



Province of Alberta

The 29th Legislature  
Second Session

# Alberta Hansard

Tuesday afternoon, December 13, 2016

Day 62

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-St. 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 (ND)  
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: 55

Wildrose: 22

Progressive Conservative: 8

Alberta Liberal: 1

Alberta Party: 1

#### Officers and Officials of the Legislative Assembly

Robert H. Reynolds, QC, Clerk

Shannon Dean, Law Clerk and Director of House  
Services

Trafton Koenig, Parliamentary Counsel

Stephanie LeBlanc, Parliamentary Counsel and  
Legal Research Officer

Aurelia Nicholls, Sessional Counsel

Philip Massolin, Manager of Research and  
Committee Services

Nancy Robert, Research Officer

Janet Schwegel, Managing Editor of  
*Alberta Hansard*

Brian G. Hodgson, Sergeant-at-Arms

Chris Caughell, Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms

Paul Link, Assistant Sergeant-at-Arms

Gordon Munk, Assistant Sergeant-at-Arms

Gareth Scott, Assistant Sergeant-at-Arms

## **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. van Dijken

Anderson, S.	Gotfried
Carson	Orr
Connolly	Piquette
Coolahan	Schneider
Dach	Schreiner
Drysdale	Taylor
Fitzpatrick	

**Standing Committee on Families and Communities**

Chair: Ms Goehring  
Deputy Chair: Mr. Smith

Aheer	Miller
Drever	Pitt
Hinkley	Rodney
Horne	Shepherd
Jansen	Swann
Luff	Yao
McKitrick	

**Standing Committee on Legislative Offices**

Chair: Mr. Shepherd  
Deputy Chair: Mr. Malkinson

Drever	Nixon
Ellis	Pitt
Horne	van Dijken
Kleinsteuber	Woollard
Littlewood	

**Special Standing Committee on Members' Services**

Chair: Mr. Wanner  
Deputy Chair: Cortes-Vargas

Cooper	Nixon
Dang	Orr
Jabbour	Piquette
Luff	Schreiner
McIver	

**Select Special Ombudsman and Public Interest Commissioner Search Committee**

Chair: Mr. Shepherd  
Deputy Chair: Mr. Malkinson

Ellis	Pitt
Horne	van Dijken
Kleinsteuber	Woollard
Littlewood	

**Standing Committee on Private Bills**

Chair: Ms McPherson  
Deputy Chair: 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. Cyr  
Deputy Chair: Mr. S. Anderson

Barnes	Malkinson
Dach	Miller
Fildebrandt	Panda
Fraser	Renaud
Goehring	Turner
Gotfried	Westhead
Luff	

**Standing Committee on Resource Stewardship**

Chair: Loyola  
Deputy Chair: Mr. Hunter

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

## Legislative Assembly of Alberta

1:30 p.m.

Tuesday, December 13, 2016

[The Speaker in the chair]

**The Speaker:** Good afternoon. Please be seated.

### Introduction of Guests

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

**Mr. Carson:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure to rise today to introduce to you and through you to all members of the Assembly 31 students from Afton elementary in the beautiful constituency of Edmonton-Meadowlark. The students are accompanied today by their teacher Nicholas Suvanto and chaperone Carlwin Irang. I would now ask them to please rise and receive the traditional warm welcome of the Assembly.

**The Speaker:** Welcome.

Hon. members, there are no other school groups?  
Seeing and hearing none, the Minister of Health.

**Ms Hoffman:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure to introduce to you and through you three community advocates and leaders from the Alberta Somali Community Centre. I have the honour of meeting with them a little bit later this afternoon. New Canadians are such an important part of our province, and I look forward to their insights into how we can improve mental health supports in their community. I ask that Habiba Abdulle, Sudi Barre, and Dhahabo Salad please rise and receive the traditional warm welcome of this Assembly.

**The Speaker:** Hon. members, any other introductions? The hon. Member for Vermilion-Lloydminster.

**Dr. Starke:** Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my very great pleasure today to introduce to you and through you to all members of the Assembly two guests that are in attendance. The first is Stephanie Shostak. Stephanie is the regional director for Edmonton north on PC Alberta. I ask Stephanie to rise and receive the warm greeting of the Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, my second guest is someone who could certainly not be called a stranger to these august chambers, perhaps has attended more sessions of question period than most of us here perhaps even combined. It's my pleasure to introduce Mr. Rory Koopmans.

**The Speaker:** Welcome.

### Members' Statements

#### Cavendish Farms Expansion in Lethbridge

**Ms Fitzpatrick:** Mr. Speaker, since being elected in May of 2015, I've listened to a barrage of negative rhetoric from opposition about our government. Well, I'm proud to be part of a government that gets things done. Yesterday in Lethbridge the myths that are told about this government were blown away with the announcement of a \$350 million private investment by Cavendish Farms with J.D. Irving, a Canadian blue-chip company. This is the largest private investment Lethbridge, and probably southern Alberta, has ever seen. This investment will boost the province's GDP by \$90 million a year during construction and \$26.6 million during operations.

Mr. Speaker, this investment came because of certainty and a vision of prosperity and growth for our province from this government and Cavendish Farms. I am so proud of being just a small part in the process which brought this to fruition. I'm so proud of all those involved: Mayor Spearman; Lethbridge city council; Economic Development Lethbridge, in particular, CEO Trevor Lewington; our city manager, Garth Sherwin; our provincial government; and, of course, Mr. Robert Irving and all of the Cavendish Farms staff. I know the long hours of work which have gone on for the last nine months to make this happen are worth it as we see the economic impact roll out in Lethbridge, southern Alberta, and Alberta as a whole.

Thank you to all of my colleagues for their support of all of this positive legislation this past session. I had planned as my statement today wishing a happy 50th anniversary to my former union, the Public Service Alliance of Canada. I am sure they will forgive me.

**The Speaker:** Thank you.

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

#### Whitefish Lake First Nation Education Program

**Mr. Hanson:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Today I'd like to congratulate the elders, chief, council, and members of the Whitefish Lake First Nation. For the last three years the nation has provided members with a 16-week program offering life skills, job readiness, and safety training. They offer five entry-level trades, including carpentry, plumbing, electrical, insulating, and scaffolding. The program prepares graduates for the workforce in the construction industry, mainly oil and gas. To date there have been six successful programs with approximately 80 graduates in total. Ninety-five per cent of the students completed the program, with an 85 per cent employment success rate. That's more than 60 First Nation members who have been trained in the trades in three years. What a great accomplishment.

On Friday I had the very real pleasure to speak at the graduation ceremonies. These 14 grads started the program in September and hope to start work very soon in the new year. This is only one example of what the First Nation offers its members in support of building a solid educational foundation. They provide studies at different times to allow people facing different life experiences lots of opportunities to continue their postsecondary studies, including intersession in spring and summer, part-time, home studies, and evening courses. To paraphrase the Whitefish Lake postsecondary education philosophy statement, the program

will endeavour to provide and maintain service delivery in education, individual and career counselling for all of the band members . . . whereby education will be the means by which each student may develop physically, socially, intellectually, emotionally and spiritually so that he or she can become a competent, responsible and contributing member of the community of Whitefish Lake . . . and the society at large.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the elders; Chief Brian Favel; councillors James Jackson, Kevin Half, and Greg Sparklingeyes; and special thanks also to Rennie Houle, the program director, and the First Nation members who are taking advantage of this great opportunity.

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

#### Protection of Children in Care

**Mr. McIver:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise today to address comments made in the Chamber yesterday by our hon. Premier. Specifically, the Premier claimed that for 44 years Progressive

Conservative governments did not adequately address flaws in Alberta's child intervention system. This is true. Although not for a lack of trying, still, we fell short. While previous PC ministers, most notably late Manmeet Bhullar, made significant and well-intentioned efforts to improve the system, we know now that it wasn't enough to save Serenity from her terrible fate. If it was easy, we would have fixed it. If it was easy, the NDP would have fixed it. Because it's not easy, now is the time to work together to make it better in public. Because we did not get it right, both the PCs and the NDP will take some criticism in the process. Let's both agree to take that heat if it results in saving young lives like Serenity's.

Children in care are the personal responsibility of all members of this Assembly. We owe them our very best efforts to get this right. Let's start by passing Serenity's law today. Then, Mr. Speaker, let's take part in an all-party committee of the Legislature, where the public can watch us do our best to fix the system.

Let's face it. Both this government and the last one have been shocked into action by public pressure in the media. Keeping the public pressure on will force all of us to do our best and move forward. The choice is simple, Premier. We can do this publicly and openly and give hope of getting better results in the future, or we can bury the process for six months behind the secrecy of a ministerial panel and hope the public forgets, at least until the next scathing report from the office of the Child and Youth Advocate. I know which choice the public thinks is best.

Let's commit today to making better choices as our own Premier has advised Albertans to do. Then, and only then, will we have earned the right to go home for Christmas vacation, knowing we will have done our best and that we can dig in for Alberta's children in care. Alberta kids deserve no less.

**The Speaker:** The hon. Member for Leduc-Beaumont.

#### 1:40 Climate Change and Energy Policies

**Mr. S. Anderson:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am passionate about a great many things – my community, my constituents, my family, and the world we live in – and I am not alone. Albertans also have a great many passions that they feel strongly about.

This weekend I watched a National Geographic program on climate change with my kids, and the figures were devastating. Looking over at my sons, I knew that in the future I'd want them to be able to say: "Thank you for understanding and believing in the science of climate change. Thank you for working to make a difference and caring about our future." Mr. Speaker, I want my community to know that we are working towards a better plan for tomorrow for all Albertans.

I am proud to be a part of this government and the climate leadership plan, which has resulted in two pipeline approvals and is driving the new businesses that are popping up to meet the demand of this new, less carbon-intensive energy market.

Areas like the Nisku and Leduc industrial parks get hit hard when the price of oil fluctuates. We've seen thousands of job losses in our community and an entire energy park slow down. However, the importance of a pipeline is something that constituents have said again and again would help, a pipeline to help create jobs all across the country and to put skilled tradespeople and engineers back to work in Nisku, where advanced manufacturing has been a shining example of what happens when entrepreneurship and innovation meet opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, Albertans are resilient, from farms taking advantage of extra funding for on-farm solar to the leadership of the city of Leduc in GHG reduction, with the rec centre having the largest municipal rooftop solar install in Canada.

We are adapting to the new energy climate, an energy climate that is about balance and a less carbon-intensive energy market. The carbon levy is an important part of this, and it shows our commitment to this new market while at the same time we are protecting Alberta families and my constituents through the rebate program.

Mr. Speaker, the changes happening to our climate are real. I want my children to look at me as a man who chose to do the right thing for this province and the world even when it was difficult. Decisions made in our backyard impact backyards across the globe. We are taking action now with our climate leadership plan, not simply because we want to but because we need to.

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

The hon. Member for Sherwood Park.

#### Festival Place in Sherwood Park

**Ms McKittrick:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Given the hard work and debate that this House has engaged in over the last few months on serious issues, I would like to encourage members to get out this holiday season and throughout the year and support art and culture organizations in their communities.

In my community we have a wonderful facility, Festival Place, which offers world-famous musical acts in a perfectly sized venue where one can bring their drink in. Recent acts include André-Philippe Gagnon, and comedian Ali Hassan will be there in January.

But beyond professional acts every year this theatre presents a community musical with many community actors and singers. I look forward to the performance this year of *Anne of Green Gables*.

My favourite event at Festival Place is the summer patio series, held outdoors with food and beverages, featuring Canadian and international Celtic, blues, and folk acts. For \$8 per night it is affordable and has introduced me to the work of many wonderful musicians.

This performance space also hosts school award ceremonies, music festivals, and space for multicultural dance and music acts as well as trains young people during the summer in the circus arts.

Like all communities Sherwood Park is home to many dance studios, music schools, choirs, and school drama groups, who spark and nurture artistic talent in residents of all ages. Last year one of these choirs of older adults sang in the rotunda.

Through support from government, including the Ministry of Culture and Tourism, and foundations, Albertans outside of the major cities often have access to Alberta's major performing art institutions. But even in smaller communities there are always many talented persons who nurture talent and provide opportunities for performances.

Mr. Speaker, as we approach the end of a session and the festive season, I would like to urge everyone in this House to take the opportunity to support their local theatre, symphony, ballet, music venue, attend performances of community groups, and enjoy the season through the arts. See you all at the theatre.

Thank you.

**The Speaker:** The hon. Member for Drumheller-Stettler.

#### National Finals Rodeo Champions

**Mr. Strankman:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Alberta is well known for cowboys and the sport of rodeo. This sport has become part of our culture and the identity of Alberta, recognized around the world. The first recognized Canadian rodeo was held in 1903 in the southern Alberta town of Raymond, near Lethbridge. Since that time we have had a great many men and women who have represented our nation in the world finals.

This past weekend the national finals rodeo in Las Vegas, Nevada, concluded with three homegrown cowboys reaching the pinnacle of success in rodeo. Unfortunately, this success has gone largely unreported by the Canadian media. Levi Simpson from Ponoka and Jeremy Buhler from Arrowwood brought home the title of world champions in the team roping event, this after becoming the first all-Canadian team to qualify for team roping at the world championships. Mr. Speaker, not satisfied with just qualifying, they put down a smoking 4.3 second run on the final go-around to seal the deal and bring home the coveted gold buckles of world champions.

Not to be outdone, Zeke Thurston from the diverse riding of Drumheller-Stettler followed up that success. Zeke, who calls Big Valley home, is now sporting his own gold buckle as the world champion saddle bronc rider. Again, Mr. Speaker, Zeke showed the grit and determination cowboys and Albertans are known for, turning in the performance of 747 and a half points on just nine head.

Today it's my privilege to stand in this House and recognize these impressive accomplishments by Levi, Jeremy, and Zeke. I invite the entire House to join me in showing our appreciation of these Canadian cowboys. They have competed and represented our nation with pride and honour at the national finals rodeo. We congratulate them on a job well done.

### Presenting Petitions

**The Speaker:** The hon. Member for Banff-Cochrane.

**Mr. Westhead:** Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to table a petition today that says:

We, the undersigned residents of Alberta petition, the Legislative Assembly to urge the Government of Alberta to take the following measures to improve the treatment and protection of the wolf population in Alberta.

- (1) prohibit the posting of bounties on wolves by individuals, clubs, special interest groups, or municipalities;
- (2) abolish the use of poison, such as strychnine;
- (3) approve humane standards for the use of snares and make documentation for all snare by-catch mandatory;
- (4) reduce the six-month trapping season and ten-month hunting season upon wolves;
- (5) keep an inventory and monitor the wolf populations of Alberta;
- (6) educate ranchers and promote the non-lethal wolf control methods; and
- (7) introduce legislation protecting wolves on public lands, including community grazing pastures.

Mr. Speaker, the petition has been approved by Parliamentary Counsel. It contains about 10,000 signatures from residents of Alberta.

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

**Dr. Starke:** Yes, Mr. Speaker. I, too, have a petition. I have several hundred names that have signed a petition that has circulated, actually, throughout the province, and I'm here to table it today. The petition reads:

We, the undersigned residents of Alberta, petition the Legislative Assembly to urge the Government of Alberta to introduce legislation to repeal the Daylight Saving Time Act and require the observance of Central Standard Time in Alberta throughout the entire Year.

Mr. Speaker, this is a petition that has been signed by Albertans throughout the province. It was, I believe, started by some constituents in the town of Mannville, and I'm happy to table it at this time.

### Tabling Returns and Reports

**The Speaker:** The Minister of Labour and minister responsible for democratic renewal.

**Ms Gray:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to rise to table the appropriate number of copies of the annual report of the Appeals Commission for Alberta workers' compensation. The Appeals Commission is the final level of appeal for workers' compensation matters in Alberta. It is independent of the Workers' Compensation Board and accountable to the Ministry of Labour. The document reports on the performance of the Appeals Commission for the period between April 1, 2015, and March 31, 2016, inclusive.

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

**Mr. Ceci:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to table the required number of copies of the Report of Selected Payments to the Members and Former Members of the Legislative Assembly and Persons Directly Associated with Members of the Legislative Assembly, also known as the MLA report – this is for the year ended March 31, 2016 – pursuant to the Legislative Assembly Act and the Conflicts of Interest Act. As members are likely aware, the report includes such things as salary, benefits, and travel expenses while on MLA or government business.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

1:50

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

**Mr. Bilous:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I rise today to table five copies of the Northern Alberta Development Council 2015-16 annual report as required under the act. This report contains a summary of the council's activities from April 1, 2015, to March 31, 2016.

**Mr. Taylor:** Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to be able to table five copies of the report that I was citing yesterday from Alberta Innovates: Bio Solutions, Biomass Innovation, which talked about a solution for us in Canada. It has a renewable resource that we have, that we can continuously use.

### Statement by the Speaker

#### Decorum

**The Speaker:** If you would hold the clock.

Hon. members, I don't choose to speak as a teacher lecturing students. It's not my intent. Yesterday was very noisy, and a very sensitive topic was being discussed. I urge all of you to treat the matter with respect and, more specifically, to control the violence. [interjections] I didn't see that part, but the words nonetheless connect. Be conscious of the words that we all use in here.

Start the clock.

### Oral Question Period

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

#### Government Policies

**Mr. Jean:** Well, it's been a busy fall for the NDP. Here are just a few highlights: 13,000 full-time jobs lost in October; a \$10.8 billion deficit; and, of course, a \$1.4 billion price tag to shut down coal in Alberta. To top it all off, the Human Services minister took weeks

to get a critical report to the RCMP about the probable murder of a little girl named Serenity. What does the Premier have to say to Albertans, who will be poorer, who are out of work, and who have lost any trust in this government because of this appalling NDP government's record?

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

**Ms Notley:** Well, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. In fact, you know, when our government was elected, we knew that the economy was going into a significant downturn as a result of the drop in the price of oil, and we committed to focusing on having the backs of Albertans, and we committed to working with them in terms of job creation. The last few weeks have actually not been so bad. Just a couple of weeks ago in Lethbridge the single biggest private-sector investment in the history of that city was made to the tune of \$350 million. The PDP announcement that we made last week will bring in 4,000 construction jobs and 1,400 long-term jobs.

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

**Mr. Jean:** The Premier should tell that to the 100,000-plus Albertans that are out of work, Mr. Speaker.

It is bad. It is very bad, and here are some more highlights: helping Ottawa out by blocking equalization reform, caps on oil sands, caps on refining, asking Alberta taxpayers to be on the hook for billions of dollars in new generation, and an ongoing lawsuit, of course, against a Calgary-owned power company. What could be better? This lawsuit has sent a chill throughout all of Alberta. It's a lawsuit that, if the NDP is successful, will mean property tax hikes for all Calgarians. When will the Premier drop this ridiculous lawsuit and reverse the tax hikes . . .

