



Province of Alberta

The 28th Legislature
First Session

Alberta Hansard

Thursday, November 21, 2013

Issue 71a

The Honourable Gene Zwozdesky, Speaker

Legislative Assembly of Alberta The 28th Legislature

First Session

Zwozdesky, Hon. Gene, Edmonton-Mill Creek (PC), Speaker
Rogers, George, Leduc-Beaumont (PC), Deputy Speaker and Chair of Committees
Jablonski, Mary Anne, Red Deer-North (PC), Deputy Chair of Committees

Allen, Mike, Fort McMurray-Wood Buffalo (Ind)
Amery, Moe, Calgary-East (PC)
Anderson, Rob, Airdrie (W),
 Official Opposition House Leader
Anglin, Joe, Rimbey-Rocky Mountain House-Sundre (W),
 Official Opposition Whip
Barnes, Drew, Cypress-Medicine Hat (W)
Bhardwaj, Naresh, Edmonton-Ellerslie (PC)
Bhullar, Hon. Manmeet Singh, Calgary-Greenway (PC)
Bikman, Gary, Cardston-Taber-Warner (W)
Bilous, Deron, Edmonton-Beverly-Clareview (ND)
Blakeman, Laurie, Edmonton-Centre (AL),
 Liberal Opposition House Leader
Brown, Dr. Neil, QC, Calgary-Mackay-Nose Hill (PC)
Calahasen, Pearl, Lesser Slave Lake (PC)
Campbell, Hon. Robin, West Yellowhead (PC),
 Deputy Government House Leader
Cao, Wayne C.N., Calgary-Fort (PC)
Casey, Ron, Banff-Cochrane (PC)
Cusanelli, Christine, Calgary-Currie (PC)
Dallas, Hon. Cal, Red Deer-South (PC)
DeLong, Alana, Calgary-Bow (PC)
Denis, Hon. Jonathan, QC, Calgary-Acadia (PC),
 Deputy Government House Leader
Donovan, Ian, Little Bow (W)
Dorward, David C., Edmonton-Gold Bar (PC),
 Deputy Government Whip
Drysdale, Hon. Wayne, Grande Prairie-Wapiti (PC)
Eggen, David, Edmonton-Calder (ND),
 New Democrat Opposition Whip
Fawcett, Hon. Kyle, Calgary-Klein (PC)
Fenske, Jacquie, Fort Saskatchewan-Vegreville (PC)
Forsyth, Heather, Calgary-Fish Creek (W)
Fox, Rodney M., Lacombe-Ponoka (W)
Fraser, Hon. Rick, Calgary-South East (PC)
Fritz, Yvonne, Calgary-Cross (PC)
Goudreau, Hector G., Dunvegan-Central Peace-Notley (PC)
Griffiths, Hon. Doug, Battle River-Wainwright (PC)
Hale, Jason W., Strathmore-Brooks (W)
Hancock, Hon. Dave, QC, Edmonton-Whitemud (PC),
 Government House Leader
Hehr, Kent, Calgary-Buffalo (AL)
Horne, Hon. Fred, Edmonton-Rutherford (PC)
Horner, Hon. Doug, Spruce Grove-St. Albert (PC)
Hughes, Hon. Ken, Calgary-West (PC)
Jansen, Hon. Sandra, Calgary-North West (PC)
Jeneroux, Matt, Edmonton-South West (PC)
Johnson, Hon. Jeff, Athabasca-Sturgeon-Redwater (PC)
Johnson, Linda, Calgary-Glenmore (PC)
Kang, Darshan S., Calgary-McCall (AL),
 Liberal Opposition Whip
Kennedy-Glans, Donna, Calgary-Varsity (PC)
Khan, Stephen, St. Albert (PC)
Klimchuk, Hon. Heather, Edmonton-Glenora (PC)
Kubinec, Maureen, Barrhead-Morinville-Westlock (PC)
Lemke, Ken, Stony Plain (PC)
Leskiw, Genia, Bonnyville-Cold Lake (PC)
Luan, Jason, Calgary-Hawkwood (PC)
Lukaszuk, Hon. Thomas A., Edmonton-Castle Downs (PC)
Mason, Brian, Edmonton-Highlands-Norwood (ND),
 Leader of the New Democrat Opposition
McAllister, Bruce, Chestermere-Rocky View (W)
McDonald, Everett, Grande Prairie-Smoky (PC)
McIver, Hon. Ric, Calgary-Hays (PC),
 Deputy Government House Leader
McQueen, Hon. Diana, Drayton Valley-Devon (PC)
Notley, Rachel, Edmonton-Strathcona (ND),
 New Democrat Opposition House Leader
Oberle, Hon. Frank, Peace River (PC)
Olesen, Cathy, Sherwood Park (PC)
Olson, Hon. Verlyn, QC, Wetaskiwin-Camrose (PC)
Pastoor, Bridget Brennan, Lethbridge-East (PC)
Pedersen, Blake, Medicine Hat (W)
Quadri, Sohail, Edmonton-Mill Woods (PC)
Quest, Dave, Strathcona-Sherwood Park (PC)
Redford, Hon. Alison M., QC, Calgary-Elbow (PC),
 Premier
Rodney, Hon. Dave, Calgary-Lougheed (PC)
Rowe, Bruce, Olds-Didsbury-Three Hills (W)
Sandhu, Peter, Edmonton-Manning (Ind)
Sarich, Janice, Edmonton-Decore (PC)
Saskiw, Shayne, Lac La Biche-St. Paul-Two Hills (W),
 Official Opposition Deputy House Leader
Scott, Hon. Donald, QC, Fort McMurray-Conklin (PC)
Sherman, Dr. Raj, Edmonton-Meadowlark (AL),
 Leader of the Liberal Opposition
Smith, Danielle, Highwood (W),
 Leader of the Official Opposition
Starke, Hon. Dr. Richard, Vermilion-Lloydminster (PC)
Stier, Pat, Livingstone-Macleod (W)
Strankman, Rick, Drumheller-Stettler (W)
Swann, Dr. David, Calgary-Mountain View (AL)
Towle, Kerry, Innisfail-Sylvan Lake (W),
 Official Opposition Deputy Whip
VanderBurg, Hon. George, Whitecourt-Ste. Anne (PC)
Weadick, Hon. Greg, Lethbridge-West (PC)
Webber, Len, Calgary-Foothills (PC)
Wilson, Jeff, Calgary-Shaw (W)
Woo-Paw, Hon. Teresa, Calgary-Northern Hills (PC)
Xiao, David H., Edmonton-McClung (PC)
Young, Steve, Edmonton-Riverview (PC),
 Government Whip

Party standings:

Progressive Conservative: 59 Wildrose: 17 Alberta Liberal: 5 New Democrat: 4 Independent: 2

Officers and Officials of the Legislative Assembly

W.J. David McNeil, Clerk	Stephanie LeBlanc, Parliamentary Counsel and Legal Research Officer	Philip Massolin, Manager of Research Services
Robert H. Reynolds, QC, Law Clerk/ Director of Interparliamentary Relations	Fiona Vance, Sessional Parliamentary Counsel	Brian G. Hodgson, Sergeant-at-Arms
Shannon Dean, Senior Parliamentary Counsel/Director of House Services	Nancy Robert, Research Officer	Chris Caughell, Assistant Sergeant-at-Arms
		Gordon H. Munk, Assistant Sergeant-at-Arms
		Janet Schwegel, Managing Editor of <i>Alberta Hansard</i>

Executive Council

Alison Redford	Premier, President of Executive Council
Thomas Lukaszuk	Deputy Premier, Minister of Enterprise and Advanced Education, Ministerial Liaison to the Canadian Forces
Manmeet Singh Bhullar	Minister of Service Alberta
Robin Campbell	Minister of Aboriginal Relations
Cal Dallas	Minister of International and Intergovernmental Relations
Jonathan Denis	Minister of Justice and Solicitor General
Wayne Drysdale	Minister of Infrastructure
Kyle Fawcett	Associate Minister of Regional Recovery and Reconstruction for Southwest Alberta
Rick Fraser	Associate Minister of Regional Recovery and Reconstruction for High River
Doug Griffiths	Minister of Municipal Affairs
Dave Hancock	Minister of Human Services
Fred Horne	Minister of Health
Doug Horner	President of Treasury Board and Minister of Finance
Ken Hughes	Minister of Energy
Sandra Jansen	Associate Minister of Family and Community Safety
Jeff Johnson	Minister of Education
Heather Klimchuk	Minister of Culture
Ric McIver	Minister of Transportation
Diana McQueen	Minister of Environment and Sustainable Resource Development
Frank Oberle	Associate Minister of Services for Persons with Disabilities
Verlyn Olson	Minister of Agriculture and Rural Development
Dave Rodney	Associate Minister of Wellness
Donald Scott	Associate Minister of Accountability, Transparency and Transformation
Richard Starke	Minister of Tourism, Parks and Recreation
George VanderBurg	Associate Minister of Seniors
Greg Weadick	Associate Minister of Regional Recovery and Reconstruction for Southeast Alberta
Teresa Woo-Paw	Associate Minister of International and Intergovernmental Relations

STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future

Chair: Mr. Amery
Deputy Chair: Mr. Fox

Bhardwaj	Olesen
Cao	Pastoor
Donovan	Quadri
Dorward	Rogers
Eggen	Rowe
Hehr	Sarich
Luan	Strankman
McDonald	Xiao

Standing Committee on the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund

Chair: Mr. Khan
Deputy Chair: Mrs. Jablonski

Amery	Eggen
Anderson	Kubinec
Casey	Sherman
Dorward	

Standing Committee on Families and Communities

Chair: Mr. Quest
Deputy Chair: Mrs. Forsyth

Brown	Leskiw
Cusanelli	Notley
DeLong	Pedersen
Fritz	Swann
Goudreau	Towle
Jablonski	Wilson
Jeneroux	Xiao
Khan	Young

Standing Committee on Legislative Offices

Chair: Mr. Cao
Deputy Chair: Mr. McDonald

Bikman	Leskiw
Blakeman	Quadri
Brown	Rogers
DeLong	Wilson
Eggen	

Special Standing Committee on Members' Services

Chair: Mr. Zwozdesky
Deputy Chair: Mr. Young

Casey	McDonald
Forsyth	Quest
Fritz	Sherman
Kennedy-Glans	Smith
Mason	

Standing Committee on Private Bills

Chair: Mr. Xiao
Deputy Chair: Ms L. Johnson

Allen	Goudreau
Barnes	Jablonski
Bhardwaj	Leskiw
Brown	Notley
Cusanelli	Olesen
DeLong	Rowe
Fox	Strankman
Fritz	Swann

Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, Standing Orders and Printing

Chair: Ms Olesen
Deputy Chair: Mr. Lemke

Calahasen	McAllister
Cao	Notley
Casey	Pedersen
Goudreau	Quadri
Hehr	Rogers
Kennedy-Glans	Saskiw
Kubinec	Towle
Luan	Young

Standing Committee on Public Accounts

Chair: Mr. Anderson
Deputy Chair: Mr. Dorward

Amery	Khan
Anglin	Luan
Bilous	Pastoor
Donovan	Quadri
Fenske	Quest
Hale	Sarich
Hehr	Stier
Jeneroux	Webber

Standing Committee on Resource Stewardship

Chair: Ms Kennedy-Glans
Deputy Chair: Mr. Anglin

Allen	Hale
Barnes	Johnson, L.
Bikman	Khan
Bilous	Kubinec
Blakeman	Lemke
Calahasen	Sandhu
Casey	Stier
Fenske	Webber

Legislative Assembly of Alberta

1:30 p.m.

Thursday, November 21, 2013

[The Speaker in the chair]

Prayers

The Speaker: Hon. members, let us pray today and give thanks for the privilege that we have been given to serve in this Assembly and for the trust that our electors have put into our hands. Let us use that trust ever so wisely. Amen.

Please be seated.

Introduction of Visitors

The Speaker: I think we have some visitors. Hon. Associate Minister of Services for Persons with Disabilities, the floor is yours.

Mr. Oberle: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is my great honour and pleasure to rise and introduce visitors on behalf of the hon. Minister of Education who are here today seated in your gallery. They have come to us all the way from the Northwest Territories. I guess they've come south for warmer weather, apparently. Here today we have the hon. Jackson Lafferty. He's the Minister of Education, Culture and Employment as well as the Minister Responsible for the Worker's Safety and Compensation Commission. The Minister of Education will be meeting with Minister Lafferty later this afternoon, assuming he gets unstuck in traffic, as he is right now, to discuss a number of issues pertaining to their membership on the Council of Ministers of Education of Canada. Accompanying Minister Lafferty today are Assistant Deputy Minister Rita Mueller, executive assistant Morven MacPherson, and Dr. Marie Wilson from the Truth and Reconciliation Commission. I would ask our visitors to rise and please accept the warm wishes of our Assembly.

Introduction of Guests

The Speaker: The hon. Associate Minister of Family and Community Safety.

Ms Jansen: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As we recognize National Bullying Awareness Week, I am pleased to introduce a courageous young teen from Innisfail: Aidan Remple. In August Aidan was viciously assaulted by a group of teens while longboarding in a park near his home. His head was cut open, and the beating gave him bruises all over his body. He could not play football for weeks because of these injuries. Aidan's teammates, coaches, and the Innisfail Minor Hockey Association all rallied around him. In September they hosted a special football tournament at McMahon Stadium in his honour. Every player and spectator wore an orange ribbon to show support for Aidan and to send a strong message against violence in their community. I want to acknowledge Aidan for his bravery and his resilience in coming here today. His story is a reminder to all Albertans of the terrible harm that violence and bullying cause. Aidan is accompanied in the members' gallery by his mother, Jennifer Remple. I'd ask them to please rise and accept the traditional warm welcome.

The Speaker: Thank you.

Let us proceed to school groups, then, starting with Edmonton-South West, followed by Strathcona-Sherwood Park.

Mr. Jeneroux: Now, Mr. Speaker, we've had introductions this past week of many wonderful school groups: one by the hon. Member for Rimbey-Rocky Mountain House-Sundre, another from the hon. Member for Edmonton-Mill Woods, and many others where they indicated that their students are the brightest students in our province. That may just be; however, let me introduce to you and to all members of this fine Assembly some of the smartest, some of the brightest, and definitely some of the best-dressed students these walls of the Legislature Chamber have ever seen. I challenge all members to find sharper and more gifted students than these 43 young, aspiring scholars that stand with purpose and poise in our gallery here today. These students are the future. These students are the leaders. These students are the hope. Quite simply, these students are from George P. Nicholson school.

The Speaker: The hon. Member for Strathcona-Sherwood Park, followed by Calgary-McCall.

Mr. Quest: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. It gives me great pleasure to introduce to you and through you to all members of this Assembly some of Alberta's brightest and best and also, not to be outdone, extremely well-dressed – we're all very proud of them – students from Wye school in my constituency just east of Sherwood Park. There are two classes with us here today. They're accompanied by teachers Mrs. Tanya Jordan, Ms Naomi Houle, Mrs. Sue King and parent helpers Mrs. Brenda Lavoie, Mrs. Kristi Cooper, Mrs. Gillian Kirkland, and Mrs. Nicole Knott. They're seated in both the visitors' and members' galleries today. I have a very strong connection to Wye school. My son, Jack, went to Wye school a few years ago and is doing extremely well. I think we can anticipate, being the great, great school that it is, that all of these students that are with us here today have a very, very successful future in front of them. If they could please rise and receive the warm welcome of the Assembly.

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

Mr. Kang: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On behalf of the hon. Member for Edmonton-Centre I'm pleased to introduce to you and through you to all members of the Assembly some special representatives from careers in transition. This organization does amazing work to help Albertans prepare themselves to gain employment by providing individual-centred adult education, training, and career counselling services. They are seated up in the gallery, and I would now ask them to rise and receive the warm welcome of the Assembly.

The Speaker: Are there other school groups?

Seeing none, let's go on with guests, then, beginning with Red Deer-North, followed by the Minister of Environment and Sustainable Resource Development.

Mrs. Jablonski: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have three introductions today. However, one of my guests, just as the minister, is stuck in traffic, and maybe I could ask that we revert to introductions later.

My first two introductions. I rise today to introduce to you and through you to all members of the Assembly seven individuals who are here today to support their petition, which contains 15,744 signatures, requesting that the government keep Michener open. My guests are seated in the members' gallery, and I would now ask each of them to rise as I call their name: Diane Esslinger, Michener family member; Jenna Baynes, Darrol Mason, and Russell Clark, all of whom work at the Michener centre; and Jason Heistad, executive secretary-treasurer of the Alberta Union of

Provincial Employees. Please join me in giving these individuals the warm welcome of this Assembly.

The Speaker: Please proceed with your other introduction.

Mrs. Jablonski: My second introduction on behalf of the Minister of Education is Mr. Kevin Pizzey, who is seated in the members' gallery. Kevin is a teacher at C.P. Blakely elementary school in Sylvan Lake and has taught for over two decades. Kevin is also the president of the Alberta Teachers' Association Chinooks Edge local. I would ask that he please rise so he can also receive the warm welcome of this Assembly.

The Speaker: While we wait for other guests to arrive, let me go on to Edmonton–Decore.

Mrs. Sarich: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is my honour and privilege to rise today to introduce to you and through you to all Members of the Legislative Assembly seven representatives from Covenant Health here today in celebration of the 150th anniversary of Catholic health care in Alberta. Covenant Health's current Catholic health care ministry began in St. Albert and long before Alberta became a province. The Sisters of Charity, Grey Nuns, founded the province's first hospital, welcoming their first patient, an elderly man reported to be 100 years old. Catholic sisters met the health care needs of many of Alberta's early pioneer families, and they continue to help in the integrated health care system we enjoy today. I extend heartfelt congratulations and sincere gratitude to Covenant Health's professional leadership and service delivery in our great province.

My guests are seated in the members' gallery, and I would ask them to please rise and remain standing as I mention their names: Dr. John Brennan, Covenant Health board chair; Mr. Patrick Dumelie, Covenant Health president and CEO; Sister Marguerite Letourneau, co-ordinator, Grey Nuns of St. Albert; Sister Blandine Roussel-Galle, member, Grey Nuns of St. Albert; Mrs. Mary Pat Skene, Covenant Health board member; Mr. Dennis Grant, Covenant Health board member; and Mr. George Lucki, Covenant Health Edmonton community board member. I would now ask that the Assembly join yours truly to provide my guests with the traditional warm welcome.

Thank you.

1:40

Members' Statements

The Speaker: The hon. Member for Edmonton-South West, followed by Calgary-Mountain View.

National Housing Day

Mr. Jeneroux: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise today to proudly recognize National Housing Day, being held tomorrow across Canada. This important day reminds all Canadians of the importance of ensuring that everybody has a warm and safe place to live. While Alberta may have some of the coldest weather in Canada, we're often recognized for leading the nation in initiatives to end homelessness. This government continues to make great strides in fulfilling our promise to end homelessness once and for all. Earlier this year our Premier appointed 33 members to the Interagency Council on Homelessness, or the IAC. The IAC brings together different levels of government, community organizations, and leaders to oversee a number of priorities.

One of these priorities includes the ongoing success of our 10-year plan to end homelessness through the housing first approach. To meet this specific priority, the council is currently leading the

development of the integrated housing and supports framework. This framework will address the housing needs of Albertans through a complete and cohesive system of housing options and supports. In addition, the group is also developing a housing strategy to expand on the 10-year plan to meet current and future housing demands across Alberta. These are just a few examples of how the council has committed to ending this issue in Alberta. The IAC is serving as a great model for the rest of Canada on how government, community organizations, and leaders can collaborate together to reach a common goal.

Mr. Speaker, I would encourage the members of this Assembly to participate in some of the great housing and homeless support events taking place around Alberta on National Housing Day and in the coming months. To learn more about upcoming events, members can definitely contact my office or the office of the Minister of Human Services. To learn more about what is being done for the homeless population, Albertans can visit humanservices.alberta.ca/homelessness.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: The hon. Member for Calgary-Mountain View, followed by Bonnyville-Cold Lake.

Emergency Medical Services

Dr. Swann: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Health Quality Council's report on emergency medical services was nine months ago, and EMS services continue to be unacceptable to Albertans. The Liberal caucus has heard from a number of these critical care staff that nothing much has changed. Inadequate communications, equipment, and staffing contribute to a climate of stress, haste, and dissatisfaction in a system that used to be the envy of other provinces.

