of Albertans have that their money is going where it is needed?

The Speaker: The hon. minister.

Ms Larivee: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The generosity of Albertans is going exactly where it was intended, to making a real difference in the lives of those impacted by this devastating wildfire. Thank you again to the Albertans who dug so deep. Our government matched those contributions by individual Albertans to a total of \$30.3 million. Those funds are targeted towards programs to help residents economically and emotionally. Through the Canadian Red Cross we are giving to great, local organizations that are already on the ground helping residents and supporting business

owners so that they can reopen their doors and take care of their staff.

The Speaker: Thank you.
Second supplemental.

Mr. Piquette: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I've heard that many small businesses in Fort McMurray are struggling right now. To the Minister of Economic Development and Trade: what supports do business owners impacted by the wildfire have available to them?

The Speaker: The Minister of Economic Development and Trade.

Mr. Bilous: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'll thank the member for the question. We know that the wildfires forced many residents of Wood Buffalo to leave behind their homes and businesses. It came at a moment's notice and at great personal cost. I can tell you that as soon as the evacuation ended, we funded a Back to Business Resource Centre to provide a one-stop shop for business, staffed with experts. Since then we've met with and I've met with business leaders, including the Minister of Municipal Affairs, and we listened to what they asked for. They asked for grants, for funding for their businesses, which we brought together, the other two orders of government and the Red Cross, and provided a \$60 million envelope.

The Speaker: Thank you, hon. minister.

Forest Fire Fighting Contracting

Mr. Loewen: Mr. Speaker, the media reports that not only did this government bungle the awarding of casual fire bomber contracts by forgetting to put them out for tender, but they mishandled them so badly that they cancelled them completely during one of the driest wildfire seasons on record and then retendered them the day after the Fort Mac fire started, at the beginning of May. Notwithstanding the heroic efforts of the front-line personnel, did these errors in any way impact the emergency preparedness for that fire season?

The Speaker: The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs.

Ms Larivee: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you to the member for the question. It is absolutely absurd to imply that in any way the government of Alberta was not completely committed to ensuring that wildfire fighters had every single resource that they needed on the front line at every single moment during every wildfire in the province this summer. [interjections]

The Speaker: Government members, when you knock on your desks that loud, I cannot hear the minister. Please contain it.

Mr. Loewen: Given that it was found that the tendering of these air tanker contracts was so poorly handled and given that the department then tried to incorporate confidentiality clauses so fire companies would stop talking to the media and opposition about this government bungling, to the Premier: were these actions a direct result of ill-advised budget cuts, and why did you ask for these gag orders, that were clearly not in the deals before?

The Speaker: The hon. minister.

Ms Larivee: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The contracts that are being talked about were actually for the 2017 fire season, so it had absolutely no implication for the fire season this summer. Certainly, we provide contracts for baseline firefighter services to provide a bare minimum of that; however, we have always had emergency

funding available to be utilized to work with our partners from across this country and around the world to ensure that for every single wildfire every single resource will be there. That happened this summer, and I'm proud of the work our wildfire fighters did.

Mr. Loewen: Mr. Speaker, given that the revised tendered contract for air tankers on May 2 contained exemptions to allow the slower, smaller, amphibious AT 802 from B.C.-based Conair to work in Alberta and given that these souped-up crop-dusters carry a smaller water load that's a fraction of the L-188s' or the CL-215Ts', did this government compromise wildfire fighting operations by procuring smaller aircraft far below what is needed to properly work Alberta's fires? Will you correct these matters before the next fire season?

The Speaker: The hon. minister.

Ms Larivee: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I do not profess to be an expert in fighting fires, and I would suppose that the member across the floor is not an expert in fighting fires either. We depend upon the experts in wildfire to tell us what resources we need, and when they tell us they need resources, we make sure they have them. I'm proud of the work they do. I am deeply opposed to any implication that our wildfire fighters are not doing everything they can to help Albertans, and we will continue to be there for them. [interjections]

The Speaker: Members, please.

The hon. Member for Calgary-Lougheed.

2:40 Government Agencies, Boards, and Commissions

Mr. Rodney: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Alberta Electric System Operator, Energy Regulator, Petroleum Marketing Commission, Utilities Commission, China petroleum corporation Alberta Petroleum Centre, Market Surveillance Administrator, Transmission Facilities Cost Monitoring Committee, and the Balancing Pool, which is currently looking for no less than four new members, all report to the Energy minister. Will she take this opportunity right now to inform Albertans of all resignations that have been tendered for each of these groups in the past week, the past month, and indeed since she has become minister?

The Speaker: The hon. Minister of Energy.

Ms McCuaig-Boyd: Thank you for that question, I think. Currently I'm not aware of any resignations this week. I can go back and give a report to the committee on all the things – we have been looking in the last while for members for the Balancing Pool as part of our ABCs' replacement of people.

Mr. Rodney: I look forward to that.

Given that outstanding Albertans are resigning from extremely important positions on all sorts of agencies, boards, and commissions across various ministries and that this is a huge problem for Albertans, I have a few questions for the Premier. Will you table a list of all of the board directors and chairs of all Alberta ABCs who've resigned since you've taken office, and when will you table that document? Will you and your ministers be tabling future documents of this kind in a timely fashion on a go-forward basis because of the importance of this, forging the future direction of our province?

The Speaker: The hon. Minister of Finance.

Mr. Ceci: Thank you very much for the question, Mr. Speaker. The agencies, boards, and commissions review is ongoing at this time.

As people know, we initiated this review. About 301 agencies, boards, and commissions were doing the work of government. We do need to better understand what they're doing. There are lots of things that this government, when it came into office, didn't understand. They didn't understand how many people were getting paid, how many contracts were out there for different organizations, and we have culled all that information and brought it in. We're saving Albertans money by amalgamating many of the agencies, boards, and commissions: \$33 million over three years.

The Speaker: Thank you, hon. minister.

Mr. Rodney: Thanks to the Minister of Finance for that, but that wasn't the question. We'll ask it in a different way. Again to the Premier: given that more and more honourable Albertans are resigning from agencies, boards, and commissions across this province for all sorts of reasons, including political interference, as has been well documented, are you at all concerned about this alarming trend, and if so, what exactly are you and your ministers planning to do about this on behalf of and in the service of Albertans? Please tell us.

The Speaker: The hon. Minister of Finance.

Mr. Ceci: Thank you for the question, Mr. Speaker. You know, what we are doing is that we are resetting the appointment process for the agencies, boards, and commissions so those agencies, boards, and commissions will look more like Albertans and less like that side.

The Speaker: Hon. members, I did not note it, but I think I'm advised that there is a point of order that was raised earlier.

Members' Statements

(continued)

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

GSS Integrated Energy

Cortes-Vargas: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am proud to be part of a government that is creating jobs and diversifying Alberta's energy sector. I constantly say that Strathcona-Sherwood Park is a community made of leaders, so it is an honour to again recognize constituents of Strathcona-Sherwood Park Mike and Lynn Roppelt and the innovative approach their company, GSS Integrated Energy, has taken to help Alberta move forward in an environmentally responsible way.

GSS is an Alberta-based company dedicated to improving energy efficiency and reducing consumption in residential, commercial, and industrial applications. They specialize in terra thermal energy exchange and storage systems, a process that captures waste heat to use when needed and reduces greenhouse gas emissions. They are proud of the many projects that they have been involved in across western Canada. These projects include residential builds that take place right in Strathcona county like Crimson Leaf Estates and other properties in and around Sherwood Park and Edmonton. Even in your own constituency, Mr. Speaker, Medicine Hat, they've provided specialized services for a variety of new and retrofit geothermal systems.

GSS uses the best high-performing technologies such as subsurface energy storage; solar, thermal, and photovoltaic energy; stormwater and grey water reuse; and cogeneration. They were recently recognized for their contributions by our local chamber of commerce during Small Business Week, winning the 2016 business

award for environmental protection. They were also named as a finalist for innovation in the new large-business product or work system category.

I am very proud to have the owners of GSS in my constituency, and I look forward to continuing to support their work.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Introduction of Bills

The Speaker: The hon. Minister of Energy.

Bill 27 Renewable Electricity Act

Ms McCuaig-Boyd: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is my pleasure to rise today and introduce Bill 27, the Renewable Electricity Act.

This proposed act will help carry out elements of the climate leadership plan. It will create the legislative framework to meet our target of 30 per cent of electricity produced in Alberta to be from renewable sources by 2030. Bill 27 will also formalize the commitment we made to create the renewable electricity program. The Alberta Electric System Operator will run the program. This bill ensures that the AESO has the authority to develop and implement the program, Mr. Speaker. This bill sets the groundwork for greener electricity in Alberta. It also helps to diversify our economy and create jobs while protecting Alberta's environment.

Thank you.

The Speaker: Hon. minister, I believe this is a money bill and it requires – is there an attachment to the bill being circulated?

Ms McCuaig-Boyd: It's been submitted, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: This being a money bill, Her Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor, having been informed of the contents of this bill, recommends the same to the Assembly. Is that a motion you would have intended to state?

Ms McCuaig-Boyd: Oh, I'm sorry. I did not know. Yes. It has been signed by the Lieutenant Governor and submitted to you.

The Speaker: We'll proceed. Thank you.

The Member for Calgary-Lougheed.

Mr. Rodney: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Unfortunately, there's an additional snag, to put it mildly. I rise on a point of privilege. I will give my brief remarks for you to consider, sir. Here's the citation for you.

The Speaker: I will take your point of privilege; however, I believe it's appropriate – I've been guided by the table – that we have a motion on the floor. The hon. minister has moved first reading of Bill 27, the Renewable Electricity Act.

[Motion carried; Bill 27 read a first time]

The Speaker: I believe there was a point of privilege. The Member for Calgary-Lougheed.

2:50

Mr. Rodney: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise on a point of privilege as just stated. For the courtesy of you and the table officers, that's standing orders 15(5) and 23(e).

I understand – and it's well documented – that a government minister spoke to the media and at a conference this morning about a new renewable energy program which had not even been introduced in this House. A government minister spoke with the

CBC *Eyeopener* this morning and to the Canadian Wind Energy Association annual conference this morning. The government also issued a news release this morning describing the same renewable energy plan. I believe that those announcements were about Bill 27, the Renewable Electricity Act, which had not yet been introduced into this House. I ask that you find that this government has violated the privilege of all members of this House.

This is the first opportunity, obviously, to raise this point of privilege since the introduction of Bill 27 just a couple of minutes ago, and that confirms that the bill was indeed that same bill referred to in the government minister's comments and news release. Mr. Speaker, the minister is clearly . . .

The Speaker: Hon. member, I will take this as a notice. At the end of the Routine we will give you an opportunity to finish your remarks.

Tabling Returns and Reports

The Speaker: The Minister of Municipal Affairs.