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

**Ms Notley:** Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think we covered a number of topics there, but to go back to equalization, I would of course go back to the member opposite and ask him, when he was in government federally, which actually has some level of authority over that matter, what exactly he did with respect to the equalization issue. I believe he got up to speak over 200 times in the House during his career, and not once – not once – did he raise the matter of equalization. [interjections]

**The Speaker:** Quiet, please.

**Ms Notley:** So you know what? I think he's kind of missed his opportunity.

**Mr. Jean:** Of course, the real reason, Mr. Speaker, is because it wasn't renegotiated when I was there.

Here's one surprise that is really rubbing Albertans the wrong way: a commitment to do Ottawa's bidding and raise the carbon tax by another 67 per cent. That's right, Mr. Speaker. The Premier and the NDP have shown open contempt for the millions of Albertans who don't support the carbon tax. The Premier thinks that they need to make better choices, choices like heating their homes or possibly buying groceries, perhaps. This is the largest tax hike in Alberta history. Can the Premier finally tell Albertans why she won't scrap this tax or at least put it to Albertans in a referendum?

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

**Ms Notley:** Well, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and I thank the member opposite for allowing me to go back to the issue of jobs;

for instance, two pipelines, 22,000 jobs – 22,000 jobs – billions of dollars back into the coffers of Albertans, billions of dollars back into the profits of oil and gas companies here in Alberta because of our climate leadership plan, that, as clearly indicated by the Prime Minister of the country, made that decision happen. Our government delivered for Albertans, and I am very proud of that.

**The Speaker:** Second main question.

**Mr. Jean:** And not a single shovel in the ground, Mr. Speaker, employing any Albertans.

### Carbon Levy

**Mr. Jean:** It's just 18 days until families see their heating bills go up, pay more at the pumps, and see the price of everything else that they buy skyrocket, but the environment minister has decided, 13 months after first announcing this job-killing tax, that it's finally time to roll up her sleeves and take some phone calls. I have a better idea. Why don't the Premier and her ministers get out of their comfy offices and hold some public town halls across Alberta and look the people in the eye that they're hurting and destroying their lives? That would be a good idea.

**Ms Notley:** Well, interestingly, Mr. Speaker, it is actually the case – I'm not quite sure what the member opposite was doing, but before we introduced the climate leadership plan, there were actually a number of public consultations out there, but he must have missed them.

That being said, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the renewable energy that our program will produce: 7,200 jobs. With respect to our tax credit program: 9,000 jobs. Interestingly, in just the last couple of weeks we have heard oil and gas companies announce billions and billions of dollars of increases in capital investment for just next year.

**The Speaker:** First supplemental.

**Mr. Jean:** Yes, Mr. Speaker. Most of that investment is in Saskatchewan.

Two-thirds of Albertans don't support this carbon tax, and the Premier knows it. It's why they've unloaded \$9 million in taxpayer-funded propaganda. It's why the Premier is sending the environment minister on a carbon tax telethon to help explain to Albertans how to, as the Premier would say, make better choices. Instead of wasting millions of dollars trying to sell Albertans on something they don't want, why doesn't the Premier take her own advice, make better choices, and scrap the carbon tax?

**Ms Notley:** You know, Mr. Speaker, there are two ways to approach building a jurisdiction over which you have some responsibility. You can say no to everything, or you can be the people who say yes. You can be timid, or you can be bold. You can have faith in the people of your province, or you can be xenophobic. You can ultimately decide that you want to move forward with leadership or that you want to go backwards and reject facts. We are moving Alberta forward. We are standing up for Albertans. We have their backs. We will not vote against Alberta's future for political points. [interjections]

**The Speaker:** Quiet, please.

**Mr. Jean:** You can create jobs, or you can do what the NDP has done and kill jobs in Alberta.

The NDP seems content with denying basic economics. Here are the facts. Australia has axed their tax, France has axed their tax, and



now the United States will be cutting their business taxes and their income taxes and will have no carbon tax. Mr. Speaker, they will be more competitive in attracting investment, and that only hurts Alberta. This is a big deal. This is not a joke. This is a carbon tax that will hurt people's lives. Why does the Premier think Alberta should pay a carbon tax when none of our major competitors across the world will be paying a carbon tax?

**Ms Notley:** Well, interestingly, Mr. Speaker, one of the folks from whom many of the members opposite take great inspiration just nominated a Secretary of State, who made the following statement, quote: at Exxon Mobil we share the view that the risks of climate change are serious and warrant thoughtful action; we have long supported a carbon tax as the best policy of those being considered. End quote. That is the statement of the nominated Secretary of State for our neighbours to the south. The folks over there should maybe do a bit of research. [interjections]

**The Speaker:** Third main question.

### 2:00 Protection of Children in Care

**Mr. Jean:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday I asked the Premier why Albertans should trust this government to fix the problems of children in care which resulted, of course, in the tragic death of a four-year-old girl. She pointed to residential schools and the legacy of the '60s scoop. She pointed to fired social workers in the '90s and the actions of the previous PC government. Can the Premier explain exactly how all these events have stopped this government and this minister from changing how child intervention works in Alberta right now, and can she explain exactly how her government has messed up the investigation of Serenity's death under her government's watch?

**Ms Notley:** Mr. Speaker, we have for a very long time been very, very concerned about the fate and the state of children in care and children who are at risk in the province of Alberta. This is something I think all Albertans care about. Some of the things that we have done, in the 18 months since we've gotten elected, to address the root causes of the risks that are faced by these children are an Alberta child benefit and tax credit which provides \$340 million in benefits to 380,000 children in poverty, to 200,000 families, and we went from a flat tax to a progressive tax, which every . . .

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

**Mr. Jean:** Yesterday I also asked the Premier why she allowed this Human Services minister to ignore recommendations for improvements made by the previous panel to study children in care. Her reply was that some of the recommendations of previous panels weren't helpful. Can the Premier please tell us which recommendations made by the Richter panel she rejected because they weren't helpful, and can she please tell us about any specific recommendations made by the Richter panel that this Human Services minister has actually implemented for the people of Alberta?

**Ms Notley:** Well, Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that roughly two-thirds of the recommendations have either been implemented or are in progress of being implemented. In addition, other things that our government has done in order to prevent the kinds of tragedies like Serenity's are that we engaged in a \$25 million increase to FCSS for prevention programs which help families at risk, and we put \$15 million into women's shelters, one of the first increases in decades, which allows children at risk to be removed

from dangerous situations. That is critical prevention work. We've reversed cuts to . . .

**The Speaker:** Thank you, hon. Premier.  
Let's all try and practise time control.

**Mr. Jean:** Yesterday I also asked the Premier why this minister's incompetence and negligence on Serenity's file goes unpunished and why it's taking more than two years to investigate what's almost certainly a murder, Mr. Speaker. The Premier deflected to talk about child tax credits. The system is broken. This minister didn't break it, but he has had 19 months to fix it and he hasn't even started. He's failed, and he needs to go. The minister says that he's done a good job. If that's the case, I would really hate to see a bad job. Why won't the Premier fire this minister?

**Ms Notley:** Anyway, Mr. Speaker, I believe I was cut off before I was able to finish. One of the other things that our government did, the first thing, was to reverse the cuts that were made to the office of the Child and Youth Advocate, who engages in these investigations, to reverse them so that he could continue to do his work. We are also moving forward on child nutrition programs and also better child care programs. All these things are focused on preventing these kinds of things because we need to do those as well. As the members opposite know, there has been an RCMP investigation in place from the beginning of this, and it continues to be in place. That work continues as . . .

**The Speaker:** Thank you, hon. Premier.  
The leader of the third party.

### Child Death Review Ministerial Panel

**Mr. McIver:** Thanks, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday the Premier told me in question period to read the terms of reference for the ministerial panel. Here's what it says. Panel members "will not have access to case-level information about specific children." Instead, they can interview the Child and Youth Advocate or read his investigations. The multiple agencies that failed Serenity did not give the advocate the information he needed to properly investigate her case. That's why we're here talking about this. Premier, how on earth does this keep it in the dark panel give Serenity or any child justice?

**Ms Notley:** Mr. Speaker, that particular clause was taken completely from the terms of reference that were used in the work that was done by former Minister Bhullar. Nonetheless, you know, the member opposite just finished saying and taking responsibility for the fact that this is a very complex file. It is a very difficult file. It is a 44-year-long file that they admit they weren't able to fix because it's hard. Yet today they proposed terms of reference that would only have the investigation go back to May 2015. For heaven's sakes, how . . .

**The Speaker:** Thank you.  
First supplemental question.

**Mr. McIver:** Thanks, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday I urged the Premier to throw off the blanket of secrecy she has thrown over the ministerial panel, and I got nowhere. The Premier assured me that secrecy will allow for "excessive public opportunity, high levels of transparency," and she started to say: prevent political grandstanding. That really means muzzling MLAs on the panel. Premier, isn't the real goal of the keep it in the dark panel to whitewash the inaction of your incompetent minister?

**Ms Notley:** Actually, Mr. Speaker, the real goal of the panel is to try, finally, after 44 years plus 19 months, to make more significant progress on this matter. The member opposite, as I said before, signed onto a set of recommendations that would have the panel stop looking past May 2015. That's where it would stop. Then they suggested that the minister should be called to testify and be put on trial. Then they proposed those terms of reference with a two-hour ultimatum just before question period. How in heaven's name can we believe they're . . .

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

**Mr. McIver:** The government gave no notice of that bogus media conference last week.

Because the concept of an all-party committee was my recommendation, I feel some responsibility for it. Never did I expect it to morph into a ministerial panel designed to cover up the actions of two ministers who did not take action on a key file. Even worse, the Minister of Human Services is being tried publicly, and you've made him judge and jury over his own trial. To the Premier: are you really going to let this sham go forward? If you do, you should resign with your two ministers. [interjections]

**The Speaker:** Quiet, please.

**Ms Notley:** Mr. Speaker, I mean, honestly, the way in which these guys are going forward in terms of positioning themselves is – we are trying genuinely to reach across and develop a process that can actually create and recommend meaningful proposals. It is very, very difficult to engage in that with the kind of yelling that we're hearing right now, this kind of behaviour, very, very difficult to have this kind of conversation, and people wonder why it won't be successful . . . [interjections]

**The Speaker:** Could you please stop the timer? I indicated at the outset: keep your volume down. You continue to do it, both sides.

Was there any time left on the Premier's comments? There was? Proceed, Madam Premier.

**Ms Notley:** As I've said before and as I said in the letter back to the members opposite, we are still happy to engage in a constructive conversation about the terms of reference. We are prepared to accommodate some of the requests that have already been made, but we will not do so in a two-hour ultimatum immediately before question period.

**The Speaker:** Thank you, Madam Premier.  
The Member for Calgary-Mountain View.

### Opioid Addiction Treatment and Death Reporting

**Dr. Swann:** Bah. Humbug. Mr. Speaker, deaths from opiates are still increasing in year 4 of the most serious public health crisis in memory. Today I talked with a grieving mother who lost her daughter, presumably from a fentanyl overdose, in July. We still don't know. Tragically, her daughter had been succeeding in a drug rehab facility right up until the point she was thrown out before her program was ended, allegedly because she also had bulimia, which the facility couldn't accommodate. This girl, a college student without meaningful family input, was literally dropped off at a gas station to be picked up. Does the Premier feel that we are doing enough, that she is doing enough to create a sense of urgency . . .

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

**Ms Notley:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you to the member for the question. As we've often discussed – but let me reaffirm – the rise of illicit opiates, including fentanyl and the more powerful carfentanyl, has created a public health crisis here in Alberta and, quite frankly, across the country. Our hearts go out to the parents, the spouses, the brothers, the sisters, and the children who have lost loved ones. This government believes in harm reduction, and we believe in offering Alberta supports, not just stigma. So we are working carefully on a number of different avenues to improve the way that, as government, we can respond to this crisis, and our members will be . . .

2:10

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

**Dr. Swann:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Given that opioid death rates in Alberta now exceed one per day – public health doctors estimate that we have approximately 40,000 to 50,000 addicts in Alberta – and given that together Calgary, Edmonton, and Cardston, the main Alberta Health Services clinics, manage only 2,500 patients a year and given that four- to six-week wait times are now the norm in our treatment centres and given that many of Alberta Health Services' clinics close at 3 o'clock every day, does the Premier feel that the urgency of this matter is being addressed in Alberta?

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

**Ms Payne:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker and to the member for the question. I have to say that I really do appreciate the member's compassion and advocacy on this issue. Our government is working very diligently to expand access to opioid replacement therapies, which are known as best practice, in order to address opioid misuse disorders. He listed off the number of clinics that are being operated by AHS. We're working with partners in the private clinics as well as working with doctors in the primary care setting so that stabilized patients in ODT centres can then be transferred back to the community for maintenance with their doctor.

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

**Dr. Swann:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, given that B.C. is managing to report on opiate deaths, emergency room visits for opiate conditions, naloxone survivors, and wait times for therapy every month but given that Alberta reports every three to three and a half months, with some families not receiving reports on their dead loved one for eight to nine months, can the Premier tell us: is she going to direct the Justice minister and the Health minister to provide more timely information on these deaths?

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

**Ms Payne:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker and to the member for the question. Certainly, in B.C. they have a different set-up than we do here in Alberta. Here in Alberta we are having the information around emergency room visits reported to the chief medical officer of health, who is leading our government's response to this very important crisis. Additionally, the reporting information that we're getting from the Chief Medical Examiner is being reported back on a continual basis to the chief medical officer of health. They're working quite closely. I look forward to talking more in depth with the member in our meeting later this week.

**The Speaker:** The hon. Member for Banff-Cochrane.

### Renewable Energy Development

**Mr. Westhead:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. While many rural Albertans are excited about the opportunities that renewable energy brings, some are concerned about renewable energy development on their land and in their communities. To the Minister of Energy: how will the government protect the rights of rural landowners?

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

**Ms McCuaig-Boyd:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you for the question. It's unfortunate that such a serious thing as landowner concerns get laughed at by the Official Opposition. [interjections]

**The Speaker:** Quiet, please.

**Ms McCuaig-Boyd:** In our new legislation there will be no mechanism that allows renewable companies to force development on landowners if they don't want it. Should they choose to do so, they will make their contracts with the companies and do private agreements. To suggest anything else is absolutely irresponsible.

**The Speaker:** First supplemental.

**Mr. Westhead:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the same minister: how will this government ensure that landowners and rural municipalities benefit from renewable energy developments?

**Ms McCuaig-Boyd:** Thank you for the question. Mr. Speaker, CanWEA, who oversees wind projects, suggests that 5,000 megawatts of wind would bring in \$1.4 billion in new property tax payments to communities in rural. In the MD of Pincher Creek, for example, TransAlta's wind farm produces 130 megawatts of energy. One megawatt will power 625 homes. That puts \$12 million back into the local economy during construction and now injects \$5.2 million . . .

**The Speaker:** Thank you, Madam Minister.  
Second supplemental.

**Mr. Westhead:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Given that landowners are worried about new transmission lines owing to the build-out of renewable energy products, again to the same minister: how will the government address these concerns?

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

**Ms McCuaig-Boyd:** Thank you for the question, Mr. Speaker. Our renewable build is not expected to require new transmission. We currently have lots of good infrastructure in Alberta. Programs will be designed to choose projects that have access to existing transmission capacity.

I want to correct one thing. I meant 425 homes per one megawatt.

**The Speaker:** The hon. Member for Battle River-Wainwright.

### Protection of Children in Care (continued)

**Mr. Taylor:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Last August the implementation oversight committee, or IOC, released a report on 58 government-accepted recommendations for improving the child intervention system. The report details that they had received responses for most, but one recommendation about child abuse was not verified. To the minister: has the improved process for the child abuse case conferencing been shared with all regions? If not, why not?

**The Speaker:** The hon. Minister of Human Services.

**Mr. Sabir:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you, Member, for the question. Last August's report tracks the progress that has been made after those recommendations were made; 58 of them were implemented. The progress was tracked independently. On those which are remaining there is ongoing progress, which is also publicly reported on the Human Services website.

**Mr. Taylor:** Given that following the IOC assessment the only other recommendation unable to be verified was a critical response protocol for staff when tragic events occur, that the recommendation is coupled by the Child and Youth Advocate's repeated calls for more caseworker training and oversight, and that this evaluation was released under this minister's watch, will the minister tell us what critical response protocol staff is or explain why he's failed to do his job?

**The Speaker:** The hon. Minister of Human Services.

**Mr. Sabir:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. That report certainly was released under my watch, and the independent implementation oversight committee was tracking the progress that Human Services made. He referred to more staff training. Those things do take money. That's why we increased by \$37 million, so we can support those front lines, so we can support our staff, so we can resource our front lines with the needed resources so that they can do their job.

Thank you very much.

**Mr. Taylor:** Given that the death of Serenity has served as a wake-up call for us all, that the report detailed the need to consult with front-line staff on new, reliable policies and processes, and that the minister has not outlined the consultation with front-line staff in his published plans for the panel, will the minister stop removing front-line workers from the process and provide them with the whistleblower protection they need?

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

**Mr. Sabir:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I've said it many times in this House and will say it again. Whatever we do at Human Services, at the heart of that work is the dedication of our front-line staff. So a couple of things: one, I sent out a survey a couple of weeks ago to hear directly from the front line. [interjections] Second thing. [interjections]

**The Speaker:** Stop the timer, please.

Hon. Member for Airdrie, your voice continues to escalate in volume.

Rebalance the timer.

Mr. Minister.

**Mr. Sabir:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. With respect to the opportunity for front-line staff to appear before the panel, certainly there will be opportunity, and I can provide assurance that there will be protection for front-line staff, that there will be no repercussions whatsoever when they appear before the panel.

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

The hon. Member for Calgary-Fish Creek.

**Mr. Fraser:** Mr. Speaker, there was a correction. May I go on?

**The Speaker:** My apologies. Yes. Please proceed.

**Mr. Fraser:** Thank you. Unfortunately, there are more cases like Serenity's. Sadly, I can recount a number of times when I've responded as a paramedic to fatalities of children in care: once, doing a welfare check, another child who had starved to death, left alone, no caregivers in sight. I can't express in words the effects of seeing and holding these children in my arms. Ministers, members, we're not talking politics here. We're talking about defenceless children. Minister, do you understand that?

**The Speaker:** The hon. Minister of Human Services.

2:20

**Mr. Sabir:** Certainly. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you, Member, for the question. The story of Serenity is not just a one-off. We have been failing these children for decades. That's what I have said. In order to find a solution, we need to look at the root causes, why children come into our care. That's why the Premier yesterday mentioned that there is a legacy of residential schools, there is a legacy of intergenerational trauma, there is a legacy of the '60s scoop, there is a legacy of the '90s firing of social workers. All of these things need to be looked into. These are hard decisions.

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

**Mr. Fraser:** You're right, Minister. We did fail. You're failing, and you're the leader right now.

An 11-year-old girl who was sexually molested over and over to the point where she hung herself with a blind cord: she seized so hard that she almost decapitated herself. Eleven years old. Minister, visualize any of these kids. Now pretend they were your children. What would you want to happen, and what does justice look like to you?