In life-threatening emergencies where seconds matter, EMS response times have not improved. Fifty per cent of the time in cities it is over 12 minutes. Rural areas have much less reliable responses, and this is part of the reason Lethbridge and Red Deer and other rural communities are upset about a dispatch system that is remote and takes their ambulances out of their control. Dispatch centres in Edmonton and Calgary create greater uncertainty in distant communities, fail to understand rural and regional conditions, and may not communicate to other first responders in a timely fashion. Formerly EMS and fire received simultaneous communications and could co-ordinate their efforts, avoiding mistakes, miscommunications, and delays.

Disabling injury rates among EMS staff are high, especially in Calgary, where the number of days lost is four times higher than any other zone. Inexplicably, this doubled over the past year according to WCB data.

The recent Parkland report on seniors' care called From Bad to Worse highlighted the inadequate staffing and attention our seniors face in many centres across the province. This results in more heavy lifting, more time demands on EMS for minor conditions, and unnecessary trips.

Inter-facility transfers continue to inappropriately consume EMS time and along with an average of one hour of waiting in the emergency room per case add to the psychological strain and rushing over distances to deal with genuine emergencies.

All this adds up to unacceptable quality and a demoralized EMS workforce, itself at risk physically and psychologically. As one EMS worker put it: how can unhealthy workers provide good care to sick and injured people?

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: The hon. Member for Bonnyville-Cold Lake, followed by Red Deer-North.

Affordable Housing in Cold Lake

Mrs. Leskiw: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On October 23 of this year Habitat for Humanity was pleased to present keys to 22 Cold Lake families. With the increasing need for affordable housing in Cold Lake, the project was a timely endeavour. The development of this was a first of its kind for Habitat Edmonton, an apartment complex with 32 units. The development was named Spirit Arms by the neighbouring Holy Cross elementary school grade 1 students. In the booming economy it is difficult to find housing, but our government and the city of Cold Lake have been diligent in ensuring they are addressing the great need in the city of Cold Lake.

Work at the housing project, which was started by the Cold Lake Affordable Housing Society, came to a halt in September of 2009 after the company hired to oversee the project and build the modular apartment complex went into receivership. The city of Cold Lake and Habitat for Humanity partnered together to ensure that this important project was completed. This development is a great example of how our government helps to facilitate sustainable, affordable housing projects. Our government laid the groundwork so that Habitat for Humanity was able to collaborate with the community of Cold Lake and other partners to provide affordable home ownership opportunities to local residents.

The city of Cold Lake has been a strong supporter of Habitat for Humanity bringing the affordable home ownership model into the city. This project comes at a crucial time and will give a lot of families hope in a very challenging housing market. We welcome Habitat for Humanity to our constituency and these families to their new homes. I'm sure that this partnership will continue to grow and to benefit all of the Bonnyville-Cold Lake residents in the future.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Thank you.

Hon. members, for a variety of weather reasons, one of the members has some guests who just got here. She's asked for unanimous consent to revert briefly to Introduction of Guests, and I'm going to allow her 10 seconds if you grant her unanimous consent.

[Unanimous consent granted]

Introduction of Guests

(continued)

The Speaker: Would you go ahead, then, hon. member, 10 seconds for the introduction and then straight into your statement.

Mrs. Jablonski: I'll be as quick as I can, Mr. Speaker. Today it's my privilege to rise and introduce to you and through you to all members Grant Johnson. Grant is the son of the late Yvonne Johnson, a woman who was an extremely active member of the Red Deer community. I will be sharing Yvonne's story with you in a member's statement today, and I'm so glad that Grant could make it and be here in time to hear the member's statement in memory of his mother. I would ask that you join me in giving him the warm welcome of the Assembly.

The Speaker: Very quickly, the hon. Minister of Environment and Sustainable Resource Development, please.

Mrs. McQueen: Well, thank you so much, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to introduce to you and through you to all members of the Assembly a group of 17 staff from Alberta Energy's oil sands division. I'm pleased to welcome them to the Legislature as part of their participation and public service orientation. If they could please rise and receive the traditional warm welcome of this Assembly.

Members' Statements

(continued)

Yvonne Johnson

Mrs. Jablonski: Mr. Speaker, where would our communities be without highly motivated and inspirational people like Yvonne Johnson, who look after the rights of others and help to make our communities great places to live?

On October 23 of this year Red Deer lost one of its most committed, passionate, and dedicated citizens when Yvonne Johnson died. Yvonne was an entrepreneur who had owned and operated Yvonne's House of Fashion, later called The Wardrobe. Her fashion advice was sought after by many dignitaries, including the Hon. Helen Hunley, past Lieutenant Governor of Alberta.

But it wasn't just fashion advice that was sought after; it was also political advice as Yvonne was a strong supporter of the Progressive Conservative Party provincially and federally. Five years before the PCs came to power in Alberta, Yvonne had been a powerful and respected member. It was not unusual to hear Yvonne say that she had recently had a conversation with the Prime Minister. Yvonne had many achievements, too numerous to list. She was a mover and a shaker who was the first female president of a PC constituency association. She was given achievement awards by Premier Getty and Prime Minister Brian Mulroney.

But most remarkable and extraordinary about Yvonne was that after she had suffered and recovered from a brain aneurysm in 1985 that left her disabled and in a wheelchair, Yvonne was just as strong and determined as ever. Yvonne became one of the strongest advocates for people with disabilities, pointing out to all elected officials the lack of accessibility in our communities. I will remember Yvonne for the persistent and determined work that she did in our community on behalf of all citizens, especially on behalf of people with disabilities. I will also remember that as she faced life's challenges with courage and dignity, I could depend on Yvonne for her wisdom and for the advice of a good friend.

1:50

Yvonne Johnson was born on December 19, 1937, in Calgary, and she died in Red Deer on October 23, 2013. She had two sons, Grant Donald Johnson and Kenneth Gordon Johnson. Grant is here today, and I would ask you to join me in acknowledging the many and great accomplishments of his mother, Yvonne Johnson.

Member's Apology

The Speaker: Mr. Clerk, just hold the clock, if you would, for a moment.

Hon. members, I've been asked by one member that he be granted a minute or so in order to make an apology and to withdraw and otherwise correct some comments he made in social media yesterday in which he publicly criticized your Speaker. The member in question in this regard is the hon. Member for Airdrie. He came to my office yesterday and apologized to me personally.

This is an extremely serious matter, hon. members, so when he asked if he could have a minute at the earliest opportunity to make his statement and apology in front of all members, I granted him his request. Accordingly, I would expect the deepest of respect and silence from all of you while he makes his statement.

Mr. Anderson: Mr. Speaker, obviously, the last two days have been quite heated, which happens from time to time in this House, but adults, of course, should talk out their differences in a civil and friendly manner.

I requested a meeting with you yesterday afternoon, which you granted, and we had a very constructive chat in your office. You listened very respectfully to the frustration of our caucus as it pertains to question period proceedings, and I thank you for that. I believe a better mutual understanding was reached.

In the spirit of moving forward, I'm going to apologize to you and withdraw any comments or tweets regarding you on these matters made in or outside this House. I look forward to high quality and fair question periods both today and in the future.

I do want to make clear in my comments, Mr. Speaker, that it is clear in our parliamentary tradition that statements made outside the House in the media or on Twitter are not commented on by the Speaker, nor should they be. Obviously, the rights of free speech must be respected, and I trust you agree. However, I am extending a hand of goodwill on this issue, and it is my sincere hope we can move on to what question period should be about, and that is holding this government to account.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Statement by the Speaker

Rules and Practices of the Assembly

The Speaker: Thank you, hon. Member for Airdrie.

Hon. members, as the member referenced, a lot of unfortunate things have occurred over these past few days, and many inappropriate comments have been made both inside and outside this Chamber. You just heard evidence of that point.

I, too, want to take a few minutes to remind all of us that once you are elected to serve in this House and you take the oath to Her Majesty, you step into a whole new world, a world full of traditions, customs, and practices. You step into an institution that has been founded on practices, procedures, and principles that, in fact, go back centuries. Those traditions, those institutions and practices are rock solid. Hon. members, they are extremely serious.

They and the entire parliamentary system are in turn fortified by rules, rules which we often refer to as citations, and more specifically in our case we have our own standing orders. We should all know at least the very basic rules and standing orders, but if we don't, we should learn them as they are cited by our House leaders, such as the one who just spoke, for example, when they are raising or defending a point of order, or when your Speaker or your Deputy Speaker or your Chair of Committees is making a ruling or interjects to remind you of a particular rule. These rules are not rules that any single one of us may have made, but they are rules that must guide us to help preserve the institutions that I just spoke about and of which we are all part.

These rules can of course be changed. They can be amended. New ones can be brought in. So if you have an issue with one or more of our rules, there is a process in place that you can use to affect change. Similarly, if you have an issue with an act or a bill that is about to become an act, a law, as it were, there is a process in place to deal with that as well. Finally, if you have an issue with the Speaker or whoever is chairing, there is a process in place to

accommodate that as well. I want to comment very briefly on that as I wrap up.

As occurred yesterday when the chair accepted yesterday's apology from the Member for Airdrie, the issue of criticizing the Speaker is really one of respect or disrespect for the institution. The role of the Speaker is something that is fundamental to our parliamentary system and our entire system of responsible government.

As members may be aware, 2015 will mark the 800th anniversary of the Magna Carta, which helped lay the foundation for our form of parliamentary government. As Philip Laundy says at page 11 in his 1984 book titled *The Office of Speaker in the Parliaments of the Commonwealth*, "The office of Speaker is almost as old as Parliament itself," as the first Speaker was designated in 1377. So there is history, hon. members. There is tradition for the respect that should be accorded to the Office of the Speaker. This is not about me. This is about the position.

The chair addressed the subject of criticizing the Speaker yesterday on pages 2965 to 2966 of *Hansard*, which is worth repeating briefly. The quotation from *Beauchesne*, sixth edition, at paragraph 167 on pages 48 to 49, states as follows:

The essential ingredient of the speakership is found in the status of the Speaker as a servant of the House. The Presiding Officer, while but a servant of the House, is entitled on all occasions to be treated with the greatest attention and respect by the individual Members because the office embodies the power, dignity, and honour of the House itself.

If someone wants to challenge the chair, the appropriate mechanism is to bring a substantive motion forward that can be debated in the Assembly. Your chair, as with any chair in our parliamentary system, will not put up with nor should members of the Assembly put up with collateral attacks that bring the Assembly and the institution into disrepute and demonstrate a profound disrespect for the Office of the Speaker and the institution. As *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, second edition, states at page 313, "The actions of the Speaker may not be criticized in debate or by any means except by way of a substantive motion."

For those wondering about the impact of social media on proceedings in the Assembly, the chair is pleased to confirm that traditions that go back as far as the 14th century can adapt and be applied to our circumstances involving social media today, social media such as Twitter, for example. The hon. Member for Airdrie referred to his tweets as being disrespectful or words to that effect.

I want to remind not only that member but all of us, all of you, that a similar situation to what we just are speaking about occurred in the Assembly of the Northwest Territories as recently as last month. There a member had apologized in the Assembly and then made comments in social media that conflicted with that apology. Speaker Jackie Jacobson from the Northwest Territories said this at page 3261 of the Northwest Territories *Hansard* on October 31, 2013:

However, I do need to strongly caution Members that statements made outside the House, whether on Facebook or in other media, can amount to a breach of privilege or even contempt of the House.

This is especially so when a Member's comments could be read as challenging a ruling of the Speaker. It's thin ice and I urge Members to stay off of it.

This is not to protect me personally. It is to keep dignity and order in the House, so that we can get our work done.

Speakers across Canada, all of whom I've met with and done an informal survey with, do their level best to be as impartial as we possibly can. We do not go to caucus meetings when session is on unless we are specifically invited to address an item such as might

come up under Members' Services or such as might come up in the House and caucus is looking for some guidance or a dialogue with the Speaker. We do not go to political events when the House is in session. We do our best to invite members to come to our offices as opposed to us going to their offices, especially government. There are exceptions that occasionally occur, obviously, but those are some of the premises.

Similarly, with respect to a website that I have, mypcmla, during session I've asked it to be withdrawn so that I can continue the role of being as absolutely impartial as I can, Lord help me.

Thank you.

2:00

Oral Question Period

The Speaker: The hon. Leader of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition for your first main set of questions.

School Construction Contracts

Ms Smith: Mr. Speaker, we believe Alberta can build what it needs without saddling our children with mountains of debt. This is the fundamental difference between our party and the party opposite, and there's no better illustration than the sole-source P3 deal to build 19 schools announced yesterday. This government likes P3s because it is a way to hide debt. However, any Albertan knows that when you only have one company bidding on a contract, you won't get the best price, you won't get the best product, and you won't likely get what you want on time and on budget. To the Infrastructure minister: will he give up on this P3 model?

Mr. Drysdale: Well, Mr. Speaker, our government knows how important these schools are to families and communities across the province, and we want to get them completed as soon as possible. Since we started building with P3s, our government has saved Alberta taxpayers more than \$245 million, and I won't apologize for saving taxpayers money.

Ms Smith: Mr. Speaker, no one is bidding on these contracts, and the government's record on sole-source contracts is abysmal. Look no further than the untendered deal handed to Enzo Developments to build school portables in High River. As it turned out, Enzo had no factory to build them and no experience building them. High River's Catholic school division did not receive the portables at the beginning of the school year as promised, and some classes are still being taught in a community hall. Again to the Infrastructure minister. The sole-source contract announced yesterday for the 19 schools is exactly from the same playbook. How can he be sure it won't produce the exact same result?

Mr. Drysdale: Mr. Speaker, for one thing, we didn't announce a sole-source contract yesterday. We're going forward with the RFP. The proponent, the Build to Learn consortium, is working up an RFP to present to government next spring. We will have a price for a traditional build, and we'll go ahead and hire an independent auditor to follow this transparency and come up with the costs on a traditional build. If the proponent bid doesn't come in under that and show value for dollar, we won't award the contract.

Ms Smith: It's a single bidder, Mr. Speaker.

Earlier this week I was proud to stand with my Infrastructure critic, my colleague from Cypress-Medicine Hat, as he released A Better Way to Build Alberta, our recommendations for how we

can build what we need to build without going into debt. Chief among the recommendations is one to end debt financing through P3s like the one announced yesterday and return to a design/bid/build model that keeps costs and scope in check. When will the Infrastructure minister realize that the best way to build what we need responsibly is through open tenders and competitive bids?

Mr. Drysdale: Well, Mr. Speaker, this government's ways of financing the future of our children through building schools and financing them is plain and clear. We have our financing in our financial statement as to how we'll build them, unlike across the floor. They plan to finance their schools by cutting operational. You can't cut \$5 billion out of operational without affecting the people of this province. They hollered when we cut \$147 million out of postsecondary education. How are they going to cut \$5 billion?

The Speaker: The hon. leader. Second main set of questions.

Ms Smith: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We would cut wasteful spending like the \$375 million.

Michener Centre Closure

Ms Smith: I want to visit a project I asked about Tuesday. The Premier and her caucus are going to be in Red Deer tomorrow, and the Premier has been invited to visit Michener Centre, which has won eight different Premier's awards of excellence from two of the last three Premiers. The residents, their families and guardians, the staff, all three opposition parties, Red Deer city council, and the Red Deer community at large oppose the Michener closure. Will the Infrastructure minister take his Premier to visit Michener Centre this weekend to understand the important and unique work that they do?

Mr. Drysdale: Well, Mr. Speaker, I have heard of the Michener Centre from lots of people and have been there as well, but closing the Michener Centre isn't an infrastructure question; it's operational. We've heard time and time again in the House from my colleagues as to why it is important to do things differently going into the future. One of my colleagues may want to supplement that.

Ms Smith: The associate minister for persons with developmental disabilities disregards the fact that this closure will break the promise made by the PC government that the residents at Michener should be allowed to live out their lives there. On Tuesday he suggested that closing Michener was what the United Nations wanted and that it was consistent with the opinions of experts and government policy. This question is to the Human Services minister. Is there a single person in charge of the care of Michener residents who thinks that moving them out of their home is a good thing and that it will improve the quality of their lives?

Mr. Oberle: The funny thing about getting evidence and doing studies and talking to people around the world and being fully involved in your portfolio and expecting your staff to do that is that every once in a while you learn a little bit about the science. When faced with best practices from around the world and science from around the world, what are we supposed to do but implement them, Mr. Speaker? I believe in my heart that we're making the right decision for the care of the people that are in the Michener Centre, and there will be better outcomes.

Ms Smith: Mr. Speaker, in this case the families and the staff are the experts.

The minister must know that the families and the staff at Michener will be protesting tomorrow outside of the convention, where the Premier will be giving one of the most important speeches of her life. I can imagine that protest won't make the delegates feel all warm and fuzzy, but doing the right thing for Michener families and Michener residents could make the Premier a hero. Will the Minister of Human Services do the right thing today and cancel the closure?

Mr. Oberle: Mr. Speaker, the Leader of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition paints this as if (a) it's a black-hearted decision and (b) one that was taken lightly, and I can assure this House that neither is true. I can also assure this House that I have talked to staff members and to family members and visited the Michener Centre and visited care homes outside the Michener Centre. I'll say it again. This decision was not taken lightly. I believe in my heart that it was taken in the best interest of the people who are the most vulnerable in that centre.

The Speaker: Hon. leader, your third main set of questions.

Ms Smith: I can tell you that's not what the families think and it's not what the staff think.

Publication of Reports

Ms Smith: Mr. Speaker, the Alberta Health Services quarterly report on wait times is late. In fact, we're only a few days away from when the next quarterly report is scheduled to be released. This raises a question about why this important report hasn't been made public. I'm guessing the report will once again make it clear that we have unacceptably long wait times for health procedures. Is the government purposely delaying the release of this report until after the leadership review of the Premier?

Mr. Horne: Mr. Speaker, as I've indicated several times since the summer, my department and Alberta Health Services are working on a revised performance measurement framework for our health care system, one that compares Alberta easily and accurately to national benchmarks such as those that are produced by the Canadian Institute for Health Information. There is no requirement to release performance data quarterly. We certainly do intend to continue to do that in the future, and as soon as the new framework is ready, I will be prepared to answer questions on it in the House.

Ms Smith: What a trend, Mr. Speaker. The 2011-12 annual report from the Legislative Assembly Office is also late, and that delay is now holding up the release of the 2012-13 annual report. These reports will likely confirm the massive cost overruns and delays facing the Taj Mahal of government waste, the federal building rehabilitation project, which will provide ritzy new offices for MLAs. Again to the Infrastructure minister: is the government purposely delaying the release of this report until after the Premier's leadership review?

Mr. Drysdale: Mr. Speaker, it's even hard to follow that question. The things we do on this side of the House in government aren't always related to politics and leadership of the party. We run and govern this province on what's best for the people of Alberta. They seem to think everything is connected to the leadership review. Nonsense.

2:10

Ms Smith: All right, Mr. Speaker. Number three. Albertans are rightly concerned about the possible conflict of interest facing the Premier over her awarding of a government contract to a law firm with close ties to her. Unfortunately, despite the fact that the report is apparently complete, its release has been delayed. This means that we don't know if the Premier has been cleared by the Ethics Commissioner. Is the government purposely delaying the release of this report until after the Premier's leadership review?

The Speaker: Hon. members, to my knowledge I haven't seen anything that would suggest that the report is complete yet or not, so I'm at a disadvantage here somewhat. I haven't seen anything official one way or the other. Perhaps we'll have that looked into.

Hon. Member for Edmonton-Whitemud, Government House Leader, do you wish to comment?

Mr. Hancock: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. As you might have gone on to suggest, a report from a legislative officer does not go to government. It goes to the Speaker, and the Speaker tables it when the Speaker has it. The legislative officer provides his report to the Speaker, and when he provides his report to the Speaker, that's when we can assume he's done.

The Speaker: That's exactly where I was going with this. So we'll review this matter and just see where it stands.

Meanwhile let us move on to Calgary-Mountain View, followed by Edmonton-Strathcona.

Emergency Medical Worker Health and Safety

Dr. Swann: Thanks very much, Mr. Speaker. The Workers' Compensation Board statistics indicate a serious problem of injuries and absenteeism among Alberta emergency medical services workers. I'll be tabling the document appropriately later. First responders continue to be frustrated, overtaxed, short-staffed, and coping with inadequate equipment, by their admission. The disabling injury rate and days lost in Alberta is increasing, especially in the Calgary region. To the Minister of Health. You have a paramedic in caucus, another running the emergency medical system. Why have emergency medical services disabling injury and WCB rates soared this past year?

Mr. Horne: Well, Mr. Speaker, quite honestly, I haven't reviewed the report to which the hon. member refers. I'd be happy to review it and provide him with comment.