Ms Larivee: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise today to table the requisite five copies of the report Home Again: Recovery after the Wood Buffalo Wildfire. This six-month progress report documents our government's immediate response to the wildfire disaster in the regional municipality of Wood Buffalo this May and our role in the region's recovery. Our government has been standing with the people of Wood Buffalo since the start of this disaster, and this report confirms our commitment to continue to support the region as it rebuilds and recovers in the weeks, months, and years ahead.

Thank you.

The Speaker: Thank you.

The hon. Member for Chestermere-Rocky View.

Mrs. Aheer: Thank you. I rise to submit five copies of the Fraser research bulletin which I read from this morning in my documents.

Thank you so much.

Mr. MacIntyre: Mr. Speaker. I have here the five requisite copies of the article in the *Financial Post* that I referred to this morning from Vivian Krause, Forest Ethics' Cash Pipeline, talking about ForestEthics, the San Francisco based organization that is trying to manipulate our pipeline process.

Thank you.

The Speaker: Hon. members, the Opposition House Leader will speak to the point of order. Is that correct?

Point of Order

Allegations against Members

Mr. Cooper: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise today on a point of order from during question period, the citation coming momentarily. That's 23(h), "makes allegations against another Member." The hon. minister of labour, jobs, skills, and training – I'm sorry; I sometimes get the name wrong of that department as it changes regularly – made an allegation to the Official Opposition that the Official Opposition had intended to keep big money in politics. And the reason why this is an allegation and not a matter of debate is that, in fact, the opposition proposed a motion to lower contribution limits on numerous occasions, many of which were significantly lower than \$105,000 over a four-year period.

As such, the minister has made a statement that, certainly, many people would say was not true and has made an allegation. In fact,

the opposition did not do something that she said that it did. Those sorts of allegations are not helpful in this Chamber. I would ask that she apologize and withdraw.

The Speaker: The Government House Leader.

Mr. Mason: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Well, having not been in attendance at the committee meeting, I can only take the member's word for it that the motions were made. Nevertheless, it is only part of the story.

One of the things that this government has been very, very interested in doing is to eliminate big money from influencing politics. There are many aspects to that and many aspects that were discussed in the committee besides just simply the question of limits per se. There is the question of: should money come from outside the province? There's the question of whether or not these rules should apply in leadership campaigns. There are many aspects and facets to it.

It is a matter of opinion on this side that the various tactics that were pursued by the opposition in that committee were designed to prevent it from reaching conclusions on a fundamental issue of whether or not money should be influencing politics in an unreasonable way. It is our submission, our view, that the opposition has been attempting to prevent the government from pursuing its objective of getting big money out of politics through a whole series of disruptive tactics.

So I would respectfully disagree with my colleague across the aisle and suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that it does not comprise a point of order.

The Speaker: Are there any other members that would like to speak to the point? The Member for Calgary-Elbow.

Mr. Clark: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I had the distinct privilege of sitting in every single one of 20 meetings of the Select Special Ethics and Accountability Committee, and I want to speak in favour of my hon. colleague's claim of a point of order under 23(h). I would also suggest that there may even be a case for a point of order under 23(i), the false and unavowed motives that the hon. minister has cast at all members of the opposition.

To the Government House Leader's point that it was all about trying to get "big money out of politics," which is a lovely talking point, I can assure you that every single member on this side of the House agrees with that. We all voted in favour of Bill 1. We all also, Mr. Speaker, in that committee, supported motions and proposed motions that would in fact lower the donation limit even more than the \$4,000 limit that the government proposes. Any claim that any party on this side of the House would in any way support having more money or "big money" in politics is patently false. So the allegations being made by that side of the House, sadly, are absolutely incorrect.

I do think it's worth noting that in this particular committee we had all four opposition parties. We had the Wildrose agreeing with the Liberals, agreeing with the PCs, agreeing with the Alberta Party. Now, that is something. There's some ideological spectrum there, Mr. Speaker, my point being that the allegations made by the minister are, in fact, patently false. I would urge you, please, to find a point of order because it's the sort of thing that does a real disservice to democracy.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

3:00

The Speaker: Any new information that can be presented with respect to the point of order that's raised?

I do not have the privilege of seeing the scripts, nor do I have a strong enough recollection of hearing the comment that allegedly was made. Ordinarily I would have probably ruled on this event, it seems, in part, but I don't want to forego my conclusion or send a signal that it may or may not be a point of order. I think I would like the opportunity to defer comment on it until I have an opportunity to read the Blues.

I think we can now move to the point of privilege. Are there any other comments that the hon. Member for Calgary-Lougheed would like to make under the point of privilege?

Privilege

Mr. Rodney: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm happy to repeat the comments, just for the clarification of everyone in the room and beyond.

Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of privilege under standing orders 15(5) and 23(e), which is, of course, anticipation. I understand that a government minister spoke to the media in a conference today about a new renewable energy program which had not yet been introduced in this House. A government minister spoke with the CBC's *Eyeopener* this morning and to the Canadian Wind Energy Association annual conference, again this morning, in Calgary. The government also issued a news release this morning describing the same renewable energy plan. So those are three different artifacts that I have right in front of me at this moment.

Obviously, these announcements are about Bill 27, the Renewable Electricity Act, which had not been introduced in this House until moments ago, so I ask that you find that the government has violated the privilege of all members of this House. This is indeed the first opportunity to raise this point of privilege since Bill 27 was introduced. It confirms that the bill was indeed the bill referred to in the government minister's comments and news release. Mr. Speaker, the minister is clearly acting with contempt for the House. I'd ask you to find as such.

It's right here. The *Calgary Herald*: Alberta to Buy 400MW of Renewable Power as It Phases Out Coal. Sentence 2: "The government will table legislation later Thursday... but [the environment minister] laid out details of the province's plan in a morning speech at the Canadian Wind Energy Association's annual conference."

In addition, at 9:49 a.m. today from CBC News: Renewable Energy Program to Add 5,000 Megawatts of Capacity by 2030, Says Environment Minister. I'll read just a couple of the spots here. "So today is sort of the first step in the real nitty-gritty details for the investment community on how we're going to move forward on that." It goes on about this program and this bill. This was from this morning.

Mr. Speaker, we all know that none of this can be broadcast anywhere to anyone until it is tabled in this House. Also, from their very own media release this morning, the same thing, sir.

I think it's a little late for rookie mistakes; it's been a year and a half. Maybe it's time for this government to get this right, and today might be a good day to start.

Thank you.

The Speaker: Hon. member, you've cited a couple of documents. I trust you will be tabling those. Is that correct?

Mr. Rodney: I will be happy to in the future, yes.

The Speaker: I have a note here from the Government House Leader.

Mr. Mason: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, of course, I have not had the opportunity to review the documents and the news reports that are referred to by the hon. Member for Calgary-Lougheed and to consider the precedents and so on. As a point of privilege is an extremely serious matter, the most serious point that can be raised in the House, I would respectfully request time to do research to compose the response of the government to this point of privilege and to afford other opposition House leaders the same opportunity. So I would request that I be allowed to make the response to this point of privilege on the next sitting day.

The Speaker: Hon. members, I, too, would need some time to look at the particular points, but I gathered from the Government House Leader that it could be as early as Monday that we would deal with this.

Opposition House Leader, do you have another point?

Mr. Cooper: Just seeking some clarification from you, Mr. Speaker, as to: if the question will be dealt with on Monday, I am also fine to reserve some comments until Monday. Having said that, if that isn't the case, then I am quite likely to speak in favour of my hon. colleague. You know, you found just this week, Mr. Speaker...

Mr. Mason: You don't get two chances.

The Speaker: Hon. members.

Mr. Cooper: I'm not sure who's in charge of the House today, Mr. Speaker, but it seems like the Government House Leader believes it to be him.

I will ask the question. If it will be dealt with on Monday, I will reserve my comments. If not, then I would like to provide some additional comment.

The Speaker: If we could just take a moment. I'd like to read 15(3). I'll read Standing Order 15(3) for the sake of those who may not have.

If the Speaker is of the opinion that the matter may not be fairly dealt with at that time, the Speaker may defer debate on the matter to a time when he or she determines it may be... dealt with.

I would be prepared to hear the arguments of all parties on Monday, after which time I would take the due time necessary to make a decision.

For those who may be leaving, have a safe journey.

Orders of the Day

Government Bills and Orders Second Reading

Bill 25 Oil Sands Emissions Limit Act

Mr. Panda moved that the motion for second reading of Bill 25, Oil Sands Emissions Limit Act, be amended by deleting all of the words after "that" and substituting the following:

Bill 25, Oil Sands Emissions Limit Act, be not now read a second time but that the subject matter of the bill be referred to the Standing Committee on Resource Stewardship in accordance with Standing Order 74.2.

[Debate adjourned on the amendment November 3: Mr. Panda speaking]

The Speaker: I am seeing the hon. Member for Calgary-Foothills. Is that correct? Please proceed.

Mr. Panda: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This morning I was talking about this arbitrary 100-megatonne cap, which will risk thousands of jobs and will also impact the livelihoods of families who are just trying to get ahead.

[The Deputy Speaker in the chair]

Something happens when you implement a cap on emissions and also curtail the production. The first people into the investment get to make money, but the last people into the investment lose money. Doesn't that sound an awful lot like a Ponzi scheme to you, Madam Speaker? The NDP are turning the Alberta oil sands into a Ponzi scheme, where the rich get richer, because they were there first, and the poor entrepreneurs get turned into suckers and are not allowed to develop the resource they bought.

There are more leases sold than the emissions will allow, so who gets to develop? Bill 25 does not sort that out, but a panel chaired by a co-radical will tell us in February. That's not good enough. We need the answer now to give certainty to the industry, Madam Speaker.

Now, talking about the unintended consequences, which the Member for Calgary-North West talked about this morning, I fear we might have to pay out these leaseholders who will not be allowed to develop the resource. It's called property rights. When the Crown does something that negatively affects my property, I get compensated, just like our coal companies are going to get compensated for their stranded assets. Instead of having land sales and the government making money, the government will be in the game of purchasing land and losing money. Where is that money going to come from? Saskatchewan is not capping emissions of their heavy oil, nor is Venezuela. Maybe my colleague from Edmonton-Ellerslie can tell the House more about Venezuela's oil sands and how they compare to Alberta's in terms of emissions and their regulations.

Australia cancelled their carbon tax, and France just did the same, Madam Speaker. But only in Alberta is the NDP looking to curb growth and development. Only the New Democratic Party thinks it is fair to deny the world market a choice in their oil. You can buy a limited supply of ethically and environmentally responsible Canadian oil if you can find it, or you can buy cheap and plentiful Saudi Arabian oil. I can attest to their oil being cheap on ethics and the environment.

3:10

In many of those countries, actually, they need military efforts to bring the oil out and to export to countries like us and to other countries. Madam Speaker, the prosperity of Alberta and the prospects for Alberta are under attack by the radical environmentalists, funded by foreign investors. It's funny how there are never any Greenpeace protests in Saudi Arabia or Russia. Maybe, you know, they're scared of the cruel punishment they'd receive from the local governments there.