**Mr. Sabir:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. These are children in our care, and these are my children. These are Albertans' children. That's why I'm reaching out to the other side. I believe that you do care, and that's why I'm setting up this panel to work on these issues, to address these historical injustices, and to put enough safeguards in place so we can avoid similar incidents from happening in the future. It's not a partisan issue.

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

**Mr. Fraser:** Minister, we failed to do it alone. You will fail to do it alone. That is why we need everybody in this House to work collaboratively.

The cutest 18-month-old baby boy, bundled in his blanket, had scabies all over his body. He was killed as a result of his intoxicated caregiver sleeping on him and smothering him in the middle of the night. Hold that in your arms. Hold that in your memories. Minister, if these were your loved ones, would you have confidence in your office, and would you have confidence in your actions to date?

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

**Mr. Sabir:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you, Member, for the question. I never claimed that I can do it alone. That's why I'm asking all the parties in the House, and that's why I will be reaching out to experts and Albertans and front-line staff. Having said that, we have taken steps to address these issues, including \$37 million in the child intervention system, including a new child tax benefit, including a progressive tax which can sustain these services, including \$25 million in FCSS, including \$15 million for women's shelters. These are the children that . . .

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

The hon. Member for Bonnyville-Cold Lake.

### Openness and Transparency in Government

**Mr. Cyr:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Access to government information in our province has gone from bad to worse. The recent Supreme Court ruling has FOIP advocates concerned that simply CCing a lawyer will be the magic solution to avoid transparency and good governance. To the Minister of Justice: is the government abusing solicitor-client privilege to avoid transparency?

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

**Ms Ganley:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and to the member for the important question. Of course, transparency is a value that this government holds so dearly. That's why we've taken so many steps to ensure that we're increasing transparency of government, to ensure that we're increasing transparency in our agencies, boards, and commissions, and to ensure that everyone has the necessary information. It's always important to balance the rights of Albertans in certain litigation cases against the rights to information. It's a very delicate balance, and we'll continue working forward to make sure we do the best job for all Albertans.

**The Speaker:** First supplemental.

**Mr. Cyr:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again no answer.

Given that lawyer and FOIP expert Michel Drapeau believes that the practice of simply copying any lawyer in any capacity is a way for governments to avoid transparency and accountability and given that the Justice minister has refused or failed to comply with Tobaccogate, political interference investigations, and FOIP law in general and given that this is the department responsible for enforcing our province's laws, to the minister: is transparency simply not a priority of this NDP government?

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

**Ms Ganley:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Transparency is always an important value for our government, and we think it's very important to ensure transparency in all aspects of governance. Obviously, I can't comment on the specific case, but in general there is a balance to be struck between ensuring the interests of Albertans in a multibillion-dollar tobacco litigation versus ensuring their interests in terms of access to information. So we will continue moving forward, ensuring that that balance is struck as appropriately as possible.

**The Speaker:** The second supplemental.

**Mr. Cyr:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again no answer to the question on the CCing of documents.

Given that this problem now risks spreading to other ministries and given that the risk is a direct affront to democracy, will the Minister of Service Alberta confirm that other departments will not abuse legal privilege by unnecessarily involving lawyers from start to finish to avoid open and transparent government?

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

**Ms McLean:** Thank you for the question, Mr. Speaker. Certainly, openness and transparency are important to our government. That's why some of our first actions as a government were on this issue. We post all sole-source contracts over \$10,000 online so that Albertans can be confident in how the money is being spent, and

unlike the previous government, which only posted salaries for a handful of senior staff, our government posts salaries and full contracts for every staffperson. This is very important to us. We've taken a number of actions on this front. Frankly, the assertions that the opposition are making around simply CCing lawyers on this are just absolutely absurd. Privilege is a complicated issue that they need to obviously read up on.

### Government Policies (continued)

**Mr. Fildebrandt:** Mr. Speaker, it's Christmastime and Santa's elves are making sure that they have all the toys for all the girls and boys, but the Wildrose has real concerns about the impact the NDP policies are having on toy production and the elf labour market. According to legitimate statistics from the Fraser Institute a \$15 minimum wage will mean a huge bar for young elves entering the toy production labour market and could result in the layoffs of hundreds of elves. The NDP's plan to unionize Santa's workshop will devastate toy production levels as seniority is rewarded over merit. Will the Premier tell the House why they're willing to accept less toys for the girls and boys at Christmas?

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

**Mr. Ceci:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. You know, the Official Opposition seems to think with regard to the elves – we call them workers for government, or we call them the civil service – that we can break employment contracts, that it's okay to do that. Well, that's not the way we roll on this side. You may want to do that, but we're not going to break employment contracts. We're going to support workers so that they can do the best job possible for this government, whether it's in Human Services or any other ministry. You break contracts. We don't. [interjections]

**The Speaker:** The subject matter has changed, but the volume is still there, folks.

**Mr. Fildebrandt:** Well, Merry Christmas from Enmax, Mr. Speaker. For nearly 2,000 years Santa has responsibly used coal, but the NDP are demanding the phase-out of this reliable and cheap source of energy. Without coal Santa will not have anything to give the naughty children except for billions of dollars of government debt, amounting to \$23,000 for every boy and girl, naughty or nice. If the oil sands emissions cap was applied to Santa, he would have to begin scaling back toy production right now. Seeing as how it's nighttime half the year in the North Pole, solar panels won't do. Does the Grinch understand the devastating impact this will have on toy production?

**Mr. Mason:** Mr. Speaker, what the opposition doesn't understand is that if we don't curtail the use of coal and the emissions of CO<sub>2</sub>, the North Pole is going to melt. What will happen to toy production then?

2:30

**The Speaker:** Hon. member for Grinch, I would just like to thank you for allowing me to enjoy this.

**Mr. Fildebrandt:** Well, Santa will just have to move to Alberta, Mr. Speaker.

According to Ethical Ocean, Santa's reindeer will emit 54,000 metric tons of greenhouse gases; milk and cookies, 9,000 tons; lumps of coal, 230,000; wrapping paper, 290,000; his workshop, 983,000; toy production, 68 million. That all adds up to a total Christmas carbon footprint of 70 million metric tons. The carbon tax, or, since it's Christmas, levy, will cost Santa \$3.5 billion. Does

the Premier understand that if their carbon tax was applied to Santa, there would be no Christmas?

**Ms Notley:** Well, you know, I just want to ask the member opposite if in all of his facts and figures and numbers – and there are so many facts and figures there, so scientific – he factored in the cost of Santa's workshop occurring on an ocean liner in return for the ice cap that it is no longer sitting on because we failed to take action because we don't believe that climate change is real. Santa is very glad that we are saving him and Christmas and toys.

**The Speaker:** I do hope the hon. Premier recognized the contribution of Mrs. Claus as well.

### Carbon Levy in Lloydminster

**Dr. Starke:** Mr. Speaker, Lloydminster is Canada's only border city, but we always strive to have our city as a singular, seamless entity, and where provincial disparities arise, our government in the city has always worked with provincial governments to minimize or eliminate them. Now, for decades the Saskatchewan government has forgone collection of the provincial sales tax from businesses on the east side of Lloydminster so that they can compete on an equal playing field with those on the Alberta side, but coming soon: the NDP carbon levy. To the Minister of Finance: did your department give any consideration of the inequities that your carbon tax will create in Lloydminster?

**Mr. Ceci:** You know, the inequity of note – what we've concluded is that Alberta still will have a \$7.5 billion tax advantage over all provinces, so we believe that we still have a really great Alberta tax advantage. Lloydminsterites, Lloydminsterians, people from Lloydminster will continue to enjoy that tax advantage like the rest of Alberta because this is the lowest tax jurisdiction in the country.

**Dr. Starke:** Well, you're welcome for that thing that you inherited from us.

Given that 2017 is only 19 days away and given that Alberta fuel dealers in Lloydminster are gravely concerned that their customers will flee across Meridian Avenue to get away from the soon to be imposed NDP carbon tax and given that the Saskatchewan government has always taken action to keep businesses on their side of the border competitive, to the minister. Meetings have been held, and people are waiting anxiously. What specific actions are you taking to support Alberta businesses in Lloydminster?

**The Speaker:** The Minister of Environment and Parks.

**Ms Phillips:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you to the hon. member for the question. We will follow up on the specifics of the questions he has asked and further point out that there is, in fact, no PST in Alberta.

Thank you.

**Dr. Starke:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I'll point out to both ministers that they've met, and people from their departments have met, and people are waiting. The businesses on the Alberta side of Lloydminster have historically had an advantage over the Saskatchewan side, and the Saskatchewan government has always stepped up to ensure that businesses on their side of the border remain competitive. Given that this NDP government has in 19 short months completely turned the tables to where it is now better to operate on the east side of the fourth meridian, to the Premier. Residents have worked hard to keep the two halves of Lloydminster joined together. Why is your government tearing us asunder?

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

**Mr. Bilous:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Actually, the premise of the member's question is quite off. Number one, Alberta continues to remain the lowest tax jurisdiction in the country. As of January 1 our government has reduced the small-business tax to the second lowest in the country, much lower than Saskatchewan's. As well, we don't have a PST. As the Minister of Finance pointed out, even with our carbon levy coming in, Alberta is \$7.5 billion cheaper. I'm wondering what Saskatchewan is going to do when Ottawa imposes a carbon levy on that province.

**The Speaker:** The hon. Member for Calgary-Shaw. [interjections] Quiet, please.

**Mr. Sucha:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and through you Merry Christmas to all the members in this House.

### Calgary Southwest Ring Road

**Mr. Sucha:** Mr. Speaker, Calgarians have been waiting decades for the construction of the southwest ring road. Given that construction will impact the quality of life of my constituents, to the Minister of Transportation: what is the government doing to keep residents up to date on construction milestones and road closures?

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

**Mr. Mason:** Thank you. We're taking every opportunity to inform and engage residents on the southwest ring road project, Mr. Speaker. The contractor has been reaching out to community members to let them know about information issues. We held three information sessions last week at sites along the boundaries of the construction, and they informed local residents of the upcoming timelines and traffic impacts as well as what we're doing to minimize environmental impacts throughout the project. In addition, there's a . . .

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

**Mr. Sucha:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Given that construction of the east section of the ring road dealt with heavy delays and challenges with traffic flow, to the same minister: what is the government doing to ensure that this project will remain on track and open at the scheduled time?

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

**Mr. Mason:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll just mention that there is a project-specific website, [www.swcrrproject.com](http://www.swcrrproject.com), a direct e-mail address for questions, and a 24/7 phone line. We are going to be working with a selected contractor, Mountain View Partners, during design and construction to ensure that the traffic impacts are minimized and that the project is completed on time and on budget. We have staff supervising the project, and we have clear expectations of the contractor. We will hold them accountable to meet all of the guidelines that we've set.

**The Speaker:** Second supplemental.

**Mr. Sucha:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Given that major transportation projects can cause impacts to neighbourhoods such as construction noise and given that Calgary-Shaw is a peaceful suburban area in Calgary, what safeguards does the province have to combat noise pollution during and post construction?

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

**Mr. Mason:** Thanks very much, Mr. Speaker. During the construction phase we are restricting the hours of work to minimize noise impacts. Hours of work are 7 to 10, Monday to Saturday, and 9 to 10 on Sundays and statutory holidays. We're having the contractor undertake a noise modelling study to determine whether noise mitigation is required for those communities adjacent to the construction. After it's open to traffic, Alberta Transportation will do an ongoing noise monitoring study to verify that the noise levels are not exceeding the provincial guidelines.

### Oral Question Period Questions and Responses

**Mr. Cooper:** Mr. Speaker, over the course of the last session we've received plenty of stock responses from the government to our questions. The answers have become so trite and predictable that I'd like to propose a game of government policy *Jeopardy*. Quote: they are "a party full of folks who deny the science of climate change." To the minister of environment: what was the question?

**Ms Phillips:** It's quite possible, Mr. Speaker, that the question was on the value of carbon pricing. Over on this side of the House we recognize the value of carbon pricing along with a number of Canadian corporate executives, including GE Canada, SNC-Lavalin, Shell Canada, Rio Tinto, Teck Resources, the Forest Products Association of Canada, Suncor, Cenovus, CNRL, Enbridge, all large job creators in this province who have asked the Prime Minister and the Premiers to continue with carbon pricing, unlike the folks on the other side, who believe that these job creators are just "self-immolating their own industry just to get Trans Mountain twinned."

2:40

**Mr. Cooper:** Wrong, Mr. Speaker. It was on caribou.

Given that the Minister of Health responded, quote, to the members opposite, who are "proposing billions of dollars worth of cuts [in the public service] which would result in laying off many nurses [and teachers]," to the Minister of Health. The topic is NDP hyperbole. What was the question?

**Ms Hoffman:** Well, I'm happy to give some more answers, Mr. Speaker. Albertans deserve the right care in the right place at the right time by the right provider, and that means that they have a government that's going to have their back, that's going to make sure that we protect nurses and teachers, and I'm proud to do just that.

**Mr. Cooper:** Nnnnn.

Given, Mr. Speaker, that we all know that the real money increases in double jeopardy and given that the Finance minister knows something about playing *Jeopardy* with Alberta's financial future and given that the Finance minister said, "They would have thrown kids out to the street by not having them in schools" and closing hospitals, to the Finance minister: what was the question?

**Mr. Ceci:** Well, I'm sure I'll find out in about 35 seconds. But I would like to say first: beer is good. Secondly, I'd like to implore the opposition over there to stop being nattering nabobs of negativism. Stand up with us, stand up for pipelines, and stand up for Alberta. [interjections]

**The Speaker:** I wish you could just spread this out over other parts of the afternoon. It would be a lot more productive.  
The hon. Member for Calgary-Fish Creek.

**Mr. Gotfried:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And, Joe, we'll take that beer later.

**Carbon Levy**  
(continued)

**Mr. Gotfried:** Given that the Premier has unilaterally committed Albertans to a \$50-per-tonne carbon levy, taxpayers anxiously await timely updates on the financial impact. Current estimates of the burden are based on \$20, scaling up to \$30 per tonne in 2018. To the beer-drinking Minister of Finance: as \$50 is supposedly the new ceiling, when will this government provide estimates reflecting the new impact of both costs and rebates of the Trudeau-Notley carbon tax on household budgets, excluding the beer?

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

The hon. Minister of Environment and Parks.

**Ms Phillips:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Earlier this session we released the economic impact and analysis of \$50 per tonne by 2022. In fact, Kinder Morgan's Trans Mountain expansion was approved and put into place. Of course, that announcement showed a positive economic impact for Alberta, which is why we have taken the positions that we have at the Council of Ministers of the Environment table and the first ministers' meeting, which is that the environment and the economy go hand in hand and that we can be responsible oil producers while also leading on climate change.

**The Speaker:** Thank you.

First supplemental.

**Mr. Gotfried:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My apologies to the beer-drinking Minister of Finance.

Given that the government's own charts show that the full rebate of 60 per cent that Alberta households will receive is based solely on direct costs of the carbon tax and given that this full rebate does not take into account indirect levies on public transportation, food, clothing, and more brought about by the carbon tax so that no Albertans will actually receive a full rebate, to the minister of environment. Your carbon tax generates enough revenue to reduce income taxes for all Albertans while investing in your green agenda. Why have your organic beer and eat it, too?

**Ms Phillips:** Okay. Thank you to the hon. member for the question on the matter of the rebates and the indirect costs and the direct costs. Analysis shows that the indirect and direct costs are still being rebated up to an approximate \$100,000 income for households, Mr. Speaker, and this is well established using StatsCan data. Now, as to the carbon price in the out-years, you know, particularly in the New Democrats' perhaps second or third term, we will have a look at the rebate levels as the federal carbon price escalates.

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

Second supplemental.

**Mr. Gotfried:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I guess the clock will tell us what's happening with that.

Given that this government's 1 per cent reduction in small-business tax is based on an initial \$20-per-tonne carbon tax, if this government is sincere about helping small businesses, we should expect further decreases in the small-business tax as the carbon tax increases. To the Minister of Finance: if a \$20 carbon tax decreases the small-business tax by just 1 per cent, a \$50 tax should decrease it by 2.5 per cent. Can we expect to see further reductions in the

small-business tax, including to your brewers, as the carbon tax burden increases?

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

**Ms Phillips:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Of course, we will review the uptake of the energy efficiency programs. Of course, many of those for small businesses will be rolling out by the second quarter of 2017, the first of the \$645 million that this province will be investing in energy efficiency. We will review that. We will also review many of the new investments and new job-creation benefits in clean tech and other sectors to examine how those programs are working along with our annual review of all of our programs. We'll have more to say about that through the 2017 and 2018 budgets.

Thank you.

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

We could allow a 20-second departure if people would like to depart.

Hon. members, please. Go on out, folks.

Now, I have sensed the feeling of the season's happiness and frivolity. I'm wondering if everyone would agree to withdraw all of their points of order, and then I would get a present. I will try and keep a . . . [interjections]

You withdraw yours?

**Mr. Mason:** If the opposition does.

**The Speaker:** The Official Opposition House Leader.

**Point of Order**  
**Language Creating Disorder**

**Mr. Cooper:** My apologies, Mr. Speaker. My hon. colleague from Rocky View-Chestermere has . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** Chestermere-Rocky View.

**Mr. Cooper:** Yeah, that one.

. . . asked if I would just very briefly point to one statement that the Premier made during question period – and it will be under 23(h), (i), and (j) – when the Premier implied that the opposition was xenophobic. Obviously, that particular word is not in the list of unparliamentary language; however, one thing that you certainly know, Mr. Speaker, is that language in this Chamber is all about context, and if I was to share the definition of xenophobia, it would be very clear that this sort of language is likely to create disorder inside the Chamber. It would be quite easy for the member to withdraw and apologize.

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

**Ms Ganley:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to start by pointing out that the Premier didn't call any particular member xenophobic. She was simply talking about the broad choices facing the province of Alberta in this time. Additionally, I can advise that in the House the word "xenophobic" has been used in the Assembly on a number of occasions without a point of order being raised. It had been raised on Thursday, November 16, 2000, 1:30 p.m.; Tuesday, November 2, 1993, 1:30 p.m.; Friday, August 18, 1989, 10 a.m.; Thursday, August 17, 1989, 8 p.m.; Thursday, July 3, 1986, 2:30 p.m. I could go on, but I think I'll just sit.

**The Speaker:** Any comments?

Hon. members, I would agree that the word "xenophobic" – this is not a point of order. However, even as late as this afternoon I

cautioned all members, particularly at these kinds of times, on the use of certain words, and they are – sometimes a flame near fuel is not good. But there is no point of order in this situation.