But I will say that he is correct. We do have the benefit of a number of people in our caucus who are very close to the emergency medical services system. They do provide me with very good advice about the pressures that EMS staff face in different parts of the province, owing to our rapid growth as we often refer to in answers during question period. Alberta Health Services is very much focused on supporting those workers through additional resources, through things such as fatigue management policies, and so on.

Dr. Swann: Well, that flies in the face of everything we're hearing from the field, Mr. Minister. Given the Alberta Liberals have heard from many concerned EMS workers who have told us that inadequate vehicles and equipment have resulted in a growing number of injuries, what is the minister doing about this? How and when does he plan to address EMS safety?

Mr. Oberle: Mr. Speaker, as the associate minister in Human Services responsible for the Workers' Compensation Board I need

to clarify for this House that any injury on the job site is indeed concerning. We want everybody to go home safe and sound to their families every night. The hon. member visited the Millard Health centre recently and presented to them his understanding of the dangers of EMS and the high injury rates, and they pointed out to him that his information was in error and that, in fact, there are other professionals that have higher injury rates. Nonetheless, we are concerned about injuries in the workplace with any profession, and we'll look into it.

The Speaker: The hon. member.

Dr. Swann: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Given that these statistics are especially shocking in the Calgary zone, where, for example, the number of days lost is four times that of any other zone for EMS workers, what is going on in Calgary, and what are you doing about it?

Mr. Oberle: Well, Mr. Speaker, as I just said, I've offered, the WCB has offered to have a sit-down with this member and discuss his data in an open format. He can table whatever he wants. I'll extend that offer again. But that's not consistent with what I understand the situation to be.

The Speaker: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Strathcona.

Michener Centre Closure (continued)

Ms Notley: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This spring the government announced plans to evict 125 people who call Michener Centre home. The minister cited a number of questionable excuses for this callous decision, but most suspect it was all about saving money. The NDP now has documents showing that a month and a half after the decision was announced, this government hired an ad agency to fabricate a rationale for the closure. To the minister for PDD: if this was truly about protecting Alberta's most vulnerable, why did you need a public relations firm to create a rationale for the decision long after it was made?

Mr. Oberle: Well, we simply did no such thing, Mr. Speaker. We did retain an advertising or public relations firm afterwards because, very obviously, we had a communications job to do. What we did was have this firm codify what we were doing in planning for the transitioning of patients, nothing to do with the decision to close it. We were planning for the transition. They codified it. They put together a document, including a flow chart, which is posted on the website. It has been for months.

Ms Notley: Well, Mr. Speaker, in an April e-mail to Calder Bateman the ADM for PDD says, quote: my request was for you to build a set of principles for AHS and PDD on transitioning from Michener to long-term care or supportive living. So instead of consulting with health care professionals, experts in the field, families, or communities, this PC government went to a public relations firm for their principles. How apt. To the minister: how can anyone believe that this is not a cynical PR move that has nothing to do with improving care for vulnerable Albertans and everything to do with spinning a heartless financial cut?

Mr. Oberle: I'll say it again, Mr. Speaker. The firm was hired to codify what we were already doing, to put it into a presentable and easily readable fashion so that it could be published on the Internet site so that families, loved ones, and staff members as well had ready access to this document so they could see the process.

Ms Notley: Well, Mr. Speaker, no amount of public relations can change the facts. This government is ejecting Albertans from a home they've lived in for decades and denying them the choice the UN convention demands. Closing Michener is a penny-pinching measure meant to offload the cost of caring for vulnerable Albertans to their families and to understaffed and underfunded community placements. Families, staff, and, most importantly, residents are all terrified about what this means for them. To the minister: will you do the right thing and keep Michener Centre open?

Mr. Oberle: Mr. Speaker, I think I've always endeavoured to be pretty honest with this House on the reasons around decisions. Now, this House will know that I made the decision to close the Eric Cormack Centre in Edmonton the year before for the same reason. I note that that party, that has been an advocate for community living for as long as I've been in here, never had a word to say about that closure. Neither did that party. The issue is the same. People living in supportive community living arrangements have better outcomes bar none. The evidence is there.

The Speaker: Hon. members, the first five slots reserved for the leaders of the parties or their designates, where we allow preambles to supplementaries, has now expired.

We're going to move on, I hope with no preambles to supplementaries, starting with Fort McMurray-Wood Buffalo, followed by Chestermere-Rocky View.

Highway 63 Services

Mr. Allen: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The gas station and restaurant that serviced commuters and travellers for many years at Mariana Lake on highway 63 shut down a few years ago. The province required them to relocate or shut down in order to accommodate the alignment of the twinning project, and they did compensate the business on its closure. Since that time there have been no fuel or services available for a 200-kilometre stretch on one of Alberta's busiest economic corridors. To the Minister of Transportation: have you given consideration to the recommendation in my report of June 29, 2012, to make land available for a commercial rest stop/service centre on this stretch?

The Speaker: The hon. minister.

Mr. McIver: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To answer the question directly, we have given consideration to that. As I think I've said here in the House before, that is a very good report, and the hon. member makes a good point that for some Albertans a 200-kilometre stretch of highway is a long way to go without a gas stop or a comfort stop. Right now I have to say to the hon. member that our focus is on the twinning of highway 63, which is the promise that the Premier made and one that I've endeavoured to make sure we keep. As we get that on the way, I will consider what the hon. member is asking about.

The Speaker: The hon. member.

Mr. Allen: Thank you. To the same minister: given that we have implemented a very much appreciated dedicated traffic enforcement initiative on highway 63 and RCMP and sheriffs are also in a situation where their only rest stop or opportunity for fuelling is at either end of the stretch, would you be prepared, if this was to move forward, to provide space for an office here for our enforcement personnel?

Mr. McIver: Again, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. member, I genuinely appreciate his enthusiasm, and I know that this is an issue close to his heart, that he's worked hard on. As I said before, our emphasis is on the twinning of highway 63, something we intend to get done. As we get further down the road on that, we will look for opportunities for comfort stops. I think it's a legitimate thing for the hon. member to ask for, and I'm sure that there are probably a lot of Albertans that would like to see it, but in the midst of a construction project sometimes you have to do things in stages. In my view, we're not at that stage today.

The Speaker: The hon. member.

Mr. Allen: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll withdraw my second supplementary. It's in the same vein.

The Speaker: Thank you.

Let us go on to Chestermere-Rocky View, followed by Calgary-Bow.

2:20 School Construction and Modernization

Mr. McAllister: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In the last election the Premier made a fairly black-and-white promise to Alberta parents and students: 50 new schools, 70 renovated schools started and completed this term. Period. Well, we're nearly halfway through this term, and it seems like the government made a promise to families that it cannot keep. Surely, the government would never intentionally mislead parents and families during an election campaign. So I ask the Minister of Education with respect: how many of these 50 new projects and 70 renovated projects that his government promised this term are currently under construction?

Mr. J. Johnson: Mr. Speaker, you know, the constant criticism we get from across the way on the amount of capital that we are building or aren't building is a little bit troubling. [interjections]

The Speaker: Please continue, hon. Minister of Education, or are you done?

Mr. J. Johnson: I'm done.

The Speaker: So we're going to have to have a discussion about heckling and how far you want this to go on.

Hon. member, please proceed.

Mr. McAllister: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I'll ask my colleagues to give the member a chance to answer this question because I think it's one we deserve an answer to.

We have done the research, and as near as we can tell, of the 28 new schools announced since the election, precisely zero are currently under construction. Nada. Zilch. Bagel. Given that it takes three years to build a school and given the clear promise that these projects would be started and completed by 2016, is this minister going to continue to ride on the coattails of the former Premier, or is he going to honour his government's commitments?

Mr. J. Johnson: Mr. Speaker, I think it's pretty clear that we are honouring our commitments. Particularly when it comes to education, this Premier made a commitment for many things, including reinstating the \$107 million in funding, which she did, getting an ATA deal, which she did, a number of other items, passing the Education Act, which we've done. We've got capital on the way.

Like I said earlier this week and like I said last week, there are currently either just finished or under way 70 projects. There are another 30 that we announced in the spring. There are a number

more coming here, I believe, by the end of this calendar year if we can get the right ducks lined up, and there will be more coming this spring. I'm happy to be accountable for what we do, but it's really difficult to be accountable in 2013 for something we're doing in 2016.

Mr. McAllister: I will simplify. Given that during the election campaign this government promised 50 new schools and 70 renovations this term as a commitment by this government, can the Minister of Education tell us today how many of those projects are under way that his government promised?

Mr. J. Johnson: Mr. Speaker, stay tuned. Ask me that question in 2016. We're going to have a number of schools built, and we're going to have more than 120 projects well under way or built by that time, during this term.

I hate to point out the obvious, but there are a number of projects where the ground was turned after the election that could have easily been cancelled if someone else had won the election and didn't want to take on P3 projects. So the question I'd have for the hon. member across the way who's asking for schools – I think 11 of their members now have asked for schools. Immediately after the front benches say, "Don't take on debt; don't do P3s; we're building too many schools," their members behind them stand up and ask for a school. Well, will they take those schools if they're P3s?

The Speaker: The hon. Member for Calgary-Bow, followed by Calgary-Fish Creek.

Flood Mitigation Projects

Ms DeLong: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The floods this past June were devastating for many of my constituents. While many are now rebuilding their lives and their homes, they want reassurance that our government is going to do everything we can to prevent this kind of devastation from happening again. Earlier today Premier Redford announced that several mitigation projects are moving forward, which is great news for Albertans. My questions are to the associate minister of recovery and reconstruction of southwest Alberta. How quickly are these projects going to be in place, and will they be ready for the next flood season?

The Speaker: The hon. minister.

Mr. Fawcett: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Quite simply, these projects that the Premier announced today require significant engineering work. They're very large projects. Not only do they require significant engineering work; they also are going to require significant consultation with the public and significant environmental approvals. Because of that it's very unlikely that they will be in place for next spring. What we will do, though, is work with our municipalities to do what we can today and over the upcoming months leading up to the next flood season to make sure that communities are protected.

The Speaker: The hon. member.

Ms DeLong: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the same minister: do we know how much these projects will cost taxpayers?

Mr. Fawcett: Again, Mr. Speaker, what I will say is that until the consultation is done and the engineering is done on these projects, it would be very ridiculous to speculate on how much they are actually going to cost. What we are doing is going through that engineering process. We've hired two consulting engineering firms

to do that work. We're going out and talking with municipalities. We're going to go through that process, including talking with landowners and with the proper environmental groups, and once those conversations are done, we'll be able to come up with a more accurate price tag.

The Speaker: The hon. member.

Ms DeLong: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. To the same minister. You did mention consultation. Will consultation include my constituents? Will they have an opportunity to have input on these projects?

Mr. Fawcett: I think it is very important that people have input on this project. One thing the Premier committed to is that we are going to work with our citizens and with our communities and the municipalities that are impacted. The one thing that we need to make sure that we do – the worst thing about doing nothing at all or doing it too fast is doing it wrong. We can't get this wrong. We can't this wrong for taxpayers; we can't get it wrong for communities. So we're going to do that due diligence, and we're going to listen to people and citizens in these communities.

The Speaker: Thank you.

Let's be reminded not to use the personal first names or last names of members elected in this House.

Let's move on, then, to Calgary-Fish Creek, followed by Calgary-McCall.

Foothills Hospital Kitchen Renovation

Mrs. Forsyth: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Albertans deserve better from their health care system. Last spring we asked why the government had failed to address an urgent priority at the Foothills hospital, a kitchen renovation. The kitchen has received several public health citations, has failing, obsolete equipment, environmental issues, and has mould and asbestos that needs to be removed. To the Minister of Infrastructure: why after four years have you not fixed this urgent issue at the Foothills hospital? Is patient safety not a priority?

Mr. Drysdale: Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't think it's the job of the Minister of Infrastructure to catch mice or anything like that. I realize there's a problem in this hospital, but Alberta Health Services is given a budget for maintenance and upkeep of the building. We've given them – if I say a number, I'll be misquoted, probably, but it's millions of dollars to upkeep their properties. In cases like this they're to be maintained by Alberta Health Services out of this budget.

Mrs. Forsyth: It's under your capital project, a FOIPed project that we have.

Given that Alberta Health Services' 2013 capital plan submission says that it is imperative that this kitchen be upgraded and in its current condition cannot support the increased demands that the Foothills new cancer centre will place on it, when are you going to make these urgent fixes to this kitchen after over four years?

Mr. Drysdale: Mr. Speaker, we're working on a big project there with the health thing, but as I told them before – I don't know if I have to repeat it – there is a budget to fix that, and it's under Health Services. I'm sure they'll look at their priorities and finish the projects that are the highest priority.

Mrs. Forsyth: Mr. Speaker, it has been their priority since 2010. Please, minister, learn your portfolio.

Given that this government has given the thumbs-up on an \$8 million in-office renovation for executives at the U of C and that you found the cash for the new roof garden for the MLA offices, how is it possible that a 50-year-old kitchen infested – infested – with mould and asbestos is not considered a higher priority by this government?

Mr. Drysdale: Mr. Speaker, again, the member is confused by what budget pays for what. This department has nothing to do with the offices at the U of C. Yes, we're fixing the roof of a hundred-year-old building. That is under the Infrastructure budget.

As I said, the maintenance and capital projects in Alberta Health Services: it's their purview to set their priorities. We give them a budget to do that.

The Speaker: The hon. Member for Calgary-McCall, followed by Edmonton-Calder.

2:30

Registry Services

Mr. Kang: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Since the government began its results-based budget scheme, Alberta Liberals have heard numerous concerns from registry owners about the changes by the Ministry of Service Alberta. Current registry owners are worried that the government is planning to make them renew their licences and then submit requests for proposals in order to keep their licences in the future. To the Minister of Service Alberta: is this what the ministry is planning to do, and if so, when will the registry owners be informed of these changes?

The Speaker: The hon. minister.

Mr. Bhullar: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm glad the member finally asked me a question in the House, but I wish he had perhaps consulted with me beforehand to get some facts instead of innuendo. The fact remains that we have a strong system in this province. We're looking continuously for ways to make it better by looking at things like offering online services. Just recently we've introduced an RFP for new registry agents in Wabasca and Chestermere. At the end of the day, we're going to make sure that everyday Albertans, hard-working people get the services they need in an affordable manner.

The Speaker: The hon. member.

Mr. Kang: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Given that when the government sold off the registry services in 1993, Albertans were told that it would "open up opportunities for small businesses" and today the government clearly wants a piece of the action, is the minister now trying to change the rules of the game while it is still being played?

Mr. Bhullar: If the member, Mr. Speaker, could provide me with a specific example of what he's asking right now, I'd be more than happy to answer a very specific question, but when they're asking pure political statements in this House and trying to solicit a real answer, it doesn't really make sense. The answer is that we have a strong system. We're going to continue that strong system and make it even better to make sure that Albertans have access to services in a way that works for them, whether it be online or in person. The fact is that we're going to keep prices low and we're going to keep the best services available for Albertans.

The Speaker: The hon. member.

Mr. Kang: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Finally, to the same minister again. The registry owners are also worried about competing directly with the government when the new online portal is launched next year. Is it this government's intention to compete directly with the registries for online revenues?

Mr. Bhullar: Mr. Speaker, when the government is introducing a new service that could potentially become a new source of business for the private sector or the government, the government has a series of responsibilities to make sure that the taxpayers of the province are well compensated and taken care of. So if the member is asking me to turn over what could be a significant source of revenue for the government to a private industry just because that's the way he wants it, I think that's unfair to everyday Alberta taxpayers. We're introducing something new. Taxpayers deserve that we would ask tough questions and make sure that they're compensated.

The Speaker: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Calder, followed by Cypress-Medicine Hat.

University of Alberta Research Partnership

Mr. Eggen: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday the Canadian Association of University Teachers released a damning report on academic freedom in our universities. This report noted that the U of A's \$13 million Centre for Oil Sands Innovation specifically focuses on "areas of strategic interest to Imperial Oil." As recently as two weeks ago the minister claimed that he wanted to preserve the independence of our universities. To the minister of advanced education: how independent does he believe the university actually is if the focus of this centre is to further the private interests of Imperial Oil?

The Speaker: The hon. minister.

Mrs. McQueen: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. The University of Alberta has strict policies with respect to intellectual property and independence. No industrial partner has the ability to block or to interfere with published research. The minister has stated on many occasions that academic freedom is a cornerstone of universities, and the principle is that it may be maintained in Alberta.

The Speaker: The hon. member.

Mr. Eggen: Well, thanks, Mr. Speaker. Given that this report states that this research agreement was made behind closed doors and the majority of the funding, \$9.8 million, came from the public purse and given that this agreement is absolutely silent on the issue of academic freedom, will the minister please tell us why this government is continuing this policy of corporate handouts without any independent academic oversight?

The Speaker: The hon. minister.

Mrs. McQueen: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Since being jointly established in 2005 by the University of Alberta and Imperial Oil, the Centre for Oil Sands Innovation has been recognized as a model for these types of agreements across Canada. That does not stop the independence of the universities. What it does is to allow for this kind of research to happen in an independent fashion.

Mr. Eggen: Well, that's very interesting, Mr. Speaker, because this agreement between the U of A, Imperial Oil, and the PC government specifically states that the university must "refrain from making any public announcement without the approval of

the minister." How can this minister stand here and claim that she values academic freedom when this office is increasing its political control over any information released from our public universities?

Mrs. McQueen: Well, Mr. Speaker, this government does appreciate academic independence, and we show that all the time. What we also show is that we work together and in collaboration and consultation with our partners, whether that be with universities, with municipalities, with industry. We are not going to ever apologize for working together and for working in a collaborative manner for the betterment of Albertans.

The Speaker: The hon. Member for Cypress-Medicine Hat, followed by Calgary-Mackay-Nose Hill.

Infrastructure Maintenance

Mr. Barnes: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This year's Auditor General's report featured a number of timely recommendations. In particular, the Auditor General noted that a recommendation he made six years ago has been carelessly brushed off. This year he again recommends that the Department of Infrastructure improve the process to maintain Alberta's valuable hospitals, schools, and roads. In this day and age maintenance should be common sense. To the Minister of Infrastructure: when will you fix this?

Mr. Drysdale: Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't know where to start. For one thing, the Auditor General's report this year had no issues with Infrastructure. What's more, that's rich coming from this member when last spring in estimates his motion was to take \$2 million out of the maintenance budget.

Mr. Barnes: Again, the Auditor General recommended that they put in a proper process to maintain the infrastructure. Given this and given that the Wildrose Party has repeatedly highlighted leaky school roofs, mould in hospital kitchens, seeping hospital structures, and compromised sewer systems, when will the Infrastructure minister do his job?

Mr. Drysdale: Well, Mr. Speaker, Infrastructure gives a budget to Alberta Education, and they've given maintenance budgets to all the school boards. Maintenance is up to the local school boards, and they're given an IMR budget to maintain and look after their schools. That's not an Infrastructure budget.

Mr. Barnes: The Auditor General has identified this process as missing. Considering that ignoring the Auditor General's report has led to Alberta's schools, roads, and hospitals crumbling into disrepair, why, again, is the Infrastructure minister brushing off our Auditor General?

Mr. Drysdale: Mr. Speaker, just let me be clear on one thing first before he scares all the people of Alberta. There are no health or safety concerns in any schools in the province of Alberta, so don't be scaring the schools and the parents that these schools are not safe.

Oil and Gas Development on Grazing Lands

Dr. Brown: Mr. Speaker, the Department of Environment and Sustainable Resource Development manages some 5 million acres of public lands for the people of Alberta, leasing them for agricultural purposes. Grazing leaseholders pay for grazing at a very reasonable rate, and at the same time they receive payments to compensate for loss of use and adverse effects from surface

disturbance from oil and gas developments. While Saskatchewan and Manitoba limit those surface rights payments to Crown lessees, Alberta does not. My questions are for the Minister of ESRD. As the manager of public lands can the minister advise the House: how many oil and gas wells are there on Crown grazing lease lands?

The Speaker: The hon. minister.

Mrs. McQueen: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you to the hon. member. We certainly realize the need to have balance in all of Alberta to ensure responsible development while maintaining the need for agriculture as well. There are approximately 20,000 wells located on grazing leases throughout Alberta, and surface access to Alberta's mineral resources is essential in responsible development of the industry. Both the oil and gas industry and agriculture play important roles in Alberta, and we'll continue to work with both groups to find the right balance.

2:40

Dr. Brown: Can the minister advise the House: what is the approximate surface area that's covered by surface rights leases on Crown grazing lands?

The Speaker: The hon. member.