One study actually estimates that this cap on emissions will cost \$150 billion to \$250 billion in lost revenue to the Alberta economy over time. We already lose enough wealth to the rest of Canada that's not reinvested in Alberta, and the equalization system makes it worse.

The NDP like to crow and be proud about their carbon tax, but since 2007 the government of Alberta and industry were in agreement and have been paying a price in carbon dioxide emissions under the specified gas emitters regulation. Alberta was the first jurisdiction with a carbon tax in North America, and some of my colleagues on the opposite side were asking: what's your plan? Yeah. If you hear, you get it. The funds from the specified gas emitters regulation went to research and development, R and D,

the innovation that comes up with ways to actually reduce carbon dioxide emissions and clean up the environment. The accelerated reclamation of tailings ponds has been from R and D.

In fact, Madam Speaker, I worked on some of those projects when I worked in the oil sands: reclamation projects, water recovery and recycling, cogen projects. They were all aimed to reduce the carbon footprint. Our plan is to encourage those kinds of investments. I worked on those projects, and if some of you want to know more, I'll be happy to talk to you.

People, by and large, are looking at the NDP and asking: "Are you really capping the development of your resources? Really? Who does that?" I came from India, where I helped to build the largest refinery in the world, at Jamnagar in Gujarat, producing 1.2 million barrels per day. That's almost one-third of Canada's production. We are competing with India, and they're not capping their development. No, it's full ahead. China is not capping their development either. So we need to be taking the R and D we do here to make the oil sands and the energy industry overall as green as possible and export that knowledge to help clean up the largest sources of pollution in India and China and other countries. That's our plan.

Alberta's resources are not the enemy in the global fight against climate change, but the solutions are here to take to the front lines of that battle, Madam Speaker. Our companies here need some flexibility and time for technology innovation, but this bill is actually, you know, driving investment away because there is no certainty for those companies who want to invest in those technologies.

That's why I oppose this bill, and, Madam Speaker, that's why I moved this amendment this morning. I encourage everyone to support that amendment.

Thank you.

The Deputy Speaker: Standing Order 29(2)(a) comes into effect. Does anybody have any questions for the hon. member under 29(2)(a)? Go ahead, Innisfail-Sylvan Lake.

Mr. MacIntyre: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I appreciate my esteemed colleague for the experience that he has in this field. I would be interested to understand from his experience his understanding of what happens in a situation like this. We have this massive oil sands field where much of the field now has to be developed by SAGD and other deeper technologies to extract that oil because the shallower areas are being mined right now, but we have this hundred-megatonne cap coming on. What happens to all of those leases that have already been purchased and paid for by smaller players, many of them Alberta companies? They put out good money and in good faith invested millions perhaps billions of dollars in these leases, and now we have – correct me if I'm wrong – about a 30- or 35-megatonne window for development.

All of these remaining leases: let's remember that each one of those leases represents thousands of jobs. It represents thousands of jobs, billions of dollars of economic activity, taxes that are paid, moms and dads having good-paying jobs, children with futures, and now all of these leases that are out there – I'm sure the owners of those leases are sitting there in their boardrooms and smaller, because some of them are quite small, and they're looking at this 30-, 35-megatonne window, and they're saying: "I wonder if there's even going to be a place for us in here. Who's going to get dibs on this window? Are we actually going to be able to develop this lease we've already put hundreds of millions of dollars into?"

I wonder if the hon. member could just expand a little bit on how they're all going to fit in here and sort of the impact that this kind of cap on expansion is going to have for these players.

Thank you.

Dr. Starke: Madam Speaker, point of order.

The Deputy Speaker: We have a point of order raised by the hon. member. Go ahead.

**Point of Order
Question-and-comment Period**

Dr. Starke: Thank you, Madam Speaker. As much as I'd really like to hear this debate continue on, in fact, under Standing Order 29(2)(b) the mover and the first speaker on a motion – 29(2)(a) doesn't apply to the speeches that they deliver. So as the Member for Calgary-Foothills was the mover of the referral motion, his speech is not applicable to 29(2)(a) nor is the speech immediately following his speech. It then kicks in after that according to 29(2)(b). As much as I hate to interrupt the dialogue that's going on here, this, in fact, is not in order.

The Deputy Speaker: Could you repeat the citation for the standing order, which number it was?

Dr. Starke: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Standing Order 29(2)(a) designates the five-minute question-and-answer period that is so commonly used here in the Chamber. Standing Order 29(2)(b) specifically says that "the 5 minute question and comment period referred to in clause (a) is not available following the speech from the mover of the resolution or the Bill in opening or closing debate." Now, the Member for Calgary-Foothills made an acceptable, or allowable, motion to refer, but that motion and the speech after that motion are not applicable to 29(2)(a).

The Deputy Speaker: Thank you, hon. member. I appreciate that. Actually, I was looking at the standing orders myself to confirm that, but the (b) portion applies to the mover not of the amendment, only of the motion or the bill itself. Amendments fall under the bill. It is in order to have 29(2)(a) on amendments, so we are in order.

Go ahead, hon. member.

Debate Continued

Mr. Panda: Thank you, Madam Speaker, and thank you to the member for a great question. Yeah, you're right. All the shallow leases were taken. Mine leases were taken. There are not many left. Most of the resource is deeper, and we need SAGD technology or other enhanced oil recovery technologies to get the resource out. That's why, you know, all those people who bought the leases before will be stranded, so they'll look for compensation, the same as in the coal phase-out situation we have.

3:20

That's why these unintended consequences – I mean, I respect the intention here of the NDP to reduce the carbon footprint, but the way we are rushing here, Madam Speaker, is not helping us. All those companies who are pioneers in this technology innovation need time and flexibility and certainty on the policy front. That's why it's not a good idea to rush this through. I see it as an attack on the prosperity and prospects in Alberta.

Every time I ask for an economic impact assessment of these environmental policies, I'm being blamed as a climate change denier. It is on record in this House that I studied science, that I believe in climate change, and I've worked on technologies that will reduce the carbon footprint. But they keep blaming us as being climate change deniers, which is not true. We are carbon tax deniers. We are reasoning with them on the economic impacts of these policies and how they impact livelihoods and kill jobs in Alberta.

That's why I encourage everyone in the House to actually support this amendment and, you know, to have fulsome discussions in the standing committee.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. Member for Lacombe-Ponoka.

Mr. Orr: Standing Order 29(2)(a)?

The Deputy Speaker: Yes.

Mr. Orr: Thank you. I just wonder if the member would clarify a little bit for me. Having worked on one of the largest projects in India and having said that there is really no greenhouse gas emissions planning there or commitment, am I right, then, in assuming that, in fact, if we make our production and our contribution to world markets out of price, then places like India will just pick it up? Carbon leakage will simply move to India? [The time limit for questions and comments expired]

The Deputy Speaker: Are there any other hon. members wishing to speak to the amendment? The hon. Member for Spruce Grove-St. Albert.

Mr. Horne: Thanks, Madam Speaker. I was quite interested to see this motion that the Oil Sands Emissions Limit Act be not now read a second time but that it be referred to committee. I don't know about most hon. members, but the first thing I think of when it goes to committee is: okay; who really needs to be consulted here? On the Oil Sands Emissions Limit Act I think everybody would agree that it is, in fact, the oil sands producers that should be talked to first and foremost.

It is from that perspective that I was interested to note that the industry caucus of the oil sands advisory group, composed of Canadian Natural Resources, Cenovus, ConocoPhillips Canada, MEG Energy, whose facility I had the opportunity to tour with many of my colleagues, Shell Canada, Statoil Canada, and Suncor have all come out in favour of this bill, saying that the "climate policy leadership reflects the ongoing collective support for responsible development of the oil sands." They go on to say that they "believe that by investing in technology and innovation, we can produce oil from the oil sands on a globally carbon competitive basis." They further go on to say that the "emissions limit acts as an incentive to continually improve our performance in a carbon constrained world" and that they "look forward to providing advice on the effective implementation of the emissions limit."

I am honestly quite baffled that there are members here claiming to speak on behalf of oil and gas workers when oil and gas workers are telling us that they want this. This is how we tell the world that we are acting on climate change, that we are committed to making sure that we live in a better world, and that we need to get a pipeline to tidewater. We cannot continue to ignore that the rest of the world is concerned about Alberta's emissions. We have the highest per capita emissions in the country, and that needs to change.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The Deputy Speaker: Under 29(2)(a), the hon. Member for Innisfail-Sylvan Lake.

Mr. MacIntyre: Yes. Thank you very much. I appreciate the passion from the hon. member across the aisle. Perhaps the hon. member could educate the House here on just why it is that we should not put this bill into committee when we have yet to see the fullness of what the oil sands advisory group has to say on this issue. We have a bill that precedes that report. It's interesting to note that

the hon. member is quoting industry when industry is supposed to be talking to OSAG. Could the hon. member perhaps tell us why he thinks it's just fine to have a bill come before this House when we haven't even had the full report yet from OSAG?

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. Member for Spruce Grove-St. Albert.

Mr. Horne: Thank you, Madam Speaker, and thank you to the member for the question. That's because I believe that this helps us get a pipeline as soon as possible. We know that the federal government is looking at a pipeline. That's coming up next month, I do believe. We need to show that we are taking action. We cannot wait for a report. We cannot refer it to committee when we talk to Ottawa. We need to act now. Well, quite frankly, we needed to act 10, 15, 20 years ago; however, we weren't in government then.

I hope that answers the hon. member's questions. We need a pipeline to tidewater. The federal government is looking at it now, and we need to act now.

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. Member for Innisfail-Sylvan Lake.

Mr. MacIntyre: Thank you, Madam Speaker. It's interesting to hear the hon. member say that we can't wait for a report. Then what in heaven's name are we having this committee for, and why are we paying them to do the work that we are paying them to do if we actually don't need the report in the first place, which is what he's telling us right now?

Granted, we need a pipeline to tidewater. The Wildrose Party has always said that we need a pipeline, and that has only become a revelation to the other side in the last 90 to 120 days. Furthermore, let's be clear that the NEB in the process of getting pipelines to tidewater is actually a federal responsibility, and somehow or other this bill really isn't going to speed that process up. It's a federal responsibility.

But I would be interested to know from the hon. member, Madam Speaker, why it is he thinks that we now need to have this OSAG report. If he's saying that we don't need this OSAG report, why are we still paying for it? They can all go home now.

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member.

Mr. Horne: Thank you, Madam Speaker, and thank you to the member for the question. I will repeat the last line I quoted from the industry caucus: "We look forward to providing advice on the effective implementation of the emissions limit." There is far more work for the advisory group to continue to do. It is not limited to just an emissions limit. It has a lot to do. The oil sands happens to be our biggest employer. I am baffled that so many members are intent on standing in this House and speaking against what they are asking for, against what our biggest employers are really looking forward to. They want to get to work, they want to be innovative, and they need to continue to work.