### Point of Order Language Creating Disorder

**The Speaker:** The Official Opposition House Leader.

2:50

**Mr. Cooper:** Yes. I think that it is relevant to activities that will take place this afternoon. As such, under 23(j), “uses abusive or insulting language of a nature likely to create disorder” – while the words that the Minister of Human Services used were not insulting, they certainly were of a language that would create disorder, when the hon. minister said on a couple of occasions that he had reached out to this side of the House and consulted around terms of reference. Nothing could be further from the truth.

At no point in time did any member from the front bench at any time during any of this discussion around the tragic events that surround Serenity’s death reach out and speak to anyone on this side about terms of reference of a panel, about a bipartisan committee. So for the minister to say that he reached out and spoke to the opposition, certainly, was untrue. Those sort of statements are definitely going to create disorder.

I might just add that when we proposed our motion 42, while the timing may not have been perfect for the government, we reached out over an hour and a half prior. We reached out multiple hours in advance of any time that we efforted to bring forward terms of references or adding to the discussion to the government. So for them to say that they reached out to us, which absolutely isn’t true, and then imply that we were playing partisan games is unhelpful to this situation.

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

**Ms Ganley:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I don’t have the benefit of the Blues, so I’m going off memory, but my understanding of what the hon. Minister of Human Services said was that he was reaching out to members across the House. The committee is set up to have members of all parties on it. The suggestion was that he was reaching out for their help because he believed it to be the case that we care deeply about this issue, that members on the other side of the House care deeply about this issue. I think it’s an issue we can all be involved in, so he had indicated that he was reaching out for them to participate in this panel going forward. I don’t think that that’s a point of order.

**The Speaker:** Well, I do have the Blues, and I’ll just read it for the record. The hon. minister indicated:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. These are children in our care, and these are my children. These are Albertans’ children. That’s why I’m reaching out to the other side. I believe that you do care, and that’s why I’m setting up this panel, to work on these issues, to address these historical injustices, and to put enough safeguards in place so we can avoid similar incidents from happening in the future. It’s not a partisan issue.

I’m glad the Official Opposition House Leader did put your opinion on the record. This may be a difference of opinion in interpretation, but the way I read it is that it was intended as a nonpartisan event. In this particular situation, again, context, which the Official Opposition House Leader has pointed out many, many times – not really a point of order but one of opinion and shared interpretation.

**Ms Ganley:** There was a point of order called, Mr. Speaker, at approximately 2:43 p.m. by the Government House Leader with respect to comments by the hon. Member for Calgary-Fish Creek.

**The Speaker:** Thank you for pointing that out. I had understood in his remarks that he had withdrawn that comment and apologized. Am I correct, hon. member?

**Mr. Gottfried:** You are correct, and I’ll do it again with apologies. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

### Privilege Obstructing a Member in Performance of Duty

**The Speaker:** Hon. members, you will recall that there was a point of privilege raised yesterday. The hon. Government House Leader made his points to the points questioned – excuse me just a second.

First of all, to the question that was addressed to me by the deputy House leader yesterday, I’m of the view that in this particular situation, particularly given the decision I made earlier in the week, the point of privilege – I think there was a request to give some more information. I only allowed him that one opportunity. I think the principle applies here, so I think we have to go on the basis of what the Government House Leader said yesterday. I have a different interpretation of the events as I reviewed them than the one that maybe the House leader had yesterday.

The other reason as to why I don’t think it’s appropriate in this situation is that the point of privilege that was originally raised before was for other members, all of government. For that reason, I think the government side has had an opportunity.

I would now call upon the Member for Calgary-Elbow.

**Mr. Clark:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I do appreciate that. I will make my case here today. You know, I will start just briefly by saying that I am somewhat confused. The government, with all its power and the tools at its disposal, would choose to use this as an opportunity to go after an opposition member for doing what is our job, which is holding the government to account.

I will cite several citations here in reading my interpretation of the rules of privilege and associated precedents, and I will present today several precedents from Speakers of both this Assembly as well as Canada’s House of Commons. In doing so, I want to emphasize the key point is that there is an exceedingly stringent test to prove a breach of privilege through words spoken, especially words spoken in this House. I have to say that I find it remarkable and more than a little troubling that the government would suggest that it’s even possible for an opposition member to constrain a minister of the Crown to do their job simply with our words. If it’s an attempt to make me sit down and be quiet, I think they’ve got another thing coming, Mr. Speaker.

I will start with the citation used by the Government House Leader yesterday. He quoted *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, page 108.

Members are entitled to go about their parliamentary business undisturbed. The assaulting, menacing, or insulting of any Member on the floor of the House or while he [or she] is coming or going to or from the House, or on account of his [or her] behaviour during a proceeding in Parliament, is a violation of the rights of Parliament. Any form of intimidation . . . of a person for or on account of his [or her] behaviour during a proceeding in Parliament could amount to contempt.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have a number of points here that will contradict the Government House Leader’s assertions. First, I’d like to clarify that I never once accused the minister specifically of negligence. In fact, look in *Hansard* yesterday. My exact words



were: "His inaction means that whoever murdered Serenity is walking free today." First, his department and therefore the minister had not provided information requested by the RCMP in a timely manner. This inaction means that whoever is responsible for Serenity's death is walking free.

Second, in my comment I was also referring to the minister's lack of action in implementing the recommendations from the Richter report and others. Two of the recommendations were creating a joint death review panel and conducting and releasing internal reports into all child deaths. In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, had these two recommendations been implemented, the processes and investigations surrounding Serenity's death would have been expedited and the charges would have been laid by now.

The Government House Leader and I do agree that whoever is responsible for the death of Serenity has not currently been charged; therefore, by that definition they are walking the streets of this province. This statement does not in any way presuppose any investigation or future judgement but is simply a matter of fact.

We'll go to *Beauchesne*, sixth edition, section 75 on page 22. It says:

The privilege of freedom of speech is both the least questioned and the most fundamental right of the Member of Parliament.

I think that's an essential point, Mr. Speaker.

Further in section 69, page 20 in the same document, it says:

Something can be inflammatory, can be disagreeable, can even be offensive, but it may not be a question of privilege unless the comment actually impinges upon the ability of Members of Parliament to do their job properly.

3:00

Again, this sentiment is echoed in *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, second edition, page 109.

In order to find a prima facie breach of privilege, the Speaker must be satisfied that there is evidence to support the Member's claim that he or she has been impeded in the performance of his or her parliamentary functions.

*House of Commons Procedure and Practice* on the same page goes on to say:

In some cases where prima facie privilege has not been found, the rulings have focused on whether or not the parliamentary functions of the Member were directly involved. While frequently noting that Members raising such matters have legitimate grievances, Speakers have consistently concluded that Members have not been prevented from carrying out their parliamentary duties.

Specific to this incident at hand, Mr. Speaker, as we're talking about question period, *House of Commons Procedure and Practice* on page 111 says:

A Member may also be obstructed or interfered with in the performance of his or her parliamentary functions by non-physical means. In ruling on such matters, the Speaker examines the effect the incident or event had on the Member's ability to fulfil his or her parliamentary responsibilities. If, in the Speaker's view, the Member was not obstructed in the performance of his or her parliamentary duties and functions, then a prima facie breach of privilege cannot be found.

Further, on the same page:

The unjust damaging of a Member's good name might be seen as constituting an obstruction if the Member is prevented from performing his or her parliamentary functions.

The last point from that book, on page 112:

There have only been a few instances of the Speaker finding a prima facie breach of privilege related to the damaging of a Member's reputation.

Mr. Speaker, one of these instances was quite extreme and was very different from what is involved here, the incident that is in question

today. The incident that was found to constitute a prima facie breach of privilege involved concerted efforts by a member to distribute a bulk mailing containing inaccurate and misleading information which the Speaker at the time found clearly impacted the minister of the day's ability to carry out his duties.

The situation that we're talking about here on this point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, is categorically different. Again, I remind the House and the Speaker that it is a very high bar that needs to be met. Citing Alberta Speaker Kowalski from *Alberta Hansard*, April 19, 2007, page 679, in his ruling on the purported breach of privilege arising from a question asked of a minister in question period – and I think that this is especially relevant – he said:

The general rule in issues of this nature is found in Joseph Maingot's book, *Parliamentary Privilege in Canada*, the second edition, at page 254, where he states, "Language spoken during a parliamentary proceeding that impugns the integrity of Members would be unparliamentary and a breach of order contrary to the Standing Orders, but not a breach of privilege."

Speaker Kowalski goes on to say:

In this case the comments raised could have given rise to a legitimate point of order. The chair does not, however, believe that this is a case that falls into that . . .

And I'll emphasize this point: does not fall into that

. . . very small category of comments that would impede a member in performing his or her parliamentary duties.

I'm just about finished, Mr. Speaker.

Finally, I'd like to cite the May 5, 1987, ruling by Speaker Fraser, which can be found on page 5766 of the Commons debates. In this ruling Speaker Fraser says:

In the case before us certain questions were asked which, in the view of the Hon. Minister, conveyed grave implications against his integrity and were, therefore, damaging to his reputation. That is the position which the Minister took. I have carefully examined the questions, together with the interventions which took place following the Hon. Minister's statement, and I confess to be very troubled as a result . . .

Given all the circumstances in this case, I am sure that the Minister's capacity to function as a Minister and a Member of this House is in no way impaired. I point out to Hon. Members that this is the real issue of privilege.

I believe the case here is whether or not my question yesterday impeded the minister's ability to function as a member of this House. It's my opinion that this question alone in no way resulted in such an impediment, nor has the Government House Leader in raising the question provided sufficient proof of that impediment. Therefore, I would ask that you find, Mr. Speaker, that there is no point of privilege in this case.

Thank you.

**Mr. Cooper:** Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak to the point of privilege raised yesterday by the Government House Leader. First of all, I'm not entirely sure that proper notice was given because when I checked the Blues, the Government House Leader merely raised a point of order. I certainly don't think that appropriate notice was fulfilled in accordance with Standing Order 15(2).

Having said that, breaches of privilege ought to be raised only in the rarest of circumstances and when the situation warrants it. I know that I weigh very carefully whether or not to bring forward a point of privilege. I try to take time. I rarely make my mind up in the half an hour it takes between question period ending and when the breach took place. Perhaps if the Government House Leader had taken a night to prepare, he may have realized that what he wanted to argue was a point of order. I remind you again, Mr. Speaker, that that is what he originally called it at the time.

I note that the Government House Leader read from page 108 of *O'Brien and Bosc* to lend credence to his argument, but I would suggest that we perhaps could have continued reading on page 109.

While frequently noting that Members raising such matters have legitimate grievances, Speakers have consistently concluded that Members have not been prevented from carrying out their . . . duties.

On page 111 it goes on to say:

If, in the [view of the Speaker], the Member was not obstructed in the performance of his or her parliamentary duties and functions, then a prima facie breach of privilege cannot be found.

Perhaps it also might be important for us to remember that it's only a matter of privilege if a member is obstructed in the performance of their parliamentary duties. It is not privilege when it comes to constituency or ministerial duties.

When I read the arguments put forward yesterday, I did not notice the Government House Leader's claim that the comment from the Member for Calgary-Elbow obstructed the minister in his parliamentary duties. "In particular, I am concerned about the member's reference to the minister and the impact that such a statement made in the public could have on [the minister's] ability to conduct his business." Obviously, the minister has not been obstructed in the performance of his parliamentary duties because he was able to answer the question from the Member for Calgary-Elbow. He voted in the House later that same afternoon on no less than three occasions.

Reading the statements from the Government House Leader, it would appear that he was mostly concerned about the minister's public image. Let me be clear. The moment that damaging a minister's public image becomes a breach of privilege, we will never get any business done here. Indeed, I would argue that every time the opposition does its job of holding the government to account, there is a real and substantial risk that the public will think less of the minister or of the government, and that, in many ways, is the point. Indeed, one could argue that the principle of ministerial accountability flows from the fact that the minister's conduct and the opposition's exposure of the minister's conduct will have damaged the credibility of the minister to such an extent that he can no longer command the confidence of Albertans and thus should resign to protect the public image of the government. As an aside, Mr. Speaker, I think that is where we are at here today on this minister and on this broader issue.

Mr. Speaker, it is an important point. If there is a point of privilege here, it is the privilege of the Member for Calgary-Elbow to hold the minister and this government to account, the privilege of the Member for Calgary-Elbow and all members of the opposition to ask uncomfortable questions that run the risk of damaging the minister's and the government's public image. We have a privilege of free speech that exists within the parliamentary system. We ask questions and debate topics here to make sure that the executive branch is held to account.

The executive branch may not always like being held to account, but the statements made in the question by the Member for Calgary-Elbow are legitimate points to raise in a question or in debate. If the Government House Leader wants to declare the point debatable, he can do so. If he wants to raise a point of order on objectionable language, on being inflammatory, he can do so. In my opinion, that is what he should have done yesterday.

**3:10**

In summary, I think that at best there was perhaps a point of order, a debatable point and quite likely a weak point around a matter of debate, but this certainly does not in any way meet the threshold for

a prima facie case of breach of privilege, and I encourage you, Mr. Speaker, to find the same.

**The Speaker:** Thank you, hon. members. Some interesting information was submitted today. I need to deliberate upon that and read some of the references that are cited. I will return to you with my ruling at a future meeting time.

## Orders of the Day

### Government Motions

#### Information and Privacy Commissioner

30. Ms Ganley moved on behalf of Mr. Mason:  
Be it resolved that the Legislative Assembly concur in the November 2016 report of the Standing Committee on Legislative Offices, sessional paper 347/2016, and recommend to the Lieutenant Governor in Council that Ms Jill Clayton be reappointed the Information and Privacy Commissioner for the province of Alberta for a five-year term commencing February 1, 2017.

**The Speaker:** The Opposition House Leader.

**Mr. Cooper:** Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to speak in favour of Motion 30. I think that there is broad support for the reappointment of the Information and Privacy Commissioner. It's just my hope that the government will work closely with her. I know that she has made a number of public comments with respect to the FOIP process and some of her concerns around it. I implore the government to work as closely as possible to ensure that all Albertans have access to the appropriate information.

[Government Motion 30 carried]

#### Committee Membership Changes

33. Ms Ganley moved on behalf of Mr. Mason:  
Be it resolved that the following change to
- (a) the Standing Committee on Families and Communities be approved: that Ms Miller replace MLA McPherson, that Mrs. Aheer replace Mr. Smith, that Mr. Orr replace Mr. Smith as deputy chair;
  - (b) the Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future be approved: that Mr. van Dijken replace Mr. Hunter, that Mr. van Dijken replace Mr. Schneider as deputy chair, that Mr. Smith replace Mr. Panda, that Mr. Drysdale replace Ms Jansen;
  - (c) the Standing Committee on Legislative Offices be approved: that MLA Drever replace Ms Jabbour, that Mrs. Pitt replace Mr. Cooper;
  - (d) the Standing Committee on Public Accounts be approved: that Mr. Cyr replace Mr. Fildebrandt as chair, that Mr. Panda replace Mr. Hunter;
  - (e) the Special Standing Committee on Members' Services be approved: that Mr. Orr replace Mr. Fildebrandt;
  - (f) the Standing Committee on Resource Stewardship be approved: that Mr. Hunter replace Mrs. Aheer, that Mr. Hunter replace Mr. Loewen as deputy chair.

**The Speaker:** Anyone wish to speak to Motion 33? The Member for Lac La Biche-St. Paul-Two Hills.

**Mr. Hanson:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure to rise and present an amendment to Government Motion 33.

**The Speaker:** Please proceed.

**Mr. Hanson:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Notice of amendment to Government Motion 33. I move that Government Motion 33 be amended as follows. Part A is amended by striking out “that Mrs. Aheer replace Mr. Smith” and substituting “that Mrs. Aheer replace Mr. Orr” and by striking out “that Mr. Orr replace Mr. Smith as Deputy Chair.” Part B is amended by striking out “that Mr. Smith replace Mr. Panda” and substituting “that Mr. Orr replace Mr. Panda.”

Thank you.

[Motion on amendment carried]

[Government Motion 33 as amended carried]

### Select Special Ombudsman and Public Interest Commissioner Search Committee

34. Ms Ganley moved on behalf of Mr. Mason: Be it resolved that:

1. A Select Special Ombudsman and Public Interest Commissioner Search Committee of the Legislative Assembly be appointed consisting of the following members, namely Mr. Shepherd, chair; Mr. Malkinson, deputy chair; Mr. Ellis; Mr. Horne; Mr. Kleinsteuber; Mrs. Littlewood; Mrs. Pitt; Mr. van Dijken; and Ms Woollard, for the purpose of inviting applications for the position of Ombudsman and Public Interest Commissioner and to recommend to the Assembly the applicant it considers most suitable to this position.
2. Reasonable disbursements by the committee for advertising, staff assistance, equipment and supplies, rent, travel, and other expenditures necessary for the effective conduct of its responsibilities shall be paid, subject to the approval of the chair.
3. In carrying out its responsibilities, the committee may with the concurrence of the head of the department utilize the services of members of the public service employed in that department and of the staff employed by the Assembly.
4. The committee may without leave of the Assembly sit during a period when the Assembly is adjourned or prorogued.
5. When its work has been completed, the committee shall report to the Assembly if it is sitting; during a period when the Assembly is adjourned or prorogued, the committee may release its report by depositing a copy with the Clerk and forwarding a copy to each member of the Assembly.

[Government Motion 34 carried]

### Government Bills and Orders Third Reading

#### Bill 27 Renewable Electricity Act

Mr. MacIntyre moved that the motion for third reading of Bill 27, Renewable Electricity Act, be amended by deleting all of the words after “that” and substituting the following:

Bill 27, Renewable Electricity Act, be not now read a third time but that it be read a third time this day six months hence.

[Debate adjourned on amendment December 13: Mr. MacIntyre speaking]

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

**Mr. MacIntyre:** Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. It’s early yet. As I was saying . . .

**An Hon. Member:** Briefly.

**Mr. MacIntyre:** You wish.

We have a number of issues with this particular bill, Bill 27, and I was delineating some of those issues. We don’t have within this bill protection, I feel, that is adequate for Albertans. We don’t have such things as performance bonding requirements. We don’t have such things as reclamation bonding requirements. These things will come to an end of life, and there’s nothing in this bill that protects the taxpayer.

3:20

Now, Mr. Speaker, to be really clear about that, we have an orphaned well situation in this province that is becoming extremely large. The orphan well fund, it appears, is not going to be adequate. Here was a situation where there was something in place, at least an attempt in place, to ensure that something could be done, that there was a pool of money available to handle such things as orphaned wells. In Bill 27 there is nothing, not a single sentence, dealing with the issue of the end of life of these massive undertakings. Across the landscape around the world we have failed solar farms, massive solar farms, we have failed wind farms, massive wind farms, time and time again. My staff has a list of a total of 64 – so far 64 – massive failed projects, and time and again it befalls the taxpayers or local municipalities who have to deal with the cleanup.

Yet in putting forward some kind of an amendment that might at least address this, this government foolishly voted it down. I have huge problems with that. That is irresponsible, and don’t tell me: oh, it’ll be in the regulations. Look, we have a bill before the House, and that is an amendment that should have been there.