Mrs. McQueen: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again, to the member: thank you for the question. There are approximately 6,000 grazing leases on 5.2 million acres of land throughout Alberta. The Surface Rights Act specifies that leaseholders will be properly compensated for any land disturbances related to development on Crown land. ESRD issues surface access dispositions on land held under grazing leases with appropriate restrictions, including watershed protection, fish and wildlife habitat, carbon storage, and opportunities for recreation.

Dr. Brown: Would the minister consider changing her department's policies to ensure that surface rights payments are more equitably shared for the benefit of all Albertans?

The Speaker: The hon. member.

Mrs. McQueen: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. We do not get involved in what the oil companies and the surface lease owners negotiate. That is up to them. We receive a certain amount of payment as a province for the lands, and like private property owners, surface-rights grazing lease owners make private agreements with the oil and gas companies. Those are not our dollars.

The Speaker: The hon. Member for Strathmore-Brooks, followed by Calgary-Cross.

Strathmore Hospital Capital Funding

Mr. Hale: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Strathmore hospital has the second-busiest rural emergency room in the province. Since constructed, in 1985, the hospital has not been modified or expanded. The emergency room sees 31,000 to 33,000 patients every year. AHS's own capital plan says, and I quote: many of these facilities are functionally and physically obsolete, creating increased health and safety issues. To the Minister of Infrastructure: when are you going to fix this?

Mr. Drysdale: Well, Mr. Speaker, here we go again asking for more. They want new hospitals. They want new schools. They want to cut the budget. They just keep asking for things.

Mr. Speaker, 1985 isn't that old of a building. There are lots of hospitals and schools way older than that. Whether they believe it or not – they don't seem to believe anything we say – Alberta Health Services is given a budget to maintain their facilities. They're given plenty of money a year from Infrastructure. It's up to Alberta Health to maintain their hospitals.

The Speaker: The hon. member.

Mr. Hale: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Given that the population of Strathmore has grown three to four times since it was built in 1985 and given that in 2006 the health region study recommended significant expansion to the emergency room, acute care, laboratory, and diagnostic imaging and given that since this report the hospital has not received any new capital funding to expand, when is the minister going to address this critical need?

Mr. Horne: Well, Mr. Speaker, we are very well aware as a government of the growth in the Strathmore area. In fact, as I've discussed with people locally, Strathmore has become a regional centre for health care that's serving a large number of residents who are in the southern part of Calgary. There's been great progress in preparing for expansion for Strathmore for the future. A brand new continuing care facility recently opened on land adjacent to the hospital. Thirty residents who lived in the Strathmore hospital in long-term care are moving to that brand new facility, making room for future expansion. We're certainly on this issue.

The Speaker: The hon. member.

Mr. Hale: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I look forward to having some more conversations with this minister.

Given that AHS has also confirmed that the Strathmore hospital is number 2 on the Calgary zone's priority list, to the minister: how is it that a hospital of this size is an AHS priority but is nowhere to be found on the government's capital plan?

Mr. Drysdale: Well, Mr. Speaker, as my colleague just said, we work closely with Alberta Health and Alberta Health Services on their priorities. You know, it's number 2 in your area, so it's not number 1. There's a whole big province there with lots of demands, with high-growth areas. I'll guarantee you that there are areas growing just as fast or faster than that area, and we're trying to build Alberta as fast as we can with Infrastructure. These guys keep saying that we're building too fast, too much. Now they want us to build more. It's hard to understand what they're asking.

The Speaker: The hon. Member for Calgary-Cross, followed by Medicine Hat.

Bingo Licensee Voucher Use

Mrs. Fritz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. For over 35 years the Whitehorn Community Association has relied on its dedicated volunteers to work bingos to help offset the costs of community centres, and to thank the volunteers, they provided vouchers to help offset the high cost of child and youth programs. A recent audit by AGLC claims that gaming proceeds are not approved to be used for these vouchers. My questions today are to the President of Treasury Board and Minister of Finance. Why are volunteers being penalized and no longer allowed to use bingo vouchers for child and youth programs that community associations can't provide?

The Speaker: The hon. minister.

Mr. Horner: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. First of all, I want to agree with this member's appreciation of these volunteer boards. I know that this hon. member spends a lot of time supporting them and working in her communities. The use of vouchers to thank volunteers has been an acceptable practice for many, many years. Volunteers may receive credits. However, the credits are to be used to help offset the costs of the programs conducted by the licensed group that they are volunteering for. Given the concerns that have been raised by this group and by this hon. member, the AGLC is reviewing the policy to consider if there are some adjustments that should be made.

The Speaker: The hon. member.

Mrs. Fritz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the same minister: given that community associations are very concerned – and I know they'll appreciate hearing your answer today, because they are watching this – about losing their volunteers and bingos due to the AGLC's interpretation of the policy, how will your ministry through this review help community associations cope with the overwhelming effects of the loss of their bingo revenues?

Mr. Horner: Well, Mr. Speaker, it's not necessarily a loss of the bingo revenues; it's the application of where those revenues are going. I think that in this particular case, due to the efforts of the hon. member and her doggedness to talk to the AGLC and to represent her members – I do know, from a conversation I had with the CEO over at AGLC, that a group is going to be allowed to use the proceeds in the manner in which they had anticipated, some \$800, I believe. I believe that message has already been transmitted to them.

But having said that, Mr. Speaker, there is an area of grey here that we need to get clarity on. The AGLC is going to review that, and hopefully we can continue with this process.

Mrs. Fritz: To the same minister: given that our community associations on behalf of their volunteers are requesting that AGLC allow this long-standing practice of issuing the vouchers to continue, how is your ministry through this review going to ensure that this practice does continue?

Mr. Horner: Well, Mr. Speaker, obviously, the community associations, under the practice where they would use it for their own licensed gaming purposes, can continue and will continue, but because there was a difference in the way the application of this voucher was going to be used, in the interim what we're going to be doing is reviewing that practice while allowing the older practice to continue.

As part of 2012-2013, you know, Mr. Speaker, there were 15,000 charities in Alberta, that raised nearly \$330 million. The charities are being served well. There's a lot of money being raised. We'll ensure that it happens well.

The Speaker: The hon. Member for Medicine Hat, followed by Edmonton-Gold Bar.

Emergency Medical Services Response Times

Mr. Pedersen: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Minister of Health just doesn't care about Albertans and is putting patients at risk. For months now municipal officials, front-line EMS workers, and residents have been sounding the alarm over his ill-advised plan to

centralize regional ambulance dispatch to our biggest cities. This plan is costing patients in communities like Medicine Hat crucial time and quality care when an emergency strikes. Will the minister listen to the growing numbers of dissenting voices and stop his one-size-fits-all approach to consolidated ambulance dispatch before it's too late?

Mr. Horne: Well, Mr. Speaker, the people I am listening to, as recently as this morning, are the mayor of Medicine Hat and council members and senior officials from Medicine Hat, who met with me to talk about their positive experiences in having become one of the first integrated EMS services in this province to consolidate operations with Alberta Health Services, and that occurred in July. We did talk about some of the challenges, including the response time issue, and, in fact, during the discussion noted that response times were measured differently under the previous system in Medicine Hat than they are today. So the hon. member might wish to check his facts before informing people that response times are inadequate.

The Speaker: The hon. member.

Mr. Pedersen: Interesting.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Given that the new mayor of Red Deer said that his minister's ill-advised plan looks good on paper but will have a real, life-and-death implication and given that six years ago Medicine Hat was the first tri-accredited dispatch in the world for police, fire, and EMS and given that forced consolidation has delayed response times by 50 per cent based upon your information on the website, why would anyone in any community want to accept this for their patients?

2:50

Mr. Horne: Well, Mr. Speaker, this morning I also met with the mayor of Medicine Hat and a number of members of council from that community, and we talked about some of the challenges that they see in consolidating their integrated system with a consolidated dispatch under AHS.

Mr. Speaker, the government is working very collaboratively, and in fact the city of Red Deer is ably represented by two MLAs in this House, who happen to be members of this caucus. We'll continue to work with local municipalities and make local adjustments as required to achieve the provincial vision for EMS.

The Speaker: Hon. member, your final supplemental.

Mr. Pedersen: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Given that the Associate Minister of Municipal Affairs, from Lethbridge, is now publicly voicing concerns over this issue – well, at least he's doing this when he's home in Lethbridge and safe from the minister's wrath – is the minister even consulting with his own caucus, or is having ultimate power all you really care about?

Mr. Horne: Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member might do well to check with his colleagues on this side of the House. The minister to whom the member refers was also present at a meeting this morning with the mayor and members of council from the city of Lethbridge. We continue to work collaboratively to preserve the best of integrated EMS delivery systems in this province, that were championed by places like Medicine Hat, Red Deer, and Lethbridge, and to hand in hand achieve provincial objectives.

Mr. Speaker, under no circumstances – and I at least hope the hon. member would agree with this – do we want a situation where an ambulance drives by a heart attack, a motor vehicle

accident, or another emergency simply because that unit is not deemed to be owned by the community in which it's present.

The Speaker: Hon. members, the time for question period has now expired. There were no points of order. It's been a reasonably good day, with some good questions and some good answers. In total, 16 members were recognized today, asking and answering 96 questions and answers, so we're getting there. I want to thank the Member for Fort McMurray-Wood Buffalo for forgoing his second supplemental, which helped speed things along; Calgary-Bow and Calgary-Mackay-Nose Hill for doing a great job on tightening up their preambles to supplementals or not using any at all; Strathmore-Brooks and others, who did a good job tightening things up so more members could be recognized. Thank you for that.

Also, preserving as much civility and decorum meant fewer interjections by the Speaker, which is what we're all after. So it's been a good day. Let's see if we can keep it going, and in 25 seconds from now we'll commence with the continuation of Members' Statements.

Members' Statements

(continued)

The Speaker: The hon. Member for Drumheller-Stettler, followed by Edmonton-McClung.

Veteran Students' Remembrance

Mr. Strankman: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I proudly rise in the House today to relay the story of some very special young people from the town of Veteran, located in my constituency. These young people worked diligently, tirelessly, and selflessly to convince Veterans Affairs in Ottawa to replace five medals belonging to 92-year-old World War II veteran Dave Pennington. Mr. Pennington served with the Loyal Edmonton Regiment of the 1st Canadian Infantry Division. When Paul Kavanagh with the Canadian War Museum heard their story, he asked the school to represent Alberta at this year's Remembrance Day ceremony at the National War Memorial in our nation's capital. These remarkable junior high students had to pay their own way to Ottawa, so they spent the summer earning extra cash so they could be in attendance for the ceremony.

The community embraced their mission and went out of their way to find odd jobs for these remarkable young people. On November 11 Alberta was proudly represented by the following students from Veteran: Emma Nelson, Jessica Sutherland, Clay Howe, Marissa Paley, Shelbie Pilling, Dylan Cartwright, Ashley Cooper, Emily Devereux, Nick Koturbash, Ashliegh Luttman, Micheal Saunders, Dalton Starosta, Kurt and Sarah Tkach, Steven Chapman, Travis Johnstone, and Hayden Schetzlsle.

Because of the efforts of these 17 students Mr. Pennington was able to wear his medals on Remembrance Day for the first time in two decades. I was honoured last April to be in attendance at the emotional ceremony that saw these students present Dave with his medals. In the words of World War II vet Dave Pennington, "They're great kids." We could not agree with you more, Mr. Pennington.

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

Registered Apprenticeship Program Scholarships

Mr. Xiao: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to rise today to recognize 275 exceptional students from across our province. I was honoured to take part in a celebration for these students in Edmonton last Friday. At the celebration each of these students was recognized for their commitment to the trades with a \$1,000 scholarship.

Alberta's registered apprenticeship program scholarship was established in 2001 as a way to encourage students to continue their apprenticeship program after high school. Through the registered apprenticeship program, or RAP as it is known, high school students accumulate hours of on-the-job training as credit towards an apprenticeship program. At the same time they are working towards a diploma.

Currently RAP apprentices train at over 1,000 sites around the province under the guidance of some of the world's best journey-persons. Last year the RAP scholarship was expanded to include students in another important program. Through the career and technology studies program, or CTS, students can enrol in one of five pathways to apprenticeship: automotive service technician, carpenter, cook, hairstylist, and welder. In just over a decade \$2.8 million has been awarded to RAP apprentices and CTS students.

Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of speaking to many of these students and can say with confidence that they have bright futures. As a result, our province will have a brighter future. I wish all of them the best in the future.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Presenting Petitions

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

Mrs. Jablonski: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Today I am presenting a petition with 15,744 signatures, that asks the Legislative Assembly to keep Michener Centre in Red Deer-North open. The total number of signatures for this petition presented to date is over 24,000 signatures.

Notices of Motions

The Speaker: The hon. Minister of Transportation.

Mr. McIver: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise pursuant to Standing Order 34(3) to advise the House that on Monday, November 25, 2013, Written Question 44 will be accepted.

Tabling Returns and Reports

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

Dr. Swann: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to rise and table the referred-to copies from the Workers' Compensation Board relating to injuries to EMS workers.

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

Mr. Wilson: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise today to table on behalf of my colleague from Medicine Hat a document that he referred to in his question today about the response times for EMS in Medicine Hat.

Thank you.

The Speaker: Well, hon. members, that seems to conclude our Routine for the day. We are right at the magic hour of 3 o'clock, so we should move onward.

3:00

Orders of the Day Government Motions

Address to House by Hon. David Alward

46. Mr. Campbell moved on behalf of Mr. Hancock:
Be it resolved that
- (1) Hon. David Alward, Premier of the province of New Brunswick, be invited to the floor of this Chamber on Thursday, November 28, 2013, immediately following Prayers, to address the Legislative Assembly;
 - (2) This address be called for immediately after the hon. Mr. Alward is introduced under Introduction of Visitors; and
 - (3) The ordinary business of the Assembly resume upon the conclusion of the address;
- and be it further resolved that Premier Alward's address become part of the permanent records of the Assembly.

The Speaker: Hon. members, this is a debatable motion under SO 18(1)(a). Are there any other speakers?
Seeing none, are you ready for the question?

Hon. Members: Question.

[Government Motion 46 carried unanimously]

The Speaker: The hon. Deputy Government House Leader.

Chief Electoral Officer Appointment

45. Mr. Campbell moved on behalf of Mr. Hancock:
Be it resolved that the Legislative Assembly concur in the report of the Select Special Chief Electoral Officer Search Committee and recommend that Glen Resler be appointed as Chief Electoral Officer for the province of Alberta, effective December 9, 2013.

Mr. Campbell: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Thank you.

This is also a debatable motion under SO 18(1)(a). Are there any other speakers? The hon. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Rogers: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm very pleased to stand and speak in favour of this motion. As chair of the Select Special Chief Electoral Officer Search Committee I'm very pleased that the process ended with the successful, unanimous recommendation by the committee of Mr. Resler to serve as our next Chief Electoral Officer. I speak very much in favour of this motion.

Thank you.

The Speaker: Are there others? The hon. Member for Lac La Biche-St. Paul-Two Hills.

Mr. Saskiw: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I also rise here today to speak in favour of the government motion with respect to the appointment of the Chief Electoral Officer. I in fact had moved the motion to appoint Mr. Resler to that position. He does have a very formidable job ahead of him, so I think the December 9 date makes sense. Of course, we want to see an end to illegal donations and soliciting illegal donations and a complete repayment of any illegal donations that have been made in this province. He has a

very tough job to do, and we hope that he gets to it as soon as possible.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Standing Order 29(2)(a) is now available. Anyone? If not, are there any other speakers?
Seeing none, are you ready for the question?

Hon. Members: Question.

[Government Motion 45 carried unanimously]

Government Bills and Orders Second Reading

Bill 44 Notaries and Commissioners Act

The Speaker: The hon. Member for Sherwood Park.

Ms Olesen: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to rise today and move second reading of Bill 44, the Notaries and Commissioners Act. Bill 44 amends two pieces of legislation, the Notaries Public Act and the Commissioners for Oaths Act. I would now like to provide some details about the proposed amendments.

The consolidation of acts. The Notaries Public Act and the Commissioners for Oaths Act will be consolidated to become the Notaries and Commissioners Act. Further, the language will be modernized and made easier to understand.

An increase in fines. Currently the act provides for fines of up to \$100 for not complying with the detailed process for placing one's seal and/or signature on a document and up to \$500 for an individual who contravenes the prohibitions as set out in these acts. The proposed fines are up to \$1,000 and up to \$5,000 respectively. These penalty amounts provide a more robust deterrent in the event of an activity that would amount to fraud, a repeat offender, or any other similar case. These new proposed fines would also be in line with our other acts.

A code of conduct. The proposed legislation includes a provision for a code of conduct. The proposed code of conduct would articulate appropriate behaviours for individuals in carrying out their duties; for example, conducting one's duties with dignity and integrity; treating all persons fairly, courteously, and with respect; providing services in a professional, ethical, and responsible manner; and complying with the terms and conditions of their appointment. Currently an information book is provided to individuals who are appointed, and although the information is helpful, a code of conduct will heighten awareness and reinforce the expected behaviours.

Regarding notary public powers, the amendments will also clarify powers for lay notaries. In order to protect Albertans and to ensure they fully understand the risks associated with any guarantees that they may enter into, the proposed changes will mean a lawyer will be the only individual who will be able to issue a certificate for a guarantee.

That is my information. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Hon. members, the Member for Sherwood Park has moved second reading of Bill 44. Are there any other speakers to it?

Were you intending to move and adjourn, hon. Member for Sherwood Park? You should say that if that's what your intention was, if that's the understanding you have with others.

Ms Olesen: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I now move to adjourn debate on Bill 44.

[Motion to adjourn debate carried]

Government Bills and Orders Third Reading

Bill 35

Financial Administration Amendment Act, 2013

The Speaker: The hon. President of Treasury Board.

Mr. Horner: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to rise today and move third reading of Bill 35, the Financial Administration Amendment Act, 2013.

The act is the backbone of the fiscal framework laying out clear rules and guidelines to ensure the government manages its finances in a responsible manner. With the passage of the Fiscal Management Act last spring, some of these rules became a little less clear; for example, which parts of supply votes can be carried forward to the next fiscal year. In addressing those issues, we also thought it was a good idea to make a few minor amendments to the act. The bill as written is not transformational by any stretch of the imagination, but it is necessary. To borrow some language from the Member for Lac La Biche-St. Paul-Two Hills, Bill 35 fixes a number of technical issues that need to be addressed. The key amendment proposed under Bill 35 is needed for the government to effectively manage appropriations for capital projects that span fiscal years.

As I said at second reading, the capital carry-over is a long-standing and valuable fiscal tool that enables efficient management of government capital projects. By eliminating the need to go back to the Legislature for approval to carry over funds that have already been voted in, the capital carry-over ensures approved projects are not further delayed by the processing of a ministry's funding approval. It doesn't matter if you're borrowing or paying cash for your capital projects; you want to have the ability to carry unused capital investment over to the next fiscal year to ensure you can keep the building process going.

Bill 35 makes it clear that Treasury Board retains this power to carry over capital investments in 2014-15 and future years. In addition, the bill also clarifies that capital grants to a third party like a university or a municipality cannot be carried forward. Only money for government-owned capital projects can be carried forward.

Other amendments in the bill are administrative and technical in nature, serving to provide clarity and help the government manage its day-to-day business. These include aligning references to the debt-servicing limit to correspond with the Fiscal Management Act, clarifying the government's authority to issue uncertified securities as part of its borrowing program, helping to bring government's issuing of securities into the 21st century, providing needed flexibility related to self-insurance coverage and services provided by the government's risk management fund so that we can do things like cover a senior official under department agreement rather than having the official sign a separate agreement, clarifying the restrictions on incorporating provincial corporations, permitting tailored government oversight of borrowing by provincial corporations by allowing them to directly negotiate loan terms where the minister considers it appropriate but subject to the minister's conditions.

As I said before, Alberta is one of the most fiscally responsible jurisdictions, and Bill 35 will not change that. In a broad sense the amended act simply helps government manage its capital and

carry out its day-to-day business efficiently. The proposed amendments reflect and support the kind of sound fiscal management Albertans want and expect.

I therefore encourage all members of the Legislature to support third reading of Bill 35, the Financial Administration Amendment Act, 2013.

The Speaker: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Calder.

Mr. Eggen: Yes. Thank you. I just wanted to make a couple of comments in regard to Bill 35 and changes to the statutes that were made last year. Very recently the government made changes on how its budget is presented and how financial information is reported to the public. On the 29th of April of this year the Fiscal Management Act replaced the Fiscal Responsibility Act and the Government Accountability Act. This legislation governs how the budget and financial statements are prepared.