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. Member for Sherwood Park.

Ms McKittrick: Okay. I would like to ask the Member for Spruce Grove-St. Albert about the workers, including Iron and Earth – the Member for Leduc-Beaumont and I attended their AGM – who are in the oil and gas sector who are very much involved in renewable energy and totally understand the challenges of not reducing the emissions. I was wondering if you could talk more about how the workers are also involved in this.

Mr. Horne: Absolutely, and thank you to the member for the question. Iron and Earth has certainly been a big movement recently. I know that they're very interested in looking at reducing our carbon footprint, and I also note that a lot of our oil and gas businesses are as well. In fact, when we were at MEG Energy, they were talking about their cogeneration program. They need steam. Of course, they're a steam-assisted facility. A lot of companies decide to bring in the water and just boil the water and do nothing with the energy.

The Deputy Speaker: Any further hon. members wishing to speak to the amendment? The hon. Member for Battle River-Wainwright.

Mr. Taylor: Yes. Thank you, Madam Speaker. Thank you for the opportunity to speak on this amendment to Bill 25, Oil Sands Emissions Limit Act. Today I rise in opposition of this ideological bill. I have to wonder if this cap was well thought out or if the goal of this NDP government is to decide once again who will be the winners or who will lose out. Will this come to a point in time where the government will decide who gets to develop their resources and who doesn't no matter how much they paid for their lease? This government's record on cap keeping is something to contend with. Maybe that makes this bill a little bit less dangerous.

3:30

But last November, when a budget was presented – and we remember this budget – the same government legislated the debt to about 15 per cent of GDP, if you recall. Government members on the other side of the House promised – they promised – and they absolutely were saying that there is no way they are going to ask for more money. This is all of the money that they're going to need. This would be the extent of how much the debt-to-GDP ratio was going to be. That was it. You knew what the situation was at the time. We were in the same straits. In fact, the oil prices have gone up since that time, so we have seen oil climbing and not keep going down. So you're looking at a situation where you just wanted to weather the economic storm, and you said: this is lots of room. Unfortunately, that's what you promised. This, you said, was a firm cap.

Along came the budget in the spring, and the government then introduced Bill 10, the Fiscal Statutes Amendment Act – we remember that one, too – which allowed them to get rid of that 15 per cent debt to GDP, in fact, to just take the lid off how much you can borrow, not putting any restraints, anything, on that. Now you can borrow, as I said in one of my previous speeches, to infinity and beyond, and that's what you're allowed to do with this other bill. You got rid of the cap, and you failed to plan how much would be the spending.

Now the NDP government is talking about putting limits on an industry, you know, a cap, but I would really like to ask: how did you arrive at this cap? What process did you take to get to that number? Has everything been accounted for, or will you have to come back to re-establish another number that's more appropriate? This causes me great concern because when the NDP was elected, a royalty review was announced. Although only minor changes came from the review, while we waited, it sent a message at the wrong time, throughout Alberta and the world, in fact, that investment in Alberta should be done with caution. The cap is one more signal to investors that the NDP government is not on the side of business, and this ideological cap will turn and worsen our economy.

I have to wonder why the government decided to task the oil sands advisory group to recommend all the details on how to implement the 100 megatonne per year emissions limit. Many of

the panel members boast about having stopped the Northern Gateway pipeline – those are the people that are on this panel – and would like our oil industry to fail. They said that publicly. I wonder how many of them even want us to get to 100 megatonnes. What metrics did they use to determine the cap? It's a nice round number, I'll grant you that. That being said, it makes me wonder if rounding off is the science that they used to determine this number. It sounds like an arbitrary number, and the bill does not answer how the performance standards for GHG emissions will be crafted.

I'm proud to be from Alberta and of the advancements we have made towards creating a clean environment. Concerns have been raised in the past about our environment. A lot of it's unfair, but Alberta companies listened, and that's why we have the cleanest technologies in the world, something that we should not be ashamed of. Instead, the government just calls us embarrassing cousins.

In times like this we should use this opportunity to diversify, not into industries that run counter to our energy sector but that complement it, ones that we already understand. Our province has been working in the oil industry for so long that they understand oil, and we have the cleanest technologies anywhere in the world. Why aren't we advancing those to places like China, India, the United States? Like, selling your technologies: it's all throughout the world.

Has this government completed and released a study to determine how many leases can be sold before the government has sold too many to accommodate the cap? Do you know where that is? Can you please tell us what that number would be? Is there room under this cap to accommodate the leases the government has already sold? Do you know that you are over the limit at this present time? Do you know by how much?

This NDP government continues to arbitrarily impose their ideological will onto industry, with no thought for the future of this province. The government continues to tie the hands of industry without even looking at the cold, hard facts. You know, the reality is that we live in an oil-producing jurisdiction, and we should embrace what we have for our technologies, not try to restrict them and kill our economy in the process. This ideology has imposed policy that has the potential to constrain future oil sands production by \$150 billion. By \$150 billion. That's what the number is. That's lost jobs, lost revenue, loss of potential, loss of innovation as a potential result of less money in the industry. Smaller oil and gas producers are worried that they will lose opportunities for business.

This government never ceases to amaze me. They talk about how they're doing everything possible to get oil to tidewater, yet they continually use anti-oil advocacy groups to propagate their true intent.

Mr. Ceci: That's not true.

Mr. Taylor: It is true.

The intent of this bill is sending signals to investors that this NDP government is not on the side of business in Alberta. Their ideological agenda is contributing to the economic crisis our province is now in. No other jurisdiction is creating limits on long-term oil production, especially if you look at – these are our neighbours – Saskatchewan, B.C. You've got North Dakota; you've got Montana. These are people right around us. They're not putting this huge cap on what they're doing. We're being unfairly put into this position for our businesses, yet this government continues to block out any potential for new business. I hope you realize that. That's what you're doing. You're blocking out potential for new business in this province with your actions.

I will not be supporting this bill – I bet that's not a surprise to you – in its current form. But I ask that everybody in this Assembly at

least consider sending this bill to the committee so that the effects can be further studied.

Thank you.

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. Member for Innisfail-Sylvan Lake under 29(2)(a).

Mr. MacIntyre: Thank you, Madam Speaker, and thank you to my esteemed colleague for his comments regarding the referral motion. I would be interested to know from my colleague his thoughts on the value of referring bills to committee for further study in general.

Specifically, although we have had some mention from the other side of large players who have apparently spoken to this bill, I have yet to hear from a small player and, specifically, players who have leases that they are now struggling to find a way to develop up there. Perhaps you could speak to the value of having a more fulsome discussion with not only players in the patch but even everyday Albertans who have something to say about a bill and who look at the committee process, that is part of our parliamentary process, that the other side obviously doesn't like to use very much. Perhaps you could speak to the value of that in furthering and strengthening our democracy here.

3:40

Mr. Taylor: Thank you to the member. This is a notice of amendment that says: "Bill 25, Oil Sands Emissions Limit Act, be not now read a second time but that the subject matter of the bill be referred to the Standing Committee on Resource Stewardship in accordance with Standing Order 74.2." Why is that important? That was, I believe, what your question was. Why is it important that we send them to these committees? If you send them to the committee, you have a chance for experts to go and look at this, and you have a group that can have a fulsome discussion and understand what's happening within this industry.

If we just generally look at something as a whole here, we don't know the ramifications often because we're not experts in the oil industry. I wouldn't say all of us. We have experts in the oil industry that are out here, but not all of us are experts, and when you bring these to committees, you bring them to experts. The experts are able to lay out a plan and their rationale and determine if that limit, that number that you've set, is the right number or what that number should be and show different ways that you can arrive at a number that would be practical for not just Alberta but for our oil emissions. So it's important to be able to get the experts onside to have their say.

Without going to this committee, I don't believe that this will be properly looked at, and this is an important bill. Frankly, it's a very important bill – and thank you for bringing it up – and this needs to be looked at in the full context that it is.

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

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

Mr. Clark: Well, thank you very much, Madam Speaker, for the opportunity to speak on this amendment. I'm going to speak in favour of the amendment, but that's not because I necessarily agree with the views of the Wildrose opposition on this topic. I actually find the idea of a 100-megatonne cap a compelling idea. I think the principle of what this bill drives at is probably a fairly reasonable principle, but the reason I support this amendment is that there are just too many questions for me.

As I sat this morning and listened to the debate, it got pretty heated at times, with lots of accusations being hurled back and

forth. But interwoven in between all of those things was, I guess, a theme that I detected from one side, being an argument that this is nothing but politics, that perhaps it's an attempt to shut down the oil sands and to leave the oil in the ground. I actually don't think that's what the government is doing. And the government would argue: well, it's just a practical way of ensuring we get pipelines built and market access to tidewater. I see no evidence in this bill that that's what's going to happen either. So I have many, many, many questions about this.

My answers to those questions are to find ways of incenting the oil and gas industry to develop technology to solve the carbon emission problem once and for all. Maybe this bill will do that; maybe it won't. But that's why I believe we need to send this bill to committee. You know, I'm optimistic. I'm ever the optimist, especially as I think about the innovation that comes from the oil and gas industry in this province. They're a world leader, quite literally, in environmental technologies, water-reduction technologies, tailings technologies – as the hon. Minister of Finance tries to distract me with the Associate Minister of Health's beautiful daughter. It's working. She's lovely. We've now got that in *Hansard* for all time. She is. She is. It's awesome, and it's great. It is really, genuinely great to see that in the Alberta Legislature. Long may it continue, my hon. colleagues, from other people than me.

We're done. Back on task here. Back on task.

You know, I want to talk a bit about the OSAG process. I guess my overall concern with the bill is that I wonder if we're cart before the horse here. That OSAG process may very well be a great process, but that should happen before we pass the legislation because it's going to answer all of the questions that we have here.

What about those smaller companies? The Member for Spruce Grove-St. Albert had listed off a number of companies that are supportive of the 100-megatonne cap. I couldn't help but notice that those were all larger companies with established operations, and that's fine. That's great. Those companies are tremendous contributors to this province, tremendous job creators, tremendous environmental stewards, and tremendous contributors to the social well-being and fabric of this province. That is absolutely undeniable, and they should be recognized for the same.

But I do have a concern that this cap does disadvantage either new entrants or smaller companies, and I would like to know how exactly the process is going to work. How exactly are we going to mediate those disputes? Is it simply a mad rush for the remaining 30 megatonnes? How much additional upgrading do we expect to have? Is that 10-megatonne cap ample? Is it a lot of cap? Is it not nearly enough? These are things I don't know the answers to and that OSAG has been tasked with determining, but until that is determined, how in the world can we pass this bill? There are other bills. What are the penalties for exceeding the limit? What happens? Is production simply shut down? The small and large producer issue I've already talked about. How will new and existing projects effectively negotiate between using that cap room? I'm curious if the government anticipates subsidies or some sort of stimulus for producers to develop those new technologies to enable production to continue to grow while remaining under the cap.