It doesn’t stop there. I talked about the electricity police being totally eliminated from involvement in renewables. It’s like renewables are this sacred cow that this government is trying to protect from scrutiny, from transparency, and from accountability. To have the MSA eliminated from that process is absolutely irresponsible.

Then we have issues such as making agreements, that the minister is going to be making agreements. Of course, there’s nothing in this that talks about making those agreements public. Not a thing. You talk about backroom deals. There’s nothing preventing that in this bill.

Then we have the issue of public advertisement of the competitive process. Again, nothing in the bill about that. We heard earlier, just less than an hour and a half ago, I think, someone on the other side spouting off about how transparency is such an important thing. Well, I’m calling them out on that, Mr. Speaker. We tried amendment after amendment trying to put some transparency in Bill 27, only to see them rejected unanimously by the other side. So don’t tell me you’re interested in transparency when you keep voting those kind of amendments down. That simply is being beyond economical with the truth.

Then we come to things like advising the results of competitions. We tried an amendment there, that 18 months we felt was a reasonable time to protect the business interest of bidders, but let’s see these things.

Then, of course, there was the issue of: what happens to landowners when generators are in arrears of payment? We have that already taking place in the oil and gas sector, where companies go bankrupt, disappear, and the farmer is left with pumpjacks and

other infrastructure on his land, and he isn't being paid for that. There's nothing in this bill that protects landowners from the very same thing happening. Nothing at all.

This bill is woefully inadequate, Mr. Speaker, and this government refused helpful amendments to improve it. On and on.

Then we come to the section regarding the government holding a security or other interest in a generating unit.

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

Are there any questions for the Member for Innisfail-Sylvan Lake under 29(2)(a)?

Seeing and hearing none, the Acting Deputy Government House Leader.

**Ms Ganley:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to move that we move to one-minute bells.

[Unanimous consent granted]

**The Speaker:** Are there any other members who would like to speak to the amendment?

**An Hon. Member:** Question.

[Motion on amendment to third reading of Bill 27 lost]

[The voice vote indicated that motion for third reading carried]

[Several members rose calling for a division. The division bell was rung at 3:26 p.m.]

[One minute having elapsed, the Assembly divided]

[The Speaker in the chair]

For the motion:

Carlier	Kleinstauber	Payne
Carson	Larivee	Phillips
Connolly	Littlewood	Piquette
Coolahan	Loyola	Renaud
Dach	Luff	Rosendahl
Dang	Malkinson	Schmidt
Eggen	McCuaig-Boyd	Schreiner
Feehan	McKittrick	Sigurdson
Fitzpatrick	McLean	Sucha
Ganley	McPherson	Sweet
Goehring	Miller	Turner
Horne	Miranda	Westhead
Jansen		

3:30

Against the motion:

Aheer	Hunter	Schneider
Drysdale	Loewen	Strankman
Fildebrandt	MacIntyre	van Dijken
Gotfried	Nixon	Yao
Hanson	Pitt	

Totals: For – 37 Against – 14

[Motion carried; Bill 27 read a third time]

### **Bill 25 Oil Sands Emissions Limit Act**

**The Speaker:** The hon. minister of parks and minister responsible for the climate change office.

**Ms Phillips:** Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise today to move third reading of the Oil Sands Emissions Limit Act.

This is a bill, Mr. Speaker, that demonstrates that we believe in our oil sands companies' ability to innovate and to continue to reduce their environmental footprint. This is a bill with historic implications in firmly establishing Alberta as a world environmental leader amongst energy producers. This legislation puts into law a 100-megatonne limit on emissions from Alberta's oil sands. It is a limit on emissions, not on production. When our oil sands companies, Alberta's job creators, tell us that they can rise to a global challenge, that they can rise to the very serious consequences of climate change and limit their emissions, when they come to us and say, "Yes, let's lead the world as Albertans, as an energy producer, as a place that takes action on climate change," this government does not shout those good ideas out of the room.

This limit, Mr. Speaker, was jointly recommended to government by leading members of Alberta's oil sands industry and national and Alberta-based environmental nonprofit organizations. As you know, Alberta has under several previous administrations faced increasing scrutiny related to greenhouse gases resulting from oil sands development.

Our energy industry is unique in providing a significant amount of provincial and national revenue. It has also contributed to significant increases in emissions at a time when global pressure to lower emissions is growing. Our province faces very real negative economic consequences if we fail to access new markets for our energy and if we fail to act credibly on climate change. Already, Mr. Speaker, we are seeing the benefits from the climate leadership plan. The Prime Minister of this country specifically referenced the oil sands emissions cap and its legislation as an important reason for his government's approval of the Trans Mountain expansion and the line 3 pipelines.

The cap on oil sands emissions complements work that industry is already doing to lower costs. It internalizes the cost to emit carbon at a time when executives like Suncor's chief executive, Steve Williams, are dealing with what they call a lower for longer scenario for oil prices. Carbon, Mr. Speaker, is an input cost. Lowering it lowers the cost for producers. The emissions cap will speed the transition to lower carbon fuels, it will allow companies to accelerate their innovation efforts, and it will provide new jobs and revenue as Alberta-developed technology is applied and adapted in other parts of the world.

Instead of just talking about the issue, as some have done in the past, or wishing it away or denying that it even exists, Mr. Speaker, our government sought to find specific, credible solutions that will ensure the world looks at Alberta differently. We can either have a made-in-Alberta future for our energy or we can have a made-in-Ottawa or made-somewhere-else future, but what there isn't is any turning back the clock. There is no nostalgic previous era where no one objected to greenhouse gas pollution or the climate change it causes. With this bill Alberta makes clear to the world that energy-producing jurisdictions can establish limits and work and, in fact, thrive within a carbon-constrained future. We can be an energy producer and a world leader on climate action. The environment and the economy in the 21st century go hand in hand.

Alberta must get the most value for our resources and find new markets for our products, but we cannot do it unless we are taking credible action, which we have demonstrated just this month with the approval of two new pipelines. Alberta must get the most value for our resources, and our plan will drive innovation in the oil sands sector and allow room for growth. Alberta got the oil out of the sand, Mr. Speaker, and now we will take global leadership to get the carbon out of the barrel.

Mr. Speaker, we are doing this for all of the working people of this province because it is the right thing to do for the environment and, more specifically, because it puts our economy on a better trajectory to deal with the reality of climate change and the reality of a carbon-constrained future. That is why so many of Alberta's job creators asked us for this legislation, and that is why we are moving forward with it. It is key to ensuring that Albertans have access to good-paying, long-term, family-sustaining jobs right here in this province.

By passing this bill, Mr. Speaker, we can show the world that Alberta doesn't just do business; we mean business. Thank you.

**The Speaker:** Are there other members who wish to speak to Bill 25, the Oil Sands Emissions Limit Act? The Member for Innisfail-Sylvan Lake.

**Mr. MacIntyre:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We have before us this Bill 25, and let's be really clear: it is, in fact, a cap on development. It is very much a cap on development. Insofar as the minister wants to try to make statements about how we need to get the most value for our products, it's interesting that every value-add amendment that we attempted to put forward on this bill was voted down by the minister's party, so that statement, while it might sound good in a sound bite, is, in fact, patently not the truth.

This government rejected the amendments we put forward, ranging in topics from accountability to investment to encouraging greener technologies, notably upgrading and partial upgrading to expand those because they so significantly reduce greenhouse gas emissions, but for reasons that are still unknown, the government was not really interested in reducing greenhouse gas emissions by increasing or improving the amount of upgrading and partial upgrading, instead putting a 10-megatonne cap on it. Both amendments would have increased pipeline capacity. Again, the minister's statement that we have to get the most we can for our product rather falls to the ground when you consider that partial upgrading and upgrading significantly increase pipeline capacity, yet government members unanimously voted those amendments down.

Again I say that if the minister was genuine and sincere about her statements regarding getting the most for our product, it doesn't make any sense at all, then, to cap that. Once again, the evidence would indicate that those are just empty words.

3:40

Limiting upgrading emissions means not only one hundred per cent carbon leakage but a hundred per cent value-added job leakage because anything we stick in that pipe in an unupgraded condition will have to be upgraded somewhere. It sure would be nice if it was here, but an awful lot of it will not be because, ultimately, the evidence would indicate that this government isn't really that interested in getting the most for our products, like they claim they are. Otherwise, they would not have capped something so important as upgrading and partial upgrading.

We put forward an amendment that would have removed the ability of cabinet to implement a cap and trade on the oil sands on top of the existing carbon tax and the high cost of abating these emissions by capping production. Now, the cost of abatement, which I don't think is entirely understood by members opposite, by capping production, would amount to \$1,035 in Canadian dollars per tonne of GHG emissions by 2040, but I don't believe the members opposite understand abatement and the cost of abatement and how you even calculate that. Nevertheless, that is a reality. That is what it's going to cost.

An amendment on removing cogeneration technology from the cap, again another technology that would dramatically reduce

greenhouse gas emissions, was rejected unanimously by the other side. An amendment to remove renewable biomass emissions from under the cap, again another technology significantly reducing greenhouse gas emissions, was rejected by the other side. Both amendments would have encouraged producers to adopt technologies on the fringe of being economical, green technologies with the potential of reducing significant levels of GHGs.

Then, of course, one of my favourites: I'm always asking for economic impact studies and have yet to see one from this government. I know that they have staff that can do it.

On and on what we've seen, Mr. Speaker, are introductions of amendments for technologies to be exempted that result in significant greenhouse gas reductions, yet those amendments were voted down by this government. I really only have one conclusion to make, and that is that they're not all that interested in greenhouse gas emissions, that this bill, Bill 25, is another bill from this government that has a name that's wrong. It's not really Oil Sands Emissions Limit Act. Oil Sands Development Limit Act would be a much more appropriate name. The details of this act are really nothing more than an underhanded manner in which to keep it in the ground in some measure and not look like you're trying to keep it in the ground. Time and time again we've put forward amendments to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, yet they get voted down. It's really very straightforward. The evidence is quite clear.

I'm not going to be voting in favour of this bill at all. I know you're surprised about that. It's going to result in carbon leakage. It's going to result in job leakage. We have proven that clearly. There is so much more that could be done for greenhouse gas emissions, but the other side have voted that all down. This particular bill, just like Bill 27, is woefully inadequate. It is counterproductive. It is a job killer. I can't see anyone who has even a remote understanding of this process of development voting in favour of this. We have estimates losses to Alberta's economy in terms of the cumulative value of lost production to be anywhere from \$153 billion to \$254 billion worth of development. This is indeed a cap on development.

I should also add that an emissions cap was never recommended by the climate leadership panel. If anyone in the House was to go through the leadership panel's report now, at this point in time, after seeing bill upon bill upon bill coming from this government, and read through the climate leadership plan that was developed by the Leach panel, I believe that now in hindsight everyone would be able to look back and say: "Wow. Well, the government didn't do that. Oh, they didn't do that one either."

There's probably quite a bit throughout that plan that this government isn't doing, yet this was the panel that was called to advise the government on what to do. We cannot argue that carbon taxes are a better alternative to cap and trade, but we are going to see cap and trade taking place in oil sands development with the remaining window of 32 megatonnes of emissions.

[Ms Sweet in the chair]

In short, Bill 25 is being praised by people like Tzaporah Berman for forcing us to leave our resources in the ground and making more pipelines unnecessary, in her words. Frankly, to sum it up, this bill is anti-Albertan. I would prefer that it not see the light of day, but that's just my opinion.

Thank you very much.

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

Are there any other members wishing to speak? The hon. Member for Cardston-Taber-Warner.

**Mr. Hunter:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I wish to speak to Bill 25, the Oil Sands Emissions Limit Act. We tried to go to committee to haul witnesses in to get the expert opinion. It didn't happen. We tried to delay the bill so that we as members could go out and consult the experts. It didn't happen. This bill must be defeated. Unfortunately, this government will not let that happen.

This bill is surrounded in controversy. The oil sands advisory group, the OSAG, is chaired by ecoradical Tzeborah Berman, a signatory to the Leap Manifesto. Avi Lewis and Naomi Klein couldn't be more proud. Another member of the OSAG, Karen Mahon, is out fundraising to stop the Trans Mountain expansion pipeline. It's true. We have the e-mail.

Multiple panel members are involved with forest ethics, a group that boasts about having stopped the Northern Gateway pipeline. These are the people tasked with considering how to implement the 100-megatonne per year carbon emissions limit for the oil sands industry, and the industry is concerned that their panel members are there only as a favour for endorsing the NDP climate action plan.

OSAG will not complete their work until February 2017, yet we're being asked to pass legislation without the feedback of the panel tasked to determine the law's viability. This cap is bad policy. Global leaders like Mark Carney, governor of the Bank of England and former governor of the Bank of Canada, are talking about stranded assets occurring to fight climate change. In an article in the *Financial Times*, September 29, 2015, Carney warns that "investors face 'potentially huge' losses from climate change action that could make vast reserves of oil, coal and gas 'literally unburnable.'" He told a Lloyd's of London dinner: "The exposure of U.K. investors, including insurance companies, to these shifts is potentially huge."

This NDP policy does just that. It strands assets. Investors, people like you and me, who bought RRSPs and mutual funds, who have pension plans, even the Canada pension plan: those savings are taken by financial managers and invested into assets like the oil sands. Investors demand a rate of return so they can be comfortable in their retirement. When we are too old to even work at the cash register at 7-Eleven, we will require an investment return from these investments.

Alberta has the largest free world holding of oil, and the NDP would strand it, make it undevelopable, and create capital flight to other dividend-generating assets for those investors and savers. The junior oil and gas producers are worried, and rightfully so, that they will be squeezed out of the market. As capital flees, there will be market consolidation and only the big players will remain. Murray Edwards at CNRL and Steve Williams at Suncor would love that, maybe even collect a big fat performance bonus for a job well done. This is nothing short of another example of the NDP's failure to recognize the incredible work that is done on an ongoing basis in the oil sands and the energy sector, more generally, to innovate and reduce emissions.

### 3:50

Innovation and technology like carbon capture and storage, to quote Mark Carney again, "would render the vast majority of reserves 'stranded' – oil, gas and coal that will be literally unburnable without expensive carbon capture . . . technology, which itself alters fossil fuel economics." Alters fossil fuel economics. Some might say that with technology we might have our cake and eat it, too. It will be costly one way or another.

Technology is also helping to find more oil. Down in the United States the U.S. Geological Survey released news on November 15 of this year.

The Wolfcamp shale in the Midland Basin portion of Texas' Permian Basin province contains an estimated mean of 20 billion barrels of oil, 16 trillion cubic feet of associated natural gas, and

1.6 billion barrels of natural gas liquids . . . This estimate is for continuous (unconventional) oil . . . and consists of undiscovered . . . technically recoverable . . . resources.

The estimate of continuous oil in the Midland Basin Wolfcamp shale assessment is nearly three times larger than that of the 2013 USGS Bakken-Three Forks resource assessment, making this the largest estimated continuous oil accumulation that USGS has assessed in the United States to date.

"The fact that this is the largest assessment of continuous oil we have ever done just goes to show that, even in areas that have produced billions of barrels of oil, there is still the potential to find billions more" . . . "Changes in technology and industry practices can have significant effects on what resources are technically recoverable, and that's why [the USGS] continue to perform resource assessments . . . Oil and gas companies have been using horizontal drilling and hydraulic fracturing, and more than 3,000 horizontal wells have been drilled and completed in the Midland Basin Wolfcamp section.

Madam Speaker, the United States of America is heading for energy independence. They will no longer have to bring in tanker loads of oil from hostile foreign countries. But until the NDP policies are replaced, capital flight will take place, and it's going to Texas, North Dakota, Montana, and Saskatchewan. The movement of capital will take jobs from Nisku, Medicine Hat, and Slave Lake to El Paso, Lubbock, and Amarillo. There will be a brain drain from Calgary and Edmonton to Houston, Dallas, Fort Worth, Austin, and San Antonio. Perhaps Albertans will have to adopt a new motto: remember the Alamo. We in the Wildrose cannot support such a devastating piece of legislation that will impact Alberta's ability to sustain its wealth and prosperity as the Texans yell: drill, baby, drill.

That brings me to my final point. Why would the NDP be doing this to the province they say that they love? The answer is found in the Alberta NDP's own constitution. I had to read to the very end of this to get the answer. It's found in appendix C under The Principles and Aims of the Alberta New Democratic Party. You might want to listen to this because I'm not sure that everybody on the other side has actually read The Principles and Aims of the Alberta New Democratic Party. They list three. The first is democracy.

Democracy is one of the most valuable parts of our heritage and recognizes that all citizens, including minorities, must receive equal civil rights with representatives elected by way of proportional representation.

It goes on to say:

The necessary role of governments must be recognized in order to build an equitable and socially just society.

That's step 1.

Step 2 talks about the economy. It says:

Socialism is essentially the application of democracy to the economy. Economic democracy, i.e. democratic socialism, assures production to supply the needs of all people. Decisions about what shall be produced, when and where, and decisions about where we shall make our living and under what conditions, are now left largely in the hands of private interests. The market economy produces transnational corporations, who give private profit priority over public interest, social justice and workplace democracy. Through the efforts of many, we have achieved a degree of social and political democracy. Economic democracy, or democratic socialism, as they call it,

demands a co-operative rather than a competitive system.

[interjections] The members opposite are saying that it sounds great. Of course, it would sound great to them. I'm starting to understand why they would be putting a cap on oil sands production.

The third part of this says:

Ecological Sustainability must permeate all economic and social policy. Meeting human material needs must not use more of Earth's resources than can be renewed within each generation.

I guess that means that they would not be able to use gas, oil, natural gas because it cannot ever be renewed within a generation. So I'm actually extremely excited about the fact that soon the NDP will be walking to work. They will not be taking any planes, and they will not be driving. This will be the final outcome of capping oil sands production.

Thank you very much.

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

Are there any members wishing to speak under 29(2)(a)?

Seeing none, the hon. Acting Deputy Government House Leader.

**Ms Ganley:** Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I rise to request unanimous consent of the House to move to one-minute bells for the remainder of the afternoon.

[Unanimous consent granted]

**The Acting Speaker:** Any other members wishing to speak to the bill? The hon. Member for Grande Prairie-Smoky.

**Mr. Loewen:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise to speak to Bill 25 at third reading. This is an ill-advised bill, meant to cap oil sands growth and development. There are many alarming things about this bill. To start off with, this government has chosen an arbitrary number, a 100-megatonne cap. They have given us no data, no information on how the decision was reached on 100 megatonnes. Obviously, they've grabbed numbers out of the air. That's an alarming way to do business.

Now, there have been reports that suggest that this bill will cause at least 3 billion barrels of oil to be left. That represents \$150 billion to \$250 billion to the Alberta economy. We can look at that as just barrels of oil and billions of dollars, but that represents jobs. That represents families. It represents livelihoods. It's not just money and oil. It's our economy here. It's what keeps this province alive.