Previously the government had to prepare a consolidated fiscal plan, including the total revenue and the total expenses by category, as well as a consolidated net revenue and expense claim. Now under the FMA the operating plan, capital plan, and savings plans are all separate.

3:10

The operational plan relates to day-to-day programs, the savings plan relates to the heritage savings and trust fund, and then the capital plan to the supporting infrastructure projects. The operational plan and the capital plan use different formats for reporting revenues and expenses and therefore surpluses and deficits, too. Due to this separation some infrastructure-related costs, especially capital grants to municipalities, which were previously expenses, have been removed from the calculations under the operational plan and are now included in the capital plan, which means they're not used to calculate the deficit. These capital grants are expenses under accounting standards, anybody's standards. They fund capital assets, but these capital assets are not owned by the province.

The Auditor General's July 2013 report found that by including them as part of the capital plan as opposed to expenses under operations, which is how they were reported prior to the budget in 2013, the government has in fact underreported their expenses, and therefore the deficit, by a factor of \$1.524 billion. Since the government insists on changing reporting and accounting requirements to make this information even more murky and more confusing than ever before, how can we get a clear picture of the current state of finances, particularly the balance of government expenses to revenues, in order to be able to make priorities for expenses in the present and informed spending choices for the future?

Because capital expenses were moved off the operational plan, they are not part of the surplus deficit calculation in this budget. Operational revenue also excludes allocation for debt-servicing costs, which are very important in determining surplus or deficit. At the end of the day, the Auditor General concludes that the 2013-2014 budget has been prepared on the same – if it was prepared as it was from last year's budget, the calculated deficit for this year should have been \$1.975 billion, which is \$1.524 billion more than the current projected value. So I really say: how can we trust these numbers and this system of accounting to accurately and adequately report financial information with these sorts of deliberate changes?

Why shouldn't Albertans have access to transparent information about the management of public funds that are owned, after all, by all of us? To get a clear picture of the province's financial man-

agement situation, it's necessary to be able to compare budgeted financial results with the actual financial results. It's also very important to be able to compare results year by year. The Auditor General's July 2013 report confirms that the changes the Tories made to accounting standards essentially makes these kinds of comparisons impossible to make.

The government must use Canadian public-sector accounting standards to prepare its financial statements but not its budget. In order to be able to get accurate budget-to-actual results and year-to-year comparisons, financial statements and budgets need to have the same accounting standards. Since the government has separated out the operational plan from the capital plan and used different formats in calculating and reporting those results, Budget 2013 cannot be accurately compared to budgets from other years.

The Auditor General has made several recommendations over the years to bring some consistency to the accounting standards and to include more sources of revenue and expenses to get a clearer picture of the true financial situation and to try to make better decisions on the budget. Instead, this government makes changes to its accounting and reporting formats that only actually make it harder to get real financial information out to the public. It allows this PC government to continue to hide mismanagement of public funds from all Albertans, and I find that, Mr. Speaker, very offensive.

Thank you.

The Speaker: Are there others? The hon. Member for Chestermere-Rocky View.

Mr. McAllister: Mr. Speaker, thank you. I, too, would like to get on the record and speak about Bill 35 for a few minutes. It's funny. You spend some time in here in the evening, and it feels like many of the points that are made are covered over and over again. That said, you know, I'm not sure there's a bigger topic around dinner tables regarding the provincial government and what it's doing effectively, what it isn't doing effectively, than Alberta's finances. The notion that we want to create different ways to borrow money is concerning. I don't think Alberta families necessarily believe that going back into debt and then piling on more debt is wise.

Now, the Finance minister often says – and I'll caution what I'm about to say. I agree with him in principle on what he says when he says that it makes more sense to save money at a higher interest rate and make money than it does to put that money down on debt. The problem is – and that would make sense if you had two pools of cash the same size and it wasn't ballooning – that when we're talking about compiling billions of dollars in debt, I don't think it makes sense for the argument to be, "Well, we're saving a little over here" when, in fact, the deficit is growing by leaps and bounds over here.

We have these discussions in our homes as well, I'm sure. Should we be paying down the debt in our homes, or should we be investing where we're getting a good rate of return? It does make more sense – doesn't it? – to get a rate of return of 8 per cent than it does to put down money on something you're paying 2 and a half per cent on, but that's not the case when you have a giant, ballooning deficit. Eventually, if it is the case that we're going to wind up with \$17 billion of debt by the end of this term, that is going to be an incredible amount of money that we're going to have to pay just in interest payments. Once you start that, it's impossible to stop. It's a trend that we've seen time and time again in governments around the world, and it hasn't been the Alberta way.

Now, I don't believe piling up debt is something that Albertans want to see, and I don't think that, sitting around with their families, they see it as wise because in families in Alberta we have to be appreciative of the difference between wants and needs. There is a giant difference between wants and needs. We can't have it all, and we can't have it all right now. Effectively, what I'm concerned this bill does is give the government more power to acquire, you know, more wants, in my view. Frankly, we have to be a little wiser about how we're investing.

Again, for the family reference, Mr. Speaker, you know full well that your kids would have you buy everything that they wanted, that you might want all the bells and whistles for yourself, but there are times when you have to say that the definition of happiness sometimes is being able to put off what you want now and realize that you can have it later. I think that in some ways we're closer than we realize here when we're discussing Alberta's finances, but we take the extreme sides of the argument on both sides of the equation. In reality, if we would just rein in some of that wasteful spending and stop piling up the debt, which this bill gives the government more ability to do, we would get even closer together.

With the surplus that was talked about during the provincial election campaign, I remember the province and certain officials saying that we'd be back in surplus within a few years. I remember debating at the time in my own riding with the candidate running, saying: you know, I can't recall a surplus in Alberta in the last four or five years, and now it's six deficits going on who knows how many, and it's not the belief that Albertans share about how we ought to be going forward. My concern is that it's a never-ending cycle, that by allowing us to borrow more, it becomes acceptable. We don't, frankly, in this energy resource province of Alberta, have to do this. I mean, \$17 billion in debt by 2016? If you would have said that, you know, five, six, seven years ago in Alberta, people would have laughed you out of the building or wherever you said it; it would be impossible for Albertans to do that.

I also want to touch base on, again, something that a lot of people in here have made reference to, and that is what the Auditor General had to say about the accounting practices and the changes to the way the Alberta government puts forth its finances in relation to this bill. Even the best accountants in his office, as he said, were having trouble with the numbers and deciphering what the real deficit was. If that's the word coming back from the Auditor General, then we need to take that quite seriously.

3:20

You know, I sat in a meeting this morning – actually, time is rolling; I think it might have been yesterday morning – with the Auditor General, and he was talking about some of the things in advanced education and not having a road map and asking for results. Well, the road map here is clear on this bill and what it provides. It provides an ability, again, for Albertans to have to pick up the tab for a government that doesn't seem to know, doesn't seem to appreciate that there's a difference between wants and needs.

I also remember the day that the budget was released and how it was reported in the media. You know, you could change the channel and every different network would have a different number as to what the deficit was. Well, that should be a great example of the confusion that you're at. If the media can't get the number straight, then clearly there are different interpretations, which is what this has done. [interjection] I hear the heckling on the media. I wouldn't do it, guys. It's never wise to do it. Just respect them. They have a job to do.

Every network had a different interpretation of what the numbers were, and that shouldn't be the way. That has never been the way in Alberta. Here's your deficit; here's your surplus. But when you change the numbers, you provide that. Effectively, you fudge the numbers that are available, and that was a frustration.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the federal government has just announced that it's going to be in surplus within a year. What a great model for us to follow, the federal government in this country and how they're running their finances. We used to lead the way in Alberta. My concern is that this bill does anything but lead the way. My concern is that it provides, again, the ability for Alberta to accept this government's need to spend, and frankly I'm disappointed in it. You know, I wanted to make those points today respectfully to the other side. I don't believe it's been the Alberta way, and I'm troubled at the direction we're going with Alberta's finances. I believe it's what Alberta families are talking about around their tables.

Thank you.

The Speaker: Hon. members, 29(2)(a) is available. The hon. President of Treasury Board.

Mr. Horner: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just as a point of clarification, do I have an opportunity to close debate on third reading?

The Speaker: Well, if there are no other speakers . . .

Mr. Horner: No. I'm not doing that now, because I do want to ask the hon. member a question.

The hon. member just made a comment about copying the federal government on their budgeting process and that they are the model we should follow. Did I hear that correctly, hon. member? That's the first question.

The second piece to that is: does he have an understanding of how much the federal government has to borrow every year – every year – to continue to balance their budget the way they do their accounting? That is how they balance their budget. Their operating potentially could be in surplus, but their revenue portion also includes borrowing. I was wondering if the hon. member was aware that that's how they do that.

The Speaker: The hon. member.

Mr. McAllister: Mr. Speaker, thank you. I appreciate the question from the Finance minister opposite. I will not stand here and pretend to tell him that I am wiser in the ways of the finances of Alberta or the province than he is, and that's why he is in the role he is. But I would say that when the federal government announces that it's going back to surplus, that is a good-news story for Canada and one that we should be proud of.

When the Alberta government announces that it's going \$17 billion into debt by 2016, that is a problem. That is the very thing that Albertans have an issue with, \$17 billion in debt. What kind of interest will we be paying on that as Albertans? How many schools might we build with the interest from that debt? These are the things that Alberta families are talking about. These are the concerns of Albertans. This is what we ought to be focusing on.

You know, I think we can learn, frankly, from other governments that do things well. We can learn from Saskatchewan when it's making strides. We should be looking all across the country. But it's interesting to know that all we seem to do is . . . [interjections] It's interesting to see how I appear to be pushing some buttons on the other side. Here's the reason why it's happening. There are two points on . . . [interjections]

The Speaker: Hon. members, we can't have seven conversations going on at once. This is 29(2)(a). It's a good chance to spark back and forth, but you've got to give each other a chance.

Please continue, Chestermere-Rocky View.

Mr. McAllister: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again, as I rise, I appreciate the question from the other side. I have appreciated the debate as we've been in here. [interjection] Really? I have appreciated as we've discussed Bill 35 and any bill.

You know, I find, frankly, that most times we take two points as far away as you can get, and we present those two sides. We'd all be wise to realize that somewhere in the middle is probably the solution to what we're talking about.

What I'm saying and saying to the Finance minister is: yes, we can learn from other governments, and we can learn from the steps they're taking, and if we're changing the way that we do things in Alberta, if we're changing how we put the numbers of our budget on a piece of paper to hide more debt, if we're confusing the Auditor General with that, if we're confusing the media with that, then we've got a problem. We're hoodwinking Alberta families. You can't hoodwink Albertans. They see what's going on.

This has become a province of debt, and that's not where we ought to go. So I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the Finance minister come back to where they used to be in Alberta, the Alberta way, recognize the difference between wants and needs, like Alberta families have to, so that we can go forward and become the Alberta that we always were and even better. The Alberta advantage is what it's about. We don't need to change the character of Albertans. We do need to change the character of what we're doing with government.

Thank you.

The Speaker: Standing Order 29(2)(a) is still available. One minute, 10 seconds.

Mr. Horner: You know what, Mr. Speaker? If anything of what he just said was true, I would agree with him. None of what he just said was true. In fact, when he talks about the federal government and balancing, the federal government borrows to cover operating deficits. The government of Alberta cannot and will not borrow to cover operating deficits, something that the opposition does not understand or simply doesn't want to admit to Albertans that they don't understand.

It's amazing to me that that hon. member can stand up there and say that we should be like the federal government and balance like the federal government. The debt the federal government has is not backed by assets for the most part, Mr. Speaker. All of the debt that we're talking about, which they talk about, is for the schools, the roads, the hospitals. We're being honest about how we're going to pay for them. Unfortunately, the Wildrose Alliance is not being honest about how they're going to pay for any of the infrastructure they've talked about. They won't tell Albertans how they're going to pay for it. They won't tell Albertans that they're going to cut \$5 billion out of the operating budget, which is health care, education, postsecondary, persons with disabilities. They should be honest.

The Speaker: Thank you, hon. members. Standing Order 29(2)(a) is now expired.

Are there other speakers for third reading on Bill 35?

Seeing none, are you ready for the question?

Calgary-Shaw, you were a bit late rising, but I saw you stand, so carry on.

Mr. Wilson: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the opportunity to address this. I do appreciate the dialogue back and forth. I believe that what we see in Bill 35 is a continuation of the departure of what the Alberta government has stood for for a very long time, which in this province has been to live debt free. This is a source of immense pride for many generations in this province. I think that what we're seeing is a complete abandonment of what used to be the principles of this government, which is also why what we've heard at this point is that in a leadership review that is coming up this weekend, 70 per cent is now, all of a sudden, a triumph because of some of the poor fiscal management that we've seen in this province.

There are countless examples of wasteful spending in this province, Mr. Speaker. I know the Finance minister likes to stand and say that we would cut all of this, that we don't have a list of what we wouldn't build. Well, the reality is that there are many things that we would not be doing in this province. We would not be spending \$375 million upgrading the federal building. We would not be putting a rooftop garden on top of the federal building. We would not be spending billions of dollars on carbon capture and storage. There is a very long list. Corporate welfare would be out. We would no longer be picking winners and losers in this province. Severance packages would be brought in line with what Albertans accept as generally reasonable.

There are a number of things that we could be doing differently, Mr. Speaker. Unfortunately, I think the saddest part of this for me is to sit here and listen to a party that at one point stood for the exact same principles around debt that we're standing for today.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I will sit down. Thank you.

3:30

The Speaker: Hon. members, 29(2)(a) is available. The President of the Treasury Board, and then Edmonton-Calder, I believe.

Mr. Horner: Well, Mr. Speaker, it's fabulous to me that they have learned how to try to save \$375 million about 10 times already today. They keep referring to the fact that they can pay for \$5 billion worth of infrastructure by not renovating the federal building. They say: well, we could find \$5 billion worth of management reductions. You could fire every GOA employee in the government today and you'd save \$3 billion. Of course, I don't expect them to know that, because they probably haven't read the budget. But \$3 billion: that's the first year. What do they do the next year for their next \$5 billion? They're not being honest with Albertans when they talk about that.

The other thing they said: many generations of being debt free. Mr. Speaker, in the '80s this province had a huge problem. We were paying for our groceries with our credit card. We paid that debt off. We are not paying for groceries with our credit card today and are not going to be doing it in the future. In fact, the financial management act makes it illegal for us to do so.

The hon. member's office should actually be a little more truthful with their constituents when they talk about the debt piece. The debt is the assets that we're building, just like you would do in your home, just like you would do in your business. It's unfortunate that many of them don't understand that business piece, and I appreciate that. I've been trying to educate them on it. Hopefully, one of these days soon they're going to get it.

He talks about poor fiscal management, yet we have the best financial situation of any jurisdiction in North America, possibly the western hemisphere, and I don't have to be the one to say that, Mr. Speaker. All of the credit rating agencies say that, the Chambers of Commerce say that, and, in fact, the federal government says that. To try to scare Albertans and put fear in

Albertans that our financial situation is somehow terrible is simply reprehensible.

The Speaker: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Calder, followed by Calgary-Shaw. [interjection] Hon. Member for Calgary-Shaw, I've recognized the hon. Member for Edmonton-Calder. I don't think there was a question there to you, but I'm going to comment on this in a moment about process.

Do we have any time left? We have three minutes left, so if you could be brief.

Mr. Eggen: Okay. Thanks, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to clarify a couple of things. The hon. member is bringing up some very good points here. I wanted to ask if he realized that expenses under the operating budget according to this Finance minister: well, they moved those over to the capital plan. So, in fact, those are not government-owned assets, right? They are, in fact, expenses, right? They've simply done this voodoo economics sort of thing, moving one expense to another and then claiming it back as an asset, right? So I just wanted to know if you knew that, because I think most Albertans don't understand that either. But as we learn about it, we realize that this minister is doing nothing but voodoo economics, playing with the obvious thing he needs to do. That is to raise the revenues to pay for the essential services that we need in this province.

We have royalties that are forgone in the billions of dollars. We have corporate taxes that are forgone in the billions of dollars as well. I think it's a crime that this government has let that money slip through our fingers for so long that now, suddenly, in the middle of an economic growth period, a population growth period, we talk about cutting, and you talk about how there's some fake austerity thing going on. I find it insulting, and I think most Albertans do, too. They can see with their own two eyes that their community is growing. They can see that there's very high employment and that the economy is expanding. So why on earth should we be making cuts to essential services such as education and health care? Why?

The Speaker: Hon. Member for Calgary-Shaw, a question has now been posed to you, and I would invite you to answer.

Mr. Wilson: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, I appreciate the comments from the hon. Member for Edmonton-Calder. Before I address some of his comments and questions, I would like to address some of the issues that the Finance minister brought up, starting with how we're not being honest with Albertans. I think that it's quite – and I will use this word, and I'm well aware of the potential ramifications – hypocritical of the Finance minister to stand in this House and tell us that we're not being honest with Albertans. Find me one PC MLA who knocked on one door and said that this government, if re-elected, is going to go back into debt. There isn't one. There is not one of them. I would also like to say, Mr. Speaker, that . . .

Mr. Horner: I did. I did.

Mr. Wilson: You did?

Mr. Horner: I said that we'd borrow for capital, absolutely.

Mr. Wilson: Well, there you go. That's not what your Premier said.

About us talking about \$375 million over and over, Mr. Speaker, it's oddly reminiscent of how we have school announcements. Nineteen schools were being announced in May. They

were announced again yesterday, but they're the same schools. So maybe this is how they're going to build 120 schools.

Mr. McAllister: Not one shovel.

Mr. Wilson: Yeah. Not one shovel in the ground other than to put up a sign to make sure that people know that eventually there's going to be a school there. When that happens we're not quite sure yet.

I agree with the hon. Member for Edmonton-Calder. This is some voodoo economics. It's why the Auditor General did suggest that even some of his finest accountants did not have the ability to . . .

The Speaker: Thank you.

Hon. members, the Member for Lac La Biche-St. Paul-Two Hills has stood for a point of clarification, and I'm going to hear it in a moment, but I had already made a note about the mechanics of 29(2)(a). If it's something different – is it on that?

Mr. Saskiw: Mr. Speaker, I think you've anticipated my question. I know it's not in the standing orders, but on 29(2)(a) I think the procedure is that it's been back and forth. Regardless of if the other member doesn't know that it's actually supposed to be a question and not just rants and raves, it still should be back and forth. Thank you.

The Speaker: I respect that, hon. member.

Speaker's Ruling Question-and-comment Period

The Speaker: I just wanted to clarify this and put it on the growing list of items for the House leaders to talk about, the physical mechanics of 29(2)(a). Here is my grinding point on this. Standing Order 29(2)(a), when it was designed – and I had a hand in that a few years back – was designed to encourage a little more back and forth between members, a member who had just spoken who might have had something that provoked another member to ask a question for clarification about something that was intended and so on. It wasn't intended to be a time – five minutes set aside, I should say – where one person stood up and consumed all five minutes, nor was it designed so that a member could continue their speech. You know, we've seen that, but there is no real physical evidence to support anything mechanical that way.

After the Minister of Finance stood up, the first member that was up was Edmonton-Calder, so I recognized him because 29(2)(a) simply says:

Subject to clause (b), following each speech on the items in debate referred to in suborder (1), a period not exceeding 5 minutes shall be made available, if required, to allow Members to ask questions and comment briefly on matters relevant to the speech and to allow responses to each Member's questions and comments.

In the case of the President of Treasury Board, I'm not sure that I picked up a definitive question. I could review *Hansard* and see. But I know that Edmonton-Calder did ask a specific question, and then Calgary-Shaw was up next.

I'll curtail the comments there but ask the Government House Leader to please meet with other House leaders of the opposition and iron out this little mechanical thing because 29(2)(a) in its real, solid purpose and spirit is a good thing for us to have in this House. It creates a little bit more liveliness, and you get answers right away to questions or comments, generally speaking.

Let us move on, then. Are there other speakers to Bill 35? The hon. Member for Lac La Biche-St. Paul-Two Hills.

Debate Continued

Mr. Saskiw: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am honoured to be here today to rise and speak to Bill 35. Of course, what this bill is aimed at is fixing some of the legal issues, technical issues that have plagued certain aspects in different areas, but I think the main purpose, at least from the Finance minister's perspective, is to find more ways to borrow money. It's kind of funny that the Finance minister said that during the election– he had said: I always said that I was going to borrow money for capital. It's interesting. If you actually listen to what the Premier had said during the election, and I will quote, we are a party of fiscal discipline. We are not a party of deficit – oh? – it's entirely possible for us to continue to provide the quality of life that we as Albertans have without going into debt, and I am committed to that. It's really interesting, especially given what's happening tomorrow, that the Finance minister is being completely contrary to what his own Premier has said.