I will note that I did have a look at the Fraser Institute report tabled by the hon. Member for Chestermere-Rocky View, and while I think that – I'll say this. I think a straight line between now and 2030 in terms of emissions growing in lockstep with production probably isn't accurate, and that's a good thing because I think new production coming on is likely to be far less carbon intense. That's a really good thing. You know, while I appreciate that it makes a point about the money that perhaps may be left on the table, all of these are things that would be answered by OSAG or at least I sincerely hope will be answered by OSAG. Will that curve bend? I

strongly suspect it will, and I think that's part of the objective here from this government.

On the flip side, the exemptions are actually quite substantial, exempting cogeneration, exempting an additional 10 megatonnes for refining. That's actually quite a lot. If part of the objective here is ultimately to reduce carbon emissions – I mean, that's one of those questions I have on the other side, saying: gosh, does that actually dilute or water down the effectiveness of a 100-megatonne cap? All of these questions are reasons why we need to have a committee review this bill.

Finally, who would be responsible for the lease payouts for current leaseholders for those leases that will not be allowed to be developed? The Member for Innisfail-Sylvan Lake, I believe, made this point earlier. In good faith companies have purchased leases, acquired leases, and spent a substantial amount of money. Are we going to strand those assets, and if so, what's the compensation model? Where does the money come from? How much is it going to be? Those are complex conversations and negotiations, and it may be a consequence, either intended or unintended, that has a negative impact on our province.

For all those reasons – and I suppose if I spent even more time on my feet I could come up with a few more – I will absolutely support moving this bill to committee. I don't commit one way or the other at this point as to whether or not I will vote in favour of the bill at second reading or beyond. I will say again, Madam Speaker, that the principle of limiting oil sands emissions is a good one. It should spur innovation in this province, but I'm left with far too many questions at this point in terms of how exactly we get there for me to be able to make a proper determination as to whether or not to support the bill in its current form. Again, I would advocate for this bill to be sent to committee.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

3:50

The Deputy Speaker: Standing Order 29(2)(a). Any questions or comments? The hon. Member for Chestermere-Rocky View.

Mrs. Aheer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would like to ask the hon. member a question regarding – and just to pre-empt my question, one of the things that he said that was very clear and compelling is that he may or may not agree with some of the people in this House about what the right numbers are or how that should look. One of the things that we need to look at is exactly that, hence the reason that committee would be so important. Given the opportunity to have experts from all levels of industry within this particular sector come forward, the hon. members in this room who are a part of that committee will have the opportunity to actually sit down with the experts that may determine one way or the other where we sit on how to move forward with this. That would be a discussion that I would highly encourage to happen, and that's something I would personally look forward to having. I am not an expert in this, and I require those experts to be around me to help to determine the right policy to come forward because the policy matters.

You were mentioning about innovation and about the opportunities that could come from any sorts of policies dependent upon what the government is seeing fit to do here. I guess my question, hon. member, is: do you think that it would be a good idea, that going to committee will slow things down a little bit, having the experts to be able to come and speak to us to potentially help you to determine how you would vote on a bill such as this?

Mr. Clark: Thank you to the hon. member for the question. Yeah. It really is about getting answers. It's not so much necessarily about

undue delay or slowing things down, but it really is about thoughtful consideration and putting all of the facts on the table so that this House can make a reasonable assessment. Who knows? Perhaps even the Official Opposition may find that they have satisfactory answers to their questions, that in fact the 100-megatonne cap is beneficial to Alberta and not detrimental to Alberta, not disadvantaging small companies. It's entirely possible that we come up with that determination. In fact, I think it would benefit the government's case if they had very clear data that showed that that was in fact going to be the case as opposed to picking a number that seems high enough that we won't hit it any time really soon but is still a cap so that we can tell the world we have a cap. You know, I hope that there's some more detail beyond just that, beyond just something that was cooked up in a strategy session. I really hope that this is actually something that's well thought through.

Again, you know, the makeup of the committee: while I certainly have some concerns about the bias of some of the members, I will give that committee its opportunity to work and see if it can in fact come up with some answers to these questions. If it can, given the very wide range of views on that committee I think it will have a tremendous amount of credibility. But that committee needs to be allowed to do its work. If it does that work, presents their findings in detail before the Standing Committee on Resource Stewardship, we, myself included – I happen to be a member of that committee – would have an opportunity to further delve into some of those details, which might even make the process of passing the bill before this House that much more efficient.

The Deputy Speaker: No other questions or comments under 29(2)(a)?

Any further speakers to the amendment? The hon. Member for Chestermere-Rocky View.

Mrs. Aheer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I am very happy to rise, that the motion for going to second reading on Bill 25, the Oil Sands Emissions Limit Act, be amended. I would like to speak a little bit about the importance of committee. To reiterate many of the things that we've already heard in here, one of the most important aspects of this is stakeholder outreach and having people come in on such an important piece of legislation. We've presented many, many parts of what our concerns are with regard to this legislation that I think are worthy of slowing these things down. We want to make sure as a government body that we have the opportunity to actually speak with these stakeholders.

Now, as the hon. member had mentioned, there are some groups that have been consulted and have made their statements towards this particular bill. However, as was mentioned by the hon. Member for Innisfail-Sylvan Lake, there are many small companies that right now are going to be questioning whether or not they're even going to be able to get in the ground, Madam Speaker.

If you look at that just from a business point of view, from an investor's point of view, when you have access to this lease – and there's a process, Madam Speaker, to even get to that. You've hedged into the future the future of your family, your business, and everything else, thinking that this was going to be the opportunity that you would have to get into this industry, and now all of a sudden you might be beyond the cap that has been set by this government and not even have the opportunity to recoup what you've already put into that, not to mention the fact that whatever investors and people and things that you've put into the future to try and make sure that you are able to do this opportunity to create the ability to drill or to do any of these other things within this sector: all of a sudden that's wiped clean because of policy and potentially a random number. All of a sudden you're outside the good graces

of a 100-megatonne cap that no longer includes you in the discussion. No longer does it take into consideration the money, time, the energy, and everything that you did as a company to go forward in this industry. Suddenly everything that you've put your livelihood into is not important.

I highly recommend that the government consider the fact that these folks are going to want to come before a committee and, at the very least, talk to the government about how to move forward and potentially even give some suggestions that would help to mitigate some of the fallout from this situation. The whole point of committee isn't to slow things down per se, but it's actually to just step back for a minute and make sure that the processes in the policy that you're putting forward are actually going to be conducive to making sure that we are able to be productive. If we're looking at production, we're slowing down production in an industry that is growing. We're actually cutting off an industry at the knees without even understanding the projections within the industry.

We presented some numbers, and there's definitely room for discussion, Madam Speaker, about how these numbers work and all of that. That's fine. But if we are at least having the ability to go to committee as a group, as we are actually supposed to do in this House, as a joint committee to sit down with these folks and have a succinct discussion about how to move forward, the possibilities are endless. Those folks are the experts, and they can give us some insight as to how to move forward. They're the innovators, especially these small companies. I mean, my goodness, we're cutting them off at the knees before they're even getting going. If you want to talk about innovation and diversity and efficiencies, you're cutting the most important group of people out of a discussion, who will tell you how to be efficient, how to save money, how to do these things. When we're talking about the oil sands, even the small companies are humongous companies compared to some of the smaller companies that are in other types of production in the province.

These are not small numbers even for the small companies. These are large numbers. These are people and families and folks that were hoping that given the opportunity and having been able to get into the lease at that time, they're going to be job creators. Now, again, we're cutting them off at the knees before they even get started. How is the government without talking to these folks going to find out how they're going to compensate these people who are already having these leases? How's that going to happen? I'm assuming that's a question that you're going to want answered before there's another lawsuit.

I'd also like to just take a moment, especially with committee, with regard to some other comments that were made. One of the most disturbing comments, I think, that came from across the way, is: who needs to be consulted? Well, I'll tell you who. The folks that have already got those leases and other people that have the ability to tell us and help us to make this policy so that we are doing it the best, so that we continue being the most environmentally responsible, so that we continue to innovate. Those are the people that we actually need to consult.

4:00

To quote again the hon. Member for Innisfail-Sylvan Lake, this government's advisory panel has not reported yet. How are we supposed to formulate any reasonable policy, Madam Speaker? I've been very vocal about how I feel about this panel and some of the folks that are on that panel. However, with all due respect, the government has created this panel, and I'm extremely interested, as is everyone on this side, to find out what the findings of that panel are. It is not my place at this point in time to make any prejudgment

about which way that is going to go. I have my own thoughts about that.

Having said that, though, that panel has been struck. That panel has been paid for with Albertans' hard-earned dollars, and Albertans deserve to know what that panel is going to advise this government before being able to move forward with actually creating policy about the industry that is being impacted by the government policies, by legislation previous to having the oil sands advisory panel even advise us. Please do; please advise us. I don't understand the backwards mentality of how that's feasible. We need to go very carefully forward with this.

Another thing that the hon. member across the way mentioned was something about implementation. That was actually a very interesting point because implementation is based on – you have to have institutional knowledge, and then there's policy involved with that and the economic realities of that, none of which we will even begin to understand, first of all, without understanding where the advisory panel is going and, second of all, without having due time to actually have some of these folks come before us and help us understand how this should be implemented. The implementation of this policy is actually the bigger picture, and I do not recall reading anywhere or understanding how that implementation is going to go forward.

It seems to me, based on comments from the other side, that that's the least of their worries. Who cares about the panel? Why do we even bother asking? Who needs to be consulted? Well, I would like to know. I'm sure Chestermere-Rocky View folks would like to know. There are a lot of people who, I can pretty much guarantee, are very invested in the future of this province, and I can guarantee you that they are watching wide-eyed what this panel is going to say and what they're going to do. I can guarantee you, with the amount of people that I personally talk to on a weekly basis, that this has been a major point of discussion, not a small one. A big, big, big part of the discussion. What do I say every time? Well, we've got to wait for the advisory panel to come back so that we understand where they're going.

I'm assuming that we're going to have consultation and stakeholder outreach because it's just a small portion, you know, of the economic realities of Canada. Madam Speaker, I assumed, maybe wrongly, that the government would be interested in making sure, based on transparency and accountability to Albertans, that that panel information would come forward, that we'd have some idea of the mandate of this panel and some idea of how that panel has talked to the stakeholders and have some of their input, and then we'd be able to go forward and legitimately look at this policy.

The whole point of committee is to be able to do those things under the auspices of this building that we are all so privileged to be here for. We are supposed to be in committee. That's our job. We were put here to have discussions, robust discussions, and we're going to disagree a whole bunch. That's okay. That's the point. So the amendment to go to committee is thoughtful; it's a process. It is part of the due diligence of this building to make sure that we do not just put something on paper and go: woo-hoo; time to pass it. That's not the way that this goes. This takes time. It takes time and energy and people and experts.