Now, another alarming thing is the potential for stranded assets. Companies that have invested money in good faith in the oil sands may not be able to produce the leases that they've invested in, and that will result in the government having to pay compensation. Again, that isn't the government paying compensation. That's Albertans paying compensation to these companies for their investment and their loss of opportunity.

This government has brought in the carbon tax. It's phasing out coal. It has tampered with PPAs. It's doing loans to the Balancing Pool. It has put a cap on electricity rates. All these things have created all sorts of consequences for the Alberta economy. Some of these things have been done to make up for the mistakes that previous bills had caused.

This government seems to be embarrassed about our resources here in Alberta, and that's shameful. They protest pipelines. Now they're in charge of championing our resource? Then we expect that bills like this are somehow favourable to our economy, our resource-based economy? I don't think Albertans buy that, Madam Speaker.

We brought amendments forward, in particular an upgrading exemption. When that didn't pass, we did a partial upgrading exemption amendment. These are processes that are value-added, that create jobs right here in Alberta. They increase pipeline efficiency so that we can actually get more of our product to where it needs to be. That's the point of pipelines, getting our product where it needs to be. So by voting against amendments that would allow more of our product to get to our customers, they're voting against pipelines.

4:00

Now, the Member for Edmonton-McClung says that upgrading is good and that they're champions of upgrading. So why put a cap on it? Why would you cap something that you're championing? That doesn't make any sense.

The Member for Calgary-East: a protester holding a sign, "No more dirty oil," at a pipeline rally. How does that make sense when that member stands up and says that she supports pipelines, that she supports the resource industry? How does that make sense?

**The Acting Speaker:** Hon. members, if I could just interrupt for a second. Just a reminder that we are in third reading, which means we need to be in our chairs if we're in the House and not moving around, please.

Thank you.

**Mr. Loewen:** Now, even recently, if people want to talk about how things that were a few years back don't count, well, how about the recent appointment of anti-oil, antipipeline activists to the oil sands advisory group, that when pipelines were announced here in Alberta, they came out saying that they were going to stop them? These are people that are appointed by this government, paid by taxpayers, and they're against our industry, and they're supposed to be representing our industry.

Now, one of the members across said something that is absolutely true – absolutely true – that we produce some of the most responsible oil in the world. Agreed. So why are we wanting to ship it elsewhere to have upgrading done? Why wouldn't we do it right here? Why aren't we championing our oil right here in Alberta?

Now, they talk about these made-in-Alberta solutions, but this government has hired anti-oil activists from across Canada, I guess, to develop this made-in-Alberta solution. But the truth truly came out, Madam Speaker, when the Prime Minister came up with his plan on the carbon tax and it was \$50 a tonne. How did the Premier respond to that? She says: well, our plan was \$30, but that was never really the top; I mean, like, I guess we're kind of flexible or something.

So now this made-in-Alberta solution, as they like to call it, is automatically made in Ottawa right now. That's what it was here for. They kept saying: why would we want to have Ottawa dictate to us what to do when we've got a made-in-Alberta solution? What happened when the Prime Minister said \$50 a tonne? Basically, he said, "Jump," and the Premier said, "How high?" Fifty dollars a tonne high. That's how high.

Now, they also talk about how the President of the United States loves it. If he loved it so much, how come he didn't do it? He didn't do it. He didn't do any of this stuff that this government is doing. But he loves it, I guess.

**Mr. Hanson:** He loves that we're doing it.

**Mr. Loewen:** He loves that we're doing it because we're in competition as countries. We do business back and fourth. It's always better when you're dealing with somebody at a worse economic advantage than you are.

Now, we brought up amendments for economic assessment. They don't like them. We've never seen any. We have no idea what anything is going to cost. We don't even have any idea what the emissions will be reduced by with any of these bills that this government has brought forward. They refuse to recognize carbon leakage. Well, it's very plain. We just talked about upgrading and how this upgrading has to take place somewhere, so if it doesn't get done here, it's going to get done somewhere else. That is carbon leakage.

We know that the members opposite at least say that we have some of the most responsible oil in the world. We've got environmental standards on the top. Why wouldn't we want to do that here, where the environmental standards are higher? Why would we ship it somewhere else?

Now, a week or so ago we received the good word that the Enbridge line 3 and the Trans Mountain expansion pipelines received federal government approval. Enbridge line 3 is the replacement of an existing pipeline to the U.S. Midwest. The Trans Mountain is an expansion of an existing pipeline to Vancouver. These are not new pipelines; however, they will provide additional volume. They were approved by the NEB last spring. These pipelines were only waiting for political approval, which would have been hard to deny as these pipelines were already existing, but the government takes credit for these pipelines, and they use it to justify bills they pass in this Legislature like the one before us today.

The Premier and the Prime Minister suggest that the approval of these existing lines was because of Alberta's climate change leadership. Let's be very clear and honest. These two individuals are using these pipelines to justify their taxes. It would be shameful to think that pipeline approval was linked to anything other than its own merits based on the guidelines of the NEB. The suggestion that safe transport of oil is held hostage by any government action is extortion. The arm's-length NEB reviews these projects; government approves them based on the NEB recommendations. This government insists on taking credit for something that happened in spite of them, not because of them. What's sad is that the media buys into the false narrative purported by the Alberta NDP and the federal Liberals.

To suggest that climate change action was responsible for the approval of these pipelines and that previous governments got nothing done is false and insulting to anyone with a hint of common sense and who can see through this smoke and mirrors. Under the federal Conservative government two entirely new oil pipelines were approved and actually built: the non-XL version of Keystone from Alberta to Nebraska, completed in 2010, and the Alberta Clipper to Wisconsin, approved in 2008 and active in 2010. The changeover in line 9 taking oil west to east was also approved and activated under that federal government. In total, Alberta got an added over 1 million barrels a day worth of pipeline capacity under the last federal government. The Liberals will add just about half that much, 600,000 barrels, with the approval of Trans Mountain's expansion. That's if it actually gets built in the face of so much protest.

You see, under the previous federal government Northern Gateway, worth 525,000 barrels a day, was also approved, but the Liberals caved to protests and cancelled it, actually proving the point that a pipeline approval is a far cry from getting it done. The Northern Gateway pipeline was approved by the federal Conservative government on June 17, 2014, but due to the B.C. NDP, which cabinet ministers of this government campaigned for, and radical interventionists, some of whom this government has hired, the pipeline was delayed, and just days ago the Prime Minister cancelled it, caving in to these protesters. He also renewed his decision to ban tankers on B.C.'s northern coast, which would have provided the only new opportunity to access the Asian markets. This proves that pipeline approval is not necessarily a done deal, and these two are not out of the woods yet. We still need to actively fight for these lines.

Now, a few months ago the NDP unanimously voted for my Motion 506 to support Energy East, Trans Mountain, and Northern Gateway and "to request that the federal government not implement the moratorium on crude oil tanker traffic along British Columbia's north coast." What has this government done to represent the

motion it helped pass? Nothing. Clearly, they supported it in words but refused to support it in any practical way. This is saying one thing and doing another. They passed it for political reasons with no care for the importance of pipelines. Albertans truly deserve better than what this government is delivering.

So, Madam Speaker, I will then propose an amendment to this bill.

4:10

**The Acting Speaker:** Thank you, hon. member. The amendment will be referred to as HA.

Please continue.

**Mr. Loewen:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move that the motion for third reading of Bill 25, Oil Sands Emissions Limit Act, be amended by deleting all the words after "that" and substituting the following: "Bill 25, Oil Sands Emissions Limit Act, be not now read a third time but that it be read a third time this day six months hence."

Madam Speaker, I've outlined some pretty good reasons why this amendment is necessary. This amendment is necessary because I don't think the government truly realizes the damaging effects of its policies. Therefore, they need to take some time. They need to consult with Albertans. They need to do economic and environmental impact studies and come to the full realization of the damage that they are creating with these bills.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Are there any members wishing to speak under 29(2)(a)?

Are there any hon. members wishing to speak to the amendment?  
The hon. Member for Calgary-South East.

**Mr. Fraser:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. You know, I think we've heard a lot about the government's climate change plan, and at the end of the day, often, I think, what we're realizing time and time again is that they're putting the cart before the horse. Certainly, I believe and I think many of the members on this side believe that action on climate change needs to happen, but in that, just like a reasoned amendment, we need to be reasonable how we approach it.

There is confusion around the piecemeal approach, with bill after bill after bill or a bill having to replace a mistake or an oversight. It's difficult when you're in government to always get it right. We've heard over and over again from the Member for Innisfail-Sylvan Lake about technology, and I think there is much out there. In talking to stakeholders, we have an opportunity to take a look at this once again, wait six months, check with the industry, take a look at the technologies, wait for a new President-elect to be sworn in in the United States to see what kind of effect that has on Alberta, whether it's good or bad. Again, sitting on this for a little bit, having regular dialogue about it I think is good for Albertans. There is no rush to put this cap on emissions today but to wait six months, check again, and do what I believe would be the right thing for Albertans.

I'll be supporting this amendment. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Are there any members under 29(2)(a)? The hon. Member for Rimbey-Rocky Mountain House-Sundre.

**Mr. Nixon:** Sure. Under 29(2)(a). Absolutely. I just want to thank the hon. member for rising to speak about this important piece of legislation. I know that my colleague from Airdrie is looking forward to speaking about this legislation, so I want to rise just to recognize what the hon. member brought forward and thank him for



supporting this important amendment. I know that he will eagerly await the comments from the Member for Airdrie, like I do.

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

Are there any other members wishing to speak under 29(2)(a)? The hon. Member for Calgary-Fish Creek.

**Mr. Gotfried:** Yes.

**Mrs. Pitt:** Really?

**Mr. Gotfried:** Well, I don't know. Just for fun.

You know what, Madam Chair? Again, this Oil Sands Emissions Limit Act is really just too controlling, I think, for the opportunities that may lie ahead in terms of our ability to maximize the opportunities in our economy. Let's keep our fingers crossed that we have those opportunities ahead that we can move ahead with.

I just would like to say that this is an opportunity for us to actually put some more sober thought into this, to not rush into something that's going to hog-tie us in the future when opportunities arise to understand where we're moving with pipelines and with capacity and with production in this province. I think a six-month period would be appropriate and would be happy to hear more on that from the member.

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

Are there any other members wishing to speak under 29(2)(a)?

Seeing none, we are back on the amendment. The hon. Member for Airdrie.

**Mrs. Pitt:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm pleased to rise to speak to this amendment. Now, this amendment is our last opportunity to make sure that we get this legislation right. We tried other amendments, amendments to support industries like biofuels. Biofuels are not only a large employer but a renewable resource. Why should it be under this cap? We tried to amend to support cogen. Cogen is a 2 for 1. Not only do you get the steam for the in situ oil sands extraction; you also get the electricity to power the grid. Since coal is being phased out rapidly from the grid, that baseload is going to need to be replaced because renewables are not always available. Don't want coal or petroleum coke emissions with nasty particulate matter and NO<sub>x</sub> and SO<sub>x</sub> emissions? Convert to cogen. But the NDP voted that amendment down, too.

This is the last chance for the NDP backbenchers to go out there and consult with industry to get their own answers. Yes, you. Don't listen to your House leader. Don't listen to your cabinet ministers, the government, and the whips. [interjections] Madam Speaker, through you.

**The Acting Speaker:** Thank you.

**Mrs. Pitt:** I wish this government wouldn't just listen to the people inside their party but go and consult because, Madam Speaker, the NDP MLAs are also free-agent MLAs. The NDP MLAs are contractors. They are hired by their constituents to represent them. They need to think for themselves.

Madam Speaker, we want the NDP MLAs to go out there and talk to the Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers. Pick up the phone and call Husky, Jaco, Syncrude, Devon, MEG, ConocoPhillips and ask them what they think about Bill 25. Go and talk to the professors at the University of Lethbridge, Calgary, University of Alberta. Talk to the engineering faculties, the chemists, the geologists, the physicists – yes, even the atmospheric scientists and economists. They will give you the real deal here on Bill 25.

They will tell you that capping emissions in Alberta is going to cause carbon leakage. Carbon leakage means there is no benefit to the environment since the atmosphere doesn't care where the GHGs come from. They don't care, but to Alberta it means fewer jobs, less prosperity, less diversification. Obviously, any bitumen extracted will be upgraded somewhere, possibly with more emissions and pollution than if it were here, likely China but probably also India and now the USA, too. Donald Trump is certainly very pro-energy and will happily take whatever investment that the NDP government scares away.

Capping emissions like this is like some kind of weird Rhinoceros Party policy. Donald Trump wasn't the first person who ever wanted to build a wall. The Rhinoceros Party wanted to build a wall, too. It was going to be a great big, beautiful and very tall wall. It would be somewhere up north, across the length and breadth of Canada, and the wall's job would be to keep winter out. I know that sounds funny, but it is true. The Rhinoceros Party wanted to build a wall to keep the winter out of southern Canada. Donald Trump, eat your heart out.

Now, the NDP barely beat the Rhinoceros Party in the federal by-election, but I don't think that imitating the party that you beat is going to help you improve on your 1 per cent vote here. But, Madam Speaker, that is pretty much what we have here, a nonsensical policy to be done in the name of climate change and will have nothing to do with climate change. It will just hurt our economic development, the people in this province.

4:20

I wonder, Madam Speaker, how many of the NDP backbenchers have ever called CAPP, ever had a conversation or reached out and touched someone on the other end of the phone by calling the rest of the oil companies. [interjections] Oh, the Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers. Please pick up the phone and call them. I'm wondering if they've called or spoken to the professors at the universities. I wonder what the investment bankers have to say. You know, the folks like the *Dragons' Den* star Brett Wilson: they will help you out. Mr. Wilson will be very helpful. Or the people that the Finance minister goes and sees on Bay Street in Toronto to sell Alberta's bonds to: what do they think?

I trust that this amendment will be adopted and that the NDP backbenchers will take the opportunity to go out there and talk to the stakeholders about this bill to make the final decisions for themselves before the final vote without government interference and propaganda adjusting their thoughts. I urge this government to do just that.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Are there any other members wishing to speak under 29(2)(a)?

Seeing none . . . [interjections] Members. Thank you.

Does anyone want to speak to the amendment? No? Okay.

[Motion on amendment to third reading of Bill 25 lost]

[The voice vote indicated that the motion for third reading carried]

[Several members rose calling for a division. The division bell was rung at 4:23 p.m.]

[One minute having elapsed, the Assembly divided]

[Ms Sweet in the chair]

For the motion:

Carlier	Jansen	Miranda
Carson	Kleinstauber	Payne
Connolly	Larivee	Piquette

Coolahan	Littlewood	Renaud
Dach	Loyola	Rosendahl
Dang	Luff	Schmidt
Eggen	Malkinson	Schreiner
Feehan	Mason	Sigurdson
Fitzpatrick	McCuaig-Boyd	Sucha
Ganley	McKitrick	Swann
Goehring	McLean	Turner
Gray	McPherson	Westhead
Horne	Miller	

Against the motion:

Aheer	Hunter	Pitt
Drysdale	Loewen	Schneider
Fildebrandt	MacIntyre	Strankman
Fraser	McIver	van Dijken
Gotfried	Nixon	Yao
Hanson		

Totals: For – 38 Against – 16

[Motion carried; Bill 25 read a third time]

### Bill 34 Electric Utilities Amendment Act, 2016

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

**Ms McCuaig-Boyd:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm pleased today to rise to move third reading of Bill 34, the Electric Utilities Amendment Act, 2016.

Inheriting the existing system has meant dealing with two serious threats that unpredictably came together. First, the sweetheart deal struck for deregulation to allow companies to foist any market losses and all their market losses onto the public after enjoying long profits. Secondly, the recent prolonged collapse in electricity prices set off the result of the price uncertainty and volatility of deregulation.

These two consequences were built into the very design of the deregulation machinery. Together they resulted in the return of unprofitable power purchase arrangements to the Balancing Pool, posing a threat to consumers. The result was clearly unfair. That's why we took action to protect consumers, to defend consumers' interests in the proper interpretation and application of the law. Despite considerable opposition we stood up for Albertans. As a result, we entered reasonable settlement agreements with three of the four PPA buyers, extracting considerable value for consumers. We took our knocks for that decision, but I am proud of that result. I am proud that we had the courage to draw the line, and we didn't stop there.

4:30

Although the deregulation apparatus created the preconditions, it failed to provide the Balancing Pool the tools it needed to manage the consequences. With Bill 34 we are providing the tools and the flexibility that the Balancing Pool needs to cover its financial obligations. This will allow the Balancing Pool to smooth price volatility, helping to ensure that consumers' electricity costs are reasonable and stable.

In the face of opposition we chose to act to defend consumers. We chose to look forward to develop the systems and structures that will serve Albertans with reliable electricity at reasonable rates for the long run. We are assembling the full program to make that possible, one part of which is the amendments before us now. That makes me proud to vote for Bill 34 today.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Are there any other members wishing to speak? The hon. Member for Innisfail-Sylvan Lake.

**Mr. MacIntyre:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. Well, I think that it might do for some of the members opposite, when they find themselves out of a job in 2019, to maybe apply as fiction writers because they're getting pretty good at it, frankly, or, you know, as historical reconstructionist or something along that line.

**Mr. Hanson:** They're not writing their own stuff.

**Mr. MacIntyre:** Yeah, that's true.

There is a reason for every bill that comes before this House, and Bill 34 is no different. The real problem is that this government is afraid to own up to the reason for Bill 34's existence. This government right out of the gate started attacking our electricity sector, and the volatility that the hon. minister was talking about was at the wholesale price level. Frankly, I don't find anything wrong with a low price on electricity, and the Balancing Pool has been very low for a very long time now. That benefits consumers like you and me. I don't have a problem with that. If I can buy electricity for 2 cents or 3 cents a kilowatt, happy day.

That's what happens in a competitive market when supply and demand are allowed to move the market freely. That's called free-market enterprise. It's not supply management. The hon. member, my colleague from Cardston-Taber-Warner, was reading the NDP's manifesto. It's interesting how they don't like the idea of private enterprise. They would prefer to have supply management in place. Well, how is that working in Venezuela? How did that work so well in the Soviet Union? They had really good supply management going on there. You couldn't buy bread, and when the shoe factory was making shoes, they were shoes no one wanted and sizes no one could fit. There's some really good supply management for you.

A competitive, free-market enterprise provides for people what people need at a price people can afford. That's the nature of a competitive, free-market market, but this government doesn't want to go that way. They absolutely detest the idea of a deregulated electricity market, where Albertans can benefit from that competition. Instead, they are going to reregulate the market under the name of a capacity market.