I'll also quote what the Premier said during the election: "We have all heard of the crises in Europe. Debt is the trap that has caught so many struggling governments. Debt has proven the [end] of countless dreams." Debt has proven the end of countless dreams. Now, the new phrase is "debt is hope." Let's get that straight. Debt is the end of countless dreams. Now, after the election, it's: debt is hope. Completely contradictory, and this is something that we're very alarmed about. When you make such blatant contradictions and you break your promises, no one can believe what you are saying. No one can believe what the Premier says when she makes future promises because she's broken them.

3:40

This is fundamental, Mr. Speaker, to the differences in our party. Our party is a party of fiscal discipline. That used to be a principle within the PC Party. That's why a lot of us left the PC Party; we saw that the party had drifted in its values and principles. What was the biggest movement there was with the election of the current Premier. She just no longer represented the values of small "c" conservatives in this province. I think it's pretty self-evident that she's lost those individuals. In the last election, I believe, it was 34 per cent of them.

You know, a lot of us had many friends in the PC Party. It was a tough decision to leave there, but now with what we've seen and given the result under this Premier where the plan is to incur \$17 billion in debt, many of us are glad about the decision we made and proud that we joined another party and another caucus, to ensure that we are the party that is going to balance the budgets. We're the party that's going to look at cost efficiencies to make sure that we respect taxpayer dollars.

It's interesting here, Mr. Speaker. In the Assembly we often see, you know, the NDP talking about raising royalties. We see the Liberals talk about raising taxes. Now the PC Party is talking about borrowing money and going into debt. We are the only party, the Wildrose, to advocate for balanced budgets and not going into debt.

If the hon. members wanted to have some other examples of how to save money, one would be, for example, the former CFO of Alberta Health Services, that I often refer to when I talk to my constituents and in town halls. Here's an individual that was able to expense \$500,000 for fixing his Mercedes, for fancy dinners, for butler service. In this province under this government, this Premier, it's entirely legal – entirely legal – so he doesn't even have to pay it back. When you look at the contract, it's not only that; he got a

million dollar severance plus \$10,000 a month for 10 years. Talking to average Albertans, when they hear these types of numbers, it's just astonishing. Who writes these contracts? Well, Mr. Speaker, it's this government.

That's one area I hope the hon. Finance minister would look into and actually is, in fact, the subject matter of an upcoming private member's bill, to ensure that these types of severances just aren't out there. We saw the former chief of staff here: \$130,000 for six months. Can you honestly go to your constituents and look them in the eye and say: yeah, people should get a month's severance for every month they worked? I don't think that's the case, Mr. Speaker.

An Hon. Member: That wasn't even reported. It could be more.

Mr. Saskiw: It could be more. We don't know yet because, of course, they're fighting the FOIP until after Friday.

Mr. Speaker, we also saw a reconfiguration of Alberta Health Services, where they got rid of five VPs. Guess what the severances were: \$2.1 million for five VPs. You know, average Albertans look at that, and they just cannot – it's very difficult to understand how that type of money is just being dished out here, there, and everywhere. But we're starting to connect the dots. We'll connect the dots even more so after Friday.

So, Mr. Speaker, we hope that the hon. Finance minister would heed the advice of the Premier prior to the election, that debt is the end – sorry; debt has proven the death of countless dreams.

An Hon. Member: One more time.

Mr. Saskiw: Yeah. I've got to try that again. Debt has proven the death of countless dreams, you know, versus debt is hope. Right? I think you guys should go back to this principle, but I don't think that this Premier, that she can do it. She has lasered in on where she wants to go: debt is hope; debt is infrastructure. Mr. Speaker, I hope that the hon. Finance minister does not follow suit here. He knows better. He knows that's not the core of the PC caucus. I think that on this side we're going to keep pushing for balanced budgets and respectful spending. Please, please. I hope that the Finance minister does not burden future generations with even more debt; \$17 billion is enough. Don't keep going and digging lower.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: The hon. President of Treasury Board. We'll see how that goes, and then we'll go to Calgary-Mountain View. This is 29(2)(a). My apologies.

Mr. Horner: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Although 29(2)(a) does say "and comments," I do have a question for the hon. member. It has to do with his colleague talking about the federal government's way of balancing. Knowing that he has a fairly good understanding of policy and, I'm assuming, a good understanding of the financial background of the federal government, would he be agreeable, then, that the province of Alberta use the same format and methodology to declare a balanced budget as the federal government will in 2015-16?

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

Mr. Saskiw: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The hon. Finance minister knows that he's comparing apples to oranges. Here in Alberta we have had record revenue over the last five years. Record revenue.

Despite record revenue in this province, the highest it's ever been, deficit after deficit after deficit. The new word in this province is Deficit Doug. We have to stop that.

In this province our economy is hot. Come to my constituency. I'd like to invite the Finance minister to come to my constituency and see how great the economy is doing there. It's doing great. But despite the economy booming, despite record resource revenue, what is this government doing? It's plunging us back into debt. Albertans can't understand that. How on earth, when the revenues are the highest they've ever been, are you still running deficits? Why?

Mr. Speaker, we do applaud careful spending, and we do support getting back to balanced budgets. If that's the question that this Finance minister has asked – should we go back to balanced budgets? – my answer is yes. [interjections]

The Speaker: The hon. Member for Calgary-Mountain View under 29(2)(a).

Let's keep the side conversations down and the chatter across the bow down.

You have been recognized. Please continue, Member.

Dr. Swann: Well, if this is 29(2)(a), I'll ask the hon. member to comment on his perception of why he thinks P3s are an inappropriate vehicle for building and how they can hide, in fact, the financial situation of the government at the long-term expense of Albertans.

The Speaker: The hon. member.

Mr. Saskiw: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I thank the hon. member for his question. It's interesting here with respect to P3s whether or not the Finance minister plans on reporting the debt that's incorporated into those agreements. I'm not one hundred per cent certain if the \$17 billion of debt that they plan to incur includes the debt that's included in the P3s. I'd be very interested to see if the Finance minister knows the total amount of liability that exists under the P3s. Unfortunately, at this stage I'm not sure what the exact number is.

What we do know is that by 2016, I believe, before the flood even took place, there was a projected \$17 billion of debt. How far this party has gone. All the work, all the hard work, all the sacrifice, all the pain that took place to get us out of debt, and then just within a few years this Premier is plunging us right back there. All those individuals that worked day and night to get us out of debt, and she's plunged us right back despite record resource revenues in this province.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Are there others under 29(2)(a)?

Mr. Horner: Well, I'm going to try one more time, Mr. Speaker. Is the hon. member suggesting that the federal government is lying when they say that they will be balanced in the format that they are going to balance?

The Speaker: The hon. member.

Mr. Saskiw: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Quite frankly, in this regard, for the hon. Finance minister to suggest that anyone is suggesting the federal government is lying is quite incredible here.

What we are saying, though, is that we support going back to balanced budgets just like other provinces have. If you look at Saskatchewan and you look at Newfoundland, they're already

balancing their budgets and are even set to run surpluses. Instead, in this province we're going to have another deficit. I hope the Finance minister stops that trend because that name that he's getting out there in this province is going to catch hold if he runs deficit after deficit after deficit after deficit. The alliteration is just perfect.

You know, I'd suggest that he follow the idea and the principle of going back to balanced budgets and going back to surpluses instead of going back into debt. Maybe with a change of leadership that might happen.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

3:50

Mr. Horner: Well, I'm going to try a different tack, then, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member talks about the balanced budget in the Saskatchewan government. They've announced 18 P3 schools, yet they're still going to be balanced. I'm curious. Does the hon. member believe that the federal government and the Saskatchewan government are not balancing their books?

Speaker's Ruling Parliamentary Language

The Speaker: Hon. members, before I recognize the next speaker, I want to make two comments.

Please, Calgary-Mountain View, have a chair for a moment, if you would.

You know, the word "lying" is one of those words, depending on how it's delivered, that could give rise to disorder. So I would just ask in this case the President of Treasury Board to be careful about the usage of that because there's an inference there that somebody in the Ottawa government might be lying. There's an inference that this member who just spoke, from Lac La Biche-St Paul-Two Hills, might be lying. You know, it's just not a good word. I'm sure that you know exactly what I mean, so let that admonishment stand.

The second comment is to revert briefly, if we could, to Introduction of Visitors. Does anybody object to that unanimous consent?

[Unanimous consent granted]

Introduction of Visitors (reversion)

The Speaker: Calgary-Fort, you have a brief introduction?

Mr. Cao: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you, hon. members. I would like to introduce to you and to Members of the Legislative Assembly His Excellency Komgrit Varakamin, consul general of Thailand to Alberta. The consul general is bidding farewell and visiting our leadership in government here on his way to appointment as ambassador to Romania and Bulgaria in Europe. I wish for all of us to give him a great welcome and congratulations on his new appointment.

The Speaker: The hon. consul general is just walking in the door, and he has just been introduced. He is accompanied by another gentleman.

Mr. Cao: Also with the consul general ambassador appointee is our honorary consul general of Thailand, Dennis Anderson. You are familiar with Mr. Anderson in Edmonton here. Once again may I ask all of us to give a big applause to our ambassador-to-be.

The Speaker: Thank you and welcome. Mr. Anderson is, of course, a former member of this Assembly. So, Mr. Varakamin, you are in good hands.

Let us move on. Calgary-Mountain View.

Government Bills and Orders Third Reading

Bill 35

Financial Administration Amendment Act, 2013

(continued)

Dr. Swann: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Well, not being a high finance guy, I don't have a lot to add to the debate around P3s. But I did get a really credible letter from a man who's been involved in corporate finance for 40 years. I thought his comments were so salient. I didn't get his permission to use his name, so I won't use his name, but I'll give you the fundamentals of why P3s are such a dangerous decision to make for government. He gives three reasons why we should not be going into major investments through P3s after 40 years of being involved in financial dealings in the city of Calgary.

In the first instance, he says, the cost of capital P3 financing is higher than conventional bond issuance by the government and likely considerably higher for two reasons. P3 financing in most instances includes an equity component which requires a much higher return than does debt, perhaps in a 10 per cent range compared to the 2 to 3 per cent range for the province of Alberta bond issuance. Additionally, the cost of the P3 debt financing will be higher than province of Alberta bonds by perhaps 1 to 2 per cent. Finally, the legal costs and bank advisory and placement fees will be considerably higher for a P3 financing, though the Crown seems to have done enough P3 deals that maybe it has a better template for those contractual agreements. Overall, if we make the reasonable assumption that the cost of capital for P3s is 2 per cent, very conservatively higher, which is likely the low side, the incremental cost of a billion dollar infrastructure project is \$20 million per annum, or \$600 million over a 30-year period.

The second important negative of P3 financing is that it disguises the financial condition of the province. We've heard about this repeatedly, the debt inequity servicing obligations associated with P3 financing, an obligation of the Crown no different in substance from the obligations arriving from a direct issuance of bonds, but because they are, from an accounting perspective, liabilities of the P3 entity, they do not appear on the Crown's balance sheets. So it becomes much less transparent for Albertans, notwithstanding the fact that we as a public don't even get to see the contractual agreement between P3s and what it's going to leave not only to our debt servicing but to future generations.

The argument in support of P3s is often made that the private sector is more efficient than the public sector. This does not hold up. With respect to project execution both P3 entities and the Crown must go to the same contractors to seek bids for engineering, procurement, and construction. These contractors are fully aware that the Crown is the ultimate obligor behind the P3, so why should it conduct itself more efficiently contracting to a P3 than contracting directly to the Crown? Depending on the structure of the contract, its returns of and on capital from the Crown there may even be an incentive for a P3 entity to be less rigorous in cost control than they would be for the Crown managing the contractor directly.

With respect to operations of the P3 a similar argument applies. For infrastructure with which the province does not have direct operational experience, it will have to contract with an external

operator as well with requisite expertise to the extent it finances the infrastructure on its own balance sheet. In the case of a P3 either the P3 operates pursuant to a contract with the Crown, or it engages in its own external operators. Again, why should the same contractors be more efficient when the contractual relationship with the province is indirect, through a P3, than they would if the relationship was direct?

In summary, P3 financing is almost certainly materially more expensive and is certainly less transparent. There's been a lot of work done by regulators of financial institutions globally to increase transparency. What sense does it make for a province to be going in the opposite direction at high rates of speed? That's an important statement from somebody who has 40 years of experience in capitalizing and financing projects in Alberta, no particular political affiliation, just commenting as a citizen of Alberta and very concerned that this government doesn't seem to get the uncertainty and the true debt that these P3s actually represent in terms of not only our generation but next generations.

Quite apart from all of this, there is a political, I guess, perception and a political opportunism here that reflects an ability or a perceived ability for government to go for years mismanaging our finances and then dump that onto the private sector and these P3 contracts to make it look like we're really serving the needs of Alberta citizens, getting the short-term bang for our political buck, giving the impression to Albertans that we are delivering when, in fact, we are delivering debt and delivering liability to future generations.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Hon. members, 29(2)(a) is available. The hon. associate minister.

Mr. Fawcett: Yeah. I appreciate the comments from the hon. member. I think he's trying to make a very rational and sound argument in front of the Legislature here. But I would like to ask him a question – he is a member that has long preached that we shouldn't think in ideological terms – on whether he thinks that we should actually do analysis on how we fund infrastructure projects. You know, that might be right. There are certain projects where P3s do not financially make sense. There might be certain times over the course of our history as a province, you know, interest rates and that sort of thing, where debt financing does make sense rather than using the cash assets that you might have available. There may be times where it makes perfect sense to pay the cash on hand to finance capital projects.

The point that I'm trying to make is that I'm wondering, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member doesn't agree that the government should get off the ideological, "No, you have to do it this certain way all the time," or whether the government should allow itself the financial mechanisms to go on a project-by-project basis to do the analysis as to what is the best financial tool for that particular project at that particular time to deliver that project for when it's needed at that time. I'm just wondering if that's not what the hon. member thinks would be a very appropriate approach by government.

4:00

Dr. Swann: Well, thank you for that question. Mr. Speaker, I guess a couple of things come to mind with respect to flexibility and financing. Number one is: does the particular government of the day have the trust of people that they're going to use responsible criteria for making these decisions, and are they actually going to examine each P3 in the context of the current financial situation? That seems to be lacking, I would argue, in

this particular government, where we've had record incomes and we're now dealing with a deficit and a government that simply doesn't have any other choices, unfortunately, because they have mismanaged our finances and because they haven't brought in a fair taxation system, a fair return on our resources. We're left in a position where you don't actually have any choice, do you? P3s are really the only option you have. Bonds don't make sense at some level, so you're stuck.

That's part of the reason why I guess we have to default to a decision on P3s that will not only be nontransparent with respect to the individual contract – so we can't judge whether it was a useful decision or not – but it will be nontransparent in their financial statements because it won't be listed as debt, and it will be a potential and unpredictable, I would say, future liability for our children.

The Speaker: Anyone else under 29(2)(a)? The hon. Member for Edmonton-Calder.

Mr. Eggen: Thanks, Mr. Speaker. I find this an interesting topic to pursue further in regard to Bill 35, and I have sort of a two-part question. First of all, the P3 model and the contracts that have been put out recently have been having a hard time finding people to actually pick up and bid on these contracts. It seems to me that if there is an advantage to P3s, you would have multiple bids, and you could pick something that is the most efficient for the public interest. If the market for picking up P3 contracts is not being assumed by different private contractors, then, you know, is it maybe not really working, at least during that market condition?

Further to that, the second part of my question. You know, certainly we need to look at things as to the most efficient way by which we can spend public monies, right? That's the bottom line, that I think we all agree on here. If you are entering into a P3 contractual arrangement and if that P3 contractor is not assuming significant risk, then I wonder if that's really the wisest choice to make. I learned that from the person who runs our AIMCo – right? – one of the largest portfolios that you'd see across this country. Dr. de Bever told us that. I took that to heart, certainly. He said, you know, that if we're not giving significant risk, if there's not significant risk being assumed by the P3 contractor, then what's the point of having that contract in the first place?

Thank you.

Dr. Swann: Thank you for the questions. To the first one: I think it relates to our previous dialogue across the floor here. If there aren't sufficient . . .

The Speaker: Hon. member, I'm sorry to interrupt, but the time for 29(2)(a) has concluded.

Let us move on, then, to the hon. Member for Rimbey-Rocky Mountain House-Sundre.

Mr. Anglin: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm going to actually support this bill. I haven't even consulted with the rest of my members, and I know they have a lot of concerns dealing with a number of issues, particularly around finance.

Now, the beauty of finance and the beauty of talking about budget and finances: nothing raises the temperature more in this Assembly than talking about money. It's probably true dealing with nonprofit organizations and voluntary organizations. It's a cultural icon of our day.

I do want to say that I'm not going to repeat all the differences that have been pointed out earlier, but one thing is absolutely sure. There are differences, and we are now showing that divide between the various parties on how we view managing finances.

Regardless of the debate here the real debate will take place in the public forum, when the public makes their determination, because they didn't get to do that in the last election. They didn't know this was coming down the road. This wasn't told to the public. [interjection] Now, the Member for Edmonton-Gold Bar can giggle, but it's just not true.

I think something that distinguishes us from the party in power right at the moment is a statement from Edmonton-Gold Bar that he made to me at a dinner function one night. He said that he wished he'd never heard of the Alberta advantage, and I think that is just iconic of what separates us as parties today.

Some Hon. Members: Shame.

Mr. Anglin: It was absolutely a shame – I would agree – because the Alberta advantage was one of these slogans that made a lot of Albertans extremely proud. I don't think there was a prouder moment dealing with finances than when Ralph Klein held up that sign that said: out of debt. I think all Albertans felt better when he held up that sign. Whether you agreed with it or not, it was a moment in our history dealing with finances.

I will tell you this on this amendment act. We would not have to have this amendment act had the government listened to us when we passed the first bill. Clearly, in dealing with the Financial Administration Amendment Act, we've been down this road, and we've gotten to debate it twice now within a year's time, and we're still dealing with the same thing.

I just want to point out a couple of very, very basic examples of what separates us. We talk about spending, and we talk about wasteful spending, and I'm going to share with this Assembly an instance of what I think is just extremely wasteful spending. Around the community of Bentley in my constituency the Minister of Transportation is building a bypass. Now the project is cancelled. Now, there's nothing wrong with prioritizing. We want this government to prioritize. We really do sincerely ask that this government prioritize for the basic management of finances. But what they did is that they spent \$3 million, plus or minus – and I will stand corrected if the hon. member wants to throw out the exact figures – but we didn't cap that. What we did is that we bulldozed it all up, cancelled the project, spent \$3 million, and then walked away from it. Now, when that project takes off again – and it's not on a priority list anywhere right now, so we don't know where it stands – they will have to start all over again to build the base of that road, and that's a shame. That's just wasteful spending. There's \$3 million right there.

That's not the only example, but I'm just pointing out the one example that is just looking everybody in the community of Bentley right in the eye. What they've seen is the runoff going into the river, the Blindman River, which affects another department, the ministry of environment. We don't generally allow this type of thing. They see this mismanagement from the finance side to the environmental side, and this bill, this amendment bill, is all about the management our finances.

We get to go out to the public and we get to discuss this going into the next election: "Is this debt, or is this not debt? Is this wise, or is this not wise?" I have to tell you that conservative Albertans know what debt is. We don't need to play the word games. We don't need to deal with this issue of debt is hope, as the Premier has maybe misstepped and mentioned, the correlation between hope and debt. I mean, these are things that resonate, but the reality is: how are we going to manage our finances wisely? How are we going to manage these finances prudently? What we're seeing here now is bill after bill to try to correct some of the things. Well, this amendment act is trying to correct what went

wrong on the first bill that they passed. They missed some loopholes. It gives you an indication of how fast they put that through.

Now, I would argue that the reason there were some minor mistakes – and the ministry staff even said so. They called it housekeeping, and I agree. It does close some loopholes, and there are a couple of significant ones it does close, and that's good. The staff said that it's going to close some legal loopholes which have not yet become a problem, so that's thinking ahead a little bit. But what they did is that they did change the way we budgeted. They changed the format of the budget. That confused, as you heard earlier, a number of people, not just in the press but other accountants. So we had a divide.

4:10

You know, there's an old adage that the idea of accounting is the complication of the simple. The simple is the money in, the money out. Everything else in between in accounting can get very, very complicated, but it's real easy, even for the average person, to understand, particularly the small proprietor. They understand the very basics of it. Yes, it does get very complicated when you get into a large industry or you've been dealing with the government, but it never leaves the simplicity. It is about the revenue in and the money that's being spent. What do you get for that money? The value that you get for the money: that's the key.