I can't begin to tell you. I mean, when I came into this portfolio, if I hadn't had the brilliance of the experts in this province, who literally have taken me from a minor understanding – even now I would say that, at best, I'm at a high-level understanding of this industry. It's so complex and diverse and beautiful and creative. I'm constantly amazed. But if it hadn't been for those folks and their energy and the time that they've put into me personally without asking, I don't think I could speak quite as passionately about this.

Because I respect the industry so much and I respect the process so much and I respect those folks who have so much more information

than I could possibly ever put forward in this House – so much, Madam Speaker – I can't begin to tell you how important it is for me personally, being educated by this industry, how much it would matter to me personally to be able to have the opportunity to go into committee with a diverse group of people with a lot of different ideas and the group of people in the middle who actually know this information to help us to figure out what is the best way to move forward.

Please remember. We have the best people in the world. Our geophysicists, geoscientists, and geologists are so underutilized right now. I can guarantee you that if this government decided to go to committee and invited in some of those specialists, they'd be here in a millisecond. This is an underutilized, massively talented group of people in Alberta right now that would happily come forward to help out with this information. I can think of hundreds of other people that would happily participate in committee as experts, come forward and help us actually craft policy that is going to inherently be there for our great-grandchildren, that we can be proud of, that we can look at and say: look at what we did not only for the oil sands but also for our own prosperity and for Canada.

It's very disturbing to me also that this government thinks that they can interfere with pipeline access. They think that some cap and other things or the social licence they keep talking about should impact national infrastructure. National infrastructure is all of ours. It's the prosperity of all of Canada. It's part of the federation. I take it very seriously that the government does not quite understand that it is the responsibility of the federal government to make decisions in the national best interest based on the information that comes to them from our very, very amazing NEB.

For the members opposite to assume that with legislation like this – I mean, there's no information to go on – our Prime Minister is suddenly going to look at a piece of legislation like this and go: oh, well, maybe we'll give them a pipeline. No. That's not how it works, Madam Speaker. If you would like a little bit more education on how the NEB works, I can try again. I've been saying it all along. The NEB is an arm's-length group. They consult, and they are your social licence. They are your social licence.

The Deputy Speaker: Under 29(2)(a), the hon. Member for Grande Prairie-Smoky.

Mr. Loewen: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I enjoyed the comments made by the member just now and how she so succinctly expressed the value of going to committee and having more consultation. She covered how important it would be to have experts from all fields come and discuss it in committee, to have the small producers there, too, and to actually have the panel's report, which would be, of course, very valuable in making a decision on this.

4:10

I'm going to just read a couple of quotes from when the Minister of Environment and Parks introduced this bill, on collaborative conversations between the oil sands industry, First Nations, municipalities, and environmental groups.

This cap, the mechanism and the logistics of it will be worked out in partnership with industry, with First Nations, with municipalities, and with environmental groups. We have established a precedent-setting, collaborative, co-operative table at which all of those who are affected are making decisions together.

She also goes on to say that this bill was

crafted in consultation with First Nations, municipalities, affected communities, Métis organizations, industry, and environmental groups.

Now, of course, it's great to have collaboration with all of these groups. All of these people are Albertans. It's all good. But where I don't see any consultation is with the public, with the rest of Albertans. I see lots of consultation with different groups and everything, but if we were to take this to committee, I would like to hear what this member thinks about the opportunity for the public, for anybody in Alberta to have a chance to learn, listen, speak their mind.

We always talk about making informed decisions. We can't make informed decisions without information, and that's what a committee can give us. It can give us this information. It can give all Albertans information so that Albertans can make that decision for themselves, make that informed decision. So I'd like to hear the member maybe speak a little bit about that, too. Obviously, she's made some great points, and I commend her for that, but I see that there's something missing in all of this conversation on collaboration and consultation that was done on this bill.

Thank you.

The Deputy Speaker: Chestermere-Rocky View.

Mrs. Aheer: Thank you, Madam Speaker, and thank you very much for your question. Look, I'm very blessed in that I have this portfolio of oil and gas, so my outreach is going to be very different from anybody else's in the House depending on who they get to speak to and what their specialties are. I have that distinct privilege of actually being able to speak to industry folks all the time, so my experience is going to be a little different. That's why this is so important. Having the privilege of having that portfolio, it's actually my responsibility to reach out to these people and to make sure that I'm listening and that I'm consulting and that I have good information to bring back for my personal education. But the expectation of everybody else and their portfolios and what they have going on – I mean, it would be great if we could always reach out to each other's portfolios, and I think quite often we're able to do that.

What this does by going to committee is that it actually brings all of the sector, all of the experts, the public – everybody – into our inner space to help determine policy that's going to impact them, the public especially. I mean, Albertans are savvy. They live this; they understand this. I have to tell you that some of the most compelling conversations that you have are out on the street with the public. They know so much more, you know, to a large degree than I do at times, even just their passion for the industry and for their province. If we're able to bring in the public, especially folks that work in the industry, people who are right now losing their jobs – the most compelling stories, of course, are from the people that end up in all of our offices, their absolutely heart-wrenching stories of job losses. I'm sure it's on both sides of the House.

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

Dr. Starke: Thank you, Madam Speaker, very much. I appreciate the opportunity to speak on the referral motion. I come to the referral motion with somewhat of a unique perspective. Having had the privilege of sitting both in government and in opposition, I can offer a perspective that is perhaps a little bit unique.

When I sat on that side of the House, referral motions were always bad. I can see, so far at least, that the pattern of this government has been that that has become, perhaps you could call it, a contagious impression, that referral motions are always bad, that they're always in place to sidetrack or delay government initiatives that are important. Yet, sitting over here, I think it's a good opportunity to recognize that referral motions are not always

bad. You know, I see my colleague the Member for Edmonton-Beverly-Clareview over there, who often moved and spoke to referral motions when he was over here. I'd be certainly interested to hear his comments as well as to whether he senses a change in attitude towards referral motions.

But I'm inclined in this case, Madam Speaker, to absolutely agree with the need to refer this motion to a committee. It's because in the very words of the climate leadership plan document there are several phrases that indicate that even the drafters of this report were not exactly sure what the consequences of some of these measures would be, and it's because we were talking in some cases about time frames that are 10, 15, 20 years out.

You know, I went to the executive summary of the climate leadership plan, which I hadn't read for a number of months, and I found on page 25 under Technology and Innovation the following statement:

Even as the world acts on climate change, there will continue to be significant demand for oil and gas for mobility, heat and power. Alberta's challenge is to position ourselves as a preferred, low-cost and low-emissions supplier amidst the market shifts now underway.

I thought that made sense.

The report goes on to say:

Even as the world acts on climate change, there will continue to be significant demand for oil and gas for mobility, heat and power. Alberta's challenge is to position ourselves as a preferred, low-cost and low-emissions supplier amidst the market shifts now underway.

Now, Madam Speaker, I didn't make a mistake there and read the same sentence twice. The same two sentences appear twice on page 25 of the executive summary of the climate leadership plan.

Now, they had experts – I know that – and they did a lot of consultation. I know that as well. But maybe they should have hired a proofreader. When you have glaring errors like this in the report, a clear, glaring error like this in the report, it makes you wonder: well, you know, perhaps we need to take a closer look at some of what's in here.

On page 27 of the executive summary it goes on to say:

Many will look at these emissions reductions and claim that our policies will not place Alberta on a trajectory consistent with global 2°C goals, and in some sense this is true – the policies proposed . . .

And I want everyone to listen to this carefully.

. . . for Alberta in this document would not, if applied in all jurisdictions in the world, lead to global goals being accomplished. However, more stringent policies in Alberta would come at significant cost to the province due to lost competitiveness, with negligible impact on global emissions due to carbon leakage.

The report goes on to say:

Imposing policies in Alberta that are more stringent than what we have suggested is not tenable, until our peer and competitor jurisdictions adopt policies that would have a comparable impact on their industrial sectors.

I want to be very clear about one thing, Madam Speaker. As I've said in this House before, I accept the science of climate change, and I accept that climate change is real. I further accept the need for us to take action on man-made climate change. I've been very clear on that, and I believe that that's important.

The third stage is what I call acceptance of climate change, and that is that Alberta and Canada have a role to play, even recognizing that we have a relatively small overall contribution to the world's greenhouse gas emissions. I know full well that Canada only contributes 1.6 per cent, I know full well that Alberta's contribution is less than 1 per cent, and I know full well that the oil sands overall

is .15 per cent. That does not absolve us of responsibility to do something about it. I cannot accept a situation that says: well, we're not going to do anything about it because they have to do something and they have to do something and they have to do something. That, to me, is unacceptable.

4:20

That being said, our measures that we choose to limit greenhouse gases have to be carefully chosen, and they have to be judicious. Because of the very risks that are pointed out in the climate leadership plan document, we have to make sure that we are not so far out in front of the game that all we are succeeding in doing is damaging our own economy and not achieving the kind of major contributions to greenhouse gas emissions that are, in fact, the goal of the report.

I'd like to further quote because this, I felt, was very interesting, too. On the bottom of page 27:

There will be concerns with respect to the impacts of these policies on our economy and on employment. Greenhouse gas policies are often painted as win-win yet, at the granular level, they may not be. In an export-oriented province like Alberta, emissions control policies will not make everyone better off. There will be trade-offs and transitions resulting from any policy which alters the way our economy values carbon emissions. Those with better technology, more willingness to adapt and a comparative advantage in low carbon resource extraction and infrastructure will benefit. Those without those advantages, or those who choose not to engage in emissions reduction opportunities, will not.

Madam Chair, my concern here relates, then, to how the 100-megatonne limit will impact the industry overall. Now, when the climate leadership plan was first announced, I heard about the 100-megatonne cap on emissions from the oil sands. Knowing that the current level is somewhere in the 66-, 67-megatonne level as of 2014, I said: well, you know, that really shouldn't be that much of a stretch for the industry to get under. One would assume that in the other 34 megatonnes that they've got left before they hit the cap, they will develop technology and innovation that will allow them to stay under 100 megatonnes, and it will not create an undue negative impact on development and investment.

It turns out that that was a somewhat naive and incorrect interpretation. In point of fact, after I've discussed this with a number of individuals in the oil and gas sector, they've told me that the 100-megatonne cap is already causing a decrease in investment in projects for oil sands extraction, and that's a concern to me. The companies that are losing out on this are, in fact, the companies that are the smaller junior oil and gas companies, that often are niche operators and can provide extraction in certain instances that are either not profitable enough for the large companies or the large companies simply aren't interested.

So while I'm interested in the group of companies that the Member for Spruce Grove-St. Albert quotes, he makes the assumption that the oil and gas sector is one homogeneous group and that they all agree on everything. I can tell you with absolute certainty that they are not a homogeneous group any more than beef producers are a homogeneous group or farmers are a homogeneous group or, for that matter, any number of other industry sectors.

The climate leadership plan talks about some players being impacted negatively and others positively. Well, a 100-megatonne cap – let us be very clear – favours existing operators. It favours those already in the business. And guess who approves of the 100-megatonne cap? All of those companies you listed off are already in the business.