Then they had – it was almost silly. They were saying, you know, that in all of North America there are only two jurisdictions with energy-only markets, Texas and Alberta. It's interesting to know that the Texas energy-only market was also a pioneer in renewable portfolio standards. They pioneered it. They made a botch of it for a number of years, but you know what? Texans, being a lot like some Albertans I know, were stubborn, and they stuck with it, and they fixed it. They now have a situation wherein their energy-only market works in tandem quite well with RPSs. They didn't have to destroy free enterprise to bring in renewables. This government seems to be of the mind that you can't possibly have renewable technologies and free enterprise.

Although they want to try to distance themselves from the Ontario debacle, the reality is that they are taking us down that same road. They are in fact hurting private enterprise. As a result of their Whac-A-Mole policies, with unintended consequences popping up at every turn, we now come to Bill 34, which is nothing more than a shallow attempt at clouding the realities that Albertans are going to be facing increased costs. Whether this government succeeds in getting those costs not shown on their electric bills but hides those costs in taxation or in the great big hole called government debt, the reality is that it will be costing Albertans more money for no good reason.

Renewables should be made to compete on a level playing field, head-to-head with every other technology that is out there, and may the best man win. That is free-market enterprise, and it can be done. But this government isn't going to risk that because they have a target, their arbitrary 30 per cent by 2030. Come hell or high water, regardless of how much damage it's going to bring to the economy, we're going to have 30 per cent renewables by 2030.

[The Speaker in the chair]

I stand opposed to Bill 34 on the basis that it's going to harm Albertans. It's just more debt. This government has an answer for everything, and it is always either more debt, more taxes, or to throw more money at it, more borrowed money at it. This Bill 34 is a direct result of this government's mismanagement of the electricity file. It is just that simple.

I was very pleased to see over the weekend a number of news articles from reporters who understand this. They're reporting accurately. They have not been fooled by what this government is doing with Bill 34. I had one of those reporters call me over the weekend, and he said: "You know, this bill is only 50 words, but I've read it, and I've thought about it. Correct me if I'm wrong, but this looks like it's actually pretty dangerous given how short it is." He explained to me what his take was on it. It was excellent, and we saw articles coming out explaining it that way. So I am grateful to the news media for reporting correctly on this electricity file. They've done a great job in seeing through the government's smoke and mirrors on bills 27 and 34 and the other things that they have done.

I would say to all members in this House that you have an opportunity – not many more left, but you have an opportunity – to get it right. I don't believe it's appropriate that a government hide things from the people of Alberta, and I believe that Bill 34 is an attempt to do just that.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**The Speaker:** The Member for Calgary-Elbow. Please proceed, hon. member.

**Mr. Clark:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I am just so frustrated and disappointed by this bill. It may go down in history as one of if not the very shortest bills in the history of our fine province, but the impact of it is far reaching – far reaching – and lacking any positive changes that I can see that will actually improve our electricity system. The minister had a choice. The minister could have chosen not to sue electricity companies. The minister could have worked with the Balancing Pool and worked with PPA owners to recoup, to accept back the PPAs, to allow the Balancing Pool to run those PPAs at market rates and avoid this whole mess.

But there is a much bigger agenda at play here, Mr. Speaker, a much bigger agenda. Despite all of our efforts in this House, I would suggest that there are still very few members in this Assembly who fully understand the magnitude of the changes that have been made and the implications of all of the changes that have been made in rapid-fire succession to Alberta's electricity system.

**4:40**

But what we do understand, what we understand clear as day, is that this bill gives the government a literal blank cheque to backstop any and all losses from the electricity system. The government in Alberta has got a pretty bad track record, Mr. Speaker, when it comes to backstopping losses from industry: Gainers, which is still on the books and comes up every year in the budget; NovAtel, \$600 million; MagCan; and there was an airline if I'm not mistaken.

There are many, many, many examples where the government, in backstopping private business, has run into big trouble for Alberta citizens and taxpayers.

There is already a mechanism to address any losses within the Balancing Pool. In many ways this solves a problem that Alberta doesn't have. It's not that the Balancing Pool would simply go bankrupt. They would simply put on a consumer allocation. But that would be politically unpopular, Mr. Speaker. Albertans would be able to look at that and say: why is this \$2, \$3, \$4 charge showing up on my electricity bill? Well, that would be because of NDP bungling of the electricity file. Well, gosh, we can't have that. Instead, what they're going to do is that they're going to backstop losses within the Balancing Pool with Alberta taxpayer dollars at a time when Alberta already pays \$1 billion a year in debt-servicing costs in interest alone, for which we receive no value: not a single teacher, not a single nurse, not a single seniors' residence. That is shameful.

And this is only going to make it worse. How deep is this hole going to get? We have no idea. The government could have chosen to cap this. The government could have provided estimates and said: "You know, we need \$10 million. We need \$50 million. We need \$100 million. We need \$200 million. We need a number to backstop here, so you know what? We're going to come forward. We're going to put this legislation forward, and we're going to backstop it to that number." I wouldn't have liked that either, Mr. Speaker, but what I like a lot less is not knowing how deep this hole could get. This is a literal blank cheque. It's absolutely unacceptable.

You know, the government thinks that this is just sort of magic, that magical money unicorns come and rain cash from the sky and that those magical money unicorns are in the form of big corporations. Big corporations, if you were to ask the NDP, are the ones who have all the money, and all we need to do as a government is to just go get the money from the big corporations. Well, guess what? Where do you think the big corporations get the money from? They get it from Albertans, especially when we're talking about electricity providers. Ultimately, Albertans pay one way or the other, and it is the policy choices of this government that mean Albertans have to pay more, Mr. Speaker. At the end of the day, it is Albertans who will pay.

All of this could have been avoided had the government accepted back the power purchase arrangements. Instead, they chose to go on offence. They chose the political path. They sat there in their ivory tower, three or four folks who are the most powerful in this province, very few, if any, of whom are actually elected, and decided: "Aha. I know what we'll do. We'll sue the big electricity companies, and Albertans will thank us. We the NDP are going to take on the big, bad corporations, and we'll be thanked for it." Well, guess what? Albertans were wise to your game. Albertans are smarter than that. They know how this all works. They like free enterprise. They like the free market.

To think that the government tried to bully companies into settling: well, it managed to succeed with three of them, but interestingly the one that's owned by the city of Calgary has yet to settle. I wonder why that is. That's because they've drawn a line in the sand and said: "No. This lawsuit is unfair. It's vexatious, predatory. You're using your power as the government to threaten the corporations that own the PPAs that maybe you might bring in retroactive legislation." That is the ultimate threat, retroactive legislation. That's the hammer that was held over the heads of all of these companies. That is absolutely the hammer. [interjection] The Minister of Justice is saying that I don't know that.

Maybe one day my FOIP will come in, Mr. Speaker, and we can prove all of this, that there absolutely were representations made

that the government may consider retroactive legislation so that, folks, you'd better settle. It's pretty tough when you're negotiating with the people who make the rules, and then they change the rules on you. The government has all the power. That's what this comes down to.

You know, what it comes down to even more essentially than that, Mr. Speaker, is a lack of oversight by this government, a lack of awareness of the contracts their government had signed, that the government was responsible for. I don't believe for one second that it was March 2016 that "or more unprofitable" or the "change-in-law" clause was known to the minister or the Premier, and if it was, that is remarkable. We know it wasn't. We know it wasn't.

If it wasn't told to the minister or the Premier, there's a bigger problem in this government because we know senior bureaucrats knew about that provision. Court documents show definitively that there are senior members of Alberta's public service working today, one of whom is in the same role that he had 15 or 16 years ago, when these contracts were signed. It is beyond imagination that this government didn't know. But if you didn't know, you should have known. You absolutely should have known. There is absolutely no excuse for it. It's poor management, poor governance.

Ultimately, at the end of the day, Mr. Speaker, I absolutely cannot support Bill 34. It proves the government is following a clearly ideological agenda. They have a preconceived idea of how this is all going to work, and it doesn't matter if it ends up costing Albertans tens of millions or even more in interest and debt repayment. They have their plan. They're going to execute it no matter what we say on this side, and that is deeply frustrating.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**The Speaker:** Hon. members, are there any questions to the Member for Calgary-Elbow under 29(2)(a)?

Are there any other members who would like to speak to the bill?  
The hon. Member for Chestermere-Rocky View.

**Mrs. Aheer:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to bring forward an amendment, please.

**The Speaker:** Hon. members, I'm advised that this will be amendment HA.

Proceed, hon. member.

**Mrs. Aheer:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to move that the motion for third reading of Bill 34, Electric Utilities Amendment Act, 2016, be amended by deleting all of the words after "that" and substituting the following: "Bill 34, Electric Utilities Amendment Act, 2016, be not now read a third time but that it be read a third time this day six months hence."

There are some very, very obvious reasons, actually, laid out by the Minister of Energy herself as to why this bill needs to – well, I would prefer to actually get rid of this bill altogether, but if we must look at this bill, let's put it ahead into the distance a little bit here because it is obvious to this side of the House, at least, and to Albertans that this minister needs some time. She needs some serious time to consider some of the things that have been brought forward and some of the things that the minister alluded to as to why this bill came forward.

I'd like to bring those up for just a moment. One of the things that the minister had said was that they are defending consumers. Well, I find that intensely interesting because as it works right now, consumers are already defended by the mechanism that is there. Unfortunately, in the other bills that we've talked about like Bill 27, mechanisms that actually protected the consumer have been removed like on the renewables file. So I find it very interesting that those would be the first words that would come out of the minister's

mouth given that in other bills the words "fair and responsible" have been removed, that they tear up 16-year-old contracts and expect other people to come in and then all of a sudden invest in this province.

4:50

On top of that, the mechanism that is already there right now is called a rate rider. That rate rider balances things out for Albertans already. Interestingly enough, the part that the minister didn't mention in saying "defending consumers" was about transparency. Right now, as I understand it, we know exactly what we're paying for, so this is a smokescreen, a complete smokescreen. The government right now is throwing Albertans right under the bus.

I would highly recommend that the House, this Legislature, vote to push this ahead a little bit, with all my heart, given the fact that the government made the mistake of tearing up those PPAs in the first place. And there were a bazillion excuses as to why that happened. They didn't have the information. They didn't read the information. Their binders were not complete. Well, maybe the binder wasn't complete on how the Balancing Pool works either.

So maybe we should take a few minutes here and give Albertans a bit of a Christmas present and have the government actually stand up and say: "Whoa. Let's put the brakes on this one for a moment and take a few minutes. Let's breathe over Christmas and take a step back and see if there's some way, actually, that we can come forward and make this better for the very people that we represent in this House."

This bill, as the hon. Member for Calgary-Elbow mentioned, is a blank cheque. I find it appalling that this government thinks that that is okay. How is it that we're supposed to just blindly pass this? Really. To quote the minister again, she feels confident that she's done the right thing and is okay with taking the knocks for her decisions. Well, let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, that those knocks are going to come in strides, in humungous numbers here in the next little while, when those bills start coming forward, on top of the carbon tax, on top of all of the other things that are coming down to all of the people in this province. Let me tell you: it is going to be one thing after another.

We have tried consistently to amend, to change, to help, to provide metrics, to provide accountability, to provide credibility to these various bills that are coming forward, and one after another: done, knocked down. No, no, no, no, no. One after another. Well, here's an opportunity. Put this one to bed for a little while. Take a step back and take a look at this. We have some amazing experts on this electricity file right in this House. I would highly recommend that the minister take a moment and speak to some of the experts, one of them being from Innisfail-Sylvan Lake. But that would require something called collaboration. That would require reaching out across the aisle to people that actually have some background in this file, to actually talk about how it is that we fix this. This is a mess. And, now, 50 words? How can so few words wreak so much havoc? On top of that – I mean, we are completely dumbfounded. There is so much. Where is the mindfulness of the bottom lines of Alberta families and the businesses that are going to be impacted by this?

Rate riders. Just to re-educate, rate riders must be approved by the appropriate regulatory authority. That is the check and balance that is already provided to Albertans. This government with this bill seeks to completely cover that up. Gone is the transparency. That rate that you will see on your bill will not even begin to cover the mass proportion of infrastructure and builds and renewables coming online, that have not even been laid out yet in any regulations or forms, let alone the efficiency panels or anything. Nobody has brought forward any information explaining to this side how this is

going to work other than the fact that we're supposed to blindly sign a blank cheque, convince Albertans that somehow the advertisements that the government is putting forward about the carbon tax are in their best interest. Yet all the government cares about is the climate leadership action plan but shows no feelings or emotion towards the actual Albertans that they're representing right now.

Mr. Speaker, this bill – normally we would have brought forward amendments. There was absolutely no amendment that we could make to this bill. This government with this bill is actively hurting Albertans. Customers once upon a time would be able to see in the rate riders – they would be able to see the credits or the debits on their monthly bills. That is what transparency actually looks like. That is a concept that has been lost on this government.

What is the government up to? What is the future here that requires that such sweeping, irresponsible changes are necessary in order for some form of control, that I just don't quite understand? You know, there have been a few speakers on the other side of the House that have stood up and spoken on this. I have yet to receive any clarity on this. Every time it's just more frustrating. We keep trying to bring to the Energy minister the ideas of what this function actually is, how this actually works, and we still keep getting the same rhetoric back about how they're going to protect Albertans. Well, Albertans don't believe this. Not for a second.

I would highly recommend that the government take a moment, take a breather, take a step back, and give us six months to take a look at this. This minister needs some time, needs some serious time and some thought about this blank cheque, that ultimately will define for this minister a legacy of what is going to be left on the back of this bill. Because this is just the beginning. We don't even know how this is going to look in the next few months, let alone the next few years.

This is not the legacy I want to leave behind for my great-grandchildren, and I would highly recommend that you vote in favour of this amendment so that it is not yours as well.

Thank you.

**The Speaker:** Any questions under 29(2)(a) to the Member for Chestermere-Rocky View?

Then the chair would recognize the Member for Calgary-Fish Creek.

**Mr. Gotfried:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's a great opportunity, I think, to speak to this bill today. I'd like to preface it by saying, again, that I have deep concern with the direction of so many of the bills that we've seen passed through the House this session. It deeply concerns me that we are seeing a decimation of yet another part of the Alberta advantage that this province has enjoyed for so many years and that we enjoyed and that we'd hoped our children and our grandchildren would enjoy as well. It's a slippery slope indeed.

I firmly believe that this bill needs to be sent back to the drawing board.

**An Hon. Member:** To the Dumpster.

**Mr. Gotfried:** To the Dumpster, in fact, yes. But six months is better than nothing, Mr. Speaker.

It's of deep concern to me that so much of what we've seen from this government is a litany of unintended consequences. Albertans cannot suffer more unintended consequences during this downturn, this unprecedented downturn in our economy.

Mr. Speaker, members of our caucus have looked at this bill from a lot of different angles, every angle we could think of, trying to come up with amendments that could serve to improve this legislation and the obvious short-circuits when it comes to the best

interests of Albertans. Our conclusion, in the end, was that this is simply a bad piece of legislation. So we agree with our colleagues to the right here that we need to push this back six months and give us some breathing room to take a look at what's happening in the economy, to get some real scientists and some real economists to take a look at the unintended consequences that could come out of this.

We've tried modest amendments which would limit the scope of the damage done to the Balancing Pool, although, I suppose, maybe we need to come up with some new names for things. Maybe we should be referring to it as the borrowing pool as there is no balance left in this pool anymore, Mr. Speaker. The balance is gone because the ability to balance is no longer there. It's really a one-sided street.

Restrictions on what the Balancing Pool could do with the borrowed money. We tried to do that and similar amendments to try and narrow the scope and the damage of what this government is attempting to do on the backs of Albertans. Those amendments were not accepted. Let's be clear. This is on the backs of Albertans. They say that it's not on the backs of consumers. It's on the backs of taxpayers. It's on the backs, sadly, of future taxpayers and future generations.

**Mr. Nixon:** Generational theft.

**Mr. Gotfried:** It is generational theft indeed.

None of these restrictions addressed the major single issue with this bill, that the Balancing Pool should not be allowed to borrow money, specifically on the public's backs, the red ink, full stop. No borrowing. The Balancing Pool was never designed to borrow money, and absent the meddling of this government, it would never have been in a position where borrowing was even considered because there was a mechanism in place. Sadly, what was once a pool, I would suggest, is going to become a sea, from a little pool a sea of red ink on the shoulders of Albertans today and for generations to come.

5:00

It's been raised in this House before, but I think the concept is so fundamental to what the Balancing Pool is supposed to be that it bears repeating. The Balancing Pool, without borrowing money, has already had a mechanism to address a negative balance over time. It was talking about time, it was talking about balance, and sometimes you need time to generate balance. That mechanism was to adjust the price that people paid for electricity, to add on a rate rider that would go towards addressing the Balancing Pool's shortfalls, again, over time in a fluctuating market, the key word being "market." I think we've heard that from some of the members here. Markets actually, given their own devices and proper tools and proper mechanisms, do work over time and create balance, not the need to borrow just because there's a hole in today's market or tomorrow's market or a deep hole. As they often say, when you're digging a hole, what's the best thing to do? Get rid of the shovel. I see a big shovel attached to this bill.

This is the point where the government would like to simply highlight the point and paint all of us who oppose this legislation as enemies of consumers, stepping on the downtrodden, those same consumers, who are the same taxpayers, out of those same wallets, that we're going to be seeing – we take our hand out of their left-hand pocket, and we put it in their right-hand pocket, or maybe it's the other way around, from the right-hand pocket into the left-hand pocket.

The first point is that the Balancing Pool, in addition to charging a rate rider when it had a negative balance, provided a rebate when it was turning a positive balance. Isn't that a unique concept? Gee,

when times are really good, we get to give you a rebate, and you pay less, which might actually happen in a time when the economy needs that rebate – wow; unique concept – a rebate that would go towards actually reducing the price that people pay for electricity during such times, which could be during tough times. Wow. Again, another way to actually put money back into the wallets of Albertans and put food back on their tables and put services back for seniors who may need them. This wasn't some pie-in-the-sky hypothetical scenario. The Balancing Pool actually had a positive balance – a billion dollars, I think we heard – for the last few years. That positive balance was only threatened when the government started to void contracts with their irresponsible and misguided environmental policies. They blew that system up pretty well, didn't they?

The first point to recognize here is that the previous government had a system that actually returned money to consumers when conditions allowed and drove the price of their electricity consumption down. Interesting. Consumers actually won in that scenario. This government has chosen to disrupt that well-functioning system. I think we could talk to people in the Balancing Pool, and I suspect that they might tell us that it was a pretty well-functioning system. I suspect that they're not really in a position to speak out on that issue right now.

This has now left consumers on the hook for increasing electricity prices. "Oh, no. Well, we'll put in a cap, so that's okay." Hmm. The same taxpayers are going to get stuck paying it in the end, right? That's what's going to happen. From consumer to taxpayer: the same people. I'm sure this is where we hear the government crying out: "Wait, wait. That's why we're letting the borrowing pool" – sorry, the Balancing Pool, but we'll call it the borrowing pool – "borrow all this money." It sounds like a big balloon, like a water balloon that's going to keep blowing up with debt, and eventually it's going to explode, and we're all going to get soaked in our wallets.