What we see is that without a prioritization list it reflects poorly on the management of the finances. Now, the government may have one, but we just don't know it. We don't see it. We'd like to see it. We've asked for it numerous times, but we haven't seen it. We'd like to have accountability, but we see less and less accountability. This amendment act, although it closes some loopholes, doesn't really address any issues of accountability. They're not there.

We actually discussed this on another bill just last night, where we talked about having access to the financial reports. It was an interesting debate, but there's a constant debate now in this House on access to reports. Without any access to the correct information consistently, accountability breaks down, and it starts to reflect poorly. Whether it's reality or perception, it doesn't matter. It reflects poorly in the public.

We're passing a bill because, in my view, we rushed to judgment very quickly to change the way we were budgeting, to change the way we're going to manage the finances, which we did. Now we have a new budgeting system. Right or wrong, that's what we have, and that's what we're going to live by. We'll see how it pans out when we see the results, but already we're starting to see situations where we're not allowed to see results, and that's unfortunate.

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of small issues that are indicative of what's happening here. That road example was one. I mean, this is about managing our finances. That's what this amending act is doing. The sign issue that we have raised for a number of days now in question period: we can't even get an answer on who authorized these signs. We've tried three days in a row, I think. We still can't get an answer as to who authorized the signs.

Mr. Dorward: Who authorized yours?

Mr. Anglin: We don't get that. We get a little heckling from Edmonton-Gold Bar, but we don't get an answer. We would rather just have the answer. But that's okay. Maybe someday he'll come over to our side when he would like to go back to the Alberta advantage.

Where we are today is the expense of these signs in relation to what is more important. Again, this goes to the management of finances. This speaks to the credibility of finances. Which is more important: putting up, you know, hundreds of thousands of dollars' worth of signs or spending it on something more prudent? How we manage these finances is what all these series of acts were about, and now we're here today to correct probably the speed at which we went through the process early in the year. I can see no other explanation why. I understand we have to correct it, and we should.

I will support the bill, I will support the minister in correcting the bill, but I will not support this government in its interpretation of its new budgeting system or how it's currently managing the finances. I don't think Albertans want to go down that road. They say that Albertans do want to go down that road. That's fine, but we'll get to decide that in the next election. This time there won't be just one member on that side that said that they knocked on doors and said this although I'll take him at his word. Good enough. I know there are a lot of others that never did, and I can pretty much say that safely. But this time the public will know, and then we get to decide. So be it if that's what the public wants, but I don't think they will. That's why there are 17 of us on this side of the House today.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Standing Order 29(2)(a) is available, hon. members.

Seeing none, are there any other speakers?

If not, let me recognize the hon. President of Treasury Board to close debate.

Mr. Horner: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I believe I have five minutes for closing.

Edmonton-Calder was, I think, the first one up this afternoon, and he talked about the confusion with the budget, that we weren't showing the old way of calculating the deficit. As the Auditor General and I had a conversation at that time, the old way was basically the change in the net financial position of the province, which is found in the balance sheet on the consolidated financial statements. I think he mentioned – and I would have to check *Hansard* – that we're not doing consolidated financial statements anymore. That's not true, hon. member. We're required to do consolidated financial statements by the acts that we have in the House, and we have a consolidated financial statement that does show the change in net financial assets, which was the amount that the Auditor General talked about.

What we did, Mr. Speaker, was change the way we present the budget, which is the purview of the government, not the Auditor General. We changed the way we do the budget to better reflect the way you do it at your home, your business, and generally what other provinces are doing.

The hon. members opposite were talking about: well, you know, the federal government is going to balance their budget, and I guess they're not in debt. Well, they are in debt, Mr. Speaker. They're in debt for different reasons even than what we are. They're borrowing to cover operating deficits. We are not borrowing to cover operating deficits. I think the hon. members should be very clear about that when they are talking about it.

The other thing. During parts of the debate, Mr. Speaker, there was a lot made about the Auditor General's apparent confusion over financial statements, that there are some statements that he made to some media during the time we presented the budget. I think it's time that the hon. members kind of got up to date. I have in my hands the report of the Auditor General of Alberta for

October 2013. I would encourage them to look at page 6, the financial statement auditing of the government of Alberta. I've read this into the *Hansard* before, but I'm going to do it again because perhaps some of the members opposite didn't hear it last time. On page 6:

The fact that none of our auditor's reports on financial statements contained a reservation of opinion means that Albertans can be sure they are receiving high quality information from the government on the province's actual financial performance.

That's what the Auditor General actually thinks in his report. To suggest otherwise, that the Auditor General has some confusion over our audited financial statements or that he has any reservations at all, would not be speaking the truth, Mr. Speaker.

The other piece that I would draw your attention to is that the Wildrose Alliance talks about the fact that this bill perhaps gives us more power, that we've got wasteful spending, and that we're going to borrow more. The debt ceiling that we instituted in the Fiscal Management Act is still the same debt ceiling. Bill 35 does nothing – does nothing – to encourage or discourage borrowing. What it does is actually provide better controls over that borrowing of provincial Crown corporations. It also provides a better and a more opportune time for us to be able to manage the notes and other instruments of finance that they do.

The Wildrose Alliance also talked about that they are the party of fiscal discipline. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that they are the party of a money-in-the-mattress financial mentality, which is basically how they're doing their finances in terms of their budget. Well, I haven't seen their budget because every time I hear about how they would do things, I look. I try to find: where is their budget that shows their balance sheet, their cash flow, their revenues and the expenditures that they would have? I can't find it.

I do find some very glossy, nice documents like A Better Way to Build Alberta: Wildrose green, Wildrose propaganda paid for by the taxpayers, I surmise. I'm not sure. I'm sure that the hon. members opposite could tell me whether or not the taxpayers of Alberta paid for some very glossy pictures of some leadership candidates that perhaps are looking off into the distance in typical, you know, Alberta pictures. There are no financials in this document at all, Mr. Speaker. There is no way of financing the supposed infrastructure of which they have a list somewhere that they're not putting out anywhere. There's no list of assets or infrastructure that they're going to build in this supposed capital plan that they have.

Then they talk about \$50 billion, that they wouldn't use Bill 35, that they wouldn't need it because they're not going to borrow money to build infrastructure. Oh, so they're not going to borrow money when interest rates are the lowest they've been in my lifetime. Most businesses, most jurisdictions are taking advantage of these low rates because the cost of not building is about 5 per cent per year, so you're actually ahead of the game from an inflationary perspective alone by doing this. The financial sense of this is recognized across the spectrum of financial advisers, across the spectrum of businesspeople. Unfortunately, if you have a money-in-the-mattress mentality about how you do your books, you're not going to appreciate that. So they're not going to borrow. I get that.

4:20

They're not going to use P3s either. P3s have saved this government and the taxpayers of Alberta over \$2 billion on the projects that we have done. The hon. Member for Calgary-Mountain View was talking about an individual that he got a letter from that says that we don't account for the appropriate liability. That's simply

not true, Mr. Speaker. We do account for the liability. It's the risk that you transferred to the proponent that saves the taxpayer a lot of money. The other hon. member, I think Edmonton-Calder, talked about Dr. Leo de Bever and his ideas around P3s. I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that he is a recognized expert in financial circles, and he knows of what he speaks, and he is a proponent of P3s.

Mr. Speaker, the other part of what they won't do, I guess, is that they won't use cash to build capital. They're criticizing us for using the sustainability account to build capital. Well, that's using cash. So if you won't use cash and you won't use P3s and you won't use the capital markets, I have no idea how they're going to wave a magic wand and build capital. Somebody has got to pay for it. It has to come out of the operating expenditures, probably, but that's cash.

Let's just assume that they'd take the cash approach that they're talking about doing: \$5 billion a year. Mr. Speaker, so far in all of the comments – all of the comments – from the members opposite that they have made today, I've added up: the federal building, if we didn't do that; the severance packages, if we didn't do that; somebody mentioned the carbon capture and storage. Well, that's stretched out over a long period of time, and you can only use one year's worth, so that's about maybe a hundred million dollars. If you added all that up, it's about \$750 million. Where are they going to get the other \$4.3 billion every year out of the operating?

Mr. Saskiw: Probably from Lukaszuk's office.

Mr. Horner: They're probably going to take out – well, there's another \$10,000, hon. member. If you keep at it, you might get to \$800 million.

Even with that, Mr. Speaker, at \$4 billion, somewhere down the line they are going to have to come clean with Albertans and tell them how they intend to pay for all this capital that they say they can do without using the markets, without using P3s, and, by the way, without using cash because that's the sustainability account approach. I'm curious about that.

When we talk about Bill 35, we talk about what we're doing to actually build Alberta and create the infrastructure that Albertans of today need and Albertans of tomorrow. Mr. Speaker, the last thing I want to leave my grandkids is not the infrastructure that we didn't build today. I don't want to leave them the opportunity that they can pay 10 times what it would cost us to build it today, and we need it today. The infrastructure deficit and the cost of that infrastructure deficit are widely recognized and well known. It's unfortunate that the members opposite don't get that.

I think Albertans are well served by the capital plan we have, they're well served by the operating plan we have, and – Mr. Speaker, they might want to listen to this – they're well served by the savings plan we have because contrary to what they go out there and talk . . .

Mr. Saskiw: Borrowing money to save. Great idea.

Mr. Horner: Actually, you know what? I do borrow money and save on my house because I have an RRSP, and I have savings, and I have a mortgage. I'm certain the hon. member opposite has the same thing because he's obviously an astute individual who

would do that for his future and his children's future, too, I'm assuming, Mr. Speaker. If not, well, then we're back to the money-in-the-mattress mentality.

Mr. Speaker, it's pretty obvious that what we are doing is leading the nation in terms of our fiscal management and our fiscal operations and our fiscal reporting. We are proud of that fact and the triple-A, gold-plated credit rating that we hold in this province, gold standard, because that allows us to build Alberta, live within our means, and maintain the future for our province.

I encourage all hon. members to vote for the bill.

[Motion carried unanimously; Bill 35 read a third time]

Bill 37 Statutes Repeal Act

The Speaker: The hon. Minister of Transportation on behalf of.

Mr. McIver: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure to rise and move third reading of Bill 37, the Statutes Repeal Act, a rather sweeping bill that ensures that we have a competitive regulatory framework that is easy for every person and business to understand.

The act will repeal a group of 24 provisions in legislation that are unnecessary and obsolete. In the interest of time I won't read them all. Perhaps more importantly, the bill creates an automatic process of review every five years whereby unproclaimed legislation is automatically reviewed and, if it is no longer needed, repealed.

Mr. Speaker, several years ago the members for Calgary-Acadia, Calgary-Klein, and Battle River-Wainwright talked about the need to reduce red tape. This legislation does just that. Many times people talk about reducing red tape for businesses and individuals. This bill turns that talk into action. This is just another reason you should do business in the province. The Statutes Repeal Act shows that Alberta is committed to actively maintaining its body of provincial laws, and I am confident this legislation will serve Albertans well.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I would like to close debate and move third reading of Bill 37, the Statutes Repeal Act.

Thank you.

The Speaker: Hon. member, I hope you didn't mean that you wanted to close debate. You might want to adjourn debate, perhaps?

Mr. McIver: Correct, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Do you want to just say that?

Mr. McIver: Adjourn debate.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for that assistance.

[Motion to adjourn debate carried]

The Speaker: Deputy Government House Leader, did you wish to adjourn?

Mr. Campbell: Yes. Mr. Speaker, I think we'll call it 4:30 and adjourn until Monday at 1:30.

[Motion carried; the Assembly adjourned at 4:28 p.m. to Monday at 1:30 p.m.]

Bill Status Report for the 28th Legislature - 1st Session (2012-2013)

Activity to November 21, 2013

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 199 are Government Bills. Bills numbered 200 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 numbers until the conclusion of the Fall Sitings.

1* Workers' Compensation Amendment Act, 2012 (Redford)

First Reading -- 8 (May 24, 2012 aft., passed)

Second Reading -- 177 (Oct. 23, 2012 eve.), 193-96 (Oct. 23, 2012 eve.), 233 (Oct. 24, 2012 eve., passed)

Committee of the Whole -- 336-39 (Oct. 29, 2012 eve.), 354-71 (Oct. 30, 2012 aft.), 373-80 (Oct. 30, 2012 eve., passed with amendments)

Third Reading -- 476-84 (Nov. 1, 2012 aft., passed on division)

Royal Assent -- (Dec. 10, 2012 outside of House sitting) [Comes into force December 10, 2012; SA 2012 c8]

2* Responsible Energy Development Act (Hughes)

First Reading -- 207 (Oct. 24, 2012 aft., passed)

Second Reading -- 263 (Oct. 25, 2012 aft.), 424-43 (Oct. 31, 2012 aft.), 445-57 (Oct. 31, 2012 eve.), 526-46 (Nov. 5, 2012 eve., passed)

Committee of the Whole -- 563-71 (Nov. 6, 2012 aft.), 593 (Nov. 6, 2012 eve.), 644-48 (Nov. 7, 2012 aft.), 649-69 (Nov. 7, 2012 eve.), 731-53 (Nov. 19, 2012 eve.), 777-94 (Nov. 20, 2012 aft.), 795-853 (Nov. 20, 2012 eve.), 902-05 (Nov. 20, 2012 eve., passed on division, with amendments)

Third Reading -- 921-41 (Nov. 21, 2012 aft., passed on division)

Royal Assent -- (Dec. 10, 2012 outside of House sitting) [Comes into force on proclamation, with exceptions; SA 2012 cR-17.3]

3* Education Act (J. Johnson)

First Reading -- 155 (Oct. 23, 2012 aft., passed)

Second Reading -- 219-31 (Oct. 24, 2012 aft.), 238 (Oct. 24, 2012 eve., passed)

Committee of the Whole -- 380-407 (Oct. 30, 2012 eve., passed with amendments)

Third Reading -- 669 (Nov. 7, 2012 eve.), 688-94 (Nov. 8, 2012 aft.), 753-63 (Nov. 19, 2012 eve., passed on division)

Royal Assent -- (Dec. 10, 2012 outside of House sitting) [Comes into force on proclamation; SA 2012 cE-0.3]

4 Public Interest Disclosure (Whistleblower Protection) Act (Scott)

First Reading -- 352-53 (Oct. 30, 2012 aft., passed)

Second Reading -- 423-24 (Oct. 31, 2012 aft.), 593-614 (Nov. 6, 2012 eve.), 627-44 (Nov. 7, 2012 aft., passed on division)

Committee of the Whole -- 975-80 (Nov. 22, 2012 aft.), 1057-74 (Nov. 27, 2012 aft.), 1075-101 (Nov. 27, 2012 eve.), 1127-137 (Nov. 28, 2012 aft.), 1139-161 (Nov. 28, 2012 eve., passed)

Third Reading -- 1161-166 (Nov. 28, 2012 eve., passed on division)

Royal Assent -- (Dec. 10, 2012 outside of House sitting) [Comes into force on proclamation; SA 2012 cP-39.5]

5 New Home Buyer Protection Act (Griffiths)

First Reading -- 261 (Oct. 25, 2012 aft., passed)

Second Reading -- 354 (Oct. 30, 2012 aft.), 457-59 (Oct. 31, 2012 eve., passed)

Committee of the Whole -- 546-49 (Nov. 5, 2012 eve.), 571-83 (Nov. 6, 2012 aft.), 585-93 (Nov. 6, 2012 eve., passed)

Third Reading -- 853-55 (Nov. 20, 2012 eve., passed)

Royal Assent -- (Dec. 10, 2012 outside of House sitting) [Comes into force on proclamation; SA 2012 cN-3.2]

6 Protection and Compliance Statutes Amendment Act, 2012 (Jeneroux)

First Reading -- 155 (Oct. 23, 2012 aft., passed)

Second Reading -- 209 (Oct. 24, 2012 aft.), 264 (Oct. 25, 2012 aft., passed)

Committee of the Whole -- 459-62 (Oct. 31, 2012 eve., passed)

Third Reading -- 855-56 (Nov. 20, 2012 eve., passed)

Royal Assent -- (Dec. 10, 2012 outside of House sitting) [Comes into force on various dates; SA 2012 c7]

- 7*** **Election Accountability Amendment Act, 2012 (Denis)**
First Reading -- 774 (Nov. 20, 2012 aft., passed)
Second Reading -- 972-75 (Nov. 22, 2012 aft.), 1015-41 (Nov. 26, 2012 eve., passed)
Committee of the Whole -- 1166-167 (Nov. 28, 2012 eve.), 1191-92 (Nov. 29, 2012 aft.), 1221-43 (Dec. 3, 2012 eve.), 1261-79 (Dec. 4, 2012 aft.), 1281-1300 (Dec. 4, 2012 eve., passed, with amendments)
Third Reading -- 1315-37 (Dec. 5, 2012 aft., passed on division)
Royal Assent -- (Dec. 10, 2012 outside of House sitting) [Comes into force on various dates; SA 2012 c5]
- 8** **Electric Utilities Amendment Act, 2012 (Hughes)**
First Reading -- 156 (Oct. 23, 2012 aft., passed)
Second Reading -- 233 (Oct. 24, 2012 eve.), 316-36 (Oct. 29, 2012 eve, passed)
Committee of the Whole -- 857-902 (Nov. 20, 2012 eve.), 943-53 (Nov. 21, 2012 eve., passed)
Third Reading -- 953-56 (Nov. 21, 2012 eve., passed)
Royal Assent -- (Dec. 10, 2012 outside of House sitting) [Comes into force December 10, 2012; SA 2012 c6]
- 9** **Alberta Corporate Tax Amendment Act, 2012 (\$) (Horner)**
First Reading -- 156 (Oct. 23, 2012 aft., passed)
Second Reading -- 209-10 (Oct. 24, 2012 aft.), 272 (Oct. 25, 2012 aft.), 311-16 (Oct. 29, 2012 eve., passed)
Committee of the Whole -- 462 (Oct. 31, 2012 eve., passed)
Third Reading -- 856-57 (Nov. 20, 2012 eve., passed)
Royal Assent -- (Dec. 10, 2012 outside of House sitting) [Comes into force on various dates, SA 2012 c4]
- 10** **Employment Pension Plans Act (Kennedy-Glans)**
First Reading -- 261 (Oct. 25, 2012 aft., passed)
Second Reading -- 521-26 (Nov. 5, 2012 eve., passed)
Committee of the Whole -- 668-69 (Nov. 7, 2012 eve., passed)
Third Reading -- 857 (Nov. 20, 2012 eve., passed)
Royal Assent -- (Dec. 10, 2012 outside of House sitting) [Comes into force on proclamation; SA 2012 cE-8.1]
- 11** **Appropriation (Supplementary Supply) Act, 2013 (\$) (Horner)**
First Reading -- 1424 (Mar. 6, 2013 aft., passed)
Second Reading -- 1480-86 (Mar. 11, 2013 eve., passed)
Committee of the Whole -- 1534-41 (Mar. 12, 2013 eve., passed)
Third Reading -- 1583 (Mar. 13, 2013 aft.), 1559-60 (Mar. 13, 2013 eve., passed)
Royal Assent -- (Mar. 21, 2013 outside of House sitting) [Comes into force March 21, 2013; SA 2013 c2]
- 12** **Fiscal Management Act (\$) (Horner)**
First Reading -- 1438 (Mar. 7, 2013 aft., passed)
Second Reading -- 1479-80 (Mar. 11, 2013 eve.), 1560-78 (Mar. 13, 2013 aft.), 1579-83 (Mar. 13, 2013 eve.), 1785-90 (Apr. 11, 2013 aft.), 1877-85 (Apr. 18, 2013 aft., passed)
Committee of the Whole -- 1967-78 (Apr. 23, 2013 eve), 1981-86 (Apr. 23, 2013 eve, passed), 2007-15 (Apr. 24, 2013 aft.)
Third Reading -- 2027-35 (Apr. 24, 2013 eve., passed on division)
Royal Assent -- (Apr. 29, 2013 outside of House sitting) [Comes into force April 29, 2013; SA 2013 cF-14.5]
- 13** **Appropriation (Interim Supply) Act, 2013 (\$) (Horner)**
First Reading -- 1456 (Mar. 11, 2013 aft., passed)
Second Reading -- 1527-34 (Mar. 12, 2013 eve.), 1556 (Mar. 13, 2013 aft., passed)
Committee of the Whole -- 1583 (Mar. 13, 2013 eve., passed)
Third Reading -- 1695-1700 (Mar. 21, 2013 aft.), 1695-1700 (Mar. 21, 2013 aft., passed)
Royal Assent -- (Mar. 21, 2013 outside of House sitting) [Comes into force March 21, 2013; SA 2013 c1]
- 14** **RCMP Health Coverage Statutes Amendment Act, 2013 (VanderBurg)**
First Reading -- 1690 (Mar. 21, 2013 aft., passed)
Second Reading -- 1875 (Apr. 18, 2013 aft.), 1925-27 (Apr. 22, 2013 eve., passed)
Committee of the Whole -- 1966-67 (Apr. 23, 2013 eve., passed)
Third Reading -- 1986 (Apr. 23, 2013 eve., passed)
Royal Assent -- (Apr. 29, 2013 outside of House sitting) [Comes into force April 1, 2013; SA 2013 c4]
- 15** **Emergency 911 Act (\$) (Weadick)**
First Reading -- 1762 (Apr. 10, 2013 aft., passed)
Second Reading -- 1875-76 (Apr. 18, 2013 aft.), 1953-58 (Apr. 23, 2013 aft., passed)
Committee of the Whole -- 2040 (Apr. 24, 2013 eve., passed)
Third Reading -- 2130-31 (May 6, 2013 eve., passed)
Royal Assent -- (May 27, 2013 outside of House sitting) [Comes into force on proclamation; SA 2013 cE-7.5]