It is a major concern of mine how this impacts the overall process. The development of an oil sands project has about a 10-

year time frame from initial conception to design to permit approvals to construction to commissioning to bringing it on phase. If you wanted to open an oil sands plant in 2026 or 2027, you needed to start planning yesterday. I was surprised by that, but these are large projects, and there is a lot of work to be done before they can actually move into that phase.

My concern is that the projections for when we will hit the 100-megatonne cap vary. Some people say that we won't hit it even by 2030, but there are a number of industry projections that indicate that we will probably hit 100 megatonnes by 2026, 10 years from now. So if you're a small junior oil and gas company that holds an oil sands lease that is considering developing a project for extraction, you are now concerned as to whether or not you're going to be able to develop that project because by 2026 or '27 there may be no room left in the 100-megatonne cap.

These are the kinds of levels of uncertainty that people are concerned about, that people in the oil and gas sector talk about. Very sadly, these are the kinds of issues that seem to consistently fall on deaf ears when they're told to this government, and that's unfortunate. This is our most important industry, this is and for years has been a number one employer of Albertans, and it is, in fact, an engine to our economy. I am concerned about the negative effects that a 100-megatonne cap will have on our overall industry, and I'm very concerned about how this will affect investment going forward.

With regard to the amendment by the Member for Calgary-Foothills I think it makes sense to refer this bill to committee. I think it makes sense to have a broader conversation that brings in not just the oil companies that agree with the government policy, but just maybe you should listen to some of the ones that don't agree with the government policy. It would be a novel approach, one that you haven't tried before.

Madam Speaker, it's important that we have also as much information as we can possibly get about what sorts of technology could indeed be applied and are on the horizon for reducing the carbon intensity of the extraction process. I think that's important.

Finally, Madam Speaker, referral to a committee would allow the oil sands advisory group to develop regulations and to go through that very important step of understanding exactly what the relationship between the oil sands advisory group and the Alberta Energy Regulator with regard to oil sands project approvals would in fact be. I am very concerned that what we are setting up here with the oil sands advisory group is a second-tier quasi-regulator and that it will just simply make the whole process of project and development approvals more complex. I don't think that that is helpful to us at all.

Until we have the role of the oil sands advisory group and the regulations that they will develop clearly defined for us, I think that in an issue like this, that is so critical to the long-term development of our oil sands and of our oil and gas industry, it's really critical that we take a very careful look, even as the authors of the climate leadership plan indicated needed to happen, at who are the winners and who are the losers, because they clearly state in the report that there will be winners and losers. The other side would have you believe that it is universally good for everyone. Well, the truth of the matter is that that's not how government policy always works, and it's certainly not how this government policy will work. They need to understand that, and they need to hear from those who will be adversely affected by the application of this 100-megatonne limit to know how it will adversely affect them.

I think referral to committee is something that should not necessarily happen automatically on all bills. I think some bills can be adequately and fully debated in the House and moved on, but on

complex issues like this one, I think that to have the input from industry experts, to have the input from indigenous groups, to have the input from environmental groups would be very useful. I want to point out that the input that was gathered for the climate leadership plan was excellent but that it is not the only input that's required.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The Deputy Speaker: Are there any questions or comments under 29(2)(a)? The hon. Member for Innisfail-Sylvan Lake.

Mr. MacIntyre: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I really appreciate, as I always do, listening to our esteemed colleague from Vermilion-Lloydminster. He brings to us a perspective from being on both

sides of this House, which I think is extremely valuable given the lack of experience of many members in this Chamber.

The hon. member touched on something – and correct me if I'm wrong – and I believe the words are “confirmation bias.” I believe that the hon. member could help us to understand something about that given the experience that he has had on that side of the House and some of the problems that were experienced with confirmation bias skewing the mindset of the party in power at the time. I know that . . .

The Deputy Speaker: I hesitate to interrupt the hon. member, but pursuant to Standing Order 4(2) the Assembly stands adjourned until Monday at 1:30 p.m.

[The Assembly adjourned at 4:30 p.m.]

Bill Status Report for the 29th Legislature - 2nd Session (2016)

Activity to Thursday, November 3, 2016

The Bill sponsor's name is in brackets following the Bill title. If it is a money Bill, (\$) will appear between the title and the sponsor's name. Numbers following each Reading refer to Hansard pages where the text of debates is found; dates for each Reading are in brackets following the page numbers. Bills numbered 1 to 200 are Government Bills. Bills numbered 201 or higher are Private Members' Public Bills. Bills numbered with a "Pr" prefix are Private Bills.

* An asterisk beside a Bill number indicates an amendment was passed to that Bill; the Committee line shows the precise date of the amendment.

The date a Bill comes into force is indicated in square brackets after the date of Royal Assent. If a Bill comes into force "on proclamation," "with exceptions," or "on various dates," please contact Legislative Counsel, Alberta Justice, for details at 780.427.2217. The chapter number assigned to the Bill is entered immediately following the date the Bill comes into force. SA indicates Statutes of Alberta; this is followed by the year in which it is included in the statutes, and its chapter number. Please note, Private Bills are not assigned chapter number until the conclusion of the Fall Sittings.

Bill 1 — Promoting Job Creation and Diversification Act (Bilous)

First Reading — 5 (*Mar. 8, 2016 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 685-91 (*Apr. 20, 2016 morn.*), 732-36 (*Apr. 20, 2016 aft.*), 749-60 (*Apr. 21, 2016 aft.*), 825 (*May 5, 2016 aft., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 987-95 (*May 18, 2016 morn.*), 1019-24 (*May 18, 2016 aft., passed*)

Third Reading — 1172 (*May 25, 2016 eve.*), 1174-79 (*May 25, 2016 eve., passed on division*)

Royal Assent — (*May 27, 2016 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force May 27, 2016; SA 2016 cP-26.3]

Bill 2 — Appropriation (Interim Supply) Act, 2016 (\$) (Ceci)

First Reading — 96 (*Mar. 10, 2016 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 162-67 (*Mar. 15, 2016 morn., passed on division*)

Committee of the Whole — 239-49 (*Mar. 16, 2016 aft., passed*)

Third Reading — 251-59 (*Mar. 17, 2016 morn., passed on division*)

Royal Assent — (*Mar. 23, 2016 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force Mar. 23, 2016; SA 2016 c1]

Bill 3 — Appropriation (Supplementary Supply) Act, 2016 (\$) (Ceci)

First Reading — 156 (*Mar. 14, 2016 eve., passed*)

Second Reading — 157-62 (*Mar. 15, 2016 morn.*), 201 (*Mar. 15, 2016 aft., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 239-49 (*Mar. 16, 2016 aft., passed*)

Third Reading — 259-66 (*Mar. 17, 2016 morn., passed*)

Royal Assent — (*Mar. 23, 2016 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force Mar. 23, 2016; SA 2016 c2]

Bill 4* — An Act to Implement a Supreme Court Ruling Governing Essential Services (Gray)

First Reading — 180 (*Mar. 15, 2016 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 285-88 (*Mar. 17, 2016 aft.*), 349-66 (*Apr. 5, 2016 aft., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 378-84 (*Apr. 6, 2016 morn.*), 399-409 (*Apr. 6, 2016 aft.*), 415-28 (*Apr. 7, 2016 morn., passed with amendments*)

Third Reading — 428-33 (*Apr. 7, 2016 morn.*), 450-55 (*Apr. 7, 2016 aft., passed*)

Royal Assent — (*May 27, 2016 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force May 27, 2016, with exceptions; SA 2016 c10]

Bill 5 — Seniors' Home Adaptation and Repair Act (Sigurdson)

First Reading — 398 (*Apr. 6, 2016 aft.*)

Second Reading — 455-56 (*Apr. 7, 2016 aft.*), 491-505 (*Apr. 12, 2016 morn.*), 532-38 (*Apr. 12, 2016 aft., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 539-56 (*Apr. 13, 2016 morn.*), 570-77 (*Apr. 13, 2016 aft., passed*)

Third Reading — 577-83 (*Apr. 13, 2016 aft., passed*)

Royal Assent — (*May 27, 2016 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force on proclamation; SA 2016 cS-7.1]

Bill 6 — Securities Amendment Act, 2016 (Ceci)

First Reading — 447 (*Apr. 7, 2016 aft., passed*), 447 (*Apr. 7, 2016 aft.*)

Second Reading — 519-27 (*Apr. 12, 2016 aft., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 527-32 (*Apr. 12, 2016 aft., passed*)

Third Reading — 583-85 (*Apr. 13, 2016 aft., passed*)

Royal Assent — (*May 27, 2016 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force May 27, 2016, with exceptions; SA 2016 c13]

Bill 7 — Electoral Boundaries Commission Amendment Act, 2016 (Ganley)

First Reading — 518 (*Apr. 12, 2016 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 585-86 (*Apr. 13, 2016 aft.*), 649-51 (*Apr. 19, 2016 morn.*), 682-84 (*Apr. 19, 2016 aft., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 820-24 (*May 5, 2016 aft., passed*)

Third Reading — 902-903 (*May 12, 2016 aft., passed*)

Royal Assent — (*May 27, 2016 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force May 27, 2016; SA 2016 c6]

Bill 8 — Fair Trading Amendment Act, 2016 (McLean)

First Reading — 568 (*Apr. 13, 2016 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 669-71 (*Apr. 19, 2016 aft.*), 684 (*Apr. 19, 2016 aft., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 824-25 (*May 5, 2016 aft., passed*)

Third Reading — 903-904 (*May 12, 2016 aft., passed*)

Royal Assent — (*May 27, 2016 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force May 27, 2016; SA 2016 c8]

Bill 9 — An Act to Modernize Enforcement of Provincial Offences (Ganley)

First Reading — 568 (*Apr. 13, 2016 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 640-49 (*Apr. 19, 2016 morn.*), 728-30 (*Apr. 20, 2016 aft., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 979-81 (*May 17, 2016 aft., passed*)

Third Reading — 1180-81 (*May 25, 2016 eve., passed*)

Royal Assent — (*May 27, 2016 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force on proclamation; SA 2016 c11]

Bill 10 — Fiscal Statutes Amendment Act, 2016 (Ceci)

First Reading — 599 (*Apr. 14, 2016 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 671-82 (*Apr. 19, 2016 aft.*), 691-703 (*Apr. 20, 2016 morn.*), 730-32 (*Apr. 20, 2016 aft., passed on division*)

Committee of the Whole — 950-51 (*May 17, 2016 morn.*), 1041-49 (*May 19, 2016 morn.*), 1077-81 (*May 24, 2016 morn.*), 1103-13 (*May 24, 2016 aft.*), 1115-23 (*May 24, 2016 eve., passed*)

Third Reading — 1124 (*May 24, 2016 eve.*), 1197-99 (*May 26, 2016 morn.*), 1263-85 (*May 30, 2016 eve., passed on division*)