We're going to get soaked by this, which brings me to my second point. Do they really think that they're protecting consumers by making them pay through the back door? Actually, they're not making them pay through the back door. It's like: "Well, let's push it off to your kids and your grandkids. That's really what we want to do here. Let's push this down the road because everything is going to look rosy, and the consumers are going to think that this is wonderful."

By the way – I think one of our members mentioned earlier – I think it was \$24,400 per person of debt. You know, I think I remember doing some math on that about a year ago, when it was only \$14,400 per person, 2.6 people per household. It was about \$34,000. We can pay that back. Every household can pay that back, but \$234 a month for the next 25 years is what that's going to take. That's the mortgage. That's the debt, the mortgage we're taking out on behalf of every man, woman, and child in this province: 25 years to pay it back at \$234 a month. That's probably subject to low interest rates. What happens if they go up?

The government is going to loan money to the borrowing pool, our money, future money, future debt, money that comes from the same consumers, also known as taxpayers, that they purport to be protecting. That doesn't sound like very good protection to me. It's not that you won't still be paying for this shortfall; it's just that you won't see how much extra you're going to be paying or maybe future generations are going to be paying. It sounds like a lot of money to me, and it sounds like an irresponsible approach to the Balancing Pool, the borrowing pool.

The amount will be hidden amongst billions in red ink that this government is amassing on the shoulders of unassuming Albertans, who are of course going to feel good because they're being

protected by this misguided legislation. So the government can go out and spend \$9 million and convince people that their policies aren't going to have an effect on their household budgets through nice flowery and fluffy ads on the TV, which drive me crazy every time I see them. I get phone calls, and I hear from Albertans telling me: why am I being told that something is good for me that I know is not good for me or my children or my grandchildren?

And if I may briefly go on a tangent, doesn't that sort of defeat the purpose of having a price on carbon, to change people's behaviour? You say that you're going to put a price on carbon. It's going to get the people to use less so that they can, oh, make better choices, right? Make better choices. Then you turn around and hide the additional costs in government borrowing and loans, trying to leave today's wallets with the appearance – and I emphasize "appearance" – that they are intact when, in fact, you're digging a deep hole to bury their finances and their family's finances and their children's finances, perhaps for generations to come.

If this government was really interested in having people reduce the amount of electricity they use, wouldn't you want the true cost of your policies to show up on people's electrical bills, not in a carbon tax? I'll throw that in: not in a carbon tax. Maybe we can actually have the market and the people react to market pricing as it is balancing up and down. Let's not forget those rebates, that we can have sometimes when it gets tough because we built up a pool through the Balancing Pool, in the way the Balancing Pool is supposed to act and used to act. These citizens can really see how much they're contributing to your climate leadership action plan: nothing to clap about here, Mr. Speaker.

I suspect the reason that you're tucking away this cost in the borrowing pool is that you know there is only so much that people and their families can do to reduce their electricity use. Note our recent cold weather records, just this past week, and the impact of short winter days, Mr. Speaker. I do not think Albertans are interested in freezing in the dark just because you want them to make better choices. They still need to keep the lights on. They may need to do some laundry, perhaps take the odd shower, or they might even wish to cook the occasional meal. There is simply a reasonable base amount of electricity that even an environmentally conscious household needs to use.

We are bound and determined – this government is – to penalize them, not to change their behaviour, Mr. Speaker, because they do need to put food on the table, hot food, on an occasional day. They do need to take showers and do laundry. They do need to take their children to school and get themselves to work. This government is making all of that more expensive on the shoulders of struggling, hard-working Albertans – hard-working Albertans – and some of those hard-working Albertans are not going to get rebates down the road on carbon taxes and things like that. They are going to pay the price here because they're going to pay it in their taxes, and they're going to be penalized in the future even more, those same hard-working, middle-income Albertans.

So to save some political face, they'll punt the responsibility down the line and saddle whoever comes after them, that government in 2019, with the true cost and burden of these misguided policies, and that is simply wrong. This bill is about shirking the responsibility to be accountable to today's and future Albertans for their policies. Mr. Speaker, that is why at least six months – six months – is all we're asking for to start with now to bring some scientists, not just political scientists. I want real scientists here to do the work, to do the numbers and real economists that can crunch the numbers.

5:10

**An Hon. Member:** He's sitting right here.

**Mr. Gotfried:** There he is.

Nothing against political scientists, but you know what? I think even the Member for Calgary-Elbow would say that we actually need some of those real scientific scientists to be shoulder to shoulder with us because that's the way we do things in Alberta.

This government needs to take this piece of legislation back to the drawing board, they need to rewire the circuits, they need to test the resistance, they need to replace the balance, and they need to come to their senses before the real sparks fly on this irresponsible, costly, and ideologically driven piece of legislation, Mr. Speaker.

You know, our caucus is absolutely willing to work with this government to make legislation better, and we're willing to work with our fellow opposition here as well because to at least buy that six months might give us an opportunity to develop better legislation, or maybe we're really smart and we throw this legislation out and let the Balancing Pool get back to balancing instead of borrowing. But the only way to improve this bill, the only way to redeem this government from this electrical malfunction and meltdown is to recognize that Albertans' fuses are about to blow. To send this social and electrical – I'll call it maybe a social engineering project because I'm not sure that there are any electrical engineers or economists behind this. Send this back to the drawing board for at least the six months, for a well-reasoned, responsible, balanced piece of legislation that's not overloaded with unintended consequences and the burden of generations of public debt.

Mr. Speaker, for those very reasons, I would like to support this amendment, this hoist amendment, to put this aside for at least six months. Thank you.

**The Speaker:** Thank you.

Are there any members who would like to speak under 29(2)(a) to the Member for Calgary-Fish Creek?

Seeing and hearing none, is there anyone who would like to speak to the amendment? No.

[Motion on amendment to third reading of Bill 34 lost]

[The voice vote indicated that the motion for third reading carried]

[Several members rose calling for a division. The division bell was rung at 5:13 p.m.]

[One minute having elapsed, the Assembly divided]

[The Speaker in the chair]

For the motion:

Anderson, S.	Horne	Miller
Carlier	Jansen	Miranda
Carson	Kleinsteuber	Payne
Connolly	Larivee	Piquette
Coolahan	Littlewood	Renaud
Dach	Loyola	Rosendahl
Dang	Luff	Schmidt
Eggen	Malkinson	Schreiner
Feehan	Mason	Shepherd
Fitzpatrick	McCuaig-Boyd	Sigurdson
Ganley	McKitrick	Sucha
Goehring	McLean	Turner
Gray	McPherson	Westhead

Against the motion:

Aheer	Gotfried	Pitt
Clark	Hanson	Schneider
Drysdale	Hunter	Strankman
Fildebrandt	MacIntyre	van Dijken
Fraser	Nixon	Yao

Totals:	For – 39	Against – 15
---------	----------	--------------

[Motion carried; Bill 34 read a third time]

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

**Ms Ganley:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I would now like to advise the House that pursuant to Government Motion 22 the business of the sitting is now concluded. I'd like to thank the opposition members for their co-operation in this expeditious end.

The House stands adjourned.

**The Speaker:** Hon. members, I think I have to do this officially. First of all, it's been a challenging yet rewarding time for all of you, I know. Be safe. Spend the time with your loved ones and take the rest that you all deserve.

Hon. members, pursuant to Government Motion 22, agreed to on November 1, 2016, this House stands adjourned until February 2017.

[The Assembly adjourned at 5:19 p.m. pursuant to Government Motion 22]





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

**Activity to Wednesday, December 14, 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.*)

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*)

Committee of the Whole — 1939-41 (*Nov. 22, 2016 aft.*), 2009-24 (*Nov. 24, 2016 morn.*), 2091-2100 (*Nov. 29, 2016 morn.*), 2192-2202 (*Nov.*

*30, 2016 aft.*), 2218-24 (*Nov. 30, 2016 eve., passed with amendments*)

Third Reading — 2317-20 (*Dec. 6, 2016 morn., passed*)

Royal Assent — (*Dec. 9, 2016 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force on proclamation, with exceptions; SA 2016 c24 ]

**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*)

Committee of the Whole — 1786-91 (*Nov. 8, 2016 aft.*), 1797-1806 (*Nov. 9, 2016 morn., passed with amendments*)

Third Reading — 1849-54 (*Nov. 10, 2016 morn.*), 1915-22 (*Nov. 22, 2016 morn., passed*)

Royal Assent — (*Dec. 9, 2016 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force December 9, 2016; SA 2016 c22 ]

**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.*), 1754-61 (*Nov. 8, 2016 morn.*), 1776-86 (*Nov. 8, 2016 aft.*), 1806-09 (*Nov. 9, 2016 morn.*), 1826-35 (*Nov. 9, 2016 aft.*), 1854-60 (*Nov. 10, 2016 morn.*), 1971-77 (*Nov. 23, 2016 morn.*), 1994-2006 (*Nov. 23, 2016 aft., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 2115-33 (*Nov. 29, 2016 aft.*), 2224-29 (*Nov. 30, 2016 eve.*), 2231-41 (*Dec. 1, 2016 morn.*), 2320-27 (*Dec. 6, 2016 morn.*), 2383-98 (*Dec. 7, 2016 morn.*), 2529-47 (*Dec. 12, 2016 eve., passed*)

Third Reading — 2588-94 (*Dec. 13, 2016 aft., passed on division*)

Royal Assent — (*Dec. 14, 2016 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force December 14, 2016; SA 2016 cO-7.5 ]

**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*)

Royal Assent — (*Dec. 9, 2016 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force December 9, 2016; SA 2016 cU-0.3 ]

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

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

Second Reading — 1747-54 (*Nov. 8, 2016 morn.*), 1835-42 (*Nov. 9, 2016 aft.*), 1944-57 (*Nov. 22, 2016 aft.*), 2038-47 (*Nov. 24, 2016 aft.*), 2077-86 (*Nov. 28, 2016 eve., passed on division*)

Committee of the Whole — 2086-90 (*Nov. 28, 2016 eve.*), 2135-55 (*Nov. 29, 2016 eve.*), 2313-16 (*Dec. 5, 2016 eve.*), 2378-82 (*Dec. 6, 2016 eve.*), 2470-72 (*Dec. 8, 2016 morn.*), 2490-94 (*Dec. 8, 2016 aft.*), 2547-58 (*Dec. 12, 2016 eve., passed*)

Third Reading — 2569-72 (*Dec. 13, 2016 morn.*), 2587-88 (*Dec. 13, 2016 aft., passed on division*)

Royal Assent — (*Dec. 14, 2016 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force on proclamation; SA 2016 R-16.5 ]

**Bill 28 — Public Health Amendment Act, 2016 (Hoffman)**

First Reading — 1726 (*Nov. 7, 2016 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 1793-97 (*Nov. 9, 2016 morn., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 1843-47 (*Nov. 10, 2016 morn., passed*)

Third Reading — 1941-44 (*Nov. 22, 2016 aft., passed*)

Royal Assent — (*Dec. 9, 2016 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force December 9, 2016, with exceptions; SA 2016 c25 ]

**Bill 29 — Vital Statistics and Life Events Modernization Act (McLean)**

First Reading — 1774 (*Nov. 8, 2016 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 1823-25 (*Nov. 9, 2016 aft., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 1847-48 (*Nov. 10, 2016 morn., passed*)

Third Reading — 1959-60 (*Nov. 23, 2016 morn., passed*)

Royal Assent — (*Dec. 9, 2016 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force on proclamation, with exceptions; SA 2016 c26 ]

**Bill 30\* — Investing in a Diversified Alberta Economy Act (\$) (Bilous)**

First Reading — 1774 (Nov. 8, 2016 aft., passed)

Second Reading — 1873-81 (Nov. 10, 2016 aft.), 1922-26 (Nov. 22, 2016 morn.), 1992-94 (Nov. 23, 2016 aft., passed)

Committee of the Whole — 2157-74 (Nov. 30, 2016 morn.), 2208-18 (Nov. 30, 2016 eve., passed with amendments)

Third Reading — 2241-47 (Dec. 1, 2016 morn.), 2262-65 (Dec. 1, 2016 aft., passed)

Royal Assent — (Dec. 9, 2016 outside of House sitting) [Comes into force January 1, 2017, with exceptions; SA 2016 cI-10.5 ]

**Bill 31 — Agencies, Boards and Commissions Review Statutes Amendment Act, 2016 (Ceci)**

First Reading — 1822 (Nov. 9, 2016 aft., passed)

Second Reading — 1960-66 (Nov. 23, 2016 morn., passed)

Committee of the Whole — 1966-71 (Nov. 23, 2016 morn., passed)

Third Reading — 2007-09 (Nov. 24, 2016 morn., passed)

Royal Assent — (Dec. 9, 2016 outside of House sitting) [Comes into force December 9, 2016; SA 2016 c19 ]

**Bill 32\* — Credit Union Amendment Act, 2016 (Ceci)**

First Reading — 1990 (Nov. 23, 2016 aft., passed)

Second Reading — 2203-06 (Nov. 30, 2016 aft.), 2207-08 (Nov. 30, 2016 eve., passed)

Committee of the Whole — 2295-98 (Dec. 5, 2016 eve., passed with amendment)

Third Reading — 2515-16 (Dec. 12, 2016 aft., passed)

Royal Assent — (Dec. 14, 2016 outside of House sitting) [Comes into force on various dates; SA 2016 c27 ]

**Bill 33 — Miscellaneous Statutes Amendment Act, 2016 (No. 2) (Mason)**

First Reading — 2186 (Nov. 30, 2016 aft., passed)

Second Reading — 2265-66 (Dec. 1, 2016 aft., passed)

Committee of the Whole — 2266 (Dec. 1, 2016 aft., passed)

Third Reading — 2344 (Dec. 6, 2016 aft., passed)

Royal Assent — (Dec. 9, 2016 outside of House sitting) [Comes into force December 9, 2016, with exceptions; SA 2016 c23 ]

**Bill 34 — Electric Utilities Amendment Act, 2016 (\$) (McCuaig-Boyd)**

First Reading — 2114 (Nov. 29, 2016 aft., passed)

Second Reading — 2302-13 (Dec. 5, 2016 eve.), 2373-78 (Dec. 6, 2016 eve.), 2431-40 (Dec. 7, 2016 eve., passed)

Committee of the Whole — 2527-29 (Dec. 12, 2016 eve., passed)

Third Reading — 2594-99 (Dec. 13, 2016 aft., passed on division)

Royal Assent — (Dec. 14, 2016 outside of House sitting) [Comes into force December 14, 2016; SA 2016 c28 ]

**Bill 35\* — Fair Elections Financing Act (Gray)**

First Reading — 2060 (Nov. 28, 2016 aft., passed)

Second Reading — 2351-62 (Dec. 6, 2016 aft.), 2363-73 (Dec. 6, 2016 eve., passed)

Committee of the Whole — 2412-30 (Dec. 7, 2016 aft.), 2440-53 (Dec. 7, 2016 eve.), 2455-70 (Dec. 8, 2016 morn.), 2516-26 (Dec. 12, 2016 aft., passed with amendments)

Third Reading — 2559-69 (Dec. 13, 2016 morn., passed on division)

Royal Assent — (Dec. 14, 2016 outside of House sitting) [Comes into force on various dates; SA 2016 c29 ]

**Bill 36 — An Act to Enhance Off-Highway Vehicle Safety (Mason)**

First Reading — 2060 (Nov. 28, 2016 aft., passed)

Second Reading — 2189-92 (Nov. 30, 2016 aft., passed)

Committee of the Whole — 2298-2301 (Dec. 5, 2016 eve.), 2343-44 (Dec. 6, 2016 aft., passed)

Third Reading — 2344-51 (Dec. 6, 2016 aft., passed)

Royal Assent — (Dec. 9, 2016 outside of House sitting) [Comes into force on proclamation; SA 2016 c21 ]

**Bill 37 — Appropriation (Supplementary Supply) Act, 2016 (No. 2) (\$) (Ceci)**

First Reading — 2295 (Dec. 5, 2016 eve., passed)

Second Reading — 2363 (Dec. 6, 2016 eve., passed)

Committee of the Whole — 2431 (Dec. 7, 2016 eve., passed)

Third Reading — 2490 (Dec. 8, 2016 aft., passed)

Royal Assent — (Dec. 9, 2016 outside of House sitting) [Comes into force December 9, 2016; SA 2016 c20 ]

**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 207 — Veterinary Profession (Clear and Timely Price Disclosure) Amendment Act, 2016 (Cortes-Vargas)**

First Reading — 1822 (*Nov. 9, 2016 aft., passed*)

**Bill 208 — Occupational Health and Safety (Protection from Workplace Harassment) Amendment Act, 2016 (Coolahan)**

First Reading — 1822 (*Nov. 9, 2016 aft., passed*)

**Bill 209 — Active Schools Week Act (Shepherd)**

First Reading — 2060 (*Nov. 28, 2016 aft., passed*)

**Bill 210 — Protection of Property Rights Statutes Amendment Act, 2016 (Stier)**

First Reading — 2506 (*Dec. 12, 2016 aft., passed*)

**Bill 212 — Employment Standards Code (Volunteer Firefighter Protection) Amendment Act, 2016 (W. Anderson)**

First Reading — 2506 (*Dec. 12, 2016 aft., passed*)

**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 c30 ]

## Table of Contents

Introduction of Guests .....	2573
Members' Statements	
Cavendish Farms Expansion in Lethbridge .....	2573
Whitefish Lake First Nation Education Program .....	2573
Protection of Children in Care .....	2573
Climate Change and Energy Policies .....	2574
Festival Place in Sherwood Park .....	2574
National Finals Rodeo Champions .....	2574
Presenting Petitions .....	2575
Tabling Returns and Reports .....	2575
Oral Question Period	
Government Policies .....	2575, 2581
Carbon Levy .....	2576, 2583
Protection of Children in Care .....	2577, 2579
Child Death Review Ministerial Panel .....	2577
Opioid Addiction Treatment and Death Reporting .....	2578
Renewable Energy Development .....	2579
Openness and Transparency in Government .....	2580
Carbon Levy in Lloydminster .....	2581
Calgary Southwest Ring Road .....	2582
Oral Question Period Questions and Responses .....	2582
Orders of the Day .....	2586
Government Motions	
Information and Privacy Commissioner .....	2586
Committee Membership Changes .....	2586
Select Special Ombudsman and Public Interest Commissioner Search Committee .....	2587
Government Bills and Orders	
Third Reading	
Bill 27 Renewable Electricity Act .....	2587
Division .....	2588
Bill 25 Oil Sands Emissions Limit Act .....	2588
Division .....	2593
Bill 34 Electric Utilities Amendment Act, 2016 .....	2594
Division .....	2599

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

For inquiries contact:

Managing Editor

*Alberta Hansard*

3rd Floor, 9820 – 107 St

EDMONTON, AB T5K 1E7

Telephone: 780.427.1875