- 16 Victims Statutes Amendment Act, 2013 (\$) (Denis)**
First Reading -- 1762-63 (Apr. 10, 2013 aft., passed)
Second Reading -- 1958-61 (Apr. 23, 2013 aft.), 1963-67 (Apr. 23, 2013 eve., passed)
Committee of the Whole -- 2040 (Apr. 24, 2013 eve., passed)
Third Reading -- 2063-65 (Apr. 25, 2013 aft., passed)
Royal Assent -- (Apr. 29, 2013 outside of House sitting) [Comes into force on proclamation; SA 2013 c5]
- 17 Municipal Government Amendment Act, 2013 (Kubinec)**
First Reading -- 1779 (Apr. 11, 2013 aft., passed)
Second Reading -- 2123-25 (May 6, 2013 eve., passed)
Committee of the Whole -- 2161-64 (May 7, 2013 aft.), 2172-76 (May 7, 2013 eve., passed)
Third Reading -- 2176 (May 7, 2013 eve., passed)
Royal Assent -- (May 27, 2013 outside of House sitting) [Comes into force May 27, 2013; SA 2013 c9]
- 18 Pooled Registered Pension Plans Act (Fawcett)**
First Reading -- 1873 (Apr. 18, 2013 aft., passed)
Second Reading -- 2125-30 (May 6, 2013 eve., passed)
Committee of the Whole -- 2151-57 (May 7, 2013 aft., passed)
Third Reading -- 2169-71 (May 7, 2013 eve., passed)
Royal Assent -- (May 27, 2013 outside of House sitting) [Comes into force on proclamation; SA 2013 cP-18.5]
- 19 Metis Settlements Amendment Act, 2013 (Campbell)**
First Reading -- 1803 (Apr. 15, 2013 aft., passed)
Second Reading -- 1876-77 (Apr. 18, 2013 aft.), 2021-27 (Apr. 24, 2013 eve., passed)
Committee of the Whole -- 2101-23 (May 6, 2013 eve., passed)
Third Reading -- 2131-32 (May 6, 2013 eve., passed)
Royal Assent -- (May 27, 2013 outside of House sitting) [Comes into force May 27, 2013; SA 2013 c8]
- 20 Appropriation Act, 2013 (\$) (Horner)**
First Reading -- 1925 (Apr. 22, 2013 eve., passed)
Second Reading -- 1943-52 (Apr. 23, 2013 aft.), 1978-81 (Apr. 23, 2013 eve., passed)
Committee of the Whole -- 2015-19 (Apr. 24, 2013 aft.), 2035-39 (Apr. 24, 2013 eve., passed)
Third Reading -- 2057-63 (Apr. 25, 2013 aft., passed)
Royal Assent -- (Apr. 29, 2013 outside of House sitting) [Comes into force April 29, 2013; SA 2013 c3]
- 21 Environmental Protection and Enhancement Amendment Act, 2013 (Jansen)**
First Reading -- 2055 (Apr. 25, 2013 aft., passed)
Second Reading -- 2123 (May 6, 2013 eve.), 2157-61 (May 7, 2013 aft., passed)
Committee of the Whole -- 2165-68 (May 7, 2013 eve., passed)
Third Reading -- 2229-34 (May 8, 2013 eve.), 2238-55 (May 8, 2013 eve., passed)
Royal Assent -- (May 27, 2013 outside of House sitting) [Comes into force on proclamation; SA 2013 c7]
- 22 Aboriginal Consultation Levy Act (\$) (Campbell)**
First Reading -- 2191-92 (May 8, 2013 aft., passed)
Second Reading -- 2275-83 (May 9, 2013 aft.), 2321-342 (May 13, 2013 eve., passed)
Committee of the Whole -- 2413-442 (May 14, 2013 eve., passed)
Third Reading -- 2468-478 (May 15, 2013 aft., passed)
Royal Assent -- (May 27, 2013 outside of House sitting) [Comes into force on proclamation; SA 2013; cA-1.2]
- 23 Tax Statutes Amendment Act, 2013 (Horner)**
First Reading -- 2080 (May 6, 2013 aft., passed)
Second Reading -- 2150 (May 7, 2013 aft.), 2165 (May 7, 2013 eve., passed)
Committee of the Whole -- 2168 (May 7, 2013 eve., passed)
Third Reading -- 2172 (May 7, 2013 eve., passed)
Royal Assent -- (May 27, 2013 outside of House sitting) [Comes into force May 27, 2013, with exceptions; SA 2013 c11]
- 24 Statutes Amendment Act, 2013 (Bhullar)**
First Reading -- 2080 (May 6, 2013 aft., passed)
Second Reading -- 2150-51 (May 7, 2013 aft.), 2171-72 (May 7, 2013 eve.), 2157-61 (May 7, 2013 eve.), 2234-38 (May 8, 2013 eve., passed)
Committee of the Whole -- 2255-58 (May 8, 2013 eve., passed)
Third Reading -- 2273-75 (May 9, 2013 aft., passed)
Royal Assent -- (May 27, 2013 outside of House sitting) [Comes into force May 27, 2013, with exceptions; SA 2013 c10]

- 25* Children First Act (\$) (Hancock)**
First Reading -- 2145 (May 7, 2013 aft., passed)
Second Reading -- 2194-2212 (May 8, 2013 aft.), 2213-29 (May 8, 2013 eve., passed on division)
Committee of the Whole -- 2342-375 (May 13, 2013 eve, passed with amendments)
Third Reading -- 2408-410 (May 14, 2013 aft., passed)
Royal Assent -- (May 27, 2013 outside of House sitting) [Comes into force on proclamation; SA 2013 cC-12.5]
- 26 Assurance for Students Act (J. Johnson)**
First Reading -- 2394 (May 14, 2013 aft., passed)
Second Reading -- 2403-408 (May 14, 2013 aft., passed)
Committee of the Whole -- 2442-444 (May 14, 2013 eve., passed)
Third Reading -- 2464-468 (May 15, 2013 aft., passed)
Royal Assent -- (May 27, 2013 outside of House sitting) [Comes into force May 27, 2013; SA 2013 cA-44.8]
- 27 Flood Recovery and Reconstruction Act (Griffiths)**
First Reading -- 2495 (Oct. 28, 2013 aft., passed)
Second Reading -- 2549-50 (Oct. 29, 2013 eve.), 2584-94 (Oct. 30, 2013 aft.), 2706-14 (Nov. 4, 2013 eve., passed)
Committee of the Whole -- 2732-44 (Nov. 5, 2013 aft.), 2749-71 (Nov. 5, 2013 eve.), 2796-808 (Nov. 6, 2013 aft.), 2809-19 (Nov. 6, 2013 eve., passed)
- 28 Modernizing Regional Governance Act (Griffiths)**
First Reading -- 2495 (Oct. 28, 2013 aft., passed)
Second Reading -- 2550 (Oct. 29, 2013 eve.), 2594-601 (Oct. 30, 2013 aft.), 2603-641 (Oct. 30, 2013 eve., passed)
- 29 Pharmacy and Drug Amendment Act, 2013 (Horne)**
First Reading -- 2495-6 (Oct. 28, 2013 aft., passed)
Second Reading -- 2534 (Oct. 29, 2013 aft.), 2550-60 (Oct. 29, 2013 eve., passed)
Committee of the Whole -- 2705-6 (Nov. 4, 2013 eve., passed)
Third Reading -- 2771 (Nov. 5, 2013 eve., passed)
Royal Assent -- (Nov. 7, 2013 outside of House sitting) [Comes into force December 19, 2013; SA 2013 c13]
- 30* Building Families and Communities Act (\$) (Hancock)**
First Reading -- 2581 (Oct. 30, 2013 aft., passed)
Second Reading -- 2788-96 (Nov. 6, 2013 aft., passed)
Committee of the Whole -- 2937-60 (Nov. 19, 2013 eve., passed with amendments)
- 31 Protecting Alberta's Environment Act (\$) (McQueen)**
First Reading -- 2496 (Oct. 28, 2013 aft., passed)
Second Reading -- 2544-7 (Oct. 29, 2013 aft.), 2560-6 (Oct. 29, 2013 eve.), 2657-65 (Oct. 31, 2013 aft.), 2703-5 (Nov. 4, 2013 eve., passed)
Committee of the Whole -- 2744-7 (Nov. 5, 2013 aft.), 2749-71 (Nov. 5, 2013 eve., passed)
Third Reading -- 2819-24 (Nov. 6, 2013 eve.), 2848-49 (Nov. 7, 2013 aft.), 2895 (Nov. 18, 2013 eve., passed)
- 32 Enhancing Safety on Alberta Roads Act (McIver)**
First Reading -- 2526 (Oct. 29, 2013 aft., passed)
Second Reading -- 2583-4 (Oct. 30, 2013 aft.), 2886-91 (Nov. 18, 2013 eve., passed)
- 33 Tobacco Reduction Amendment Act, 2013 (Rodney)**
First Reading -- 2837 (Nov. 7, 2013 aft., passed)
Second Reading -- 2885 (Nov. 18, 2013 eve.), 2981-87 (Nov. 20, 2013 aft., passed)
- 34 Building New Petroleum Markets Act (\$) (Hughes)**
First Reading -- 2786 (Nov. 6, 2013 aft., passed)
Second Reading -- 2846 (Nov. 7, 2013 aft.), 2913-27 (Nov. 19, 2013 aft., passed)
Committee of the Whole -- 2997-3010 (Nov. 20, 2013 eve., passed)
- 35 Financial Administration Amendment Act, 2013 (Horner)**
First Reading -- 2678 (Nov. 4, 2013 aft., passed)
Second Reading -- 2731-2 (Nov. 5, 2013 aft.), 2928-31 (Nov. 19, 2013 aft.), 2933-37 (Nov. 19, 2013 eve., passed)
Committee of the Whole -- 2993 (Nov. 20, 2013 aft., passed)
Third Reading -- 3029-39 (Nov. 21, 2013 aft., passed)

- 37 Statutes Repeal Act (\$) (Denis)**
 First Reading -- 2786 (Nov. 6, 2013 aft., passed)
 Second Reading -- 2846-47 (Nov. 7, 2013 aft.), 2891-94 (Nov. 18, 2013 eve.), 2960 (Nov. 19, 2013 eve., passed)
 Committee of the Whole -- 2993-96 (Nov. 20, 2013 aft., passed)
 Third Reading -- 3039 (Nov. 21, 2013 aft., adjourned)
- 38 Statutes Amendment Act, 2013 (No. 2) (\$) (Denis)**
 First Reading -- 2837-38 (Nov. 7, 2013 aft., passed)
 Second Reading -- 2885-86 (Nov. 18, 2013 eve.), 2960-62 (Nov. 19, 2013 eve., passed)
 Committee of the Whole -- 2996 (Nov. 20, 2013 aft., passed)
- 39 Enhancing Consumer Protection in Auto Insurance Act (Horner)**
 First Reading -- 2786 (Nov. 6, 2013 aft., passed)
 Second Reading -- 2847-48 (Nov. 7, 2013 aft.), 2987-90 (Nov. 20, 2013 aft., passed)
- 40 Settlement of International Investment Disputes Act (Quadri)**
 First Reading -- 2678-9 (Nov. 4, 2013 aft., passed)
 Second Reading -- 2732 (Nov. 5, 2013 aft.), 2990-93 (Nov. 20, 2013 aft., passed)
- 41 Premier's Council on the Status of Persons with Disabilities Amendment Act, 2013 (Oberle)**
 First Reading -- 2727 (Nov. 5, 2013 aft., passed)
 Second Reading -- 2787-8 (Nov. 6, 2013 aft.), 2896-98 (Nov. 18, 2013 eve., passed)
- 43 Alberta Economic Development Authority Amendment Act, 2013 (Lukaszuk)**
 First Reading -- 2727 (Nov. 5, 2013 aft., passed)
 Second Reading -- 2788 (Nov. 6, 2013 aft.), 2898 (Nov. 18, 2013 eve.), 2927-28 (Nov. 19, 2013 aft., passed)
 Committee of the Whole -- 3010-14 (Nov. 20, 2013 eve., passed)
- 44 Notaries and Commissioners Act (Olesen)**
 First Reading -- 2976 (Nov. 20, 2013 aft., passed)
 Second Reading -- 3028-29 (Nov. 21, 2013 aft., adjourned)
- 201* Scrap Metal Dealers and Recyclers Identification Act (Quest)**
 First Reading -- 92 (May 30, 2012 aft., passed)
 Second Reading -- 291-301 (Oct. 29, 2012 aft., passed)
 Committee of the Whole -- 716-22 (Nov. 19, 2012 aft.), 1725-26 (Apr. 8, 2013 aft., passed with amendments)
 Third Reading -- 1726-27 (Apr. 8, 2013 aft., passed)
 Royal Assent -- (Apr. 29, 2013 outside of House sitting) [Comes into force on proclamation; SA 2013 cS-3.5]
- 202 Public Lands (Grasslands Preservation) Amendment Act, 2012 (Brown)**
 First Reading -- 130 (May 31, 2012 aft., passed)
 Second Reading -- 501-13 (Nov. 5, 2012 aft.), 1723-25 (Apr. 8, 2013 aft., defeated on division)
- 203 Employment Standards (Compassionate Care Leave) Amendment Act, 2012 (Jeneroux)**
 First Reading -- 473 (Nov. 1, 2012 aft., passed)
 Second Reading -- 1900 (Apr. 22, 2013 aft., passed)
 Committee of the Whole -- 2298-303 (May 13, 2013 aft., passed)
 Third Reading -- 2303 (May 13, 2013 aft., passed)
 Royal Assent -- (May 27, 2013 outside of House sitting) [Comes into force on proclamation; SA 2013 c6]
- 204 Irlen Syndrome Testing Act (Jablonski)**
 First Reading -- 968 (Nov. 22, 2012 aft., passed), 1912 (Apr. 22, 2013 aft., referred to Standing Committee on Families and Communities), (Oct. 28, 2013 aft., motion to concur in report), (Nov. 4, 2013 aft., reported to Assembly, not proceeded with)
- 205 Fisheries (Alberta) Amendment Act, 2012 (Calahasen)**
 First Reading -- 1117 (Nov. 28, 2012 aft., passed), 1913 (Apr. 22, 2013 aft., referred to Standing Committee on Resource Stewardship), (Oct. 28, 2013 aft., motion to concur in report), (Nov. 4, 2013 aft., reported to Assembly, not proceeded with)
- 206* Tobacco Reduction (Flavoured Tobacco Products) Amendment Act, 2013 (Cusanelli)**
 First Reading -- 1350-51 (Dec. 6, 2012 aft., passed)
 Second Reading -- 2303-312 (May 13, 2013 aft., passed)
 Committee of the Whole -- 2687-94 (Nov. 4, 2013 aft.), 2865-73 (Nov. 18, 2013 aft., passed with amendments)

- 207* Human Tissue and Organ Donation Amendment Act, 2013 (Webber)**
First Reading -- 1690 (Mar. 21, 2013 aft., passed), 2375 (May 13, 2013 eve., moved to Government Bills and Orders)
Second Reading -- 2395-403 (May 14, 2013 aft., passed)
Committee of the Whole -- 2534-44 (Oct. 29, 2013 aft.), 2566-8 (Oct. 29, 2013 eve., passed with amendments)
Third Reading -- 2566-8 (Oct. 29, 2013 eve., passed)
Royal Assent -- (Nov. 7, 2013 outside of House sitting) [Comes into force November 7, 2013; SA 2013 c12]
- 208 Seniors' Advocate Act (Towle)**
First Reading -- 1315 (Dec. 5, 2012 aft., passed)
Second Reading -- 2873-83 (Nov. 18, 2013 aft., adjourned)
- 209 Severance and Bonus Limitation Statutes Amendment Act, 2013 (Anderson)**
First Reading -- 2976 (Nov. 20, 2013 aft., passed)
- Pr1* Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints in Canada Act (Dorward)**
First Reading -- 1999 (Apr. 24, 2013 aft., passed)
Second Reading -- 2410-411 (May 14, 2013 aft., passed)
Committee of the Whole -- 2445-446 (May 14, 2013 eve., passed with amendments)
Third Reading -- 2478 (May 15, 2013 aft., passed)
Royal Assent -- (May 27, 2013 outside of House sitting) [Comes into force May 27, 2013]
- Pr2* Wild Rose Agricultural Producers Amendment Act, 2013 (McDonald)**
First Reading -- 1999 (Apr. 24, 2013 aft., passed)
Second Reading -- 2413 (May 14, 2013 eve., passed)
Committee of the Whole -- 2445 (May 14, 2013 eve., passed with amendments)
Third Reading -- 2478 (May 15, 2013 aft., passed)
Royal Assent -- (May 27, 2013 outside of House sitting) [Comes into force May 27, 2013]

Table of Contents

Prayers	3015
Introduction of Visitors	3015, 3035
Introduction of Guests	3015, 3017
Members' Statements	
National Housing Day	3016
Emergency Medical Services	3016
Affordable Housing in Cold Lake	3017
Yvonne Johnson	3017
Veteran Students' Remembrance	3027
Registered Apprenticeship Program Scholarships	3027
Statement by the Speaker	
Rules and Practices of the Assembly	3018
Oral Question Period	
School Construction Contracts	3019
Michener Centre Closure	3019, 3021
Publication of Reports	3020
Emergency Medical Worker Health and Safety	3020
Highway 63 Services	3021
School Construction and Modernization	3022
Flood Mitigation Projects	3022
Foothills Hospital Kitchen Renovation	3023
Registry Services	3023
University of Alberta Research Partnership	3024
Infrastructure Maintenance	3024
Oil and Gas Development on Grazing Lands	3024
Strathmore Hospital Capital Funding	3025
Bingo Licensee Voucher Use	3025
Emergency Medical Services Response Times	3026
Presenting Petitions	3027
Notices of Motions	3027
Tabling Returns and Reports	3027
Orders of the Day	3028
Government Motions	
Address to House by Hon. David Alward	3028
Chief Electoral Officer Appointment	3028
Government Bills and Orders	
Second Reading	
Bill 44 Notaries and Commissioners Act	3028
Third Reading	
Bill 35 Financial Administration Amendment Act, 2013	3029, 3035
Bill 37 Statutes Repeal Act	3039

If your address is incorrect, please clip on the dotted line, make any changes, and return to the address listed below. To facilitate the update, please attach the last mailing label along with your account number.

Subscriptions
Legislative Assembly Office
1001 Legislature Annex
9718 – 107 Street
EDMONTON, AB T5K 1E4

Last mailing label:

Account # _____

New information:

Name:

Address:

Subscription information:

Annual subscriptions to the paper copy of *Alberta Hansard* (including annual index) are \$127.50 including GST if mailed once a week or \$94.92 including GST if picked up at the subscription address below or if mailed through the provincial government interdepartmental mail system. Bound volumes are \$121.70 including GST if mailed. Cheques should be made payable to the Minister of Finance.

Price per issue is \$0.75 including GST.

Online access to *Alberta Hansard* is available through the Internet at www.assembly.ab.ca

Subscription inquiries:

Subscriptions
Legislative Assembly Office
1001 Legislature Annex
9718 – 107 St.
EDMONTON, AB T5K 1E4
Telephone: 780.427.1302

Other inquiries:

Managing Editor
Alberta Hansard
1001 Legislature Annex
9718 – 107 St.
EDMONTON, AB T5K 1E4
Telephone: 780.427.1875