Royal Assent — (*Jun. 13, 2016 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force June 13, 2016, with exceptions; SA 2016 c17]

Bill 11 — Alberta Research and Innovation Amendment Act, 2016 (Bilous)

First Reading — 773 (*May 2, 2016 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 907-908 (*May 12, 2016 aft.*), 971-79 (*May 17, 2016 aft, passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 1012-18 (*May 18, 2016 aft.*), 1024 (*May 18, 2016 aft., passed*)

Third Reading — 1068-69 (*May 19, 2016 aft., passed*)

Royal Assent — (*May 27, 2016 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force on proclamation; SA 2016 c4]

Bill 12 — Aboriginal Consultation Levy Repeal Act (Feehan)

First Reading — 802 (*May 3, 2016 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 904-907 (*May 12, 2016 aft., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 985-87 (*May 18, 2016 morn., passed*)

Third Reading — 1069 (*May 19, 2016 aft., passed*)

Royal Assent — (*May 27, 2016 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force May 27, 2016; SA 2016 c3]

Bill 13 — Veterinary Profession Amendment Act, 2016 (Gray)

First Reading — 872 (*May 10, 2016 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 965-71 (*May 17, 2016 aft., passed on division*)

Committee of the Whole — 1024-25 (*May 18, 2016 aft., passed*)

Third Reading — 1069 (*May 19, 2016 aft., passed*)

Royal Assent — (*May 27, 2016 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force on proclamation; SA 2016 c15]

Bill 14 — Health Professions Amendment Act, 2016 (Hoffman)

First Reading — 872 (*May 10, 2016 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 983-85 (*May 18, 2016 morn., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 1076-77 (*May 24, 2016 morn., passed*)

Third Reading — 1077 (*May 24, 2016 morn., passed*)

Royal Assent — (*May 27, 2016 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force May 27, 2016; SA 2016 c9]

Bill 15 — An Act to End Predatory Lending (McLean)

First Reading — 901 (*May 12, 2016 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 1062-67 (*May 19, 2016 aft., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 1153-57 (*May 25, 2016 aft., passed*)

Third Reading — 1172 (*May 25, 2016 eve., passed*)

Royal Assent — (*May 27, 2016 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force on various dates; SA 2016 cE-9.5]

Bill 16* — Traffic Safety Amendment Act, 2016 (Mason)

First Reading — 921 (*May 16, 2016 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 1067-68 (*May 19, 2016 aft.*), 1071-75 (*May 24, 2016 morn., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 1157-63 (*May 25, 2016 aft.*), 1197 (*May 26, 2016 morn., adjourned*), 1219-23 (*May 26, 2016 aft., passed with amendments*)

Third Reading — 1223-25 (*May 26, 2016 aft., passed*)

Royal Assent — (*May 27, 2016 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force May 27, 2016, with exceptions; SA 2016 c14]

Bill 17 — Appropriation Act, 2016 (\$) (Ceci)

First Reading — 950 (*May 17, 2016 morn., passed*)

Second Reading — 995-1000 (*May 18, 2016 morn., adjourned*), 1025-29 (*May 18, 2016 aft., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 1031-41 (*May 19, 2016 morn.*), 1070 (*May 19, 2016 aft., passed*)

Third Reading — 1096-1103 (*May 24, 2016 aft.*), 1113 (*May 24, 2016 aft., passed on division*)

Royal Assent — (*May 27, 2016 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force May 27, 2016; SA 2016 c5]

Bill 18 — An Act to Ensure Independent Environmental Monitoring (Phillips)

First Reading — 964-65 (*May 17, 2016 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 1125-35 (*May 25, 2016 morn., passed on division*)

Committee of the Whole — 1191-97 (*May 26, 2016 morn., passed*)

Third Reading — 1199-1205 (*May 26, 2016 morn., passed on division*)

Royal Assent — (*May 27, 2016 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force June 30, 2016; SA 2016 c7]

Bill 19 — Reform of Agencies, Boards and Commissions Compensation Act (Ceci)

First Reading — 1011 (*May 18, 2016 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 1135-40 (*May 25, 2016 morn.*), 1153 (*May 25, 2016 aft., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 1171-72 (*May 25, 2016 eve., passed*)

Third Reading — 1173 (*May 25, 2016 eve., passed*)

Royal Assent — (*May 27, 2016 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force May 27, 2016; SA 2016 cR-8.5]

Bill 20* — Climate Leadership Implementation Act (\$) (Phillips)

First Reading — 1095 (*May 24, 2016 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 1163-70 (*May 25, 2016 aft.*), 1173-74 (*May 25, 2016 eve.*), 1181-90 (*May 25, 2016 eve.*), 1288-98 (*May 31, 2016 morn.*), 1311-21 (*May 31, 2016 aft.*), 1338-56 (*May 31, 2016 eve.*), 1357-72 (*Jun. 1, 2016 morn.*), 1405-07 (*Jun. 1, 2016 eve., passed on division*)

Committee of the Whole — 1408-24 (*Jun. 1, 2016 eve.*), 1425-42 (*Jun. 2, 2016 morn.*), 1458-61 (*Jun. 2, 2016 aft.*), 1479-91 (*Jun. 6, 2016 aft.*), 1493-1541 (*Jun. 6, 2016 eve., passed with amendments*)

Third Reading — 1541-43 (*Jun. 6, 2016 eve.*), 1545-57 (*Jun. 7, 2016 morn., passed on division*)

Royal Assent — (*Jun. 13, 2016 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force June 13, 2016, with exceptions; SA 2016 c16]

Bill 21 — Modernized Municipal Government Act (Larivee)

First Reading — 1310 (*May 31, 2016 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 1583-96 (*Nov. 1, 2016 morn.*), 1624-28 (*Nov. 1, 2016 aft.*), 1634-41 (*Nov. 2, 2016 morn., passed*)

Bill 22 — An Act to Provide for the Repatriation of Indigenous Peoples' Sacred Ceremonial Objects (Miranda)

First Reading — 1219 (*May 26, 2016 aft., passed*)

Bill 23 — Miscellaneous Statutes Amendment Act, 2016 (Mason)

First Reading — 1454 (*Jun. 2, 2016 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 1478 (*Jun. 6, 2016 aft., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 1478 (*Jun. 6, 2016 aft., passed*)

Third Reading — 1479 (*Jun. 6, 2016 aft., passed*)

Royal Assent — (*Jun. 13, 2016 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force June 13, 2016; SA 2016 c18]

Bill 24 — Forest and Prairie Protection Amendment Act, 2016 (Carlier)

First Reading — 1571-72 (*Oct. 31, 2016 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 1609-24 (*Nov. 1, 2016 aft.*), 1629-34 (*Nov. 2, 2016 morn., passed*)

Bill 25 — Oil Sands Emissions Limit Act (Phillips)

First Reading — 1606 (*Nov. 1, 2016 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 1641-43 (*Nov. 2, 2016 morn.*), 1677-89 (*Nov. 3, 2016 morn.*), 1703-13 (*Nov. 3, 2016 aft., adjourned on amendment*)

Bill 26 — Ukrainian-Canadian Heritage Day Act (Littlewood)

First Reading — 1659 (*Nov. 2, 2016 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 1660-69 (*Nov. 2, 2016 aft., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 1669-73 (*Nov. 2, 2016 aft., passed*)

Third Reading — 1673-76 (*Nov. 2, 2016 aft., passed on division*)

Bill 27 — Renewable Electricity Act (\$) (McCuaig-Boyd)

First Reading — 1701 (*Nov. 3, 2016 aft., passed*)

Bill 201 — Election Recall Act (Smith)

First Reading — 92 (*Mar. 10, 2016 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 119-32 (*Mar. 14, 2016 aft.*), 303-304 (*Apr. 4, 2016 aft., defeated on division*)

Bill 202 — Alberta Affordable Housing Review Committee Act (Luff)

First Reading — 92 (*Mar. 10, 2016 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 305-16 (*Apr. 4, 2016 aft.*), 470-73 (*Apr. 11, 2016 aft., passed*)

Bill 203 — Fair Trading (Motor Vehicle Repair Pricing Protection for Consumers) Amendment Act, 2016 (Carson)

First Reading — 280 (*Mar. 17, 2016 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 473-83 (*Apr. 11, 2016 aft., referred to Standing Committee on Families and Communities*)

Bill 204 — Alberta Tourism Week Act (Dang)

First Reading — 468 (*Apr. 11, 2016 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 616-30 (*Apr. 18, 2016 aft., passed*)

Bill 205* — Pharmacy and Drug (Pharmaceutical Equipment Control) Amendment Act, 2016 (Ellis)

First Reading — 707 (*Apr. 20, 2016 aft.*)

Second Reading — 839-50 (*May 9, 2016 aft., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 924-31 (*May 16, 2016 aft., passed with amendments*)

Third Reading — 931-34 (*May 16, 2016 aft., passed*)

Royal Assent — (*May 27, 2016 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force January 1, 2017; SA 2016 c12]

Bill 206* — Post-traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) Awareness Day Act (Goehring)

First Reading — 902 (*May 12, 2016 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 1241-49 (*May 30, 2016 aft., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 1249-55 (*May 30, 2016 aft., passed with amendments*)

Third Reading — 1255-57 (*May 30, 2016 aft., passed*)

Royal Assent — (*Jun. 13, 2016 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force June 13, 2016; SA 2016 cP-19.7]

Bill Pr1 — Bow Valley Community Foundation Repeal Act (Westhead)

First Reading — 447 (*Apr. 7, 2016 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 1171 (*May 25, 2016 eve., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 1197 (*May 26, 2016 morn., passed*)

Third Reading — 1219 (*May 26, 2016 aft., passed*)

Royal Assent — (*May 27, 2016*) [Comes into force May 27, 2016; SA 2016]

Table of Contents

Introduction of Guests	1691
Members' Statements	
Remembrance Day	1692
Clean Energy Technology Centre	1692
Geothermal Project in Hinton	1692
International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers 125th Anniversary	1693
Inclusive, Accessible Facilities in Sherwood Park	1693
GSS Integrated Energy	1701
Oral Question Period	
Energy Policies	1693
Carbon Levy	1694
Ethics and Privacy Investigations	1694
Electricity Power Purchase Agreement Lawsuit	1695
Remand Centre Drug Overdoses	1695
Bovine Tuberculosis	1696
High-risk Offender Monitoring	1696
School Fees	1697
Home-schooling Providers	1698
Economic Development	1698
Ethics and Accountability Committee	1699
Fort McMurray Wildfire Recovery	1699
Forest Fire Fighting Contracting	1700
Government Agencies, Boards, and Commissions	1700
Introduction of Bills	
Bill 27 Renewable Electricity Act	1701
Tabling Returns and Reports	1702
Orders of the Day	1703
Government Bills and Orders	
Second Reading	
Bill 25 Oil Sands Emissions Limit Act	1703

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